

AN EXPLORATION OF THE DYNAMIC BETWEEN LEADER AND FOLLOWER

Jeffery Morse

Brandman University

Author Note

For correspondence concerning this paper Jeffery Morse can be reached at

jmorse@mail.brandman.edu

Abstract

This paper explores the research between leaders and followers; one might even say tyrants and subjects. For some reason people tend to follow blindly someone who seizes power and forces control of the masses, whether the controlling power is a religious leader, a king, or a politician has little relevance on the base question. Why do some have the power to control the masses, and why do those masses respond? Several papers will be reviewed to expose the different aspects of this topic. At the end of this review the knowledge gain should help to clarify the dynamic of these leader follower relationships.

Key words: literature review, synthesis, leaders, followers, tyrants, obedience, doing evil.

AN EXPLORATION OF THE DYNAMIC BETWEEN LEADER AND FOLLOWER

Many times throughout history and even today many people give way to destructive commands from leaders with only self interest in mind. These destructive commands many times lead to a very negative outcome morally as well as corporately as a species. As a result an exploration of the dynamics of the leader follower relationship is the first step to the path to enlightenment of preventative measures. A relationship has two main subjects, namely the leader and the follower. As a result, we will review papers to show the dynamic of why people follow destructive commands, and why leaders give destructive commands. In the paper Steps for finding good foundational truths (Morse, 2016) the paper points to a problematic concern of society. Namely, the fact that we as society are failing to apply what we have learned in the past to current events. The paper reports two events that occurred over centuries that ended in suspiciously similar circumstances as evidence that we still have not learned anything. These two instances are relevant because they both are great examples of a “leader/follower dynamic” that ended very dreadfully. First the author takes the stand that the finding of foundational truth is a “must” because if we establish our lives on a lie then we are susceptible to like violent outcomes reported in the two instances listed. The paper then springboards into an exploration of the relativity of truth. I agree that we must have stable truth on which to found our lives, but it is the list of what the world is believing reported in the paper that first is prominent for this paper. Here is the breakdown of what people are believing according to the author: atheistic or agnostic as 11% (Hemant Mehta, 2015). Leaving 89% believing in religion. That is 32% Christian, 23% Muslim, 15% Hindu, 7% Buddhists, and .2% Jewish ((PRC, 2012). Why is this relevant to the leader follower dynamic? Because all these are some form of the leader/follower dynamic. In the Paper the question of why people are following is not stated but implied, they

are deceived by believing lies as their foundational truths. Enter in the need to know the real truth. The author defines it as “the state of being the case” (Websters, 2015). After which the author goes in to a rant about relative truth verses absolute truth and then states something that is at the crutch of our point. “Since this idea comes from such a notable figure we tend to accept it and repeat it.” (Jeffery Morse, 2016) Implied authority is one of the real dynamics that are at play when looking at the leader follower relationship. The idea that we must know the truth to place it in our foundation is presented but the issue of implied authority is mentioned but a little, but it is mentioned in referring to Einstein. At its core the paper supported knowing the truth and the fruit that it produces. This does line up with our hypotheses, but the author makes the implication that if we as people would do this it would help in the entirety of life not just the leader/follower dynamic (here forward referred to as the LFD). However, in the LFD this is especially helpful as to reveal a good leader from a bad one. Reading on, a definition for truth and lies are given, with the information that lies have negative psychological, physiological and emotional effects. This is also backed up by Dr Yoshiaki Omura in his study on the physiological reactions to lying. (Yoshiaki, O., Nihrane, A., Lu, D., Jones, M. K., Yasuhiro, S., & Motomu, O, 2015). A Study that reports that anytime that a person lies, counting even the smallest of white lies, there are recordable physical changes in the eye, nose, mouth lips etc. The assertion of Bella DePaulo is supported from her paper which asserts that people can be put into two categories: Those that lie and those that do not (Bella M. DePaulo et al, 1996). The author goes in argument of this paper upholding his argument of choosing absolute over relative truth in choosing a foundational belief, however, such is not the context of Dr. DePaulo’s paper. In fact, her paper is about the little white lies one tells, while this paper is about foundational lies that lead to tragic and violent ends--this is incongruent. This incongruence spurns from the fact that

this paper's topic aligns itself to the LFD while Dr. DePaulo's does not. So to recap, while the paper does point out the need for a way to tell truth from lies, and gives a promising solution, it fails to realize a holistic view of the reasons leaders lie. To add to this, the author takes for granted that the deception of placing lies as foundational truths are always the reason people follow and perform destructive commands, and though it may be one cause for it to be the only cause, or even the most frequent cause, is not the case. We will present the review of 4 papers to show the real natures of this dynamic

Milgram's Study of Obedience.

In the LFD Milgram's Study (Milgram, 1963) reveals why people follow questionable commands. In this famous study of obedience a surprising two thirds of people studied obeyed the directive to knowingly do harm to another simply if an implied authority gave a verbal command-- that they "had to do it" (Milgram, 1965). This was an astounding conclusion that was opposite the initial hypothesis. It was thought that as people were asked to increase the discomfort level on another person that people would refuse to comply. Though shouts and yells proceeded from the receiver to the pain (the student), the implementer (the teacher), proceeded to deliver electric shock in increased increments exceeding 400 volts. Unfortunately, ten years later little had changed when the study was repeated (Milgram, S. 1974). This has bearing in the LFD because it tells us why people follow a leader even when confronted with destructive commands from that leader although they may have moral objections. This outcome was further enhanced by the implication that the "teacher" was someone of importance or respected position (Milgram, 1965, 1974). Basically, if one believes the leader is a person of influence or someone higher in social hierarchy than ones self, one tends to believe the implied authorities commands to the

point of action though one might consider those action to be non-humane or morally wrong.

Somehow humanity seems to be hard-wired for obedience. From a Christian stand point this is understood as the need for God and obedience is hard-wire to choose God's will over one's own.

As it turns out this is a good thing as reported by the research of Tom Knox in the reporting of all the benefits of being faithful (Tom Knox, 2011). The problem is that there are just too many entities plying for that position of God in one's life. To do someone harm simply because of an implied authority could be curbed by simply questioning that authorities command when faced with moral objections, however, so few ever do. In Milgram's study almost two thirds went all the way to the highest voltage knowing that the subject had a heart issues and though they heard sounds of pain and agony they complied just because someone who implied authority told them they "had to continue". This thought of hard wired for obedience to God was tested in a further adjunct of Milgram's study. In a study done by David C Bock and Neil Clark Warren entitled, "Religious as a factor to Obedience to Destructive Commands". The Milgram study was extended to the religious forum. The results again did not line up with the beginning hypothesis. It was believed that as people who became more categorized into the religious right would become more susceptible to this idea of obedience to destructive commands by implied authority-as they are hard wired to obey God. However, the results did not support the hypotheses. Instead the results of the study revealed a bell curve. If a person was entirely humanist, and humanitarian, or if a person was very actively Christian they tended to question the authority of the person giving the destructive command and, as a result, tended to not perform them (David C. Bock, Neil Clark, 1972). Further, they found that those believers that were middle of the road or the "luke warm" believers or agnostics were much more at risk of following through with a destructive command from an implied authority. This was believed to

be true because of the indecision of “not knowing” or the questioning what one knows or believes. So the “luke warm” believer, which I am sorry to say is about 77% of believers (Caleb K. Bell, 2013), or the agnostic are given to surrendering their will instead of submitting to their moral conscience. Tendencies to forfeit ones will to any impending source of implied authority in the absence of cemented beliefs is preferable to the time and dedication it takes to cement one’s beliefs. So to sum it up, these papers show that in the absents of the definite conviction of firmly knowing what one believes and why, one is likely surrender one’s will to an implied authority whether that authority is giving destructive commands or not, and one is more likely to perform those commands despite of negative feeling in one’s own conscience. It seems people would rather be sheep than take the time to study and research what they believe. Unfortunately as we have evolved into an instant gratification society this is more often the case than not. The next review shows how this may even be more the case in the U.S.A.

Believing in Economic Theory: Sex, Lies, Evidence, Trust and Ideology

To further examine the idea of surrendering ones will to implied authority we must investigate how this applies in the governmental, political, and economic schools of thought. A study relevant to the LFD in that it is current to our political and governmental processes. Most of us in the U.S. are a currently interacting in a leader follower relationship between us and those that are elected over us; we tend to, as constituents, submit to our elected officials and or those in control of our governments. In this study done by D. Andrew Austin and Nathaniel T. Wilcox (2004) we find some light shed on the LFD. First off, the result of their study illustrates that whether conservative or liberal is of little consequence in the face of unconfirmed beliefs. It was found, that though optimism is more present with conservatives, at the end they both adopt the

same conclusions in the absence of clear evidence. People form their prior convictions by depending on their ideology, but if implied autoreactive evidence is given, people ignore their priors and all end up with similar beliefs (D. Andrew et al, 2004). In otherward, we tend to surrender what we have learned just because an implied authority is presented as creditable. Doubt in what we know is question because belief is not concrete and weakly held prior beliefs are easily overwhelmed. Ideology simply acts as a replacement for firm belief. Also if an implied authority is seen to reflect ones ideology convictions are more readily and quickly surrendered. Those beliefs that are dissimilar take a back seat to the destructive commands if one's implied authority. Thus enters an avenue to deceive ourselves as a means of self-preservation. Heterogeneity is the propensity for socially desirable responses. Reportedly may create a counterfeit relationship between beliefs and ideology (D. Andrew et al, 2004). More plainly, if a person believes that correct responses are desired by their implied authority, then they are at least partially motivated to please that authority and answer or perform against their own conscience. One just might lie to become acceptable or aligned with an implied authority. We may choose to lie in order to conform to the affiliations surrendering our moral conscience and implement and follow through on a destructive command. In *steps for finding good foundational truths*, the author points out that lying is "bad fruit" (Jeffery Morse, 2016). Many proofs are offered about how lies bring sickness. It is amazing that we will surrender to the lie so readily when our belief is not concrete even though such action may lead to comprising our own mental, emotional, spiritual and physical health (the truth about lies). The next study reveals why the follower deceives themselves and is not the only subject in the LFD that is given to lying (Chris Lliades, MD, 2010), (Adam Dachis, 2012), (Allison Kornet, 1997).

People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil

Let us explore this dynamic of why we choose to lie just to accommodate an implied authority. In the book *People of The Lie, The Hope for Healing Human Evil*, by M. Scott Peck, he defines “the lie” as a self-deception, and is the result of the “inability or unwillingness to tolerate the pain of self-reproach”. Implied authority with destructive commands or “evil” as he puts it originates in an effort to escape guilt (Peck, 1983). Sort of like Adam when God asked, “Have you eaten from the tree” and Adam’s response was, “The woman gave it to me”. Somehow lack of accountability is implied if we are just following orders. This brings to mind that Tom Cruise movie, *a few good men*, where the marines were on trial for following orders even though it resulted in the death of a fellow marine. They were convicted of misconduct because they should have questioned authority. The marines’ conclusion was, “we were supposed to be protecting him”. Peck states that this is “the pretense of blamelessness in today’s culture; e.g. everyone is a victim, no one is really at fault” (Peck, 1983). A pretense that aligns itself to the lack of accountability, and reveals that one should always question destructive commands, but does not because we deceive ourselves into believing that there is no accountability if one is following the orders of one’s implied authority. Self-deception is the integral part of behavior that allows one to sacrifice, harm, and even destroy others in order to preserve one’s own self-image. Peck names this trait “malignant narcissism” and states it to be the root of all evil (Peck, 1983). Congruently, he further implies that the authority giving destructive commands are always using lies to deceive also. In a review on the book Barbara Buzzard (2010) points out that one’s ‘image,’ or ‘appearance’, are critical in understanding the morality of those who are giving destructive commands. While motivation to be good is lacking, the desire to appear good is present. How clean should I ‘appear’ to be, certainly a dilemma of

lawyers and clergy alike. These are ‘The people of the lie.’ So we have created a bridge from follower to Leader. So let us now focus in the next review as to why leaders give destructive commands.

The Dark Triad and The Dark Triad Returns

In researching the motivations of implied authorities that give destructive commands hence forth known as “Evil” we begin to look at the personality types that assume those roles and why. In Williams and McAndrews paper on the “Dark Triad” and the “Hexaco” Model (2002). The “Hexaco Model” is a measure of the six major dimensions of the personality. Put simply it is a categorization of the underworld of personality types. The “Dark Triad” loosely refers to money, power, and sex as a major motivation for “Evil” to assume power (Williams, K. M., McAndrew, A., Lynam, T., Harms, P., & Paulhus, D. L., 2001). Leaders whom attain power to satiate their need to achieve high status in either money, power, or fame. This paper points that such people usually fall into one of three personality constructs or sometimes a combinations of all three. We will research these as they show the LFD of leaders who tend to give destructive commands. The first, Machiavellianism, is a personality construct characterized by a cynical view of human nature combined with a deceitful and calculating interpersonal style (Christie and Geis 1970). They use power to benefit themselves without having remorse about any collateral damage to those involved. The Psychopathy personality construct is a person who is characterized by grandiosity, has no empathy, a manipulative interpersonal style, as well as an antisocial lifestyle.(Hare, 1991; Harpur, Hare, & Hakstian, 1989) Think of Hitler and you’ll be right on the money here. The third is Narcissism. This personality construct is characterized by exhibitionism, a sense of self-importance, interpersonal exploitation and an entitlement mind set.

(Raskin & Hall, 1979; 1981). To define this look at most teenagers in the U.S. The entitlement mindset is running ramped. The tendency to manipulate individuals for selfish gain and to fraudulently misrepresent one's self with bad intentions even to the point of lying, cheating or theft to fulfil personal goals (Hodson, G., Hogg, S.M., & MacInnis, C. 2009). The study finds that with these personality constructs successfully predicting opportunistic behaviors for selfish gains or instant gratification is in the higher percentiles, and suggests that such people do not do well as team players but favor the between-group hierarchy (Hodson et al, 2009). They want to be the boss. Personality constructs that include a need to be at the forefront of the list. The death of followers is not to be of moral conflict as long as there is media coverage. In this world there is no shortage of such leaders. Basically if one achieves a prominent position at the top of a given hierarchy through other means than by hard work and selflessness then they are more than likely one of the dark triad personality constructs. This being the case we can expect that they are given to doing whatever it takes to get and retain a position with little or no moral conscience to the collateral damage on followers. They gain power, money, or success through sacrificing others while guarding their own conscience through self-deception, and their own image by deceiving their followers without remorse (Hodson et al, 2009; M., McAndrew et al, 2001). Unfortunately, combined with the fact that followers are so given to surrender their will and perform the destructive commands of an implied authority while deceiving themselves about any accountability for those actions gives us a very bleak prognosis (Milgram, S. 1963, 1965 1974). The elucidation, 'Lies are perhaps like a skin for you that keep you warm and safe in a world where you feel you can't trust anyone' as the likely foundation of this article are as good as any when speaking of self-deception. So in support the article titled "the many faces of lying," patients seek to control the other through the use of what Lemma defines as "sadistic lying" as a

conscious victory to deceive or humiliate another (Lemma A, 2005). As if it were not bad enough. To further the displeasure of these truths we find that some leaders deceive, lie and manipulate just for the pure joy of it. This differs from self-preservative lying where the sadistic impulse is not utilized. Granted Lemma holds an equivocal outlook on lying, she summarizes its restorative and developmental uses quite well, but the worry is its sadistic uses in the control of a leader who elicits one of the dark triad personality constructs.

In conclusion this is what we have uncovered in our reviews concerning the reasons inside the Leader/Follower Dynamic that destructive commands are given and surrendered too. They are completed by the follower though they may have moral conscionable objections to such commands. Many leaders willfully rise to the top, they usually fall under one or more of the “Dark Triad” of personality constructs. Of these construct none take the welfare of the follower as an item of concern. Generally speaking they are self-serving, non-empathetic people who have little or no moral cares about hurting or causing the hurt of others, even their own followers and in some cases do harm and manipulate just for the joy of it. These people generally employ self-deception as means to create a positive self-image and then portray that imagined self-image to their followers through lies and deception, while in the attaining of wealth, power, or the spotlight to satisfying their own insatiable self-centered needs. To add to this a follower who is un-cemented in their beliefs, one who is not stable in what they believe and why they believe it have more than a sixty percent chance of surrendering their will to this implied authority. Believing the manipulation that such implied authorities send forth and then lying to themselves as to bare no accountability of their actions—“they were just following orders”. In my mind this explains so much of the horror and tragedy of the world. It explains why the two examples

presented by the author of *Steps for finding good foundational truths* actually happened. In the time of the Papal States it was impossible to know what one believed and why because the bible was only available to the clergy. This left the masses at the will of those leaders who, according to history, defiantly fell into one of the three personality constructs of the dark triad. Mohammed is documented as to conscripting those of lesser education, and as a result built an army of people who followed his commands, as reprehensible as they were, as the mouth piece of Allah. Today those teachings are still the same and my guess is that so are the radical followers who are willing to numb any accountability dictated by conscience in the name of obedience. Still I offer this one light at the end of the tunnel--the last article presented in hope of this light. In an article by Monica Cantilero (2015) with the title "Isis seen undermining Islam". The quote that brings light is this, "Many Muslims are saying, 'If ISIS is Islam, I'm leaving.' The proof is the result they have to the horrific actions of ISIS. Many Muslims are questioning implied authority. They are leaving behind the dark triad rulers they have followed for those that are more hard working and selfless by nature. Brother Rachid, whose father was a Moroccan imam lived in secret as a Christian convert for 15 years. If this is happening in Islam then maybe there is hope for us all. It is promising to see such conversions, however, dark triad leaders will never cease. Those self-centered people who endeavor to gain power, money and fame without morality. People, however, can change. One can ground their beliefs, through study, research employing the "good fruit test" exterminating the manipulations and lies of "Evils" that have no moral conscience or compass whose end is self-serving at best and gain promotion through any means possible.

References

Adam Dachis, (2012) *What Lying Actually Does to Your Brain and Body Every Day*

<http://lifehacker.com/5968613/what-lying-actually-does-to-your-brain-and-body-every-day>

Allison Kornet, (1997) *The Truth about*

lying <https://www.psychologytoday.com/articles/199704/the-truth-about-lying>

Barbara Buzzard (2010) *Review People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil*

M. Scott Peck, M.D. http://www.21stcr.org/multimedia-2012/1-articles/bb-people_of_the_lie.html

Bella M. DePaulo, PhD (The Social Psychology of Good and Evil. New York:

Guilford Press.2004) *The Many Faces of Lies* Chapter 12, pp. 303-326

<http://smg.media.mit.edu/library/DePaulo.ManyFacesOfLies.pdf>

Caleb K. Bell Religion News service. (April 4, 2013) Poll: *Americans love the Bible but don't*

read it much. <http://www.religionnews.com/2013/04/04/poll-americans-love-the-bible-but-dont-read-it-much/>

Chris Lliades, MD(2010) *The Truth about Lies* Deirdre Lee Fitzgerald, PhD,

Assistant Professor of Psychology at Eastern Connecticut State University in

Willimantic.<http://www.everydayhealth.com/longevity/truth-about-lies-and-longevity.aspx>

Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press

D. Andrew Austin (CERGE-EI, Prague) and Nathaniel T. Wilcox (University of Houston)

(2004) *Believing in Economic Theory: Sex, Lies, Evidence, Trust and Ideology*

<https://www.cerge-ei.cz/pdf/wp/Wp238.pdf>

David C. Bock and Neil Clark Warren Source: Review of Religious Research, Vol. 13, No. 3,

Denominational and Interdenominational Studies (Spring, 1972) *Religious Belief as a Factor in Obedience to Destructive Commands* pp. 185-191

Delroy L. Paulhus, and Kevin M. Williams Department of Psychology (2002) *The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy*, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver V6T 1Z4, Canada

http://members.shaw.ca/ssucur/materials/02_selected_notes/06_tempest/03_PaulhusWilliams.pdf

Hare, R. D., Hart, S. D., & Harpur, T. J. (1991). *Psychopathy and the DSM-IV criteria for antisocial personality disorder*. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 100, 391–398.

Hodson, G., Hogg, S.M., & MacInnis, C. (2009). *The role of “dark personalities” (Narcissism, Machiavellianism, Psychopathy), Big Five personality factors, and ideology in explaining prejudice*. Journal of Research in Personality, 43, 686–690.

Lemma A (2005) *The many faces of lying*. Int J Psychoanal. Tavistock Clinic, 120 Belsize Lane, London, NW3 5BA, UK. lemma@dircon.co.uk

Milgram, Stanley (The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol 67(4), Oct 1963)

Behavioral Study of obedience, pp 371-378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0040525>

Milgram, S. (1965). Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority. Human Relations, 18, 57–76.

Milgram, S. (1974). Obedience to authority: An experimental view. New York: Harper & Row.

Monica Cantilero (2015) *ISIS seen undermining Islamic faith as more Muslims convert to*

Christianity. http://www.christiantoday.com/article/isis.seen.undermining_islamic.faith.as.more.muslims.convert.to.christianity/55622.htm

Morse, J. C. (2016) *Steps For Finding Good Foundational Truths*

http://www.jefferymorse.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Morse_J_Written_Communication_Research_Paper3.pdf

Peck, M. (1983) *People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil*. New York: Simon and Schuster,.

Power Research Center (PRC, 2012) *The Global Religious Landscape*

<http://www.pewforum.org/2012/12/18/global-religious-landscape-exec/>

Raskin, R. N. & Hall, C. S. (1979). *A narcissistic personal inventor*, Psychological Reports. 45. 590.

Raskin, R. N. & Hall, C. S. (1981). *The Narcissistic Personality Inventory Alternate form reliability and further evidence of construct validity*. Journal of Personality Assessment. 45. 159-162.

Robert D. Hare, Timothy J. Harpur, A. R. Hakstian, Adelle E. Forth and Stephen D.(1989) *The*

Revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and Factor Structure Hart University of British Columbia Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<http://psych.wisc.edu/newman/SecurePDF/Hareetal1990.pdf>

Tom Knox(2011) *The tantalizing proof that belief in God makes you happier and*

healthier <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-1358421/The-tantalising-proof-belief-God-makes-happier-healthier.html#ixzz3wzvqXqjE>

Webster's Dictionary <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/truth>

Williams, K. M., McAndrew, A., Learn, T., Harms, P., & Paulhus, D. L. (2001). The dark triad returns: Entertainment preferences and anti-social behavior among narcissists,

Machiavellians, and psychopaths. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.452.3138&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Yoshiaki, O., Nihrane, A., Lu, D., Jones, M. K., Yasuhiro, S., & Motomu, O. (2015). *Simple New Method of Detecting Lies By Identifying Invisible Unique Physiological Reflex Response Appearing Often Less Than 10-15 Seconds on the Specific Parts of Face of Lying Person*; Quick Screening of Potential Murderers & Problematic Persons. *Acupuncture & Electro-Therapeutics Research*, 40(2), 101-136.