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Abstract:
William Golding’s perception of democratic leadership promotion versus dictatorial one for sustainable development has been challenged through times. This relaunches the debate about ideal political leadership for development, in spite of several reforms or changes yet shown successful. The purpose of this analysis is to get inspiration from the writer’s limited view on the issue to demonstrate that sustainable development is rather a matter of good leadership adapted to socio-political, cultural, scientific and economic contexts of societies than that of only well-built democracy versus totalitarianism. Psycho-analytical and historicist approaches have enlightened this study for which it is expected a new form of contextualised and ideal leadership, shaped for the true sustainable development of all the countries of the world.
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Résumé :
Le point de vue de William Golding sur la promotion d’un leadership démocratique contre celui dictatorial pour le développement durable a été défié par l’usure du temps. Ceci relance le débat au sujet d’un leadership politique idéal et favorable à ce développement, malgré plusieurs réformes ou changements pourtant démontrés réussis. L’objectif de cette analyse est de partir de la compréhension limitée de l’auteur sur la question pour montrer que le développement durable est plutôt une affaire d’un leadership adapté aux contextes socio-politiques, culturels, scientifiques et économiques des sociétés que celle seulement d’une démocratie bien établie contre le totalitarisme. Les approches psycho-analytique et historiciste ont orienté cette réflexion dont on attend une nouvelle forme contextualisée et idéale de leadership élaborée pour le vrai développement durable des pays et du monde.
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1. Introduction

A rule of power in a context of a well organised governance system is a matter of competition to check who is able to convince a larger number of people who accept and defend the ruling methods of the leader. One often struggles for power that is gained, but not given, truly. This sends to the concept of leadership to which is associated management for a successful governance system. Leadership consists in “influencing people to follow one’s vision” (Maxwell 1998). There may be political, social, cultural, economic leadership, etc. Leadership and management, without meaning the same, are closely linked and complementary in social and political governance. Management, then means “maintaining systems and processes of an organisation to achieve a vision” (Ibid.). Political leadership is the main issue in Lord of the Flies by William Golding, sustained by certain aspects of social governance.

In fact, the writer features two boys: Jack and Ralph who compete to gain confidence and support of the other boys to become their leaders. Each of the protagonists influences the group to accept his ideas in terms of organization and management to live or survive in the new social entity they have built. By describing the strategies and methods used by these young leaders to promote their modes of governance and management, the writer is putting a stress on the close link between the forms of leadership, governance and management of each of them; which may comfort or betray people’s true roles in the running of power, through an actual or betrayed democracy.

The purpose of this study is not only to analyse the writer’s perception on the above-mentioned issues, but also to share a critical analysis on different systems of political rule, in terms of norms, strategies, behaviour’s and actions within the novel, and throughout social realities in the United Kingdom and in the world, yesterday and today. For this target, and with a qualitative approach, I have used New Historicist and Psychoanalytic Criticism to shed light on historical and psycho-sociological dimensions of the novelist’s view on dictatorship and democracy, as well as political leadership, in real life, yesterday and today. Information from novels essays journals, newspapers and articles have helped this analysis.

This analytical contribution to English literature and British social and political studies covers strengths and flaws of William Golding’s perception on dictatorial and democratic political leadership, as well as all the dimensions of British and others social and political strategies, actions, minds ideologies to be reoriented to an ideal political leadership favourable to sustainable development. In the same vein, I have divided this work into two chapters. The first has shown writers’ views on political leadership, management and governance, including William Golding’s. The second has demonstrated the strengths and flaws of the novelist’s perception compared with other social and political views, theories and practices of a good political leadership favourable to sustainable development.
2. Some Writers’ Perception of Political Leadership

2.1 Understanding Leadership in Relation with Governance and Management

Many past literary theorists have discussed the issue of leadership in relation with governance and management. However, they have failed in putting a large focus on the competitive aspects as has further depicted Golding in his book. Lord et al. (2009) studied the relationship between leadership and governance in terms of: “leadership and governance are reciprocally connected”. This means that they are interrelatively linked. These critics have shown that, “strong leadership” paths the way to “effective governance” by taking the needs of all the citizens as a priority. Governance is then a matter of a collective work to build, promote, protect and defend general interests. They also insisted on the fact that well-set governance systems provide strategic directions for leaders, help them to foster commitment, shared aims and to associate people to the mission. (Ibid.).

Tony Blair (2001), one of the British former Prime Minister and a leader of the Labour Party, has underlined the importance of leadership for governance. This is the reason why, in a number of his speeches, he made clear that “leadership was central to public service delivery and where successful leadership could not be found in the public sector then the government would look to the private or voluntary sectors irrespective of the policy area in question”.

In other words, rules of leadership were originally set for the ruling of State or public institutions; and as such, when we fail in it, it is the collapse of all social and political institutions ruling. Tony Blair thinks that in such a situation, it is better the private sector takes the leading. However, mention should be made that it is the responsibility of the public sector to rule, control and regulate the private institutions. It is the reason why State leadership should demonstrate best models to show ways to private institutions and individuals.

In 2001, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) carried out a research which led to the conclusion that “leadership is the flesh on the bones of the Constitution” and therefore it “is at the heart of good governance.” This means that constitution, which is the cornerstone of a governing system, cannot operate without leadership. Leadership is even compared with the flesh without which bones cannot stand and maintain human bodies. It is also shown to be the heart of good governance; the heart as a central organ of life in human body. Truly, no governance system cannot exist and operate without a well-set system of political leadership.

In governance and management, leadership is not a matter of game. Israelmore (2021) puts a stress on the fact that “leaders say « no » to corruption” and he reminds that “anyone playing a role in governance, and is not ready to do this is not a leader.” It means that leadership requires leaders to be models in matters of governance and management. In one of their research works, Afegbua et al. (2012) concluded that no one can deny “the fact that the quest for leadership is an undeniable fact in human history, especially in matters relating to management” and “the success or otherwise of any country depends on the effectiveness or otherwise of its leaders”.
In spite of all those explanatory, argumentative and critical views on leadership as determining in governance, bad governance with corruption and their corollaries still disturb and undermine yet well set and ideal systems of leadership. This simply means that a successful political leadership or management does not necessarily imply a successful political governance for political, social, cultural, scientific and economic sustainable development. This process rather needs to add political morality rooted in social justice, equity, hard work, and sense of accountability, patriotism and responsibility.

Even in Lord of the Flies (2009), well set political norms, institutions, procedures and ideologies have been turned into dictatorship by Jack against an attempt of an ideal democracy by Ralph. This means that no democracy is absolutely perfect nor satisfying in practice. People’s representation or exercise of rights and duties is subject to debates. The morality of the majority rule before the minority, makes admit that the principle of the rule of power by the people, in democracy, is still restricted, and needs to be improved for people’s interests. Richard Vernon further explained these inequalities: “But all the same, no democracy, however ideal, can hope to accommodate differences entirely… Maybe everyone will lose some of the time; and those who are defeated will have to endure policies which they regard as morally deficient”. Democracy goes with multiparty. Unfortunately, all the parties don’t have the same rights and duties in taking part in the ruling of the system. Most of the time, corruption, social injustice and other unjust behaviours make them betray the principles of leadership, management and genuine democracy favourable to sustainable development.

In Animal Farm (2010), a corruptive absolute power has made Napoleon broken democratic principles and ideologies, officially established, that has been turned into a totalitarian regime against the will and ideals of the majority group or of the other citizens. In A Man of the People (1977) the corrupted leader, Chief Nanga with his political team, have erected corruption and the embezzlement of public funds into a system against a good governance rule, in spite of well officially set leadership and management systems. A successful political leadership is not, then a matter of well-built political leadership and management, it is rather of people’s minds and behaviours accepting the principles and ideologies of truly democratic management and leadership for sustainable development. Corruption has also sustained Big Brother’s dictatorial regime, betraying actual democracy, in Nineteen Eighty Four. Corrupted political morality has led Marcus Brutus to the fatal and tragic betrayal of his family for the interests of his political group.

For Wole Soyinka, in The Lion and the Jewell (1998) fight against corruption and social discrimination, should not be a game with songs and incantations, it is a matter of brave decisions and actions against discriminations, injustice and corruption. For Laure Clemence Capo-chichi Zanou, in her Corruption in selected African Novels (2012), some African novels: A Man of the People (Achebe 1966), The Beautiful Ones Are Not Yet Born (Armah 1968), No Longer at Ease (Achebe 1960) and Fragments (Armah 1970), have all shown that corruption, social injustice and political betrayal have made democratic management and leadership fail in Africa against political success for sustainable development (Capo-Chichi Zanou 2012).
In Benin Republic l’Autorité Nationale de Lutte Contre la Corruption has edited and started sensitizing people with the law No 2011-20 of October, 12th, 2011 (ANLC, 2011). Corruption, social injustice, other evils of political immorality are then omnipresent realities. They exist in Italy, in Ghana, in Nigeria, in Benin Republic, in the United Kingdom and elsewhere. It is confirmed by this sentence by Simon Leys in Orwell ou L’horreur de la Politique: « La scène du livre est située en Angleterre pour souligner le fait que les populations de langue anglaise ne sont pas meilleures que les autres et que, si on ne le combat pas, le totalitarisme peut triompher n’importe où. » (49). This means that corruption can affect developed, underdeveloped or developing countries in contexts of totalitarianism or authoritarian democracies favourable to those misdoings.

To fight more effectively against corruption and terrorist penalties and criminalities, a special court was created in July and started working in September 2018. This court helps to reduce considerably, evils of corruption, and economic crimes in the country. Despite all those critical or analytical contributions to successful political leadership for sustainable development, beyond William Golding’s perception, many other and diverse approaches have shown that it is not only a matter of well-set political leadership and management but also of people’s minds, behaviours accepting the principles and ideologies of good governance, leadership and management, out of social and political evils of corruption and immoral actions and behaviours. Nevertheless, let’s revisit all the social, political and psychological dimensions of the writer’s view about political leadership and management, in the novel.

1.2. Political Leadership as Depicted in the Novel

Authoritarianism and democratic leaderships have been shown in the novel. Authoritarian leadership refers to a process of governance in which an omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent like leader rules a society from a higher and single decision making centre. His or her ideas, words, actions and decisions are undebatable or improvable. System allows such a leader to decide on the behalf of his or her society, to impose them his or her will, and to orient them as he or she thinks or wants. The other citizens undergo authoritarian leadership without contribution. Punishment initiatives and prerogatives are held by the leader of this system. Jack’s authoritarian ideas, actions and behaviours have been pointed out. He has self-appointed leader of his society, and has set up his authoritarian, dictatorial, autocratic, tyrannic, Nazis, despotic, absolute and totalitarian systems and styles of governance. The writer has compared Jack’s leading styles to some Adolf Hitler’s tendencies in ruling naziist Germany before and during the World War II. Like Hitler, Jack has been shown as driven by blinding evil forces for a negative ruling of power and lust for blood.

With the rise and under the influence of Jack’s governance, the boys, on the island, moved further away from the rule of law, but rather deeply rooted in one-man’s law and emotive governance. Jack has used authority in arbitrary and unfair ways and no established democratic rules govern his behaviours. His detainment of boys on the island illustrates this point. Under his ruling influence, Wilfred has been tied and beaten without any evidence of guilt (Golding 186).
More than this, the writer has selected words, phrases and sentences, to show the similarities of the regime he has described with the terrifying, troublesome, horrible and totalitarian traits of absolute, wars and atrocities of political regimes in 1940s. Some aspects of the novel show this: “If we take Ralph’s remark about ‘the darkness of man’s heart’ as coming very close to the subject of the book, it is worth just remembering that different from Ballantyne’s, one which had seen within twenty years, the systemic destruction of the Jewish race.” (Ibid. iv). This refers to the World War in 1945, with the images of the mushroom cloud of the atomic bomb with its effects on our political and moral thinking.

This explicitly shows that the satirical orientation of the novel puts a focus on totalitarian ideologies and practices of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin; which promotes the negation of human and socio-political rights and duties. The writer is then satirising those political regimes or evils that surprisingly claim to fight to establish democracy, and launches a call to people who should work to move from those false democracies that totalitarianism wants to establish or to reach the actual democracy that he wants for the sustainable development of the society.

A plea for a human, realistic and intelligible democracy for development against the atrocities of totalitarian regimes is also that of the writer in this book. This is well explained, in other words: “Golding’s experience in World War II had motivated him to find out the real reasons behind this destructive war. Golding suggests that one of the main reasons of this war is the rise of many dictators” (Deyab 76). He believes that the novel depicts annihilating dangers of dictatorial rule. This is also considered as a fictional plea for people to live under democracy than under dictatorship (Ibid.).

He has even taken an active part in the war, serving in the Royal Navy as a commander of a rocket-lanucher and having participated in the invasion of Normandy during the war. (Loc. Cit.). In these missions, William ordered the destruction of German ships and submarines and he killed German troops from sea during the D-Day landings. (Loc. Cit.). It is then obvious that those nightmarish situations and missions made Golding despise totalitarian regimes for true democracies helpful to human beings. Indeed, this plea and defence for true democracy by the writer derives from his personal contribution to the war during which he witnessed awesome and troublesome events provoked under totalitarianism.

Two systems of governance are set in the novel inspired with the writer’s personal experiences in an orientative vain of a roman fleuve. are the main characteristics and features of totalitarian regimes, and those of suggested ideal democracies facilitating development. Jack’s dictatorial leadership is opposed to democratic leadership headed by Ralph. In fact, the writer has shown Jack setting a totalitarian system in the ruling process of the boys’ community. Unilateral decisions have been made. Freedom of speech has been strictly restricted. Intimidating, humiliating and insulting strategies have been used, as well as verbal or physical aggressive behaviours and practices, side by side with forceless democratic trials. Horrible, terrible, nightmarish, sad and darkest aspects dictatorship versus democracy have been shown satirically by the writer in the novel: “As Jack gradually loses his name so that at the end of the novel, he is simply the Chief…” (Ibid. Viii) Dictators like the showing off of their titles against their role of good leaders and coaches.
Very proud of their titles, dictators change their names into myths to be respected. The sadness of this socio-political context and social differences between the boys of this system have been shown through: “My dad’s dead”, he said quickly, “and my mum...”, Piggy said. Death to death, killing to killing, is the main characteristic of this political system set by Jack. Seeing blood and killing are a game for him: “Jacks describes his first kill … I cut the pig’s throat...” (Loc. Cit.). This sense of sadism is shown to be proper to dictators who play happily with the sufferings of poor and weak people.

Totalitarian images recall the horrors of the WWII: “…Didn’t you hear what the pilot said? They’re all dead.” (Ibid. 20).

Feelings of disasters and chaos are shown dominant with: “Indeed, the weight was already pulling a lump from the poor soil and soon it would fall.” In spite of the social conditions of the boys, running towards dangers, the preoccupation of Jack is to get Chief: “I ought to be chief, said Jack with arrogance.” (29). But the population don’t share his will; they rather prefer Ralph through their votes which made Ralph chief, with applause with the disappearance of flecks on Jack’s face under a blush of mortification (30). Jack didn’t accept the people’s choice for Ralph. “We don’t want you”, said Jack, flatly (...). “There was a general dispersal.” (32).

Jack has missed legitimacy from his people. The votes of the people haven’t confirmed his authority. They preferred Ralph. Jack is arrogant. He likes bloodshed. He behaves as a dictator. He likes chaos and war conditions. People’s rights and duties are not his preoccupations.

Ralph is a democrat. He consults his people before taking any decision. This idea is shared by the assembly’s intelligence: “Let’s have vote” - “Yes!” - “Vote for chief” - “Let’s vote” (30).

In the same vein of the process, the assembly asked Ralph to be their chief: “Ralph! Ralph!” . “Let’s him be chief with the trumpet-thing”. (Loc. Cit.). In the same process, Ralph raised his hand, and every hand outside the group was raised, even the hesitating hand of Piggy was added. (Loc. Cit.). “Ralph counted. I’m chief then”. (Loc. Cit.).

These are illustrations of a successful democratic election of Ralph against a failed auto-claiming chief by Jack. This caricaturing of democratic rule desired by the legitimate people over a unilateral totalitarian governance relaunches the debate about qualities, conditions, situations, norms of democratic systems versus totalitarian regimes. These focal aspects of the writer’s fictional perception covers a part of political leadership demands, but the actual qualities of leaders, the main characteristics of good governance for sustainable development are still to be examined through times and contexts to better appreciate the success of democracies over dictatorial regimes for peoples’ development. Golding’s perception of the two categories of regimes is more fictional and utopian than realistic. Many flaws have been connected to his view of totalitarian and democratic regimes. He has limited his understanding of leadership, governance and management to some behaviours of Jack and Ralph without further explaining the principles, ideologies, institutions and practices of governance directed to the strategies and rules of sustainable development. A critical analysis of William’s perception with the help of
other writers or theorists, is required for new and realistic perspectives for a successful political governance.

3. Political Leadership Understood beyond the Writer’s Perception

3.1 Political Leadership, and Ideological, Institutional and Constitutional Organisations

Leadership, management and governance are transversal to totalitarian and democratic regimes. In fact, a leadership system is a set of constitutions, laws or other rules, procedures, ideologies, practices and qualities according to which goals are put and missions assigned for the achievement of specific results. The characteristics or colours of political regimes then depend on the handling of the above-mentioned political concepts either for the interests of a person, a small group or of the whole people. Leadership refers to the actions, behaviours and qualities of a leader. He may be the conductor of a social, scientific, economic, technical, cultural and political team in the name of the other populations and for their welfare, development and general interests. According to John C. Maxwell (1999), a leader should show twenty-one indispensable qualities: character, charisma, commitment, communication, competence, courage, discernment, focus, generosity, initiative, listening, passion, positive attitude problem solving, relationships, responsibility, security, self-discipline, servanthood, teachability and vision. Taking into account all these qualities of a leader, becoming a good leader is demanding to satisfy people’s interests. It is sacerdotal and self-sacrifices imposing for altruism. Among all the other qualities, a good leader is mainly a charismatic, committed, brave, altruist, self-disciplined, positive and competent person.

A good leader holds a vision, directed to a specific objective for determined results profitable to the whole society. His vision is connected to a precise ideology sustained by principles, strategies and actions that he shares with other persons, managers, helping him in the process.

So, leaders and managers are closely interrelated for the achievement of a common goal. The leaders give the leading directives to the managers who adapt them to their activities, conditions and contexts for the single purpose of secured and sustainable development of societies. Managers, on line with the leader’s orientations set different agents or workers into teams for working fitting the desiderata, the vision and the objective of the leader, in link with the governance rules and procedures: “True leaders move their organizations forward in a positive direction” (Stout 37). Six key competencies are connected to the three primary functions of a leader: The philosophy or ideology is drawn from their vision and values; their personal traits for problem solving and decision-making from their wisdom and courage; and their interpersonal attributes of working with others from their trust and voice. (Ibid.). They are summed up into leadership capital necessary to achieve Ideal Leadership Model to avoid an anti-leadership and managerial approaches.

“Leadership implies change and initiating change”, whereas management makes maintain the organisation, keep it run well. Leaders help to make change and to go
beyond the status quo. (Ibid. 39). A leader is then a visionary, a progressist, a revolutionary or positive change maker, through laws, procedures, institutions, strategies and actions. He is helped by a manager, most of the time, an executive worker sharing the vision of the leader, and who is able to make agents and other workers adapted to the vision of the leader, all working in the same direction, for the same objectives and expected results.

A certain number of conditions are required to make leadership accepted by the followers and to make it successful. Any forceful change without the will of the other people is authoritarian and betrays one of the conditions of good leadership. It is difficult for people to accept a change without enjoying the benefit of this revolution. These conditions should make the right person be at the right place, at the right time, doing the right thing with the right people to truly impact a change. (Ibid. 40, 42). A good leader can easily become a good manager, but it is difficult for a manager to become a good leader, if he does not originally show competences, capacities and aptitudes for. Showing Jack and Ralph in the mirror of these details on leadership, William is still very far behind in convincing us that Jack and Ralph are good leaders nor Ralph is a better democratic leader than Jack who is rather shown as a dictator.

With those conditions and principles of good leadership and management, any political leader just have to follow then to rule the society in the interests of the people, making them sharing the sacrifices and the benefits with their will, in discipline not against their will nor with anarchy from them, out of their single and common vision. The vision of a leader is inspired by a philosophy set in an ideology. Ideological orientation, in a political system, is a key to other political, social, economic and scientific agreements and actions of political leaders. Ideology has been shown the cornerstone of most of political national and international competitions. In Homage to Catalonia (Orwell 1938), the Spanish Civil War has been demonstrated as highly political and mainly ideological armed conflict to save Spain from the danger of Nazism and Fascism for democracy and free world: “Nazi leaders and feudalists wanted to protect their ideology and natural resources in Spain by supporting Franco’s movement whereas the Western allies wanted to stop that Nazism and promote democracy, a free world and their natural resources by supporting the national militia.” (Dansou 227). Political governance, rooted in a well set ideology, is exercised in a defined framework of institutional, constitutional and legal settings.

As a matter of fact, a political system whether dictatorial or democratic, is ruled through a system of the hierarchy of norms, through well-defined institutions and procedures. The top and fundamental principle of this system is its constitution. The other laws are made in connection with the ideology and philosophy of this constitution of the system. The constitutional structure regulates leaders and common citizens’ rights and duties in link with their behaviours and actions in societies. Laws organise and regulate socio-political dimensions in specific sectors or subsectors. They are generally made by assemblies or peoples as well as constitution through specific procedures. Decrees are taken by the Head of a State or the government or ministers of a government. Other decisions are made by decentralised or devolved institutions in the single vein of
the national or international ideology and laws organising and guiding political systems, whether they are dictatorial or democratic.

Dictatorial or totalitarian regimes, generally have a central centre of analysis and decisions, in connection with dependent regional, sub regional and local executives. In this context, a powerful leader is the only one deciding on the behalf of the others, for or against their will, rights and duties. It is often a one-man system, supported by a very close team for decisions making. Democratic regimes, are multi-party systems, with the executive, legislative and judiciary powers, theoretically involved in decisions making and in the ruling of the system. Administrative and staff organisation depend on the structuring of the central and decentralised or devolved structures of the branches of power in democracies and divisions and subdivisions of service in totalitarianism.

Above William Golding’s perception, political leadership is shown not to be the only condition to a successful governance. Democracy is neither a panacea to good governance favourable to sustainable development. Once the concept set and principles made, the other thing is to respect them and make them respected strictly through minds, behaviours and actions facilitating the sustainable development of people and societies. No regime is fixed; it depends on the practice made of it. Totalitarianism can be changed into democracy, if minds, behaviours and actions of leaders and common citizens go in the same way as rules and authorised behaviours and actions. Democracies can also be turned into dictatorial regimes, if leaders and common citizens’ minds, behaviours and actions betray rules and authorised actions. Contrary to the writer’s perception, democratic political leadership versus totalitarianism is not then sufficient to achieve peoples’ sustainable development. A true exercise of power by people or by the representatives of people, taking into account peoples’ rights and duties, for the whole people’s socio-political and economic development can give the true and contextual meaning of political leadership under totalitarianism or under democracy.

3.2 Challenges and New Perspectives for Political Leadership or Governance favourable to the Sustainable Development of Societies
Political leadership is a transversal and changing concept throughout governance systems. We may have many forms of leadership in both totalitarianism and in democracy. Leadership is a set of abilities, aptitudes, competences and other values of a person or a group of people who administer, guide, conduct or coach another person or gatherings of other people to their success and development. For a governance system to be legitimate, it should be from true people’s will, with a legitimate constitution. “A legitimate constitution usually allows a State to establish a stable framework for a peaceful coexistence of its citizens.” (Kuhnelt 1).

In a tyranny, the leader can show exaggeration in his or her leader style till ill treatments, bloody and fatal manifestations or actions against established norms and people’s interests. Tyrannical regimes likely show the same leadership as absolutism, despotism and totalitarianism. All of them are dictatorial political systems with varied levels of iron discipline. Political leadership here may be said tyrannical, absolute, despotic or totalitarian. In such a context, political crises or violence can appear as a
response to totalitarianism, and constitute another challenge to a good and legitimate political leadership: “Political violence in the form of wars, insurgencies, terrorism, and violent rebellion constitutes a major human challenge today as it has so often in the past. It is a challenge not only to life and limb, but also to morality itself.”.

An ideal political leadership, in illegitimate totalitarian contexts is debatable, and may be good for the leaders and bad for the losers in these regimes. The ones may justify that these systems of iron discipline have help them make people work in order to truly develop their societies, out of anarchy. The others, the governed may see them as systems against peoples’ interests for the ones of a single person or of a small group of illegitimate leaders.

A populist tendency may sustain that tolerable leadership is required to respect people rights and duties; and by this, they may favour a governance system deeply rooted in anarchy, betraying the true meaning of leadership turned into disorders, destructions and anti-development practices. Franco’s ruling system, in Spain, with its negative effects of the Spanish Civil War have illustrated this largely flexible and insecurity producing leadership.

A well organised democratic leadership can help the promotion of people’s rights and duties for development. However, a democratic rule can be turned into totalitarianism if strict attention is not accorded to the principles of ideal and legitimate democracy for peoples’ interests. People’s interests can be considered as the general will expressed though Jean Jacques Rousseau’s social and political contract in which democracy is still challenged by dictatorship against peoples. The main difficulty seems to arise from the fact that Rousseau was definitely not an integrated personality; the democratic elements of his minds could not form a harmonious structure (Barbu 56).

British political system has moved from absolute monarchy to constitutional monarchy rooted in an approach of flexibility in customs, constitution and laws, with suitable reforms adapted to development and sustainable policies. Arguments, rules and practices, in times, have then shown that William Golding’s fictional perception have been less convincing about ideal leadership of which many other views and practices have demonstrated the right orientations. Whatever the forms ideal leadership should functioned in the framework of a well organised and disciplined social and political system, run for the general interests of all. Many examples have shown that political regimes, in the world, are very far from the reaching of this objective. Some totalitarian regimes set exaggerated rigour and discipline which destroy people’s rights and duties. Even certain democratic regimes have become totalitarian democracies because of the breach of laws and procedures of leaders and citizens. It is then understood that leadership alone cannot achieve the sustainable development of a country. Adapting it to specific principles, actions, minds and behaviours of system, of people and societies constitutes the major challenge to take. The sense of justice and morality should be the cornerstone, above the theoretical structure of democracy which is sometimes challenged by social, political and sociological contexts and practices. “The British constitution has harmoniously blended within itself the three somewhat incongruous features of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy.” (Vishnoo et al. 16).
All strategies, and wishes are first of all utopian. But, when the minds connect leadership to contextualised behaviours and actions in the vein of principles and ideologies, it can help to achieve the sustainable development of regimes and peoples. A successful political leadership is not a matter of democracy against dictatorship, it is rather that of which leaders make the best options of strategies, ideologies, principles, actions and minds adapted to the cultural, economic, social, psychological, sociological, national and international realities of these peoples.

Power abuse, in even well organised democracies, is another challenge. Corruption against people’s interests for the benefit of a small group is another evil in democratic political regimes. Cheating and betraying principles and peoples constitute other phenomena. People’s representation systems are still affected by difficulties. Sometimes, elected people betrayed their electors, and the representation modes and process are not fair. Laxism sometimes paves the way to direct or indirect anarchy, to upheavals and wars. Social discriminations, favoured by the non-respect of principles and political agreements, are other challenging realities of political leadership. Political leadership, seen in terms of democracy to fight against dictatorship for the sustainable development of countries, is still subject to debate, and the analysis should go beyond the carrying out of an ideal or perfect political regimes, to rather take into consideration the minds, the behaviours, actions and the social values of leaders and common citizens in accepting to play their part in terms of rights and duties in a contextualised leadership oriented to demands of traditional and modern values favourable to sustainable development.

The separation of powers in liberal democracies is another challenge. In British context, the power of the Monarch is limited, with the principle of the Magna Carta; and shared with other institutions of the system: the Cabinet is headed by the Prime Minister, with the Legislative and the Judiciary. This has even been reinforced with the separation of powers in British democracy. In spite of these guarantees, problems still exist in the process of achieving ideal and perfect democracy accepted by all. There are “problems of apathy, ignorance and volatility; of contest between different publics, or between majority opinion and minority rights”. (Cole 39). Democracy is still a paradox; which results “from two socio-psychological processes necessarily involved in the democratisation of a community. Democracy requires the crystallisation of the group of individuals in a common pattern of life. But democracy requires also that the common pattern of life should be flexible enough to be adjusted to the world of each individual member of the group.” (Barbu 42).

Psycho-sociological or socio-psychological dimensions of people and societies are to be taken into consideration in their evolution, as well as their capacities to adapt themselves to social, cultural scientific and economic changes for sustainable development. Democracy is then a matter of flexibility and adaptation for success. Political leadership in authoritarian or democratic regimes, is also a matter of evolution taking into account social and individual interests through psycho-sociological changes of time.

In terms of perspectives, political leadership is more behaviourist, mind shaping and pragmatic matters than theoretical or talkative. Political leadership results from
many other forms of social leadership. Self-control participates in psychological and behavioural leadership. Leading oneself is also a process of shaping one’s mind towards the vision of the leader. It consists in orienting the leader’s actions and behaviours towards the vision maintaining objectives for the success of the mission. The leader’s personality is then very important for the development and success of leadership. His or her courage, wisdom, intelligence, determination and competence favour his or her reaching of expected results. This individual leadership becomes attracting and a model to collective leadership.

Collective leadership should be understood by the combination of social, political, scientific, cultural and economic leadership. Leading a social group requires a leading vision with precise objectives for expected results. ‘Polis’, from Greek, and meaning the city or society, political leadership also meaning the leading system and procedures in which a vision and practices of social organisation and ruling are implemented for expected results. Scientific leadership connects scientific leading methods and vision to social and political leadership for development. Cultural leadership refers to cultural vision, methods and practices implementation for social and political leading success.

Political leadership is then a multi-dimensional, integral and diversified leading process and practices, rooted in a strong vision and adapted strategies and practices to reach the expected results. Managing and leading are interrelated for the well organisation and ruling of people and societies. Political leadership should change totalitarian regimes not only into democratic regimes but also into a legitimate democratic leadership in which the interests of all the citizens will be developed and protected for welfare and sustainable development. Italy, Germany, France, Spain, China, Japan and others, have been affected by totalitarianism. Today, some of them practise well set and adapted democracies. However, they are still working for the sustainable development of their systems.

Sustainable development does not then depend on the form of neither political regime nor a classical political leadership only. It depends on a system of leadership regulating very well, the rights and duties of common citizens and of leaders in the single vein of hard working for success and development. This form of leadership should take into consideration the intrinsic and extrinsic values and skills of social and political rulers. Sense of management and leadership through social and political governance system is required to operate social and political changes ahead for sustainable development. Contrary to William Golding’s perception, the sustainable development does not depend on democracy versus totalitarianism, vice versa; it rather depends on people’s ability to use their minds, behaviours and practices in the direction of the development of individuals and societies for general interests.

4. Conclusion

It is relevant for William Golding to raise the debate of political leadership in his novel. But the scope of the issue is larger than what he has explained in his book. Before and during his times, many other challenges of his approach of leadership have been
demonstrated in their various diversities. Totalitarianism is the evil the world has fought and is still fighting against for human and peoples’ rights and duties and for sustainable development; hence a plea for democracy versus dictatorship. A totalitarian Jack has been shown with his dictatorial features versus a democrat Ralph, in his recommended qualities.

In spite of this, the problem of leadership and sustainable development is not only that of a preferred political regime, it is rather more than that of adapted and contextualised leadership oriented to a vision and to objectives benefiting from conditions favourable to individual and peoples’ development. Even good leadership only cannot achieve sustainable development. It should be helped with people’s minds, behaviours and practices accepting the vision, the objectives and expected results of the leader. This should be shown through the ideological, constitutional, legal and institutional organisation and ruling of social, political, cultural, scientific, psychological and sociological communities. In British democracy, “the monarch still retains a theoretical right to reject legislation passed by parliament.” (Evans 5). Leadership in a governance of parliament through a real exercise of power by the people is still debatable and a matter of sociological, social and political contexts.

Leadership is then a transversal ability and process to governance and political regimes, and its positive results depend on the skills of the leader in ruling the systems associating other people, in discipline, for the general interests of all. The problematic of good leadership for sustainable development is still subjected to the world’s evolution and the effects of times changes. Realistic leadership is then recommended to reach the sustainable development of each country and for that of the whole world.
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