In recent years, political scientists have looked at utilising tools in order to grade and effectively rank political leaders against each other. Various models, approaches and theories have been developed to explain and evaluate actions at any one particular time and to consider whether any leader at that time would have behaved in that way, or if this behaviour ensured that a mark was left on a particular point in history that arguably no other person would have made. This essay will use “borrowed” tools from various American political scientists including Neustadt and, in particular, Greenstein, who have considered and evaluated presidential leadership as an area of power. This is different from Britain where more interest has been placed on institutions, structures and resources rather than the personal attributes of the person occupying the role of Prime Minister at a particular point in time. Gordon Brown, Labour Prime Minister 2007-2010 will be the subject of Greenstein’s model. With reference to this model this essay will attempt to find whether Gordon Brown was indeed the unsuccessful prime minister which many within his own government and staff openly declared he was, and where a most recent ranking list has placed him as one of the worst leaders since 1945 or if he had qualities that elevate him to a higher position.

Theakston suggests that Anthony King was the first academic to consider the usage of the literature available and proposed similar questions relating to the Prime Ministership of Britain. Attempts have been made to apply the assessment to British Prime ministers since 1945 starting with Clement Atlee up to Gordon Brown’s term of office. Greenstein builds on Neustadt’s work in *Presidential Power, and the Modern Presidents*, utilising six points in an attempt to assess individual political leaders. The six points considered are: Public Communication, Organisational Capacity, Political Skills, Policy Vision, Cognitive Style and Emotional Intelligence.

Theakston indicates that the qualities being assessed come in pairs. Public communication is the outward appearance of a leader, while the organisation capacity is more internal and is concerned

---

1. Theakston, Kevin. (2011)*Gordon Brown as Prime Minister: Political Skills and Leadership Style.* British Politics(6) 78-100
2. Theakston, Kevin. (2011)*Gordon Brown as Prime Minister: Political Skills and Leadership Style.* British Politics(6) 78-100
3. Theakston, Kevin. (2011)*Gordon Brown as Prime Minister: Political Skills and Leadership Style.* British Politics(6) 78-100
An Assessment of a political leader (Gordon Brown) using the Greenstein model. (5143 Words)

with how the leader utilises the power of the office effectively. Political skill is considered to complement policy vision and Lastly cognition and emotional attributes are an assessment of the psychological ability of a particular leader. From a study of the six points it is possible to see the various strengths and weaknesses of a particular leader while ranking the subject against those previously in office.

It has been observed that Gordon Brown did not possess the same presidential skills that Tony Blair had utilised. This is confirmed by Rawnsley who noted that Brown lacked presence both in opposition and then as Prime Minister. Brown suffered greatly in comparison with slicker performers and many sound bites emerged as a result, such as “not Flash, just Gordon”. It was considered by many of his own ministers that he did lack authority and this came across on a weekly basis in his performances against David Cameron, and as Rawnsley commented, his lack of skills in public communication appeared as a weakness and limitation.

The role of Prime Minister as the public face of government requires the occupant to be an effective communicator. Electors need to see evidence of strong leadership to be satisfied that the right person is in power. Such messages, both direct and indirect, can make or break leaders, just as it did for Brown. Brown had been a highly effective Chancellor but being Chancellor requires different skills from the communicative ones necessary for the Prime Minister.

Brown's media history has often been forgotten however; although Imhirst and Freedland remind us that he had three years experience as a television producer when he was noted as a skilful speechwriter and master of sound bites. Unfortunately what is recalled is the monotone and relentless delivery of his speeches which were not as eloquent as his past experience might have suggested. Thus Brown may arguably have been better suited to being a Parliamentary staff member using his skills in the place where it could make a wider impact than as an actual representative. His personality and low public profile did not help when he attempted to communicate messages; he was just not the person to spread the messages. Brown is one of very few prime ministers who had come from
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academia having studied at university to a higher level than most and achieving a Ph.D. in history and demonstrating that he was highly intellectual. However the media focused upon his communicative weaknesses. Elmherst and Freedland remark that he was uncomfortable with the other side of the camera. At his best he could be a great speaker but he lacked the ability to provide good debate.

In comparison, Blair was a natural at speaking and at retaliating within the debate; he was also very effective at reaching out to the wider public as well as maintaining the power to persuade. This explains why Blair is towards the top of the ranking list whereas Brown is towards the bottom and supports Greenstein's logic that public communication is one of the highest desirable characteristics for those wanting to be political leaders who must appear to be natural and charismatic. Being on the public side of the camera did not aid Brown at all and as Hughes suggests although he referred to "a vast range of sources and great thinkers he would have been better to have taken office during Gladstone’s era." Mandelson highlights that even though Brown did have strong policy vision he could not communicate such. Mandelson cites Brown’s comment that he was good “at what politics used to be, about policies, but now people want celebrity and theatre.”

Another important factor of public communication is that of appearance which means that if they look good politicians can be seen as iconic or even attain celebrity status no matter how intelligent they are. Barack Obama is a good example of where people were inspired to choose a youthful looking man versus the older but much experienced candidate, John McCain. This has been very much the case since the time of President Kennedy who looked more attractive and beat Nixon in the televised debates. Politicians from there on had to ensure that they were able to stage manage themselves. Brown very much suffered from lacking the slick and youthful looks that had benefited Blair in 1997 and it contributed to his lack of ability to charm audiences.

All in all, it is possible to see that public communication, considered to be the most important of Greenstein’s points, could have been the determining characteristic that destroyed Brown as leader.
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Organisational capacity is Greenstein’s second point and considers the inner workings of leadership, in this case the Prime Minister. It assesses his or her ability to rally colleagues as well as how effectively their activities are managed. Theakston has suggested that Tony Blair in office greatly increased the size of staff reporting directly to him. There was a lot of resentment from his colleagues within other departments, and public disagreements resulting in resignations followed. Seldon argues that the Number 10 operation was amateurish. The office of Prime Minister under Blair saw an increase in personnel but the office was less consensual and showed a more presidential style of leadership.

Brown, on the other hand, brought with him close and trusted advisers from the Treasury; he was considered to be very effective at micro managing especially in times of crisis such as 2007 during the period of flooding and in the terrorist attack at Glasgow airport. Although Brown’s organisational capacity was successful in regards to the reforming of the civil service, Rawnsley saw Brown’s management in Number 10 as being chaotic or even dysfunctional. It is even suggested that Brown surrounded himself with others who amplified the look of the weak leader rather than compensating for these weaknesses. Hughes, notes that Brown was not intellectually challenged as he did not surround himself with those that could give positive criticism of his policy. This might therefore have contributed to his poor skills of communication as he did not have practice at being intellectually challenged over policy and thus would struggle to engage with the debate. During his time in office it is said by many who had worked for Brown felt very reluctant to tell him he was wrong or attempt to contradict him out of fear. Overall it has been noticed that he a had a small
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circle in whom he believed he could trust and was not effective in bringing more than one group together to interact and communicate with each other.

In the Treasury Gordon Brown had adapted the department to work around him. Here he was less people centred than the likes of Thatcher or Blair. He had felt that the old Whitehall structures in place could not be trusted and he spoke about reforming the organisation within the Treasury to suit him, and attempting to modernise the Department.\textsuperscript{18} It also set in train ideas for the modernisation of the departments of government which saw the creation of the Department for Children, Schools and Families, the Department for Energy and Climate Change and lastly merging two departments to create the Department for Business, Innovations and Skills. There were attempts by Brown to move away from micromanagement, and to return to a more collective Cabinet government.\textsuperscript{19} However, as Peter Mandelson claims, many of Brown’s ideas never got off the drawing board.\textsuperscript{20}

In Cabinet meetings Brown’s body language seemed to suggest he would have rather had been elsewhere. Geoff Hoon commented that he had felt that neither Blair nor Brown had any actual time for ministers the only difference between the two was that Blair would let them get on with it and was usually uninterested unless something went wrong, whereas Brown wanted to interfere with everything and was incapable of delegating responsibility.\textsuperscript{21}

Brown proved to be most successful over the years when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. He enacted many positive changes such as the minimum wage and family tax credits. In the latter years of being Chancellor it was often considered that Brown was trying to undermine Blair and had publicly appeared to despise Blair, and had himself had shown that he wanted to occupy the office.\textsuperscript{22} As Chancellor of the Exchequer Brown was effective as it was a role that required a range of skills and attributes other than the Prime Minister’s role entails. Brown managed to hide away
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essentially from the public viewing until times where it was of importance such as during the budget.

As Prime Minister, Brown had to change the style of leadership in terms of talking to others within the office and managing crises that arose. Brown had been seen as an influential member of the Labour Party and within Parliament but his workings with other ministers had suffered many bumps. There were a number of attempts to challenge the leadership of Brown. As Rawnsley suggests there were no real, so-called “big beasts” or “alternative prime ministers” in Brown's Cabinet, which again was a sign of mistrust between colleagues and a fair hint of paranoia.23

Political skill according to Greenstein assesses one’s skills in persuasion, negotiation, manoeuvre and deal making. The British case is different from the American system of leadership, it is required that prime ministers can not only watch friends within their party but more particularly can watch and dispel enemies.24 The fact that prime ministers are accountable to their party as well as their constituents is not a feature of Greenstein's evaluation of modern presidents. Prime ministers are subject to paranoia due to the potential political manoeuvring in the background by fellow Cabinet members to gain more power and thus challenge them for his job. Prime ministers have more freedom to choose who they wish; presidents must seek approval for most positions from the Senate. In the United Kingdom the Prime Minister only seeks the common voice and selects people from various factions within the party.

It has been noted that Brown lacked the power of persuasion which is closely related to the failures that were considered related to public communication.25 Brown had to work with “enemies” or “Blairites” such as Mandelson, David Milliband and Alistair Darling. Presidents are provided with much more freedom and choice as it is he that has the mandate of the people, not the officials. The Parliamentary system consists of influential members who are deemed untouchable as to move or get rid of them could cause widespread outcry from factions within the party. Brown led by giving off a sense of fear along with the mistrust which had stayed with him since his time as Chancellor. He also
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used underhand tactics, such as not announcing his position until the last minute so opponents lacked
the time in which to respond\textsuperscript{26}. He has been likened to a chess player by Hughes\textsuperscript{27} and Rawnsley\textsuperscript{28}
furthermore added that he had always been at least a dozen moves ahead. This indicates that Brown
did hold a vast ability to assert authority even if it was through aggressive means. It is important to
note that most actions were pre-planned, showing a deep minded thinker with the ability to reinstate
his position by using allies to support him in asserting fear amongst the troops. His inaction and
indecisiveness not to hold an election in 2007 affected him both publicly as well as amongst Cabinet,
and gave rise to a number of political resignations and challenges. Brown’s decision not to hold an
election was later considered to have been wrong and showed that indeed not calling an election was
as Mandelson remarked was probably his biggest political mistake while in office\textsuperscript{29}. On the other hand
Brown's leadership during the financial crisis, starting in 2008, was successfully led and joined the
discussions of the European Union and G20. Overall, political skill is one area where Gordon Brown
did manage to score well.

The next point to be considered by Greenstein is policy vision. Greenstein suggests that it is
an important skill ensuring direction over politics will ensure the success of a leader.\textsuperscript{30} Theakston
debates that vision driven Prime Ministers have been an exception rather than the rule, due to the
collective party system at work within the British system.

Brown has been said to make up policy as he went along. Watt\textsuperscript{31} states that Brown was so
eager to occupy the role of Prime Minister that he planned how to get there but not what to do
afterwards. It has been remarked that most of the time Gordon Brown was making up a direction and
policies to follow. Theakston notes that Brown was indeed a co-architect of the New Labour project,
to renew the party to make it more electable. Although Brown had much influence from his position
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within the Treasury he could not simply move away from the direction led by Blair, no matter how anti Blair he may have been. He definitely saw himself as a completely different leader to Blair. Griffiths 32 explains that within the post war period, mid-term successions and changes of Prime ministers without an election, or change of party, witnessed that there were no significant differences between one Prime Minister to the other. Only with the change of party does a noticeable change in policy vision may actually occur.

Hughes argues that there were many initiatives from Brown but that these were seen to lack a coherent policy agenda. 33 Brown had seemed too focused upon the finer details rather than the wider picture; prime ministers need to look at the wider picture understanding everything government is doing rather than being bogged down by one or two issues. Rawnsley considers that Blair was concerned about Brown as he felt that there was an absence of a coherent programme of policy being implemented. 34 Mandelson noted in his observations of Brown that he felt Brown had been a leader who reacted to events and that he was too short termist. 35 He later suggests that even where Brown had considered the wider picture he had tended to create tactical opportunities rather than an actual strategy to advance it. 36 Beech and Lee imply that Brown’s government suffered from the lack of ideological direction which hindered Brown’s effectiveness as leader and as prime minister. 37

The reasoning behind not calling an autumn election in 2007 was that Brown wanted more time to consider and be able to spell out vision for Britain. 38 Unfortunately this was only to come back and haunt him two years later as Kettle argues that the media had felt he has no idea what he believed in. 39 The fact that he could not change the direction of policy that had been followed was seen as too radical and would hurt him politically as he was as seen to be a major actor in decisions before becoming prime minister. Lee also suggests that Brown had moved away from the traditional
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social democratic ideals and more to the American neo conservative line of thought especially in regards to how the markets are run. Theakston surmises that Brown’s main issue was his lack of skill in being able to communicate what he was trying to achieve and publically show that there was a clear sense of direction. This was to damage his credibility and thus weakened his leadership. Overall even though Brown had indeed a good scope on policy his lack in ability to communicate such failed him within most of the factors. This is therefore closely linked to Greenstein’s first criterion that public communication is extremely important for leaders to be good at otherwise policy vision in their leadership may be questioned.

Greenstein’s fifth point is cognitive style which he explains as being the ability to process the flood of advice and information that is sent to the leader. It considers both the intelligence of a leader as well as the leader’s ability in avoiding being stuck down on specific details. The modern day world leaders need to process much more information than their earlier counterparts had done pre-Second World War. Some prime ministers, for example, Callaghan and Major had not gone to university compared to Brown, who had been the first of all prime ministers to achieve a PhD. However good this may be on paper some critics for example Prospect suggest, that although having more intelligence they do not necessarily know how to use it effectively. An effective leader should use intellectuals rather than be one.

Having a higher level of intelligence seemed to act as a hindrance for Brown. Jack Straw compared both Blair and Brown’s decision making approach. Blair was deemed, according to Straw, to have been a more instinctive decision maker, while Brown on the hand had a more methodical, cautious and slow approach. This had very much aided him during his time as Chancellor, however the role of prime minister relies on fast decisions and the day to day aspects of the job are
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unpredictable. Brown had been used to being able to take a much slower pace, ensuring finer details for his appearances at large scale events which happened only a few times a year. Riddell confirms this notion as he openly suggests that the position of Prime Minister does indeed require the ability to make spontaneous and immediate decisions, unlike his rare event appearances as chancellor in which he was able to have more time to prepare. Brown according to Price had a deeper grasp of policy than Blair but paid too much attention to the final details before making decisions. Brown spent too much time micromanaging and as Rawnsley puts it, “did not excel at multitasking” and spent too much time concentrating on one big thing at a time. This strongly suggested that Brown was not of leadership quality, but one who would be better to advise one.

Due to the slow decision making many decisions began to accumulate and he faced criticism and lack of support from various ministers and eventually the electorate. His indecisiveness not to call an autumn election, dithering on the 10pence tax rate issue and the expenses scandal, highlighted this inability publicly and had cost him dearly in elections held in May 2008. Rawnsley further noted that a senior civil servant observed Brown’s time consuming decision making process, suggesting that Brown had wanted to find better options but the longer it took the decisions got worse. Hughes stated that to make matters worse, once Brown made a decision he was heavily reluctant to change it arguing he understood the topic more than they. This showcases his stubbornness, lack of will to be flexible, and unwillingness to change his mind despite media and public pressure.

Another issue as observed by Bower is that Brown took a dislike to open debate and challenge and he cites an official stating that Brown had lacked the ability in distinguishing between disinterested advice or a stab in the back. The Economist supports this claim as it agrees with Bower that Brown “copes badly with criticism”. Again this shows Brown’s weakness no matter how intelligent he in reality was. One official had stated Brown’s answer to debates was to thump out

bullet points until he had ground the opposition down.\textsuperscript{52} This worked against him towards the end of his period as Prime Minister the top of the party showed signs of weakness. Theakston further adds that ministers had been reluctant to give any advice due to his unwelcoming approach for help or advice.\textsuperscript{53}

Brown’s cognitive style favoured him in actual intelligence, but in terms of practical usage it weakened him as leader as he was too cautious and concentrated too much on micromanagement, which is fantastic in times of crisis but not in day to day leadership. Brown had been reluctant to receive support or advice from those close ministers or advisors around him, and this, along with his unpopularity and arguably paranoid behaviour, quickly led to his downfall.

Emotional intelligence according to Greenstein may allow leaders to fail if they cannot control their emotions, and are not able to turn them into constructive uses.\textsuperscript{54} Greenstein suggests that a `first class temperament` could be argued as more important than a `first class intellect` in regards to the way they deal with crises and daily stresses due to the high demands of the office.\textsuperscript{55} However, Greenstein does concede that ` great political ability does sometimes derive from troubled emotions`, but he emphasises the dangers and problems that could potentially arise within this area.\textsuperscript{56} This is important in relation to Brown, as it was often stated that he had an unstable frame of mind and where it has even been argued that he would bully ministers, advisors and staff.\textsuperscript{57} Tom Bower has claimed Brown was a `brooding volcano` a man of `demons and grudges `tantrums and offensive behaviour` and later suggests that he was indeed an insecure individual.\textsuperscript{58} As it can be seen, Brown performed
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poorly in the emotional intelligence category and proved to be insecure which added to the lack of appeal he had within public communication.

Blair was deemed by Rawnsley as being more emotionally intelligent, seen by the example of his speech during the immediate aftermath of Princess Dianna’s death. He was argued to use his emotions in such a way that could emotionally connect with public audiences as well as colleagues. On the other hand, Winston Churchill was much more similar to Brown. Prone to violent mood swings and depression, yet he is regarded as one of the highest ranking prime ministers for his war time leadership effort. In contrast, Brown was also seen to have a hidden charm, warmth and humour within his private life, he had also suffered from the bereavement of his infant daughter. He later decided to open up about his feelings in an attempt to show genuine emotion which he had normally tried to hide. On the comparative basis both Bose and Greenstein argue that although George Washington and Abraham Lincoln were seen as great leaders, they may not have fared so well on emotional intelligence. Thus great leaders, as seen by the few examples may sometimes not channel emotions effectively enough.

After evaluating Gordon Brown as a leader using Greenstein’s model, the remainder of this essay will critically assess the model and discuss whether evaluative models created for presidents can be “borrowed” effectively to evaluate British Prime Ministers, or whether a new model needs to be created to address the differences between the two different political systems.

Firstly, Greenstein’s model was derived from earlier works of King, Neustadt and Barber although he tries to differ from their ideas by introducing the character of a president and the skills that they have which are important to the holder of the office. Each president is seen to have a
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significantly different leadership style, just as Prime Ministers do. Although each presidential leader is put through the test none is shown to be perfect; using Greenstein’s model political scientists and historians can find strengths and weaknesses which differentiate between leaders over time, and the information can be utilised to create a ranking system. Each leader must change at a fast pace especially in issues to be addressed or communicated with the people. It is considered that specific events can make or break leaders. Some leaders have been considered to be at the right place at the right time, where others step up to the challenge once an event becomes apparent. Franklin D Roosevelt could be considered to be one President who was in the right place at the right time, while Bush stepped up after the horrific events of 9/11 and declared war on terror but the Watergate Scandal broke Nixon’s presidency. However, John F Kennedy once famously questioned the value of evaluating leaders in this way when one is not in the office and cannot understand the pressures or the information leading to the decisions made.65 In a British context this would be hard to obtain as it is only Wilson and Macmillan who had wrote anything in regard to their reflect thoughts of when they had been in office.66

Greenstein himself argued that his model could not work within the British context due to the collective leadership style the United Kingdom uses. He cites Winston Churchill, Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair as example of rare successes, though he further adds that they are outnumbered by the many, Stanley Baldwin, Harold Wilson and John Major, were leaders Greenstein suggested who had limited impact.67 However, it is pointed out by Jim Buller and Toby James that although Theakston uses the six points, he only does so by keeping institutional contexts in mind.68 They do, as a whole, agree with Greenstein and point out the difference in leadership styles between the two countries, just as Greenstein does. For instance presidents are noticeably more effective in foreign matters than domestic due to the limitations that the check and balance system implements. This differs with British Prime Ministers who usually have large enough majorities within the House of Commons,

enabling them to be effective in both the domestic and the foreign political spheres. However, although it is noted party politics are more important and are of a much stronger factor than with their American counterparts it is suggested that it is possible to see that Prime Ministers have become more significant figures in recent times. The system remains strongly party political, but there are many similarities between the British and American systems, Presidents for example have EXOP (Executive Office of President) while Prime Ministers rely on special advisors who report to them only, instead of just ministers with potential hidden ambition. This suggests that with time the two systems will be close enough to be evaluated more effectively.

Against Greenstein’s model of evaluating presidents it can be seen that the interpretation of what is considered within the six points is too broad; there is a strong possibility for many different interpretations and possible different outcomes. This demonstrates that the data continues to be qualitative leaving the question of whether one can truly rank a political leader open. Theakston has indicated that it is possible to use Greenstein’s six point model and rank leaders in order of perceived success.

The question of why is it important to evaluate presidents must be asked. It remains open to discussion amongst the academics, though one major argument in support of doing so notes that the wider public can make wiser electoral choices but more importantly they are able to place potential candidates within a historical context and make their choice about whom they feel is the right person, at the right time.

The Guardian Newspaper had initiated a poll, in 1991, looking at ranking British ministers in rank order of who they felt were the best to the ones they may not even know about or think whose term was a disaster. It had included 50 individuals, which had included historians, political scientists and other social scientists on Margaret Thatcher’s leadership, six months after she left office.
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to see an early judgement. The result had place Thatcher on the top of the list, which was said to be hugely due to the length of time in office and generals style of leadership.\textsuperscript{71}

The fact there vast are differences which academics consider in relation to both sides of the “pond”, one is age where there has not been any real interest looking at the age of Prime Ministers compared to that of American Presidents.\textsuperscript{72} Educational wise, only ten out of the twenty Prime Ministers had previously attended Oxford University, not forgetting three going to Cambridge, leaving seven who had not attended university. This showing a mixed bag but more emphasis of having attending the best Universities, though in saying that, Eton graduates are increasingly popular choice David Cameron being one example and Nick Clegg on the other.

Thus in conclusion, it is very clear that Gordon Brown as British Prime Minister performed badly in accordance with most of the leadership requirements defined by Greenstein’s six points. Brown had been seen to fail heavily in public communication and emotional intelligence, although he had a good ranking within policy vision. In the other areas he had a mixed ranking as he had some positive aspects as well as negative but could be seen to lean more towards being negative. Brown was a highly intelligent prime minister with vast life experience, yet this is increasingly not required and now even not preferable for the holder of the position. Brown was a victim of a progressive form of politics, which turns politicians into the celebrities of today. Using tools to evaluate leaders in a British context as seen is far more complicated than that of American presidents.
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