THE IMPORTANCE OF MORAL LEADERSHIP WITHIN TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE

Abstract

Conflicts, division and human rights violations have always been part of our lives in the world we live in. Every generation experience challenging times, especially those generations who live in transitional systems. The reality is sad, but not hopeless; we can all agree that peace and justice are needed. This article shows that by electing moral leaders, people can make a powerful interaction with each other and achieve many good things together. Through a theoretical approach of transformational leadership, the authors present a new way of thinking in solving the systematic problems and co-creating a better future. It is suggested that it would be very beneficial on the path towards the democratization of the country and achieving peace for leaders and people to reflect on the conditions of reconciliation. In this article, the authors emphasized that transitional justice measures are more likely to succeed in a system that has a leader who owns strong democratic inclinations. Also, fundamental reforms in critical sectors of governance such as the judiciary, parliament, security, electoral process and other public services are required. International support can also help in achieving the needed democratic goals.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This article examines the importance of moral leadership within transitional justice, which is also a central research question. It contains four related topics with many arguments that support the claims. The article begins with a theoretical approach of a transformational theory which explains leadership as a process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower. In this process, both sides create an interaction which is the essence of social and political relationship that can truly help in
the process of democratization of the transitional country. Then, it is explained the concept of transitional justice and the role of moral leaders in the process of democratization. The authors, also add that international norms from cases of transitional justice field help to frame the domestic approaches and they are also welcome on the path towards democratization.

This article ends with a brief evaluation of J.F Kennedy’s record as a moral transformational leader on the issue of protecting human rights in times when the American transitional society experienced systematic challenges. JFK is given as an example of a transformational leader who confirms the importance of moral leadership in the process of democratization and seeking justice.

Then and now, many cases indicate that the United States remain a nation in transition because many extremist and racist groups such as Ku Klux Klan, White nationalist, Black nationalist and others exist in that strongly divided society. Yuvraj Joshi¹ thinks that laws concerning affirmative action, school desegregation, voting rights and disparate impact are part of America’s racial transition. According to him, other factors are specific to the US, such as belief in American racial exceptionalism. The country is exempted from political and legal considerations applied to other transitional societies, despite its centuries-long struggle with sponsored racial violence which is a never-ending story. The fact that Kennedy’s goals on justice and peace are not established yet it provides room for the US to become a country case study within the field of Transitional Justice (TJ) even though it is still not part of the discipline. Authors like Yuvraj Joshi and many others identify it and emphasize that racial structural segregation and discrimination in the United States and the rest of the world require an additional engagement in the field of TJ.

II. INTERACTION BETWEEN LEADERS AND THE PEOPLE (THEORETICAL APPROACH)

Through the years, leadership has been defined and conceptualized in many ways. The component common to nearly all classifications is that leadership is an influence process that assists groups of individuals toward goal attainment. Peter Northouse in his book “Leadership: Theory and Practice” emphasized that leadership is defined as a process whereby an individual influence a group of individuals to achieve a common goal. Because both leaders and followers are part of the leadership process, it is important to address issues that confront followers as well as issues that confront leaders. Leaders and people should be understood concerning each other.

This theoretical approach is known as transformational and thus those who motivate and inspire people and who also have or had ethical and moral standards are called transformational leaders. The transformational theory explains leadership as a process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower. This type of leader is attentive to the needs and motives of followers and tries to help followers reach their fullest potential. Back in the past, Mohandas Gandhi is a classic example of a transformational leader. He raised the hopes and demands of millions of his people, and in the process, was changed himself. Other good examples are Kennedys (both John and Robert), Martin Luther King with famous “I Have a Dream” speech, Nelson Mandela and many others. This, one of the most encompassing approaches to leadership is concerned with the process of how certain

leaders can inspire followers to accomplish great things and have also emerged from the writings of Burns and Bass and other representative works of Bennis and Nanus in 1985 and Kouzes and Posner two years later.

Interaction of leaders and the people is the essence of social and political relationships that can help in the process of democratization. As such, it partakes of the responses to each of the preceding queries of the template of leadership. This question, it will be recalled, ferrets out the dynamics of the expected relationships of leaders and the people. Also, it reveals much about the complexities posed by the seemingly simple assertion of popular sovereignty. Leadership, as historian Edmund S. Morgan has told us, is a new model of social relations and a new way of determining who should stand up among the few to govern the many. And, indeed, what form the leadership relation takes – that is, the nature of the relations between leaders and the people, who have sovereign power – remains the central challenge of leadership in a democracy. One way to frame the issue is through the concept of representation. As political scientists Schmitter and Karl point out, ‘the central question, therefore, is not whether or not there will be a political elite, but how these representatives are chosen and then held accountable for their actions’. Accordingly, representation has been a central aspect of the relations between leaders and the people in a modern state. Disputes arose concerning the nature of the relationship between representative and constituent – disputes that echoed the assumptions about the respective roles of leaders and the people. Some advocated a ‘trustee’ form of representation, in which elected leaders acted on their own best judgment in the interests of all, while others demanded that representatives be mere ‘delegates’, acting out the wishes of their constituents. Another related aspect of this new social and political relation called leadership is the nature of the interaction itself; the dynamic interchange between leaders and the people as they interact in the face of challenges to desired ends. This we can call the leadership process, where every leader must in cooperation with others establish procedures to ensure that relations among stakeholders are governed by rules of justice’.4

III. A MORAL LEADER HAS THE ABILITY TO PREVENT HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

The idea of a leader is a social and historical construct and as such, it is also laden with moral values. The history of the idea of leadership is directly connected with the history of human rights and democracy, a true leadership is and was not part of dictatorship nor tyranny where people do not enjoy their freedom. Theorists that belong to the field of International Relations IR, as well as transitional justice scholars, argue that a leader’s ability to sequence events for peacebuilding, reconciliation etc. relies on the sovereign will of the nation’s leader.5

Great moral leaders can become a source of moral encouragement to us, arouse us and stir us, move us to do things when we might otherwise not be provoked, and they have the will to act in pursuit of purposes we have come to regard as important.6 A Leader with moral values can play an important role in shaping the protective strategy within transitional justice, that type of

leadership never disappoints people, country, international community because it knows how to prevent in case of human rights violations.

A leader can weld people’s diverse aspirations and activities into a coordinated pattern directed toward particular goals . . . Somehow, amid the clamour of the merits of the competing desirable goals, the people or group will have to decide which one to pursue wholeheartedly together. A leader functions to resolve this competition of goals; he provides a vision of a desirable goal, articulates a feasible plan for reaching it, and inspires enough people to move along that path. 7 The main question in leadership research has always been what makes leaders influential and effective. Inspired by research injustice in recent years’ leadership research has increasingly engaged with the notion that to answer this question we need to understand the role of leader fairness. 8 There is circular reasoning at play in that on the one hand just leadership is stated as being about a concern for the good of others and the collective good, but on the other hand, what is claimed to be the value of enacting leadership justice is that it has a ‘substantial impact on the evaluation and effectiveness of leaders’. 9

Justice is thus offered initially as a genuine concern for others, but this is subsequently revealed not as a goal to be valued in itself but as a step towards a different set of subsequent outcomes. The kind of outcomes that perceptions of leadership justice are thought to result in ‘include greater trust and commitment, improved job performance, more helpful citizenship behaviours, improved customer satisfaction, and diminished conflict’. 10 If a leader is fair, it is argued, s/he might be better accepted by the followers as well as being able to make them cooperate more effectively. 11 The position is that ‘leader fairness can be reliably linked to behavioural outcomes’ such as performance and commitment and that ‘justice perceptions have been shown to have effects on people’s motivation, well-being, performance, attitudes, behaviours and other outcomes relevant for organizations’. 12

Authentic moral leadership share the idea that leaders not only will but can, lead in a way that displays ethical care and respect for each and every other person. However, it is the ethics that distinguishes ‘pseudo-transformational leadership’ from ‘truly transformational leadership’. By this account, a central component of truly transformational leadership is ‘the moral character of the leaders and their concern for self and others’. 13

John Stuart Mill called upon leaders to be transformative. He took some care to portray how leaders could affect a more capable populace. In Mill’s scenario, ‘the instructed few that is, the leaders . . . teach principally by example: Through deliberation in the representative assembly, electoral campaigns, and other public places they demonstrate how to reason intelligently about the ends of

politics’. Under Mill’s theory, the very process of debating public policy issues better prepared the citizens for governing, and, of course, participation in the process itself had a similar effect.\textsuperscript{14} There are five functions that every transformational leader should have. One fruitful function a leader must perform is to keep the people from becoming complacent and to alert them to leadership challenges that may not be readily discernible in the regular course of things. Thus, to quote James MacGregor Burns, the leader can ‘critique … the gap between wants and values and actualities’ or, in the language of Ronald Heifetz, identify ‘the gap between the values people stand for and the reality they face’. However, by bringing such discrepancies to the people’s attention – indeed, at times forcing the people to take such notice – the leader performs the estimable function of what Benjamin Barber calls ‘challenging the paradigmatic present’. In doing so, the leader, although creating some immediate discomfiture, nonetheless ensures the long-term health of the polity. Another leader role that enhances but does not usurp the role of the people is the ability to educate them concerning matters relevant to their discourse. For example, leaders should help people see the bigger picture. As Tocqueville put it, the people need to ‘go beyond immediate gratification’, and their focus must be upon the long term. More than this, however, it is the task of democratic leaders to help the people see beyond themselves in a larger sense. They must lift the vision of the demos to its higher calling of the public interest. A democratic leader can also educate the populace by helping them to define their realities and their values. Another intervention which involves the competence of the leader – and another instance of the ‘dance of leadership in a democracy’ – is the role the leader can play in suggesting future directions and potential solutions. Again, this reveals the assumption that some individuals do see farther than others in terms of future implications, do have the capability to perceive connections amid complexity, and do have the spark of creativity needed to craft innovative solutions. The key point is that these leaders may have a potent vision of what is and what might be, but cannot impose their insights and solutions upon the people, but only fold them into the mix in the most persuasive way possible. Ultimately the people will make the determination, and then be accountable for the results. The competence of the leader is also needed as the public discourse moves forward. This competence is both substantive and procedural. On the substantive side of the ledger, Ruscio notes how leaders ‘are obligated’ to ‘transcend’ the ‘vices’ of the people, and to ‘control and guide the irrational while promoting the rational’. On the process side, one of the world’s foremost authorities on the practice and teaching of leadership, Ronald Heifetz suggests the many varied and important ways that a leader can ensure that the actual discourse of democracy is substantive and effective. In Heifetz’s own words, his approach ‘departs from Plato’s perspective fundamentally’. In Heifetz’s model\textsuperscript{15}, a leader’s ‘actions are nothing if not expert, but they are expert in the management of processes by which the people with the problem achieve the resolution’. This involves ‘the orchestration of conflict’ and bringing ‘these conflicting voices into some sort of harmony’. In both substance and process, then, the leader brings competence to the table in important ways. It is possible for the leader to create a leadership process in which the actions of the leader can have a direct impact upon the capabilities of the people, in such a way that the desired transformation from individual to a citizen is accelerated. This, too, requires a certain competence on the part of the leader.\textsuperscript{16} Ronald and many others believe that competence and courageousness is necessary for every democratic leader.

IV. DEMOCRATIZATION AND TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE

To recover from periods of mass atrocities, gross abuses of human rights and longstanding systems of oppression, individuals, communities and societies face complex challenges: to understand the meaning of what has transpired; to consider reparations for those who were injured; to hold those responsible to account; to transform the underlying systems of power and privilege that contributed to the violence; and to build or rebuild trust in people, institutions and leaders. Sufficient trust allows for the collaborations necessary for solving problems and co-creating a better future. Whether the authoritarian regime has come to an end as the result of internal restoration after internal reforms or externally monitored installation, sooner or later the legacy of the former regime has to be addressed. Any country which attempts to establish accountability for past abuses of human rights during the process of democratization faces political, judicial and ethical problems. In the aftermath of a democratic transition, decision-makers, leaders, politicians, and human rights professionals very often adopt casuistry, trying to find their way to unveil the truth and to craft democracy during ongoing conflicts. The discourse of transitional justice developed rapidly from the 1980s, mainly concentrating on the regime changes in Latin America. It is worthwhile recalling Guillermo O’Donnell and Philippe Schmitter here, who were among the first to mention the problem of state-sponsored repression of the past in their concluding volume of the transitions from “Authoritarian Rule” series. In their writings, they conclude that ‘if civilian politicians use courage and skill, it may not necessarily be suicide for a nascent democracy to confront the most reprehensible facts of its recent past’. However, transitional justice and the politics of memory gained more public and scholarly interest in the course of the so-called fourth wave of democratization. The transition from communism in Europe and the former Soviet Union after 1989 differed notably from the first waves in the way the past or the past as it was constructed – was used as a homogenizing, differentiating, or classifying discourse. The concepts and political institutions in those regimes that emerged from the fourth wave of democratization often were influenced by how the past had been treated. The fact that some of the post-communist regimes that emerged after 1989 remain unconsolidated, unstable, and illiberal democracies justifies the call to concentrate more closely on the problems involved in transitional justice. A renewed focus on transitional justice is further justified by its increasing importance in post-conflict societies. After an external intervention, a coalition of states or the international community will often install mechanisms for transitional justice to build sustainable peace, stabilize the society, and foster democracy. Local distrust of international processes and a problematic domestic legal system may pose serious obstacles in these cases and demands for justice have to be balanced carefully with realistic assessments of what can be achieved. Lack of formal transitional justice mechanisms in some recent post-conflict societies, such as in East Timor, Bosna and Herzegovina, Kosovo, and Afghanistan, led to the creation of mixed tribunals – courts composed of international and local judges. Mixed tribunals were established to address war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide as well as murder, sexual offences, and torture. A basic precondition for a democratic society lies in the ‘self-evident truth’, that everybody acknowledges everybody else as a free and equal citizen, regardless of religion.

ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, social status or heritage. Tensions between people of
different ethnic or religious groups may be so overwhelming that promoting reconciliation must
be considered a key priority. The decision to use a certain mechanism for reconciliation in a given
case must be seen as a function of the political opportunity structure, existing historical and cultural
conditions, and the measure’s objectives.\textsuperscript{19} To achieve sustainable peace, it is essential to reflect
on the conditions of reconciliation. Reconciliation starts with the acknowledgement of our shared
and common humanity and dignity. It may take the form of a set of complex processes that could
take generations and which depends not only on the state, social organizations but also on the
agency and inclusive leadership and courageous followership of individuals. Reconciliation may
involve the processes based on acknowledgement of past wrongs, political and social reforms
through economic and educational transformations, dealing with the structural causes of
marginalization and discrimination.\textsuperscript{20}
Also, international norms from cases of transitional justice field help to frame the domestic
approaches. Attention to the special concerns of women, children, minorities and other
marginalized groups provides a decent example of how the global human rights discourse helps to
reshape the norms of human conduct in the period of transition. The negotiations leading to the
Treaty of Rome and the establishment of the institutions like International Criminal Court indicate
impulse to implement law where there was none. In establishing democratic principles in one
country decisive role has also played international legal norms which are supported by the
international community including neighbouring countries of the state, but also the national leaders
have the power and moral task in troubling times to unite their divided societies and protect human
rights and because of that reason they need to interact with people following the transformational
leadership theory.
Through strong state institutions afforded by the principles of democracy, transparency,
accountability and non-interference with judicial and non-judicial, transitional justice processes
are fortified. Transitional justice measures in the process of democratization are more likely to
succeed in a country that has a strong democratic leader who owns strong democratic inclinations
and who fights for the people’s rights with a dedication.
Fundamental reforms in critical sectors of governance such as the judiciary, parliament, security,
electoral process and the public service are required in achieving the goal. In this paper, we used
the legacy of the former President of the United States, John Kennedy as an example of a moral
and typical transformational leader in turbulent periods of his country.

V. AN EXAMPLE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL MORAL LEADERSHIP IN
TRANSITIONAL COUNTRY

There are a lot of studies which evaluate the US. President John F. Kennedy as an example of the
nation’s teacher on the issue of human rights in times when American society faced systematic
challenges. JFK was elected by those who sought peace and justice- the people. While he was in
the office, he declared that a new generation of Americans was ‘unwilling to witness or permit the
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Limited. pp.11-49.
slow undoing of those human rights to which that nation has always been committed, and to which the people are committed today at home and around the world.\textsuperscript{21}

In the early 1960s, President Kennedy confronted a nation that was largely asleep. While dramatic events would finally shake the nation out of its slumber, those events would not reach their peak until late into the Kennedy years. His visionary views included the term ‘human rights’ in his 1961 inaugural address, which was a rhetorical shift from the Eisenhower years when some conservatives viewed human rights as a plot to undermine national sovereignty.\textsuperscript{22} His actions had been many years before the great wave of world’s democratization.

The freedom rides, sit-ins, and the march on Washington, as well as media coverage of the occasionally violent resistance to civil rights that manifested itself in the South, all focused sustained attention on the problem of racism in the early 1960s and made necessary some response by the president and the executive branch he headed. Instead of refusing, as his immediate predecessor in the White House had done, to take any positive action on civil rights because it might "inflame racial feelings",\textsuperscript{23} he used his position as president, slowly at first but with growing resolve, to teach the nation the moral, as well as the legal, imperatives of equal treatment under the law. He tried hard, through statements and speeches on the subject as well as through private meetings with business, labour, and community leaders, to create the environment in which substantial change could come. A plurality of Democrats felt that the intensity of Kennedy's efforts in human rights was "just about right." The president's deepening commitment to the cause was viewed favourably by black Americans, who saw him as a friend and ally.\textsuperscript{24}

President Kennedy's efforts to persuade the nation that progress was needed in the area of human rights often were accompanied by more practical steps to bring about that progress. He emerged as a significant leader of the civil rights movement in the latter months of his administration. As one of his critics has written, "a people can be nourished to believe that there are necessary things to be done, which they have overlooked and that they have the necessary capacity to do them." Kennedy as the president tried to provide his people with that nourishment.\textsuperscript{25}

In the context of this article, Kennedy serves as a role model or example of a leader who had shown great potential on protecting human rights in troubling periods for America when the people faced a transitional crisis, human rights abuses and injustice.

In Columbia, South Carolina on October 10 in 1960, the former US President had asserted, "I think it is clear . . . that if we are- to have progress in this area [civil rights], and we must have progress to be true to our ideals and responsibilities, then Presidential leadership is necessary so that every American can enjoy his full constitutional rights. Some of you may disagree with that view, but at least I have not changed that view in an election year, or according to where I am standing."\textsuperscript{26}

Also, Kennedy had used the foreign policy interests of his country as an argument for civil rights progress for black Americans at home. In New York City, on October 12, 1960, the former

\textsuperscript{23} See Report of the Committee on Commerce, pp. 246, 1011, 245, 432.
President asserted that, "We must wipe out all traces of discrimination and prejudice against Negroes at home if we are to win the respect and friendship of the Negro peoples of Africa". He indicated support for specific actions and policies relevant to human rights progress. In Los Angeles, for example, he remarked, "We must strengthen the President's Civil Rights Commission. We must grant the Attorney General power to enforce all constitutional rights and wipe out discriminatory poll taxes and literacy tests and pass effective anti-bombing and anti-lynching legislation". Before Martin L. King's arrest, Kennedy had been warned by at least three southern governors that if he intruded himself into southern affairs by endorsing King, "the south could be given up as lost to the Democratic ticket." Nevertheless, despite this threat and the admonition he received from some of his advisors, Kennedy did intervene by personally telephoning King's wife and by having his brother Robert telephone the Georgia judge who had sentenced the civil rights leader to urge his release. King was soon free on bail, pending an appeal, thereby ending widespread fears that he would be murdered while in prison. Word of the Kennedy brothers' intervention spread rapidly throughout the black community and thus some observers have credited Kennedy's victory on the presidential elections to the strong support he received from black voters. By doing this and other moral actions during the mandate, he had broken his relationships with Republicans, Congress and even with his political party, his policies were dangerous, but he confirmed the importance of a moral leader who initiated a process of democratization and sought justice in his own country and abroad, risking his life.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this article, the authors emphasize the significance of moral leadership within transitional justice. Here, leadership is defined as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal- to prevent human rights violations and bring peace. Because both leaders and followers (people) are part of the leadership process, it is important to address issues that confront followers as well as issues that confront leaders. This theoretical approach is known as transformational. In the leadership process, every leader must in cooperation with others establish procedures to ensure that relations among stakeholders are governed by rules of justice. Our central idea is that the leader who has moral values can play an important role in shaping the protective strategy within transitional justice and that type of leadership never disappoints people, country, international community because it knows how to prevent in case of human rights violations.

It has been proven that the virtue of moral leaders can increase individual effectiveness and organizational performance in implementing transitional justice instruments in divided societies. Any country which attempts to establish accountability for past abuses of human rights during the process of democratization faces political, judicial and ethical problems and thus sufficient trust between leaders and people allows for the collaborations necessary for solving problems. Here, we suggest that it would be beneficial on the path towards the democratization of the country and achieving peace, to reflect on the conditions of reconciliation. Measures of TJ in the process of democratization are more likely to succeed in a country that has a moral leader who owns strong democratic inclinations and governs responsibly. Fundamental reforms in critical sectors of governance such as the judiciary, parliament, security, electoral process and the public service are required in achieving the goal, while international support is also welcome. In this article, JFK is

---

given as an example of a transformational leader who confirms the importance of moral leadership in the process of democratization because he protected the people and sought justice in his transitional country risking his own life.
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