CHAPTER-I

CONCEPT OF POLITICAL LEADERSHIP AND BRIEF LIFE SKETCH OF SRI MALLIKARJUN M KHARGE

Among the many issues that political science deals with, the problem of leadership clearly stands out. Leadership is an essential feature of all government and governance: weak leadership contributes to government failures, and strong leadership is indispensable if the government is to succeed. Wise leadership secures prosperity in the long run; foolhardy leadership may bring about a catastrophe. The lack of leadership reutilizes governance. Its political and creative aspects fade away: it becomes no different from administration, focusing solely on pattern maintenance and repetition of the same. On the other hand, over-assertive leadership pays little attention to institutional constraints: it may bring about sudden, unexpected changes, and disrupt the normal flow of the political process, thus detracting from its transparency and/or predictability. Political leadership and followership account for significant differences across and within individual nation states in responding to both newer global problems and traditional governance issues. Globalization creates the demand for new forms of international and supranational leadership: as a ‘package of transnational flows of people, production, investment, information, ideas, and authority’¹, “globalization elevates the significance of leadership of international organizations, regional groups of states, and global agencies”².
Leadership is a historically concrete phenomenon; that is, its structures and methods change with the passage of time. To influence events and affect outcomes, leaders need to be prepared to abandon policy instruments and ideas that no longer work in a new environment. They need to be able to embrace the new and reevaluate the old, even some of the earlier discarded ideas and methods of adapting to environments, if the circumstances call for it. Contributors to this book attempt to demonstrate in various ways that strategic-tactical innovative adaptation is the key to effective political leadership in a diverse set of regime types and cultural contexts. Innovations may take different forms, however. Though all of our authors are generally committed to democracy, human rights and environmental sustainability, we do not entirely agree on what these ideals mean theoretically and imply practically.

Definitions

Leadership is a part of multicausal social processes that bring about concrete political outcomes – election results, for example. In the literature on leadership and management, political leadership from the local to the national to the global level is usually and correctly viewed as a subtype of human social leadership – though we would stress that it is a special ‘thick’, potentially all-inclusive, subtype. To understand, explain and predict patterns of political leadership and arrive at normative prescriptions for its ‘proper’ design and implementation, inquirers need to analyze the beliefs, values, characters, power relations, and ethical/unethical values, attitudes and actions of leaders and followers, as well as their historical situation and cultural-institutional context.
Both leaders and followers are involved in a circular process of motivation and power exchange that is often difficult to break up into a causal sequence. Still ‘politics as leadership’ does occur, however complex it is to conclude about the significance of its causal role: leaders mobilize a significant number of followers to accept their diagnosis of, and policy prescriptions for, collective problems or crises. Moreover, leadership is a symbolic activity mediated by culture, for leaders as ‘identity entrepreneurs’ are engaged in providing myths/visions to create, reshape or enhance national and other political cultures. “In the process, leaders and followers themselves are affected by what they help create”.

Political leadership is one of the most widely experienced and intuitively or tacitly understood phenomena – like great power competition, Olympic rivalries, climate change, the right to develop, or central human rights controversies about trade-offs between security and civil and political rights. In contrast, “the concept of political leadership is difficult to define essentially, because it is dependent on institutional, cultural and historical contexts and situations – both particular and general”. Empirical operationalization of the concept of leadership involves a host of methodological issues, specifically those related to the definition of variables and the problem of spurious correlation. Nonetheless, “the phenomenon of leadership clearly incorporates leaders involved in some type of innovative adaptation with followers, group objectives and organizational means, and problematic situations and contexts”.
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The Concise Oxford English Dictionary defines “a ‘leader’ as ‘the person who leads or commands a group, organization, or country’. ‘To lead’ means to ‘cause (a person or animal) to go with one by drawing them along; show (someone) the way to a destination by preceding or accompanying them’.

In other words, goal setting and motivation both figure prominently as essential attributes of the notion of leadership. Other languages differ considerably with the meanings of equivalent translatable terms, but have also adopted the English ‘leader’ and ‘leadership’ in the last century”.

‘Leadership’ is of more recent usage. The term was coined in the early nineteenth century and refers to

“The dignity, office, or position of a leader, esp. of a political party; ability to lead; the position of a group of people leading or influencing others within a given context; the group itself; the action or influence necessary for the direction or organization of effort in a group undertaking”.

One should note that military command has been and remains a standard dictionary meaning of leadership in the Oxford English Dictionary and other English dictionaries (other languages present their own linguistic diversity and complexity because of historical and cultural differences). In the military, people in positions of command show followers the way, but are not open to debates in which the force of the better argument decides the course of action. Their hard power of command with coercive enforcement is always in reserve to ‘guide’ the followers in the direction chosen by the leaders. Indeed, the ancient linguistic root of the English verb ‘to lead’ means ‘to go forth, die’.
regards an overall guiding definition of political leadership for research purposes, cultural context matters in giving substantial content to any definition. For example, in a Russian cultural context, a leader with a sentimental, compassionate or weak character would be rejected as a failure.

Moreover, research purposes do allow for a plurality of definitions, each of which is appropriate to the type of study undertaken. Still, most researchers agree that the following elements should be taken into account in defining political leadership:

- The personality and traits of a leader or leaders, including her or his ethical and cultural character;
- The traits and ethical-cultural character of the followers with whom the leader interacts (keeping in mind that leaders of different followers and followers of different leaders interact as well, cooperatively or competitively);
- The societal or organizational context in which the leader–follower interaction occurs—general culture, political culture, political climate, norms, and institutions;
- The agenda of collective problems or tasks which confront the leaders and followers in particular historical situations;
- The nature of the leader’s interpretive judgment, since situations do not define themselves, but have to be defined by leaders’ insights accepted by the followers;
➢ The means – material and intangible – that the leaders use to attain their ends and/or their followers’ goals; these are ‘the techniques which the leader uses to mobilize support on behalf of her or his agenda and/or to maintain support or position’

➢ The effects or results of leadership (whether real or symbolic, long lasting or transient).⁹

‘Political leadership’ overlaps significantly with the higher levels of military, legal, organizational, and religious and ideological leadership, and is a special part of ‘social leadership’ in general, as we contended above. The latter includes parental, business, educational, scientific and technological, athletic, medical, cultural, artistic, religious, and other forms of leadership. Some scholars focus on social leadership as a whole, and deal with political leadership as a part among parts. Social leadership and political leadership manifest themselves in formal positions and behaviorally. “Scholars who stress that political leadership is a special part of social leadership also affirm that leadership is ‘related to power: a leader (in the behavioral sense) is a person who is able to modify the course of events’."¹⁰

One notes that power and leadership are equally elusive concepts that are both difficult to operationalize. The alternative is to go in the direction of strict stipulate definitions, but this may present us with research dilemmas and methodological issues beyond the scope of this book. We agree with those who define political leadership as a rather unique set of power relations and influences that is exercised over a broad range of nationally and globally salient
issue areas and from a position of authoritative preponderance involving ideologies and ethics:

“While many of us have power over a group, perhaps for relatively long periods, and may be leaders as a result, political leaders exercise this power over an area comprising foreign affairs, defense, and the economic and social wellbeing of citizens, even culture and the arts. ... At least in principle, political leadership is broad and might be all-embracing: decisions that could be taken by the leader might cover any subject”.11

There is an overlap between social and political leadership, but the latter is ‘thicker’ than any other type of social leadership in having a monopolistic or preferred access to coercive and inducing hard power, in addition to attracting, persuasive soft power based on ideology, symbolism, ethical/non-ethical character, and perceptions of followers about leaders.

Analytical Framework

“Political leadership implies followership, as well as group tasks to be accomplished through innovative adaptation in a specific situation and institutional cultural context”.12 Leadership–followership is part of the social reality of any group confronting its environment as problematic, in which the group must continually adapt and innovate. The leadership–followership exchanges evolve into a real interactive process, in which the two parts are mutually constitutive and ‘dialectically’ related as a whole that is greater than the sum of the parts. “Leaders affect their followers’ attitudes, beliefs, demands and needs; and the followers affect the leader’s style, qualities, beliefs and
motivations, as they both transform the environment and are reflectively transformed by their own actions”.

Whatever contextual variations exist, political leadership–followership is always a social process of adaptation and innovation – hence, innovative adaptation – to an environment or context that challenges a group’s way of life and values. The leader’s tasks are to:

1. interpret problems
2. prescribe ends and means to solve them
3. propagate personal visions as solutions or, at least, responses to problems
4. Mobilize followers to implement those solutions or responses.

“A growing number of political analysts see leadership as a dynamic, open social system, a coherent process, rather than just a number of sporadic individual acts: ‘some kind of process … that in some way gets people to do something’, or involves ‘some sort of relationship between leaders and followers in which something happens or gets done’.

A leader, says Kellerman, ‘chooses a particular course of action and then in some way gets others to go along; or more subtly, the leader encourages the led to ‘choose’ the course that the group will follow …’ The co-determination of the two parts of the leadership–followership system means that leaders are, to a significant extent, created by the led. Followers matter; indeed ‘leadership, seen as a process, is caused by following’. “Whether people follow primarily by inner ‘instinct’ or through cultural socialization, the significance of
followership for leaders’ successes and failures has become better appreciated in the recent literature”\footnote{\protect\textsuperscript{16}}.

The actual ‘supply’ of leadership is driven by a pre-existing societal ‘demand’, which the political entrepreneurship of a would-be leader seeks to satisfy. More often than not, there is more than one way to satisfy that demand, or to create an impression that the problem can be resolved. Historical contexts and problematic situations are variously ‘interpreted’ by opposing elite groups, political leaders themselves as members of these elites, their advisers and organizational ‘machines’, and mass followers. Political leadership may therefore be seen as a form of competitive entrepreneurial activity in the marketplace of ideas and values, sometimes stressing structural leadership, intellectual leadership or charismatic leadership. Of course, in addition to leadership–followership, elite–mass formations alienated apolitical individuals, independent intellectuals, and professional and epistemic communities are also involved in interpreting their common world and its problems. “However, leader–follower groups are unique, as they not only interpret problematic situations, but also prescribe specific courses of action and mobilize people to solve social problems, thus seeking to transform existing contexts and situations”\footnote{\protect\textsuperscript{17}}.

It is important to stress that contextual and situational interpretations are not ‘pre-programmed’ into the fabric of social life. As environments are not self defining or obvious to political actors, a conscious interpretive effort is called forth and provided by political leaders. The results of such an effort are
naturally open to political and ideological contestation. Social environments are not reducible to natural or technological entities that are simply ‘out there’ for all to see, but rather also include socially constructed facts resulting from the norms and practices accepted by a group. To be sure, some contexts are relatively easier to interpret than others—for example, famines, natural disasters, military invasions, disease pandemics and severe economic recessions or depressions—such as the deep global recession that started in 2008. Even so, once cause-and-effect relationships enter into political discourse, once responsibility gets assigned and Accountability demanded, the re-interpretive function of leadership immediately comes to the fore, and the space for political entrepreneurship and creativity increases exponentially.

While traditional studies saw great leaders as creative agents driving political processes for the society at large, newer research is placing increased emphasis on the necessity to avoid drawing a simple dichotomy between social structures and political agency, including leader–follower groups. Social structures are ‘collections of people, organized perhaps in some ‘system’ or multiple systems, but still people, and thus malleable, susceptible to the ultimate agency of human learning and leadership. In other words, unlike natural structures, social structures are only relatively enduring and do not exist independently of the activities they regulate or constitute. Agents who accept shared conceptions, norms and identities in their activities construct social structures that persist only as long as these conceptions, norms and identities remain relatively static and do not significantly change. Some leader–follower
interactive groups are long-lasting; others are temporary, contingent upon the ‘strategic selectivity’ of the group’s structural environment.\textsuperscript{18}

The leader–follower relationship exists on a continuum from extreme inequality and asymmetry, whereby strong leaders exercise overwhelming domination over subordinate followers (a significant constant in the past and present), to the opposite extreme of almost total symmetry and equality, whereby strong leaders influence and inspire followers to become strong, autonomous leaders themselves (a rare utopian event, except within elite leadership circles involving leaders, co and sub-leaders and advisers). Leadership at both ends of the continuum, however, is characterized by interaction, whether it is materially ‘transactional’ or morally ‘Transformational’.\textsuperscript{19}

Moreover, one can distinguish between ‘adaptive’ leaders who react and respond to challenges from local and global systems by introducing changes on the margins, and ‘innovative’ leaders who seek to implement more radical changes and revise the very rules of the game, or the nature of societal responses to the problem. Innovative leaders frequently demonstrate exceptional (‘charismatic’) leadership which seems to emanate from the personality of a leader. Charismatic leadership tends to arise in times of crisis and always leads, for temporary periods at least, away from the world of everyday life and everyday routine. Innovative leadership, says Sheffer, refers to:
“... dominant leaders who introduced new ideas or novel orientations, and for better or for worse promoted major changes in their respective societies, which in turn altered both the nearer and more remote external environments of these societies ... [by advancing] vision, inspiration, conceptualization of change, articulation of ideological goals and their communication to followers and foes, risk taking, [the] formation of groups of followers and their occasional mobilization, [and] guidance of followers toward the achievement of goals”.

Sheffer’s summary refers to ‘fuzzy’ concepts such as vision, inspiration and risk taking. These concepts seem to be of a subjective nature and refer to individual psychological qualities of a leader. However, none of those qualities would be of any interest to us, if not for their lasting social importance. When a leader’s ‘charisma’, vision and inspiration become the catalysts of social and political change, they leave the realm of individual psychology and acquire the new qualities of an inter subjective reality shared by a great number of people. It is these people’s actions, guided by a common set of goals first articulated by a leader or leaders. Those objectify the leader’s vision and help transform the environment. What is good leadership and how does it differ from bad leadership? This is an area where empirical political science encounters normative political theory. The terms are loaded. We tend to believe that ‘good’ leadership should be good both ethically and instrumentally. ‘Bad’ leadership can be designated as such if it is morally evil, rests on the violation of human dignity and rights (or some variant moral orientation), or caters
solely to the egoistic whims and private interests of a ruler. It may also be ‘bad’ in the sense of being ineffective due to, for example, incompetence, rigidity or intemperance in leaders or followers that interferes with the use of appropriate means to attain the ends sought.

In ‘effective’ leadership, the leader successfully chooses the means that bring about the desired ends. If the means chosen are devised anew – rather than simply taken from the arsenal of time-tested, routine responses to typical problems – effective leadership corresponds to the pattern of innovative adaptation. Complex leadership can be both ‘effective’ and ‘ethical’; that is, the leader successfully chooses the means that are most likely to attain the ends sought, but also seeks to embody end-values (equality, freedom, justice, human rights, environmental sustainability) and modal-values (honesty, reliability, trustworthiness, fairness) in the process. “The effectiveness of leadership is determined by the actual short- and long-term consequences of leaders’ actions. Judgment of a leader’s effectiveness may be revised in historiographies, in view of long-term consequences”.

The degree of ethics in leadership is determined by relevant argumentation and discourse. However, there is a core set of ethical/moral insights that is available for practical application: principles of the just-war tradition; reciprocity; elementary principles of distributive justice requiring that society or the dominant group care for the ill, the most vulnerable, the starving, and the economically worst-off; and an appreciation of the core virtues of
ethics including practical wisdom and judgment, moderation, courage, and a sense of fairness and justice, sympathy and compassion.

Some theorists argue that leadership by definition is ethically good. It is ‘a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal’ but without using coercion and Bass (1990; 1998; 1985) have correctly pointed out that the Northhouse-Burns approach has a fundamental weakness, which is the problem of the so-called ‘Hitler’s ghost’. Kellerman argues that not only was Hitler’s impact on the twentieth century arguably greater than any other state leader’s; Hitler was skilled at inspiring, mobilizing and directing his followers. Notwithstanding the indiscriminate use of coercion against followers and adversaries alike, and despite the evil of his racist and Social Darwinist ends, Hitler’s leadership was unusually effective in a purely instrumental sense of the word. Kellerman’s argument is empirically persuasive. We cannot dismiss the problem of instrumentally effective, even if morally repugnant, leadership by simply refusing to use the term ‘leader’ in such cases. Labelling Hitler as a ‘ruler’, ‘tyrant’ or ‘power-wielder’ in pointed avoidance of the term ‘leader’ does little service to empirical political science. If we decide to limit the studied universe of leaders by weeding out all tyrants, egoistic ‘power-wielders’ and morally deficient individuals, the remaining number of cases might be too few from which to draw any meaningful conclusions. For comparative purposes, we would, therefore, seek to employ a value-neutral definition of leadership that focuses on its instrumental (ability to influence people and effect outcomes), organizational (goal-setting and
motivation), strategic-visionary and entrepreneurial (innovative adaptation and creativity) qualities, rather than post hoc normative evaluation of its end-results.

Successful leaders are those who have demonstrated their ability to move their society tangibly in the direction that seemed clearly supportive of their suggested ‘grand design’. Unsuccessful leaders are those whose efforts to move their society in the direction of their choosing have backfired or brought about results clearly destructive of their propagated strategic vision. Historical evidence suggests that a good number of political leaders evade academic attempts at neat classification, as they switched from the one to the other side of the ‘Successful/ Unsuccessful’ divide at various times in their political careers and especially in regards to this or that particular element of a ‘grand design’ under consideration. Without a doubt, the ‘successful/unsuccessful’ classification is also profoundly influenced by the interpreter’s point of view, methodological premises and evaluative frames.

In the voluminous, and growing, social science literature on political leadership and followership, one can find a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches to studying leadership, but little agreement on what reliable knowledge about leadership does exist (for example, Grint 1997; Grint 2000; Grint 2005; Kellerman 2008; Peele 2005; Nye 2008; Yukl 2009). Defining, explaining, predicting and evaluating leadership are all areas of active scholarly debate. Nonetheless, there is a degree of consensus among political scientists and historians that the case study approach with qualitative
methods, and the systematic use of counterfactual analysis, combined with comparative quantitative investigations have been and will continue to be indispensable for arriving at reliable knowledge about political leadership – without denying the value of experimental and other methods used to study leadership in social and political psychology.

Given the importance of impersonal cultural, ecological, demographic, scientific-technological, and institutional structures globally and within states, what role do individual political leaders actually play and how causally significant are their contributions in bringing about political outcomes? The debate about whether particular leaders with their personal attributes, characters, beliefs, values and skills should be considered as important historical, causal agents in their own right remains at the centre stage of leadership studies. Do leaders change history, or do historical forces primarily move them? Why do followers follow leaders – because of leaders’ ‘charisma’ or, less mysteriously, because of tangible economic or other self-interests of followers? What part of a leader’s world-historical personality might be regarded as properly individual and personal, and what part of it as a mere reflection of the predominant social structures and historical situations?

Individual leadership approaches in conjunction with contextual and situational approaches are indispensable for understanding causality in international relations and comparative politics today. Leadership studies provide a productive source for hypotheses that seek to clarify the agency-structure nexus across the broad spectrum of social and political sciences. In
addition, these studies help formulate prescriptive positions for solving national and global problems, some of which arise from the lack of effective individual leadership, while some others reflect individual leaders’ miscalculations or plain inadequacy. As the debate continues, there are also those who opt for the primacy of social structures and reject the usefulness of theorizing at the level of the actions and personalities of individual leaders.

The personality-centered approach is advanced by studies of some highly effective political leaders who have themselves ‘consciously developed theories of leadership that functioned with compelling success in their own worlds’: for example, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Stanley Baldwin; Churchill; Lenin; Deng Xiaoping; and even such socially destructive and narcissistic leaders as Mao, Stalin and Hitler. US President Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953–61) has been described by Greenstein (1988, 105) as a ‘leadership theorist in the White House’, one who ‘drew extensively on an explicit conception of the means and ends of leadership that he had developed before assuming office’. Studying the letters, memoirs and polemical writings of successful leadership ‘practitioners’ and innovators as different as Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr. and Nelson Mandela, on the one hand, and Kemal Ataturk, Vladimir Lenin and Fidel Castro, on the other hand, might provide glimpses into their respective leadership approaches and strategies, thus helping to advance theoretical conceptualizations and sound practical prescriptions.

Nonetheless, skeptics argue that the prominence and influence of individual, personal leadership is overstated in the press and in scholarly case
studies. To the critics of a leadership-focused approach in political science, ‘it is not at all clear that leadership requires any remarkable talents, or that major differences in the success of organizations reflect differences in the capabilities of their leaders, or that history is the product of leaders’ actions’. Citing such evidence as King’s quantitative study of the relation of leaders’ personalities to election outcomes in six countries, some scholars conclude that, in view of the study’s uneven results, the judgments, decisions and actions of leaders in modern democratic societies do not matter much. However, King contends that despite particular national elections not being a leaders’ ‘beauty contest’, leaders always matter in developing party platforms before and during elections, pursuing electoral strategies, and later governing with one leadership style or another. We agree with King that both the leadership approach and the organizational and impersonal forces’ approach are needed to understand and explain political outcomes and develop policies.

The Marxist tradition of political leadership is valuable for its insights into agency-structure dynamics under conditions of reform or revolution. Marxist-inspired political theorists of leadership have had to respond to Marx’s heavy emphasis on structural economic and technological forces advancing class conflict to the point of a revolutionary political and cultural transformation of society in the direction of socialism and communism, which he saw as the final stage of political-economic development. To be sure, Marx qualified his seeming structural determinism with the notion of mutual dialectical transformation of individual and collective agents and the historical
situation and contexts. Friedrich Engels and subsequent Marxist theorists went further than that, emphasizing the role of ‘ideological relations’ and other ‘super structural’ phenomena in the maintenance and adaptation of modern capitalist relations of production and social control.22

In the subsequent Marxist-Leninist tradition, leadership is understood as a function to be performed by a group of committed individuals – a party, or an organization of professional revolutionaries – vested with the role of ‘lending energy, stability, and continuity to the political struggle’ of the working class. Several important features distinguish Lenin’s approach to leadership, including the unabashed emphasis on the superior qualities of the leadership elite. First of all, the leadership elite of a movement must claim a superior knowledge or understanding of not only the long-term goals and immediate tasks of the movement, but of the society at large and the laws of history that govern its evolution. The mastery of revolutionary theory is the surest way to the mastery of a revolutionary movement, as ‘the role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory’.23

Second, Lenin conceives of leadership as a collective, rather than individual function and attribute, although the leading elite is by no means seen as inclusive, broad-based, or numerous: ‘…without the “dozen” tried and talented leaders (and talented men are not born by the hundreds) … working in perfect harmony, no class in modern society can wage a determined struggle’. The elite’s primary task is to educate the followers, to shape their understanding of their own interests and the world outlook generally speaking:
‘Class political consciousness can be brought to workers only *from without* …’.24 The ‘wise men’ that instill the right type of consciousness into the masses of followers could be of any class background – ‘students or working men’ – as long as they are ‘*professional revolutionaries*’.25 The latter term implies a combination of unique personal qualities, stringent training and a lifetime of devotion to their political leadership (‘revolutionary’) career. Third, the leadership elite is supposed to employ superior knowledge and expert skills to organize followership: political leaders are seen as ‘talented organizers capable of arranging extensive and at the same time uniform and harmonious work that would employ all forces, even the most inconsiderable’.

There is a consistent emphasis on an objective, inescapable contradiction between the ‘spontaneity of the masses’ and ‘a high degree of consciousness’ that should distinguish ‘a constant and continuous organization capable of leading the whole movement’.

The whole body of Lenin’s work on the question looks as if it were more informed by neo-Hegelian thought on the power of ideas, rather than classic materialist determinism characteristic of Marx. Indeed, Lenin’s Conspectus of Hegel’s *Science of Logic* has this remarkable admission: ‘The thought of the ideal passing into the real is profound: very important for history. But also in the personal life of man it is clear that this contains much truth. Against vulgar materialism. NB. The difference of the ideal from the material is also not unconditional …’ The barely hidden idealism of Lenin’s theory of leadership is premised on the notion of superiority of theoretical
insight provided by Marxist scholarship. This theory of leadership makes full excuse of social experimentation, and proudly presents the grand designs devised by the few ‘wise men’ as not only the latest achievement of social sciences, but as the only correct insight into the objectively predetermined path of social evolution that the rest of humanity must follow.

Critical theorists have learned much from the Marxist tradition, but have proceeded in a variety of directions, some trying to combine strong democracy with strong leadership. Habermas and the Frankfurt School have proposed three conceptions of political activity in the context of the relationship of theory to practice and leaders to followers: the interpretive conception (the explication of meanings since humans are intentional and meaningful in their actions); the technical conception (using knowledge as a tool to change the social and natural worlds through our understanding of causal nexuses and other regularities); and the educative conception (enlightening people about which means are effective for the ends that they desire to pursue, as well as clarifying alternative ends available for adoption). These three forms of political activity are often intertwined in forms of political leadership, though clearly ‘the technical and educative uses of political and social science are dependent on the interpretive use’. It is not clear, however, whether the technical and educative uses of knowledge and leadership can be reconciled, so as to give priority to the educative use in the pursuit of constitutional democracy, human rights and environmental sustainability. The constructive ordering of these forms of political activity for idealist-realist (not
utopian) democratic, human rights, and sustainability leaders and followers would be the technical form serving the educative form of leadership, and both being informed by a strong normative interpretation of democracy as participative, human rights as implying responsibilities, and environmental sustainability including high-technology innovation and adaptation. Nonetheless, at times technical action would seem to be needed to safeguard the preservation of these educative ideals. There is no neat Leninist resolution to these dilemmas.

**Types of Political Leadership**

Types of help us pose and answer questions about leaders, followers, objectives, situations and contexts. Types are logical devices for the mental ordering of the universe of cases. As instruments of classification and ordering, types can be used to describe various observable groups of leaders and followers, the nature of the relationship that binds the two groups together, their social and psychological traits, functions and social roles, as well as the extent and character of the impact they may have on a society at large. Some of the pertinent questions that arise in this regard are:

- How and why do particular individuals gain power in a particular organization or society or state? What are the origins of a leader’s power? What are the instruments by which this power is exercised? How do and should leaders exercise mixes of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ power – that is, ‘smart power’?
• What are leaders’ and followers’ personal characteristics? How do leaders and followers relate?
• What functions do leaders serve in what situations and contexts? How do they diagnose problems, prescribe solutions, and mobilize followers to implement policies and visions? How do leaders and followers realize their ‘vision’?
• What motivates leaders and followers, and how do leaders motivate followers and followers motivate leaders?
• Are there any types of leaders not included in traditional, rational/pragmatic and charismatic types?
• How do leaders move history or does history move them?
• Is there a type of leadership ‘for all seasons’?
• Should ‘followers’ be abolished as a term and reality or replaced by the term and reality of ‘collaborators’?27

We know that all leadership occurs in social situations and contexts, which endow followers with certain cultural characteristics, and which permit leaders to utilize certain personal characteristics: inherent qualities, socialized habits, learned skills; intelligence of various types, including especially emotional intelligence and contextual intelligence, including social insight; but also power-wielding, organizational and communication skills. We also know that some leaders have ethical-political visions, or at least some ideas about what should be done for the group and in the group. We know that leaders
fulfill the functions of diagnosing problems, prescribing solutions and mobilizing followers or supporters to solve those problems and engage in change or preservation through degrees of innovative adaptation. Based on this accumulated empirical and analytical knowledge and normative perspectives, researchers proceed with constructing various kinds of types that usually connect two or more variables together; for example, leadership style and social functions, or leader’s goals and leadership outcomes.

Dichotomous typologies can be constructed in relation to leaders’ individual qualities and how they generally relate to their followers and others – good or bad, effective or ineffective, strong or weak, formal versus informal leaders. Trichotomous types of, especially during the Cold War, stressed differences among pragmatic (Western democratic, first world), ideological (Communist, second world) and revolutionary (independent third world states) leaders. There are also normative and empirical types of, as well as those of a mixed or hybrid nature.

**Table 1.1 Good Bad Regime Leadership According to Aristotle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of rulers</th>
<th>Common advantage or good</th>
<th>Private advantage or particular good of the leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Kingship</td>
<td>Tyranny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Aristocracy</td>
<td>Oligarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>Democracy / Mobocracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Aristotle. 1958*
Normative Types of leadership:

Normative types equip us with an important instrument for ethical assessment of leadership in the modern world. Among the classic leadership types still current in the West one of the more popular is Aristotle’s normative dualistic type that distinguishes between self-interested rulers and leaders and common-interested rulers and leaders. Aristotle’s ethical thrust has been followed by many political philosophers and empirical theorists over the centuries. The tradition continues today. Nye, for example, has given his own version of normative types of good and bad leadership.

Aristotle’s normative types of political leadership correlates two variables: the number of rulers, on the one hand, and the motivation and end results of their ruling, on the other hand. Thus, when one person rules for the common advantage, the regime is a kingship; one-person rule for private advantage results in a tyranny. When a few rules for the common advantage, the regime are an aristocracy; rule for the particular gain of the few results in an oligarchy. When the multitude rules for the common good, the regime is a polity (a constitutional democracy); rule for the particular advantage of the multitude (who, for the most part, are relatively poor), results in an (electoral) ‘democracy’ or ‘mobocracy’ in today’s vocabulary.28

While Aristotle tried to distinguish between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ leadership based on ideas that modern scholarship summarizes under the notion of the public interest, subsequent attempts at normative theorizing paid more detailed attention to the question of ‘good’ leadership and its specific characteristics.
Nye’s modern normative type compares two broadly accepted meanings of the term ‘good leadership’: the one referring to the leader’s ability to achieve results (whatever his or her ends might be) and the other offering an ethical judgment on the value of the goals pursued, means applied, and results obtained throughout the whole cycle of leadership.

**Table 1.2 two meanings of good leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ethical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Balance of realism and risk in vision</td>
<td>Values of mentions, goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Efficiency of means to ends</td>
<td>Quality of means used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>Success in achieving the group’s</td>
<td>Good results for in-group and outsiders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A clear-cut definition of the foundations or premises of an ethical judgment seems indispensable to make a normative type work in comparative contexts. Thus, even ostensibly ‘value-free’ judgments of leadership effectiveness and efficiency will have, upon second thought, to be clarified against the foundational questions of the ‘good’ and ‘goodness’ and ‘right’ and ‘rightness’ when addressing the ‘realism’ of the leader’s ends, or the extent of the means-ends match, or, indeed, the leader’s ability to implement the group’s ‘true objectives’. Just as in the case of Aristotle’s typology, defining the ‘common advantage’ of the group, the group’s ‘interest’ as such, appears to be
the key. An even more complicated moral judgment is called forth when the group’s interest is scrutinized against any of the universal moral criteria, which of necessity engage considerations of the good of ‘others’, the out-group reality and the common values of humanity at large.

**Empirical Types**

Empirical types as an approach refocus the researcher’s attention on the observable functions of leadership, the personal qualities of a leader or the sources of a leader’s authority. Rather than assessing leadership from the sublime perspective of terminal values, empirical types seek to situate the problem within a context of individual and social psychology, group interactions and intergroup processes, as determined by historically concrete configurations of social structures and institutions. Max Weber’s tripartite ideal-type analytical type of traditional, rational-legal and charismatic leaders is representative in this regard. Weber employed a leadership-centered approach to political thinking and acting by viewing politics as ‘the leadership or the influencing of the leadership of a political association, hence, today, of a state’; that is, a ‘human community that claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory’. Asking the question about what makes people obey authority; Weber distinguishes between the cultural, social and psychological sources of leaders’ powers. Leadership, according to Weber, “is exercised according to traditional, legal-rational or charismatic domination, authority and legitimating. Weber’s typology of the most common ‘Motors’ of leadership in pre-modern and modern societies emphasizes leaders’
embeddedness in society and helps solve research tasks of a comparative nature”. 29 Karl Deutsch has offered a typology of leaders based on the extent of leaders’ powers. Devised as a continuum that ranges from strong, successful leaders to relatively weak and unsuccessful ones, Deutsch’s typology correlates key features of the leader’s personality, the type of support extended by the followers, and, crucially, the fit between the policies advocated by the leader and the prevailing ‘spirit of times’, or the requirements of the historical situation that the leader can ignore only at his or her own peril.

**Table 1.3 Weber’s Types of Legitimate Power/Authority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of legitimate power/authority</th>
<th>Source of legitimate power/authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Custom, perennial institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational-legal</td>
<td>Legal-bureaucratic procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>Personal qualities of the leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Weber 1946/58

**Table 1.4 strong versus weak leaders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Personal qualities</th>
<th>Types of support from followers</th>
<th>Fit between leaders’ policies and situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong, decisive personality</td>
<td>A large group or coalition of groups strongly united with consistent bonds of attitude and interest</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak, indecisive personality</td>
<td>Few supporters, or many supporters who are weakly united</td>
<td>Lack of fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Deutsch 1978.
Oran Young has developed a typology that is especially useful for the analysis of leadership in international relations. Building upon Max Weber’s classic scheme, Young distinguished structural, entrepreneurial, intellectual and charismatic leadership in international politics, especially with regard to regime formation and institution building.

Similarly, Robert Tucker followed in Weber’s footsteps, saying that ‘politics in its essential nature is the leadership of a political community and all the activity, including participatory activity by citizens that may enter into the process of leadership’. Tucker distinguished between enlightened leadership that was characterized by its essential commitment to moral humanism and responded to global dangers in a responsible way, on the one hand, and a form of anti-leadership that did not rise to meet the challenges of the Cold War, on the other hand. Tucker’s types of therefore combined empirical and normative elements.

Kellerman’s functionalist types are also of a mixed nature, particularly in its emphasis on meaning creation and the provision of certain public goods by the leader. In classifying the main functions of political leadership, Kellerman underscores the functions of a generally positive nature and broad social impact.

For Kellerman (2004), leaders (a) create meaning and goals; (b) reinforce group identity and cohesion; (c) provide order; and (d) mobilize collective (adaptive) work (21–5). It is fair to say that most modern typologies of leadership seek to provide a convincing combination of empirical and
normative elements and pay special attention to the wider social impact and long-range consequences of leadership activities.

**Table 1.5 Synthesis of the Leadership types of Weber and Young**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of power</th>
<th>Position and official roles predominate</th>
<th>Personal qualities predominate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization (rational-legal authority)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual policy and strategic vision</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


On the other hand, Kellerman constructed a very suggestive typology of bad leadership based on business and political case studies she had analyzed: incompetent, rigid, intemperate, callous, corrupt, insular and evil. Kellerman did put forward controversial judgments, such as declaring former US President Bill Clinton to have been an insular, bad leader regarding the Rwandan genocide, and only one category of badness above the evil Radovan Karadzic and Pol Pot. Nye says that Kellerman is correct in a way, but overall circumstances were such that Clinton could not have done very much because of Congress’s unwillingness to become involved in Africa after the Somalian disaster, adding that “good leaders today are often caught between their cosmopolitan inclinations and their more traditional obligations to the followers who elected them”.

---

43
A Brief Life-Sketch and Career

Any development takes place within a political framework. Therefore the researcher has to take into account the importance of the political context and the leadership component of change. The need for Political leadership is felt genuinely in the event of crises. Man, being a Saul animal, living in a Saul group, needs guidance and such guidance comes from a “leader because a leader is required to lead and guide persons from darkness to light and from ignorance to literacy”31.

Such a leader, who has his concern for the welfare of the people, uses political power, not for himself but for the masses. He is the embodiment of “the people always, struggling hard to seek the wellbeing of the masses”.

The same holds good in the case of Sri Mallikarjun M.Kharge. Because as a representative of the people of Hyderabad Karnataka area particularly and people of Karnataka generally and as a minister of the Govt. of Karnataka and Union Minister, Sri. Mallikarjun.M.Kharge has served the people of Karnataka particularly and In generally he has many achievements and masses, Sri Kharge, since the beginning of his political career, believed and believes in the commitment to the service, and performance, establishing the credibility the people or the electorate. All his achievements and accomplishments clearly indicate that he is a man of actions, always representing the spirit of devotion and dedication to service. What he desired and desires, accomplished and accomplishes the same, through the political platform. Therefore, lie was a man of commitment but not after power or politics32.
Sri Mallikarjun M.Kharge is not simply a political leader to acquire, retain and expand power for himself but a leader, who has used power as a means through which, the welfare and development of the people of Karnataka in general and the people of Hyderabad Karnataka in particular, could be achieved. Due to such great achievements Sri Mallikarjun M.Kharge deserves to be included in the galaxy of great men or personalities, Naturally, the brief life sketch and career here of such great men are worth mentioning. Because it is said that, biography is nothing but biography of great men or souls’. Sri Mallikarjun M. Kharge is great, in the since, souls, he has served and has been serving the’ people of Karnataka, with the spirit of strong determination and devotion and dedication.

Born in a poor but in an untouchable family on 21.07.1942, in a village called VARAVATTI (B) of Bhalki Taluka of Bidar district, Sri Mallikarjun M.Kharge experienced and realized many hardships and difficulties during his childhood.

But however, his father’s aim was to provide proper education, so as to shape the future of the son. Accordingly, Sri Mallikarjun Kharge was admitted to Nutana Vidyalaya at Gulbarga, the institution, which was known for its high standard, merit and service, in those days Sri Mallikarjun Kharge had his primary, Middle and High School education through marathi medium from the same institution. In the Nutana Vidyalaya Institute Sri Kharge had a golden opportunity, to take keen interest not only in learning but also to participate in sports and games.
As a sincere, honest and obedient student to his teachers Sri Mallikarjun Kharge won the confidence and hearts of his teachers. The teachers were responsible for shaping the life, character and carrier of Sri Kharge in the right direction. There was no any sign of discrimination seen by Kharge, on the basis of his caste during his school days.

Later, Sri Kharge, completed his graduation from Government College, Gulbarga in 1965. The College was equally so unique , that it had the sincere and devoted and dedicated teachers with great eminence. There also, Sri Kharge established his credibility in the teachers friends around him. That is why, Sri S.B. Hungund, the Physical director of the College and great admirer of Sri Kharge says:

“Though, poor economically, Sri Kharge had the rich and rare quality of respecting his teachers and adjusting and accommodating himself to his friends.”

Along with his studies, Sri Kharge started taking active and keen interest in College elections. His leadership qualities began to take root from his college days. In the student Union elections, Sri Kharge, was elected as the General Secretary, with the support and cooperation of his student friends. It was the first basic ground provided to Sri Kharge, to dream of becoming a leader in due course of time. Commenting on the same, Sri Sadat Hussain remarks.
“Sri Kharge, getting elected as the General Secretary of the Students Union created a new chapter in the history of Government College Gulbarga”.

During his college days, Sri Kharge learnt and realised the importance of values like, respecting the teachers because of their good teaching, respecting his friends for their support and cooperation in all endeavors., He also get an opportunity to become good orator, necessarily for becoming a good leader. improving his studies, Sri Kharge, taking active interest in sports and games, brought reputation to his College, teachers and the society in general.

As an untouchable student, Sri Kharge was greatly influenced by Political, economic and social philosophy of Dr. B.R.Ambedkar. Therefore, inspired by the teachings of the Great Soul like Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Sri Kharge actively started participating in the various movements launched for the purpose of providing land to the landless, improving the socio-economic conditions of the untouchables and so on.

He was also the President of Republican Party of India and Organised Yuva Morcha in 1964 and represented the same at Nagpur. The spirit of agitating and struggling for the right cause and justice during the student days only, made Sri Kharge really a man of actions and moral guts. Even he was imprisoned due to his agitational spirit. During the same period, He launched his agitation and struggle, against the injustice done to the workers of M.S.K. Mills at Gulbarga. He also rendered Yeomans Service in helping to organise
and establish employees union or association of Hyderabad Karnataka Employees to redress their grievances.

As the firm lever in the Principles of Dr.B.R.Ambedkar, Sri Kharge, during his students days alone, started, to awaken the down troddens people from the shackles of caste discrimination, so as to realise the dream of establishing a society based on the values of liberty, equality and fraternity. Taking keen and active interest to propagate the ideals of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Sri Kharge used to visit and tour every nook and corner of the villages. Such visits enabled him to know and understand the serious and gravity of the problem of untouchability, and also to seek solution to eradicate the same once and for all. Being an untouchable himself he was the right person, to understand the worse Consequences of the problem of untouchability.

Completing his law degree in 1967 from HKE Societies Seth Shankar Lohoti Law College, Gulbarga. Sri Kharge started his career as a lawyer(1968) struggling hard always to emancipate the untouchables. Law and constitutional provisions strengthened his hands, to do a lot to the cause of the untouchables.

He was also appointed as a legal advisor to the workers union of the M.S.K. Mills at Gulbarga, so that the timely solutions to the issues and problems of the workers could be sought. Appreciating on the service of Sri Kharge, rendered to the welfare of the workers of the MSK Mills, Sri. Shivaraj Pattedar.
“As a legal advisor, to the M.S.K. Mills, labour Union, Sri Kharge fought against all sorts of injustice caused to the workers and the management and also tried to redress the grievances of the workers”.

During the student days alone, Sri Kharge started exhibiting leadership qualities, by organising various unions and associations. He also had the capacity to mobilise the people around him, to get support for all his programs and dreams to be implemented and realised.

The capacity to organise, mobilise and agitate for the right cause is said to be an in-born quality of Sri Kharge. He never tolerated any kind of injustice done to the untouchables, but at the same he used to follow and practice the principles of love, non-violence, liberty and equality preached by Great souls, like Bhagavan Goutam Bhudha, Mahtma Basaveswara and Bharata Ratna Dr. BR, Ambedkar. As an active member and the President of Republican Party of India. Sri Kharge did a lot to the cause of untouchables. He played a dynamic role in the struggle to eradicate the problem of untouchability and even in the ‘Jail-Bharo-movement’, his role was quite unique.

Sri Kharge owes much to Sri Dharmarao Afzalpurkar, M.P. for having inspired and encouraged him to make an entry into Political field’ and to start his career as a Political leader to’ translate all his dreams into a reality. Sri Dharma Rao, was attracted by the spirit of agitation, courage and service mentality of Sri Kharge and always depended on him for his support for his many movements, launched, Sri Kharge also extended his fullest support and cooperation to Dharmarao for realising his ideas and ideals.
1969 is the year, which witnessed the dark days’ for the Indian National Congress. It was the year in which the congress split took place. Congress (I) or Indira congress became too popular throughout India and Mrs. Indira Gandhi, became also the strongest Prime Minister of India. When Dharma Rao Afzalpurkar, joined Congress (I), head an appeal to the youth, to join congress (I) to strengthen it. Even he persuaded Sri Kharge to join Indira Congress. Then, Sri Kharge started studying and analyzing the principles and programs of congress (I). He was much fascinated by 10 point economic programme launched by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The programme, like, eradication of poverty, bank nationalisation, state trading, ablation of privy purses, land reforms etc. convinced Sri Kharge that all of them aimed at building India as a democratic socialist, secular and welfare state. At the last movement Sri Kharge decided and determined to join Indira Congress and he did the same in the year 1969. Thus, he started his political career.

After joining Congress (I), Sri Kharge was made the President of City Congress Committee, due to the blessings of Sri Dharmarao Afzalpurkar, Sri Devaraj Urs and Kollur Mallappa.

In 1971, Sri Kharge took election tours and participated in election campaigns, and worked hard to see that Sri Dharma Rao was elected to the Lokasabha. Due to such leadership of Sri Kharge, Sri DharmaRao was elected to the Lokasabh with a thumping majority of votes. Dharmarao needlessly is said to be the first Political Guru of Sri. Kharge. Sri Devaraj Urs, the then Chief Minister of Karnataka another Political Guru of Sri Kharge decided to field Sri
Kharge from Gurmitakal constituency (Reserved) to the Assembly elections of 1972. Due to the support and help of all congress (I) leaders and Sri D.Devaraj Urs, Sri Kharge got elected to the Assembly with majority of voters, more than expected.

In this ways, Sri Kharge, who was in the hearts of the people of Hyderabad Karnataka only, before 1972, became a leader hearts of all people of Karnataka after 1972 elections.

Sri Kharge never experienced any defeat in his life time. He fought all elections and won the same. He knows no defeat’ so far as the elections are concerned. Such long standing, stay in Politics and government of Karnataka, provided the golden opportunity to Sri Kharge, not only to serve the people of Hyderabad Karnataka, but also the people of the whole of Karnataka . With same spirit of dedication and devotion.

The following list, clearly is the mirror in which Kharge multi-faceted personality reflects.

1969 : Joined Congress (I) Party and became President, City Congress Committee, Gulbarga.


1972-75: Served as a member on the Board of Regents, University of Agricultural Science, Bangalore.
1973: Appointed as Chairman, Municipal Finance Enquiry Committee by the Govt. of Karnataka and submitted the report of Municipal Finance Enquiry Committee and on his recommendations, the octroi was abolished in the Karnataka State.

1975: Assigned the job of Chairmanship of Karnataka Leather Industries Development Corporation (LIDKAR).

1976: Appointed as Minister of State for Primary and Secondary Education in Devaraj Urs’s Ministry.

1979: Appointed as Cabinet Minister for Rural Development and Panchayat Raj in Devaraj Urs’s Ministry.

1980: Appointed as Revenue Minister in R Gundu Rao’s Ministry.

1983: Served as Secretary of Karnataka Legislature Congress Party.

1985: Served as Deputy Leader of the Opposition in Karnataka Legislative Assembly.

1990: Again appointed as Revenue Minister in S.Bangarappa’s Ministry. Thereafter he was also assigned the portfolio of Rural Development and Panchayat Raj in addition to Revenue.


1994: Assigned the port-polio of Industries during the reshuffle.

1998: Appointed as Home Minister in S.M.Krishna Ministry

2004: Appointed as a Water Resource and KSRTC Minister in Dharam Singh Ministry.
2009 : Appointed as a Union Minister for Labour and Employment in Dr.Manmohan Singh Ministry.

2013-14 : Appointed as a Union Minister for Railway and Social Justice and Empowerment Ministry in Dr.Manmohan Singh Ministry.

2014 till today: Appointed as a Congress Legislative leader in Loksabha by the Congress High Command.

He served as Chairman, Public Account Committee of Karnataka Legislative, Member of Public Undertaking committe and estimates committee and Chairman of Municipal Finance, Enquiry Committee of Government of Karnataka, Leather Industries Development Corporation, general Secretary as Vice President and President of KPCC, Opposition leader of Karnataka Legislative Assembly and Election Committee Member of KPCC, AICC and CWC Member of Congress Party, Sri.Kharge has effective education weapon and was greatly influenced by Dr.B.RAmbedkar’s slogan of educate, agitate and organize.

In 1976 he opened Karnataka People Education Society. Sri. Kharge started emerging as a great philanthropist of Education provided the education to children of Karnataka. Now in KPE Society 36 school and colleges with thousands of teachers as staff. Sri. Kharge is believer in pious principles but pragmatic leader and leads to bring radical charges.

He is responsible for taking up special recruitment on massive scale in the Education Department during his regime as Minister of State for Primary and Secondary Education, wherein several thousands of people got benefit and
a major, share has gone to SC/ST applicants. He has also taken keen interest in getting grants to several institutions run by down trodden people. He was the primary, mover of regularisation of unauthorized cultivation of Government land by bringing an amendment to Land Revenue Act, by means of which lakhs of people in Karntaka became land owners. He is mainly responsible for strictly implementing the Land Reforms Act benefiting the actual cultivators who were landless people. Another major achievement which goes to his credit is the enhancement of reservation quota for SC/STs from 15% and 3% to 18% and 5% respectively, based on the population figures of 1991. He is also responsible for making revolutionary changes in Cooperative Department by bringing several amendments to the Act. By means of these amendments the poor, women and weaker sections are made to take active participation in Cooperative movement and management and they become members at the cost of Government.

For the improvement of backward area he is one of the persons mainly responsible for the formation of Hyderabad Karnataka Development Board (HKDB) for Gulbarga Division.

Right from the beginning he has taken keen interest in establishing or assisting several education institutions which are serving the cause of poor. He is one of the promoters of Dr. Ambedkar Medical and Technical Colleges in Bangalore. He was the President of Siddhartha Education Society for several years and he is responsible to establish Medical, Engineering and Dental Colleges of Siddhartha Education Society as its President, He is the Founder
President of Peoples Education Society in Gulbarga which is one of the prime society in Hyderabad Karnataka region.

He is mainly responsible for spreading education among weaker sections of the Society and for establishment of several educational institutions including Technical and Medical Education in Karnataka under Scheduled Castes Management.

He is not only political leader but also spiritual leader, he established Lord Buddha Vihar in Gulbarga for spread of peace and communal harmony in Karnataka. Her Excellency president Smt. Pratibha Devi Patil and spiritual leader of World, Ven. Bhante Dalialma inaugurated this world famous Siddharth Buddhavihar in 2009.

In short he is not simply a believer in the slogans or false promises, but a practical person to implement anything that was for the welfare of the people. He is not simply believer in politics as a struggle for power, but he considers power politics as a means to ends.

He believers in the service of the people as the services of Lord and he is not simply political leader to seek party elections and seek power, but a great statesman, who always look for the welfare of the next generations.

Considering his service to the society the Gulbarga University, Gulbarga awarded him as a Honorary doctorate on 17th Feb. 2011 in 29th Conviction and Karnataka University Dharwad also awardes him a Honorarium Philosophy of Doctor in 15th Feb. 2012 in 63rd Conviction. The Indian Origin of America Citizens awarded him as “Pride of India” in USA on 1st February 2012.
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