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Many leadership studies have shown that leaders are to a great extent influenced by their models. These can be mentors, the manager taking after his manager. The models can also be people and situations one encountered when one was young. This involves conscious and unconscious imitation. This conference paper has been written as part of a research project, the aim of which is to read feature films from a leadership standpoint (see Rombach and Solli 2002). The equivalent has been done with for example novels (e.g. by Czarniawska-Joerges and Guillet de Monthoux 1994) and with the TV series "Helt hysteriskt [ Completely hysterical]" (e.g. by Höök 1998).

We are posing the question as to whether film is an undervalued bearer of norms with regard to adults' behaviour in professional life. Popular films have a wider dissemination than books. We – two middle-aged men – have seen at least 4,000 films, though a lot of them have admittedly been repeats. Reading books is part of our work, but we still believe we have read less books than we have seen films. Furthermore, several action-oriented studies demonstrate that leaders seldom read books – it takes too long (Mintzberg 1973, Kotter 1982, Tengblad 2001).

It is perhaps also the case that we approach films less critically than memos and journals. The message goes in because we are open towards them of our own free will, and we even pay to see them. If we do not enter into the spirit of the film, the only effect will be that we are subjected to flickering light and hear someone talking and making a noise whilst simple music is played. When a film viewer falls asleep with the remote control in his hand, both of these things have taken place. He has had a fair amount of amusement by seeing how hot and uncomfortable or how lovely and cool it can be in other places. Sometimes he will also have received a lesson in leadership.

ANALYSIS OF THE SURFACE OF FILMS

Films can be read at various levels. All films can be interpreted. A good film has several levels which are fairly easily accessible to interpretation. We have read films in the same way as one otherwise reads case studies in the field of social-science research, though films, as with the novels dealt with by Czarniawska-Joerges and Guillet de Monthoux (1994, Introduction),
are not cases. One difference is that in feature films, as in fictional texts, we are given data about things we do not normally detect in the context of scientific studies or journalistic work. For example, we may get to know exactly what people are thinking and what they are doing in secret, without them knowing about it. An overall picture can be presented. When reading we have sought clear lessons for the manager or future manager seeing the film. The emphasis is on the leader's leadership, but we are also interested in the overall picture, including their private life.

In the practical analytical work we have been inspired by David Altheide's "Qualitative media analysis" (1996). He mixes traditions and achieves a practical approach rather than a tool. We have also been influenced by the semiotic currents which for a time were highly fashionable in the field of organisational research. In general, this means we think the recipient is as correct as the sender in his interpretation. We are thus interested in the surface rather than what lies below. If there are subtexts there, it is not our problem.

A film's text strip can unproblematically be lifted into our text. A text can be quoted unchanged in another text. What is said in dialogues can also relatively easily be quoted. When we transcribe, i.e. make written text out of talk, we lose things such as vocal pitch, pauses and facial expressions. Compared with making text out of what we see, these are minor problems. To make an image into written text, a translation is required. In translating from image to text our aim has been to make descriptions rather than interpretations. We thus consciously attempt to remain on the surface. The fact that each translation of an image to text is an interpretation is something we have no control over.

The problem of translating from image to text is one reason why anyone reading this report should see the films we are analysing themselves. But that does not eliminate the problem either. The number of translations just increases. The problem our readers and we have with the translation from what we see to our external comprehension of what is happening should not be exaggerated. As soon as we see something, this process starts – so we are good at it. Researchers who have studied the psychology of lying actually support videoing at hearings involving suspected criminals. The argument is that it is easier to see if someone is lying on film than when you see them in the flesh (Asklöf 2001, page 17; see also Strömwall 2001).

Anyone seeing a film in company can read one thing into it, whilst the person sitting next to him sees other things, but there are also things both of them will have seen. This would naturally also apply if we had each been lying in front of a separate TV set. It is not the case that comprehension of the underlying content requires special education or that it is more refined. On the contrary, much education restricts the field of view. We can more easily agree that we have seen the same thing if it is presented so that it reaches the eye directly, without involving so much of our analytical capacity.

When we discuss the effect of films here, what we are interested in is that which is clear and on the surface. One reason for this external reading is that it is predominant for certain audiences in certain situations. The audience we are alluding to is managers who have a career or are getting on a bit. They watch films on TV late at night – often in hotels, or drowsily
reclined on the sofa after having put the children to bed. They have not actively selected the film but rather eliminated porn, golf and chat shows, and have ended up in a story, which is already in progress. If it gets late they will switch off the box regardless of whether the director has finished what he is saying.

ALL THE UNDERLYING DATA IS AVAILABLE

This essay analyses what leaders do in The Godfather (1972). Picking one film out of the context covered by the project was not without problems. The best is to see The Godfather as an example of how you may work with reflections based on a feature film.

The underlying data is the behaviour of bosses in The Godfather. The film we are studying is in its entirety available also to anyone reading this essay. This approach dramatically reduces the methodical problems compared with other studies of leaders' actions. Normally the gathering and reproduction of data is a major problem. Case studies do not permit replication. The researcher must make it credible that she has seen what she is asserting. You also have to demonstrate to what extent what you report is dependent on your actually having been there. We have no such problems. In our case the underlying data remains in its entirety in precisely the condition it was in before we started our study.

Yet it is too simple to state that methodical problems connected with data are completely lacking. We have together seen The Godfather over ten times. The first and perhaps the second time we watched the film we saw it as a whole. After that we largely concentrated on parts of it. Also, we often stopped the film to make notes, and we wound it on and rewound it to look for objects for analysis. The common problem that what you see is being influenced by preconceptions and knowledge applies to this study as to others.

THE GODFATHER – AN EVIL DECISION-MAKER

Few films create their own reality, but those which do are ground-breaking. One such film is The Godfather, which was directed by Francis Ford Coppola and is based on Mario Puzo's book (1969) of the same title. Many people are convinced that what is called the Mafia in the USA is more or less as described on the surface of the film. It is hardly surprising that the film encountered major protests from the Italo-American Association, senators etc. in the USA. The film creates a probable image of the truth, regardless of how fictitious it is.

The film involves three key concepts – family, business and violent crime. The whole idea behind a large proportion of the film is that these three ingredients should not be mixed, but when in spite of everything this happens, the film often takes a new turn. Tradition must also be added to the three main ingredients. Respecting traditions and customs is not merely a way of maintaining relationships but also a way of communicating. If you receive a package containing something you know belongs to a good friend together with a dead fish, this means
that the good friend is lying at the bottom of the ocean. That’s clear and unambiguous symbolis-
mism.

A peculiarity of the film is that most of it progresses very slowly, but in a manner of speaking constantly. Francis Coppola is said to have said that the film's rhythm is delivered "legato, rather than staccato". Not much is said in the film. In two hours and forty-seven minutes only just over 14,000 words are spoken, which means that one has to stretch these few words out in order for them to suffice. However, the tempo for murders and similar dramatic events is fast, thus reinforcing the effect very tangibly.

**Fast-forwarding/-rewinding**

The first scene in the film – the wedding of Don Vito Corleone's daughter – shows the Godfather. At the same time as the festivities in the garden Don Vito is holding a sort of reception in his study. The room is gloomy and screened off from the outside world. The doors are kept closed. There are windows with drawn blinds. In his analysis of *The Godfather* (Internet reference 1) Martin Johnsson describes the room as being "comparable to a prison". "However much he (Don Vito) wants to break loose and, for example, spend more time with his family and avoid needing to worry about things turning out badly, this is a practical impossibility."

"We shape our buildings, and afterwards our buildings shape us,” was the way Winston Churchill put it in a completely different context (Internet reference 2). The room is important for those who in a more narrow sense belong to the organisation. It is also important for those encountering the organisation. There is symbolism attached to the rooms and buildings where the organisations reside (see Yanow 1996, chapter 6), whereby the interior decoration and design of rooms, surfaces, buildings etc. give the organisation's management the opportunity to send signals to those encountering the organisation.

As it is his daughter's wedding, Don Vito is expected to be generous, and this also applies to those who have sought an audience with him. As the party progresses the important characters are introduced. In addition to Don Vito these are his sons Sonny, Fredo and Michael. Sonny is very close to his father when it comes to business. Fredo is less well equipped than his brothers when it comes to intellectual capacity, and he is thus allotted simpler assignments. But he is really hopeless at them too. When much further on in the film the father is seriously wounded, Fredo fumbles with his revolver and ends up dropping it without having fired a single shot.

When the film begins, Michael has just come home from the war with honourable commenda-
tions, and he is completely without any ambitions of becoming involved in the family's criminal activities. When an unpleasant but unbloody little case of blackmail is referred to, he says to his fiancée "That's my family, Kay. It's not me".

Tom Hagen plays an important role. He is a lawyer, and on his way to becoming the family's so-called *consigliere*, i.e. lawyer and advisor. The women in the film have relatively obscure roles. One exception is Michael's fiancée Kay, who among other things, by way of the
questions she asks Michael, makes the gist of what is happening clear to us members of the audience.

The festivities are followed by a number of scenes which deal with how Don Vito's promises made during the wedding are realised. Don Vito makes one such promise to Johnny Fontane, a singer of sentimental songs, who complains that he has not been given the film role his career needs. Don Vito utters what have now become winged words: "I'm gonna make him an offer he can't refuse." The person who is to receive the offer is the studio boss Jack Woltz. After various vicissitudes, everything resolves itself when Woltz finds his favourite horse's head in his bed. Michael quotes the same expression when in answer to Kay's stubborn questions he provides an insight into the family's activities. In that case it was Luca Brasi, the most prominent hit man in Don Vito's gang, who gave a bandleader the choice between his signature or his brain on a contract. Sonny likewise uses the expression on one occasion. Everything points to expressions such as these not being completely unusual, and to their being winged words in the Corleone family too. When Michael gradually takes over as the Godfather, he also makes offers nobody can refuse. Not even the casino owner Moe Greene – though he refuses up until his violent death.

Moe Greene is murdered in his home with a shot in the eye, just like the real gangster Bugsy Siegel. The film's other characters, however, in general lack an obvious equivalent in or connection to the Mafia in the USA. The Godfather, Don Vito Corleone, leads one's thoughts towards Carlo Gambino, without the resemblance being particularly good. Johnnie Fontaine might represent Frank Sinatra as well as Vic DeMone (see, for example, Internet reference 3).

After a number of the promises made during the wedding have been fulfilled, the film changes direction from everyday gangster behaviour to war between New York's Mafia families. The background to the war is that Don Vito refuses to embark on drug trafficking. One of Don Vito's very valuable assets is that he "owns" a number of politicians and judges. They do not have a great deal against contravention of alcohol legislation, gaming and gambling or prostitution, but in Don Vito's opinion they will not like drugs.

Virgil Sollozzo is the one who proposes that Don Vito go into drug trafficking. To push his business concept through, he organises a murder attempt on Don Vito, who is seriously injured. Sonny takes over management of the business during Don Vito's convalescence, and through a number of different circumstances Michael is drawn further and further into the family's criminal activities. He finally becomes part of the business when he cold-bloodedly slaughters Virgil Sollozzo and the city's corrupt chief of police McCluskey. One of the consequences of the slaughter is that Michael flees to Sicily.

While Michael is in Sicily things happen in the US. The brother Sonny is murdered in an attack in which his brother-in-law Carlo is involved. Unwisely, as one can be strangled for less. Don Vito gradually gets well and resumes power. To get some peace he accepts, in the presence of the other Mafia families, commencement of drug operations. During the meeting Don Vito realises who was behind Sollozzo. He also realises what should be done. Michael
returns to the USA and marries Kay. Don Vito prepares him for a power takeover by retreating more and more. When Don Vito dies of a heart attack while playing with one of his grandchildren, Michael is well prepared.

When Constanza's son is christened, Michael is the Godfather, and at that moment Michael's orders regarding various assassinations of competitors are also carried out. The film ends with Michael denying to Kay that he is behind the murders. Lonely and hardened, he remains the undisputed Godfather.

The film contains quite a number of leader figures. The first time you see the film Don Vito is the most apparent, but on second viewing Michael stands out as an increasingly significant leader. Both Don Vito and Michael leave powerful impressions during and after the film. Less clear impressions, but from an analytical standpoint interesting behavioural patterns, are demonstrated by Sonny. Below we focus on how Don Vito functions in the film, while the others will have to wait for their own essays.

**Vito Corleone**

Don Vito Corleone does not have that many sides to his character. His moral code is fairly predictable. Business is for men, and as a man one should look after one's family. Just before Don Vito dies he says the following in a confidential discussion with Michael: "I spend my life trying not to be careless. Women and children can be careless, but not men." A man should be happy with his family. Don Vito emphasises this not just in the scene above, but several times during the film.

The family and private matters are one thing, and business is another. Keeping them apart is necessary, not least to the rationale of decision-making. Keeping business and private life apart is just one side of the matter. At the same time, no business is done just for money or even primarily for money. To a large extent, actions are based on friendship or debts of gratitude combined with respect. The money will come anyway.

A tangible quality in Don Vito is his thoughtfulness. It is precisely thoughtfulness which seems to be an important instrument for leaders. It creates respect in that people have to wait. Whenever Don Vito is interrupted in his reflections, a reprimand is immediately issued. But it is only Sonny who makes such a mistake, and he finds out about it in front of everyone else.

This thoughtfulness also gives an impression of calculation in that the decisions are well founded. It is not necessarily the case that reasons are given for Don Vito's decisions, but it happens now and again. After having carefully listened to Sollozzo and decided not to take part in drug trafficking, Don Vito says the following: "I said that I would see you, because I heard you were a serious man, to be treated with respect. But I must say no to you. And I'll give you my reason. It's true, I have a lot of friends in politics. They wouldn't be friendly long if I was involved in drugs instead of gambling, which they regard as a harmless vice, but drugs is a dirty business." After that, there is no room for further discussion of the matter.
The decisions are made not just in the light of reflection, but they are also based on information. Don Vito asks others for information, but it is usually he who puts it all together to form the irrevocable decision. Here then, is a combination not only of questioning, reflection and calculation, but also of experience.

At several stages in the film Don Vito demonstrates an almost incomprehensible ability to interpret signs and drive things in the direction he wants. Don Vito’s way of talking to people – reprimanding, accusing and forgiving – cannot lead to anything other than their subjecting themselves to his will. During a meeting Don Vito also somehow realises that it is Don Barzini who is actually behind the murder attempt on him. He knows such things as how to recognise a traitor. In short, he knows his business – perhaps better than anyone else. Don Vito actually only makes one mistake; in not realising that he will be the object of a murder attempt while buying fruit; the cinema audience understands this far earlier.

Don Vito leaves behind clear traces of being a clever, considerate, experienced, decisive and just leader. He can even let go. At the end of the film he becomes Michael’s consigliere and gives him every conceivable support. Don Vito is portrayed as a congenial person – despite his being a gangster. Without the latter quality he would make an excellent president of the USA or chairman of Volvo Trucks.

In The Godfather, Don Vito gives us a great deal to reflect on: decisions, delegation, dynamic decisionmaking, efficiency, thoughtfulness, experience, the family, information, contrasts, legato, muddling, the unconscious, planning, problems, rational choices, respect, keeping things apart, slow thinkers, dustbin, disconnection, choice and bonds of friendship. In this context we have chosen to emphasise what we were most drawn by: decisionmaking.

**DECISIONS – RATIONAL AND CONSCIOUS**

There are few phenomena more closely linked to leadership than decisions. Leaders are expected to make decisions, but they do not devote an especially large proportion of their time to decision-making, though this of course depends on what one means by decisions. Herbert Simon is one of the thinkers in this field (see for example Simon 1947). Things sometimes become difficult if one thinks a lot. To Herbert Simon, decisions are conscious or unconscious choices. With a definition such as this, everything constitutes a decision, i.e. nothing (Månsson and Sköldberg 1983). If we want to give a sense to the concept of decision we need some kind of delimitation or connection. By decisions we mean here such judgements as are principally directed at influencing others’ actions.

Decisionmaking as a norm is fairly simple. The rational pattern prevails. Opinions differ as to what exactly this decision-making pattern looks like. A not uncommon pattern is the following (to be found, amongst many others, in Sharkansky 1978, Brunsson and Jönsson 1979): (1) identify the problem; (2) clarify the goals and put them in order; (3) draw up all conceivable options; (4) evaluate the options; (5) select the alternative which is most in line with (2).
The rational selection model is fundamental within micro economics when dealing with the distribution of resources, theories of political science with regard to the way coalitions are formed, and statistical decision-making theory, as well as for many other models in the field of social science. The idea of rational choice is probably as old as that of human behaviour (March 1994).

Despite the pattern for rational choice being the norm, the criticism of it is well known. The norm for rational choice is perhaps the most criticised one we can show off. It is not especially difficult to show that goals in an organisation are often contradictory and can by no means be put into an order (see Rombach 1991). Despite this, we do not need to see the idea of the clear goal as something logical and thus paradoxical. It is significantly less frustrating if one sees it as something para-logical, i.e. something which has nothing to do with logic (Czarniawska-Joerges 1992). Social processes can be better understood precisely if they are seen as being social, as opposed to scientific.

Examining every conceivable option is unreasonable. Back at the end of the 1950s, Charles Lindblom wrote the following: "Limits to human intellectual capacities and to available information set definite limits to man's capacity to be comprehensive. In actual fact, therefore, no-one can practise the rational comprehensive method for really complex problems ..." (Lindblom 1959, page 84). The matter is not improved by the fact that the time available is usually limited.

The list of criticisms of the model for rational decision-making can be made very long. By the same token, it seems that every book on decision-making starts with a chapter describing what is wrong with the model in question. Guy Peters (1988) appears as a spokesman for many when he writes that the rational model lacks any basis in reality. Nils Brunsson and Sten Jönsson really get going when they state that it almost feels "like kicking someone who is already down when one criticises this model of decision-making" (Brunsson and Jönsson 1979, page 18).

Despite the massive criticism, the rational model is in the best of health. One might wonder why. One explanation is that no-one, or at any rate hardly anyone, feels very comfortable about posing as irrational, however reasonable that may be (see Brunsson 1985). Another explanation may be that we do not usually mean rational when we say rational, but rather sensible under the present circumstances. A third explanation may be that we have recently been to the cinema and seen The Godfather. On film, decisions can be portrayed as being rational. Take the scene where Don Corleone goes to a meeting to listen to Virgil Sollozzo. The problem is clear. It is about business, and Sollozzo has references to display in this field. Sollozzo presents relevant information. Don Vito weighs up the option of earning a lot of money against the risk of losing the support he has from politicians and judges. His decision seems well founded and follows the model for rational choices. This is no isolated case. Don Vito makes his decisions in a way which in all its essentials is in accordance with the rational model. Yet we wonder whether there is perhaps an alternative model that is even more appropriate.
A long time classic model for decision-making was presented by Michael Cohen, James March and Johan Olsen thirty years ago (1972). It goes under the name of the "garbage can". In short, the model says basically that decisions come about when the problem, the solution, the decision-maker and the options are to be found in the same place. An interpretation beneath the surface of the film could be that Don Vito was seeking an opportunity to announce that he was against drug trafficking and that this opportunity presented itself when Sollozzo took the matter up. Everything else that happened after the meeting speaks against this interpretation.

One does not have to link decisions to what is actually done. A not unusual argument in the literature on decisions is that decisions and implementation do not necessarily need to belong together. There are examples of organisations in which a decision is made and something else is done, while a third thing is being said. This is often called disconnection (see Rombach 1986). For Don Vito, decisions and action belong together, but how things stand with talk is less clear. A gangster can hardly go around talking the truth all the time.

Another classic among decisionmaking theories goes under the designation "muddling through". In accordance with this theory, decisions do not come about all at once but muddle their way through a labyrinth of obstacles, especially in the form of limited comparisons of options (Lindblom 1959). It is definitely an attractive description of the way decisions come about in spite of everything. In a later article (1979) Charles Lindblom developed his thoughts on "muddling through", and in his opinion this is not just a good description but also a good norm. Muddling through leads to reasonable decisions. Don Vito does not share this opinion, but instead confirms our notion of the strong leader who issues clear information. In The Godfather there is definitely no muddling.

Another theoretical concept which lends itself to inclusion in the argument is about dynamic decision-making. The thought pattern here is that the situation changes with time and it then goes without saying that fresh decisions must be made at a later stage. This is consequently a theory of decision-making which does not presuppose an end, and in which counter-decisions are common (see, for example, Jönsson and Solli 1995). If decisions are seen in this light, the time factor becomes important (Brehmer 1992), and it is important not only to know what to do, but also when to do it. A vital element in the dynamic theory of decision-making is the decision-maker's ability to handle feedback. There are many things that can go wrong here. The incomplete information is evident, as well as the decision-maker's ability to see that old recipes no longer work (Kerstholt and Haajmakers 1997). As we see it, Don Vito has problems in this respect; his methods from the period of prohibition do not work as well in the age of drug trafficking.

However we twist and turn Don Vito and his decision-making we come to the conclusion that the rational decision-making model is a fitting description of how he proceeds when he makes his decisions. One wonders how it can come about that the rational model seems so improbable and is still so well suited to describe Don Vito's behaviour? The answer lies in us all wanting to be rational. When we have made a decision we can often reconstruct the course
of events in retrospect so that it actually looks rational. Retrospective rationalisation is the expression for this! On film one can retrospectively rationalise beforehand – so it looks much wiser.

The decision-making models we have hitherto discussed have at least one feature in common. They presuppose awareness in the decision-makers. It is the method of reaching decisions and the way of looking at them that vary. If one is to critically survey decision-making, consciousness cannot stand unchallenged.

Tore Nørretranders (1999) has discussed in detail the matter of whether decisions are conscious or unconscious. He principally uses Benjamin Libet's experiments as a point of departure. In the latter, Libet has tried to describe in detail small occurrences such as how the decision to move a finger comes about. The conclusions are used to understand decision-making at a fundamental level. Just like the results of much other micro-oriented research, Benjamin Libet's results are of significant philosophical relevance.

One conclusion which Benjamin Libet draws from his experiments is that "awareness of wanting to perform an act which one decides on oneself occurs almost half a second after the brain has begun realising the decision" (Nørretranders 1999, page 292). It is possible to question the results, and there is research which indicates that it does not actually take as long as half a second until we become aware of what the brain is up to. Despite this, the fact that the brain does a lot of things before we are aware of them appears quite certain. One can now object that, in spite of everything, in the course of time we become aware of what the brain is doing. But this rather means that it happens with a certain delay.

Firstly one can discuss what is meant by so-called free will if decisions are made before we know about them. This picture of decision-making goes against a large proportion of the research concerning decisions within the sphere of management. Can it be the case that decisions are normally made unconsciously? According to Benjamin Libet the answer is both yes and no. Yes, as they are actually made before we become aware of them. No, because in spite of everything we become aware of them, and then our consciousness can veto the decision made by the unconscious.

Consciousness cannot begin an action, but it can decide that the action will not be carried out. Consciousness is thus a refuser. Is should be said here that consciousness does not usually say no. It so to speak does not care. When a conflict arises between the conscious and the unconscious, the conscious wins. It all results in what the Freudian tradition calls suppressed experiences. It follows from this that the veto process is a quite unpleasant occurrence. Or to quote Tore Nørretranders on this point: "It's best for humans if they just act" (1999, page 332).

Benjamin Libet supplies data which forms the basis for the construction of a model which clearly conflicts with the rational model. In our opinion his contribution means that the circle can be closed. We better understand Don Vito's wrong decisions. Certainly Don Vito unconsciously decides to broaden operations so as also to include drug traffic. A villain is despite everything a villain. When he becomes aware of his decision, the refusal machine in the form
of the consciousness gets going and prevents it all. And so things get crazy, also in the long run.

Decision-making is connected with tempo. Don Vito appears slow, whilst others are fast. We recall an argument of Pierre Bourdieu (referring to Plato) which is about "fast thinkers" and thus in accordance with our interpretation "slow thinkers" (e.g. 1998, pages 44-46). In the age of economism we admire the fast dealing of traders on the stock exchange and the notion everything having to be fast (Löfgren 2001). People who think slowly are little appreciated. The Godfather clearly shows that "slow thinkers" are superior in the long run, a conclusion which Plato, Pierre Bourdieu and we ourselves like.

**EPILOGUE**

Decisionmaking is central to the film. The decisions are clear and they are not misunderstood – they are hardly circumstances which are common in reality. We have discussed how decisions actually come about. The lesson to be learnt is about notifying people of decisions in situations where these decisions will be heard and noticed. People who see a lot of films expect clarity. But imagine if leaders believed that decisions were rational and conscious! It is probable that a manager, the day after having seen The Godfather, will scratch herself thoughtfully, like Don Vito, and come to the decision that "I'm gonna make him an offer he can’t refuse", without knowing why.

Our presentation of data and our analysis are necessarily fragmentary. One can find more of interest in The Godfather. The analysis can be both broadened and intensified. Even more obvious is the fact that there are many more films which show leadership. But there is no room for anything further in this essay, and we have not planned a sequel. However, we would welcome someone else taking advantage of this opening by writing further texts dealing with leadership in films. We would like to read about leaders in Russian, German and French films, and why not Asian films too. We would also like to read an essay which concentrates solely on a single leadership-related topic based on a scene from a film or perhaps a hundred scenes from as many films.
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