The Meaning of Leadership in Political Systems
Abstract

In today’s democracies, we, citizens, elect individuals to represent us, to talk on our behalf. In this way, political leaders embody the beliefs, wishes, and will of populations, and must act as citizens’ representatives. However, nowadays, a crisis of confidence seems emerge between citizens and politicians. The particular leadership pacing political systems can give to us an interesting point of view to understand this phenomenon. In this way, it is essential, for all of us, citizens, to understand what define us as such, what is our role, what kind of power is in our hands. It is also necessary to understand what the role of politicians elected as representatives is. More significantly, it is a necessity for all of us to have a critical look about what the core components of our societies are.

Thereby, in this thesis, I give an enlighten point of view about the meaning of leadership in political systems. I hold six different perspectives in the aim of emphasizing the components of political systems, our role of citizens, and the role of political leaders. Those six perspectives are the following: the reasons explaining the emergence of societies, the role and the explanations about the existence of political parties, the characteristics of political leaders, the characteristics of citizens as political followers, the importance of the authenticity in political systems and finally the moral and ethical dimension as a necessity in the way to handle power.
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Chapter 1:

Introduction

In the aim of raising the understanding about the objectives of this thesis and to introduce the subject, which will be discuss in this paper, I would like to start by using two quotes which illustrate the basis of my research:

- “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness” (Thomas Jefferson - 1776). These words are borrowed from the declaration of independence of the United States in 1776, and express the sacredness which ties citizens within a country.

- “The art of leading others come from the art of leading oneself” (Philippe Daudi). This well-known sentence which is in the core of our master’s program underlines that each one is able to be the leader of his or her own life. However, we can wonder how is it possible to lead oneself to pursue the three rights previously enumerated: life, freedom, and happiness; and even to catch them; knowing that your liberty can be limited by the liberty of others, that naturally human beings reach happiness only by living with others, and the life without the two previous rights, has only bitterness.
Section 1: From the State of Nature to the Social Contract

The solution found by the individuals resides in the most complete form of human organization: the democracy. In political systems the state embodies the role of the guarantor of these three rights which are unalienable and universals. Moreover, it allows citizens to remain the leaders of themselves, and the leaders of the countries that they are part of. Thus, democracy reflects the values and beliefs of individuals and even the vision shared by citizens. Therefore, I will start my thesis by understanding what lead people to live within democracies and in a more significant way, what lead people to gather in societies. In this way, I will take an interest in the concept of state of nature which was studied by different authors such as John Locke (1980), David Hume (1739), Thomas Hobbes (2000). This study seems important to understand the reasons of the gathering within societies. Then, I will study the perspective developed by Aristotle (1848) who exposed the positive advantages resulting from this gathering. I will also enlighten the natural tendency of men and women to gather, and try to understand what lead them to this gathering, in particular by emphasizing the psychological reasons according to Kaës (1976). Furthermore, the writings of Robert Nozick (1977) will allow me to bring the aspect of moral explaining the emergence of democracies, by a comparison with an anarchical situation. Additionally, the existence of democracies implies the existence of a social contract. Thus, I will focus on the concept of social contract as a need for democracies. Therefore, thanks to the writings of Rousseau (1762) I will present the concept of civil liberty and I will expose the explanations of Tocqueville (2010) about the creation of social contract. Furthermore, I will present the different limits and paradoxes existing within a democracy; which have been broached by different authors for a long time. Therefore, I will write about the selfish characteristic of individuals which constitutes a risk for societies, as explained by David Hume (1739). Moreover, I will take an interest in the concept of tyranny of the majority in the perspectives of Alexis de Tocqueville (2010) and John Rawls (1999). I will then emphasize the concept of “unsociable sociability” developed by Kant (2002), and the paradox of voting developed by Kenneth Arrow (1963). Finally, concerning the limits of democracy, it is essential to broach the concept of representativeness. As we can observe in different democracies, there is currently a feeling of reject of politicians which emerges from the citizens. Thus, it will be interesting to understand how this break can appear between followers and leaders and the way it is translated in political systems. One of the assumptions could be
the feeling of a lack of representativeness. Indeed, different authors such as Jean-
Jacques Rousseau (1762) and Pierre Bourdieu (1981) expressed their mistrust vis-
à-vis the effectiveness of representativeness and questioned the risks related to this
concept.

Section 2: The emergence of Political Parties

A democracy is a place of exchange, where people share different opinions, beliefs and values. Political parties present in democracies embody those elements and have the task to gather people around them. In this way, I will reflect about the reasons explaining the emergence of political parties. Moreover, I will determine whether it is possible to have a typology of the different people belonging to different political parties and whether it is possible to create taxonomies of political parties. Thus, I will consider the writings of Robert Michels (1914), Marx (1969) and Max Weber (1919) who studied the link between social classes and political parties. Are the political beliefs inherent to social classes? Is it individuals who construct their political beliefs independently from their belonging to social classes? Thus, this study will determine whether the political beliefs represent the expression of social classes’ wishes. Moreover, I will study the writings of Rokkan and Lipset (1967), Daniel-Louis Seiler (2001) and Maurice Duverger (1954) who realized classifications of political parties according to different models. This study is necessary, in order to try to emphasize the roots of political parties. Furthermore, I will approach the explanations about the way political leaders appear from those parties. This discussion is essential because of the importance for political leaders to convince people who share a same set of beliefs before convincing others. Thus, I will pay special attention about the history of political parties and their nature. In this way, I will study the power relations existing in such organizations and the emergence of leaders within them, thanks to the writings of Robert Michels (1914).

Section 3: The characteristics of Political Leaders

To guarantee, to defend, and to sanctify the common interpretation that people have in the way to live together, citizens name people who are considered as the most able to represent them in the aim of asserting their beliefs and the vision
they have about the direction that should take their country. In this thesis I will study those people who are considered nowadays as leaders in political systems. I speak about leaders elected by citizens in a town, in a region, or even in a state level. However, the events which are pacing Ukraine for few months, lead me to wonder about the role of political leaders and the limits of their leadership. Indeed, Ukrainians do not believe anymore in their current politicians and express their wish to have one more time the possibility to concentrate the power between their hands because of their feeling to have lost it for a long time. Moreover, they have the wish to show that they want to be in the core of the political decisions taken by leaders, in order to regain their rights: life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. Thus, the waves of contestations against the power of Victor Ianoukovitch are in the core of the current political situation in Ukraine. Wishing a clear and effective independence, Ukrainians have the feeling that their rights have been flouted and the ex-president has jeopardized their right to express their wishes and beliefs. In this way, it seems essential to understand the characteristics of political leaders and the characteristics of their leadership. Thus, I will focus on the reasons explaining the will to become a political leader, by firstly writing about the concept of the search of power, which was studied by Lasswell (2009) and Kellerman (1986). Moreover, I will study whether it is possible to create a typology of political leaders as tried by Kellerman (1986), Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight (2009). This discussion is necessary to determine whether political leaders share the same characteristics. Furthermore, it seems important to consider the Weber's perspective concerning the necessary qualities of political leaders and the risks related to such position. Then, I will be able to describe and analyze the link between leadership present in business world and the particular leadership in political systems. Thus, I will look for similarities and differences by basing my work on the researches of different authors who study leadership as a way to gather people around a same purpose and objective. I think in particular to Cyert (2010) who studied the main missions of leaders and to Bashen and Dihsmaier who considered three main characteristics of leaders. Additionally, I will be interested in the work of Bennis and Nanus (2012) who studied the real role of leaders in organizations and their abilities to lead those organizations in a positive way. Furthermore, political leaders being only representatives of citizens, I will broach the concept of Servant Leadership developed by Greenleaf (1982) and also studied by Northouse (2012), which seems related with the role of such leaders. I will also bring the perspective of Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight (2009), who defined and
presented the concept of political leadership. Then, I will present three elements which seem constitute the prerequisites of political leaders: Ethos, Logos, Pathos, according to different authors such as Demirdogen (2010), Edinger (2013) and Koffi-Lezou (2012).

Section 4: The concept of Followership

The Ukrainian events reveal the darkness in which leadership in political systems can drown. Moreover, it shows the huge impact political leaders have in citizens’ lives and thus the big stakes which reside in the choice to elect someone to represent a population. Besides, it highlights the fragility of this leadership, with the possibility to reallocate it by the citizens to the citizens. All these stakes will be in the core of this thesis with the wish to understand what lead people to trust someone to make him or her, their representative, who will make choices which will have impacts on their lives. Of course, it will help me to understand the meaning of leadership in political systems, the way of using it and the characteristics of political leaders nowadays as well as the characteristics of political followers. Thus, one of my objectives is to study the mass movements which rise among individuals to elect people who will represent them. Moreover, in a leadership perspective, it will be relevant to take an interest in the relationship between those individuals and especially to understand who embody the role of leaders and who embody the role of followers in such situation. Indeed, as I previously explained, politicians are the representatives of citizens and should act as such. However, nowadays, we can observe another phenomenon. Indeed, it seems clear that today, politicians are opinions’ leaders. Thus, this is them who create a mass movement around them and incite people to follow them and to gather around their own vision. However, a political leader remains a citizen among the citizens, and this is the individuals who have the power to express what they want for the future. Thus, rather than an individual thought which becomes global because of the sharing of this thought, it seems that today, this is some individuals who gather people around their own thoughts and incite them to follow. So, I wonder whether it is a global movement of the citizens which lead to the political decisions taken by the politicians, or it is the ability of some individuals, the political leaders, to create a mass movement among the citizens which lead to the political decisions.
It is essential to notice that the cultural differences between different countries have huge impacts on the interpretation of political leadership. Indeed, in contrary to a lot of countries in the world, in many democracies political leadership is not embody by some individuals, but rather by political parties. Indeed, in such situation, people follow political parties rather than political leaders. This cultural distinction is essential, and will be considered throughout the process of writing.

Anyhow, in political systems, the relationships between followers and leaders are completely different than in business world, where people do not make a choice to elect their leaders but simply make the choice to follow or not. Thus, in political systems, the evaluation of leadership is in three steps. The first step is the ability of someone to lead people and gather them around him or her to show that he or she is indeed able to lead citizens in order to be elected. The second step is the ability of a political leader to lead effectively citizens when he or she is in the position. Finally, the third step corresponds to the way for political leaders to stay in power position.

In this way, a first question about followers’ characteristics and their roles emerge: Are there different types of political followers? The answer seems related to the level of engagement of those individuals. Thus, I will in particular refer to the work of Kelley (1988), who studied the phenomenon of followership which appears among individuals and what define them as followers. Indeed, the author studied the different roles of the followers depending on their behaviors, and distinguished fives types: sheep, yes-people, pragmatics, alienated, and star-followers. Kellerman developed also a theory of followership, by distinguishing five types of followers depending on their level of involvement in organizations: isolates, bystanders, participants, activists and diehards.

Furthermore, a second question must be addressed: Is there a relation of dominance between political leaders and political followers? In my opinion, I must broach the concept about the acceptance of domination because of the importance of this relation in political systems. So, it seems to be a key point in this thesis. Indeed, the acceptance to follow a political leader implies the recognition of his or her domination by followers. Thus, to understand this phenomenon, I will study in particular the analysis of Pierre Bourdieu (1997) and Stanley Milgram. Moreover, I will relate their findings with the writings of Max Weber (1919) who considers three factors to explain the acceptance of the dominance of State embodied by political
leaders: traditional power, charismatic power and legal authority. I will also relate it to the political perspective of Robert Michels (1914). Furthermore, I will consider the writings of Masciulli, Molchanov, Knight (2009) and Kellerman (1986), who wrote in details about the meaning of followership and the relations followers/leaders.

Section 5: Authenticity

In my opinion, political leadership, through representativeness requires the ability of political leaders to prove their authenticity toward citizens. Thus, I will pay attention to the authenticity aspect underlie by a position of leader in a political system. Indeed, the fact of being elected as a representative implies the ability for a leader to show his or her true-self, because he or she embodies the values and wishes of people. Moreover, this authenticity is the necessary condition and the crucial point to implement the trust between individuals and especially between leaders and followers. The trust is probably the most important issue in the relations between leaders and followers in particular concerning the interactions which are not direct like in political systems. This analysis will take as a starting point the work of Ladkin and Taylor (2010) who worked on the ability of some individuals to embody an authentic leadership. In this way, after have defined the meaning of authenticity applied to leadership, I will study the manner that this authenticity is translated and used by political leaders.

Section 6: Ethical and Moral Dimensions

However, the fact of pretending to be authentic is not enough. Indeed: « A certain quality of hypocrisy, which can leads to the worst forms of intolerance, is unavoidable for an individual, who, in the aim legitimizing his or her power, would assert his or her identity with the group and its values » (1953, p. 455) [My translation]. This quotation of François Bourricaud leads me to consider the ethical and moral dimension associated with the practice of leadership in political systems.

I will especially have an interest in the different traps existing and the tendency by different leaders to fall in them. The objective of this part is to describe those different traps and understand the reasons which lead leaders to reject the moral principles supposed by their position.
Section 7: Research question and objectives

Rather than having a simple exposition of facts, my objectives is to have the deepest understanding of the actors present on the political scene, leaders and followers. In this way, rather than being only focus on the leadership literature I want to bring other perspectives from different fields of researches and from different period of our era. My objective is not only to bring a description of the characteristics of political leaders. Indeed, my wish is to bring the widest perspective about all the stakes resulting from the presence of political leaders in our current societies, and from their way to lead citizens. Therefore, my research question is:

“What are the components of Leadership in Political Systems, their relations and influence on our current democracies?”

Thus, this thesis is related to the fundamental issue concerning our role of citizens and the importance for us as such, to be aware of what constitute our societies, what underlies our role, and what underlies the role of political leaders.

Moreover, another reason which explains the importance to write about this subject is my wish to raise the understanding of political events, or political features. Indeed, I want to bring in this thesis, a critical eye on political leaders by linking the theoretical work with the analyses of real events or elements which characterize the mandates of different leaders: their failures, successes, dreams, power, symbols, lies, truths, oversights, infidelities, commitments...

Furthermore, I have the wish to use all the courses which paced this master’s year, in particular: strategic leadership, intercultural communication and the leadership as construction of meaning. I am convinced that the use of all what we studied during this year will constitute a considerable added value.
Chapter 2:

Methodology

Section 1: Me, as a creator of knowledge:

As a student who makes part of the master’s degree Leadership and Management in International Context, I am aware about the fact that, in this year in general, and especially during the writing of this thesis, I am humbly a creator of knowledge. By the way, this idea is in the core of this program. As expressed by Phd Philippe Daudi at the beginning of this year, we, the students, are not in this master’s degree to be fed, but we have to cook our own cuisine, the knowledge. We are creators of knowledge, not only recipients. As such, we are personally involved in the task. The thesis you are reading, is not only a state of facts, of concepts, of theories, but also my own personality and my own perspective about the subject I tackle. I will not claim that I have been neutral in the writing of this thesis, because I was not. Indeed, the choice of the subject is not neutral itself. It results from my own personal interest about the political world. The environment where I grew up is directly responsible for a part of this interest, my curiosity and my citizen involvement took care of the rest. The idea of absence of neutrality is developed by Philippe Daudi, in his book: Power in the Organization: The Discourse of Power in Managerial Praxis (1986, p. 115). Indeed, Philippe Daudi explains that the personality of the author should be present in the text, and the pursuit of a total objectivity weakens the arguments used by the author.
Nigel Harwood considers that traditional writings are characterized by a wish of writers to look for objectivity. Indeed, scientific writings would have a tendency to base their work only on empirical facts which are universally accepted. Thus, the fact of impersonalize the writing would serve for bringing a complete objectivity and would give strength to the writing (2005, p. 1108). However, the author disproves this idea by explaining that the direct involvement of the writer, gives to the writing more persuasion and show the responsibility of the writer as a creator of knowledge. This idea is also supported by Davies and Spencer who explain that subjectivity can “strengthen the validity of findings” whether they are considered suitably (in Collins and Cooper, 2014, p. 90). Moreover, according to Harwood, the fact of showing the contribution of the writer, by the use of pronouns as “I” or “We” and the non-use of only empirical fact, show the uniqueness of the writing and underlie the interpretation and the work realized by the writer (2005, p. 1212). Because this work results from my own interpretation and my own way to approach this subject, the pronoun “I” will be use in this thesis to emphasize certain of my reflections, and to confirm my belief on what I write about.

Moreover, in the aim of making my argumentation unique and strong, my wish is to make clear the reasons explaining my choice broach this subject. Rather than writing about business organizations, I chose to write about political systems, because of the questions which are present in my mind since my childhood: Why people gather them within a society? Why people elect someone to represent them? What lead them to elect that person in particular? Is it really possible, in a large country to have huge similarities between the ideals, wishes and beliefs of all the citizens? Who runs a country: citizens or representatives? Thus, the fact of writing about a subject related to leadership represented an opportunity for me to dive deeply in all these questions. I have no political ambitions; I have not the prestige to say I have made clear the significance of leadership in political systems. However, I have the right to affirm that I open a reflection for me and for readers about it, by bringing my own understanding. That is why, I was not neutral. Moreover, the six perspectives present in this thesis I chose to develop in order to describe and understand the meaning of leadership in political systems are not neutral. It comes from my own understanding about what underlie this subject of study. However, to develop each perspective, I brought the point of views of different authors to push and feed my reflections. It allowed me to step back. By the way, step backs have paced my process of writing and the 1440 cigarettes I smoked during this work are
symbolic of those steps back. Beyond the tobacco which disappeared in smoke, those cigarettes represent time of reflection, to have an overview, a critical eye about the way I was writing, as well as a critical look on what I was writing about.

A summary about all the process of reflection which leads me to decide to write about leadership in political systems is present in the table below. This table is based on the Watson Box (in Fisher and Buglear, 2010, p. 85):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have an important interest in political world. I want to develop my knowledge about leadership, in particular in political systems. I want to become an expert about leadership in political systems</td>
<td>My objective is to develop my own understanding about leadership in political systems, and make emerge reflections on others about this subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How - Conceptually?</td>
<td>How - Practically?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My two objectives are to use the different contributions studied this year, and to create a bridge with political sciences</td>
<td>My wish is to broach the subject with different perspectives (the six presented in the introduction) in the aim of having a wide approach and creating knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Qualitative approach

Rather than using quantitative data and statistics in this thesis, I decided to use exclusively qualitative data. This choice results first of all from the relevance to use a qualitative approach to tackle the subject and the research question exposed in the introduction of this work. Indeed, my wish is, inter alia, to raise the understanding about the relationships between leaders and followers in political systems. In this way, qualitative analysis is in concordance with my objective. Qualitative research is defined by Strauss and Corbin, as research which “produces findings not arrived at by statistical procedures or other means of quantification” (1998, pp. 10-11). As emphasized by the authors, qualitative analysis, which
characterizes this thesis, represents the data collection which are interpreted by the writer in the aim of creating a “theoretical explanatory scheme” (1998, p. 11).

As I explained in the previous section of this chapter, I was not neutral during the writing of this thesis. This absence of a complete objectivity in a qualitative approach requires emotional reflexivity. This idea is supported by Collins and Cooper who explain, thanks to the definition of Schwandt (2001), that emotional reflexivity represents a “process of critical self-reflection on one’s biases, theoretical predispositions, preferences” (2014, p. 90). The importance of such reflections is explained by the two authors by the fact that the writer, the researcher, makes part of the context which he or she tries to understand. In this way, it seemed necessary for me to develop emotional reflexivity because of my state of student and citizen in a particular political system, which have an impact on my perception of political systems in general and the way to practice leadership in those systems. Thus, it has an impact on the findings I highlight during this entire thesis. Moreover, in my opinion, it is also important for readers to develop this process of self-reflection, in order to understand the way they receive and interpret my writing. Of course, readers are also impacted by subjectivity, inter alia because of their belongings to political systems.

Furthermore, as explained by Strauss and Corbin, qualitative approach is composed by three main elements (1998, pp. 11-12): data, which are characterized in this thesis by the literature’s contributions and my own inputs; procedures, which are present in this thesis through the different perspectives I emphasize; and finally the last element is the written or oral report, which is represented by this paper and the viva.

Strauss and Corbin emphasize the impact of the qualitative approach on researchers in general and on students. They explain that researchers through this approach “change beneficially” (1998, p. 4). Today, I can confirm this thought. However, I prefer to use the term development than change. Indeed, thanks to this thesis, and all the researches related to it, I must say it represented a huge self-development, and provided to me more flexibility and stimulated my ability of reflections, as a student as well as an individual.
Section 3: The application of the systems view

Arbnor and Bjerke developed different methodological views which determine the way that the writer develops his or her thought and writing:

- Analytical view
- Systems view
- Actors view

In this thesis, I applied the systems view.

3-1) Definition of the systems view

As defined by Arbnor and Bjerke, the systems view is the result of an assembly of three factors: systems theory, holism and structuralism (2008, p. 102).

The system theory is defined as a description and the analysis of a whole composed by different elements which, together, create some results. Thus, this idea implies the existence of interactions or at least relationships between different components. Moreover those elements share some properties, which by the gathering form a system.

The holism defines a system which represents an ensemble of elements, which cannot be defined only by the explanation of each component. Thus the elements composing the whole are inseparable to give the explanation of the whole.

The structuralism refers to the use of different theories which emerge from different fields of research. It determines the relationships which can exist between those different theories, and all together, constitute a set of considerations which form and explain a system.

Thus, the systems view allows creating an understanding of an entity, global and homogeneous, which is composed by different elements that together, thanks to their relations, create a system, a whole, which leads to the emergence of results.

The way to consider the system and the choice of different theories and fields of research result from the interpretation and the objectives of the researcher.
Indeed, the way to consider a system depends on the way the researcher interprets this system. Therefore, in my opinion, the outcome of the systems view is the result of the person’s interpretation who studies the system. Then, the interpretation leads the researcher to consider the most relevant theories to apply, according to him or her. Another person can have a different perception of the system and apply different theories than the previous one.

3-2) Different orientations in the systems view:

Furthermore, according to Arbnor and Bjerke, the creator of knowledge can adopt different orientations in the systems view. Indeed, the two authors consider three different perspectives: systems analysis, systems construction, and systems theory (2008, p. 122).

The systems analysis consists in the description and the reasoning of a system which already exists. Moreover, it represents the analysis of factors that compose the system and the relationships between those components. Therefore, the objective of the systems analysis is to raise the understanding of the system and make a clear description and understanding of it.

The systems construction is a reflection about the development of a new system because of the weaknesses of the existing system, or even its absence. In this way, the systems construction leads to the creation of a new system.

The systems theory refers either to no specific systems or to a limited number of determined systems. The objective is to find similarities between them and consider either the structures as the main consideration or the existence of different systems’ categories.

I will write deeper about the systems view in the paragraph dedicated to my decision to write this thesis with the help of this view.

3-3) The reasons of this choice

At the beginning of this work, I must say that I was lost between the different views, and in the determination of the most relevant to use for this work. After a
deep study of the different views, I came to the conclusion that the most appropriate was the systems view.

Indeed, my objective being to consider leadership in political systems as a whole, in which different factors compose and influence it, it was relevant according to me to use this approach. Thus, the system I broached is political systems. The determination of the elements composing it depends on the individuals. Indeed, people have different perceptions and interpretations about what compose political systems. For instance, those elements can be: Parliament, President, Prime Minister, Members of parliament, Minister, executive power, legislative power, judiciary power... This idea corresponds to the systems theory. To be unambiguous about the subject, and what I mean by political systems, which I wrote about in this thesis, I must add that my objective was to study democracies in their most accomplished form. Thus, to delimitate the subject, an illustration can be the countries that are members of the G20, but not all of them. Indeed, in my opinion, countries like Russia, China or Saudi Arabia do not correspond with the definition of democracy at all, or in its purest form. Thus, I wrote about political systems as existing in United Kingdom, France, United States of America, Italy, Germany, Canada, and so on.

Moreover, the subject being really wide and the time to write this thesis being limited, my objective was first to determine the different perspectives that I wanted to hold and develop on political systems. Therefore, the subject being the meaning of the leadership in political systems, I pointed out six main perspectives, which represent my six angles of approach, in order to have a wide description and analysis:
Each perspective is related to each other because of my belief that together, they allow diving deeply in the understanding of leadership in political systems. This method is related to the reductionism as noticed by Ingeman Arbnor and Björn Bjerke (2008, p. 103). As I previously noticed in this chapter, this way of generating knowledge is opposed to the Holism which defines a system of which it is impossible to point out different perspectives which are inseparable. The use of reductionism allowed me to raise my understanding about the subject thanks to the reduction of it to its fundamental perspectives, which are themselves interconnected.

Furthermore, for the writing of this thesis, I used structuralism in the aim of gathering different theories present in different fields of research. Indeed, I used theories which are present in:
The use of theories present in all these fields of research allowed me to have a clear and deep understanding, and knowledge about the different parts constituting my subject.

Moreover, in this thesis, I used the systems analysis. As I previously explained, the systems analysis, in contrary to the systems construction and the systems theory, refers to the description and the reasoning of a system which already exists. Indeed, my objective was to describe and analyze the six perspectives which allow understanding the fundamentals of the subject, and so the fundamentals of leadership in political systems, considered as a whole. Thus, the use of the systems analysis corresponds perfectly to my research question: *What are the components of the Leadership in Political Systems, their relations and influence on our current democracies?*

**Section 4: Data collection**

Kothari explains there are two different methods of data collection: primary and secondary. The author defines primary data as data “which are collected afresh and for the first time” (2004, p. 95). Kothari defines secondary data by explaining that those data were already collected by other researchers.

My objective with data collection in this thesis was to have the most complete theoretical framework in the aim of being able to write efficiently about the meaning of leadership in political systems. According to Collins and Cooper, in a qualitative approach, the ability to collect data demands an emotional maturity and a strong interpersonal skill. Indeed, it supposes for the writer to be able to read and listen
others, in order to make explicit their understanding of certain phenomena (2014, p. 89).

4-1) **Primary data:**

One of the key points in data collection in this thesis was the discussions I had with different persons who have different backgrounds and fields of interests. Thus, I conversed with people who study psychology and political sciences through more or less informal conversations. Furthermore, I had the opportunity to discuss with people committed in political systems. I am not referring to leaders but to followers, with the objective to understand their perspectives and points of views about leadership in political systems. The goal of those discussions was to raise my inspirations and widen the perspectives I had before the writing of this thesis. In this way, the contributions of those discussions represent primary data, because of the nature of those data, which I collected myself.

Furthermore, the observation of the news and the analyses of different past or current events, constituted also a way to collect data which was important in this thesis. Thus, this method of data collection results from a method of content-analysis as emphasized by Kothari (2004, p. 110). In this way, those analyses represented also a way to collect primary data.

During a period I had also the wish to collect primary data directly from political leaders, in the aim of bringing their own perspectives about leadership in political systems and about the use of the power by them. However, in my point of view the main risk related to this kind of approach is to receive from those leaders a “featureless” analysis which would be not useful for this thesis. However, I wanted to observe directly their practice of leadership by analyzing speeches, interviews, videos, and so on. I must add that I would like after the end of this work to hand in this thesis to different political leaders in order to have their feedbacks and their own analysis and critics about it.
4-2) **Secondary data:**

By diving deeply in different fields of studies and by using the literature’s contributions from different fields of research, I collected secondary data. This approach represented the main way I collected data. As explained by Kothari, secondary data require for the researcher to “look into various sources” (2004, p. 111). Indeed, I had the wish to create a great theoretical framework, by having a wide perspective, with the objective of having the most accurate and relevant work as possible and tackling efficiently the purpose of this thesis.

Kothari notices researchers have to consider the three following characteristics in the aim of having relevant secondary data (2004, p. 111):

- **Reliability of data:** It is important to determine the quality of data, by identifying the persons who collected data, and the methods they used.
- **Suitability of data:** Researchers must determine what data are relevant to use.
- **Adequacy of data:** Data must be in concordance with the objective of the researcher, depending on the purpose of the subject.

During the process of data collection, I respected these three characteristics, in order to have data really useful. Indeed, as I previously explained, my objective was to develop a relevant and accurate work.

**Section 5: Critical reflection**

By making the choice to broach political systems with different perspectives resulting from my own choice, I am aware of the fact that I missed certainly different aspects of the meaning of leadership in political systems. Indeed, resulting from my own approach and my own interpretation of what should be emphasized, I broached mainly the subject with a sociological look. It results from my own interest about sociological issues and my interpretation of what imply leadership and politics. Indeed, in my opinion, before all, leadership as well as politics should be considered as interactions between individuals. Rather than the research for
strategies, the human relationships and the results of those relations should matter before all.

Furthermore, I have deep convictions and beliefs about political issues and the way that leadership should be acted. However, my objective was not to strengthen my opinions, but rather to shake up my beliefs, and by extension the readers’ beliefs. Therefore, in this thesis, I did not strengthen all the reflections with examples of politicians or current political systems. This choice is justified by my wish to have an overall perspective, and so, to lead readers to develop their own reflections and thoughts about how is it possible to apply those researches on their own understanding and examples.
Chapter 3:

From the “State of Nature” to the “Social Contract”

This objective of this chapter is to create a first step that will allow raising the understanding about the meaning of Leadership in Political Systems. In this way, it seems essential to understand what lead people to live within democracies and a fortiori, what lead people to gather in societies. In this way, I will emphasize the different notions related to the concept of state of nature and the reasons that led individuals to leave this situation and create societies. Moreover, I will take an interest in the concept of social contract that lead individuals to accept to live within democracies, and the different stakes flowing from this social contract. Finally, I will expose the different limits and paradoxes related to democracies.

This study will constitute my launching ramp in the aim of raising the awareness about different stakes present in societies.
Section 1: The State of Nature

This approach results from the political philosophy with the objective of considering what would be the situation and the behaviors of individuals in a context where there would be not societies or even states or democracies.

Different authors broach this subject, in particular Hobbes, Hume, and Locke. These three authors express three different perspectives in order to illustrate what would be the state of nature in the case of an absence of societies and what lead individuals to leave this state of nature and to gather in societies.

1-1) The John Locke’s perspective

According to John Locke, in a State of Nature, men have a full right on their life, liberty or possessions (2005, p. 43). Indeed, according to the author, in such situation, no one can have an arbitrary power, and no one can have a superior power on someone else. Thus, each individual has a same power to preserve his or her right of life, freedom or possessions.

So, in a state of nature, no one can give a bigger power to someone else, and no one can have a superior power in the aim of destroying his own life or taking away the life or possessions of someone else (2005, p.43). Moreover, in contrary to Hobbes that I will study later in this chapter, Locke considers that in a state of nature, individuals have moral values, which allow them to distinguish what is good and what is bad. Thus, individuals would respect a natural morality. Moreover, individuals in such situation would be naturally good. Each individual would have naturally integrated the concept of morality and each person would try to pursue his or her right to live, be happy, or be free. They would not try to fight against others, because they would not have the need of it to reach the three rights previously enumerated.

Thus, we can wonder in this perspective what leads people to leave this state of nature, which reminds me the golden age appeared in the Greek and Roman mythologies. In this myths, the period following the creation of men was characterized by harmony, peace, love and common property as written by Ovid (2009, p.414) or Plato in Cratylus.
John Locke explains the importance of a State in the aim of guarantying the private property. In this case, State would be the guarantor of the exchanges by the creation of the money which provides safety. According to Locke, in this perspective, the liberty or the moral powers are the only elements that an individual can give up to the society. This abandon of such elements would constitute the only way for the individuals to allow the emergence of a strong State that will have enough power to protect the advantages coming from the gathering of its members. In this way, according to John Locke, “the political power is the power that every man has in the State of Nature and gives up into the hands of the society” (2005, p. 56).

1-2) The David Hume’s perspective

According to David Hume, the origin of societies cannot be explained by the pursuit of advantages that are allowed by them. Indeed, in his opinion, in a state of nature, men cannot be aware of the advantages they can have with the society. Therefore, the author considers they have to have the experience of the society to be aware of the advantages that would flow from it.

Thus, Hume explains that the only way for individuals to have a perception of the advantages flowing from a society, results from their sexual instinct (1739, p. 485). Indeed, thanks to the reproduction two individuals can perceive the advantage to create a union between them in order to protect their children. Then, the children would have also this awareness by observing the positive results of such gathering between individuals.

David Hume explains that men are the animals with which the nature has been the cruelest. Indeed, Hume claims that in contrary to other animals, men have a lot of necessities and low means to reach or satisfy their needs (1739, p. 484).

Thus, the society would constitute the only mean for men to satisfy their needs. Societies would provide three advantages that allow individuals to satisfy their needs: “force, ability and security” (1739, p. 484). David Hume explains the force by the gathering of the strengths between individuals which leads to the raise of power. Moreover, he explains the ability by the division of labor, and the security by the mutual assistance which allows struggling against the uncertainty.
However, Hume notices that with the emergence of a society the needs of individuals increase, but thanks to the gathering, individuals are able to satisfy them. In the same time, the author observes that thanks to the emergence of societies, individuals can reach a level of happiness they would never reach in a state of nature.

1-3) The Thomas Hobbes’ perspective

The Thomas Hobbes’ perspective about the State of Nature is more pessimistic. Indeed, according to the author in his book *Leviathan*, the state of nature would be characterized by a “War of all against all” (2000, p. 224). In this perspective, the author explains that fight between individuals because of the human nature which leads people to have the will to have a superior power on other individuals. Thus, people would look for having the most possessions as possible, the safety, and the reputation (2000, p. 224) which are explained by three elements inherent to the human nature: competition, mistrust and glory. It would be also explained by the insatiable desires of the individuals. This pursuit of a desire which leads to a frustration whether it is not realized is also described in the writings of Schopenhauer: “Every satisfaction he attains lays the seeds of some new desire, so that there is no end to the wishes of each individual will” (188-?, p. 18); “Need and boredom are the two poles of human life” (188-?, p. 9). These two quotes show the inability of the individuals to be fully satisfied. Indeed, each time that a need or a wish is satisfied, directly, a new desire appears because of the feeling of boredom which emerges by the satisfaction of this need or wish. So, the life of human beings would be constituted by satisfaction and frustration.

This idea about the will of the individuals to satisfy their unlimited desires was also approached by Plato. Thus, the author compares the men to a leaky jar (1864, pp. 77-78). Therefore, it would impossible for men to reach happiness because of their unlimited desires (1864, pp. 77-78).

Thus, Thomas Hobbes explains that knowing that the individuals’ desires would be unlimited and the elements that are desirables are limited, individuals would have to fight against others in the aim of quenching as much as possible their need to comply with their desires.
Moreover, according to Hobbes, in a state of nature there is no morality and no justice. Thus, each individual is free to do whatever he or she wants, and even to kill someone else, because it would constitute the natural right of liberty. Therefore, in such situation, the liberty of each individual is unlimited.

Thomas Hobbes considers that the injustice and the absence of morality lead people to create a State, with the objective of having a safety, because the State would be able to stop the “War of all against all”. It implies that each individual accepts to give up his or her natural right of liberty in order to have the protection of the State. Thus, the existence of the State would allow implementing a social peace and stopping this will to dominate others thanks to the monopoly of the legal violence by the State. The author gives us an enlighten perspective by considering that people would be ready to give up their liberty with the purpose of getting this social peace and guarantying their safety.

The different perspectives broached in the literature result from a question that paces the philosophy from centuries: “Is the human naturally good or bad?”

**Section 2: The will to look for a positive result and the moral aspect**

2-1) **The will to look for a positive outcome**

Thus, different aspects explaining the creation of a state exist in the literature. In this way, different authors such as Aristotle explain the origin of States as a way for citizens to be able to be self-sufficient. Other authors consider that the main explanation of the origin of States comes from the moral values internalized by the individuals, and this is this moral aspect which would explain the need for people to gather in a society.

According to Aristotle, the origin of the society is a phenomenon completely natural. The author explains that State is composed by the gathering of villages, which result themselves from the gathering of families.
This association of different villages is explained by Aristotle by the fact to seek a positive outcome from it. It would be the expression of the wish to be self-sufficient which becomes possible because of this association. This idea is also defended by Lewellen, who explains thanks to the Engel’s writings that the first societies were characterized by a wish to gather the resources (2003, p.57). Moreover, Aristotle claims that Phaleas goes further and considers that the basis of each State resides in the equality of wealth and in the equality of education. (1848, p. 78)

Furthermore, Aristotle explains the gathering of individuals because of the natural need of the human beings to reproduce. Indeed, the sexual instinct of individuals, as explained also by David Hume, would represent the basis which explains the people’s desire to meet each other (1848, p.5).

Additionally, the fact that the human beings have the ability to speak would also constitute an argument which would explain the natural tendency of individuals to live together. Indeed, according to Aristotle, the fact of being able to share opinions about the fair and the unfair, about the good and the evil, thanks to words would be a reason making able the constitution of a State.

Aristotle adds that naturally, states are above individuals. Indeed, according to the author “the whole must of necessity be prior to the part” (1848, p. 8), because of the inability of the individuals to be self-sufficient and this is a necessity for them to be part of a society. Thus, because of the necessity to live together, the individuals have to put the interests of the State ahead of their personal interests.
Finally, Aristotle underlines the instinctive behaviour of individuals to gather within a society because of their wisdom and virtue. Without those two elements, the human beings would be only monstrous animals who would satisfy only their need to eat and reproduce. Thanks to this gathering, law and justice appear and represent the binder of the citizens, embodied by the State, which represents the guarantor of these elements. According to Aristotle, humans would be naturally sociable (1848, p.7), and people who are not, are either gods, or barbarians. Thus, the author explains that the research for the *Philia* or friendship would constitute the main reason explaining the wish of individuals to gather and to organize them by establishing a State. Aristotle claims that, this is only by this gathering that people are able the express their humanity. Because of the human beings are political animals, they can express their humanity only by the fact to join a community. Moreover, the author explains that the State gathers individuals sharing the same beliefs about what are fair and what are unfair (1848, p.8).

2-2) The “unsocial sociability”

According to Kant, this natural penchant of the individuals to gather within a society is more complex. Indeed, Kant considers the “unsocial sociability” as a force that leads in the same time the individuals to join a society and to leave this society. According to the author, individuals have a tendency to join a society in the aim of expressing their humanity as also explained by Aristotle. However, Kant highlights that individuals have also naturally a wish to be isolated because of the will to control and organize their lives depending on their mood (2002, p. 9). From this confrontation of these two opposite intrinsic behaviors, individuals succeed to leave their first need and to gather within a society. Moreover, the author considers that this opposition allows the individuals to surpass themselves and thus, their will to compete with each other explained by their wish to dominate others and to have the most possessions as possible. Therefore, because of this unsocial sociability, people are able to surpass their potential and to reveal their exceptional abilities (2002, p. 9). In current societies, this idea can be related to the will of citizens to follow political leaders who run countries, and in the same time, their will to pursue their own interests, which are sometimes against political decisions.
2-3) **The pillars of psyche**

Furthermore, different specialists of psychology have also had an important interest in what lead individuals to live within a society. Thus, Kaës explains that the individuals are characterized by having a sexual instinct, and by their ability to communicate with others thanks to the language. Moreover, the author considers that the individuals have the ability to surpass the unsocial sociability that I wrote before in this chapter. Thus, Kaës considers three pillars of psyche:

- Sexuality
- Word
- Inter-subjective links

Indeed, Kaës explains that the relations of a group allow each individual to internalize the social characteristics of the group. Thus, a relation between an individual and the group that he or she belongs to would be characterized by a perpetual exchange: internalization and externalization. It would constitute the basis of the relationships between individuals, and thus, the explanation of the acceptance of the individuals to live together.

2-4) **The comparison with an anarchical situation**

Robert Nozick compares the anarchical situation with the existence of a State (1977, p.5). According to him, in an anarchical situation the majority of citizens would look for the defense of their own interests and would not overcome the moral constraints. However, as explained by the author, all the individuals would not be so virtuous in such situation (1977, p.5). Thus, Nozick explains the importance of a State because of its ability to be superior to the anarchy, in particular because of the moral aspect underlay by it. Thus, a democracy would emerge in a natural way because of the moral values provided by a State. Indeed, according to the author, in a state of nature or in anarchy, individuals would know what are morally allowed and what are not. Despite this awareness, some individuals would transgress this morality. That is why; the existence of a State is important, in the aim of making respected those moral values.
Section 3: The Social Contract

3-1) The need for a social contract

Rousseau developed the idea of the social contract by explaining this is the only way for individuals to leave the state of nature. Indeed, according to the author, the fact to stay in a state of nature would constitute a real danger for individuals, and would lead them to their extinction. Rousseau explains the need for people to gather within a society thanks to the social contract. According to the author, the necessity of a social contract comes from the fact that the obstacles present in a state of nature harm them. Because of the inability of people to raise individually their strength or to adapt them enough to such situation, they have to gather with the objective of forming a community to unite their strengths. Without this community, individuals would not be able to survive.

According to Rousseau, the creation of a community implies the creation of a social contract. Thanks to this social contract, the community would be able to protect each individual and allows them to keep the same level of freedom they had in the state of nature. However, the liberty is not the same. Indeed, in the aim of joining the social contract, individuals have to accept to alienate their natural liberty to embrace the conventional liberty. Thus, on the one hand, because of the social contract, individuals lose their natural freedom and their right to do whatever they want. However, on the other hand, thanks to the social contract, individuals have a new kind of liberty: the civil liberty and the property (1762, p.21). This is about this liberty that I wrote at the beginning of this paragraph.

As I explained in the introduction of this thesis, the State would be the guarantor of three main rights: life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. According to Rousseau with the social contract, the State would guarantee the liberties of individuals not by free them from laws, but rather by getting them involved in the writings of those laws. Thus, this is thanks to the participation of citizens to the writings of laws that individuals are free within a democracy. Thus, they are free because they participate to the writings of the laws that they are submitted. This is also the idea defended by Montesquieu when he explains that « the liberty is the right to do whatever the law allows » [My translation]. Moreover, this characteristic of the laws is written in the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the
Citizen: Article VI: “The Law is the expression of the general will. All the Citizens have the right to contribute personally, or by their representatives, to its creation” (1789) [My translation].

Furthermore, the link between the laws and the state of nature was broached by Michel Foucault, when he explained that the jurists who developed the laws have considered theoretically, the behaviors of human beings in the state of nature (1975, p. 200). This thought underlies that even if the state of nature is considered currently as an abstract model, certain fundamental laws are actually based to prevent some behaviors in our societies, which would be inherent to the human beings in a state of nature.

Besides, according to Pascal, laws have not the obligation to be fair. The objectives of laws are mainly to guarantee a social peace. We can illustrate these words by the well-known sentence of Goethe: “Better an injustice than a disorder” (1793).

If we now consider the thought of Schopenhauer which is developed in section 1-3) of this chapter, it is possible to create a link between the insatiable desires of human beings and the solution provided by the social contract thanks to the law. Thus, Rabindranath Tagore explains that: “If he [man] was made to live in a world where his own self was the only factor to consider, then that would be the worst prison imaginable to him, for man’s deepest joy is in growing greater and greater by more and more union with the all. This, as we have seen, would be an impossibility if there were no law common to all. Only by discovering the law and following it, do we become great, do we realize the universal; while, so long as our individual desires are at conflict with the universal law, we suffer pain and are futile” (1915, p. 37).

3-2)  **The social contract in Tocqueville’s writings**

Tocqueville, by taking as example the United States, and explaining that a democracy is superior to an aristocratic government (2010, p.86), approached also the concept of social contract. Indeed, according to the author, democracy would bring a dignity to citizens. This dignity would forge the patriotism of the individuals
and would incite them to respect laws by their appropriation by them, because they consider they contributed in their writings.

The idea about the loss of natural liberty developed by Rousseau can be related to the thought of Alexis de Tocqueville who explains that people prefer equality rather than liberty. Indeed, according to the author: people tend to prefer the equality in servitude than inequality in freedom (2010, p.56). Thus, laws thanks to the social contract would allow individuals to reach this equality which represents the first motivation of citizens.

However, according to the author, the emergence of a State leads to a change of the properties. On the one hand, the personal become collective. But, on the other hand, the individuals take care mainly of their own interests and not the collective interests (2010, p.55). Thus, in a State, and thanks to the social contract individuals have to confront their wishes to defend their personal interests with their duty to give the priority to the State’s interests. This characteristic leads me to the next section, the paradoxes existing within a democracy.

Section 4: The paradoxes of democracy

4-1) David Hume’s approach

One of the paradoxes of democracy was enlighten by David Hume, who considers that the selfish characteristic of individuals constitutes a risk for societies: “This avidity alone, of acquiring goods and possessions for ourselves and our nearest friends, is insatiable, perpetual, universal, and directly destructive of society. There scarce is any one, who is not actuated by it; and there is no one, who has no reason to fear from it, when it acts without any restraint, and gives way to its first and most natural movements. So that upon the whole, we are to esteem the difficulties in the establishment of society, to be greater or less, according to those we encounter in regulating and restraining this passion.” (1739, p. 492). Thus, according to the author, the society would provide force, ability and security to the individuals as I previously wrote. However, the pursuit of the own interests which defines the human beings would constitute a real hazard.
4-2) **The tyranny of the majority - Tocqueville**

According to Alexis de Tocqueville, one of the main risks related to democracy is the fact that the citizens’ power, which is in reality in the hands of the majority of the citizens, becomes tyrannical (2010, p.89). Indeed, the author confronts the will of the majority with the will of the minorities by explaining this is completely possible for the majority to abuse of the power resulting from the number of its members (2010, p.91). This idea reminds me the notion of state of nature, in which the weakest is persecuted by the strongest (2010, p.98). In such situation, the strongest is embodied by the majority and the weakest by the minorities.

4-3) **The tyranny of the majority - Rawls**

This is also the idea defended by John Rawls (1999, p. 313), who explains that the laws are the result of the majority’s wishes, because in a democracy, the majority always wins. Thus, according to the author, the rights tied to a democracy would not be universals because of the ignorance of the minorities’ liberty. This liberty is ignored because if the liberty of the citizens comes from the contribution in the writings of laws that they are submitted as explained by Rousseau, in a democracy, the minorities have also to be submitted to those laws, which do not represent their wishes. Thus, they are not free. So, the rights guaranteed by the State are not universals.

4-4) **The paradox of voting**

Kenneth Arrow enlightened also one of the weaknesses of democracies. The author, in his book *Social choice and individual values*, brings an enlighten perspective about the impossibility to defend a global interest from individuals choices. This idea was developed by the author thanks to the theorem of Arrow’s impossibility which is related to the paradox of Condorcet created in 1785.

**Theorem:**

- The individual 1 prefers A than B and B than C, so, 1 prefers A than C
- The individual 2 prefers B than C and C than A, so, 1 prefers B than A
- The individual 3 prefers C than A and A than B, so, 1 prefers C than B
Thus, the majority of individuals would prefer A than B and B than C and so, would prefer A than C. But, in the same time, a majority prefers also C than A (1963, p. 3).

According to the author, it is impossible to define the global will. We can apply this theorem to democracy by considering the votes of the citizens during elections. This perspective brought by Kenneth Arrow enlightens the impossibility which resides within a democracy about the fact that the individual choices or wishes cannot be represented by global decisions. Thus, this limit of democracy shows the impossibility for a State to fully consider the individual preferences.

4-5) The limits of representativeness

By borrowing the words of Held, Tom Bramble defines democracy as “a system of rule embracing elected “officers” who undertake to “represent” the interests and/or views of citizens within the framework of “the rule of law” (2000, p. 304). In this way, representativeness is in the core of the concept of democracy. Indeed, by electing representatives who will talk on their behalf, citizens would be able to express their wishes and wills concerning the direction they want for cities, regions or countries.

While Montesquieu considers representativeness as the only way, in a large State to express the wishes of a population (1832, p. 91), different authors consider however, that the use of representativeness constitutes a real risk for democracies. Indeed, Rousseau considers that the sovereignty cannot be represented (1762, p. 98). Moreover, the author notices that by electing representatives, people lose their power and their liberty. Therefore, Jean-Jacques Rousseau illustrates his idea by explaining that the only moment when citizens are free and have power, is during the election, after that, they become slaves. Indeed, according to the author, during elections, there is a connection between collective will and the will of representatives. However, after the election, there is no indication that this connection will still exist (1762, p. 98). It seems even more significant in democracies during periods of big changes and crisis which can emerge during a mandate. For instance, during the first mandate of Margaret Thatcher between 1979 and 1983, while she won the election to become Prime Minister, only 23% of the population supported her in 1981 (2011, p. 233). This is also true in France, where 18% of French people supported François Hollande in April 2014 (AFP,
2014), and more widely in the world where 39% of Americans supported Barack Obama in November 2013. This percentage was the same for David Cameron in the same period (Joseph, M., 2014).

Thus, Rousseau claims that a citizen can be only represented by himself or herself, because of the fact that a will cannot be transmitted between individuals (1762, p. 27). In this way, Hans Kelsen explains that an individual “is politically free if he is subject to his own will” (in Sandrine Baume, Hans Kelsen and the Case for Democracy, 2012, p. 19). As emphasized by many authors, the fact of being subject to his or her own will is impossible in democracies because of the existence of representatives. Moreover, as underlined by Dominique Turpin, more the number of citizens is important, more the intensity and the effectiveness of representativeness is low. Thus, by building his thought on the work of Sartiori, Dominique Turpin explains: “The Member of Parliament who represents everyone no longer represents anyone” [My translation] (1978, p. 13).

Furthermore, beyond the thought of Rousseau about the inability of representatives to represent collective will, Pierre Bourdieu considers that representativeness constitutes a threat for democracies. Indeed, the author explains it can lead to a dispossession of citizens’ power and a loss of control on the political machine (1981, p. 5). Moreover the author adds that political leaders can impose their own interests while claiming that their decisions result from the collective will (1981, p. 5). Of course, this idea goes against the very nature of democracies.

Besides, Maurice Duverger brings an interesting perspective about representativeness, by affirming it is impossible for citizens to give directives to their representatives. Indeed, rather than those directives, citizens would be only able to give the right to representatives to talk on their behalf, and let them make their own decisions, which are supposed to be tied with the collective will (1988, p. 88). Thus, this perspective would reveal that representatives have an important power of decisions, which goes over citizens’ power.
This chapter began with the assumption that democracies emerged in the aim of allowing individuals to leave the state of nature. In this way, I emphasized the different perspectives of David Hume, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke, about what underlie the state of nature and the reasons, as the moral values and the search of safety, that lead individuals to leave this situation. I brought also the Aristotle’s thought about the positive impacts of the gathering of individuals in societies, such as self-sufficiency, and the different explanations focusing on the wish of individuals to live together. Furthermore, with the objective of explaining the emergence of democracies, and the acceptance by individuals to live in this form of society, I wrote about the social contract, in particular thanks to the work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. I also had an interest in what imply this social contract for citizens. Finally, I wrote about the different paradoxes and limits related to democracy, in particular about the concept of tyranny of the majority and the limits of representativeness.
Chapter 4:

The emergence of Political Parties

This chapter will be constituted by a reflection about the emergence of political parties. Indeed, it seems essential to consider the way that political parties emerge in order to understand the reasons of their emergence. Moreover I will broach the explanations about the way that political leaders appear from those parties. Thus, I will pay attention in the history of political parties and their nature. In this way, I will study the power relations existing in such organizations and the way they are organized.
Section 1: The reasons of the emergence

It seems essential to understand the roots of political parties, and even more significant whether it is possible to have typologies of individuals belonging to different political parties.

1-1) The influence of the social class - Michels

According to Robert Michels, the establishment of political parties is the only way to create a collective will (1914, p.5). Indeed, according to the author: “The organization is in the hands of the weak, a weapon against the strong ».

Robert Michels believes in the existence of a link between the belonging to a social class and the fact to belong to a certain political party. The author studied in particular the socialist parties of the beginning of the 20th century in Germany, France, England and Italy. According to the author, the establishment of political parties allows the labors to create a political resistance and get a social dignity. Thus, it seems clear for him that people belonging to the same social class gather in the aim of expressing the wishes of this social class. Thus, the ideas defended by a political party would be the expression of the will of a certain social class.

We can wonder about the stakes resulting from the emergence of political parties. Indeed, the interest would reside more in its organizational form, the fact to create a united organization, rather than in its “social interests or in the expression of a doctrine” (1996, p.1) as explained by Sawicki.

1-2) The Marxist approach

This is also the idea defended by Karl Marx. Following the coup carried out by Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the 2nd December 1851, Karl Marx decided to write a paper about the period between 1848 and 1851 in which, France sought the opposition of different political parties and different classes, according to the author. Thus, according to Marx, a political party would be the expression of a certain social class. Therefore, each political party would be related to a social class.
Karl Marx explains that political parties were the result of existing fractions within the bourgeoisie of this period. There would be especially during this period, different political parties such as the Republican bourgeoisie or Democratic bourgeoisie.

The author makes a link between this thought and the idea he previously developed about the class struggle, explaining the existence of these political parties from the fight of the bourgeoisie against the proletarian class which is itself represented by what the author names: the "party of the anarchy," the "party of socialism," or "the party of communism".

Lenin supported this idea. The confrontation between political parties would be therefore the clash between classes. Thus, it would be possible to classify the political parties by connecting them to the classification of social classes.

Thus, the belonging to a social class would determine the existence of a link and affection for a particular political party. It underlies that each political party wants to defend the interests of a certain social class. Therefore, the feeling of proximity of an individual for a political party would be actually only the expression of a wish to defend his or her own interests and by extension the interests of his or her social class.

1-3) The Weber’s perspective

In some extent, Max Weber supports this idea about the existence of a link between political beliefs and the feeling of belonging to a social class, when he wrote about the representation of the professions (1919, p.46).

In the aim of explaining the emergence of political parties, Max Weber in his book Politics as a Vocation (“Le Savant et le Politique" in the references), takes the example of England. He explains that before the emergence of political parties such as we know them nowadays, the belonging to a political party concerned only the aristocracy. According to Weber, this aristocracy was divided in different political fractions or political parties, depending on the different “social classes” existing within the aristocracy, the ideological reasons or family traditions (1919, p.47).

Thus, it was only the individuals who were comfortably off, who constituted political parties, and only in a local level. Moreover, as explained by Weber, political
parties were only constituted by the aristocracy in a sporadic way. Therefore, during this period, there were not real organized political parties which were stable and present in a regional or even national level. Moreover, this period was characterized by the absence of political leaders. Thus, the heads of those associations did not remain the same and had honorific power.

The wish to establish real united political parties, by being present in a national level, emerged with the need to create a general movement by an harmonization between each district with the objective of adopting only one program and direction, to have cohesion and a unified policy (1919, p.48).

Despite the will to unify the different associations present in a local level, the objective was not reached and the members of those associations were still people from the aristocracy. One of the characteristics of this period was also the fact there were not many professional politicians, as it is the case nowadays. Indeed, it concerned only the Members of Parliament. Furthermore, the individuals were elected thanks to their good relations with the aristocrats by ensuring to them that their wishes would be realized.

Max Weber claims that the situation has completely changed. Indeed, the influence of the aristocrats and their domination is a distant memory. The author notices that a democratization of the political activity appeared. Moreover, he considers political parties are now “the children of democracy, of mass franchise, of the necessity to woo and organize the masses, and develop the utmost unity of direction and the strictest discipline” (1919, p. 49). Thus, it is not anymore the notables or the parliamentarians who dominate the political life, but the militants, who name their representatives and it is different personalities who, in another way, dominate personally or financially the political machine. It is those individuals who are able to influence political decisions. Thus, according to Weber, it is because of this ability to influence political decisions that the direction’s members are chosen.

It seems relevant now, to test the assumption of Lenin that I wrote above in this paper about the existence of a link between political parties and social classes.
Section 2: The classification of the political parties

2-1) Classification by cleavages

The assumption about the existence of a link between social class and political parties was studied by different authors, in particular by political scientists, such as Stein Rokkan. He studied this issue by looking for the foundations of political parties in the social classes. Thus, he developed taxonomy of political parties with the objective of classifying them by their proximity with a particular social class. Thus, the author operated this classification thanks to four cleavages: State/Church; Centre/Periphery; Urban/Rural; Worker/Owner.

According to Rokkan and Lipset, two of these cleavages (State/Church and Centre/Periphery) would have emerged from the creation of Nation-States. The two others (Urban/Rural and Worker/Owner) would appear thanks to the Industrial Revolution (1967, p. 15).

By the way, Daniel-Louis Seiler tried to classify the different political parties from the assumption of Rokkan and Lipset. Thus, thanks to this taxonomy it seems possible to oppose the parties of the middle-class and the parties of the labor, the centralist parties and the regionalist parties, the Christian-Democratic parties and the anticlerical parties, and finally the agrarian parties (1996, p. 7).

The table presents in the next page examines these cleavages:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social cleavage</th>
<th>Social categories opposed by this cleavage</th>
<th>Current situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleavage related to the relations between <strong>Religion</strong> and <strong>State</strong></td>
<td>Cleavage between:</td>
<td>Cleavage pronounced in France until the beginning of the 20th century, still present in certain countries (Italy, Poland, Muslim countries, …)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clerical parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Laic parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposed in particular on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Separation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church/State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control of school system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleavage related to the <strong>industrial revolution</strong> (19th century)</td>
<td>Cleavage between:</td>
<td>This cleavage persists with the appearance of the environmental movement which is opposed to the insatiable increase of the productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social categories that get benefits from industrial development (employees and entrepreneurs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Categories that are afraid of being excluded by the development (self-employed workers and farmers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleavage related to the <strong>class struggle</strong> (19th century)</td>
<td>Cleavage between owners and workers</td>
<td>Cleavage still current (Although it changed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleavage between <strong>national</strong> and <strong>local</strong> (18th century, beginning of the political power’s centralization)</td>
<td>Cleavage between:</td>
<td>Cleavage still current, minor in France, but very present in other European countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partisans of the political, economical and cultural unity of the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The partisans of local particularities, of regional independence, of cultural uniqueness against the dominating culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to different authors such as Sawicki (1996, p. 7), this model seems to be irrelevant because of the contradictions appearing in the comparison of different parties in Europe. However, Seiler claims that this taxonomy allows reaching the awareness about the difficulty to create a classification of political parties, in particular because of the difficulty to define those parties. Indeed, the author claims that it is impossible to consider all the diversity of political parties and it is for instance impossible to classify parties thanks to their labels which are became unclear if we try to compare different parties in Europe (2001, p.9).

Daniel-Louis Seiler enlightens the real nature of political parties. Indeed, according to the author, they would be before all the expression of conflicts, of different oppositions. Indeed, the word “party” itself comes from the French word “partir”, which means originally: divide in parts. So, a party would represent a part of a whole and the division of this whole in different parts would results from the conflicts existing within it (2001, p. 6). Thus, political parties would be the expression of oppositions of ideals or beliefs existing within a country.

2-2) Duverger’s taxonomy

Other authors created also taxonomy such as Maurice Duverger. The author considers it is possible to classify political parties by creating a cleavage between the mass parties and the cadre parties. The dichotomy operated by Maurice Duverger differentiates parties not by the number of the members, but by their inherent structures as explained by Daniel-Louis Seiler (2010, p. 60). Duverger bases this dichotomy thanks to different approaches. First of all, the difference between a mass party and a cadre party resides in the structure, not in the number of the members. Indeed, according to Duverger, in a mass party the members are “the substance of the party, the stuff of its activity” (1954, p. 63) and an elite would emerge from the members. The activity of the party is based on the wishes and beliefs of the militants. In a cadre party, the activity is based on the thought and wishes of the leader. Moreover, the financing is different. In a mass party the financing is democratic in contrary with the cadre party where the financing is provided by the notables. Furthermore, according to Duverger, in a cadre party, the power is based on a circle of notables who are well-known and have a high reputation.
I affirm that the different classifications operated by different authors would have an impact on the meaning of leadership in the political parties. Indeed, if I take the classification of Maurice Duverger, it seems clear that the leadership would be not the same in a mass party than in a cadre parties: the power relations would be different, the influence of the militants would be different, the influence of the heads would be different, the organization and the structure would be different... To illustrate this dichotomy, it is relevant to consider the situation of the militants. The militants in cadres party would be considered as followers while the militants in a mass party would be consider as the engine of party’s activity.

Section 3: The power relations within political parties and the emergence of political leaders

As I explained in the end of the first section of this chapter, Weber considers that now, militants dominate the political life by naming their representatives. However, he considers also that different personalities dominate personally or financially the political machine.

According to Robert Michels, it is impossible for the masses, to govern directly a political party. The author develops his idea by explaining it is impossible that each member expresses his or her opinions, a fortiori in political parties including thousands of members. Moreover, he considers that members cannot be aware of all the decisions took by the party and they cannot make a judgment about each decision. Thus, the author illustrates his words by explaining it is impossible for the party’s members to resolve “the controversies which arise at its heart” (My translation, 1914, p. 10).

Thus, according to the author, it is necessary for members to elect representatives who will be able to express their wishes. In this situation, Michels explains “the head is the servant of the mass » (1914, p.10). Furthermore, the author underlines the democratic aspect of political parties by specifying that all the members are equal, eligible; and knowing that the representatives depend on the collective will, they can be dismissible permanently. Robert Michels explains in
part this power which is gave to the masses by the fact it allows avoiding distrust which could destroy the organization (1914, p.10).

As noticed by Robert Michels, it is clear that today, there is a real presence of professional politicians. The author explains this phenomenon by the fact that despite the democratic system existing within political parties, the position of representatives implies different abilities and personal qualities: “a certain personal acumen, public speaking skill, an important knowledge” (1914, p. 12).

Thus, Robert Michels foresaw at the time of the writing of his book, the need for certain parties, including proletarians, to open their doors to individuals who do not belonging to the same class and have a "higher education" (1914, p.12). We can make a connection of this thought with many politicians who mostly come from the same schools as the ENA (National School of Administration) in France for example; where many French political figures were formed, such as François Hollande, Jacques Chirac, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, Laurent Fabius, Michel Rocard, Dominique de Villepin, Lionel Jospin... Therefore, the author explains that different political organizations trained some individuals who had a high potential in schools, such as the “Partieschule” in Germany or the “Umanitaria” in Italy (1914, p.14).

This practice had as consequences to widen the gap between the masses and the heads (1914, p. 15). Thus, the author explains: “the decision-making power [...] is almost removed from the masses and concentrated in the hands of the chiefs alone. And those, who were at the beginning the executive bodies of the collective will, became independent of the mass, by subtracting its control”. Thus, according to Michels, an oligarchy emerged in political parties and there would be a minority which leads and a majority which is directed (1914, p. 16). According to the author, this phenomenon appears when the organization becomes bigger. Thus, militants have the obligation to renounce to their wish to lead and entrust this task to the heads. It seems clear that this phenomenon represents a risk against the democracy existing within political parties.

The author illustrates his thought by borrowing words from Pierre-Joseph Proudhon: “Representatives have no more soon gained power; they begin to consolidate and strengthen their power. They surround their positions constantly with new defensive trenches, until they manage to completely dispense with the popular control. It is a natural cycle and that goes all power: from the people, it eventually rises above the people” (1914, p. 20). Therefore, militants hand their
power over professional politicians who use it in order to stay in the position. In this way, political leaders would create distance between them and militants in terms of power.

Therefore, this situation would imply a will of political leaders to create enthusiasm among the mass in the aim of legitimizing their position. Moreover, it implies an acceptance of the domination of political leaders by militants who become followers. I will go deeper about this issue later in this thesis.
SUMMARY

In the aim of broaching efficiently the meaning of leadership in political systems, it was important with this chapter to present the characteristics of political parties. In this regard, this chapter began with the reasons explaining the emergence of political parties in democracies, thanks to the explanations of different authors, in particular Max Weber, Karl Marx and Robert Michels. Moreover, I tackled the different taxonomies existing of political parties, as approached by Stein Rokkan and Maurice Duverger. Furthermore, with the objective of understanding the functioning of political parties, I had an interest in the emergence of political leaders from those parties, and the power relations existing within them.
Chapter 5:

The characteristics of Political Leaders

In this chapter I will approach the characteristics of political leadership and in particular the characteristics of political leaders. In this regard, I will take an interest in the reasons leading some individuals to become political leaders, and their characteristics. Moreover, I will determine whether it is possible to compare the leadership existing within business world and political leadership. Of course some similarities and characteristics are inherent to the role of leader, no matter in what kind of organization this leadership is practiced. However, it seems there are some differences.
Section 1: The reasons explaining the will to become a political leader

First of all, I will broach the reasons that lead politicians to reach such position. Thus, to develop this idea, I will in particular write about the psychological reasons. Indeed, it seems quite easy to understand the reasons which lead an individual to be a leader within a business organization. One of those reasons can be illustrated by a will to drive an organization because of the passion for what realize that organization, and the fact that thanks to his or her position the leader can reach a personal satisfaction, and so pursue personal interests. However, it becomes more complex for politicians who should act in the aim of not pursuing their own interests but the interests of others, citizens. This commitment would result from the will to be completely altruistic. It seems a bit naïve to think politicians practice their leadership in a way totally selfless.

1-1) The search of power

According to different authors, the main reason explaining the involvement of people to become politicians is ascribed to the search of power. So, politicians would be defined as power-seekers according to Lasswell (in Kellerman, 1986, p. 70). The author explains the search of power because of the need of the individuals to compensate a low self-esteem. In this way, Lasswell explains that some individuals have an “unusually strong need or striving for power as a means of seeking compensation for damaged or inadequate self-esteem” (in Kellerman, 1986, p. 71). Thus, power would represent the solution to resolve this inadequate self-esteem by securing the satisfaction for personal values (such as rectitude, respect, affection, as described by the author). However, in my opinion, the assumption developed by Lasswell seems weak because of the generic way to explain the search for power. Indeed, I think that by looking for a general response about the reasons that lead individuals to become political leaders, the author does not embrace all their motivations. However, Lasswell opens a door leading to a reflection about the concept of power. Thus, Alexander George describes three reasons explaining the desire of power (in Kellerman, 1986, p. 75):
- To dominate and/or to deprive others
- To not be dominated
- To produce political achievements

While the second element can be explained by a will to avoid the dissatisfaction resulting from the feeling of being dominated, in contrary, the two others would provide satisfaction by complying with personal needs and/or values. This approach seems to me more relevant because it is more global. However, the risk is to create a typology of political leaders leading to create a stereotype which would not represent the reality, all the complexities and differences existing between individuals involved in political systems as leaders.

1-2) The typology of political leaders

However, it seems possible to create an accurate typology of political leaders in accordance with their way to lead societies. Thus, Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight distinguish different typologies developed by different authors (2009, p. 15). Therefore, Aristotle makes a distinction between two antagonistic typologies: on the one hand the typology of self-interested rulers and leaders, on the other hand the typology of the common-interested rulers and leaders. This dichotomy gives birth to different political systems depending on the number of rulers and the motivation of those rulers. Indeed, in a situation where there is only one person who leads and looks for common benefits, Aristotle considers the regime as a Kingship. However, when this person looks for personal interests, the regime is a tyranny. Moreover, according to Aristotle, when there is a little number of rulers who pursue common interests, the system is aristocratic, while whether those rulers pursue their own interests, the regime is an oligarchy. Finally, whether the majority of the citizens rules the society and pursues common benefits, the regime is a Polity as named by Aristotle, while whether they pursue the interests of the majority and ignore those of minorities, the regime is a democracy.

More recently, Barbara Kellerman developed also a typology of political leadership by distinguishing the good leadership and the bad leadership. First of all, the author defines the good political leadership as the abilities of political leaders to “create meaning and goals; reinforce group identity and cohesion; provide order; and mobilize collective work” (in Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight, 2009, p.
18). Then, she builds her explanation of the bad political leadership on empirical cases about bad political leaders. Therefore, according to Kellerman, a bad leadership can take the form of ineptitude (as Juan Antonio Samaranch according to the author), sternness (Thabo Mbeki according to Kellerman, or Margaret Thatcher in my opinion), intemperance (Boris Yeltsin), insensitivity, corruption, insular (Bill Clinton according to the author because of the Rwandan genocide) and evil (Radovan Karadzic, Pol Pot, according to the author, and Slobodan Milosevic according to me).

This typology gives an enlighten perspective about the way to determine what define political leaders. However, it is important to go deeper by understanding the way that politicians can be considered as political leaders.

**Section 2: The Weber’s perspective**

Max Weber explains the emergence of leaders in political systems by different reasons. Firstly, it would result from a desire to achieve this leading position. Moreover, he adds it is the leader’s ability to be demagogic that allows him or her to reach this position. In this way, the author emphasizes one of the political leader’s abilities, the talent "to exploit the emotions of the masses" (1919, p.53).

I discussed previously in this chapter, the reasons explaining the wish of an individual to become a political leader. The search of power constitutes also, according to Weber, the main explanation. Indeed, Max Weber explains it is the feeling of power provided by this title that pushes individuals to become political leaders. Indeed, according to the author, it is the possibility to have influences on others, and somehow the position that would allow political leaders to contribute to history, that would lead individuals to take that commitment (1919, p.59).

2-1) **The three necessary qualities**

The will to become political leader, is of course not enough. Thus, Weber examines the necessary qualities of a political leader:
First, he explains that the passion is one of the three vectors for an individual to become a political leader. He argues that the passion for a cause is the first element. However, he adds that if this passion is combined with an absence of sense of responsibility, that passion has no echo. Indeed, the sense of responsibility gives to an individual the desire to pursue his or her passion for his or her cause and prove that he or she is responsible for the political acts.

The third necessary quality according to the Max Weber is the glance. By this word, Weber wants to express the ability of an individual to show detachment from the facts, to maintain a permanent capacity of reflection through meditation and quietness, implied by this detachment. The author notices that it seems difficult for an individual to juggle with detachment and at the same time with the passion which animates him or her. However, according to the author, this detachment allows politicians to not enter into a "sterile excitement", and thus, represents the main force of a political figure (p.60).

Weber notices that the absence of cause and the lack of sense of responsibility are the "two deadly sins in politics" (1919, p. 60).

2-2) **The risk of vanity**

Moreover, Max Weber adds that one of the main threats affecting a political figure is the vanity. The risk of vanity results from the fact that in the search of power practiced by a politician, this desire (power) designed simply to serve the cause for which he or she has a passion, can drive him or her to exhilaration, which results from this feeling of power. Thus, the desire of a politician to be in the foreground, can lead him or her to a loss of the wish to defend a cause and to a loss of sense of responsibility implied by the position. In this case, according to Weber, vanity pushes the individual to give up the cause and to simply "seek the appearance and brightness of power instead of the real power." In addition, the author adds that vanity can lead the individual "to enjoy only the power for itself, without any positive purpose." (1919, p. 61)
**Section 3: What is the role of a political leader and how a politician uses his or her leadership?**

Different authors agree to say there is no accurate definition about leadership and leader. However, it is possible to find some similarities about the concepts developed in the literature.

3-1) **Cyert: The main missions of a leader**

Thus, different pillars explaining the role of leaders were highlighted by different authors such as Cyert (2009, p. 503). The author explains that three main missions are in the core of the task of a leader. Therefore, a leader implements a direction for an organization. Secondly, a leader is responsible for the moral values that he or she would like to implement in the organization. Finally, in contrary with a manager who makes the decisions rights, a leader makes the right decisions in the aim of reaching the objectives.

3-2) **Pashen and Dihsmaier: The three essential characteristics of leadership**

The leaders’ missions developed by Cyert can be completed by the contribution of Pashen and Dihsmaier who explain there are three essential characteristics of leadership. First of all, according to the authors, the leadership is a social phenomenon. Because it supposes a social hierarchy, leadership has the objective to make people follow. Thus, thanks to raising the motivation, people become followers and take part of leaders’ vision. Therefore, people do not pursue their own interests or will, but the will of leaders. Secondly, leadership requires a meaning. The authors explain this characteristic by emphasizing that leadership is goal-oriented. In this way, the role of leaders is to make clear to followers that they have common objectives, which can be reached only by driving all the strengths of the followers together. To do that, the most important manner is to give a clear meaning of the task, of the objective, and of the way to reach this goal by the gathering of the followers. So a leader is a manager of the meaning. He or she has
to give and to make share a common understanding, a common meaning, about the role of the organization and the role of each member to reach the objectives of the organization. Finally, according to Paschen and Dihsmaiter, the third essential characteristic of leadership is the power underlies by the position. Indeed, the authors explain that this power represents the ability of the leader to highlight to the followers the risks existing for them if they refuse to obey, and if they want to give up the leader. It can be highlighted thanks to punishments or rewards. The authors underline that this power is potential. Indeed, they consider that only the awareness of this power by the followers can be enough for them to accept the authority of a leader (2013, p. 6).

3-3) The Bennis & Nanus’ perspective

Furthermore, Bennis & Nanus provide a huge contribution to the leadership literature by explaining the role of leaders as creators of a vision within an organization. According to the author, this is the main role of leaders. Indeed, this vision has to define the future of the organization by specifying the objectives that the organization has to reach (2012, p. 83). Those objectives represent the direction wished by the leader, and become clear thanks to the meaning brought by the leader. Therefore, the objective of a vision is to gather the individuals present within the organization. The word “gather” is really important, because thanks to the vision, the leader does not force people to follow him or her, but incite them. It explains the gathering of the individuals which emerge in accordance with their wishes, not by forcing them. So, leaders do not impose a vision but share it with followers. Thus, Bennis and Nanus explain it is not a coercive act, but an act leading to a gathering, thanks to persuasion (2012, p. 99). This vision legitimizes the role of the leader and allows him or her to raise the motivation of people to follow, and therefore incite people to take part in the vision. That is why the vision represents a primordial pillar to conduct the organization toward the future, according to the authors.

Bennis and Nanus explain that the sharing of a vision becomes efficient thanks to the way to communicate on it (2012, p. 100). Indeed, the role of the leader is to make clear the vision by managing its meaning. Thanks to the management of meaning the vision becomes understandable and it becomes easy to take part of it for the followers. Because of this sharing, the organization becomes
homogeneous because all the individuals work together with the objective of reaching the same objectives and defending the same values. It is possible to link this thought about the necessity to convey a vision, which is understandable, with the thought of Masciulli, Malchanov and Knight who explain that Lenin considers that one of the most important tasks of a political leader is to shape the understanding of the followers and to make them aware about their own interests (2009, p. 13).

This idea about the homogeneity of an organization can be related to the thought of François Bourricaud who explains that a political group is defined by the existence of individuals who interact and gather them thanks to the links which unified them through their beliefs and wishes. According to Bourricaud, the sociologically function of a political leader is to ensure the cohesion of the group, in which he or she belongs to (1953, p. 447).

According to Lasswell, in a democracy, leaders are chosen to protect and perfect the values and the institutions of the society (2009, p. 108). One of the most important points is that leaders in political systems should act at the same time as servants and leaders. This idea leads me to write about the concept of servant leadership.

Section 4: The concept of servant leadership

The practice of leadership by political figures can be related to an approach developed by different authors who wrote about the concept of servant leadership. The servant leadership is a concept that emerged in the 1970's thanks to Greenleaf. Thus, Peter G. Northouse explains that rather than the traditional approach of leadership which describes that a leader influence the followers, and the followers are the servant of the leader, the concept of servant leadership considers that the leader is at the same time a leader and a servant. Thus, the leader has a power of influence and a role of service. As what should be the role of politicians, the servant leader has to consider mainly the interests and concerns of followers; he or she has to show empathy toward followers, and support them (2012, p. 219).
Therefore, by basing his work on the Greenleaf’s writings, Peter Northouse explains there are ten characteristics composing servant leadership:

- Listening
- Empathy
- Healing
- Awareness
- Persuasion
- Conceptualization
- Foresight
- Stewardship
- Commitment to the growth of people
- Building community

- Listening

The task of a leader is not only to speak but also to have an interest in the listening of the collaborators, the followers. So, Northouse explains that communication between the leader and the followers is characterized by an exchange, an interaction where the two parties speak and listen. This way of communication requires a leader’s will to hear the perspectives of the followers and so, to consider their perspectives. It seems essential for political leaders who represent the voice of an entire population. How it would be possible to express the will and wishes of a group of individuals without hearing what they want? Thus, the servant leader, the politician, has to be able to listen before speaking. A politician without ears would be only a representative of himself or herself.

- Empathy

Of course, listening per se is not enough. The servant leader has to show empathy toward followers. It requires a deep understanding about the feelings and thoughts of the followers in order to be able to really consider their perspectives. By the way, Greenleaf defines the empathy as “the imaginative projection of one's own consciousness into another being” (1982, p. 10). It demands an acceptance, a tolerance vis-à-vis the perspectives of the followers. Indeed, empathy supposes open-mindedness toward what feel and what express the followers in the aim of showing that really the leader can understand the different perspectives. It
represents a necessary condition for politicians to understand the wishes and beliefs of citizens. Without empathy a politician is only a listener without understanding.

- **Healing**

  Greenleaf illustrates the word “healing” by explaining that it means “to make whole” (1982, p. 20). Indeed, according to the author, the healing implies to share something. Thus the servant leader shows to the followers that together they are part of a whole. Thanks to that, the servant leader is able to take care of the personal problems of the followers and so to take care of their well-being. The author adds that thanks to the research of wholeness, the servant leaders can heal themselves because of their raise of awareness that they also belong to that whole. In political systems, healing is a necessity in the aim of being able for political leaders to deal with the citizens’ questions, and to take care of their concerns.

- **Awareness**

  According to Greenleaf, awareness requires an ability of leaders to consider the environment. Thanks to this awareness, the servant leaders can wide their perspectives and are able to see opportunities they would never think about without that. The author emphasizes that with awareness, the servant leaders have “more intense contact with the immediate situation” (1982, p. 14). In political systems, this awareness is a prerequisite in all the policies, in order to make decisions in concordance with the environment.

- **Persuasion**

  It represents the ability of a leader to convince the followers. Northouse emphasizes the difference between persuasion and coercion (2012, p. 222). Indeed, the coercion implies the use of the authority, which would legitimize itself the decision of the leader. Because of the hierarchical position which underlies an authority, followers should accept the leaders’ decisions. However, the servant leaders use the persuasion thanks to an argumentation which legitimizes the decisions. Thanks to the persuasion, followers do not have the feeling to alienate their wishes, or even to act only in accordance with the leaders decisions. Indeed, by convincing followers, leaders make them aware of the reasons which led them to take such decisions. Moreover, it leads followers to really agree and accept in a
voluntary way to do what leaders want. Because of the importance of followers in political systems, persuasion is a necessity. Without that persuasion, the system becomes tyrannical.

- **Conceptualization**

  The conceptualization is related to the management of meaning within an organization. The conceptualization allows making clear the objectives and the direction took by the organization. Indeed, the conceptualization allows leaving the short-term perspective to adopt a long-term perspective, which leads the organization’s members to have a global vision about the role of the organization and the effects of their work and the effects of the leader’s decisions in a global way. This conceptualization legitimizes the decisions and also raises the understanding about the direction took by the organization. In political parties, the conceptualization allows making clear the whole thought of the organization and for instance legitimizes a program or policies realized by this political party.

- **Foresight**

  It represents the ability of a leader to predict the future by basing the reflection on present and past events. This ability in the political systems is in the core of the practice of leadership. Indeed, all the political decisions have to have an impact on the present as well as on the future in the aim of linking the regulations practices in accordance with the wishes of an entire population.

- **Stewardship**

  The stewardship is the ability of leaders to take the responsibilities supposed by their position. Leaders accept their role with the objective of taking care of the people and of the organization. It is even more significant in the political systems where the stewardship is in the core of the practice of leadership and where the elected individuals have the will to take responsibilities. By the way, citizens entrust the responsibilities to manage the city, the region, the country, to politicians in order to practice the greatest stewardship as possible, in harmony with their will.

- **Commitment to the growth of people**

  Greenleaf defines this characteristic by explaining that leaders have the responsibility to help each individual to grow personally and professionally. In
political systems, this role can be defined as the ability to consider the personal interests of citizens and to involve them in the decision-making, which is the basis in a democracy. Moreover, politicians have to take care of all the stakes resulting from the society: the employment, well-being, social interests... All those stakes demand a commitment from politicians in the aim of considering firstly the citizens’ interests, which result from the citizens’ will, with the objective of satisfying those interests, which will allow them to grow in all the aspects of their lives.

- Building community

The servant leaders have to have the wish to create a union between the members of the organization. They have to raise the feeling of unity. Of course, in a society, this is a major role of politicians. All the differences present in the society, all the interests, all the values and beliefs should join together and the role of the politicians should be to unify them; those of the majority as well as those of the minorities. In societies, the community is already built; however the feeling of unity is not necessarily present. According to this characteristic, the role of political leaders is to raise the feeling of belonging to the society for all its members. By the way, this is probably one of the most important stakes in Ukraine nowadays. Indeed, it would seem there is the existence of a breaking point between the Ukrainians. Indeed, a part of the population does not have the feeling to belong to the Ukrainian society, while most of the citizens demand a national unity.

Section 5: The Political leadership in Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight’s perspective

The authors consider leadership in societies as an essential pillar, which would determine the failure or the success of a government. They define political leadership as the ability of leaders to mobilize followers in the aim of listening and accepting their diagnoses and recommendations about collective problems and crisis (2009, p. 4). The authors notice it is impossible to have a global definition of this concept because of all the differences between political systems in terms of culture, institutions, and history. Indeed, if I compare the Russian vision about what should be a political leader, it seems clear that one of the most important
aspects is the ability of the leader to show certain strengths, as embodied by Poutine. In other cultures, compassion, humility or even sentimentalism would be more considered as important.

Moreover, the existence of differences between democracies in terms of forms of governments makes here again difficult to create a common interpretation of political leadership. Indeed, if I compare for instance Parliamentary Monarchies, Parliamentary Republics or Semi-presidential systems, the roles and the powers belonging to political leaders are different. Indeed, while in Sweden for instance, the executive power is in the hands of the Prime Minister, who is responsible to the Members of Parliament and can be removed from his or her position by them, in France the executive power is embodied by the President elected by citizens who is accountable only to them. In this way, while the executive power embodied by the Prime Minister in Sweden has the duty to convince at the same time the population and the Members of Parliament, it is not the case in France. The way to practice leadership in political systems is so impacted by the political regimes pacing our societies because of the differences in terms of powers and accountability.

5-1) The definition of political leadership

Furthermore, the authors reach an agreement to define political leadership as “a rather unique set of power relations and influences that is exercised over a broad range of nationally and globally salient issue areas and from a position of authoritative preponderance involving ideologies and ethics” (2009, p. 6). Moreover, by relying their words with the thought of Young, Masculiulli, Molchanov and Knight notice that because of the existence of oppositions between political leaders, this specific leadership represents also “a form of competitive entrepreneurial activity in the marketplace of ideas and values, sometimes stressing structural leadership, intellectual leadership or charismatic leadership” (2009, p. 7). The authors add that the main difference between a successful leader and an unsuccessful leader is the ability to make move the society toward the direction suggested by them, and so, to achieve the objectives fixed (2009, p. 10).
5-2) **Adaptive leaders and innovative leaders**

Furthermore, Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight emphasize that it is essential to distinguish different types of leaders who are present in business world as well as in political systems. Thus, the authors distinguish adaptive leaders and innovative leaders (2009, p. 9). The adaptive leaders implement shifts, representing only responses concerning the challenges that organizations or societies have to face, while the innovative leaders introduce total changes having impacts directly on the deep nature of the organizations or societies. In political systems, the practice of the innovative leadership appears in time of crisis, or in time when the defiance against the system is very high. By the way, nowadays in Europe, we can observe the raise of this will to adopt an innovative leadership in political parties. This is even more significant in the extremist parties which try to embody this innovative leadership by wishing revolutionize the systems. The authors explain that Sheffer, who wrote about innovative leadership, describes this concept as a notion referring to the individual qualities of the leader, to his or her psychological qualities. Indeed, according to Sheffer, such leadership requires “vision, inspiration and risktaking” (2009, p. 9), because of all the disruptions that may arise from this practice. Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight emphasize that “when a leader’s ‘charisma’, vision and inspiration become the catalysts of social and political change, they leave the realm of individual psychology and acquire the new qualities of an intersubjective reality shared by a great number of people. It is these people’s actions, guided by a common set of goals first articulated by a leader or leaders, that objectify the leader’s vision and help transform the environment” (2009, p. 9). This notion corresponds to an interrogation of many scientists who wonder whether it is political leaders who change the history or it is the historical events that force them to adapt their policy.

**Section 6: Ethos, Logos Pathos**

According to different authors such as the Bertelsmann Foundation, there are three main prerequisites of political leadership (2006, p.3): Ethos, Pathos, Logos. This thought is a part of the legacy left by Aristotle.
6-1) **Ethos**

The first prerequisite is the Ethos. Indeed, Ethos represents the ability of leaders to make the followers active participants of the vision. To do so, leaders do not only express wishes or wills which are in concordance with followers’ expectations. Rather than that, leaders introduce new set of convictions. The objective is to raise the motivations of followers. The goal is not only to make them aware of those convictions but also to make them active participants in the management of those convictions. The Ethos prerequisite helps leaders to express their credibility and integrity according to Scott Edinger (2013). Thanks to the Ethos, leaders are able to raise the trust existing in their relationships with followers.

We can find this prerequisite present in political systems especially in the speeches of politicians. Indeed, one of the most relevant examples of the use of the Ethos is the speech of François Hollande in a televised debate against Nicolas Sarkozy during the presidential campaign in 2012. In the speech, François Hollande realized a tirade during more than 3 minutes during which he started each sentence by “Moi, Président de la République” [“Me, President of the Republic”]. He repeated these words fifteen times. At that time, not being president, the practice of the Ethos aimed for giving to him certain credibility with the wish to gain the trust of the electorate.

By the way, according to Aimée-Danielle Koffi-Lezou, the Ethos among the three prerequisites (Ethos, Pathos, Logos), is the main element because it assures the credibility of the individual and so the efficiency of the speech (2012, p. 205).

6-2) **Logos**

The Logos represents the ability to give sense, to make clear, to make explicit the speech by a deep explanation about the content. Thanks to those explanations, leaders are able to show their knowledge and understanding about the methods and the analyses that they are talking about. The practice of the Logos is essential to be sure that the message is well received and understood by followers, such as explained by Scott Edinger (2013). So, the Logos demands logic or reason. Rather than using emotion, in a Logos argumentation, the speaker uses facts.

It is even truer in political systems where all the followers are not familiar with the processes or the policies developed by political leaders. Thus, the objective of the Logos is to push out the followers from the confusion to make them enter in a frame of understanding.

However, Robert Michels considers that political leaders do not use the Logos in the aim of leaving the masses in a situation of confusion. Indeed, according to the author, while one of the roles of political leaders is to be theoretical translators for the masses, they juggle with the words and digressions, to prevent the masses to understand them. The objective would be to avoid the raise of the masses’ power. By preventing the understanding of the masses, political leaders would remain the masters of political systems (1914, pp. 60-61).

6-3) **Pathos**

The last prerequisite is Pathos. Pathos is related to the emotional aspect of a speech. Indeed, it represents the emotional concerns of the speaker. It allows showing empathy toward people and so, showing understanding and interests about the concerns and feelings of others. Because it causes the emergence of emotions, Pathos is a way to persuade others thanks to the sharing of emotions. As explained by Demirdogen, Pathos demands an emotional intelligence (2010, p. 192). As explained by the author, Aristotle considered that “some virtues like justice,
generosity, courage, gentleness and wisdom” contribute to the use of Pathos. It is possible to use as examples the speech of Hillary Clinton in 2011 in Geneva, when she talked about LGBT people, or the well-know speech of Martin Luther King, “I have a dream”, which was part of the movements for civil right in the United States. In a more personal point of view, I can also add as example, Christiane Taubira with her closing speech about the homosexual marriage in 2013.
This chapter began with different explanations about the development of the wish of individuals to become political leaders. Then, I emphasized the necessary qualities and missions ascribed to leaders. Moreover, I wrote about the concept of Servant Leadership, which is in my opinion suitable for political leaders. Furthermore, I had an interest in the perspective of Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight, who developed the concept of political leadership. Additionally, I exposed the three main prerequisites of political leadership (Ethos, Logos, Pathos), which are essential in political systems nowadays. Throughout this chapter, I built parallels between the characteristics of leaders in business world and the characteristics of leaders in political systems.
Chapter 6:

Followership

After the description and the understanding of the characteristics of political leaders, it seems essential to have an important interest in the characteristics of political followers, and wider about the concept of followership. Indeed, the existence of leadership implies the existence of followership. In this way, it is essential to understand who the people who follow are and what their characteristics are. Moreover, in my opinion, followership implies the acceptance of the authority of leaders. Thus, I will study the relationships dominant/dominated existing between leaders and followers, in particular in political systems. Furthermore, with the objective of understanding deeply this notion, I will study the notion of symbolic violence, which seems to be especially relevant to understand political leadership.
As explained by Robert Kelley, the success of an organization is most of the time considered as the result of a well-practiced leadership (1988, p. 142). However, the author is one of the first who considered the importance of followers in the success of an organization. By the way, Kean and al. consider the traditional view of followers as “a homogenous group of uncritical, unreflective obedient people, following unquestioningly the directives of their leaders” (2011, p. 508). Thus, this approach does not consider the impact of followers in the successes or failures of organizations. The merits or the damages are often attributed to leaders. However, it seems essential to consider that a leader only exists because of the existence of followers. Thus, Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight, by studying the writings of Kellerman, explain this is actually followers who create leaders (2009, p. 7). Therefore, leadership, as emphasized by Smircich and Morgan, is socially constructed and results from the interactions between individuals (1982, p. 258). In this way, Smircich and Morgan underline the importance of interactions between leaders and those who are led. Indeed, they define leadership as the ability of someone to shape the reality of others. Those others, followers, have thus the responsibility of the reception of the leader’s direction, and leader’s reality. Therefore, according to Smircich and Morgan, the existence of negotiations between leaders and those who follow, lead followers to accept to surrender their power to frame their own reality, and accept the reality shaped by leaders (1982, p. 258). This acceptance has thus an important impact on the successes or failures of organizations. That is why; the concept of followership is now considered as a determining element in the literature devoted to leadership.

Section 1: Followership’s theories

First of all, it seems essential approach the different theories existing within the concept of followership in the aim of understanding the influence of followership in the meaning of leadership in political systems. I will start this study by the contribution realized by Boas Shamir.
1-1) **The Boas Shamir's taxonomy:**

In this way, different taxonomies about followers exist in the literature. One of them is the concept developed by Boas Shamir, which was described by Jackson and Parry. Thus, by interesting them to the writings of Boas Shamir, Jackson and Parry distinguish six traditional roles embodied by followers (2011, p. 47):

- **“Followers as recipients of leader influence”:** In this approach, followers are considered as passive. Thus, they have no impact on leadership, and there is an absence of exchanges between leaders and followers: leaders lead, the followers obey. In political systems, this approach can be tied to an authoritarian regime or a dictatorial regime, where leaders have full influence on countries or on citizens.

- **“Followers as moderators of leader impact”:** In this role, followers are also considered as recipients of leader’s influence. However, the style of leadership is impacted by the followers’ characteristics. Thus, the style adopted has to depend on the maturity of the followers, which is defined by their abilities and motivations.

- **“Followers as substitutes for leadership”:** In this approach, the leader’s impact is really thin. Indeed, followers do not need leaders to be motivated or effective. So, the leader influence is unnecessary to raise the followers’ engagement.

- **“Followers as constructors of leadership”:** This approach is related to the representation that followers have about leadership. Indeed, it pertains to the way that leadership is perceived by followers. Three different aspects emerge from this approach: First of all, it is the romanticized leadership, which is socially constructed and emerge from interactions between followers. Together, they create their opinion about the leader. Secondly, it is the psychoanalytic theories of leadership, which is defined as the projection and transference of the followers’ ideals on the leader. Moreover, the way to follow and the acceptance of the authority would depend on the particular past of the followers, on their attitudes with their parents during their childhood. In this way, the leader would represent a father or a mother, which leads
followers to idealize him or her. Thus, the leader would provide a feeling of safety toward followers, especially in a chaotic period. Thirdly, the social identity theory of leadership is related to the way that a group of individuals identify them, thanks to their similarities existing within the group according to their values and beliefs, and what differentiate them from what is outside the group. Then, the level of acceptance of a leader depends on his or her likeness with the members of the group. In this way, followers are able to support the leader and give to him or her, the possibility to influence them. This thought can be related to the cycle created by Haslam, Reicher, and Platow, about the social identity (2011, p. 73):

- “Followers as leaders”: In this approach, Jackson and Parry consider there is no distinction between leaders and followers. Indeed, this idea explains that people can be at the same time leaders and followers. Thus, in this situation, leaders would not be the only people who lead because followers would also have the opportunity to lead.
  By extension, the authors write about the concept of “shared leadership”, which is defined as the fact to implement rotations in an organization with
the objective that each individual would have the possibility to lead. Thanks to rotations, individuals can share their experiences, and the official leader can empower the followers.

- “Followers as co-producers of leadership”: This approach is characterized by a mutual exchange between followers and leaders. Indeed, Jackson and Parry use the thought of Edwin Hollander to explain that this leadership “is a two-way influence” (2011, p. 63). Moreover, the authors link this approach with the concept of servant leadership developed by Greenleaf, of which I wrote about in the chapter five of this thesis. In this way, followers have an essential role. Indeed, they provide some contributions to leaders thanks to “focus and self-direction, gratitude and loyalty, commitment and effort, cooperation and sacrifice, and respect and obedience” (2011, p. 63). Furthermore, the authors add that followers have to be active in the creation of leadership. Thus, they illustrate their idea by writing: “we get the leaders we deserve” (2011, p. 64). Therefore, followers are responsible for the leadership practiced and are co-producers of this leadership. That is why; they have to be active, in order to have the most effective leadership as possible. In some extent, this approach seems especially relevant for democracies. Indeed, citizens embody the role of leaders and followers, because they are in the core of the reflections about the policies implemented, and in the same time, they follow political leaders who get the legitimacy to lead, because of their abilities and involvement. Moreover, citizens have to be committed in the leadership practice with the objective of participating in the conception and the realization of the leadership they wish to follow.

All these approaches can be related to different political systems and regimes. Moreover, the cultural aspect of a country has a huge impact on the use of these approaches and determines what leadership is practiced.
Section 2: The followers’ categorization:

According to different authors, it is important to differentiate followers in different categories. Indeed, the theories about followership previously studied in this paper allow raising the understanding about the way to follow. However, it is necessary to understand deeply the individuals who follow and their characteristics. Thus, Kelley and Kellerman created taxonomies of followers. Therefore, I will start by the categorization realized by Robert Kelley:

2-1) The Kelley’s approach

According to Robert Kelley, followers can embody different roles. Thus, the author distinguishes five different types of followers. To do so, Kelley creates a diagram to illustrate his idea (1988, p. 145):
Robert Kelley defines sheep as passive followers who never criticize negatively leaders or their decisions. They simply obey to leaders and do the works assigned to them, not less, not more (1988, p. 143). Thus, because of their absolute obedience, they do not take initiative, and do not take responsibilities. In political systems, this role can characterized some non-voters who do not vote because they do not feel concerned. It can also characterized people who do not reflect about political issues, and simply vote according to the opinions existing in their environment, and the choice made by others: family members, friends, and so on. They just follow the mass and not try to make emerge a reflection. They do not have interests on political issues.

- Yes-people:

As sheep, Yes-people do not take initiatives. However, they have a complete acceptance of leaders and their decisions. Rather than being not concerned, they always agree and consider leaders as sources of inspirations that they could not have alone. Moreover, by the acceptance, Yes-people reassure leaders in their practice of leadership and decisions. In my opinion, they constitute a risk for leaders. Indeed, the fact of accepting all the decisions without questioning the leaders’ initiatives, can lead to a lack of awareness and interrogations about the situation for leaders. It can be related to individuals in political systems, who follow traditionally the same political leader or party, and consider him, her or it, as making the best for them and for the society in general. They accept blindly the decisions of political leaders, who are according to them the most able to take those responsibilities, and if those leaders take a particular decision, Yes-people consider it is the best solution found.

- Alienated

According to Robert Kelley, alienated are independent thinker and do not hesitate to criticize leaders and their decisions. However, the author notices that they do not take initiatives to change the situation or to reinforce it, despite their agreements or disagreements. Indeed, they are active in reflection but passive in action. It is translated by an absence of opposition against leaders. In my opinion, to illustrate alienated followers, it is possible to use as example, people who have
political concerned, reflect about policies and political leaders, but are not active on political scene, such as some non-voters or some militants in political parties.

- Survivors

Robert Kelley considers survivors as people, present within an organization who look for safety. They manage their way to follow by being sure that their position toward leaders would reassure them in their position. They adapt them relatively easily to changes in order to be sure that their position in the organization will never be compromised.

- Effective followers

The existence of effective followers as described by Kelley is essential in the success of an organization. Therefore, Robert Kelley describes effective followers as enthusiastic, intelligent, and self-reliant. The author adds that four qualities are essential for effective followers: self-management, commitment (for a person, a purpose or a principle), they use their competences and efforts to make maximum impact, and finally they are courageous, honest and credible (1988, p. 144). To illustrate this idea, I consider it defines people who are politically active, who fights for their beliefs and vision, and are ready to be opposed to leaders in the aim of respecting their own values. They believe in their commitment and they consider before all the interests of their political beliefs. They make their own reflections and take initiatives.

2-2) The Kellerman’s categorization:

Now, I will broach the categorization realized by Kellerman. The author explains that followers can be characterized thanks to their behaviors according to their acceptance of doing what their leaders want them to do. Thus, Barbara Kellerman describes followers as having low power and low hierarchical position. Therefore, according to the author, they have less influence and authority than leaders. Furthermore, the author distinguishes also five different types of followers. This taxonomy results from the level of commitment of followers determining the relationships between them and their leaders. Therefore, the level of commitment would result from interpersonal relationships between followers and leaders, and the level of passion of followers for organizations which they are part of (2007, p.
Thus, below are the five different types of followers according to Barbara Kellerman:

- **Isolates:**

  According to Barbara Kellerman, the individuals within an organization who are considered as Isolates, are characterized by a complete detachment. Thus, the author explains that Isolates do not have interests in the organization, or even in their leader. Thus, this behavior leads them to be passive by an absence of enthusiasm and they just think about their wages.

- **Bystanders:**

  The Bystanders, as the Isolates, are not committed in the organization. However, their passive behavior disappears in a case where they can pursue their own interests, not the organization’s interests. Moreover, in contrary with the Isolates followers, the Bystanders are aware of what is going on in the organization. They are just observers who are committed when this engagement is safe and can provide to them a positive outcome. This type of followers can be illustrated by people who, in political systems, are only committed in political systems when they can get a positive interest, or when one of their interests, as their social gains, is in danger. On the other hand, Barbara Kellerman explains that Bystanders are productive. Indeed, they take care about their own work, but, they do not care about the global mission of the organization.

- **Participants:**

  According to Barbara Kellerman, Participants have the will to have impact on organizations. Indeed, Participants are committed in the organization, and this engagement can be translated by an opposition or an agreement toward leaders, but always for the good of the organization. They do not measure their time or money invested in the organization, because it represents for them a passion.

- **Activists:**

  Activists are characterized by the author, as people who work hardly to support leaders, or *a contrario* to fight against them. They have critical thinking and engage their energies and beliefs to support their thoughts, even if it implies to
conflict with leaders. They are really involved in their work and in the global mission of the organization. Thus, they can represent great allies for leaders, or formidable opponents.

- **Diehards**

Diehards are fully engaged in organizations. They dedicate all their energies and even in some cases their lives for the leaders or the organizations. By the way, Barbara takes the example of Goebbels who came to suicide with his family after the death of Hitler. Indeed, this extreme reaction results from the Goebbels’ beliefs that without Hitler, the life would not deserve to be enjoyed.

The different theories and taxonomies developed previously, allow raising the understanding about followers in a global perspective. Now, it seems essential to understand the reasons explaining the need, or even the will of citizens to follow political leaders. One of those reasons was developed by Max Weber, who describes a relation of dominant/dominated between citizens and political leaders.

### Section 3: Dominant/Dominated

In this way, according to Max Weber, State is defined as the only organization entitled to legitimate violence, and it is precisely this that defines the State (1919, p. 29). There is therefore a relationship of dominant / dominated according to the author, where citizens submit to the authority of State. This acceptance of the dominance of the State can be explained by three factors according to the author:

- Traditional power
- Charismatic power
- Legal authority

**Traditional power:**

Weber explains the traditional power as the habits of the individuals to be subjected. According to the author, the existence of customs related to the
acceptance of authority which stood the test of time, legitimize those customs and validate them. Thus, individuals have the habit to respect the authority of a person who is considered as having a superior power. I can relate this idea with the thought of Aristotle who compares different ratios of authority: the animal which is subjected to the man, the woman submits to her husband, the child submits to his father, the slave who is subjected to his master (1848, p. 45). Therefore, Aristotle explains that the acceptance of the authority within a society results from the habits of submission to the authority existing within a family (1848, p. 6).

Charismatic power:

According to Max Weber, the charismatic power represents the ability of individuals to be subjected to a person, and to give to him or her, a complete devotion, because of the existence of a trust. This trust would be the result of the qualities of the leader, his or her heroism, his or her exceptional particularities, which lead the individuals to follow him or her. In order to illustrate the charismatic power, Max Weber uses as example the prophets, the lords of war, and also political leaders. By the way, the author explains that the dedication and the choice of a party's chief do not reside in “the abstract mediocrity of a program”, but in the personality of a chief and his or her “charisma”. The author adds that the parties’ members hope that the demagogic influence and the personality of the leader would allow them to get a maximum of votes (1919, pp. 49-50).

Legal authority:

Max Weber explains that another reason of the acceptance of the domination of a leader results from the fact that individuals accept to be subjected to someone because they believe in the validity of the legal status of the leader, and in his or her ability to lead. So, it would be the legal aspect of the chief's position that would confer on him or her, the devotion of individuals, and thus the domination of the leader. In addition, the rational aspect of the rules explaining the leader's position, lead the individuals to accept the leader's authority, and to accept to obey to him or her.
Section 4: Robert Michels’ considerations

The relation dominant/dominated between citizens and political leaders, is also supported by Robert Michels. Indeed, the author considers that masses accept the domination of political leaders because they are considered as “martyrs” who fight and devote them to the causes defended by masses. Because of the commitment of political leaders, followers can let them taking care of political issues, and thus have the possibility to work and live in societies without having those concerns (1914, p. 39). Thanks to that, political leaders get gratefulness from citizens in exchange for their engagement. According to Robert Michels, this phenomenon of gratefulness is illustrated by the renewal of leaders’ mandates (1914, p. 41).

Furthermore, Robert Michels explains gratefulness also by the abilities of political leaders. Indeed, according to the author, the most important element explaining this phenomenon would be the public speaking skills of political leaders, which allow them having a suggestion power on followers (1914, p. 48). It underlies that the notion of followership, is not a conscious will by followers, but rather something that they internalize because of hero-worship they feel for political leaders and their need to be guided (1914, p. 33). Moreover, the author adds that the public speaking skill, which is particularly appreciated by followers, leads to an absence of concerns about the content of speeches. It is possible to connect this idea with the thought of Max Weber about charismatic power, which I wrote about previously in this chapter.

The idea about gratefulness can be translated, according to Robert Michels, by idolization leading to the adoption of political leaders’ names by followers who support them. Indeed, is easy to find examples as in France with the Sarkozists who support Nicolas Sarkozy, or the Royalists who support Ségolène Royal (1914, p. 42). Moreover, this idolization can continue even after the death of leaders. Robert Michels uses as example Karl Marx.

However, it is important to notice that gratefulness can be removed by political followers at anytime whether political leaders do not fit with their expectations. I think in particular to Rick Perry, and his well-known “oops” in a debate during the conservative primaries in United States, in 9th November 2011 (in
Rick Perry did not succeed to remember the third agency that he would have eliminated as President. This forgetfulness caused the loss of the election.

Furthermore, the author notices that it is easier for citizens to follow someone who has already reached honors and glory, and has a name already well-known by citizens. Thus, if political leaders reached success, even in other discipline, they can more easily reach the gratefulness of masses when they come into political position. It can be explained by the fact that those leaders have already the affection of masses, and their names are synonyms of glory (1914, pp. 52-53). To illustrate this phenomenon, one of the main relevant examples in current societies is Vitali Klitschko, who is one of the most talented boxing champions ever, and became a political leader in Ukraine. Ronald Reagan illustrates also this idea. Indeed, before becoming the 40th President of the United States of America, Ronald Reagan was a famous actor.

**Section 4: The notion of violence related to Followership’s concept**

To go deeper in the discussion about the relation dominant/dominated between citizens and political leaders, it is important to have an interest in the writings of Pierre Bourdieu. Indeed, the author considers that certain dominations result from what he calls the symbolic violence. The symbolic violence as explained by Pierre Bourdieu and reaffirmed by Gérard Mauger represents all the constraints weighing unconsciously on individuals, who are participants and also contributors in the implementation of those constraints (2006, p. 86). This domination and the symbolic violence would result from the inequalities between individuals and their social position. Thus, this domination does not result from the superiority of an individual on another, but rather from the superiority of a position on another. Thus, the State would implement this symbolic violence thanks to scholar system and in order to have domination on citizens because of the internalization of this domination, which becomes a habit. This *habitus* leads individuals to not call into question the power that they are subject. By extension, I think that political leaders who are at the same time the representatives of citizens and representatives of States have in their hands the use of the symbolic violence. Because of that, States
, which have the monopoly of the legal violence, as developed by Max Weber (1919, p. 29), do not need to resort to physical violence. Indeed, Lahouari Addi explains that thanks to the symbolic violence, a civil peace emerge within societies (2001). Thus, citizens, the followers, internalize this symbolic violence, and follow political leaders, in part because of this unconscious phenomenon.

Therefore, political leaders, by their positions providing to them legitimacy and symbolic power, would dominate others, and citizens would follow them unconsciously. This idea can be link to the works of Stanley Milgram. Indeed, thanks to experimentations focusing on the level of acceptance of people towards someone embodying authority, Milgram reveals the characteristics of obedience of people. Thus, the symbolic power related to a position, a structure, or someone, can lead people to obey in a very high level, even against their own moral beliefs. In this way, the internalization by individuals of the duty to respect authority, can lead citizens to have a high level of obedience towards political leaders who embody this authority. Therefore, Robert Michels explains that citizens respect the authority embodied by political leaders, because of their perception that those leaders have more knowledge than them, and are the most able to take care about political issues. The author adds that this acceptance can lead to an oligarchy (1919, p. 64).

In my opinion, the main risk in societies, related to this idea, is that followers become the instruments of the power rather than the guardians of democracies.

Furthermore, it is essential to understand the three mechanisms being in the core of democracies and fighting against the absolute symbolic power of political leaders. Thus, as explained by Butcher and Martin those elements are representation, accountability, and participations. According to the authors, Representation is a structural mechanism that allows having a balance between the role of political leaders and masses in the management of a society, because of the presence of a democratic debate resulting from this balance. Then, the authors express the existence of accountability. Indeed, they consider that thanks to the fact of voting, masses are able to punish of reward political leaders. It gives to citizens a power and so, the capacity of leading the decisions took by political leaders. Finally, Butcher and Martin enlighten the role of Participants of citizens. Therefore, by being committed in political systems, citizens are able to express their level of trust toward leaders (2006, p. 988).
These mechanisms suggest an important involvement of citizens. However, as I previously explained, there are different types of followers illustrating different levels of engagement. Moreover, Max Weber distinguishes two types of individuals within societies: people being "politically active" and people being "politically passive" (1919, p. 46). Weber explains that it is not possible to compel individuals to become active and their choice depends on their free decision.

Therefore, the concept of followership and the level of political commitment of citizens confirm the crucial role of followers within societies, who can be viewed as a support for political leaders, as well as guarantors to preserve democracies.
Because of the importance of citizens in political systems and their important influence on political leadership, it was necessary with this chapter to have an interest in those political followers: citizens.

Moreover, the concept of leadership implies the existence of followership. In this way, I began this chapter by introducing different theories related to this concept of followership. I studied in particular the writings of Boas Shamir. Furthermore, I highlighted the existence of different types of followers existing in organizations thanks to the works of Kelley and Kellerman, who created different taxonomies of followers. Additionally, with the objective of understating deeply the emergence of followership in political systems, I broached the relationships dominant/dominated as studied by Max Weber, who exposed three explanations of the domination of States, and its acceptance by citizens. Moreover, I approached the thoughts of Robert Michels who gave enlighten perspectives explaining the ability of citizens to accept the power of political leaders. Furthermore, the particularities of followership in political systems, led me to emphasize the importance of the symbolic violence in such situation.

Thus, my objective with this chapter was to describe and understand deeply all the characteristics of citizens in political systems, and their relations as followers with political leaders.
Chapter 7: Authenticity

I would like now to explain the importance of the notion of authenticity in this thesis. Indeed, the notion of democracy implies the existence of representatives who will talk on the behalf of an entire population. This representativeness requires the existence of a trust between political leaders and citizens because of the stakes resulting from the fact to elect someone. As noticed in the introduction, citizens do not want to be flouted, and they have the wish to entrust political leaders who will defend and embody the role of guarantors of the citizens’ beliefs, wishes, and values. Thus, it seems essential for political leaders, to prove their personal engagement towards citizens. Moreover, it important for them to show and even prove their similarities with citizens, in terms of values, beliefs and convictions. Thanks to that, citizens would be able to entrust political leaders, because they have the feeling that they share the same thoughts with them. This is only by this condition that citizens accept that leaders talk on their behalf.

Thus, it would be thanks to authenticity that political leaders are able to prove their similarities, and convince citizens that they are involved in political systems to defend some convictions shared by citizens.

Thus, in this chapter, I will discuss the importance of authenticity in the practice of leadership in general, and its necessity especially in political systems.
Authenticity is defined as “the quality of being true or real” (in dictionary of Cambridge). This idea is also supported by Ladkin and Taylor who explain that authenticity would be defined as the ability of someone to show one’s true self. However, the concept of authenticity in political leadership seems complex because of the necessity of political leaders to act at the same time as representatives and authentically. In this way, in a first section, I will discuss whether it is possible for political leaders to juggle with these two concepts.

**Section 1: Is it possible to be at the same time representative and authentic?**

This discussion sends me back to the third chapter in the section devoted to the limits of representativeness. Indeed, as I wrote in page 33, according to Rousseau, a citizen cannot be represented, because of the impossibility to transmit wishes or beliefs to another individual who will defend them (1762, p. 27). In this way, political leaders cannot defend those interests because they do not share them completely. They would be only the representatives of themselves rather than representatives of an entire population. Moreover, even if political leaders try to act in complete concordance with citizens’ expectations, it can lead political leaders to act against their own wishes, hence the emergence of a lack of authenticity, because the objectives they pursue do not fit with their own expectations. Indeed, by wishing defend only the beliefs of others, political leaders deprive themselves of their will to pursue their own wishes. In this way, authenticity and representativeness seem to be two opposite concepts. Indeed, the fact of being representatives would lead political leaders to be not genuine, toward themselves and toward others.

This discussion makes more complex the understanding of the political leaders’ ability to be authentic, because one of the assumptions would be that they are not authentic because of their positions of representatives. In this way, in the next section I will broach the concept of authenticity in the aim of making a first step to understand this phenomenon.
Section 2: The different perspectives within the concept of authenticity

It seems essential to make clear that this authenticity is in the same time intrapersonal and interpersonal as explained by Peter Northouse. Indeed, being authentic suppose being genuine toward oneself and others. In this way, Peter Northouse describes different approaches of authentic leadership, and in particular: Intrapersonal perspective, Interpersonal perspective, and development perspective (2013, p. 254).

In my opinion, the latter covers the intrapersonal and interpersonal perspectives. Indeed, as defined by Peter Northouse, the development perspective underlies a dynamic process, which leads to change the personnality of leaders according to their life experiences. Thus, in my opinion, this dynamic has an impact on the intrapersonal perspective on the one hand, and on the interpersonal perspective on the other hand.

1-1) Intrapersonal perspective:

The intrapersonal perspective reflects the ability of leaders to be true toward them. This approach requires self-awareness by leaders, who have to be fully conscious about who they are, what define them as persons, and what led them to be who they are. Thus, self-awareness is defined by Elisabeth Plum as “the ability to be aware of our emotions at any given moment and to use these preferences to guide our decisions. It is also having a realistic assessment of our own abilities and being in possession of a sound and solid feeling of self-confidence, our inner compass” (2008, p. 44). Therefore, leaders have to be fully conscious of what their behaviors are, what lead them to adopt those behaviors, and what their abilities are. Thus, it demands self-awareness and so, self-confidence. The importance of self-awareness is fully considered in leadership literature. However, as noticed by Avolio and Gardner, self-awareness is not an end in itself. Indeed, it would represent only the way to develop authentic leadership, not to prove it (2005, p. 324).

To dive deeply in this concept, it is interesting to have an interest in Shamir and Eilam’s writings, who define authentic leaders as individuals who are
“genuine”, “original”, and do “not fake” (2005, p. 396). According to them, authenticity appears also with a self-awareness of leaders who have self-knowledge, self-concept clarity, self-concordance, and person-role merger. All these characteristics underlie the existence of harmony, on the one hand between who they are, and who they claim to be, and on the other hand, a virtuous correlation between who they are and their position.

Thus, the development of life-stories would be essential to make emerge authenticity. So, it is important, according to Shamir and Eilam, to have a look by leaders on their own life-stories in the aim of being authentic, and creating a meaning on who they are and on the development of their own decisions and convictions. The word “convictions” is essential to understand authentic leadership. Indeed, according to Shamir and Eilam, authentic leaders practice their leadership by convictions, not to look for glory or rewards (2005, p. 397). They drive their energy in order to defend and implement those convictions. Thus; they pursue objectives which are in harmony with their values and beliefs. Moreover, Shamir and Eilam explain that those leaders “do not pretend to be leaders just because they are in a leadership position” (2005, p. 396). Thus, they do not pursue power for itself, but rather to implement decisions which are in concordance with their convictions. This idea goes against the thought of Max Weber who explains, as I previously wrote, that a risk for political leaders is the search of power for itself, for the appearance and the brightness of power (1919, p. 61), rather than the power to implement their convictions.

Life-stories allow leaders to explain the process which led them to be who they are. Thus, life-stories legitimize leaders’ position, by the narration by them of what led them to reach such position. Moreover, all the values, beliefs, convictions, thoughts, would result from personal experiences. Thus, to show authenticity, leaders have to convey the process explaining how they get those elements. Furthermore, this reflection, and the process describing life-stories has to be unique according to Shamir and Eilam (2005, p. 397).

Therefore, this process is characterized by self-awareness about personal stories. In this way, Harter describes authenticity as self-awareness about personal experiences. The author uses as example emotions, thoughts, desires, beliefs. (2011, in Gardner and al., p. 1121). Therefore, leaders would reflect on their personal life-stories, in the aim of making emerge the reasons explaining their
position, their personal values and beliefs. It requires a high ability to reflect about who they are, and what lead them to reach a leader’s position. Thanks to that, leaders are able to prove their authenticity toward themselves because they raise their own understanding about them.

1-2) Interpersonal perspective:

In the first section, I explained how is it possible for leaders to understand who they are and their convictions, and thus, to be authentic toward themselves. However, leadership demands interpersonal interactions which lead leaders to show authenticity toward others.

Therefore, in this part, the notion of authenticity can be related to the emergence of trust. Because leaders reveal their true intentions and act as real representatives of citizens, a trust can emerge between political leaders and political followers. In my opinion, trust is defined as the existence of predictability between two individuals or parties. Because of the existence of a trust, it is possible to predict the behaviors of others to whom we show confidence. Therefore, the fact of being authentic toward others, and also toward oneself, allow gaining the trust of others.

It seems easy to understand how personal life-stories can generate convictions and authenticity for an individual. However, it seems more difficult to understand how convey this authenticity toward others. Therefore, it underlies the enactment of authenticity by leaders. Different authors, such as Ladkin and Taylor, developed theory describing the way to embody authentic leadership (2011, p. 68). Thus, the authors create a bridge between leadership and acting. In their perspective, the authors explain that in order to prove authenticity, it is important to show emotions. In this way, the fact of using past feelings making emerge emotions has to be used by leaders to show their authenticity. Thus, leaders, as well as actors, have to remember a past situation in their own personal life story, and use the emotions link to this memory in the aim of showing to others the right emotion, in the right moment. Therefore, it demands to apply a past feeling on a present situation. Is it really authenticity? I am not really convinced by this approach. Indeed, authenticity, in my opinion, implies to be true, and for leaders to show what they really feel, and not to use past emotions with the objective of trying
to have the right reaction in the right moment. This approach is close to acting, and acting, according to me, is far to define authentic leadership. Indeed, in this theory, authenticity seems not natural, but rather close to a competence of actually being inauthentic.

In my opinion, authentic leadership is the ability (not a competence), to show true emotion felt in a moment, and succeed to convey this emotion to others. Indeed, the importance to convey is essential. Leaders can have some convictions, feelings, if they do not succeed to make aware followers about what they think and what they feel, authenticity is useless. However, in some extent, I think that the theory developed by Ladkin and Taylor can be relevant. Indeed, as I explained, political leaders are representatives. Thus, it is important for them to show empathy toward others. In this way, it seems impossible for an individual to share exactly the same feeling of someone else, concerning a certain situation. In my opinion, individuals interpret things differently and do not have the same reactions on a same event. Therefore, to show empathy, this idea about acting is relevant. Indeed, the fact of using a past event, of personal life-story, that seems to be in concordance with what feel an individual, is essential, and useful. In my opinion, people, who are not personally affected by an event, can make emerge empathy toward others. In this way, the emotions emerging in other individuals who suffered directly from this event; make them remember a feeling that they had in another situation. In this way, they can try to understand others, but not understand them.

Showing true emotions seems important or hazardous for political leaders according to the situations. As explained by Max Weber, it is important that political leaders keep detachment and so a capacity of reflection (1919, p. 60). However, the fact of showing authenticity reveals the deeper nature of human beings, the natural emotions. A political leader is before all an individual who has feelings. Not sharing those emotions with others may make emerge an inauthentic aspect of their person.

Section 3: Bill George’s contributions:

According to me, one of the most relevant models defining authentic leadership, which seems to be enough accurate to characterize authenticity for
politic leaders, is the model developed by Bill Georges in 2003 (2003, p. 36). The author developed a concept about authentic leadership summarized by Peter Northouse in the following figure:

![Diagram of Authentic Leadership Model](image)

Source: George, B., Authentic Leadership: Rediscovering the Secrets to Creating Lasting Value, 2003, p. 36

- **Purpose and passion**

  In this way, Bill George explains it is essential for leaders to have fully conscious of their purpose and to have passion for it (2003, p. 36). Indeed, authentic leaders are aware about what their job consist in and what direction they take. Thus, the implementation and awareness about a purpose give to them passion, because they are aware about the reasons that lead them to work. An example is Mahatma Gandhi, who was aware about his own convictions, and it led him to have passion to defend those convictions. He knew what he wanted for the future of India, and because of that, he was fully committed in his purpose.
• Values and behaviors

Moreover, Bill George adds that authentic leaders are aware of their own values and behaviors. It leads leaders to be fully conscious about the roots concerning who they are, and the explanations about their behaviors. Thus, they adopt always behaviors being in concordance with their own values, in order to strengthen them. Thanks to that, they determine what they want. Peter Northouse uses as example Nelson Mandela, who spent 27 years in jail and refused to make compromises against his convictions in the aim of reducing his prison term (2013, p. 260). Again, Gandhi is in my opinion, a good example of this relation between behaviors and values. Indeed, he never adopted a behavior contravening his values. One of the clearest examples is his principle of non-violence that he respected until his death in 1948.

• Relationships and connectedness

Thirdly, Bill George affirms the importance to create and maintain strong relationships with others (2003, p. 40). Thus, according to the author, it implies the ability to be open toward others, and to accept to deliver personal stories. According to Peter Northouse, this openness allows the emergence of a trust between leaders and followers (2013, p. 260). I think it can be explained because of the fact that followers have the feeling to have deep knowledge about the leaders they follow. Moreover, the fact of sharing personal stories leads to a mutual understanding which connects leaders and followers and raises the trust between them.

• Self-discipline and consistency

Fourthly, Bill George emphasizes the importance for authentic leaders to have self-discipline. Indeed, thanks to that, leaders are able to remain focus on their objectives, and thus, to avoid panic in a situation of crisis. Therefore, they can remain consistent with their goals because of self-discipline which provides serenity. Furthermore, as explained by Peter Northouse, self-discipline is also conveyed to followers, and leads them to have a feeling of security (2013, p. 261). Moreover, in my opinion, followers can take a leaf out from leaders’ book. Therefore, they do not give in to panic. According to me, the speech of Georges W. Bush after
9/11 illustrates this self-discipline. Indeed, in his speech, we can observe the former U.S. president in the oval office as usual, not in a bunker as we could expect. Moreover, his words themselves are symbolic of this self-discipline: “The functions of our government continue without interruption. Federal agencies in Washington which had to be evacuated today are reopening for essential personnel tonight and will be open for business tomorrow. Our financial institutions remain strong, and the American economy will be open for business as well” (2001). These words underlie the wish of Georges W. Bush to not give in to panic, and to ensure that Americans do the same.

- Heart and compassion

Finally, Bill Georges notices the necessity for authentic leaders to feel compassion toward others (2003, p. 39). This idea can be related to the importance of being open as developed previously. However, in this case, the objective for leaders is not to share their own stories, but rather to be enough open to receive, listen and understand the stories of followers. The author explains the ability to have compassion thanks to life experiences, which allow leaders to open their heart. This thought is essential in political systems where political leaders act as representatives of an entire nation. As such, they have to joggle with the feelings of others and share their feelings, in order to show compassion, and to bring their heart forward.

Section 4: Do the political leaders have the duty to be authentic?

However, authenticity is not always well received by citizens. A good example is about Nicolas Sarkozy in 2008, when he pronounced these words: “Casse-toi pauvre con!” to an individual who did not accept to shake his hand. These words are translated by Times such as "Get lost, silly bastard" (in March 6th 2008, Lauren Elkin, Huffington Post). It was a complete authentic behavior. However, it shows also the limit of authenticity. By being so authentic, Nicolas Sarkozy gave the image of a person unable to remain calm and accept criticisms. This, goes against the role
of a public figure who musts be representative of a whole population, and therefore also minorities who express their discontents.

Thus, it leads me to wonder whether the political leaders have the right or even the duty to be always authentic.

Today, citizens look for authenticity in political leaders who tend to accept to enlighten this aspect. Indeed, a lot of political leaders show who they are in their professional and private lives, more or less freely, in magazines, newspaper and so on. Personal life-stories of those leaders are constituents of the discussions in the mass media. It seems important for political leaders to show who they are, and for citizens to know who they are, even in their personal lives. For instance, during presidential campaign in United States in 2012, Mitt Romney or Barack Obama, appeared proudly with their families during different political meetings. The objective was certainly to show they share similarities with citizens, that they are “normal”. It is certainly also to convey that they have important interest in family’s value. By the way, even in the website of the White House, there is a photograph of Barack Obama surrounded by his two daughters and his wife, Michelle Obama:

Source: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/first-lady-michelle-obama](http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/first-lady-michelle-obama)

Somehow, this photograph narrates a story of his life, his story as husband as well as father.

In political systems, authenticity would be a guarantor of effectiveness, and a proof that political leaders are human beings like others, and so, to make emerge a trust between political leaders and citizens because citizens can recognize them in those leaders. However, it seems that leaders, especially in political systems, should act authentically, but always in concordance with what expect citizens. It underlies
the fact for political leaders to represent the ideals of political followers, their fantasies about what should be, and how should act political leaders. In this way, it leads them to depict their lives as virtuous lives as much as possible. Rather than simply embody the role of representatives, they usually try to embody the role of models of excellence: with lives without sins, with heart, compassion, empathy, without sinister stories, and so on. However, sometimes, the true comes to the light, with for instance corruption affairs, sexual scandals, alcohol addiction...
Concerning the latter, an example is Boris Yeltsin whose the mischief are many, and appeared several times obviously drunk, like in 1994, in Germany, during an official event where he took the role of the conductor of an official orchestra, and started to make confused movements.

Thus, authenticity, in the deeper nature of this word, can become too extreme, and reveal the genuine personality of leaders. It can lead political leaders to dive in deep darkness, and remove all the legitimacy of their attributes and so, their legitimacy to be leaders. It leads me now to the last chapter of this thesis, devoted to the moral and ethical dimensions.
SUMMARY

I began this chapter by a discussion about the possibility or not to be at the same time a representative of a population and authentic. Then, I introduced different theories about authenticity. I related those theories with the importance for leaders to act as authentic persons by basing my words in particular on the writings of Peter Northouse, Shamir and Eilam. Moreover, I reflected about the notion of authenticity by confronting my point of view with the theory developed by Ladkin and Taylor. Furthermore, I described the concept of authenticity developed by Bill George, because of the relevance of this model according to me. In this way, I then considered the duty for political figures to act as authentic leaders.

This chapter, allowed me to raise the understanding about the importance of the authenticity in political systems, in order to get the trust of citizens.
Chapter 8: Morality & Ethical Dimension

Leadership in political systems underlies the necessity to practice it with ethics and moral. Indeed, the stakes link to the representativeness and to the power present in the hands of political leaders, require their ability to be in concordance with the values expressed by citizens. Thus, in this final chapter, I will introduce the concept of ethical leadership and the reasons explaining the need and even the duty for political leaders to adopt certain values and to act in concordance with them.

The necessity of this chapter results from the importance of the morality and the ethical dimension in political systems, where political leaders who do not respect some values, are directly subjected to the mistrust of citizens. Moreover, it seems essential for political leaders to embody moral values and to be able to convey them toward citizens, with the objective of creating harmony.
As explained by Paschen and Dihsmaier, the word ethics implies a moral understanding, and so, the fact to adopt a moral behavior. Moreover, they define morality as a set of rules present in societies that are considered as internalized by individuals. Thus, it emphasizes the norms accepted and even internalized and shared by individuals in societies.

According to Peter Northouse, the ethics dimension can be defined as a set of principles defining what is morally acceptable in the decision making. It is important to notice the dynamic aspects of morality in terms of time and space. Indeed, what is morally acceptable in a society is unacceptable in another. What was morally acceptable five hundred years ago, is not acceptable nowadays.

So, in this chapter, I will remain focus on political leaders, and describe what ethical leadership means, how it is applied, and determine what the traps in which political leaders can fall are.

Section 1: The ethical leadership

Zhu and al. describes ethical leadership in political systems as the ability of political leaders to consider before all, the moral values, and so the interests of the majority, and the interests of the nation, before the interests of some individuals, the minorities (2014, p. 110). Thanks to those considerations, a trust can emerge between political leaders and citizens. A contrario, Conger and Riggio explain that unethical leaders, put their personal interests before all (2007, p. 153).

Furthermore, as explained by Masciulli, Molchanov and Knight, ethical leadership implies the existence of a bad and good leadership. In this way, they describe bad leadership as the fact to violate human dignity and rights (2009, p. 9). In good leadership, as related by the authors with effective and ethical leadership, leaders pursue certain values such as equality, freedom, justice, human rights and so on. Moreover, they explain that to do so, leaders must embody moral values like honesty, reliability, trustworthiness, fairness (2009, p. 10), in their practice of leadership.
As I explained in the end of the previous chapter, rather than simply be authentic, political leaders must act as examples for citizens. Thus, they have to show that they have a deep morality in their practice of leadership. Because of that, and as described by Zhu and al. they can “elevate public moral awareness” (2014, p. 110). Thus, first of all, ethical leaders have to show their possessions of moral values. Moreover, ethical leadership requires the ability of leaders to incite followers to adopt those moral values. In this way, they adopt a role of “moral’s manager” (2014, p. 111). To implement moral values, ethical leaders would use rewards and punishments, with the objective of making internalized those values by followers.

This idea about the two perspectives of ethical leadership, the possession and the transmission, is also supported by Conger and Riggio, who explain that leaders have on the one hand to behave morally, to show their moral values, and have on the other hand to incite others to adopt a morally behavior, by shaping “ethical contexts” (2007, p. 151).

Section 2: The need to be ethical

2-1) Toxic leadership

The importance for political leaders to behave morally is explained by Conger and Riggio by the fact that they have power, authority and responsibilities (2007, p. 151). Thus, the authors differentiate ethical leadership which can lead to the brightness, with immoral leadership which leads the organization to dive into darkness. As emphasized by Lipman-Blumen, the absence of ethical leadership can lead to the emergence of a toxic leadership (in Timothy Heppell, 2011, p. 243). By the way, Heppell describes toxic leadership as methods having negative impacts on all the individuals who suffer from them. To make clear his thought, Heppell explains that toxic leadership can use as methods: corruption, criminal behavior, sabotage, and so on. Moreover, this concept of toxic leadership leads MacGregor Burns to consider that in a case of absence of morality or ethics in the practice of leadership, leadership does not exist anymore (in Heppell, 2011, p. 243). Furthermore, Conger and Riggio define toxic leaders as individuals having “a lack of integrity, insatiable ambition, avarice, ethical insensitivity, and cowardice” (2007, p. 151).
Therefore, they highlight that the practice of unethical leadership can be explained by a fear of leaders that the organization falls into chaos. It seems paradoxical because this is this fear that leads to the adoption of methods being responsible for the darkness in which sink the organization. Thus, to prevent the organization from the chaos, unethical leaders adopt strict rules destroying creativity and initiatives (2007, p. 153). Moreover, Conger and Riggio consider that the leaders’ greed also explain unethical leadership. Indeed, they consider that the pursuit of selfish interests, leads leaders to not consider and orientate their focus on others’ needs and concerns, but only on their own interests. Furthermore, the search by leaders for omniscience and omnipotence cause the development of an oversized ego, that gives to leaders the feeling that they can do whatever they want, and so, immoral decisions (2007, p. 154).

2-2) The ability to shape ethical context

As I explained, ethical leadership is a two dimensions concept: possession of moral values and ethics, and the ability to transmit those elements to followers. The latter is characterized in the literature by the ability of leaders to shape ethical contexts. Thus, this is not only by showing their possessions of moral values that leaders incite others to internalize ethical behaviors. Indeed, it requires the implementation of reflections and actions that leads to the shaping of ethical contexts. Conger and Riggio consider that to succeed in the implementation of ethical contexts, leaders must first of all, implement defensive strategies with the objective of preventing unethical behaviors. It underlies the creation of policies, which do not tolerate wrongdoings and misbehaviors such as “incivility”, “aggression”, “sexual harassment” and “discrimination” (2007, p. 155). Thus, policies have the objectives to punish all the practices being not in concordance with the values advocated by organizations. Besides, it seems essential to convey the values being in the core of organizations. Thus, ethical leaders should create statements representing the moral commitments of leaders and organizations. Moreover, the fact of making clear the moral values defended in organizations, leads individuals to raise their motivations to work efficiently in organizations, because they are conscious that organizations do not pursue only profits, but also that organizations sanctify and defend values they share. By the way, Kacmar and al. consider that working for an ethical organization represents one of the expectations
of workers (2012, p. 40). It is also true in societies, where citizens want making part of an ethical society, and give responsibilities to political leaders in order to expect from them to act ethically. In organizations, the implementation of moral values implies that the processes of decisions-making must consider and be in concordance with those values. In this way, Kacmar and al. explain that ethical leaders reward behaviors resulting from an understanding and an application of moral values by followers, and punish the misbehaviors (2012, p. 35).

However, the process of decision-making can lead leaders, in organizations as well as in societies, to be confronted to ethical dilemmas.

**Section 3: Ethical dilemmas**

Paschen and Dihmsmaier describe ethical dilemma as the fact for leaders to make decisions representing costs for others. Indeed, in political systems, the existence of different beliefs and wishes leads inevitably to the dissatisfaction of a part of the population, mainly the minorities. Thus, ethical dilemma represents the search for the good, which implies to have bad consequences on others, or at least, on a part of the population. Thus, first of all, political leaders have to be aware of the consequences resulting from ethical dilemmas.

In my opinion, an ethical dilemma characterizes a choice of an individual who have either the possibility to follow his or her moral values; or to neglect them. The choice is made in accordance with a reflection about the consequences, which could flow from the two possibilities. In the two cases, consequences cannot be avoided and will have impacts either directly on the individual who makes the choice, or on others. Indeed, if an individual makes a choice in concordance with his or her own moral values, there will be negative impacts on others. If an individual makes a choice against his or her values, there will be positive impacts on others, but the individual will not be comfortable with his or her set of principles. Thus, it represents a fight between individuals’ values.

Thus, I can apply this idea about ethical dilemma to political systems and by extension to democracies, because of the fact that acting ethically, requires the fact of acting as wished by the majority. However, the fact of acting for the majority, and
so, against the minorities can lead to ethical dilemmas for political leaders, whether the choice of the majority suppose to act against their own moral values. In this way, I wonder why they remain in power. Indeed, the fact of acting against one’s own moral values seems completely unnatural. So, why remaining in power if political leaders are not anymore in concordance with the wishes of the majority? It can be explained by the fact that in every decision ethical dilemmas emerge. Indeed, each citizen has his or her own culture with his or her own set of values. Thus, the fact to make a decision itself leads inexorably to the oppositions of principles between individuals. In political systems, the best solutions, which results from the concept of tyranny of the majority, seems to be the acceptance of the decisions of the larger number of citizens, and so, to neglect others. This idea can be related to the thought of Zhu and al. who explain that political leaders must act with fairness (2014, p. 112). Indeed, the authors explain that if citizens perceive political leaders as ethical, it is because of their feeling that political decisions result from a wish of political leaders to create fairness. Thanks to this feeling, political leaders are perceived as credible. Thus, it would be easier for them to implement a vision well received and accepted by citizens. Moreover, as I explained at the beginning of this chapter, if political leaders are able to prove their sense of morality, it is possible for them to gain the trust of citizens. Indeed, it can be explained by the fact that if political leaders show their moral values and act in concordance with them, it is easier for citizens to predict the future behaviors of political leaders, and thus, to create trust. However, if their actions or words go against those moral values the trust disappears.

**Section 4: The absence of morality**

In this way, I will now give different example of absence of morality, as perceived by citizens, in political leaders’ behaviors. Therefore, I will expose different examples related to two of two sins: lust and greed. This choice results from the unbelievable number of cases tied to these sins, and which are present in political systems.
• Lust:

In political systems the examples of politicians who yield to this sin are many. I think in particular to Bill Clinton and his sexual affair with Monica Lewinsky, in 1998. This affair has shocked the Americans, certainly also because of the perjury of Bill Clinton about it. I think also to Dominique Strauss-Kahn who was sued, among other things, for sexual assault in New York in 2011, for procuring as an organized band in Lille in 2012. While he had serious chances to become President of France in 2012, all these revelations destroyed his image. Finally, another example is Silvio Berlusconi, who had, here again among other things, sexual affair with Karima El Mahroud while she was minor.

All those affairs reflect only personal stories which have no impacts on the abilities of political leaders to run a country. However, even if these events do not call into question the skills of those political leaders as such, it leads citizens to think that those leaders are not able to respect certain moral values.

• Greed:

I think in particular to Jérôme Cahuzac who was sued for tax evasion in 2013, while he was minister for the budget in France. After the revelations, he resigned from his position, and was excluded from socialist party. I think also to the different affairs of corruptions which paced Spain in 2013 and implicated Mariano Rajoy.

All these examples reveal in which traps can fall political leaders. Moreover, it is in particular interesting because of the repudiation which emerges from citizens. It is explained by their feeling that if those political leaders are unable to respect in their private lives, the set of values, which are supposed to characterize democracies, and be respected by individuals, they cannot respect those same values in their position of political leaders. Thus, the trust smashes to pieces.
I began this chapter by introducing the concept of ethical leadership as described by Zhu and al., which emphasize the importance for leaders, and especially political leaders, to embody moral values and to convey them. Moreover, the absence of morality, leads to the emergence of toxic leadership. In this way I defined this concept and described the consequences related to it. Furthermore, with the objective to understand the implementation of ethical leadership, I emphasized the necessity to create ethical context by leaders. Then, because of the oppositions existing within democracies in terms of moral values, I had an interest in the concept of ethical dilemma. Finally, I presented different traps, in which political leaders in particular can fall.

This chapter allowed me to raise the understanding about the stakes tied to the position of political leaders in terms of moral and ethics. Indeed, thanks to these elements, political leaders can gain the trust of citizens, and act in concordance with their expectations.
Conclusion:

The necessity to have a perpetual reflection about political leadership and what flow from it; is in my opinion essential. Indeed, our state of citizens gives us the right, and even the duty to question perpetually the effectiveness of our political systems, and the leadership pacing it. Indeed, the six perspectives present in this thesis are the components allowing me, and certainly others, to have a critical eye on the meaning of leadership in political systems. Because the six perspectives developed in this work represent the components determining the way that we perceive democracies and political systems in general, it was essential to broach them. Indeed, according to me, it is first of all essential to understand deeply, the reasons explaining the emergence of our political systems in order to be able to understand them and criticize them positively or negatively. Moreover, because of the dominance of political parties in our current democracies, it is primordial to understand their nature, the way that they are organized and the way that wills emerge from them. Furthermore, the existence of representatives who embody the wishes and beliefs of all a population implies the necessity to understand their true motivations and their way to use the power they have in their hands. Additionally, a democracy being first of all an entity gathering citizens, it is primordial to have a huge interest in their intentions, in their way to follow, and in their acceptance, or not, to surrender their power to political leaders. Finally, because of the duty of political leaders to handle an important power, it is essential to understand how they are able to prove their honest intentions toward citizens thanks to authenticity and moral values.

This writing is the work of an individual, a citizen, who loves deeply the concept of democracy, and who in the same time foresees its limits. Democracy
allows each of us to express, loud and clear, our wishes, dreads, fears, wills, beliefs, values, liberties, differences... However, the expression of those elements is one thing, take them into account is another thing. Minorities suffer from the concept of democracy. By extension, each of us suffers from it, because even if we make part of a whole, essential for our survival and our happiness, each of us is different. Each of us represents a minority.

What will be the next step? What will be the next form of society, which will surpass our democracies, which will be more efficient, which will be able to satisfy the hopes, wishes, beliefs of an entire population, not only those of a majority? What kind of leadership will be used in those new forms of societies? We cannot answer to those questions now. However, we can and we must, keep critical eyes on our current political systems. Because we are citizens, and because we are human beings endowed with thoughts, we have to keep our eyes and our minds wide open, in the aim of continuing the emergence of reflections, and analyses.
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