

The Effect of Envy on Leadership: A Kleinian Analysis of the "Good" Leadership Failure

Mohamed HAFSI *

Nara University, Faculty of Social Research

The leadership phenomenon is one of the core subjects in psychoanalysis. Until the advent of psychoanalysis, the psychological theories available to historians dealing with leadership study were based merely on intuition (Mazlish, 1984). The Freudian leadership model which conceives of the leader as the ego-ideal—and in other words, as a father figure and thus the embodiment of the superego—of the group members (Freud, 1927), has had a marked influence on these researchers. Illustrative is the large number of psychoanalytically oriented treatises on many historically famous leaders (e.g., Langer, 1972; Gatzke, 1973; and Waite, 1977, on Adolf Hitler alone). Most of these works have attempted to understand leaders in terms of their childhood deprivation experiences and unconscious motives. Interestingly, historians were more prone to apply the Freudian theory than did political scientists who opted initially rather for, as a source of inspiration, Adler's work and its de-emphasis on libidinal factors and emphasis on inferiority and superiority complexes.

However, since the 1940s, there has been a remarkable development within the psychoanalytical current itself. For those psychoanalytically oriented leadership researchers who were increasingly uneasy with Freud's *Id* orientation—because of the difficulty to trace back some aspects of the leader's personality to early years of life due to lack of materials or data from the historical record—they looked to Erikson (1970) and his ego-psychology. While retaining the Freudian emphasis, Erikson also added the claims of ego and superego and focused on identity crisis whose dimensions were more available in the historical records (e.g., diaries, journals, accounts, acting out, and so forth.). The stress he put on the study of "second fathers" as well as "rebellious sons" merged directly with considerations of leadership. He also wrote himself about followership and disciples as parts of the great man's mission. Further, according to Mazlish (*ibid.*), Erikson's psychosexual stages provided historians with "a developmental scheme which accorded with their historical sense of the way in which a great man's leadership changed over time".

Another contribution to the understanding of the leadership comes from Melanie Klein's work or "object relations theory", and all the researchers of the Tavistock Institute who have applied her ideas to group phenomena. As mentioned earlier, for Freud, the relationship of the group to the leader is similar with the dependent love of the child for his parents. The leader is put at the place of the ego-ideal of each

group member and of the whole group. Similarly, the relationship of the group members to each other is like the jealous rivalry of siblings. From a Kleinian perspective, Wilfred Bion (1961), while not denying this parallel, argues, on the other hand, that the group experience marks a regression to the paranoid-schizoid position. The group devotes, thus, much of its energy to defending against paranoid-schizoid anxiety. Further, as pointed out by Yalom (1985), another important aspect of Bion's contribution is that the group is leader-centred. But this does not mean that "the leader is that unique, hypnotic figure he is frequently made out to be. Rather, the leader is more akin to an empty vessel, which the group members can fill up with projected versions of their own needs and desires." As discussed latter, Bion argues that the group attributes the function of leader to its sickest, most paranoid member. It should be noted here that when Bion wrote about leadership, he had in mind the leadership that emerges within the group, namely, the informal leadership. This distinction between the informal, or emergent leader, and the formal leader is very important for the understanding of the ideas which will be developed later.

Obviously, the purpose of this paper is not to give a description of the different psychoanalytical conceptions of leadership, but rather to emphasis the indirect and direct contributions of psychoanalysis to the understanding of the leadership function and dynamics. Let me now tackle with the main subject of this paper, namely, the relationship between "envy" and the failure of the "good" leadership. However, before addressing this issue, it is necessary to trace back envy to the infant's early development stages, where, as psychoanalysis and especially Klein's work (1959), has allowed us to know, our adult world has its roots.

Envy of the "Good" Object

The work of Melanie Klein is too well known to need detailing, however, it is necessary to outline briefly the infant's earliest mode of object-relations, namely, the "paranoid-schizoid position".

According to Melanie Klein, although the infant's early Ego is largely elementary and unorganized at birth, it is relatively able to experience anxiety and resort to defence mechanisms. It is characterized, from the beginning, by a tendency towards integration. In the earliest stages, writes Segal (1974), the "Ego is labile in a state of constant flux, its degree of integration varying from day to day, or even from moment to moment".

This immature Ego is exposed from the birth to anxiety stirred up by the inborn polarity of the death and life instincts and their immediate conflict, and also by the impact of the external reality. When faced with anxiety, the Ego resorts to such defence mechanisms, as splitting, projection, introjection, and idealization. The infant's Ego splits itself into "bad" ego-parts (which contains parts of the death instinct) and "good" ego-parts (libidinal impulses). The Ego projects then the "bad" ego-parts into the original external object, the mother's breast, which will be,

thus, perceived as containing the infant's death instinct, and, consequently, felt as "bad", persecuting and threatening to the Ego. This gives rise to a feeling of persecution. The parts of the death instinct remaining within the Ego are converted into aggression and directed against the persecuting "bad" object. This is a description of the relationship of the infant to the "bad" object-breast only.

For at the same time, a relation is established also with a "good" object-breast. As with the "bad" ego-parts, the Ego resorts to projection mechanism. It projects "good" ego-parts outward into the breast-object which becomes a "good" object, meeting thus the Ego's instinctive need for self-preservation. The remainder "good" parts will be invested to establish a libidinal relationship with this "good" object. Thus, at this early stage of mental development, the Ego has, as the result of splitting, a relationship to two opposit part-objects: the "good" breast and "bad" breast. The phantasy of a separate "good" object and "bad" persecutory object is confirmed, respectively, by each gratifying deprivating and painful experiences which the infant has in relation to the real external mother. The infant's aim, at this period of his development, is to keep inward, by introjection, the "good" object (perceived as life-giving and protective) and identify with it, and, at same time, to keep out (by projection) the "bad" persecutory object and the ego-parts containing the death instinct. The anxiety the infant faces here emerges from the fear that the persecutory object "will get inside the Ego and overwhelm and annihilate both the "good" object and the self. Since the leading anxiety experienced by the infant at this stage is of a paranoid nature, and the Ego and its objects are characterized by such schizoid state of splitting, Melanie Klein (1988) refered to this development stage as the "paranoid-schizoid position".

According to Klein, for a "normal and healthy" development, it is vital that the infant experiences (at this stage) more gratification than deprivation, and in return, a feeling of gratitude, a feeling she sees as a "major derivative of the capacity for love", and an essential factor "in building up the relation to the "good" object". It is also at the root of the "appreciation of goodness in others and in one self". When this feeling is frequently experienced by the infant as he is being fed, the introjection of "good" object-breast results in a feeling of relative security and trust (of the "good" object-breast). A feeling of "gratification at the breast means that the infant feels he has received from his loved (good) object a unique gift which he wants to keep", and wishes to return the pleasure felt. Emphasizing the importance of the feeling of gratitude, Melanie Klein (1957) writes:

"The more often gratification at the breast is experienced and fully accepted, the more often enjoyment and gratitude, and accordingly the wish to return pleasure, are felt. This recurrent experiences makes possible gratitude on the deepest level and plays an important role in the capacity to make reparation, and in all sublimations..."

However, the development of the infant's capacity to experience gratitude is not an easy task; it depends on both external and internal factors. That is, not only external (physical or mental) deprivation prevents gratification, "but even when the environment is conducive to gratifying experiences", there are still some internal factors that interfere with or prevent the feeling of gratification and gratitude. Among these factors, "envy" is the most influential one.

In her *Envy and Gratitude*, Melanie Klein (1957) distinguishes the emotion of envy, which she sees as the earliest manifestation of the death instinct, from jealousy, and greed. Klein argues that jealousy, which pertains to a triangular relationship, is based on love. It aims at the possession of the loved object and, consequently, the removal of the rival. It pre-requires thus a clear recognition of the object as a whole-object and its differentiation from others. Whereas envy is a dual relationship to part-objects (even if it is found latter in whole-object relationships) in which the subject envies its object for a given possession or quality.

On the other hand, while greed aims at taking all the goodness one can extract from the object, even if this may lead to its destruction and spoiling, envy "aims at being as good as the object". As soon as the infant becomes aware of the breast as a source of life and good experiences, his love and desire to possess, and preserve it increases. But the same experience stirs also in the infant the "wish to be himself the source of such perfection". When fused with greed, envy aims at exhausting or emptying the object entirely, so that it no longer contains anything enviable. Envy is not directed towards the external object-breast only, but also towards the very nourishment (milk, as a part of the breast) that has been taken in, and the internal object.

Moreover, envy operates also (and often mainly) by projection. As Segal (1974) put it, when the envious infant experiences anxiety, and feels himself to be full of "bad" impulses as compared with the breast—seen as the source of all enjoyment and goodness—he projects into the latter his own "bad" impulses aiming at devaluating it, making it "bad" and unenviable. This allows the infant to rationalize his fantasmal attacks of the "good" breast "by spitting, urinating, defecating, passing of wind, and by projective, penetrating looking (the evil eye)". This kind of relationship with the breast is, as development proceeds, carried over into the relationship with the mother's body and her babies, and later into the Oedipus situation.

What makes envy detrimental to the infant's "healthy" development is the fact that it interferes (when it is very intense) with the normal functioning of schizoid mechanisms. The process of splitting the object into "good" and "bad" objects, so important in the paranoid-schizoid position as a defense against anxiety, does not initially succeed. This failure results, as described by Klein (Idid.), "in splitting between an omnipotently idealized and a very "bad" primal object". However, this splitting can not be maintained, for, sooner or later, this idealized object, in its turn, gives rise to envy and is attacked and spoiled. Which leads to a confusion

between the “good” and “bad” objects, and, consequently, to the inability of the Ego to introject and identify with the “good” object. Therefore, the relationship to the “good” breast is characterized by a vicious circle. The envy prevents good introjections (depriving thus the Ego of its capacity for growth and assimilation) which, in its turn, increases envy towards the object.

Since excessive envy prevents the introjection of good objects, it leads to a state of acute pain and despair, because a loving “good” object can not be found. To defend against envy, the cause of the feelings of pain and hopelessness, the infant’s Ego resorts to some powerful defence mechanisms. Spoiling of the object which constitutes initially the aim of envy can become partly a defence against it. For when spoiled, the object can not be enviable. The devaluation of the object which consists in lessening its value to protect it from total spoiling, is another defence mechanism. These two defence mechanisms are found to be usually fused with powerful projection of envy. Besides the devaluation of the object and projection of envy, the infant resorts to rigid idealization in an attempt to preserve some ideal object. Hence, idealization serves as a defence against both persecutory anxiety and envy. However, this idealization is most precarious, since, as Klein (Ibid.) put it “if envy is very strong, it is likely, sooner or later, to turn against the primal idealized object and against other people who, in the course of development come to stand for it”.

It is noteworthy that in spite of the temporary relief these defence mechanisms against envy may bring to the infant, they contribute largely to the weakening and crippling of the infant’s ego. In “normal” development, envy is usually easily more integrated. That is, the “good” and gratifying breast stimulates not only envy, but also admiration, love and gratitude. Later, with the integration of the Ego, “these feelings enter in conflict, and if envy is not overwhelming, gratitude overcomes and modifies (and reduces) envy”. Then, the “good” breast, introjected with gratitude in a stable and securing way, “becomes a part of the Ego” which will be felt as “more full of goodness itself”. However, some envious feelings in relation to the primary object still remain, and will be latter displaced on to other objects. This question will not be addressed here. For further details, I refer the reader to Klein’s own work, *Envy and Gratitude*.

Envy and the Failure of the “Good” Leadership

Now, why did I describe these early stages of mental development ? The reason is that, as Freud (1961) put it, “nothing once formed in the mind could ever perish ...everything survives in some way or other, and is capable under certain conditions of being brought to light again ...”. Moreover, since Freud, we know that the group situation induces a regressive thrust to our early experiences, and, therefore, the revival, as developed by a number of Kleinian researchers, of early object relations and their characteristic anxieties. Speaking about the difference between individual and group psychology, Bion(1961) argues that their apparent differences

are not emergent phenomena. They simply reflect the fact that the "groups provides an intelligible field of study for certain aspects of individual psychology, and in so doing brings into prominence phenomena that appear alien to an observer" unfamiliar with the group. Explaining this idea differently, Alford (1989) writes that in "the group one sees aspects of individual behavior that one does not see otherwise, since these aspects are first activated in the group". Melanie Klein (1959) concludes, thus, that "a group — whether small or large — consists of individuals in a relationship to one another; and therefore the understanding of personality is the foundation for the social life." In passing, all these viewpoints adhere to "the principle of methodological individualism" (as defined by Alford), which constitutes also the background of the main hypothesis in this paper.

Let me now turn to the main subject of this paper, namely the question of why the so-called "good" leadership fails? What is called a "good" leader here is the one that has been chosen or elected by the majority of a group, after a country, a period dominated by a harsh, authoritarian, and strict leadership, as during a military or colonial regime, for instance. It is a leader that provides a leadership which is principally people-oriented. That is, a leadership that emphasizes the people's well-being, "democracy", "freedom", individual's rights, and "equality". Psychoanalytically speaking, it is a leadership which is principally based on the pleasure principle. In this sens, it is very similar, for example, to such concepts of "concern for people" leadership (Blake & Mouton, 1964), "consideration" leadership (Fleishman, 1973, for instance) and "maintenance-type leadership" (Misumi, 1985).

The Russian president Gorbachev is a "good" leader par excellence. His *Glasnost* and *Perestroika* —which, as a book, was a best seller in many parts of the world— has relatively brought more freedom, more democracy and a more decentralisation of power. Since he was elected as the head of the Soviet Union, he had been working to repair the "mistakes" of his stalinian predecessors, by making it up with the internal opposants to the communist party, and human rights activists. For instance, recently, he has issued a decree to restore the Soviet citizenship to all dissidents deprived of it for their political activity between 1966 and 1988. Moreover, by accepting to sign with the United States the treaty on the reduction of nuclear arms, withdrawing Soviet forces from Afghanistan, president Gorbachev has gained also international trust and attracted sympathy from all over the world, even from the United States, the one time enemy. As shown by all the products (T-shirts, dolls, posters, films, etc.) representing Gorbachev (or Gorby) which sell like hot cakes in the market, his national, and international achievements have made of him an idole, a "good" leader, and brought him the *Nobel Prize*. A militant pacifist (quoted by Thom, 1989) compares Gorbachev to Jesus and states that "he (Gorbachev) is always offering us goodly things, like disarmament proposals..."

Obviously, Gorbachev's popularity at home did not, however, last that long. He first began to hear the catcalls and shouts of protest cascading from citizens in

Moscow during the annual May Day parade in the Red Square. As reported by the press everywhere, he was object of many kinds of acting outs: insulting words, hurling of rocks and other objects, spitting, etc. His misfortune did not stop here. For he has been, since then, facing a number of difficulties at home. The split of the communist party, the independancy problem of the Baltic Sates, and the confrontation with his onetime allies in the party's Politburo are among the most serious problems faced by his leadership.

In a letter to a newspaper—which was the principal stimulus to this paper—a reader, who intrigued by the attitude of the Soviet peopls, asks:

"I really can't understand the Russians...they wanted freedom, they have it now...why are they complaining so much...Gorby is the best leader they have ever had...why don't they give him a chance...?"

I think that neither an economical, nor a socio-political analysis can help us to answer this question. For, even if the socio-economical and political reforms carried out by Gorbachev did not improve the living conditions of the people, they did not objectively speaking, worsen it neither. Only a psychoanalytical approach can, thus, shed light on the real latent motives behind the people aggressive attitude towards Gorbachev's leadership.

The present paper suggests that this ambivalence towards the "good" leader, represented by Gorbachev here, is the result of a massive regression to the early object relations, and, especially, the interference of excessive envy and greed. In other words, as can be shown by the analysis of the numerous events which have been occuring since Gorbachev has had access to power, the Russian people attitude towards him is very akin to the behavior of an infant when experiencing envy at the paranoid-schizoid position. Like an infant in relation to the primal object-breast, as soon as the soviet people became aware of Gorbachev's leadership as a source of life improvement and more satisfaction, the people's love toward him, and the desire to preserve him increased. Which explains his early popularity that led to his reelection (July 1990) as the Soviet Communist Party chief, and the credit of being the only person that has the ability to hold the increasingly unpopular party together. But, this very experience of the goodness associated with Gorbachev's leadership, has stirred also in the people envious feelings towards him. Thus, like the primal object-breast is envied for its goodness by the infant, Gorbachev stirs envy for his success in challenging the former rigid communist ideological apparatus (by favouring *Glasnost*), and by his increasing popularity inside and outside the country. As regards the shouts of protest, demands for his resignation, insults, and real attacks, he experienced in the annual May Day parade, they are direct manifestations of this envy and greed. These envious attacks are not, as in the case of the infant, directed toward the object (Gorbachev himself) only, but also towards the very nourishment (milk), represented here by *Perestroika*. This has led, as

seen during the congress of the Communist Party (held in July 1990), to its (*Perestroika's*) suspicious questioning, criticisms and rejection by many delegates. The fact that envy underlines these criticisms and denunciations was also suspected by *Pravda* (3 August 1988):

"One of our chief errors has been that while we were busy building a new world, we failed to notice the destructive force of envy...as long as we do not put a lid on envy, the success of Perestroika is doubtful".

The aim of envy towards Gorbachev's leadership is, like in the infant-breast relationship, to take away all the goodness one can extract from it, empty it, devaluate it, spoil it, and make it unenviable. Thus, the people's envy of Gorbachev is not limited to the wish to be as good as him — a desire which clearly motivates his principal opponent, Boris Yeltsin. It is accentuated by its fusion with greed, a feeling which is at the roots of the endless demands of more freedom, openness, autonomy (etc.) from many parts of the Soviet Union.

This may sound paradoxical. One can not avoid asking how an envied object become also object of aggression and rejection? This can be, as noted above, explained by the fact that envy operates by projection. The envious subject projects his "bad" impulses onto the object, aiming at devaluating, and, therefore, making it unenviable and bad. Which led, in the case of Gorbachev, to such rationalizations as "he is incapable, his reform (*Perestroika*) will lead our country to ruine, he should resign then".

The Soviet people's excessive envy of their leader has many consequences. It has interfered with the normal functioning of the process of splitting the object into "good" and "bad" Object, leading to a splitting of a different nature. Like the infant, owing to excessive envy, the Soviet people resorted to splitting between an omnipotently idealized Gorbachev (different of a "good" one), perceived as the "Saviour" that can hold the nation and the party altogether, and an extremely "bad" Gorbachev, the one whose leadership "has led to hunger and the nation's ruine". This schizoid splitting, expressed in form of attitudinal ambivalence towards Gorbachev, was manifestly observed during the ten days of the 28th Congress. However, this splitting, it will be recalled, can not be maintained, for, sooner or later, this idealized object will give rise to envy and will be attacked and spoiled. Thus, the incapability of the people to carry on the fundamental normal splitting into the "good" and "bad" has generated a state of confusion and uncertainty about the goodness of the leadership. This confusional state has, like in the infant-breast relationship, the effect of preventing the people from identifying with and introjecting Gorbachev as a "good" object, and, consequently, increasing their greed and destructive impulses.

The people's envious attitude has interfered, like in the case of the envious infant, with their capacity to enjoy whatever they receive, and consequently

undermined their feeling of gratitude. Which explains to some extent why any attempt (by Gorbachev) to save the ailing soviet economy has been object of destructive criticism from both sides. In fact, Gorbachev's *Perestroika* has come under fire from the traditionalists for proceeding too quickly and from the reformers for moving too slowly. This behavior reminds us of the feeling of envious infant towards the feeding breast. As described by Klein (1957), even if adequately fed the infant also

"may have a grievance that milk comes too quickly or too slowly; or that he was not given the breast when he most craved for it, and therefore, when it is offered, he does not want it anymore...turns away from it and sucks his fingers instead".

For, the very satisfaction the breast provides gives rise, in the infant, to envy and the resulting destructive and spoiling wishes as a result of the feeling that, as Klein (Ibid.) put it, "this gift (satisfaction) seems something so unattainable" and perfect. The rejective attitude of the Soviet people towards the personality and socio-political reforms of Gorbachev can be interpreted, in the same way, as the result of this primitive envy towards the satisfactory breast and resulting lack of gratitude. Of course, the fact that gratifying leadership stirs envy does not imply that deprivation will free the people from their envious feelings. On the contrary, deprivation, as is the case in the infant increases the people's greedy feelings, persecutory anxiety and, consequently, envy.

But, how does it happen that the "good" leader (like the "good" breast) becomes object of envy ? The reason is that the people when experiencing a given deprivation feel (like a deprived envious infant towards the breast) that the object (physical or spiritual) of their demand is deliberately withheld from them and kept by the leader (the party, the government) for his own benefit, and this stirs envy and greed. Such daily complaint from the Soviet people as "they (Party leaders, State, etc.) have all that they want, but we (people) have nothing" which are reported in many newspapers, may illustrate this envious mentality. The food shortage and empty stores in Moscow are illustrative expressions of greed, a greed which, in its turn, is increased by persecutory anxiety. This anxiety is expressed in form of fear to be deprived of the vital products, and thus subjected to death. According to a poll reported in an edition of the *News of Moscow*, 62 percent of the Soviet Citizens fear that famine will reign in the country in the near future (*Mainichi Daily News*, November 17, 1990). Hence, Gorbachev was right when he interpreted the increasing dissatisfaction as due not only "to empty store selves...(but) to empty souls as well" (*Mainichi Daily News*, July 4, 1990).

Since, as discussed above, excessive envy towards the object gives rise to such acute feeling of pain, a certain amount of guilt and hopelessness, a number of defence processes are mobilized against it. Among the consequences of envy, feeling

of guilt and hopelessness are among the most observed phenomena in the case of the Soviet people. These feelings are manifest in the following critical excerpt from a long article by the Rector of the *Historical Archives Institute of Moscow*, published in the *Mainichi Daily News* (September 7, 1990):

"Gorbachev..(took) his first real political step to the left in many months; he met with Boris Yeltsin...This turn of events seems to call for sincere rejoicing. But there is anxiety too. The two parties that have come to an agreement about the future of the whole country (which country ?) are the Center and Russia (and is it all of Russia at that ?). In other words, in the conditions of a disintegrating USSR and growing ethnic suspiciousness this meeting could be perceived as an agreement between the Center and the Center...So this is how we live now. A flash of hope, a reason to rejoice ! And immediately, new difficulties and even more complex problems."

As principal defences against its envy towards leadership, the Soviet people resorts to such mechanisms which aims at the spoiling and devaluation of the object (Gorbachev). These defences which constitute, as described earlier, the aim of envious feelings, are, thus, used also to defend the object (leader) from envy. They consist in forming a spoilt and devaluated image of Gorbachev and his reforms. For a spoilt and devaluated object arouses no envy. This spoiling and devaluation of leadership may take an intellectual and pacific form, like the criticism displayed by many delegates during the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. It may be also expressed, like during the May Day parade, in a form of direct aggressive behavior. Holding up Gorbachev's portrait marred by insulting words and drawings may be another indirect devaluation method, which was chosen by the Moscovite arrested (July 29, 1990) on charges of insulting the president.

The Emergent Leadership : A pipe-line for the people's envy

Let me now turn to the function fulfilled by Boris Yeltsin as an "emergent leader", a concept designating the informal leader who emerges within the group as a result of the group dynamics. It is, thus, different from the formal leader. The role of the emergent leader is reserved, as noted by Bion (1961), to the member who is most overwhelmed by persecutory anxiety. In a different paper (Hafsi, 1990), the author argued that the emergence of leadership within t-groups, is the result of the group's regression to paranoid-schizoid position and resort to splitting as a defence against persecutory anxiety associated with the trainer and the training. This splitting leads to the creation of a "good" group comprising the participants, and a "bad" persecutory group embodied by the trainer, the rules and the training content. The group resists to, and attacks the "bad" trainer, allowing (consciously and unconsciously) a leader to emerge as a "carrier" (Anzieu et al., 1982, and Anzieu, 1984) of the group's negative transference. This temporary

idealized leader will lead the group (for a number of t-group sessions) in terms of his own, and by the same token, the group's phantasy. Hence, the author concluded that the emergent leadership fulfils a defensive function against the "bad" group. It allows the group facing persecutory anxiety to defend against the persecutory "bad" group.

This interpretation applies also to Boris Yeltsin. His personal excessive envy—which is partly grounded in reality,—and paranoid attack towards Gorbachev has led the people to identify with, and select him as the "carrier" of their envious attacks towards the persecutory "bad" Gorbachev. As reported by Hazan (1990), Gorbachev has suspected the latent motives underlining Yeltsin's reactions to his leadership, when he referred (in a speech addressed at the Moscow Gorkom plenum, on 11 November 1987) to his (Yeltsin's) mistakes as "springing from personal ambitions and desire to stand out...immoderate vanity, and desire to be always in the public eye". In fact, his personal ambitions and envy were manifest to the public eye. That is why he was driven, owing to an "unconscious alliance" (Anzieu et al., *ibid.*) to emerge in order to externalize and carry out their conscious and unconscious envy. He functions then, in metaphorical terms, as a pipe-line through which flow the people's envious wishes to empty and spoil Gorbachev. This comes very close to Bion's comparison of the leader with an empty vessel which the group members can fill up with their own needs and phantasies. This explains then the popularity he has been enjoying among the people. As evidence of the people's support, and identification with him a number of some 10,000 Moscow's citizens marched on 19 March to demonstrate their solidarity, chanting "Hang on in, Yeltsin !" (according to *Paris AFP* in english, 19 March 1989). This support is also illustrated by the example of buttons with "Yeltsin's picture and captions (that read 'Tell'em, Yeltsin!') which were sold in Moscow (according to *Washington Post*, 9 August 1988), and the insistent demand for the publication of his speech at Central Committee of the communist party in 1988. He was also elected top of the Congress of the People's Deputies by a majority of more than 89 percent, according to *TASS International Service* (27 March 1989). Asked by *L'Unita* about the reason of Yeltsin's popularity, the Central Committee Secretary Aleksandr Yakovlev answered that "this is a phenomenon which really must be studied". He suggested that this was due to the fact that "he was insulted —as a result of his expulsion by the party— and people felt sorry for him".

However, this is not the only reason that binds the people to Yeltsin. His popularity stems rather from his personal constant envious attacks against the privileges enjoyed by the apparatchiks, which is, as discussed earlier, the result of the feeling that these privileges are deliberately withheld from them and kept by the leader (the party, the government) for his own benefit. These envious denunciations were, thus, music to the ears of the citizens who were also haunted by the same feelings. In fact, his opposition to the privileged high-ranking bureaucrats—represented by Gorbachev— "was one of Yeltsin's pet topics". He was quoted by Hazan (*Ibid.*)

as saying to the Warsaw daily *Nin* (26 October 1986) that they "have no moral right to luxuries".

As an emergent leader, Yeltsin's behavior reflects not only the people's envy, but also their ambivalence or confusion about Gorbachev, a confusion which, as discussed earlier, stems from the incapability to carry on the fundamental normal spitting into the "good" and "bad", and, consequently, the difficulty to identify with and introject the "good" leader (Gorbachev). In fact, Yeltsin's attitude towards Gorbachev is very ambivalent. While criticizing and attacking him at many occasions, he also denied the fact that he was running against Gorbachev. In his interview with *Time*, he insisted: "I am not an alternative candidate to Gorbachev. I accept Gorbachev as a leader" (20 March 1989). According to *Pravda* (13 November 1987), he also addressed the participants at the Moscow Gorkom plenum (two days earlier) saying:

"I bear a great burden of guilt before the Moscow party organization, ... (and) personally before Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev, whose prestige is so high in our organization, in our country. and throughout the world".

The question that rises from this discussion on Yeltsin's role is what is the future of this emergent leadership? In other words, is it a temporary or lasting phenomenon? In response to this, one can easily predict, based on past examples, that as long as Gorbachev (the envied object) is still in power, Yeltsin's leadership will remain functional. In other words, Yeltsin will continue—in terms of his own and the people's phantasy—his battle against Gorbachev as long as the people are actuated by envy. But, the unconscious alliance between him and his supporters is soon broken off when the envied object, Gorbachev, is removed (following resignation, for example). If this happened, sooner or later, Yeltsin is likely, then, to become, in his turn object of attack and rejection by the people. This phenomenon is commonly observed in small groups (e.g., Anzieu, 1984; Anzieu et al. 1982; Hafsi, 1990), and is not rare also in the political world.

Conclusions and Discussion

Adhering to the postulate of methodological individualism and Kleinian thought, the author has, up to here, attempted to discuss why a "good" leader cannot function effectively. Defining the actual Soviet president Gorbachev as a "good" leader, he developed the hypothesis that the latter (Gorbachev)'s leadership failure is the result of a massive regression to the paranoid-schizoid position, and, therefore, the effect of excessive feeling of envy coupled with greed as defined by Melanie Klein. That is, like the "good" breast, the "good" leadership also stirs the people's envy. Which leads the people to display a negative attitude towards this leadership. Consequently, as in the case of the president Gorbachev, every proposal

or reform he carries is criticised, attacked and finally rejected, because he could not be introjected and integrated as a "good" (object) leader. This negative attitude aims at emptying him of all his goodness, spoiling him and taking his place as a source of gratifying experience. These envious feelings towards Gorbachev are "pipe-lined" by the emergent leader, Boris Yeltsin, as a result of an "unconscious alliance" or complicity (between him and the people), which is based on lateral (people-people) and vertical (people-leader) identifications.

Useless to say, that the analysis proposed here is not limited to Gorbachev only, but to all those leaders in many parts of the world to whom the definition of "good" leader applies. It applies, for instance, to Mahatma Gandhi, Anwar Sadat in Egypt, Corazon Aquino in the Philippines, Pakistan's Benazir Bhutto, Violeta Chamorro in Nicaragua, to name only those. The common characteristic to all these leaders is the fact that they emerged at the head of their respective nation following a harsh colonial, or military regime. They were all people-oriented leaders, and as such, they were exposed to their peoples envious destructive attitude, which led, some of them to death or forced resignation. (As to those who are still in power, they are likely, soon or later, to face the same destiny.).

Here stops the resemblance between the infant-good breast relationship and the relationship between a large group and its "good" leader. For, the normal infant can usually work through the paranoid-schizoid position, and succeed in introjecting in a stable way the "good" object. Which, as described above, results in a decrease of envy, and an increase of admiration, love and gratitude towards the object. This usually coincides with the entrance into the depressive position and the mobilization of more constructive defence processes (reparation, for example) to combat depressive anxiety. Obviously, the role played by the infant's social environment in working through the paranoid-schizoid position is decisive. Without a stable, loving and gratifying environment, the infant will never succeed in this task.

The problem with the large group, however, is that it tends, as shown by many Kleinian oriented researcher (Bion, *ibid*; Jaques, 1955, for example, to name only those), to remain fixated at the paranoid-schizoid position. As described by Bion, the group wastes a large part of its time and energy defending against paranoid-schizoid anxiety, and can, thus, hardly be freed from its painful envious feeling towards the "good" leadership. Unlike the infant, the large group very often does not have the time to see its feeling toward the leadership comes to maturity. This maturity process is often interrupted by the emergent leadership which functions to increase the group persecutory anxiety and envy, and reinforce such paranoid-schizoid defences as splitting and idealization. This emergent leadership may sometimes stimulate also what Klein call "mock reparation". Unlike real reparation --which is a defence against early depressive anxiety-- consists, as pointed out by Segal (1981), in denying the dependence on and the ambivalence towards the "good" object (leadership); "the object is controlled omnipotently in phantasy and treated with either triumph, or contempt, so that its loss is not so

painful or frightening...Mock reparation is also often coupled with the phantasy of being able to repair the damaged object magically", writes Alford (1989). The "500 days" economical plan proposed by Yeltsin may be an illustrative expression of this very mock reparation process.

When we consider the modern history of the Soviet Union, it becomes clear that people have always behaved in a similar way towards their "good" leaders. That is, the difficulties Gorbachev's leadership is facing are similar to those experienced by his predecessors, Lenin and Krushchev, for instance. Moreover, the same history shows also that a "good" leader is often followed by an emergent "mock reparative leader" (as opposed to a real reparative leader, a concept used also differently by Volkan, 1980). Accordingly, Lenin (a "good" leader) was followed by Stalin, and Krushchev (another "good leader") by Brezhnev, leading thus to a succession of "good" and "mock reparative" leaders. Hence, it is very likely that Gorbachev's leadership will sooner give way (following resignation) to a mock reparative leadership, confirming, thus, this succession. This succession, or cyclicity, was described also by Breslauer (1989) who portrayed it in terms of alternation of revitalizing (corresponding to the "good") and consolidative leaderships. He summarized this cyclicity of the leadership as follows:

Stalin : consolidative leader
 Khrushchev : revitalizing leader
 Brezhnev : consolidative leader
 Andropov : revitalizing leader
 Chernenko : consolidative leader
 Gorbachev : revitalizing leader

Finally, one of the principal implications of the hypothesis developed in this paper is that a "good" leadership, which tends to favor the pleasure principle, can not be effective (Hafsi, 1989). This has been confirmed by a number of empirical studies (e.g., Misumi, 1984), although different concepts are used to describe this kind of leadership. Hence, the leadership effectiveness does not reside merely in being people-oriented and the emphasis of the pleasure principle. It lies rather in the capability of the leader to emphasize both, as discussed by the author somewhere else (Hafsi, *ibid*), the pleasure principle and also the principle of reality. To conclude, I hope that the above mentioned intrigued newspaper reader can find now an answer to his question and understand the latent motives behind the lack of gratitude he attributed to the Soviet people. However, the author does not pretend to provide here the "right" explanation to this phenomenon. For, it is a real *tour de force*, and a "risky business" as put by Thom (*Ibid.*), to try to analyse and write about a situation whose outcome is still invisible, and where emotion and fantasy reign.

Author's Notes

1. Melanie Klein (1959) writes that "as regards envy, it is not easy to explain how the mother who feeds the infants and looks after him can also be object of envy. But whenever he is hungry or feels neglected, the child's frustration leads to the phantasy that the milk and love are deliberately withheld from him, or kept by the mother for her benefit. Such suspicions are the basis of envy..." (p. 254).
2. The ever increasing number of these Kinds of insulting and slanderous manifestations against Gorbachev's personality has led the Soviet legislature to pass a law on slandering the president.
3. If we consider that Boris Yeltsin was among the first architects of 'Perestroika and Glasnost', and that he has been put away from the road to popularity and power by Gorbachev (who seems to be the main person to get credits of it), his envy and attacks become relatively understandable.

References

- Alford, C.F. 1989. *Melanie Klein and critical social theory*. Yale University Press.
- Anzieu, D. 1984. *Le groupe et l'inconscient: L'imaginaire groupal*. Paris: Bordas.
- Anzieu, D., kaës, R., Bèjarno, A., Missenard, A., & Pontalis, J. B., 1982. *Le travail psychanalytique dans les groupes: Cadre et processus*. Paris: Bordas.
- Bion, W.R. 1961. *Experiences in groups*. New York: Basic Books.
- Black, R.R., & Mouton, J. S. 1964. *The managerial grid*. Houston:Gulf.
- Breslauer, G.W. 1989. From Brezhnev to Gorbachev: End and means of Soviet leadership. In R.C. Taras (Ed.), *Leadership change in communist states*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Erikson, E. 1970. On the nature of the psycho-historical evidence: In search for Gandhi. In D.A. Rustow (Ed.), *Philosophers and kings: Studies in leadership*. New York: Braziller.
- Fleishman, E.A. 1973. Twenty years of consideration on and initiating structure. In E. Fleishman and J. Hunt (Eds.), *Current developments in the study of leadership*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Freud, S. 1927. *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego*. International Psychoanalytic Press.
- Freud, S. 1961. *Civilization and its discontents*. New York: W.W.Norton.
- Gatzke, H.W. 1973. Hitler and psychohistory. *Amer. hid Rev.*, 78,394-401.
- Hafsi, M. 1988. A psychoanalytic approach to Performance-Maintenance (PM) leadership. *Psychologia*, 31,2, 71-83.
- Hafsi, M. 1990. The leadership function in training groups: A psychoanalytical approach to group dynamics. *Psychologia*, 33, 4, 230-241.

- Hazan, B.A. 1990. *Gorbachev and his enemies: The struggle for Perestroika*. Westview Press.
- Jaques, E. 1955. Social systems as defence against persecutory and depressive anxiety. In M. Klein, P. Heimann, and R. Money Kyrle (Eds.), *News directions in psycho-analysis*. London: Tavistock.
- Klein, M. 1957. Envy and gratitude. In *Envy and gratitude and other works: 1946-1963*. London; Virago Press, 1988.
- Klein, M. 1959. Our adult world and its roots in infancy. In *Envy and gratitude and other works: 1946-1963*. London: Virago Press, 1988.
- Klein, M. 1988. *Envy and gratitude and other works: 1946-1963*. London; Virago Press.
- Langer, W.C. 1972. *The mind of Adolf Hitler*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mazlish, B. 1900. History, psychology, and leadership. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Misumi, J. 1985. *The behavioral science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Misumi, J., and Hafsi, M. 1989. La théorie de leadership de PM (Performance-Maintenance): une approche Japonaise de l'étude scientifique du leadership. *Bulletin de Psychologie, Tome XLII, 392, 727-736*.
- Segal, H. 1974. *Introduction to the work of Melanie Klein*. New York: Basic Books.
- Segal, H. 1981. *Melanie Klein*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Thom, F. 1990. *The Gorbachev phenomenon: A history of perestroika*. London: Pinter publishers Limited.
- Volkan, V.D. 1980. Narcissistic personality organization and reparative leadership. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 30, 131-52*.
- Waite, R.G. L. 1977. *The psychopathic god: Adolf Hitler*. New York: Basic Books.
- Yalom, I.D. 1985. *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy*. New York: Basic Books.

SUMMARY

This paper investigates the cause underligning the failure of the "good" or people-oriented leadership. Applying Melanie Klein's theory on early object relations, the author proposes a psychoanalytic analysis of the failure of the leadership of the Soviet president, Gorbachev who presents the characteristics of a "good" leader. The hypothesis developed in the paper is that Gorbachev's failure was the result of interference of excessive "envy" and, consequently, the incapability of the people to experience "gratitude" towards his leadership. Hence, this paper describes both the behaviors that result from the people's envy towards Gorbachev and also the mechanisms mobilized by the people against their envious feeling. The emergence of Boris Yeltsin as a leader is also analyzed in relationship to the people's envy. This has led to the hypothesis that the latter, thanks to "an unconscious alliance" between him and the people, functions, in Anzieu's terms, as the "carrier" of, or a "pipe-line" for both the people's and his own envy. The author bases his analysis on the events reported by the mass-media, and some documents, such as books and articles.

