Dialectics of Leadership for Peace: Toward a Moral Model of Resistance

Bernice Ledbetter
Pepperdine University

This paper presents an argument for establishing the purpose of leadership as peace. Leading for peace assumes the possibility of moral progress. Using a dialectic approach, power and resistance are considered not dualistic opposites, but rather complex, ambiguous and interrelated constructs. From this dialectic, a model of resistance leadership, grounded in moral imagination, is presented. The Occupy Wall Street Movement is discussed as an example of moral resistance leadership, operating in the service of moral progress. By casting leadership as a certain kind of resistance, we discover a possible framework for understanding social change within organizations and societies.

INTRODUCTION

Peace is not commonly associated with the study of leadership. In most leadership texts, one is not apt to find a chapter dedicated to advancing peace in the world. Much of the seminal research in the field of leadership studies deals with the structure of leadership in search of a single definition and a general theory (Goethals & Sorenson, 2006). Behavioral approaches to leading involving various styles of leadership also feature prominently. A more pressing question for leadership scholars and practitioners has surfaced, what is the purpose of leadership – leadership for what? While this question has simmered beneath the surface of leadership scholarship since its inception, it is steadily rising to the surface of leadership consciousness.

The topic of peace has historically been located in the scholarship of public policy, political science, and history. Threats to peace are headline news, for example, tension in the Middle East, the worldwide economic decline, and the stubborn high rate of unemployment. Social movements such as the Arab Spring and the Occupy Movement along with Muslim leaders' call for peace have all foregrounded social justice issues and invited serious consideration concerning the connection between leadership and peace. World events are forcing leadership scholars to consider the deeper purpose of leadership – leadership for what? This paper suggests peace is the primary answer.

PEACE

Frequently definitions of peace begin with cessation, e.g. the reduction of violence, hostility, unrest, and war (Fort & Schipani, 2002). Matthew King (2010), provides a straight forward description, "Peace is a state of existence for a society within which conflicts are managed without violence, and result in the advancement of social, moral, economic and political aspects of society to the betterment of the people" (p. 172). Peace is concerned with civil and human rights, and justice. Peace builders aim to prevent violence and work to bring a reconciliation of issues for the good of society**.** We know peace is present

when there is a recognition and rejection of violence, where differences are resolved through dialogue and not violent conflict, where there is critical awareness of injustice, and where a moral imaginative understanding of peace leads to increased social justice (Lederach, 2005; Joseph & Duss, 2009).

Transcending cycles of violence and advancing durable peace requires moral imagination and involves a great deal of responsibility (Lederach, 2005). According to Wolpe & McDonald (2008) a culture of sustainable peace requires establishing "collaborative capacity" among those engaged in or holding the potential for conflict (p. 141). Such capacity invites a shift in consciousness to understand the deep connection shared between individuals and groups. Yet, there is a certain ironic fear that exists because connection invites freedom to choose, to speak, to act and this carries with it a kind of fear of responsibility, Bauman (1993) calls this, "the unbearable silence of responsibility" (p. 78). Might there as well be a fear of peace? For peace demands a high level of responsibility to first build and then keep the peace. Is peace too fragile to keep? The fragility of peace is wrapped up in vulnerability, in so far as peace requires recognition of the fundamental truth of our interdependence and connection to one another. This played out dramatically in the Truth & Reconciliation Commission in South Africa where vulnerability gave rise to responsibility for administering justice for all. Indeed, it was collaborative capacity that enabled reconciliation to exist which paved the way to peace. Reconciliation required enormous vulnerability expressed through the "…acknowledgment of guilt; showing remorse and repenting; asking for and giving forgiveness; and paying compensation or reparations" (Murithi, 2009, p. 228). This process set the conditions for developing a culture of peace. Which begs a question, what if instead of preparing for war, we planned for peace? The challenge of building lasting peace is ever present.

To address this challenge I proceed as follows. I begin by explaining a dialectic approach to reconceptualize power and resistance, not as duality but as mutually constructive elements of leadership (Collinson, 2005). This sets the groundwork for conceiving of resistance as a form of leadership useful for building peace. Next, I argue that resistance leadership to advance peace must engage moral imagination, and to make this claim I show that moral progress is possible. Lastly, I propose that peace will take some time and thus depends on the generation now coming into leadership, GEN Y, to carry the work forward. I end by applying the ideas of resistance leadership for moral progress to a contemporary case example, the Occupy Wall Street Movement to illustrate how peace work might advance in a similar fashion. At the out-set, I establish a set of four propositions:

> *Proposition 1. Mapping a process of leadership for peace requires a dialectical approach*
> *Proposition 2. Resistance leadership for peace must be moral*
> *Proposition 3. Moral resistance for peace assumes the idea of moral progress*
> *Proposition 4. Moral progress and the work of resistance for peace depends on the next generation*

The central purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that peace leadership requires moral resistance and the Occupy Movement is a case example of this possibility.

DIALECTICS OF LEADERSHIP: POWER AND RESISTANCE

A dialectical approach begins with dialogue, evidence of this method reaches as far back as Plato in the Socratic dialogues (Lublink, 2011). Dialectical seeks to hold together seeming opposites. Such an approach offers a process for dealing with contradictions by inviting us, as Hegel instructed, to preserve the useful portion of an idea or thing or society while moving beyond its limitations (Brincat, 2009).

In the dialectical, both ideas in the contradiction have something in common. To grasp this commonality requires an understanding of the parts to understand their relationship within the whole system. The whole of reality as an evolving process is considered and therefore a dialectical approach rejects dualisms in favor of maintaining focus on both ideas simultaneously. Dialectical is a transcendence of opposites entailing an imaginative leap to a higher level of reasoning that leads to a

justification for rejecting both alternatives as false and/or helps illuminate a real and integral relationship between apparent opposites that have been kept apart and regarded as distinct (Brincat, 2009).

For the purposes of this discussion, I will argue that leadership for peace requires considering the dialectic of power and resistance. In this way, rather than dualistic opposites, power and resistance are understood as complex, ambiguous and interrelated constructs (Collinson, 2005). Typically with reference to leadership we think of power as a means for dealing with resistance; power over to suppress resistance. Holding these constructs dialectically offers a way to see resistance as influence necessary for leadership rather than contrary to leadership, particularly leadership for peace.

By casting leadership as a certain kind of resistance, we discover a possible framework for understanding social change for peace within organizations and societies. Resistance leaders see themselves as social change agents, activists and consciousness-raisers. They work to re-humanize work and society – reconceptualizing the dominant organizational bureaucratic power-over paradigm, which ultimately leads to instrumentalism, dismantling the tendency to see people as instruments to accomplishing organizational goals (Collinson, 2005). Ironically, organizational leaders create dysfunctional structures and, dialectically play a critical role in disrupting common paradigms of power and resistance to re-humanize work. When leadership itself is seen as possessing the capacity for social critique to uncover deep power structures embedded within the traditional views of the discipline, we can begin to understand a simultaneous leadership process involving both power and resistance useful for transforming structures of domination (Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007). Resistance leadership challenges traditional either/or thinking and instead views power and resistance as "mutually implicated, co-constructed and interdependent processes that have multiple, ambiguous and contradictory meanings and consequences" (Collinson, 2005, p. 1427). This broader view of leadership, a sort of radical translation of the concept of leading, involves the willingness to ascertain, determine and discern oppression, and domination in its subtle and profound forms as impediments to peace.

A dialectic of power/resistance views resistance as a form of power where power is seen as influence, exercised as resistance and not as power over and against. Familiar concepts come to mind when we consider power as it relates to leadership – charisma, authority, and influence. Charisma in particular has received a good deal of attention in the leadership literature and is associated with organizational change (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Recall, however Weber, who was among the first to articulate a theory of charisma, cautioned that charisma is naturally unstable, and even revolutionary (Adair-Toteff, 2005). Because of its inherent instability, charisma is not considered a viable source of power in the dialectic with resistance for leading peace. All too often power is explored as a surface issue in its relation to leadership to the neglect of deep power structures in society, which must be taken up if we have any chance at leading for the sake of peace. Rost (1991) got at this problem at bit by placing the focus on leadership content rather than the leader or leadership. Moreover, modern origins of leadership studies in the work of Burns (1978) have given us the construct of the transformative capacity of leadership in society.

Critical theorists have argued leadership research has focused too much on managerial effectiveness rather than social critique (Brown, 2004; Fournier & Grey, 2000; Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007). The largely quantitative and managerial focus of leadership studies has produced a kind of methodological individualism, a belief in the 'power of one' (Gronn, 2000, p. 319). Adding to this, mainstream leadership theory tends to emphasize leadership as a process that is asymmetrical and unidirectional. In the rush to set goal accomplishment and shareholder wealth as the primary ends of leadership, leadership theory neglected the deeper moral purpose of leading.

In considering the dialectic of resistance and power, the notion of freedom also comes into play. Resistance leadership approaches leading as the practice of freedom in the sense of liberation (Freire, 2000; hooks, 1994). Leading to promote liberation is leading to transgress boundaries that deny freedom – this requires critical interrogation of practices, processes, and systems that promote power to dominate at the cost of freedom. Resistance leaders liberate through speech to undermine coercive power, and through silence to give space for tolerances that resist power. Commenting on Foucault, Harvey (2006) suggests different historical eras produce, and are produced by different kinds of power. The sword was the old

power, modern power is the power of surveillance, and thus Foucault praises resistance in response to modern power structures that limit freedom; and if we limit freedom, we limit peace.

The leadership literature is for the most part silent on the idea of leadership as conceived as transgressing boundaries and transforming structures of domination. Culturally embedded images of power have been displayed through strength and violence. George Orwell, through his own struggles with power in Burma, writes, "...when man turns tyrant it is his own freedom that he destroys" (as cited in Harvey, 2006, p. 81). Moreover, leadership has been understood as a form of domination, as a kind of "colonization" to bring followers into compliance using power as domination. Thus, ideas of dissent and resistance have long been understood from the point of view of revolutionary followers.

Indeed, managerial scholars often treat organizational resistance as disruptive of stable meanings, cultures, or systems, which must therefore be managed. The assumption often is that dissenters, almost by definition, destabilize things to disrupt the flow of organizing, while management seeks to return to the status quo. However, resistance leaders must manage both the fluidity and consistency of systems, which means resistance leadership may involve disrupting a stable system and this may require rejection of long standing, well-established definitions of leadership and power.

RESISTANCE LEADERSHIP

This paper posits that peace is the purpose of leadership and is primarily achieved through resistance. Critical leadership scholars point out that resistance can be understood as a form of leadership, that leadership can actually facilitate resistance (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012; Zoller & Fairhrst, 2007). Resistance leaders critique dualisms common to mainstream leadership approaches such as leader-follower, individual-collective, worker-manager, and reason-emotion (Collinson, 2005; Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007). Resistance leaders are those who notice and attend to practices of domination and exploitation and respond by developing a "hidden transcript of indignation" (Scott, 1990, p. 7). Because of this awareness, resistance leaders are in the best position to transform structures of domination and "… formulate discourses of dignity and justice for the marginalized…" (Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007, p. 1347). In this way, resistance leadership acts as a mobilization process for transformation, often involving many and not merely one central leader.

Albert Camus, French writer and philosopher, often associated with the existentialist camp, won a Nobel Prize for Literature in 1957, he was a person with a checkered past, he became a pacifist and devoted his efforts to human rights in the 1950's and his thinking is often associated with the practical ideas of resistance and rebellion.

In an essay in 1957 under the heading "The Artist and His Time" Camus writes of the role of the artist and the writer in society to effect change. If we take leadership to be a kind of art and replace Camus's references to the artist with the word leadership – I believe this is what Camus (1961) would say to us today. "Every leader tries to give form to the passions of his time. Yesterday it was love. Today the great passions of unity and liberty disrupt the world. Perhaps it is harder today. It is possible to fall love once in a while. Once is enough, after all. But it is not possible to be a militant in one's spare time. And so the leader of today becomes unreal if he remains in his ivory tower or sterilized if he spends his time galloping around the political arena. Yet between the two lies the arduous way of true leadership. It seems to me that the leader must be fully aware of the dramas of his time and that he must take sides every time he can or knows how to do so" (Based on Camus, 1961, p. 182). What Camus is saying is passion must fuel social action and such action is not a sidebar hobby. Social action leading to change is a choice to live in a tension, leading through the dialectic of power and resistance to advance liberation for the sake of peace.

To lead with resistance, to transgress forms of domination individually and collectively, we must critically consider our values and the valuing of peace. bell hooks (1994) rightly points out that resistance leaders create a location of possibility. In this field of possibility, we labor for freedom, but, she asks, do our values and habits of being reflect our commitment to freedom, our commitment to peace? Moreover, Dr. King declared, "…we will be unable to move forward if we do not experience a true revolution of

values… We must rapidly shift from being 'thing oriented' to 'person-oriented'…. A civilization can flounder as readily in the face of moral and spiritual bankruptcy as it can through financial bankruptcy. It is not enough to say, we must not wage war. It is necessary to love peace and sacrifice for it. We must concentrate not merely on the eradication of war but on the affirmation of peace" (King, 1968, p. 195-197).

Might we be bankrupt in the currency of peace? Currency of this kind is available through a social commitment to the common good defined as the "intersection of personal passion and public need" (Crosby & Bryson, 2004, p.853). Morally grounded in the ethical values associated with dedication to the common good such as compassion, empathy, and shared power, resistance leaders strive to advance peace. I suggest that in order to move forward with a sustainable plan for greater peace, moral grounding, wisdom, and keen insight are needed if we are to promote peace vis-a-vis resistance leadership. Without morality, resistance subsumes into violence and even war. Without this grounding leadership as resistance can too easily lead to leadership for force and domination. Viewing leadership through the lens of resistance thus requires moral imagination.

MORAL IMAGINATION

Moral imagination needed for leading for peace according to John Paul Lederach (2005) is mainly a concern for holding together paradox, curiosity, creativity and risk; these tensions, if you will, create a kind of generative energy necessary for peace-building. Lederach (2005) argues relationship is the central organizing concept in the moral imagination for peace. "…moral imagination rises with the capacity to imagine ourselves in relationship, the willingness to embrace complexity without reliance on dualistic polarity, the belief in the creative act, and acceptance of the inherent risk required to break violence and to venture on unknown paths that build constructive change" (Lederach, 2005, p. 29).

Building on this notion of relationships, Margaret Wheatley (2003) reminds us that nothing living lives alone. Indeed for peace to exist individuals and communities must develop and enlarge their capacity to imagine themselves in a web of relationship, even with enemies; this speaks to the interdependency of our collective web. Thus, resistance leaders for peace must be skilled in the arts of web making and web watching.

Moral imagination demonstrates concern for injustice expressed as moral indignation in the context of political consciousness. Narrative is important here in the form of story. Effective resistance leaders develop powerful stories that embody collective action and resonate with a particular constituency (Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007). Narrative as a form of moral imagination is the means by which we stir urgency for this real but intangible challenge. This implies the necessity for agency, essentially the belief that change is possible – to deny the immutability of some undesirable situation – to believe we are agents of our own history.

From the leadership literature, we can take a good understanding of agency and the role of mobilizing and influencing to lead change. However, the existing critical leadership literature points out that we often see the one single leader leading change and thus greater attention is needed to understand the process of mobilization from individual action toward collective attempts at social change (Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007). Envisioning leadership as collective rather than individual requires a moral imaginative leap in interpretation of leadership theory and practice.

Moral imagination in the service of peace requires us to resist fatalism and cynicism and its close cousin contempt – where hopelessness and powerlessness may prevail - cynicism has become chic and works in the opposite direction of moral imagination; cynicism has a self-defensive nature (why waste my time on something I cannot influence?). The tone is ironic, providing a safe distance and an air of condescension toward political systems and civic engagement. Equally challenging to the goal of peace is the deep-rooted individualism in our culture. We must resist these tendencies and instead exercise moral imagination. This shift requires tremendous courage because it means I must come to acknowledge and confess my failings in fully accepting my responsibility in humanizing the other, courage to acknowledge I have contributed to the problem of a lack of peace – I am part of the pattern of systems that have worked

against peace. Thus, moral imagination requires a kind of resistance against the potential for self-ignorance, in favor of reflexivity, honest appraisal and rationality to engage in simultaneous objectivity and subjectivity.

Finally, moral imagination involves identity in the form of defining who the "we" is in a movement for social change; here we attend to inclusivity and consider collective identity and race, a color-blind discourse, even in the context of considering peace, can exclude people of color. If we fail to examine the way in which whiteness and privilege influence worldviews and relationships, we have failed to be inclusive. Being inclusive in this discourse must be intentional. In actuality, avoiding racial and class differences leads to exclusionary practices, which only serve to undermine peace (Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007).

Identity also refers to the capacity to name. Using moral imagination to ground resistance as a potential form of leadership involves the capacity to name the world as it is. To name something is to give it voice and place. Naming can and often is a collective process of resistance when dialogue gives way to transforming domination; to deny naming is dehumanizing aggression (Freire, 2000). Further, I would suggest that the ivory tower of yesterday's leadership is filled with images of domination and top down hierarchies of oppression, these ideas and models of leadership aren't going to get us very far down the road toward peace. A morally imaginative approach to leading with resistance for peace will build on the values of prudence, moderation, tolerance and the belief that peace as the necessary basis for human progress (Lievan & Hulsman, 2006).

THE IDEA OF MORAL PROGRESS

While critics take issue with this notion of progress (Nietzche, 1886; Popper, 1957) still I think it is worth our while in this particular discussion on advancing peace to consider this philosophical construct, which serves as the underlying assumption built into the proposition of leading for peace.

The idea of progress gained philosophical and practical prominence during the period 1750-1950 and as Nisbet (1994) points out "No single idea has ever been more important than, perhaps as important as, the idea of progress in the Western civilization" (p. 4). This is an idea finding its zenith in the enlightenment and lies beneath other ideas including liberty, justice equality, community and peace. Indeed, "…all of the social sciences without exception – political economy, sociology, anthropology, social psychology, cultural geography, and others [including leadership] – were almost literally founded upon the rock of faith in human progress…" (p. 175).

It can be argued that the idea of progress is a way of orienting time, taking a linear view, suggesting that as time progresses, things get better. In a similar way, progress assumes continuity, gradualness, naturalness, and by many considered not accidental, but part of the scheme of things in the universe and society, where advance occurs from inferior to superior. (Nisbet, 1994; Marx, 1996).

We can think of progress in at least two ways, the progression of thought, say in science and technology that lead to scientific advances, evidenced in obvious and measureable examples such as increase in the standards of living. The second, less certain way to think about progress is the advancement of humanity's moral or spiritual condition (Marx, 1996; Mazlich, 1996; Nisbet, 1994). With respect to the first, advancement is typically sequential, incremental or cumulative where the aim is to reach a better understanding and control of the matter of study such as physics, biology or mathematics. Here there is a kind of accumulation and revision, in such instances we have little doubt what it means to make progress and its value (Marx, 1996). Conversely, Mazlich (1996) posits moral progress is not cumulative and not progressive in the same way we understand scientific inquiry. Moody-Adams (1999) suggests we know moral progress has taken place when our understanding of moral principles deepens. When we consider progress along the lines of morality, matters become almost hopelessly complicated and conflicting. When we try to speak of progress in humanity or civilization, we are immediately confronted with the knowledge that great good and great bad have come from those each embracing the idea of progress. Even still, Leo Marx (1996) points out that, "The history of all that is greatest in the west – religion, science, reason, freedom, equality, justice, philosophy, the arts, and so on – is grounded deeply

in the belief that what one does with one's own time is at once tribute to the greatness and indispensability of the past, and confidence in an ever more golden future" (p. 8). Rorty (2007) adds that "we have been equally successful in both morality and physics", that scientific inquiry along with moral inquiry works much the same way (p. 921). He makes the point that a good deal of evidence exists to support the claim that moral progress is alive and well, by pointing out we know more about right and wrong than we did two centuries ago and we know more about nature; our practices have changed for the better. Still, Iggers (1965) would disagree and remind us that change does not necessary indicate moral progress.

However, Immanuel Kant argued that progress is neither automatic nor continuous and does not measure knowledge or wealth, but is a painful and largely inadvertent passage from barbarism through civilization toward enlightened culture and the abolition of war (Schuler, 1995). Kant called for education, with the education of humankind seen as a slow process whereby world history propels humankind toward peace - through war, international commerce, and enlightened self-interest (Schuler, 1995). In other words, Kant believes we do pass through a kind of continuum or dialectic perhaps from war to peace – how long that takes, he does not say.

In order for the idea of progress to exist and advance, rational values are required. Iggers (1965) states, "Without the belief in the existence of rational values, the idea of progress is meaningless" (p.2). Thus, the idea of progress requires sustainability of rational moral values. Even still, how does moral progress develop? Is moral progress simply greater realization of the Golden Rule, an accumulative perspective, a belief that morality builds on itself much like scientific knowledge accumulates? This question of moral progress is central to the idea of increasing or expanding peace in the world. Is moral progress a matter of moral development and is our moral development, developing to higher levels as we progress through history – this is nearly impossible to answer. It is important to establish we cannot live without a moral system. One may ask from whence does such a system arise? Ironically, we may point to Darwin who embraced altruism as an evolutionary development, in other words we can think of altruistic Darwinism rather than social Darwinism in our discussion of moral progress (Mazlich, 1996; Rosas, 2007).

When advancing moral progress it is necessary to consider the "unit of analysis" from which such progress initiates. Mazlich (1996) suggests culture may become more moral, while individuals within society may not. Institutions may move in a progressive moral direction rendering society more moral. South Africa is a prime example of this in the post-Apartheid period. The general movement toward less autocratic forms of government in favor of more democratic, rights-respecting political order is a sign of moral improvement. On this note, Mazlich (1996) argues less war equals moral progress. Indeed it has been said, violence creates the reasons for its own elimination.

On the other hand, according to Moody-Adams (1999) moral progress is always local, "…in relatively circumscribed domains of concern" (p. 169). By this she means, we cannot target a goal of moral progress but we can go more deeply into say a particular moral idea, such as justice or compassion. "This involves coming to appreciate more fully the richness and the range of application of a particular moral concept (or a linked set of concepts)" (p. 169). Moreover, one must recognize "Moral progress in one domain may be accompanied by regression in some neighboring domain" (p. 170).

From this, we deduce that moral progress involves agency, surfacing the question, who drives moral progress? According to Moody-Adams (1999), "…the main engine of moral progress is the advocacy of engaged moral inquirers" (p. 180) who have personal engagement with the everyday consequences of the moral argument they advance. They must be willing to assume great personal risk in order to advance the causes they advocate for, which means they may deliberately expose others to risk, allowable only as is morally necessary. Moral inquirers offer their own lives and practice as moral examples and rely on nonviolent public protests and demonstrations. By doing so they create an 'intellectual crisis' through which people might be willing to acknowledge inconsistencies in belief and practice otherwise ignored or denied (p. 180). Thus, the role of moral inquirer requires the ability to break down her audience's resistance to self-scrutiny. Who are the moral inquires of our day? Enter Gen Y.

CASE EXAMPLE: THE OCCUPY MOVEMENT

Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky (2009) remind us, achieving our highest and most noble aspirations for our world may take more than a lifetime. Building sustainable peace will depend on the next generation of leaders, Gen Y. Seth Godin (2008) in his popular culture book titled *Tribes*, admonishes tribal leaders to *lean* into challenges and struggles. Commenting on the emergent and rotating nature of tribal leadership, Godin explains "this posture of leaning in is rare and valuable" (p. 57). Leaning into the problem is messy and demanding, and this is the struggle of leadership. A contemporary example of leaning in as a form of resistance leadership can be detected in the Occupy Wall Street Movement (OWS). Largely populated with Gen Y members, this widespread, international movement is seeking to raise awareness concerning economic inequality. The OWS movement provides an example of widespread resistance leadership, from which peace work might glean insight. Moreover, a strong linkage between economic conditions and peace can be demonstrated (Gartzke, Quan, & Boehmer, 2001; King, 2010; Press-Barnathan, 2006). Spreitzer (2007) cites Gandhi's observation that poverty paves that way to criminal violence and civil unrest, clearly, when economic inequality is present, peace is held at bay.

Gen Y is teaching us a bit about using resistance leadership to lean into the vexing problem of economic inequality. Generational differences between Gen Y and Boomers suggest distinctive approaches to achieving social change. Boomers wanted a better world and our approach was to dismantle all things conservative through behavior change (e.g. music, dress, drugs, etc.) we tried to build a counter culture and in small ways, we were perhaps only somewhat effective.

Gen Y in many ways carries the seeds of our Boomer hope for a better more peaceful world, but they are more strategic and systemic about this effort, using their values they are moving institutions and even society in the direction of moral progress. Boomers thought more in dualistic either/or terms; Gen Y is teaching us to think more dialectically. By leaning in, they are working within established systems, rather than against them, to create organizations that benefit society through their strong commitment to social justice and peace, expressed politically, environmentally, and across cultures.

Gen Y members of the Occupy Wall Street Movement (OWS) began in Zuccotti Park in Manhattan on September 17, 2011 to protest economic inequality. Six months into the effort, the movement boasts 750 events or encampments worldwide (Rogers, 2001). Perhaps the movement's greatest contribution has been to find a way to forge a public space for a continuing discussion on a set of crucial issues related to jobs and debt (Buell, 2011). The Occupy Movement garnered rapid support for its general message. As reported by Fast Company, "If it were possible, within the context of the current government, to formulate and advance a coherent set of demands, there would be no need for the protest in the first place. However, when certain ideas like treating the creators of the financial meltdown as criminals instead of saviors are outside contemporary elite discourse, those ideas instead get expressed in whatever space is available outside the mainstream" (Ungerleider, 2001, ¶ 11).

Could it be that OWS is, in one sense, taking on the role of "moral inquirers" articulated by Moody-Adams (1999)? Moral progress depends on moral inquirers, those who examine moral principles and disseminate new moral ideas. Central to determining the degree to which moral progress is evident in and through the movement is to ask, is the act of questioning the morality of policies and practices of influential institutions a sign of moral progress? It might be argued that through their personal engagement with the everyday consequences of economic imbalance and by relying on non-violent direct action through public protests and demonstrations, the Occupy Movement participants have at least initiated a moral line of inquiry concerning current economic practices and policies. OWS has persisted with a consistent message and methodology and as movements tend to, this one has made people uncomfortable. Could it be these moral inquirers are attempting to break down their audience's resistance to self-scrutiny? (Moody-Adams, 1999).

Fueled by the methodology and early outcomes of the Arab Spring, and similar movements in Spain and the Argentinian protests during the economic crisis of 2001, the Occupy Movement sought to build on models of active resistance to regimes of misappropriated power (Sitrin, 2011). So potent is this moment of movements in our history, TIME Magazine identified the Person of the Year for 2011 as "The

Protestor" (TIME, 2011). This surge of activism raises an important philosophical question, one that has lain dormant for nearly 40 years, is moral progress possible? The Arab Spring and the Occupy Movement provide the impetus to take up this question integral to advancing democracy and peace in the world.

The occupy movement has been called a leaderless movement and a movement of leaders, rhetoric that simultaneously adds mystery to its mission and keeps a laser focus on the purpose rather than on a person. With intent and by design the Occupy Movement initiators set out to leave open ended the "one demand" they sought in favor of making movement-building the central strategic goal and letting demands come later. An example of this comes from a member of Occupy Orange County at the Fullerton, CA encampment who explained the change they work toward begins with working with local city governments to pass resolutions related to economic justice (e.g. predatory lending) with a plan to escalate demands to the state level (personal communication, February 14, 2012). Through the experiment of pure democracy within the Occupy Movement, participants attempt to embody the very message they seek to convey, representative governing, and collaborative decision-making, within an egalitarian non-hierarchical structure.

Evidence of moral progress can be discerned when our understanding of moral principles, such as justice, deepens, when violence and coercion are diminished. The premise of the movement is the vast imbalance in both political and economic power. Mainly young people who aligned with this message took to the streets to use their physical voice because they perceived they did not have a financial voice to effect change. Thus, resistance against those structural forms that represent oppression, dictatorial rule and tyranny in favor of individual and collective rights and political order in society is evidence of moving in the direction of moral progress. Is moral progress inching its way, as Kant suggests, from barbarism through civilization toward enlightened culture? The great divides of our time, as in times past, seem primarily concerned with questions of equality, justice, freedom, humanity - might it be that inroads are being forged toward moral progress? The OWS movement provides a suitable example of resistance leadership, supported by moral imagination as a means for advancing peace, and thus reviving moral progress.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

How might organizations take the ideas of resistance leadership , advancing moral progress and promoting peace and operationalize these commitments in practice? While it is easy to see leadership as a solo endeavor, it is critical to remember that leading with resistance takes place through the collective. Models of shared and distributed leadership are more commonplace now and can serve as path to resistance leadership (Jackson & Parry, 2011). Zoller & Fairhurst (2007) astutely indicate this approach will require challenging reified dichotomies of workers vs. managers, followers vs. leaders in favor of exploring "…how members all along the hierarchy may resist" (p.1341). Resistance leadership can manifest at any level within organizations to raise awareness regarding systems and processes that lead to dehumanizing work and other manifestations of asymmetrical power structures. Organizational resistance leaders are akin to Meyerson's (2001) idea of "Tempered Radicals", informal leaders who lead change quietly to effect evolutionary change, challenging prevailing wisdom, and transforming organizational customs and norms, slowly. Simple, consistent, collective acts of resistance build over time to advance moral awareness and increase peace within organizations.

Embracing moral progress as the moral grounding for leadership requires a willingness to understand leadership as the means to advancing the common good over individual self-gain. Organizational leaders who operate with the idea of moral progress see their work and the influence of their organizations in society as promoting values, ethics and morals in the world, and this perspective is certainly a precursor for leading for peace. Indeed, advancing peace is predicated on a widespread acceptance of the common good.

At the micro-level, leadership for peace begins within the individual, though significant and ongoing commitments to advance peace in relationships, to extend compassion, to exercise self-restraint (Thich Nhat Hahn, 1991). Organizational leaders can influence the moral mindfulness of the people in their

organizations, through articulation of moral values, serving as role models, and rewarding moral action (Thomas, Schermerhorn, & Dienhart, 2004).

One form of leadership that captures these commitments well is servant leadership, which begins with a commitment to serve others first. Organizational leaders who embrace this style of leadership invert the hierarchical pyramid, placing themselves at the bottom rather than the apex, seeing customers as those possessing the most rights rather than the least, in contrast to most top-down approaches (Wilson, 1998). Servant leadership builds on the work of James MacGregor Burns' (1978) idea of transforming leadership, and its bold claim that such leadership ought to increase the level of morality for both leader and led.

Evidence of resistance leadership and moral progress for peace is seen in the growing number of organizations demonstrating commitment to sustainability practices to assume environmental and social responsibility. By definition, organizations that embrace authentic commitment to sustainability do so throughout their entire supply chain (Lawler & Worley, 2011). Sustainable organizations resist the profit only motive in favor of a triple bottom-line approach to measuring success, invest in production and distribution partner organizations and thus demonstrate a higher level of moral reasoning. Excellent examples of this more holistic and to some, radical business model, are Patagonia and Timberland. Each of these organizations have embedded moral practices in their business processes, clearly demonstrating moral progress and resistance leadership and through their commitments to environmental sustainability and social justice, each has advanced peace through raising awareness of the common good.

CONCLUSION

This paper set out to address an under researched question, leadership for what? – and suggested peace is certainly one hope for outcome of leadership. I argued that leading for peace involves using leadership influence as a kind of resistance to challenge power-over domination in organizations and society. Resistance leadership, however must be grounded in moral imagination, if the kind of moral progress is to occur that will lead to the advancement of peace. In the wake of world-wide social movements, it is imperative that leadership scholarship and practice consider the role of moral resistance as a form of leadership for peace. Policy and regime changes, along with conversations in the public square both actual and virtual concerning inequality, freedom and democracy seem to be pointing us in the direction of moral progress. While much good work has been accomplished in advancing peace, the torch is passing to the next generation of leaders, Gen Y, to carry the work forward. Expanding peace in the world will depend on enlarging our cooperative capacity through moral consciousness centrally necessary for moral progress to occur at the individual, organizational and societal levels. There are many hopeful signs and I hope we can add "increased peace in the world" to a growing list of positive, moral developments in our time. For now, we fix our eyes on the slow, tentative emergence of institutional and organizational embodiments of moral improvement – and who will lead the change we long for, those who raise the level of consciousness, the moral inquisitors who individually and collectively lead for peace.

Clearly, more dialogue is needed between leadership scholars and critical researchers in order to understand resistance leadership, moral progress and peace. While these fields may initially perceive there is little in common, upon further exploration commonalities and connections come into sharper focus. While measures exist for moral development (Kohlberg, 1981; Rest, Navaez, Thomas, & Beneau, 1999), moral progress is perhaps best captured in longitudinal studies using qualitative interviews. Central to the challenge of assessing moral progress is establishing a set of outcomes or goals against which the idea of moral progress can be determined. Equally challenging is assessing resistance leadership. Zoller & Fairhurst (2007) suggest ethnography might provide a better understanding of resistance leadership, since the expression of such leadership is socially and contextually situated. Future studies addressing these constructs might explore the role of organizational leaders in advancing moral progress by examining the question, what role do organizations play in advancing moral progress in society and of course, this interplay could be reversed, the role of society in spurring the moral progress of organizations.

One approach for exploring these ideas is found in the field of positive organizational scholarship, which has identified "positive deviance" as an evaluative construct useful for mapping intentional behaviors that depart from organizational norms (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003). Positive deviance as a methodology identifies exceptional and innovative practices within organizations or groups. Through qualitative data collection such as interviews and observation, researchers discover positive successes, which can be replicated in the system in order to support organizational progress by building on what is already present within the organization. This approach holds promise as a means for exploring moral progress expressed through resistance leadership as an expression of moving beyond the status quo to effect positive change at the group, organizational or societal levels toward the end of advancing peace.

REFERENCES

Adair-Toteff, C. (2005). Max Weber's charisma. *Journal of Classical Sociology, 5*(2), 189-204.

Alvesson. M. & Spicer, A. (2012). Critical leadership studies: The case for critical performativity. *Human Relations, 65*(3), 367-390.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994).*Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bauman, Z. (1993). *Postmodern ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brincat, S. (2009). Negativity and open-endedness in the dialectic of world politics. *Alternatives, 34*(4), 455-493.

Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(1), 77-108.

Buell, J. (2011). Occupy wall street's democratic challenge [Supplement]. *Theory & Event, 14*(4). Retrieved from http://muse.jhu.edu.lib.pepperdine.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v014/14.4S.buell.html

Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Camus, A. (1961). *Resistance, rebellion, and death*. (J.O'Brien, Trans.). New York: Knopf.

Collinson, D. (2005). Dialectics of leadership. *Human Relations, 58*(11), 1419-1442.

Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2004). Leadership for the common good. In J. M. Burns (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of leadership Vol. 1* (pp.853-857). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fort, T. L., & Schipani, C. A. (2002). The role of the corporation in fostering sustainable peace. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, 35*(2), 389-436.

Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations, 53*(1), 7-32.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (Myra Bergman Ramos, Trans.) New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1993).

Gartzke, E., Quan, L., & Boehmer, C. (2001). Investing in peace: Economic interdependence and international conflict. *International Organization, 55*(2), 391–438.

Godin, S. (2008). *Tribes: We need you to lead us*. London: Penguin.

Goethals, G. R., & Sorenson, G. L. J. (2006). *The quest for a general theory of leadership.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational   Management Administration and Leadership, 28*(3), 317-338.

Harvey, M. (2006). Power. In G. R. Goethals& G. L. Sorenson (Eds.).*The quest for a general theory of leadership* (pp.74-95). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). Leadership in a permanent crisis. *Harvard Business Review, 87*(7/8), 62-69.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Iggers, G. G. (1965). The idea of progress: A critical reassessment. *The American Historical Review, 71*(1), 1-17.

Jackson, B. & Parry, K. (2011). *A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about studying leadership* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Joseph, P. B. & Duss, L. S. (2009): Teaching a pedagogy of peace: A study of peace educators in United States schools in the aftermath of September 11. *Journal of Peace Education, 6*(2), 189-207.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). Moral stages and the idea of justice. In L. Kohlberg (Ed.) *Essays on moral development: Vol. 1. The philosophy of moral development* (pp. 311-372). San Francisco: Harper and Row.

King, M. (2010). Peace. In R. A. Couto (Ed.), *Handbook of political and civic leadership*, (Vol. 1) (pp. 172-180). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

King, M. L. Jr. (1968). *Where do we go from here: Chaos or Community?* Boston: Beacon Press.

Lawler, E. III, & Worley, C. (2011). *Management reset: Organizing for sustainable effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lievan, A., & Hulsman, J. (2006). Ethical realism and contemporary challenges. *American Foreign Policy Interests, 28*(6), 413-420.

Lublink, S. (2011). Who may live the examined life? Plato's rejection of Socratic practices in Republic VII. *British Journal for the History of Philosophy, 19*(1), 3-18.

Marx, L. (1996). The domination of nature and the redefinition of progress. In L. Marx & B. Mazlich (Eds.) *Progress: Fact or illusion* (pp. 201-219). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Mazlich, B. (1996). Progress: A historical and critical perspective. In L. Marx & B. Mazlich (Eds.) *Progress: Fact or illusion* (pp. 27-44). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Meyerson, D. E. (2001). Radical change the quiet way. *Harvard Business Review, 9*(9), 92-100.

Moody-Adams, M. M. (1999). The idea of moral progress. *Metaphilosophy, 30*(3), 168-185.

Murithi, T. (2009). An African perspective on peace education: *Ubuntu* lessons in reconciliation. *International Review of Education, 55*(2/3), 221-233.

Nietzsche, F. (1886, 2011). *Beyond good and evil*. Helen Zimmern Trans. New York: Soho Books.

Nisbet, R. (1994). *History of the idea of progress*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Popper, K. (1957, 2002). *The poverty of historicism*. NY: Routledge.

Press-Barnathan, G. (2006). The neglected dimension of commercial liberalism: Economic cooperation and transition to peace. *Journal of Peace Research, 43*(3), 261-278.

Rest, J. R., Navaez, D., Thomas, S. J., & Beneau, M. J. (1999). DIT2: Devising and testing a revised instrument of moral judgment. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(4), 644-659.

Rogers, S. (November 14, 2011). Occupy protests around the world: full list visualized [The Guardian Data blog]. Retrieved from http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2011/oct/17/occupy-protests-world-list-map

Rorty, R. (2007). Dewy and Posner on pragmatism and moral progress. *University of Chicago Law Review, 74*(3), 915-927.

Rosas, A. (2007). Beyond the sociobiological dilemma: Social emotions and the evolution of morality. *Zygon: Journal of Religion & Science, 42*(3), 685-700.

Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership in the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.

Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Schuler, J. A. (1995). Reasonable hope: Kant as critical theorist, *History of European Ideas*, *21*(4), 527-533.

Sitrin, M. (2011). Horizontalism: From Argentina to Wall Street. *NACLA Report on the Americas, 44*(6), 8-11.

Spreitzer, G. (2007). Giving peace a chance: Organizational leadership, empowerment, and peace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(8), 1077-1095.

Spreitzer, G. & Sonenshein, S. (2003). Positive deviance and extraordinary organizing. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.) *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 207-224). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Thich Nhat Hahn (1991). *Peace is every step: The path of mindfulness in everyday life*. New York: Bantam Books.

Thomas, T., Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr. & Dienhart, J. W. (2004). Strategic leadership of ethical behavior in business. *Academy of Management Executive, 18* (2), 56-66.

TIME. (2011, December 12). Cover: The protestor. *TIME, 178*(23).

Wheatley, M. J. (2003). Leadership in turbulent times is spiritual. *Frontiers, 18*(4), 19-26.

Wilson, R. T. (1998). Servant leadership. *Physician executive, 24*(5), 6-13.

Wolpe, H., & McDonald, S. (2008). Democracy and peace-building: Re-thinking conventional wisdom. *The Round Table, 97*(394), 137-145.

Zoller, H. M. & Fairhurst, G. T. (2007). Resistance leadership: The overlooked potential in critical organization and leadership studies. *Human Relations, 60*(9), 1331-1360.

Ungerleider, N. (2011, October 7). The stealth leaders of occupy wall street. http://www.fastcompany.com/1785698/occupy-wall-streets-leadership-trail

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Bernice Ledbetter, Ed.D.

Graziadio School of Business and Management, Pepperdine University.
Faculty, Organizational Theory and Management, Graziadio School of Business and Management, Pepperdine University. Dr. Ledbetter teaches graduate-level classes across a range of management and leadership topics, including organization theory and management, leadership and ethics, leading theory & practice, and organization development and change. Dr. Ledbetter is the co-author of *Reviewing Leadership: A Christian Evaluation of Current Approaches* (2004, Baker Books) which has been translated into Korean, Chinese and Spanish. Her chapter on "Leading Self" appears in the *Political and Civic Leadership Handbook* (2010, Sage Publications). Dr. Ledbetter holds a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies, a Masters of Divinity, and a Doctorate of Education in Organizational Leadership.