**Examining three types of leadership in Popper's theory**

Abstract

This article examines three leadership styles according to the structure learned from Popper, who distinguishes between Socrates and Plato. The three leadership styles MFL, SAL and servant leadership, correspond directly or indirectly with religious thought.

This article addresses three key elements of leadership - the leader, the mission and the followers. In accordance with these variables, we examine how each style sets priorities according to each of these elements and what are the consequences and meanings arising from this.

From what we learn from Popper, Socrates represents egalitarian intellectualism, anti-authoritarianism, dialogic thought and tolerance, while Plato represents authoritarianism, encouraging indoctrination and shaping thoughts as well as strong opposition to critical thinking.

MFL represents a distinct hierarchical structure of leadership, and in contrast, SAL represents an egalitarian, dialogic structure and opposition to hierarchy and obedience.

Servant leadership has a reverse hierarchical structure whereby followers are at the top of the structure. Leadership takes place through dialogue, trust and in a soft way. In this, SAL and servant leadership are close to Socrates, while MFL is the furthest, of the three, from Socrates and largely close to Plato. Maimonides' leadership motivation was a product of the religious mission; Spinoza's so-called religious motive was the commitment to reason and his appeal was to the person as he is a person in the universal sense of the matter;

The motivation of servant leadership is the commitment to provide service to the followers standing in front of them.

Although the three types of leadership correspond with, so-called religion, this article can be used as a means of matching a leadership style to a specific organization. This is in accordance with the organization's values and goals. It is appropriate that further future studies examine these relationships according to the structure learned from Popper and refer to the three elements of leadership we mentioned.

An organization that has a primarily dogmatic vision like MFL, is closer to Plato's concept, as Popper understands, while when the vision is dynamic and dialogic in essence, like SAL and servant leadership, it is close to Socrates, as Popper understands.

The attitude towards the vision can help in adapting the leadership style to the organization. To a large extent, the attitude towards the vision determines the leadership style desired for the specific organization

**Introduction**

This article examines three different styles of leadership: Maimonides’s flexible leadership (henceforth MFL), Spinoza’s affective leadership (henceforth SAL), and servant leadership. Leadership styles are analyzed according to the conceptual structure taught by Popper (Kessler, 2021; Matthews, 2018; Kidd, 2018; Coope, 2019; Klagge, 2022). and also examines in what way the ultimate goal of each leadership style brings it closer to Socrates or Plato.

The structure learned from Popper serves us to examine to what extent each of the three leadership styles relates to the relationship between the three elements: the leader, the mission and the followers? And what are the consequences and meanings arising from this?

The three leadership styles are on a continuum between Socrates and Plato and are a kind of test cases of the three components.

Although this article, which expands the program learned from Popper, is theoretical and abstract, however, it has great practical potential. Organizations with specific goals can adopt a leadership style based on the core values ​​and vision of a particular organization. The range of leadership structures that this article analyzes can help adapt a leadership style to a specific organization.

**The three leadership styles**

An article was devoted to examining the leadership style called MFL. To summarize the main points, it is said that MFL, the concept of flexible leadership reflected by Maimonides, refers to adapting one’s method of leadership to complex situations as well as diverse and changing contexts. A flexible leader is able to influence a wide range of people (Hoch & Bentolila, 2021; Kaiser & Overfield, 2010; Jia et al., 2018). One of Maimonides' expressions on this matter is found in the *Guide for the Perplexed*, where Maimonides says that of all the purposes of the Bible is flexibility and delicacy, to which. Maimonides adds, that man should not be stubborn and rude, rather he responds to those who turn to him, obedient, repents of his evil deeds and corrects them, comfortable with people and flexible (see *Guide for the Perplexed*, Part 3, Chapter 33). That is, a fundamental part of walking in the ways of God, is expressed in the shaped personality of man, his complete standing before himself, before others and before his God. According to Maimonides, the whole person, with the moral, intellectual and religious qualities, is the right man for leadership (*Guide for the Perplexed*, Part 3, Chapter 54; Altmann, 1972; Malach, 2021).

Summarizing the key characteristics of SEL, it is said that this leadership style is based on three elements and they are: non-hierarchical leadership, obedience is not a requirement, and emphasis is placed on the enjoyment by both leaders and followers. (Hoch, 2022; Munro & Thanem, 2018; Munro & Thanem, 2020).

Contrary to perceptions that emphasize the leader, as the perfect individual (Aksoy,2021), who by virtue of his personality he cultivates excellent leadership, Spinoza highlights the benefits of the shared decisions of the society in which free and intelligent people participate, who legislate their laws. Freedom, of which Spinoza is one of the great representatives, has moral and existential characteristics, but no less, political and these are based on a general partnership in decisions (Dumitrescu, 2018; Yuval, 350 notes 1,2).

In general, servant leadership consists of the following contributions: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Spears, 1995).

The main characteristic of servant leadership, which distinguishes it from other leadership styles, is in prioritizing and focusing on followers.  (Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004). servant leadership directs the focus first on developing the ability of individuals to succeed and then on the success of the task. Servant leaders help their followers achieve growth and success. Servant leadership has proven to be effective and efficient and desirable leadership. (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

**A paragraph that represents the leadership ideal of each of the three styles**

To illustrate the uniqueness of each of the three leadership styles, I will quote a paragraph from each of the three thinkers, on which the styles are built, which summarizes the fundamental principle of the desired leadership they offer.

The paragraph that represents the Maimonides ideal of leadership is near the last words of the last chapter of the *Guide for the Perplexed*:

“The knowledge of God, the knowledge of His Providence, and of the manner in which it influences His creatures in their production and continued existence. Having acquired this knowledge he will then be determined always to seek loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness, and thus to imitate the ways of God” (Moses Maimonides, 1904, Part 3, Chap. 54)

Maimonides ideal is the intellectual achievement of God, who is at the top of the hierarchy of reality and influences most of his goodness on his creatures. The ideal person must imitate God and lead people in a similar way as well as influence them in a way of kindness, judgment and charity.

Spinoza's leadership ideal, which is part of an overall metaphysical concept, is found at the end of the second part of the Ethics where Spinoza says:

“4. Lastly, this doctrine confers no small advantage on the commonwealth; for it teaches how citizens should be governed and led, not so as to become slaves, but so that they may freely do whatsoever things are best”. (Spinoza, The Ethics, [PART II](https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3800/3800-h/3800-h.htm#chap02))

Spinoza talks about leading people not out of obedience or coercion, but out of human partnership and maximum freedom.

Robert K. Greenleaf was the first to use the term servant leadership (Jones, 2018), in an article he published in 1970, "The Leader as Servant". The basic idea of ​​the servant leader is embodied in the awareness of a person who is first and foremost a servant and only then a leader and in the words of Greenleaf:

“The servant-leader is servant first ... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first” (Greenleaf, 2008). Greenleaf talks about two basic passions, one is to serve and the other is to lead. The servant leader longs first and foremost to serve and thus his uniqueness.

**Between time, place and leadership style**

It is difficult to ignore the connection between the social reality in which a thinker lives and creates and his philosophy. Maimonides, born in Córdoba, Spain, wandered through Morocco, arrived in Israel and from there continued to Egypt and served as physician to the vizier al-Fadil, the king's deputy, and later also to Saladin's son. The social reality, into which Maimonides was born, is a hierarchical one in which the ruler exerts coercion on his people (Kraemer, 2008). Although Maimonides leadership is inclusive and flexible and adapted to a specific person or community to which he addresses, it must still be remembered that his world of concepts and his structure of thinking belong to the general atmosphere of The Middle Ages and considering his time it is appropriate to understand his path.

It is worth understanding that of Spinoza, who was Jewish by origin, against the background of the tolerance that prevailed in the Netherlands (Laerke, 2021; Spaans, 2021). Unlike Spain and Portugal, which in the 15th and 16th centuries persecuted Jews because of their religion, Netherland was a place of refuge for Jews who could live according to their faith and religion. The liberal atmosphere, at that time, constituted, to a large extent, the breeding ground for Spinoza's revolutionary ideas.

Robert K. Greenleaf lived and created in the United States, and probably absorbed its values, as formulated in the Declaration of Independence of the United States based on the principles that all men are created equal and that a just government leadership derives its powers from the consent of the governed. )Nakai, 2006)

That is, Greenleaf was born into a relatively balanced atmosphere between leaders and followers and a constant examination of the power relations.

**Four themes of the article**

An analysis of the three leadership styles according to the structure that distinguishes between Socratic and Platonic thinking, learned from Popper. brought up four themes:  
  
1. The three leadership styles are found on the continuum between Socrates and Plato, as learned from Popper. 2. Who should lead and how according to the three leadership styles? and Popper's contribution to the study of leadership 3. The relationship between each of the three leadership styles and religion.4. The elements of leadership and the value base of the three leadership styles according to the structure learned from Popper about the sequence between Socrates and Plato

The three leadership styles are related to the question of the supreme commitment in the leadership triangle - is the leader? Is it for a mission? Is it for followers?. 3. The three leadership styles answer the question of who should lead and how. The question corresponds. directly and indirectly, with a religious worldview and any leadership style. Delving deeper into these topics can help build an adapted leadership style that is a derivative of an organization's values, goals and vision.

**Popper Authoritarian leadership and liberal leadership - philosophical roots**

Popper in his book The Open Society and Its Enemies, asks who should lead? (Kamtekar, 2009) And how can we organize institutions in a way that can prevent bad, or failing, leaders from doing too much damage? Popper distinguished between Socrates and Plato. In his opinion Socratic intellectualism is egalitarian in the sense that any person can perceive even abstract matters. Socrates' intellectualism is anti-authoritarian and thus, in the method of a midwife, man can be brought to the truth. Compared to Socrates, Plato, according to Popper, expresses uncompromising authority, encouraging indoctrination and shaping thoughts, and strong opposition to critical thinking. Plato's ideal is the king-philosopher )Rist, 2022) . According to Popper, it is difficult to imagine a greater contrast than that between the ideal of Socrates and that of Plato.Socrates represented rational and humble individualism while Plato represented the totalitarian leadership of a philosopher-leader who is a half-god.

The expression of Socrates' greatness is the honesty and intellectual modesty he knows what he does not know, in other words he is well aware of his limitations. Unlike Socrates, a king-philosopher, whom Plato describes as a human ideal and ultimate ruler, sees everything in a bright light and is therefore not wrong. This is in contrast to ordinary people who make mistakes and only then, can correct them (Popper, 2020; Agundu & Ukange, 2020) . Plato's leaders are connected to the eternal ideas, which are above and beyond time, place and changing reality.

According to Plato, as Popper understood, the perfect rulers should not be trusted to appear, so by chance, in society and lead perfectly without prior intention, but rather to direct potential rulers, by indoctrination and shaping opinions, preventing or suppressing any innovation in education (Saxi, 2018; KOVACI, 2021), legislation, censorship of all intellectual activity of the ruling class as well as ongoing propaganda, aimed at shaping the opinions of members of the ruling class and uniting them. Religion should also be a function in society, although it is only a human invention, but it is a noble lie with which society can be educated.

Popper seems to understand Socrates' way as a method, or rather a dialogical method, expressed in a constant examination of arguments and the possibility of improving and correcting them and on the other hand, Plato's way expresses doctrine, that is, in rigid and uncompromising assumptions that do not need to be changed or improved, because they are, so to speak, perfect.

This paper examines the three leadership styles using the structure proposed by Popper, which distinguishes between Socrates and Plato.

Popper concludes his book Open Society and Its Enemies and suggests that instead of impersonating prophets, we should be the designers of our destiny. We must learn to do things to the best of our ability, and observe our mistakes. He adds and expresses hope that one day we humans will be able to overcome the importance we attach to the power factor and its use.

**Who and how should lead? - An examination of three leadership styles in the spirit of Karl Popper**

MFL represents a distinct hierarchical structure of leadership and this in accordance with an overall worldview of a hierarchical reality in which the lower is disciplined by the higher; SAL represents a dialogic leadership structure that opposes hierarchy and obedience. In this leadership style the leaders are the followers and the followers are the leaders. There is equality between the leaders and the followers.

In servant leadership there is a hierarchical structure, in the sense that one side is in the center and is more important than the other side. In an unusual way that in a leader-follower relationship, in servant leadership the followers and their desires are the main ones, while the leaders are the instruments. The hierarchy in servant leadership is reversed, that is, the followers are at the top of the structure while the leaders are below them.

In servant leadership there is trust and a definite dialogue between the leaders and the followers and it is not an authoritarian concept of leadership. The reverse hierarchy it upholds is a soft hierarchy and more like a Socratic character than a Platonic one.

If so, we see three structures: the first is hierarchical according to which the leader determines and decides how the followers should behave; The second is egalitarian in which the leaders and followers are essentially one body; The third is hierarchical according to which the followers determine and decide how the leaders should behave. , but through dialogue, trust and in a soft way (Jeyaraj & Gandolfi, 2019).

It seems that the difference between servant leadership and SAL is that while servant leadership emerges from a hierarchical paradigm of leadership, which is a derivative of a hierarchical paradigm of reality, SAL avoids a hierarchical concept of leadership as part of a non-hierarchical paradigm, but a unity of reality as a whole. It is possible that a difference between the basic paradigm affects the nature of leadership and the relationship between leaders and followers.

It seems that SAL and servant leadership, despite the different paradigmatic foundation, are closer to Socrates, while MFL is the furthest, of the three, from Socrates and largely close to Plato.

With the power of examining and characterizing the three leadership styles, which are on the axis between Socrates and Plato, point to prototypes of follower and leader relationships. Following this, it is possible to adapt a leadership style to the vision and goals of different organizations.

**Popper and examination of leadership styles**

Popper has researched political society at the macro level, we suggest using the tools learned from it, to examine a more limited issue, but its implications are extensive.

Popper systematically analyzed the foundations of political societies and made distinctions between an open and a closed society, he explored the motivational root of adopting a radical ideology headed by total leadership, and on the other hand he examined what underlies the motivational basis of a liberal-democratic ideology (Kamtekar, 2009).

Popper's thought carefully examines the complex foundations of human society including utopian ideas and their toxic temptation. He warns of the dangers in a society that strives to be perfect and of those who lead them, and he also deals with the dynamics between social ideology and the place of the individual, his freedom, the ability to criticize himself, criticize his environment and change them.

**The leadership of Maimonides and religion**

Unlike an anthropocentric worldview, according to which the basic obligation is towards the person who is the highest value in reality, Maimonides held a theocentric worldview, according to which God is at the center and constitutes the supreme importance and foundation of essences. Maimonides saw himself as a mediator between God and the people, but the primary service is directed to God and only the secondary to the people. In other words, doing good to human beings receives its importance and value from God and His commandments (Diamond, 2006).

Maimonides undoubtedly had a high self-awareness. He saw himself as having significant knowledge, for which he had the responsibility to convey it through a variety of scriptures - from the laws of religion, through philosophy and medicine to the leadership of the public. The foundation for motivation for these extensive projects is the religious mission that Maimonides undertook.

**The leadership of spinoza and religion**

Spinoza uses a religious name to express the religion of reason. This religion is not a ritual religion, headed by a founder who is the connection and bridge to God, but an internal religion related to man's intellectual attainments (Tamimi ,2022). This religion is not particulate, belonging to a particular people, but belongs in principle to every man, wherever he is a man. People close to this religion are not supposed to speak a particular language and have no particular genetic affinity that they share. What they have in common is their intellectual abilities and commitment to reason (Sangiacomo, 2019). No one is born into this religion, they have no external hallmarks. According to Spinoza's religious worldview, which is part of his overall picture of reality, which some call pantheism (Mander, 2012; Melamed, 2018; Popejoy, 2019; Gilead, 2021), similarly, in the matter of leadership, one can learn from his books about the reciprocity between leaders and followers, which together form one overall partnership.

**Between Maimonides and Spinoza**

When it comes to the truths of philosophical beliefs and the ritual-practical precepts of religion, Maimonides is not characterized by religious tolerance and pluralism, and accordingly his view of leadership is authoritarian, while Spinoza is one of the central pioneers of religious tolerance and religious pluralism, Which constitute, in his view, conditions for a proper social and human life (Green, 2015).

Spinoza's religious message is fundamentally universal, in the sense that it is relevant to any person. The great mission that Maimonides undertook was to introduce philosophical thought, which is essentially universal, into the life and thought of the Jewish religion, which is a particular religion, if only in the very fact that it belongs to a specific people (Harvey, 2021). The attitude to religious worship; The fear of faith-philosophical mistakes; Commitment to a specific target audience is what distinguishes authoritarianism-theocracy as embodied in Maimonides. In contrast to maimonides, Spinoza, who was one of the promoters of universalism and pluralism, thought that society should avoid the interference and coercion of individual beliefs and opinions.

**servant leadership and religion**

Servant leadership is found in a variety of religious and philosophical worldviews Judaism emphasizes that leaders should adopt a commitment to the dignity of man, wherever he is, and to the dignity of both Jews and foreigners.

In Christianity, the clear example of servant leadership is Jesus. Following him, leaders strive to reproduce the character, behavior and conduct of the Christian Jesus in fulfilling the mission of the organization. Out of awareness of their mission, which originates from God, they adopt qualities of humility and modesty.

Islam sees leaders as those whom God has entrusted, them for dedicated care of human beings in their various resources, with sensitivity and wisdom.)Roberts, 2018)

Zentner Drawing speculation to commonalities between servant leadership characteristics and faith-based values pointed out similarities between the dominant values of eleven different religions, and servant leadership. The main contributions that are common between the religions and servant leadership are – listening, stewardship. empathy and a little less common - awareness, healing and conceptualization (Zentner, 2015).

Wallace sees the Judeo-Christian worldview as a being that sustains the servant leadership, whose existence is not only a tool and a means of use, but it is a kind of archetype or ideal that is expressed in everyday interactions. It's about the essence and not just the function (Wallace, 2007).

Shirin distinguishes between ideas arising from the Christian theology of Augustine and servant leadership in the modern sense, and shows the fundamental differences between them. According to him, unlike the modern business paradigm of servant leadership, an authentic Christian community is a community whose members serve each other, but not only in the sense of customer-oriented service, but a comprehensive community commitment both in and out of the workplace. (Shirin, 2014)

**The three styles of leadership and religion**

One of the things the three leadership styles have in common is their correspondence with religion, in the broadest sense. Maimonides was a religious leader in the clear sense he represents religious Orthodoxy; Spinoza created a kind of alternative religion to the established religions. The religion he proposed was based on reason, brotherhood and freedom of thought; servant leadership is deeply connected to the commitment learned from the religious tradition.

**The three elements of leadership -** **leaders,** **mission and Followers**

The diverse leadership styles refer to three intertwined elements: the leaders, the mission, and the followers. The difference in the dose of commitment of each leadership style to each of the elements, creates the significant differences between the leadership styles.

Another way to refer to the three components is to ask what is the holy thing to know each of the three styles? From the answer to the question it is possible to understand what is the means and what is the purpose in each of the styles?

It should be noted that the three leadership styles discussed in this article are similar in that they focus more on the mission and followers and less on worshiping the leaders and their goddess. In fact, Plato's king-philosopher also has a role in social service and not one that is worshipped.

Of the three leadership styles, MFL seems to represent a leader who knows in advance which direction he is going. The mission is the "holy" thing in this style, in SAL there is no clear vision that exists from the beginning. The direction is shaped while the followers and the leaders move together. The joint activity and design constitutes the "holy" matter.

In servant leadership, the vision is not determined by the leader from a previous vision, but the followers shape the vision while the leader is responsible for its realization.

It is in the framework of relations between leaders and followers that the mission stands. The dominance of the leader in MFL is great, while in SAL it is much less.

In servant leadership the greatest power exists among the followers.

An organization that has a primarily dogmatic vision like MFL, is closer to Plato's concept, as Popper understands, while when the vision is dynamic and dialogic in essence, like SAL and servant leadership, it is close to Socrates, as Popper understands.

The attitude towards the vision can help in adapting the leadership style to the organization To a large extent, the attitude towards the vision determines the leadership style desired for the specific organization

**Maimonides between Socrates and Plato according to Popper's distinction**

Is Maimonides closer to the way Popper presents Socrates or to the way he presents Plato? If we look at Maimonides' leadership according to the structure of Popper who distinguishes between Socrates and Plato It seems that in the book The Guide for the Perplexed, Maimonides operates in the method of Socrates. He instructed the reader to study his book using the 'turn the chapters on each other' method, much like Socrates who taught his students as a midwife. That is, active learning in which the reader cross-references information between chapters of the book. Moreover, the study of truth as a Socratic ideal, accompanied by skepticism and perpetual self-criticism, is reflected in the introduction to the third part of the Guide for the Perplexed, in which Maimonides says that there is a possibility that his interpretation of the subject Ma'aseh Merkabah (Work of the Chariot) that constitutes the culmination of philosophical-religious consciousness, is quite different from what it really is.

Unlike the Socratic side, the Platonic side of Maimonides is expressed in his monumental composition Mishneh Torah, in which Maimonides wrote all the laws of religion (Halacha) including matters of beliefs and opinions and did not allow deviation from them, and this is similar to Plato, as Popper presented.

While in the Guide for the Perplexed, Maimonides encourages the student to intellectual activism, flexibility and open-mindedness, and no less, he expresses doubt about his own interpretations, in the Mishnah Torah Maimonides demands absolute obedience and commitment and thus the resemblance to Plato.

In general, it can be said that Maimonides has two obligations. One is towards reason, from which Maimonides acts as Socrates. The second is the commitment to the Scriptures and the religious establishment from which Maimonides acts as Plato.

**Spinoza between Socrates and Plato according to Popper's distinction**

which he perceives as the most perfect proofs Spinoza aspired to reach the absolute truth and not the relative truth. Absolute truth is no longer an opinion, but it binds consciousness. We would expect a thinker who holds a firm conception of truth to oppose free thought, which is essentially free and changeable, and to prefer a total and absolute conception in matters of politics and society. And it may come as a surprise that Spinoza is the great representative of liberalism and freedom of thought. In this he is an appropriate representation of Socrates, as Popper understands it.

Spinoza created an alternative to the institutionalized religions and to understand his motivation for the matter, it is worth asking what bothered him in the institutionalized religions? An answer to this can already be found in the introductory chapter to a theological-political article, and it is that the fear of God and religion is contemptible to reason and rejects rational thinking and has claimed that they are less than innocent faith.

Spinoza, like Socrates, according to Popper's understanding, is anti-authoritarian, he prefers the rationale of man and the freedom of the individual, over authority and coercion and thus is close to Socrates.

According to Spinoza the religious establishment despises the intellect and prefers superstitions.

Spinoza's way in a theological-political article is to re-examine the Scriptures, in a free opinion and without prejudice. Spinoza's commitment is to reason and thus he is similar to Socrates as Popper understood.

**Popper on Spinoza**

Popper brings up the idea that since Spinoza's main concern was freedom of thought, he taught that no ruler can rape the thoughts of human beings, since thoughts are free. Any attempt to achieve the impossible is tyranny. On this doctrine he based his support for the power of the secular state

P.718 In that Spinoza is close to Popper's Socrates, not Popper's Plato.

**Maimonides and** **Spinoza - Between human wholeness, freedom of thought and worthy leadership**

Maimonides proposed a philosophical method that aims to train the person with the religious and intellectual potential to reach perfection. Spinoza also proposes a philosophical method that is a means of achieving human perfection and attaining freedom. According to Spinoza, the free person is an active person who lives according to reason and awareness of his self-determination and his uniqueness in reality - his 'connatus'. This person sees the big picture of reality, which consists of infinite parts. (Carriero, 2011; Aksoy, 2021)

In contrast to Maimonides, according to which the perfect person should lead and determine for followers the way and even the beliefs and opinions, that Spinoza advocates the freedom of the individual and the non-interference in his beliefs and opinions (Hoch, 2022).

Maimonides' leadership, which is not characterized by religious tolerance and pluralism, when it comes to the truths of beliefs and opinions, Spinoza sees the importance of choices of beliefs and opinions as well as partnership and reciprocity between leaders and followers.

**Maimonides - between religious motivation and philosophical motivation**

Maimonides created far-reaching changes within an existing religion. His ambition was to bring the Jewish religion closer to the religion of pure reason, that is, to philosophical thought. Much of Maimonides 'writing is addressed to the general Jewish public, most of whom are unfamiliar with philosophical thought and Maimonides' main motivation was to bring about, at least initially, the recognition of philosophical truths, which he believes are religious truths. His ambition was that the common people would also embrace philosophical truths and transcend the ritualistic aspects towards intellectual virtues.

**Between servant leadership and Socrates and Plato - Does servant leadership really serve followers first and foremost?**

Does servant leadership really favor the followers over the mission? An argument that servant leadership is in fact the leader's walk after his followers, eliminates the foundation of leadership, and makes the leader a follower of his followers and not their leader. The thing that may differentiate between a man who follows his followers and a leader, is a higher external validity. The role of the leader is to mediate the sublime idea to his followers. A leader leads his followers to a higher goal, than they can achieve without him, for that to happen must first be a goal. Hence the goal is the important thing while the leader and followers are the tools through which the sublime goal is realized.

If the main and only motivation of a serving leader is to serve his followers, then they will also set the ultimate goals. And the question arises what will happen if the followers choose bad goals? Will he still follow them or lead them somewhere else? That is, is a leader like a shepherd walking after his flock and led by them, or is he leading the flock? And if he leads them somewhere else, according to what principles? And if there are principles that will guide the leader, then they are a value that precedes the followers and it means that servant leadership is actually a kind of camouflage for leadership that operates under the auspices of another ideology and the role of servant leadership is to be the tool to realize ideology.

In order to answer these questions, it is appropriate to go back and refer to the relationship between servant leadership and religion.

As we have shown, there is a connection between servant leadership and religion. If it is claimed that the fundamental nature of the religious mission is in its importance before the followers, then how can it be explained that the servant leadership puts the followers before the mission? It seems that the answer to this is that servant leadership is religiously oriented and adopts some religious values, but it cannot be said that servant leadership is religious leadership. It draws elements from religion that correspond to its values, but still religion is a tool, with the help of which the desired leadership is reached and not an end in itself.

The tools that the servant leadership derives from religion are means used by it as a backbone in front of the followers. These values ​​mark the limits and the framework in the activity designed to serve the followers.

The values ​​that servant leadership comes with allow on the one hand to serve the followers and on the other hand to avoid serving negative ideas. Servant leadership strives to do good for followers. The values ​​on which the doing of good is based are directly and indirectly related to religion and with them comes servant leadership towards the followers

Servant leadership is dialogic in the Socratic sense, it maintains a channel of communication between the leader and the followers, from which the true needs of the followers are learned. Dialogue is possible when there are two sides facing each other, that is, the side of the leader and the side of the follower. The leader's side exists by virtue of certain values ​​that he comes with, some of which are drawn from values ​​that exist in the sources of religion.

**Between Maimonides and servant leadership**

Maimonides acted in accordance with God's mission, as he understood and saw himself as a leader who taught his followers the obligatory commandments of God, and they were supposed to obey those laws. It can be argued that Maimonides' ultimate goal is the service of God. He is the mediator between God and followers. The followers are very important, however, God and his commandments are Followers are the sublime while God and his commandments are the supreme essence. A servant leader, on the other hand, does not pretend to determine for his followers what is right for them and what is not, but, at least in principle, is the messenger on behalf of the followers

**Between Spinoza and servant leadership**

What is between SAL and servant leadership? The SAL is based on three elements: Non-hierarchical leadership, suspicion of demanding obedience, joyful encounters. Both SAL and servant leadership do not base their method on obedience and it can be assumed that in servant leadership, as in SAL, there are good meetings between leaders and followers SAL leadership has far fewer celestial elements compared to servant leadership, which while it is meant to serve people, but intentionally, so to speak, from an external source. SAL is a method that stems from a joint decision of people working together to benefit people. Their action is an expression of their will and not of a factor that is outside reality. SAL is essentially a method that can be called secular. joyful encounters.

**Socrates, Plato and the three leadership styles**

Socrates, in Popper's view, represents dialogue. Of the three leadership styles, SAL, is the more dialogical style, i.e. more Socratic, while MFL is the style more built on hierarchy and obedience and thus is closer to Plato.

Servant leadership has dialogical-Socratic characteristics between the leader and the followers. The constant clarification as to the need and desires of the followers produces a dialogue. In this leadership style the power of the followers is so great that the followers are seen as the leaders while the leaders are seen as the followers, ostensibly, equality is broken in favor of the followers.

The encounter of servant leadership with religion may create a tension of commitments. On the one hand a commitment to the followers and their desires, and on the other hand, the commitment stems only from the fact that the followers are God's creations, commanding the leaders to serve them. Tension can be manifested when followers strive to achieve goals that are contrary to the laws of religion.

So servant leadership that meets religion is dialogical-Socratic, but it has a platonic complex in the sense of elements that are above and beyond the reality that delimit the leadership and moral activity.

An organization that has a primarily dogmatic vision like MFL, is closer to Plato's concept, as Popper understands, while when the vision is dynamic and dialogic in essence, like sal and servant leadership, it is close to Socrates, as Popper understands.

The attitude towards the vision can help in adapting the leadership style to the organization. To a large extent, the attitude towards the vision determines the leadership style desired for the specific organization.

**conclusions**

In this article we examined three leadership styles according to the structure we learned from Popper, who distinguishes between Socrates and Plato. The three leadership styles correspond directly or indirectly with religion.

We took into account three key elements of leadership - the leader, the mission and the followers and examined how each style places each of the elements in terms of order of priority and what are the consequences and meanings arising from this?

From what we learn from Popper, Socrates represents egalitarian intellectualism in the sense that every person can understand even abstract matters. Socrates was characterized by anti-authoritarianism, modesty and tolerance, while Plato represents uncompromising authoritarianism, encouraging indoctrination and shaping thoughts as well as strong opposition to critical thinking.

In accordance with an overall worldview of reality, MFL represents a distinct hierarchical structure of leadership, and in contrast, SAL represents an egalitarian and non-hierarchical structure of reality, and accordingly dialogic leadership that opposes hierarchy and obedience.

Servant leadership has an inverted hierarchical structure whereby the followers are at the top of the structure while the leaders are subordinate to them but through dialogue, trust and in a soft way. It seems that SAL and servant leadership, despite the different paradigmatic foundation, are closer to Socrates, while MFL is the furthest, of the three, from Socrates and largely close to Plato.

Maimonides' leadership motivation was a product of the religious mission he undertook, which in large part was addressed to a particular people, on the other hand, the so-called religious motivation of Spinoza, was the commitment to reason and his appeal was to man wherever he is. This is a distinctly universal concept.

The motivation of servant leadership is the commitment to providing service to followers

The Maimonides' was committed to both reason and religious tradition. His commitment to reason, as expressed in the Perplexed Teacher, expresses a Socratic attitude of casting doubt and intellectual humility, and in contrast, the Maimonides' commitment to the Holy Scriptures, as expressed in the Mishna Torah, expresses a commitment to the Holy Scriptures and the religious establishment Thus Maimonides' behaves like Plato. Maimonides' is also similar to Plato in that he is an embarrassed teacher in that he thinks that the deep philosophical knowledge should not be published to the masses of the people, but should be left to the virtuous individuals.

Spinoza is a rationalist, anti-authoritarian. His commitment was to the individual and his freedom and against authority and coercion. In this his approach is close to Socrates as Popper understood it.

Servant leadership is dialogic in the Socratic sense. Unlike SAL, the language and paradigm is hierarchical, although it is an inverted hierarchy in the status of the roles between the leader and the followers, there is still a division of high and low, in terms of importance, between them.

Maimonides has a hierarchical concept of leadership committed to the supreme task; Spinoza has an egalitarian concept of leadership in which the leaders and followers are intertwined; servant leadership is committed to the followers, but there is a hierarchical structure, an inverted hierarchy.

To adapt a leadership style to an organization, it is desirable to know its ultimate goal, from which actions are derived. Different organizations have different values ​​and therefore an adapted leadership style must take into account the highest value of the organization. Rambam's supreme value is the mission, and thus he is similar to Plato as understood by Popper; Spinoza's supreme value is equality through dialogue, in that he is close to Socrates; the supreme value of servant leadership is the followers that there is a dialogue between the leaders and the followers, although it is reduced from Spinoza's and there is order Hierarchical, although reversed, in the leadership structure, but reduced from that learned from Plato, as Popper understood.
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