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Abstract

In the last few decades, we have witnessed the inclusion of Literature in a variety of disciplines. ‘Multidisciplinary studies’ and ‘multiculturalism’ being key terms in the academia—chiefly in the Humanities and the Social Sciences—various academic disciplines have started strengthening their syllabi in this direction. Sociology, Anthropology and History, for example, derive a lot of references from the literary world to contextualize histories forgotten or rewritten. So does the newly-developed discipline of Leadership Studies.

Leadership Studies has emerged as a distinct field of academic study in the last few decades. The scope of the study is multi-disciplinary, and it focuses on leadership in the context of organisations and in human life (Bass and Stogdill, 1990). It is a discipline which draws a lot of references from a host of fields such as Psychology, Management, Sociology, Education, Literature, etc. Each discipline has something unique to contribute to the understanding of the concept of leadership, leaders and leading (Ciulla, 2011). In the past, Leadership Studies was divided into sub-groups such as business leadership, educational leadership and political leadership—specifically involving a single-disciplinary approach. But in the 1980s, with a relative lack of plurality, the single-disciplinary approach to the pedagogy of leadership was rejected and multidisciplinary approaches became a trend in the study of leadership (Rost, 1993).

In academic circles, in business classrooms, we have started witnessing the introduction of literary texts for the study of leadership. This dissertation argues that a single-discipline approach to the study of leadership fails to strengthen the critical pedagogy. It reads Shakespearean tragedies and focuses on inclusion of literary texts, such as Shakespeare’s, in the discipline. It explores a few Shakespearean tragedies—chiefly Julius Caesar (1599), King Lear (1605), Macbeth (1606), Hamlet (1600-01), Othello (1603-04) and Antony and Cleopatra (1606)—in the light of issues concerning leadership that the discipline has attempted to address in the present decades. While I begin by emphasizing a traditional approach of the defence of literary texts, i.e., literary texts help in developing different perspectives and understanding multiple issues in leadership, I also analyse Shakespearean tragedies in the light of issues such as narcissistic leadership, role of emotions and passions in leading, the dilemma of ethical leadership and explore the concepts of good and evil
in leading. I take a social constructionist stand for leadership model and take examples from the modern world to compare literary representations with contemporary leadership scenario. Hence, though at the outset, part of the dissertation seems to be ‘traditional’ in the strictest sense of the term, I argue that including Shakespearean tragedies not only helps us understand problems in leading, it also offers, in principle, a multidisciplinary approach to the discipline of Leadership Studies. The study concludes with an emphasis on the need for a holistic approach towards the understanding of leadership.

The research method consists of interpretation of primary texts by William Shakespeare in the light of issues in leadership put forward in the present decades. I also use historical, philosophical and biographical texts in order to establish that Shakespearean tragedies are helpful in understanding problems in leading and in drawing parallels from modern-day scenario. I support my argument with a significant number of texts, critical essays, and books on Leadership Studies and also criticism on Shakespearean plays.

Key Words: Leadership, tragedies, narcissism, emotions, good and evil.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

From its infancy, the study of history has been the study of leaders—what they did and why they did it.

Bernard Bass and Ralph Melvin Stogdill

1.1 Introduction

In the last few decades, the academia has witnessed the inclusion of Literature in a variety of disciplines. “Multidisciplinary studies” and ‘multiculturalism’ being key terms in the academia—chiefly in the Social Sciences and the Humanities—various university disciplines have started strengthening their syllabi in this direction. Sociology, Anthropology and History, for example, derive a lot of references from the literary world to contextualize histories forgotten or rewritten. So does the newly-developed discipline of Leadership Studies.

This dissertation argues that a single disciplinary approach fails to address a literal tradition and canon in Leadership Studies. It reads Shakespearean tragedies and focuses on inclusion of Literature into the discipline. It explores select Shakespearean tragedies—Julius Caesar (1599), King Lear (1605), Macbeth (1606), Hamlet (1600-01), Othello (1603-04) and Antony and Cleopatra (1606)—in the light of issues concerning leadership that the discipline of Leadership Studies has attempted to address in the present decades. While I begin by emphasizing a traditional approach of the defence of literature, i.e., literary texts help in developing different perspectives and understanding multiple issues in leadership, I also analyse Shakespearean tragedies in the light of issues such as narcissistic leadership, role of emotions and passions in leading, the dilemma of ethical leadership and explore the concepts of good and evil in leading. While I take a social constructionist stand in support of leading by taking examples from real world to compare it with literary representation in most cases, I also highlight an intermediary approach that most modern scholars deviate from. Hence, though at the outset, part of the dissertation seems to be ‘traditional’ in the strictest sense of the term, I argue that inclusion of Shakespearean tragedies not only helps us to understand problems in leading, it also offers, in principle, a multidisciplinary approach to the discipline of Leadership Studies.

---

Including Shakespeare in Leadership Studies, especially in business classrooms, has its own merits. William Shakespeare arguably is one of the leading figures among writers of any generation. Noteworthy to mention here is that from nursery rhymes to school text books, from the mode of teaching poetry to drama, from citing instances of human condition to claiming the art of universality, Shakespeare’s works have been popularized throughout the different ages. There have been traditional text books on criticism, children’s text book series on Shakespeare’s tales, books of erotica based on Shakespearean themes, re-reading and re-writing of Shakespeare and there are multiple versions of Shakespeare’s plays. There is also Shakespeare for drama, for comedy, for tragedy, for poetry, for romance, for satire and Shakespeare for post-colonialism and feminism. Numerous other discourses have proved time and again that Shakespeare has achieved an unrivalled status that rarely any other writer has achieved so far. Samuel Johnson places him above all the modern writers. He says, “Shakespeare is above all writers, at least above all modern writers, the poet of nature; the poet that holds up to his readers a faithful mirror of manners and of life” (Chalmers, 1803; 2). He further declares that Shakespeare aptly imitates essential human nature. His plays depict something which is ‘universal’ rather than just being a social phenomenon:

His [Shakespeare’s] are not modified by the customs of particular places, unpractised by the rest of the world; by the peculiarities of studies or professions, which can operate but upon small numbers; or by the accidents of transient fashions or temporary opinions: they are genuine progeny of common humanity, such as the world will always supply, and observation will always find. His persons act and speak by the influence of those general passions and principles by which all minds are agitated, and the whole system of life is continued in motion. In the writings of no other poets a character is too often an individual; in those of Shakespeare it is commonly a species (2).

There are numerous such instances where Shakespeare is admired, interpreted and used for different situations and purposes. Shakespearean plays have been admired for their plot, characters and poetic quality. Alexander Pope, for example, in the preface to The Works of Shakespeare Volume I (1723) writes:

The poetry of Shakespear (sic) was inspiration: indeed, he is not so much an imitator, as an instrument of nature; and it is not so just to say that he speaks from her, as that she speaks through him. His characters are so much nature
herself, that it is a sort of injury to call them by so distant a name as copies of her…every single character in Shakespear, (sic) is as much an individual, as those in life itself; it is as impossible to find any two alike (9).

Harold Bloom goes a step further and gives credit to Shakespeare for “the invention of the human” (1998, 5). He asserts that “the early modern English was shaped by Shakespeare; The Oxford English Dictionary is made in his image” (6). He adds further: “Later modern human beings are still being shaped by Shakespeare, not as Englishmen, or as American women, but in modes increasingly post-national and post-gender” (10). Though with the growing popularity of different theories such as Post-Structuralism, Deconstructionism and Marxism, the acclaimed ‘universality’ of Shakespeare has been put into question, it has proved beneficial to Shakespearean Studies; and what we have instead is there are multiple Shakespeares. In literary analysis, minor characters and figures from his plays have found ample importance in the last few decades. With the rise of sociological theories such as Marxism, Feminism and Cultural Materialism, their significance and sociological structure have been analysed to judge a society or a character so as to centralize the periphery.2 Psychoanalytic criticism, with the rise of Freudian and Jungian theories, studies and analysis characters, and has furthered the debate to a significant degree where the thought process remains of ample significance. In the Humanities and the Social Sciences—as in the case of Literature and Language—Shakespeare has thus established a significant place for himself.

There are multiple reasons for which Shakespeare has been highly popular in the modern era, which may not be documented here in detail. The prominent reasons include, but are not limited to, the use of language and literary expressions, theatrical concepts and dramatic techniques, and above all his characters and themes are of ample importance to the present world. Schegel writes:

Never, perhaps, was there so comprehensive a talent for the delineation of character as Shakespeare’s. It not only grasps the diversities of rank, sex, and age, down to the dawnings of infancy; not only do the king and the beggar, the hero and the pickpocket, the sage and the idiot speak and act with equal truth; not only does he transport himself to distant ages and foreign nations and pourtray (sic) in the most accurate manner, with only a few violations of

---

2 For further reference, see Ania Loomba’s Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1989.
costume, the spirit of the ancient Romans, of the French in their wars with the English, of the English themselves during a great part of their history (Lobban, 2009; 2).

With ever-growing demand of such historical and literary thematization, the importance of introducing Shakespearean plays has been visible in Leadership Studies as well. The present thesis, thus, reads Shakespearean plays for an analysis of issues in leadership and concentrates on a few select tragedies for the same. I not only argue that introducing Shakespearean plays has its importance to the academic discipline of Leadership Studies, I also suggest that the study of tragedies will develop nuances of analysing the contemporary world in a better way.

The limitations of such an exercise are numerous as well. In fact, any critical work on Shakespeare in the present generation seems to be a reproduction of earlier criticism; several others, when characters are taken into the purview of analysis, seem to be far less than Bradley’s or Knight’s work. The methodological clarification, in this regard—when I concentrate on issues in leadership and Shakespearean themes, characters and plots—need further clarification. I highlight the need of Shakespearean tragedies because flaws, drawbacks in characters and limitations open up new possibilities for deliberations in classroom situations and Leadership Studies needs to derive a lot from the technique of ‘failed leading’. The thesis, thus, argues that drawing parallels from real-life situations in the light of fictional success and failures will help students of Leadership Studies and Organisational Behaviour to draw parallels in real-life situations and give them an understanding of handling professional life in a better way.

1.2 Terms and Terminology
Leadership Studies has emerged as an independent field of study in the last few decades. The scope of the study is multi-disciplinary and it focuses on leadership in the context of organizations and in human life (Bass and Stogdill, 1990). The study of leaders, leading and leadership has been of interest to scholars from multiple fields of study. This is because a single disciplinary approach has failed to address all the dimensions of leading and leadership (Burns, 1979). It is a discipline which encompasses a host of sub-fields and is filled with definitions, theories, styles, functions, competencies, and historical examples of successful and diverse leaders. Scholars argue that in the pluralistic world and highly complex societies, the study of
leadership and leading has become indispensable. This is because students are supposed to be nurtured to be leaders who with their active, thoughtful and effective participation can bring about positive changes in the world.\(^3\) This thought has not come without a wide range of criticism however. There have been debates whether leadership studies is a truly scholar and critical discipline as it lacks a unifying theory and lacks the criticality of judgment practically in the strictest sense of the term. Scholars have also debated whether it should be included within a strict academic discipline and in traditional departments such as Management, Political Science, or History.\(^4\)

In this dissertation, the terms “hero” and “leader”, and “heroism” and “leadership” have been extensively used interchangeably. Though it delimits the scope of the terms and sometimes leads to confusion, it has been done purposefully owing to the perceived meanings of “leading” and “following” in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Terminology thus crucially affects the socio-cultural life of the period mentioned, and with a careful examination of etymological meanings of the words, this dissertation uses them synonymously. Further, difficulties also arise in locating a definite set of meanings for the purpose of a comparative analysis of Shakespearean tragic characters and modern-day leaders. Hence, this dissertation technically uses the words “leading” and “leadership”, sometimes highlighting a sixteenth-century condition, keeping in mind the ways persons of high order were represented, imitated and followed during the said periods. This is not to state that there is no differentiation in the concepts of “hero” and “heroism” as used in the seventeenth century texts and the way modern definitions of “leader” and “leadership” are contested. Joseph Clarence Rost, for example, extensively deals with the terms “leader”, “lead” and “leadership” in *Leadership for Twenty-First Century* (1993) to contextualize their meaning to past and present cultures. The word “leader” is contextualized relatively in and around the nineteenth century. However, the words “leader”, “lead” and “leading” have been used in several European Languages with Anglo-Saxon and Latin roots, from 1300 to the present, as reported by *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1933). The word “leader” is derived from the verb “lead” which

---


comes from old English “leden” or “leodan” meaning “to make go”, “to guide” or “to show the way” and from the Latin word *ducere* which means “to draw, drag, pull; to lead, guide, conduct”. The Latin word *ducere* appears in the Bible and other Christian books as early as 800 (Rost, 1993; 38).

Samuel Johnson’s *Dictionary* (1755) defines the verb “lead” as “to guide by the hand; to conduct to any place; to conduct as head or commander; to introduce by going first; to guide or show the method of attaining; to draw, entice, allure, to induce, to prevail on by pleasing motives; to pass, to spend in any certain manner” and the noun “lead” signifies “guidance, first place” (Rost, 1993; 27). Johnson defines “leader” as “one that leads; captain commander; one who goes first; and one at the head of a party or faction”. Perry’s *Royal Standard English Dictionary* (1788) defines “leader” as “captain” or “conductor” but does not define the term “leadership”. The word “leadership” was not in use till the mid-eighteenth century among the English-speaking people. The nineteenth century dictionaries take into purview all the three terms “leader”, “lead” and “leadership”; the definitions are similar to those given by Johnson. The *Roget’s 21st Century Thesaurus* (2009) gives around thirty synonyms, namely, boss, captain, chief, chieftain, commander, conductor, controller, counselor, dean, dignitary, director, doyen, eminence, forerunner, general, guide, harbinger, head, herald, lead, lion, luminary, manager, mistress, notability, notable, officer, pacesetter, pilot, pioneer, precursor, president, principal, rector, ringleader, ruler, shepherd, skipper, superintendent and superior. Most of them are used in the present century to replace the word “leader” the meaning of which is basically regarded a “person who guides”.

Thus, “leadership”, the term, appears in 1828 in Webster’s *An American Dictionary of the English Language* but the concept is believed to have originated from the beginning of civilizations. One could argue that the time when kings ruled and the time associated with the birth of legends and heroic tales of mythical or real heroes may also be the times of genesis of the concept. These stories basically deal with the lives and exploits of heroes, synonymous with leaders. The ancient allusion to the concept of heroism or heroic leadership is found in the texts by Confucius, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (1933) defines

---

5 See Chapter 2 for further analysis.
6 A detailed discussion on the concepts of heroism and heroic leadership by ancient philosophers is introduced in Chapter 2.
“leadership” as “the dignity, office, or position of a leader, esp. of a political party; also, ability to lead” (Rost, 1993; 41). A review of the scholarly studies on leadership suggests that there is a wide variety of different theoretical approaches to explain complexities of the leadership process (Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg, 2004; Bass, 1990; Bryman, 1992; Gardner, 1990; Mumford, 2006; Rost, 1993). Leadership is defined in different ways by the practitioners of Leadership Studies but in any case all definitions, by nature, are contested. In the past sixty years, as many as 65 different classification systems have developed to define the dimensions of leadership (Northouse, 2010). Ralph Stogdill argues: “There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (1974, 259). Some definitions indicate leadership as the ‘focus of the group processes’ (Green and Mitchell, 1979; Krech and Cruchfield, 1948). Others show that it as an ‘influence process’ (Bass, 1960; Cartwright, 1965) from the personality perspective which suggests, in principle, that leadership is a combination of special traits and characteristics that some individuals possess. Some others see it as an initiation of structure and the instrument of achieving goals (Homans, 1950). A few others have defined leadership in terms of ‘relationship’ between a leader and his/her follower; and further, leaders are servants to their followers (Greenleaf, 1998). Based on the different ways in which leadership has been conceptualised, Peter Guy Northouse notes down the following common components of leadership: a) leadership is a process, b) leadership involves influence, c) leadership occurs in group, and d) leadership involves common goals (2010, 2). Based on these components, leadership can be defined as a process of influence that is goal-oriented. It involves influencing followers or a group within an organisation and a leader is the one who helps them fix goals and motivates them to achieve those goals.

Hence, keeping in mind the judicious nature of the definitions, this thesis uses the terms “leader” and “follower” in an open-ended manner. While technical terms such as “leader” and “hero” are interchangeably used in numerous contexts, it may be mentioned here that in the sixteenth century English society, the terms were aristocratic in nature; hence taking a social constructionist standpoint this dissertation proceeds for an explanation of the same.
1.3 Theories: Past and Present

Leadership or leading is a social construct (Meindl, 1995; Grint, 2005; Sjostrand, Sandberg and Tyrstrup, 2001). It is discussed as an interactive and complex process where not only a leader affects the followers but the followers also affect him/her. A review of literature reveals an evolving series of schools of thought from the Great Man theory and Trait theory to Transformational leadership. The early theories of leadership tend to focus on the traits, characteristics and behaviour of successful leaders. The traditional approaches to leadership, viz., the Trait approach, Behaviour or Style approach, and the Situational Leadership approach, are criticized in the present generation due to their narrow perspectives which fail to cover all aspects of leadership and leading. It fails on account of lack of empirical evidences to prove that traits and behaviour of leaders are responsible for effective leadership. The traditional theories conceptualize leaders as active players and followers as passive. Chiefly, leaders have been perceived as people with unique traits different from that of followers. Leadership relations are often represented in the context of social hierarchy and usually understood as situations that are socially predetermined. However, later theories on leadership begin to consider the role of followers and the contextual nature of leadership, which are discussed in detail in the next chapter. The contemporary approaches conceptualise leadership as a process of interaction. The recent approaches do not presume the existence of a predetermined situation in which the roles of leaders and followers are clearly distributed according to a formal organizational structure, but it is seen as an interactive process where individuals pursuing particular aims influence each other. Therefore, all members of an organization are capable of being leaders and a formal distinction between leader and follower is not possible in such a situation.

Many new models and approaches to Leadership Studies such as Attribution Theory, Psychodynamic Leadership Approach, Neo-charismatic Leadership, Leader-Member Exchange Theory, Symbolic Leadership, Role Theory of Leadership,

---

7 The evolution of leadership theories began in the twentieth century and earlier the focus of all studies was on leader’s personality. The studies on leadership during 1930’s and 1940’s focused on the leaders and their traits; they searched for those special traits and attributes in successful leaders which set them apart from others. These studies resulted in the Trait Theory and Great Man theory. Leaders were believed to have exceptional qualities like boundless energy, deep intuition, uncanny foresight, irresistible persuasive powers, etc. But it was too limited in scope. For decades, Trait Theory and Great Man theory dominated Leadership Studies. Most notable are the writings of Thomas Carlyle (Hero and Hero Worship, 1841) and Francis Galton (Hereditary Genius, 1869) in this regard.
Idiosyncrasy Credit Model of Leadership, Micro-Politics Approach to Leadership, and Social Learning Theory of Leadership have come up in the recent times. Consequently, the contemporary approaches to leadership present it as “a sequence of multidirectional, reciprocal influential processes among many individuals at different levels, in different subunits, and within executive” (Yukl, 1994; 498). The focus of all these theories has been on the subjective perception of the individual for developing and forming leadership relations. It is understood as a result of the various interactions among members which is hardly ever predictable. Further, leadership in the present is a sociological process which has evolved with the growth and development of democratic principles.

1.4 Humanities and Leadership Studies:
The term “humanities” first appeared during the Italian Renaissance in relation to the education of Christians for their moral and spiritual development. The classical Greek notions of the humanities were to provide a basis of a broad education for the Greek citizens. Today the term refers to those disciplines of knowledge which are broadly concerned with human thoughts, creative expressions and culture, and are classified as non-science academic disciplines. Humanities include the study of classical texts, languages and literature, philosophy, religion, visual and performing arts and history.

The study of leadership is incomplete without including Humanities (Ciulla, 2011). It is humanities that supplies a rich foundation for understanding the context of leadership and it offers a gigantic repository of information about morality and human behaviour that spans over time and across cultures (Jaeger, 1986). Subjects such as History, Literature, Philosophy and Religion offer a rich background for the study of leadership. This is because the aim of liberal arts is to impart “knowledge that is good in itself and to educate citizens to live and make choices in a free society” (Jaeger, 1986). Most of the contribution in the growth and development of Leadership Studies comes from Management and Social Psychology but Humanities provides the basis to understand the theoretical aspects. Today many business schools have started including literary texts to teach leadership. For example, in an article entitled “Can

---

8 For further understanding of the contemporary theories, see Ingo Winkler’s Contemporary Leadership Theories: Enhancing the Understanding of the Complexity, Subjectivity and Dynamic of Leadership (2010).

9 A section of Chapter 2 discusses in detail concepts of theories of leadership.
Shakespeare Really be a Useful Management Tool?” published in The Independent on 18 January 2007, by Peter Brown draws our attention towards the new Management course called ‘Politics, Power and the Art of Influence’ launched by the Said Business School, Oxford. In this article he highlights the upcoming trend, among the Management teachers, to use Shakespearean plays for teaching lessons in leadership and management. Designed for experienced executives, it combines Shakespeare’s history play, Julius Caesar, role play and modern management theory. This is just one example. There are many management institutes which use literary texts to teach leadership and management. The contribution of Humanities in Leadership Studies has been significant from which references will be drawn in the subsequent chapters.

1.5 The Elizabethan Period:
Prior to examining Shakespearean tragedies in the light of Leadership Studies, it is important to locate Shakespeare’s England during the period. With the introduction of navigation and discoveries of the New Worlds—new cultures, new races, new religions, new belief systems and new wealth in other words—it was in fact the beginning of a ‘new’ age of ‘curiosity’. Europe no more remained the ‘imaginary’ centre or the only place in the world; the volumes of Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of England (1665) in fact document it in great detail and show the way the Elizabethan rulers struggled to establish business deals in places like India. Spain and Portugal were constant rivals in terms of gaining supremacy over the seas though. The English or Western notion of ‘fear’ for the ‘Other’ remained as a shock and it remains visible the mode of which is well portrayed in the introduction of the ‘foreign’ in many a theatrical performance and in literary representations of the sixteenth century. Shakespeare’s Caliban, who remains such a microcosm of ‘fear’ for the ‘Other’ that in modern times the ‘postcolonial’ has been synonymous with the ‘Caliban Complex’.10

10 Laura E. Donaldson, for a ‘womanist’ reading of Jane Eyre, explores the concepts of “Miranda Complex” and “Prospero Complex”. The reading indicates how Prospero’s role as the colonial master is destabilised by Caliban’s “disastrous rehearsals of enforced heterosexuality”—the attempted rape—a phrase Donaldson quotes from Jeffner Allen’s Lesbian Philosophy: Explorations. The “Miranda Complex” is upset not only by Prospero, the representative of colonial master, but also by Caliban—black and slave. Donaldson observes: “Caliban’s overdetermined participation in imperialism and masculinism as both victim and victimiser radically questions any construction of him as a homogenous colonised Other of the Prospero Complex.” The use of the representation of the ‘Other’ has been a trend in the modern world which has its genesis in the sixteenth century European navigation and colonization. For a detailed discussion, see Laura E. Donaldson’s “The Miranda
Moreover, this period precedes scientific revolution; science was in its infancy during Shakespeare’s time. It is now an established fact that during this period laws of mechanics were unknown, diseases were a mystery, genetics was unheard of and even intelligent people believed in ghosts, witchcraft and magic. Scientific method was struggling to gain foothold (McGinn, 2007). Francis Bacon was laying the foundation of scientific method \cite{TheAdvancementofLearning(1605),TheGreatInstauration(1620),NovumOrganum(1620),TheoryofInduction(1620)}. The most advanced learning available was from the ancients. Not much was known about other cultures and other lands but global exploration had started taking its course during Shakespeare’s time \cite{Bondanella, 1987; 261}.

The Queen’s period (1558-1603) is marked by development of English consciousness, nativisation of the English language, in-house peace and her ability to maintain stability in the kingdom \cite{Loomis, 2010; Shenk, 2010}. The prosperity of multiple academic learning, theatrical development and continuous literary or dramatic activities justify, in principle, Elizabeth’s ability to maintain peace and brotherhood during her reign. It was the period during which Spain and Portugal were actively engaged in the process of colonization. In the middle of the sixteenth century, English and French took Columbus and Spain as their model for colonial expansion of the Americas. England tried to protect its interests in different manners by competing with other colonial expansions of France and Portugal. On 31 December 1600, Elizabeth I issued charter for the founding of East India Company. It had 218 subscribers and possessed a monopoly for English trade in Asia and Pacific. The first English ship sailed to India in 1608, but it was the monopoly of Portuguese traders for which the Moghul governor of Surat—anxious but not to anger the Portugese traders—ordered the departure of the English fleet in 1610. Moghul Emperor, Jehangir (1605-1627) reigned in India during this period and England was trying to establish trade and commerce relations with India. The Moghul Empire was not friendly to the English traders till 1611; English trade ships opened relations with

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{11} Elizabethan Age is known for increase in commerce and trade which was accelerated with navigation and exploration. Navigation had begun with explorers like Sir Francis Drake \cite{SirFrancisDrake(1542-1596)}, Sir Richard Grenville \cite{SirRichardGrenville(1541-1591)}, Sir Martin Frobisher \cite{SirMartinFrobisher(1535-1595)}, Sir Humphrey Gilbert \cite{SirHumphreyGilbert(1538-1583)} and many others. They went to distant lands to acquire opportunities of wealth, power and fame. It was also scientific curiosity and renaissance spirit that encouraged voyages of discovery. Francis Drake and John Hawkins were equally active in slave trade.
\end{flushright}
other coasts that were outside the reign of Moghul Empire (Hart, 2011). Thus, England was struggling to increase trade and commerce, and was competing with its rivals Spain and Portugal to explore and discover new territories for wealth, power and knowledge. These navigators and explorers produced texts about the New World, travel and expansion focused on emulating Spain to create American colonies. Through these written accounts of the explorers and pirates like John Hawkins and Dominique de Gourages (French) justified their actions for breaking Spanish laws and for wreaking revenge on Spain. Francis Drake, Walter Raleigh, Cabot, Frobisher and many others explorers and navigators were exploring new and rich lands and they inspired writers with new imagination. Therefore, literature was produced to match the spirit of the Age and to cater to the tastes of the public that demanded adventure. This spirit of the Age is best expressed in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* (1610-11), and many plays written by other dramatists too introduce the ‘foreign’ as a mode of narratives. Among the many texts the Elizabethan writers produced—from Francis Bacon’s “Of Travel” (1620) to recommend the Grand Tour to Niccolo Machiavelli’s *The Prince* (1532) to educate princes, there remain various documents that address the issue of ‘leading’ and taking the country to a great height. Shakespearean tragedies are unique in their choice of themes and subjects, in forms and representation; they provide us with much scope for learning—of an ‘advancing’ age and its people, of society and of characters and situations. In the following section Shakespearean tragedies are contextualized in the light of issues in leadership and it suggests their inclusion in business classrooms so as to educate a generation that needs literary principles in the application of a theoretical pedagogy.

---

12 Walter Raleigh, in his *Discoverie of Guiana* (1596), suggested that England should emulate, rival, and displace Spain in parts of South America. His book concentrates a good deal on the power and riches the Spaniards reaped in the New World and what that did to the balance of power in Europe. Raleigh compared himself to Columbus and convinced Queen Elizabeth to back a conquest and conquer new lands. For further understanding see Jonathan Hart’s *Representing the New World*.

13 Example Richard Hakluyt, known for writing texts that promoted colonization of North America *Drivers Voyages Touching the Discoverie of America* (1582) and *Discoueries of the English Nation* (1589-1600).

14 John Hawkins (1532- 1595), a ship builder, slave trader and navigator, he served as the Vice Admiral in the battle between England and Spain in 1588 or the defeat of Spanish Armada for which he was knighted. He was the chief architect of Elizabethan navy.


16 See Chapter 2 for further details.
1.6 Further Chapterization:

**Chapter Two** is entitled “Leadership Studies and Pedagogy: Contextualising Shakespearean Tragedies”. It locates the genesis of leadership studies—a discipline of recent origin in the academia—and proposes the ways Shakespearean plays—especially tragedies—contribute in explaining and contextualizing different aspects of leadership issues in the present context. It has three sections. The first section deals with the genesis of Leadership Studies and the introduction of literary texts in management classrooms to draw lessons in leadership. The second section generally introduces Shakespearean plays and jots down their relevance in business classrooms. It addresses the problems and difficulties leaders or rulers face—socially—and introduces how in pedagogical endeavour such problems can be addressed. The third section is a critique of difficulties that arise and problems in comprehending sixteenth century language in modern-day business classrooms. While documenting the problems in locating issues concerning leadership, pedagogical issues involved in the process of contextualizing sixteenth century language to contemporary linguistic boundaries are taken into consideration.

**Chapter Three** is entitled as “Towards Narcissistic Leadership: A Study of *Julius Caesar*”. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section introduces concepts such as narcissism, narcissistic personality and narcissistic leadership. It highlights the way narcissism—the concept—has been used to define leadership. Having its genesis in the Greek myth of Narcissus (from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Book III), the concept is constantly referred to in modern-day critical pedagogy. This section argues how the concept of ‘narcissism’ goes beyond the literary representation and encompasses a variety of discourses and subjects. Its application encompasses different fields such as Literature, Socio-linguistics, Psychology and Psychiatry. The scope of the concept has been extended to Leadership Studies as well. Here its implications embrace the issues of leading and leadership, behavioural conditions of leaders and rulers, and success and failures of people of high rank. The second section is a critique of Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* (1599) in the light of narcissistic leadership; it argues that it is because of high narcissistic trends that Caesar dismantles much on personal and professional fronts. The chapter focuses on understanding narcissistic tendencies, which include, but are not limited to, radical self-adoration, excessive self-confidence, fragile ego, high-end self-esteem and high arrogance. References are also drawn from Shakespeare’s *King Lear* (1605) and both
the texts are contextualized in the light of narcissistic trends. The third section, in line of the thesis statement, argues that it is because of the development of narcissistic trends that emphatic leadership fails. It draws parallels from modern-day leadership practices and connects the way *Julius Caesar* and *King Lear* can be used as potential texts for the study of effective leadership. A reference to the regime of Napoleon, Stalin, Hitler, Saddam Hussain and Ayatollah Khomeini are drawn in the discussion so as to show that the trend can be destructive for self and society.

Understanding the nuances of good and evil in literary representation and decision making has been a trend in the neo-academic circle. **Chapter Four** of the thesis is thus entitled as “Good and Evil in Leadership: A Study of *Macbeth* and *Hamlet*.” Within the framework of Leadership Studies, this chapter locates Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* (1606) and *Hamlet* (1600-01) central to the understanding of the concepts of good and evil in leading. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the concept of good and evil and their place in the art of leading. The discussion begins with the problem of relative nature of concepts such as good and evil. Divergent views on good and evil from Philosophy, Theology and Sociology are explored. The second section argues that *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* are potential texts for an emphatic understanding of good and evil in leading. It not only argues that the characters of Macbeth and Claudius can be represented as prototypes of understanding the dynamics of righteousness and evil leaders, it also suggests that teaching ethical issues of leadership can be strengthened by an analysis of the characters of Macbeth and Claudius. The last section of the chapter draws parallels from real-life cases bringing out the consequences of unethical leading. The case of Byrraju Ramlinga Raju is drawn into discussion and contrasted with ethical leaders such as Azim Premji, (Chairman of Wipro Corporation), Narayan Murthy (Chief Mentor and founder of Infosys), Ratan Tata (Chairman, Tata Sons), Dr. Abdul Kalam (Former President of India), late Dr. G. Venkatswamy (Chairman, Arvind Eye Care in Madurai) etc.

**Chapter Five** is devoted to the study of emotions in the process of leading and is entitled as “Emotions and Passions in Leading: A Study of *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Othello*”. This chapter examines the importance of emotions in managing and balancing personal and social fronts, and argues that leaders and rulers require handling of their emotions and passions intelligently in their personal and social career for efficient leading. Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606) and *Othello*
(1603-04) are taken as prototypes to understand management of emotions and passions in social representation of life. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the role of emotions and passions in leadership studies. Central to the discussion of emotion and passion remain issues such as conflict of reason in personal and professional endeavor. The second section is an analysis of the characters of Antony, Cleopatra and Othello. This section argues that the fall of these leaders was inspired by their inability to control and manage passions and emotions. The third section traces parallels in real life and takes into account women characters and managers who have proved to be effective leaders by handling their emotions effectively. References to Indian women business leaders like Kiran Mazumdar Shaw (Chairman and Managing Director of Biocon Ltd), Indra K. Nooyi (Chief Executive Officer of PepsiCo), Gitanjali Kirloskar (President, Litertainment), Chanda Kochhar (Managing Director and Chief Financial Officer of ICICI), Shikha Sharma (Managing Director and CEO Axis Bank), Ambika Srivastava (CEO, ZenithOptimedia), and Kalpana Morparia (CEO of JP Morgan) etc. have been highlighted.

Chapter Six is a review of the work done and it concludes the present study. Despite voluminous research on leadership and numerous approaches towards developing leaders / leadership skills through theories and training programmes, there exists a significant gap between theory and practice. It is important to generate a holistic approach towards the understanding of leadership. What is needed instead is a coherent, interdisciplinary approach towards the study of leadership with a practical thrust based on literariness. Leading or leadership is an art which is learnt through experience and maturity. Shakespearean tragedies in fact have posed before us some challenging issues in leadership and it is such serious literature that encourages critical thinking and provides a platform for self-reflection and sense-making. This in turn enables people to break out of their constraining ways of thinking. The interpretation of the tragedies in the light of issues in leading and the philosophical enquiry into concepts such as good and evil, conflict of passion and reason, nature of ambition, pride and arrogance or narcissism will supply a deeper understanding of leading as a process and the problems confronted in the process of leading.
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Chapter 2
Leadership Studies and Pedagogy:
Contextualising Shakespearean Tragedies

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section deals with the genesis of Leadership Studies and the introduction of literary texts in management classrooms to study lessons in leadership. The second section generally introduces Shakespearean plays and notes down their relevance in management classrooms. It addresses the problems and difficulties leaders or rulers face—socially—and introduces how in pedagogical endeavour such problems can be addressed. The third section is a critique of difficulties that arise and problems in comprehending sixteenth century language in modern-day business classrooms. While documenting the problems in locating issues concerning leadership, pedagogical issues involved in the process of contextualizing sixteenth century language to contemporary linguistic boundaries are taken into consideration.

I

Leaders have a significant role in creating the state of mind that is the society. They can serve as symbols of the moral unity of the society. They can express the values that hold the society together. Most important, they can conceive and articulate goals that lift people out of their petty preoccupations carry them above the conflicts that tear a society apart, and unite them in pursuit of objectives worthy of their best efforts.

John W. Gardner¹

Leadership Studies as a discipline is of recent origin; however, concepts such as “leading” and “leadership” are relatively old. “Leadership,” the term, appears in 1828 in Webster’s An American Dictionary of the English Language. But the concept is age-old and is believed to have originated from the beginning of our civilization. Critics may refer to the genesis of the concept of leadership to the times when kings ruled and the times associated with the birth of legends and heroic tales of mythical or real-life heroes. Hence, the genesis of leadership and leaders can be traced from the time of the growth and development of civilizations. The development of the concept has been a process where leaders have laid the foundation of civilizations and they have also been affected by the changes, growth and evolution of those civilizations. Each civilization in the history of humankind has been creative and has had something unique to offer to the study of leadership.

There are few documents that deal with the concepts of leading and heroism historically. Ptahhotep’s *The Instruction of Ptahhotep* (2300 BC) attempts to document the desirable qualities and attributes of Pharaohs.² The Chinese have documented in detail the role and duties of a leader in their texts as early as the sixth century BC. For example, Lao Tzu (600 BC) compiled his lifetime observations and meditations in *Tao Te Ching*. A text on political leadership, the text discusses the qualities of an outstanding leader in *Tao Te Ching*. Lao Tzu suggests selflessness, unbiased leadership (being just and fair) and the role of being a facilitator (being a midwife or having respect for others) to be qualities of effective leaders. Further, Confucius (551-479 BC) offers insights about the moral duty of a leader, and Taoism proposes leadership to be what we discuss as servant leadership and collaborative leadership in modern times.³ The concept of leadership—often projected as heroic deeds—extends to classical Greek texts as well. Works by Homer and Virgil and further the heroic tales of Achilles, Odysseus, Agamemnon, Nestor and Ajax illustrate the qualities of heroes the Greeks admired and appreciated.

In *The Republic* (380 BC), Plato proposes that an ideal king is the one who is also a philosopher. Aristotle (384 BC-322 BC) in *The Politics* (350 BC) deals with concepts such as values and ethics and proposes that it is important for rulers or leaders to be ethical. Further, he emphasizes on the need to educate youth for leadership. Later, Plutarch in his *The Parallel Lives* gives an historical account of noble Grecian and Roman rulers and leaders. All these texts suggest that the study of hero or heroism, and leaders, leadership and leading has been as old as civilizations.

In the recent past it was during the Renaissance that numerous texts dealing with the topic of ruling and statesmanship were given ample importance. Thomas

² Around 2200 BC, Ptahhotep was a minister under King Isesi of the Fifth Dynasty of Egypt. His teachings or instructions are important for many reasons. First, they provide some glimpse into profoundly intellectual and spiritual way of life of Egyptians and second, his instructions are maxims which hold importance even today. As far as leadership and leaders are concerned, his instructions are explored to understand attributes and duties of an ideal ruler. Bernard Bass in *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory Research and Managerial Practices* (2008) quotes from the *Instruction of Ptahhotep*, for example, Ptahhotep emphasizes on three virtues or desired attributes of a leader, namely, robust authority, perceptive heart and equitable justice: “Authoritative utterance is in thy mouth, perception in thy heart and thy tongue is the shrine of justice” (5). Egyptian Pharaohs conformed to this maxim. For further reading, see by Battiscombe G. Gunn’s *Instruction of Ptah-hotep and the Instruction of Ke’ gemni: The Oldest Books in the World*. New York: Dutton and Company, 1998.

³ For further reading see *Leading Change in Multiple Contexts: Concepts and Practices in Organisational, Community, Political, Social, and Global Change Settings* by Gill Robinson Hickman (2009).
Hoby’s translation of Count Balsasarre Castiglione’s *The Courtier* (1561) became a popular book that deals with ethics and moral values among heroes (courtiers).\(^4\) It had substantial influence of the idea of ‘gentlemanliness’ among the English upper class. Niccolo Machiavelli’s *The Prince* (1532) was a breakthrough in the field of political philosophy. Today this text forms an integral part in Leadership Studies. Being a pragmatist, Machiavelli highlights the qualities of a leader and encourages even unethical ways to achieve a desired goal. The treatise was criticized because it urged leaders to use craft, threat, treachery and violence as required according to situations and circumstances. On the other hand, the treatise remains important even today for its practical applications. Further, Philip Sidney’s *An Apology for Poetry* (1579) alludes to the concept of effective heroism and leadership during the Renaissance. Sidney recommends that the tales of heroes such as Hercules, Achilles and Aeneas prepare children to “hear the right description of wisdom, valor and justice” (Abrams, 1963; 499) and hence they remain important in creating virtuous citizens. Sidney’s writings focus on the importance of virtues, principles and education for a prince.\(^5\) He writes the purpose of poetry is to “delight and teach; and delight, to move men to take that goodness in hand, which without delight would fly as from a stranger…” (1963, 501). Richard Hooker, another prominent voice of England during the sixteenth century, in his book *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594), discusses the need for a ruler to maintain order in his/her kingdom with the help of religion.\(^6\)

\(^4\) The English translation of Castiglione’s *Il Cortegiano* done by Thomas Hoby was entitled as *The Courtier* (1561). It was extremely popular among the sixteenth century Elizabethan readers. It presents the constituents of an ideal courtier to be a perfect blend of ethical values and richness of character. The book is organized as a series of conversations that occur between the courtiers and Duke of Urbino (1507) when Castiglione was part of the Duke’s court. In the book the courtier is described as having a cool mind, a good voice, along with proper bearing and gestures. At the same time though, the courtier is expected to have a warrior spirit, to be athletic, and have good knowledge of the humanities, classics and fine arts. Over the course of four evenings, members of the court try to describe the perfect gentleman of the court. In the process they debate the nature of nobility, humour, women and love.

\(^5\) See Sidney’s *An Apology for Poetry* (1579); he lifts the poet as a king over scientists, mathematicians, physicians and philosophers since the poet makes nature better in a newly imagined form, while others merely study it. He writes that this imitation of life can better serve to instruct virtues. The poet “doth not only show the way, but giveth so sweet a prospect unto the way as will entice any man to enter into it” (Sidney, 428). Sidney’s writing and his subsequent popularity indicate, in principle, the importance Elizabethans placed on a virtuous and learned ruler.

\(^6\) Richard Hooker’s best known work is *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594). The book discusses his moderate religious philosophy, embraces both scripture or Church tradition and man’s ability to reason. In Book I, Chapter 10, “The Foundation of Society”, he asserts that “religion and virtue are only as men will accompt of them” (Hooker, 392). Hooker theorizes that leaders are granted power by that “soul” to rule and govern so that “peace, tranquility, and happy estate of the rest might be
Indian texts such as the *Vedas*, *Upanishads*, *Ramayana*, *Mahabharata*, *Bhagvad Geeta* and Kautilya’s *Arthashastra* have shaped the Indian mind for generations. All these texts are a source of ancient Indian wisdom dealing with questions of ‘self’ and ‘existence’. *Ramayana* tells the story of lord Rama who is better described as an ideal king. It gives an insight into the understanding of the roles and duties of kings. *Mahabharata* is another ancient text that deals directly with the duties of kings, the art of warfare, strategy building, ethics and values. Kautilya’s *Arthashastra* is an ancient Indian treatise on economics and politics. Kautilya in this work envisions state as the means of individual, religious and economic happiness for all. He categorically decries the abuse of power and deviation from the path of righteousness and develops a holistic and integral approach to the art of management. Thus, almost all civilizations have dealt with the concept of leadership and leading to some extent. Leaders during this period were either kings or great warriors who ruled, led armies and waged wars. In the present situation, the concept of leader or leadership has undergone sea changes; it is no longer the story, work and deeds of kings or warriors, rather of managers, CEOs, heads, politicians, teachers and others who occupy status of a “leader”. They guide, inspire and motivate a group of people or followers in order to achieve a desired goal.

The study of leaders, leading and leadership has been of interest to scholars from various academic disciplines. Leadership Studies has emerged as an independent academic field of study and is also a multidisciplinary field of knowledge enquiry. At the outset, the chief focus is on leadership in the context of organizations and in human life (Bass and Stogdill, 1990). This is because a single disciplinary approach has failed to address all the dimensions of leading and leadership. Hence, its genesis borrows a lot from other academic disciplines, and both the approaches—social constructionism and essentialism—have impacted upon the discourse in various manners. With this, it has developed as a set of academic pedagogies and the discipline encompasses a host of sub-fields and is filled with definitions, theories, styles, functions, competencies, and historical examples of successful and diverse rulers and leaders. Each discipline has something unique to contribute to the understanding of the concept of leadership, leaders and leading. Earlier Leadership

*procured*” (Hooker, 394). Hooker’s theory of secular leadership places the church in a utilitarian role of service. See “On Moderation in Controversy” from the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* for further information.
Studies was divided into subgroups, namely, Business Leadership, Educational Leadership and Political Leadership—specifically involving a single disciplinary approach. But in the 1980s, a cadre of academicians, trainers and practitioners rejected the single disciplinary approach to the study and practice of leadership and introduced multidisciplinary approach for its pedagogy. The notable scholars in the field of Leadership Studies include, but are not limited to, Bruce Avolio, Bernard Bass, Warren Bennis, James McGregor Burns, Georgia Sorenson and Barry Posner. Ralph Stogdill’s article “Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature” (1948) is cited as an important text in understanding the nature of leadership. Further, Joseph Rost, popular writer and professor at the School of Leadership and Education Sciences, University of San Diego, Victor Vroom, consultant to GE and American Express and professor at the Yale School of Management, have contributed significantly towards decision making and leadership; Gary Yukl, professor at the University of Albany, is celebrated as a leading writer on Organizational Leadership. Not only these, many scholars from across the disciplines such as Psychology (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988), Anthropology (Bailey, 1988), Sociology (Selznick, 1957), Education (Sergiovanni, 1990) and Political Science (Tucker, 1981) have contributed to further the growth of Leadership Studies.

Hence, in the last few decades Leadership Studies has emerged as a well-established academic field of study. Numerous journals and academic programmes and courses offered by universities around the world have given impetus to its growth and development. There are several doctoral programmes in Leadership Studies offered throughout the United States. The University of San Diego was the first institute to offer such a programme in the year 1979. Today there are many institutes that offer doctoral programmes in Leadership Studies. For example, Gozango University has been offering PhD programmes in the field for more than 20 years. Dallas Baptist University, University of Central Arkansas, Marshall University, The Burns Academy of Leadership at the University of Maryland and Harvard University have started offering doctoral programmes in Educational Leadership. It was in 1991, the University of Richmond, Virginia, inaugurated the undergraduate programme including Leadership Studies as a major subject. In India Infosys is believed to have established the first Leadership Institute in October 2001 with the vision of grooming

---

a new generation of leaders. The new recruits into Infosys are introduced to a rigorous foundation programme and are provided with round-the-year training for its future managers. The Institute offers a 16-instructor-led training programme and 59 e-learning programmes to train them to become confident leaders.

Taking the view of an essentialist, Aristotle believed that from the hour of birth, some are marked out for subjugation and others for command. Citing the axiom of noble birth, the earlier approaches to “ruler” or “leader” take an essentialist stand while declaring “ruling” or “leading” comes by birth. The earlier notions held dictate a person is born with leadership traits. Both the Great Man Theory and Trait Theory have laid the assumption that people are born with leadership traits (Robbins and Sanghi, 2006). According to the Great Man Theory, leaders arise when there is a great need. The theory proposes that “breeding” is also another factor that determines leadership because generally leaders are from the aristocratic class and not from the middle or lower classes. It also takes into account mythical domain of documenting knowledge, namely, divine rights of kings, and proposes that during the time of a crisis great leaders arise as if by magic. The birth of Mosses, Jesus or Prophet Mohammed is cited to substantiate the argument (Manning and Curtis, 2002). Trait Theory proposes that people are born with ‘inherited’ traits of a divine ruler (Chemers, 1997). Some traits are particularly suited for leadership. People who make good leaders have the right (or sufficient) combination of desirable traits. However, in today’s pluralistic society the belief that leadership quality is inborn is regarded as a fallacy and is utterly rejected. The Behavioural Approach to leadership suggests people can be trained to be leaders (Robbins and Sanghi, 2006). If the specific behaviours that are identified in leaders could be taught to ordinary people, then we can train ordinary people to be effective leaders. A person whether or not born with a lineage of leaders can be groomed to be one. The Behavioural Theory emphasizes that successful leadership is based on definable and learnable behaviour. It, in fact, does not seek inborn traits or capabilities among people, rather it explores what leaders actually do in our society. Consequently, Behavioural Theory can be cited as a

---


9 The failure of the trait studies led researchers in the late 1940s and 1950s to explore different directions of the discourse. They began looking at behaviours exhibited by specific leaders and tried to find out if there was anything unique in the behaviour of successful leaders. The behavioural studies took to critical determinants of leadership by which people could be trained to be leaders. The Ohio State Studies, University of Michigan Studies, the Managerial Grid, Scandinavian Studies were
transition from trait theory. The Behavioural Theories have had modest success in identifying consistent relationship between leadership behaviour and group performance, but the major drawback of this approach is that the situational factors are missing that influence the success or failure of leaders.

Today ‘leadership’ or ‘leading’ is a believed to be a social construct (Meindl, 1995; Grint, 2005; Sjostrand and Tyrstrup, 2001). It is discussed as an interactive and complex process where not only a leader affects the followers but the followers affect him/her as well. The early leadership theories tend to focus on the traits, characteristics and behaviour of the successful leaders. The traditional approaches to leadership, viz., the Trait Approach, Behaviour or Style Approach and the Situational Leadership Approach, are criticized in the present generation due to their narrow perspective, which in turn fail to cover all aspects of leadership and leading. It fails on account of lack of empirical evidences to prove that traits and behaviour of leaders

main studies dealing with the study of behaviour of efficient leaders. For further reading see Robert N Lussier and Christopher F. Achua’s Leadership: Theory, Application, and Skill Development (New York: South Western Education, 2009) and Stephen P. Robbins and Seema Sanghi’s Organisational Behavior (Delhi: Pearson, 2006).


The evolution of leadership theories began in the twentieth century and earlier the focus of all studies was on leader’s personality. The studies on leadership during 1930’s and 1940’s focused on the leaders and their traits. Researchers searched for those special traits and attributes in successful leaders which set them apart from others. These studies resulted in the trait theory and Great Man theory. Leaders were believed to have exceptional qualities like boundless energy, deep intuition, uncanny foresight and irresistible persuasive powers. But it was too limited in scope. For decades, trait theory and great man theory dominated Leadership Studies. Most notable are the writings of Thomas Carlyle (Hero and Hero Worship, 1841) and Francis Galton (Hereditary Genius, 1869) in this regard; their work explores the traits of successful leaders in detail. Further, the researchers could not bring out set of those traits or attributes that could guarantee success of the leaders. The theories failed and the focus shifted to the study of behavior of leaders which resulted in the behavioral theories and leadership style. Managerial grid model by Robert Blake and Jane Moutan in 1964 suggested different styles of leadership. In 1950’s R.M. Stogdill (1948) and R.D. Mann (1959) brought into focus that it is not the traits that determine the success of a leader but situation also determines success and failure of a leader. A leader with a set of traits may be successful in one situation and fail in another situation. Thus, situational approaches to leadership gained momentum. Herbert Spencer (1884) said that it is the times that produce a leader and not the other way. Fiedler contingency model, Vroom Yetton decision model, path goal theory, Hersey Blanchard situational theory were put forward to support the views. Then the transformational and transactional theories focused on the relation of leader and followers. For further understanding see Fred. E. Fiedler’s A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness (1967), J.M. Burn’s Leadership (1978), Ingo Winkler’s Contemporary Leadership Theories: Enhancing the Understanding of the Complexity, Subjectivity and Dynamic of Leadership (2010).
are responsible for effective leadership. The traditional theories conceptualized leaders as active players and followers as passive. Leaders are seen as people with traits different from the followers’ and the relations are seen in the context of social hierarchy and usually understood as situations that are socially predetermined. However, later theories on leadership begin to consider the role of followers and the contextual nature of leadership (Winkler, 2010). The contemporary approaches conceptualise the process of leadership as a process of interaction. The recent approaches do not presume the existence of a predetermined situation in which the leader’s and the follower’s roles are clearly distributed according to the formal organizational structure but it is seen as an interactive process where individuals pursuing particular aims influence each other. Therefore, all members of an organization are capable of being leaders and a formal distinction between a leader and a follower does not technically exist.

Many new models and approaches to leadership have come up in the recent times, namely, the Attribution theory, Psychodynamic leadership approach, Neo-Charismatic leadership, Leader Member Exchange theory, Symbolic leadership, Role Theory of leadership, Idiosyncrasy Credit Model of leadership, Micro-politics approach to leadership and Social Learning theory of leadership. The contemporary approaches to leadership present leadership as “a sequence of multidirectional, reciprocal influential processes among many individuals at different levels, in different subunits, and within executive” (Yukl, 1994; 498). The focus of all these theories has been on the subjective perception of the individual for developing and forming relations with regard to leading. It is understood as a result of various interactions among members of an organization which is hardly ever technically predictable. Thus, leadership in the present scenario has been a sociological process which has evolved with the growth and development of democratic principles.

The role of Humanities remains crucial in shaping Leadership Studies. It is the discipline of Humanities that supplies rich foundation for understanding the context of leadership and it offers a gigantic repository of information about morality and human behaviour that spans over time and across cultures. In other words, subjects such as Literature, Philosophy and Religion offer a rich background for the study of

---

leadership and Leadership Studies derives its foundation from these subjects. This is because the aim of liberal arts is to impart knowledge that is good in itself and to educate citizens to live and make choices in a free society (Jaeger, 1986). In general, most of the contribution in the growth and development of Leadership Studies comes from Management and Social Psychology but Humanities provides the basis to understand their theoretical aspects.

It is around the end of the twentieth century that management teachers and consultants started exploring works of classics to derive lessons in leadership and management. The real impetus to this new trend came up with the publication of an article entitled “How Business Schools Lost Their Way,” in May 2005, in the Harvard Business Review, by two very popular academicians in the field of Leadership Studies, namely, Warren G. Bennis and James O’Toole. Their article created a positive confusion in business schools in relation to the changes needed in the curriculum. Earlier, the focus of Leadership Studies was more on theories than their application in real life. The article highlighted the inefficiency of the business curriculum and its inability to cater to the need of students. It argues that business schools have lost their way because of scientific model that dominates business research and teaching leading to strong dependency on theories but its practical application remains ineffective. Executives often fail to apply these theoretical concepts in real-life situations. Therefore, they strongly recommend a course in literature for management students because literary texts can be instructive and helpful in developing insights. It was also realized that teaching business and leadership can be entertaining through fiction.

By the end of the twentieth century, the idea of introducing literary texts among business management students started a new trend in the United States and the United Kingdom, which became popular with the publication of a number of books and articles focusing on literary texts to teach lessons in management and leadership. Paul Corrigan’s Shakespeare on Management (1999) goes on to use Shakespearean plays to demonstrate the psychology of leadership. He explores how Shakespeare through his plays present before us the different roles a leader can take and the different skills needed to be a successful leader. Further, Shakespeare on Management: Wise Business Counsel from the Bard (1999) by Jay M. Shafritz explores most popular topics in business, from mergers to acquisitions, and office politics and power plays to public relations. Another important work in this field that
holds attention and has become a bestseller is *Power Plays: Shakespeare’s Lessons in Leadership and Management* (2002). It is a joint effort of Tina Packer and John O. Whitney. The writers, highlighting the obvious question of the complexity of assessing Shakespeare in business management, make their methodological clarifications clear and note down the reasons for which Shakespearean Studies remain important:

William Shakespeare as a management consultant? “Nonsense,” you say? Not so fast...he is arguably the Western tradition’s greatest thinker and student of human psychology. James Joyce once said that after God, Shakespeare has created most. The eminent Yale literary critic Harold Bloom has long argued that Shakespeare’s plays can be taken as a kind of secular Bible of modern consciousness.... Bloom even goes so far as to argue in his most recent book, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*, that by inventing so many deep and diverse characters that have entertained playgoers and readers for almost half a millennium, Shakespeare has, in effect, *invented us*. (2002, 11)

Rationalising Shakespeare, in other words defending literature, has been part of the canon while we frame the pedagogy of Leadership Studies. Notwithstanding the nature of the debate, scholars have extensively dealt with the problem of locating Shakespearean characters and themes in the light of the same. Joseph L. Badaracco, for example, uses works of serious writers as case studies to teach business ethics. In his book *Questions of Character: Illuminating the Heart of Leadership through Literature* (2006), he argues that literature helps leaders develop personal answers to specific questions. Works of art provide powerful perspectives on fundamental dilemmas faced by managers and executives. For example, Badaracco rationalizes the study of Arthur Miller’s play *Death of a Salesman* (1949) to put forward the two propositions about dreams and generalizes how within our society we have singular or multitude of dreams that take us towards success (2006, 11). Citing literary or historical situations, thus, helps us in locating human positions in a better way than reading theoretical lessons about lifestyle.

The trend of using literary texts has attracted many a scholar practicing Leadership Studies in pedagogical endeavour. James G. March, for example, provides an innovative contribution to the study of organizations. In a course on leadership at Stanford University he explores the problems involved in leading and leadership using acclaimed works such as *War and Peace* (1869) and *Don Quixote* (1605).
March uses literature to examine a set of dilemmas related to leadership, and further investigates questions concerning the balance between private life and public duties, ingenuity and innocence, diversity and integration, and the expression and control of sexuality. Warren Gamaliel Bennis in his book *On Becoming a Leader* (2003) taking a social constructionist approach argues that when we nurture individuals with societal leadership skills, we contribute to their growth of taking responsibilities. This book serves as a beacon of insight, delving into the qualities that define leadership. In India, it is at Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, since 1989, Professor S. Manikutty and Professor S.P. Singh have been teaching a course entitled “Leadership: Vision, Meaning and Reality” based on literature. Though a prototype of imitation, it was first of its kind in India. The course was highly popular amongst graduate students and witnessed some positive changes. They document their experiences of the course and discussions in *Essence of Leadership: Explorations from Literature* (2010). The book argues that understanding leadership is really about understanding life and this starts with gaining an understanding of the self. They start with Cervantes’ masterpiece *Don Quixote* (1604) highlighting the protagonist’s ‘high’ self-confidence. This is followed by other texts that highlight important issues: ambition and purpose in Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* (1958), faith versus reason in Bertolt Brecht’s *The Life of Galileo* (1937-39), awakening the human spirit in Bernard Shaw’s *Saint Joan* (1924), authenticity in Girish Karnad’s *Tughlaq* (1964) and *Mudrarakshasa* (4th or 5th century) by Visakhadatta, leader and society in Arthur Miller’s *All My Sons* (1947), role of illusions in Ibsen’s *The Wild Duck* (1884) and *A Doll’s House* (1879) and the epic *Mahabharata* for development of perspective. Its limitations, however, include the incoherent attribution of texts without much methodological clarification plus the way texts of different periods and cultures housed under one category.

In the last decade literary and historical characters from various texts have been used as pedagogical tools by teachers of business management and leadership consultants; Shakespeare and Shakespearean characters have been extensively used for an understanding of the human condition. Shakespeare’s plays are analysed and investigated by the teachers of business management to develop perspectives and find answers to perennial problems that have perplexed even best of leaders. Michael Useem, Director of the Wharton Center for Leadership and Change Management, points out that “by watching how historical figures behave in settings far before our
time...we often get very good insights into what is vital in our own leadership or managerial moments”. Further, he asserts that “we include Shakespeare in our range of learning experiences because it is one of the more indelible ways we have found of bringing points to life—in part because of the power of his insights and also because of the intrinsic elements of the stories he tells”. Hence, introducing Shakespeare has been an in-trend.

Among other practitioners of Shakespeare in business classrooms include Carol Adelman and Ken Adelman, founders of Movers & Shakespeares (1997). They use Shakespeare’s plays to teach modern management skills to executives. Ken Adelman, along with Norman R. Augustine, has authored a book called *Shakespeare in Charge: The Bard’s Guide to Leading and Succeeding on the Business Stage* (2001). It deals with the application of Shakespeare’s understanding of palace politics and strategies of warfare to twists and turns of the corporate world. The Ariel Group: Leadership Presence is another international training and consulting firm that uses theater-based, experiential learning techniques to teach business executives how to develop and hone their individual leadership presence. Craig Cochran states that Shakespearean tragic heroes have lots to offer to management students. In the article “A Shakespearean Lesson in Leadership” posted on *Inside Quality Insider* (2007), he praises Macbeth as a war hero who embodies bravery, resoluteness, and strength—quintessential attributes of good leaders but his downfall points out the pitfalls involved in being over ambitious.

Thus, introduction of literary texts into business classrooms has become a trend in the modern era. Arguably, this is because literature serves to introduce the basic issues in life which cannot be separated from the issues in leadership. In other words, both the issues of life and leadership are inseparable. If we take an Aristotelian view point, literature introduces us to the imaginary world but it is not far from the real one. Besides, literature also stimulates reflection on the issues of life. Oliver Williams, a scholar of religion and business ethics, argues that “stories that ‘ring true’

14 Ibid.
15 Carol Adelman is the President of Movers & Shakespeares. Ken Adelman is the Vice President of Movers & Shakespeares. He began teaching Shakespeare in 1977 at Georgetown University, and taught honors students at George Washington University for years.
bring us in touch with the fullness of our humanity” (1998, 7). Aristotle in *Nichomachean Ethics* claims that the best education should not only impart information but it should also develop our capacity to feel and sympathize because to feel delight and pain rightly or wrongly has no small effect on our actions (Ross and Brown, 2009). Literature is also helpful in arousing awareness regarding those issues which a person may not have experienced directly but needs to be prepared for. Robert Brawer states: “The values and insights we glean from serious literature sensitize us to ourselves and, by extension, to the problems inherent in managing people in an organization” (2000, 2). Literature is also popular in Leadership Studies and Business Management classroom because stories or storytelling method is immensely appreciated for being entertaining. Stories open the imaginative side of human mind; Martha Nussabaum suggests that “storytelling and literary imagining are not opposed to rational argument, but can provide essential ingredients in a rational argument” (1995, xiii). She clarifies the role of literature in rational argument as “an ethics of impartial respect for human dignity will fail to engage real human beings unless they are made capable of entering imaginatively into the lives of distant other and to have emotions related to that participation” (1995, xiv). It is generally observed that speeches by great leaders include storytelling as a strategy to make principles concrete for the followers. The defense of introducing literature in business classrooms continues. Gardner (1995), Teal (1996), Fleming (2001), and Ready (2002) argue that storytelling is a central part of the work of leaders. Howard Gardner asserts that “chiefly through the stories they (leaders) relate” the human condition (1996, 9). Therefore, storytelling and stories have become an integral part of Leadership Studies and Business Management classrooms. Introducing Shakespeare in such classrooms not only helps students understand the basis of his writing, they also understand the human predicament in a different way.

II

Shakespeare’s popularity has survived till date. From the *First Folio* (1623) to *Riverside Shakespeare* (1974), from Charles Lamb and Mary Lamb’s *Tales from Shakespeare* (1878) to S. Viswanathan’s *The Shakespeare Play as Poems* (1980), there have been numerous instances of different versions of Shakespeare—both in the form of texts and criticism—in various countries. Whether in the form of children’s stories or that of re-making or re-reading, the impact of Shakespearean discourse has
been significant on people, writers and scholars of all subsequent ages.\textsuperscript{16} The Romantics, for example, took inspiration from Shakespeare; in fact Shakespeare became the touchstone by which the Romantics could distinguish themselves from their adversaries and could establish themselves as major poets. Victor Hugo in the \textit{Preface to Cromwell} (1827) schematises the history of poetry as an interrelation of ode, epic and drama, identified it with the Bible, Homer and Shakespeare (Bate, 1992; 232). He states in the preface that drama, which Shakespeare embodies, “combines in one breath the grotesque and the sublime, the terrible and absurd, tragedy and comedy” (1992, 267). The union is a defining characteristic of ‘the third epoch of poetry, of the literature of to-day’ (1992, 225-26). Shakespeare, for the Victorian writers, has been a way of expressing all sorts of beliefs, ideals, desires and fears about authority, including monstrous visions of its travesty (Sawyer, 2003). Thomas Carlyle in his lecture on the “Hero as a Poet” begins by nominating Dante and Shakespeare as exemplary poets, and hails them as “saints of poetry” (1840, 98). In the modern period, the New Critics found Shakespeare’s plays responding perfectly to their search for imagery, wordplay, irony, ambiguity, coherence and antithesis (McDonald, 2004). We could say that as is the reference of Plato and Aristotle to history and philosophy, so is the case with Shakespeare to the literary world. Helen Vendler, a celebrated formalist critic, explores the antithetical quality in Shakespeare’s plays as: “His mind operates always by antithesis. As soon as he thinks of one thing, he thinks of something different from it” (Mcdonald, 2004; 17); the religious critics assert that his plays extol doctrines of Christianity (Batson, 2006); psychoanalytical critics search the real meaning underlying the apparent meaning of his plays in terms of Freudian, Jungian and Alderians theories (McDonald, 2004). If not much, Shakespearean plays have been used to serve specific purposes of different generations of critics and scholars, which we shall examine in subsequent chapters.\textsuperscript{17}

There are multiple reasons for which Leadership Studies, in the present generation, has borrowed much from Shakespearean Studies. The popularity of the plays and sonnets has ensured the inclusion of Shakespearean scholarship in the

\textsuperscript{16} A sample may include, but is not limited to, Suniti Namjoshi’s \textit{Sycorax: New Fables and Poems} (Penguin, 2006) and Michelle Cliff’s “Caliban’s Daughter: The Tempest and the Teapot” published in \textit{Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies}, Vol. 12, No. 2 (1991), pp. 36-51. The list is moreover vast and ever-expanding.

\textsuperscript{17} See, for example, the chapter on ‘Narcissistic Leadership’ for a detailed discussion on Freud’s use of Shakespeare in his voluminous work.
academia and further because of the subject that Shakespearean theatre touches upon they have been included as prototypes of realities. Ben Jonson was true in anticipating Shakespeare’s future when he claimed in the “Preface” to the First Folio, “He was not of an age, but for all the time” (Schelling, 1892; 87). The issues of leadership and heroism that the plays address are so central in forming a sense of historicity that subjects such as History, Politics, Management, Language and Culture Studies have derived much inspiration from Shakespearean Studies. With the advancement of ‘liberal humanism,’ the focus of Shakespearean plays shifted from literary dogmas to that of portraying morality and virtues in a two-fold way. On the one hand, the depiction of evil has been so central so as to encourage values and virtues, and on the other hand, the fall of principal characters, especially the tragic heroes, arouses pity and fear—according to first generation of classical criticism—so as to understand the concept evil in society.\textsuperscript{18} For instance, the fall of a woman character such as Lady Macbeth remains central in Macbeth (1606), which can be interpreted in many ways. Firstly, the religious critics interpret it as a parallel to the concept of ‘Original Sin’—Adam being tempted into Sin by Eve—just as Lady Macbeth tempted Macbeth to murder King Duncan (Forsyth, 2003). Secondly, the feminist critics see Lady Macbeth’s challenging notions of womanhood—the representation of a murderous mother and daughter—as a misappropriation of women characters during renaissance England.\textsuperscript{19} She is seen in conflicting roles as a barbaric, cruel, ruthless and passionate wife: “These two images of Lady Macbeth—as barbaric and passionate or domesticated and caring—figure the conflicted notions about women’s role in the nineteenth century” (Werner, 2001; 60).

To the common reader, thus, traditionally, Shakespeare’s plays have been classified in three genres as comedies, histories and tragedies by his fellow actors Henry Condell and John Heminges who published his plays collectively in the First Folio in 1623. Shakespearean tragedies have attracted a great deal of attention in the academia. The twelve plays that are put under the category of ‘tragedies’ do not have a fixed pattern; in fact there are claims such as there is nothing as Shakespearean tragedy, it is only Shakespearean tragedies (Mehl, 1986; 2). Each tragedy is unique and discusses some profound problem or situation of life. Andrew Cecil Bradley in

\textsuperscript{18} For further reference, see the chapter on ‘Good and Evil in Leadership’.

his *Shakespearean Tragedies* (1904) asserts tragedies to be the supreme presentation of a view of life, an explanation or at least a glimpse of the great problem of the nature of good and evil. All the Shakespearean tragic heroes are persons of ‘high degree’, often kings or princes; if not, they are leaders or men holding power and position in a state. As traditional critics such as Bradley explore, these heroes often prove their worth as leaders yet they fail in the most tragic manner—often implanting situations beyond their control—chiefly because of their own flaws or weaknesses in character. Shakespearean tragedies, in the field of Leadership Studies, thus offer lessons in failed leading; in doing so do they achieve in ‘portraying’ a vision towards a succeeding leading technique. Julius Caesar, Macbeth, Claudius, Antony, Lear, Othello—all of them prove their worth as leaders, yet their fall is inspired by their vulnerabilities. Caesar and King Lear’s fall is inspired by their excessive pride or hubris; Macbeth and Claudius succumb to the temptations of evil; Antony gives way to the pleasures of body more than his duties as a general; and further Othello fails due to his uncontrolled jealousy and anger. These characters and situations are often analysed in business classrooms so that they can offer insight into understanding the causes of derailment of leaders serving as warning to avoid the pitfalls in leading. The traditional way of exploring Shakespeare has its distinctive merits, moreover; they can be cited to show a human predicament of persons with great achievements.

Historically, moreover, Shakespeare wrote during a period when the political situation of England had been stabilized after a long period of unrest. He was born after the reign of Henry VIII (1491-1547), a dynamic force who changed the entire constitution of England by breaking away from the Papal supremacy. The reign of Henry VIII was marked by less violence and increase in national power, the entry of Reformation and most important the separation of England from all ecclesiastical bondage in ‘Parliament’s famous Act of Supremacy’. His successor Edward VI (1537-1553) was only nine when crowned as the king of England. Unfortunately he could not survive long and was replaced by Mary I (1516-1558) in 1553. She was known to bring back Catholicism in England and in the process many religious dissenters were persecuted and she has been known as ‘Bloody Mary’. Her failing health and inability to produce an heir to the throne of England resulted in passing on
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20 This is similar to what Aristotle proposes of the tragic hero, “He must be the one who is highly renowned and prosperous—personage like Oedipus, Thyestes, or other illustrious men of such families” (Butcher, 2002; 47). Similarly, early Shakespearean scholarship deals with the same issue.
of the crown to her half-sister Elizabeth I who ruled England from 1558-1603. It was Queen Elizabeth who left indelible impression on the history of England (Legouis and Cazamian, 1981). England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth had actually emerged out of a period that was filled with uncertainties and conflicts related to both religion and questions of succession. When she ascended the English throne, the country was passing through a difficult period with religious discords and empty treasury. It was advised that she should marry soon and lean on her husband for support. Between two great powers—Spain and France—the position of England was very delicate (Long, 1909). But with her astute political insight and leadership skills, she could manage to steer England out of the politically unstable situation. Under the leadership of Queen Elizabeth, England achieved the most unexpected and prospered into one of the most powerful forces in Europe (Dobson and Watson, 2002; Loomis, 2010). Her first victory, the defeat of Spanish Armada (1588) created a new image of lady queen and won the confidence of her people (Riehl, 2010; Shenk, 2010). In her speech addressed to the English army at Tilbury Fort in 1588 she could inspire, motivate the soldiers and lead the army bravely:

My loving people, we have been persuaded by some, that are careful of our safety, to take heed how we commit ourselves to armed multitudes, for fear of treachery; but I assure you, I do not desire to live to distrust my faithful and loving people.

Let tyrants fear; I have always so behaved myself that, under God, I have placed my chiefest strength and safeguard in the loyal hearts and good will of my subjects. And therefore I come amongst you at this time, not as for my recreation or sport, but being resolved, in the midst and heat of the battle, to live or die amongst you all; to lay down, for my God, and for my kingdom, and for my people, my honour and my blood, even the dust.

I know I have but the body of a weak and feeble woman; but I have the heart of a king, and of a king of England, too; and think foul scorn that Parma or Spain, or any prince of Europe, should dare to invade the borders of my realms: to which, rather than any dishonor should grow by me, I myself will take up arms; I myself will be your general, judge, and rewarder of every one...
of your virtues in the field... we shall shortly have a famous victory over the enemies of my God, of my kingdom, and of my people (Clive, 1975; 126).21

The speech remains important for multiple reasons: first, a queen gaining a ‘receiving audience’ becomes the central theme; second, she could motivate the soldiers and win their confidence, during the time of such a big crisis; and third, with this she could show her skills in managing warfare during the time of a crisis. The purpose was to unite the soldiers to move ahead fearlessly and assure them they are guided by a strong leader.

Prior to Elizabeth’s accession to the throne, the history of England had few rulers who saw such success. The victory of Henry V (1386-1422) at the Battle of Agincourt (1415) followed by the Treaty of Troyes (1420) gave England somehow a stable history. His successor Henry VI (1421-1471) was but a shadow of the king, “a puppet in the hands of powerful nobles who seized the power of England and turned it to self destruction” (Long, 1909; 80). Cade’s Rebellion (1450) and the War of Roses (1455-1485) initiated further destruction in England. The frightful reign of Richard III brought about the end of the civil wars, self destruction of feudalism and encouraged a new growth of ‘English national sentiment under the popular Tudors’ (Long, 1909). Shakespeare wrote about this period and his works reflect the anxiety, uncertainties and the politics of sixteenth century England. The history of England was the main source; it was specifically from Raphael Holished’s *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* (1577) from which Shakespeare derived allusions for his plays. He wrote around ten history plays dealing with the history of England. Shakespeare composed *Richard III* (1591) during the reign of Queen Elizabeth and he portrayed Richard III as a tyrannical ruler who is ultimately dethroned by Henry VII who was Queen Elizabeth’s great grandfather. Had Shakespeare portrayed Richard III positively, it would have certainly proved Henry VII usurper and that he would have lost the Queen’s favour (Armitage et al., 2009). These were the political considerations of sixteenth century England which Shakespeare kept in mind while composing them, but at the same time the message that becomes clear from the play is that tyrannical and evil rulers are ultimately dethroned or meet a tragic end. Richard III was brutally killed by Henry VII and in the same manner Macbeth is slain by Macduff and

Claudius by Hamlet. Thus, perhaps Shakespeare wanted to convey that tyrannical rulers meet a tragic and fatal end and it was a warning for rulers to be ethical and just.

The plays project rulers who either failed or ruled successfully. In fact his history plays *Henry IV* Part I and II (1596, 1599), *Henry V* (1599), *Henry VI* Part I, II and III (1591, 1594, 1595), *Richard II* (1595), *Richard III* (1591), *Henry VIII* (1613), *King John* (1596-97), etc., deal with rise and fall of kings. Richard III is portrayed as a Machiavellian hero who struggles to achieve power and status unethically. In the process he gets his brother Clarence murdered who stands before him in the line of succession and marries his wife Lady Anne. In the end Richard III or Duke of Gloucester meets a tragic end at the battle of Bosworth Field at the hands of Richmond who ascends to the throne of England as Henry VII. Henry V or Prince Hal of *Henry IV* is portrayed by Shakespeare as an ideal king. Restless and irresponsible Prince Hal of *Henry IV* is transformed into a mature king in *Henry V*. He proves his worth at the battle of Agincourt (1415) defeating France. The most memorable passage of the play is the speech delivered before the battle on St. Crispin’s Day, when the English soldiers are hungry and tired. They had lost all the hope of winning the war because the French soldiers outnumbered the English by six to one. Henry V proves to be an exemplary leader, succeeds in motivating and persuading his soldiers to give their best. The speech is admired for its language and the art of persuasion. Today the speech is used as a text in leadership classrooms as an example to teach the art of persuasive speech. Though a fictitious piece composed by Shakespeare, it shows the importance of oratory skills for the success of a leader:

> This story shall the good man teach his son;  
> And Crispin Crispian shal ne’ev go by,  
> From this day to the ending of the world,  
> But we in it shall be remembered--  
> We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;  
> For he to-day that sheds his blood with me  
> Shall be my brother…  
> And the gentlemen in England now-a-bed  
> Shall think themselves accurs’d they were not here (4.3.56-65)

Henry V succeeds in communicating the vision he had seen for England. He makes his troops realize that they are fighting for a cause that will bestow on them eternal
glory and honour. This is one of the numerous instances constantly evoked to draw parallels in modern-day critical pedagogy.

Shakespeare’s tragedies also demonstrate the rise and fall of leaders (monarchs), the dilemmas faced by them and causes of their failures and success. It is true that leadership or leading has changed considerably from the fifteenth century to the twenty-first century but what is noteworthy is that the basic problems associated with leading and leadership remain the same. There remain, however, other concerns such as comprehending sixteenth century language in the twenty-first century for its complexity, obscurity and in contextualizing monarchical heroes in a democratic world. Hence, in what follows we discuss the problem of sixteenth century language in pedagogical endeavour of twenty-first century management classrooms.

III

Earlier we have explored that Shakespearean plays continue to be popular and they entertain and amuse us. At the outset, they are so created that we marvel at the writer’s gift of making the insubstantial actual and sometimes endow the creations of his fancy with a greater reality that its existence appears to be like living characters. The fascination has been so central that throughout the subsequent ages, scholars have used Shakespeare’s plays in their field of study as broad as Psychoanalysis and Marxist economics. For example, Freud has discussed several plays of Shakespeare to discuss various psychological problems and nervous disorders. Freud was so fascinated by Shakespeare that he often included his works in his discussions of Psychoanalysis. For example, Hamlet has been discussed in the light of Oedipus complex, Macbeth in the light of psychological implications of childlessness, and King Lear and Othello have been used to illustrate psychic displacement. Julius Caesar has been discussed in Interpretations of Dreams (1900) and several other plays of Shakespeare are taken up to illustrate psychological problems and motives of action. Earnest Jones, one of Freud’s students, extensively comments on this as Shakespeare was Freud’s “favorite” and Joan Riviere, in speaking of “his [Freud’s] astonishing knowledge of literature”, noted “his memory, especially for Shakespeare” (Holland, 1960; 163). Hanns Sach writes recollecting Freud’s interest in Shakespeare that “Freud would show how Shakespeare could display or conceal his characters motivations at will, throwing logic to the winds and courting contradictions.
if they suited the emotional situation” (Holland, 1960; 164). Even four hundred
years after his death, the bard continues to be popular and relevant in the modern
situation.

In spite of all the popularity generated by introducing Shakespeare into the
Business Management classrooms, there are certain limitations and problems
associated with using Shakespearean plays among technical and management
students. Shakespeare chiefly wrote for theatre to please the Elizabethan audience. He
was required to be a poet because in his time plays were mostly written in verse form.
Further, it has to be admitted that the language of his plays is sometimes not only
difficult, it also baffling scholars of English Literature. There are very few scholars
who have exclusively worked on the language used in Shakespearean plays when
compared to those who worked on character studies, performance or stage technique
or the bibliographical problems surrounding the date of texts. Dryden, Samuel
Johnson, Coleridge and Keats have discussed his language and in the recent times F.P.
Wilson’s *Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life* (1941), Caroline Spurgeone’s
*Shakespeare’s Imagery* (1935) and Dr. Wolfgang Clemen’s *Shakespeare Bilder
(1951) have given general direction to the study of Shakespearean language. It has
been exclusively the imagery in his plays that are explored and how language was
instrumental in creating those images in these works of art. Besides this, Shakespeare
uses language as a subtle medium for reflecting the differences and interactions
among characters, situations and moods. Therefore, the words are not to be treated as
abstract entities but expressions of particular attitudes of quite distinct characters in
distinct dramatic situations. The nature of language used by him in his plays actually
contributed in the development of the plays. He frequently used in his plays both
prose and verse forms. Prose was used for the non-serious or inferior characters and
verse form was applied for serious and royal characters. Some exception may be
visible in few characters such as Hamlet and Brutus. These deviations in language and
the early modern English which Shakespeare uses in his plays make them complex
and at times difficult for modern readers. Critics such as L.C. Knights, Wilson Knight,
D.A. Traversi, J.F. Danby and a host of other scholars approach his plays as lyric
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poems, abstracting ‘themes’ and ‘symbols’ from the whole complex development of drama.

Understanding the language of Shakespearean plays is difficult four hundred years after its origin. This is because language is an evolving entity. Besides language of ordinary people grows strange, recedes into the past, along with other social practices and assumptions taken for granted in one age yet hard for a later age to understand it because language is ever-changing. For example, if we read or see a modern play, say, George Osborne’s Look Back in Anger, we can understand the language spoken and the jokes and its implications; on the other hand, however, when we approach Shakespeare, sometimes the dialogues and characters remain obscure, and we miss the subtle implications of several jokes and pun. For example, the words ‘quat’ (pimple) in Othello (5.1.11) and ‘fap’ (drunk) in The Merry Wives of Windsor (1.1.164) were in common usage during the Elizabethan period. It was found to be used in the areas around Warwickshire, very much part of the dialect spoken in that part. The modern reader may find it odd and not part of ‘standard English’ but at that time there was as such no written ‘standard English’ to be universally acknowledged. There was ‘chancery English’, the standard to be used for legislative and bureaucratic purposes.

The language of Shakespeare’s plays reflects the problems related to the rules of grammar and uncertainties of English language in the sixteenth century. English during the sixteenth century was in a state of flux when grammar and spelling were both uncertain. Even by the end of the century, there were no grammar books or dictionaries. G.S. Gordon writes: “One exhilarating result of the linguistic science of the century was, in its later years at any rate, a period of almost complete freedom” (Evan, 1952; 3). The language spoken by the royal and upper class people was believed to be the standardized form. There are many evidences to suggest that during Shakespeare’s time the monarch and the court served as models for imitation in speech, judging by comments made in print by schoolmasters and commentators. The earliest reference to monarch’s English as model comes from Shakespeare himself from The Merry Wives of Windsor (1602). Mistress Quickly warns that with Dr. Cauis, a Frenchman “here will be an old abusing of God’s patience and the King’s English” (1.4.4-5).

From linguistic point of view Shakespearean plays show us the changes in the process of the development of the English language. This is because Shakespeare has
introduced thousands of words and phrases to the English language along with new concepts and grammatical structures. Shakespeare literally coined words to describe and discuss situations and events, thereby enriching the English language immensely. His explorations of the poetic form and grammar also expanded the scope of English, laying the foundation for other authors who worked during his times. Shakespeare is believed to be the greatest word maker: “Of the 17,677 words Shakespeare employs in his plays and poems, his is the first known use of well over 1,700: one new word in every ten (Adamson, 2000; 237). Most of the new words that he created and used in his plays may be transparent to the modern reader but quite of few of them are harder to interpret because they are either formed after several word-formation processes or derived from nonnative languages. He borrowed words generously from Latin, French and Greek. During the Elizabethan age, including words from other languages proved to be a popular method in embellishing the English language. For example, complex poetic compounding is a common element of Shakespeare’s verbal creativity. For instance, in *Twelfth Night* Shakespeare presents:

Clown: Would you have a love-song or a song of good life?

Toby: A love-song, a love-song. (2.3.35-37)

This passage illustrates a *lovesong* or *love-song* is a name for a particular kind of song (‘song of love’). As with compounds in general, no change in the grammatical function of the base-word *song* has taken place. A *lovesong* and a *song of good life* are the alternatives the Clown has to offer; both are something that he could perform. By means of compounding, a longer expression can be telescoped into one word, to be used grammatically in the same way as the word on which it is based. Compounding of words was the most popular way for expanding English vocabulary right from the Anglo-Saxon period. Similarly, he is also known for coining many phrases which have become an integral part of the modern English Language. For instance, “a fool’s paradise”, the phrase occurs in *Romeo and Juliet* (1592) which means “a state of happiness based on false hope” and further “wild goose chase” means “a hopeless quest” in the present context. There are numerous phrases that Shakespeare produced have become famous proverbs. For example, phrases such as “When sorrow come, they come not in single spies but in battalions” (*Hamlet*), “All that glitters is not gold” (*Merchant of Venice*), “All the world’s a stage” (*As You Like It*), “All’s well that ends well (*All’s Well that Ends Well*) and “Brevity is the soul of wit” (*Hamlet*) have been used consistently in modern times.
Another reason for complexity in Shakespearean language is that it is highly figurative and metaphorical, and it also includes “heightened strategies” such as puns and parodies (Adamson, 2000; 8) difficult for modern readers to understand without having some prior knowledge of the history and culture of the Elizabethan age. The purpose of introducing puns was to add humour; for example, in Julius Caesar Act 1 scene i, the scene is Rome, the celebration of the festival of Lupercalia. The crowds are out to cheer Caesar’s triumphant entry into the city. The tribunes Flavius and Murellus try to clear the streets but the working folk are in a holiday-mood and are disposed to resist the officials’ angry demands of ‘what trade art thou? Answer me directly (1.1.12)’. They do not answer directly. A cobbler teasingly describes himself as mender of bad souls’ (1.1.14), and begs exasperated Murellus states ‘be not out with me’, adding ‘yet if you be out…I can mend you’ (1.1.16-17). To Flavius, he declares, ‘all that he lives by is with the awl’ (1.1.22). The pun on all/awl and the play on sole/soul, with which the cobbler justifies his ‘safe conscience’ (1.1.13-14) remain central to Shakespeare’s invention of the English language. It can be understood easily. The cobbler, further, says, “As proper men as ever trod upon neat’s leather have gone upon my handiwork” (1.1.26-27). As ever trod upon neat’s leather” is an Elizabethan catch phrase, here given particular point in its application to shoe mending. In spite of the complexities as far as language is concerned of the Shakespearean plays, they are thoroughly enjoyed and appreciated by audiences worldwide. The language of the plays offers it a unique flavor; the English director Richard Eyre in relation to the performance of Shakespearean plays declares:

- The life of the plays is in the language, not alongside it, or underneath it. Feelings and thoughts are released at the moment of speech. An Elizabethan audience would have responded to the pulse, the rhythms, the shapes, sounds and above all meanings, within the consistent ten-syllable, five stress lines of blank verse. They were the audience who listened.23

With so many translated versions and adaptations, Shakespeare has appealed not only students of English Language but also students of divergent backgrounds. For example, performance-centered pedagogy and criticism have been taken up in many business management classrooms to teach lessons in leadership and management using Shakespearean plays. The advantage of taking up this instructional

strategy is that it arouses lateral thinking over serious issues and emotional engagement of students. For example, the Melbourne Business School’s Leadership programme includes enactment of scenes from Shakespeare’s plays. It has groups of up to 30 students who enact along with professional actors scenes from plays such as *Henry V*, *Henry IV*, *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar*. When they perform a particular scene from the play, it is claimed, they can relate the represented situation to the action represented and sometimes to situation from everyday life. In the same way Columbia Business School’s Executive Education programme has also introduced a course on leadership and Shakespeare entitled “Realising Leadership Potential: Applying Leadership Lessons from Shakespeare’s Greatest Characters” in June 2011. Shakespearean plays are also taken up as case studies to analyse issues from different angles as diverse as everyday realities. Case study method leads to development of strategic thinking and problem-solving skills. But the problems and drawbacks of taking sixteenth century text and contextualizing it in the twenty-first century can be challenging as far as language or pedagogy is concerned. In spite of the difficulties, Shakespeare still remains relevant and his plays still attract the modern audience.
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Chapter 3  
Towards Narcissistic Leadership: A Study of Julius Caesar

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section introduces the concepts of narcissism and narcissistic leadership. It highlights the way narcissism—the concept—has been used to define leadership. The second section is a critique of Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar (1599) and references are also drawn from King Lear (1610). It argues that it is because of high narcissistic trends that the character of Caesar dismantles much on personal and professional fronts. The third section, with the line of the thesis statement, argues that it is because of the development of high narcissistic trends that emphatic leadership fails. It draws parallels from modern-day leadership studies and connects the way Julius Caesar can be used as a potential text for the study of effective leadership.

(The leader’s) intellectual acts were strong and independent even in isolation, and his will need no reinforcement from others… (He) loved no one but himself, or other people only in so far as they serve his needs.

Sigmund Freud

I

The term “narcissism” originates from Ovid’s Metamorphoses (Book III, 339-510), which tells the story of Narcissus, a Greek shepherd, who could not stop staring at his reflection in a pond, fell in love with his own image, and met his end. In Ovid’s myth, Narcissus is a handsome young man who spurns the advances of many a potential lover, including the nymph Echo. In modern day critical pedagogy, the term has been extensively used to describe a variety of situations. In clinical pathology and psychology, for instance, the scope of the term goes beyond its traditional meaning; it is used to describe a psychological disorder called Narcissistic Personality Disorder, which generally alludes to a condition of extreme self-love. Its implication can be seen in several other disciplines as well.


2In Ovid’s myth Narcissus is a handsome young man who spurns the advances of many potential lovers, including the nymph Echo. Echo was named this way because she was cursed to only echo the sounds that others make. “Narcissus now had reached his sixteenth year / And many a girl desired him, but hard pride / Ruled in that delicate frame… / And never a girl could touch his haughty heart…” Now when she (Echo) saw Narcissus wandering / In the green by ways, Echo’s heart was fired…”; so goes the description (Metamorphoses, Book III, 326-90). Narcissus’ rejection of the beautiful nymphs infuriated them and they prayed to the gods to punish him by making him fall in love with his own reflection in a pool: “He mocked; till one scorned youth, with raised hands prayed, / ‘so may he love and never win his love!’ / And Nemesis approved the righteous prayer” (Book III, 391-429). Finding that the object of his love cannot love him back, he pines away and perishes: “And love he kindles while with love he burns” (Book III, 391-429).
The term “narcissism”, derived from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, was first used by the British psychologist Havelock Ellis in 1898 to describe a clinical condition of “perverse” self-love, i.e., auto-erotism. The concept was later developed and used further by Sigmund Freud to explain various facets of male homosexuality. In his later work, Freud revises the concept and uses it to define types of personality and behaviour. First, he treated it as perversion or a pathological condition but, later in 1914, in a discursive essay entitled “On Narcissism: An Introduction”, he discusses narcissism as a normal maturational phase of healthy development in all children—a “complement to the egoism of the instinct for self-preservation” (1959, 73-74).

Moving beyond the idea of sexual perversion, Freud explores different forms of narcissism. He introduces the term ‘primary narcissism’ and suggests that it is normal and essential to self-preservation; ‘secondary narcissism’, however, according to Freud, moves away from healthy self-preservation to infantile feelings of omnipotence, when a person starts placing his/her own wishes and desires above others, and develops an idealized sense of the self that people love and adore. Secondary narcissism, in Freud’s explanation, is remarkably harmful, and it prevents mature love and healthy interpersonal relationship and does much consequential disservice to both individual and society.

In *Libidinal Types* (1931), Freud describes narcissism as one of the three normal ‘personality types’: the erotic, the obsessive and the narcissistic. The erotic is a person for whom loving and being loved are of extreme significance. The obsessive is the conservative character who preserves order and maintains moral values. Freud

---

3 Havelock Ellis links Ovid’s myth of ‘Narcissus’ to autoeroticism in the paper entitled “Auto-erotism: A Psychological Study” (1898).

4 Freud uses the concept of narcissism in the form of “ego libido” and “narcissistic libido” interchangeably in his book *On Sexuality: Three Essays on Theory of Sexuality and Other Works* (1905).


6 Freud theorizes that before children are able to invest their “libidinal” energy in other people, they go through an adaptive period of primary narcissism in which they are egocentric and cannot take the perspective of others. Healthy development consists of a departure from primary narcissism, when people invest their libidinal energy into another person rather than themselves. Freud believed in an economic model of love in which each of us has limited libidinal energy that can only be invested in one place at a time. Thus, when people progress from primary narcissism to object-love, their own feelings of self-regard are lowered. A healthy relationship is reciprocal, with both people investing their libidinal energy into each other, neither experiencing a loss as a result. See Freud’s “On Narcissism: An Introduction” for further reference (*SE* 14. 100).
presents that the ‘narcissist-type’ is the one who has an impressive personality and is a
great innovator who engages in breaking the status quo bringing about changes. These
are not arbitrary types; Freud argues that there are infinite varieties of personalities,
and the dominance of personality type explains the behaviour of the person.\(^7\) Freud
(1931) attributes narcissistic personality type in an individual whose main interest is
in self preservation; the person is independent and impossible to be intimidated. He
suggests that individuals belonging to such personality group impress others as being
strong personalities and are especially suited to act as bastions for others, essentially
in the role of leadership:

People belonging to this type impress others as being “personalities”; they are
specially suited to act as a support for others, to take on the role of leaders and
to give a fresh stimulus to cultural development or to damage the established
state of affairs (SE 21, 100).

In general, understanding the ‘personality type’ of leaders is helpful in
determining their style of leading. It is important for multiple other reasons as well; it
determines a person’s approach towards work and relationships, and it is also helpful
in determining which leader is best suited for a particular situation. Though the strict
categories delimit a ‘personality type’ in the strictest sense of the term and sometimes
act as loose entities, a leader can belong to—but is not limited to—any of the
personality types: erotic, obsessive or narcissistic, or even to a combination of the
three.\(^8\) The efficiency or success of a leader in a particular situation depends upon the
dominant form of ‘personality trait’. For example, leaders having erotic personality
type are believed to be caring and they aim at bringing people together facilitating
interdependence; they are successful in the field of social service. Notwithstanding the
traditional boundaries, the term narcissism has come to represent numerous traits such
as attitude of superiority (Reich, 1949; Horney, 1939), confidence (Reich 1949,
Freud, 1931; Kohut, 1966) arrogance (Reich, 1949) and a mild element of sadism
(Reich, 1949). In the decades following Freud, the idea of narcissism has gone beyond
the pathological condition and the concept of narcissism has moved from being a


\(^8\) Freud suggests three personality types, viz., erotic, obsessive and narcissistic. To these three, Erich
Fromm (1900-1980), a social psychologist, adds a fourth type—the marketing personality. Michael
Maccoby discusses the ‘erotics’ as helpers, the ‘obsessives’ as experts, the ‘narcissists’ as innovators
and the ‘marketing types’ as self developers. See Michael Maccoby’s Narcissistic Leaders: Who
psychological disorder to a positive trait found in persons with higher sense of abilities (Kohut, 1966).

Thus the concept of narcissism goes beyond its original literary representation and encompasses a variety of discourses / subjects such as Literature, Socio-linguistics, Psychology and Psychiatry. The scope of the concept has been extended to Leadership Studies as well. Here its implications embrace the issues of leading and leadership, behavioural conditions of leaders and rulers, and success and failures of people of high rank. This further helps in understanding the ways success and failure depend on progressive narcissistic trends in people. The studies of Kets de Vries and Miller (1990, 1997), Michael Maccoby (2002, 2007), B. Glad (2002), J.M. Post (1986, 1993), Seth A. Rosenthal and Todd L. Pittinsky (2005), H. Kohut (1966, 1977) are important in this aspect. Their studies utilize psychoanalysis in understanding specific behaviour of leaders who either posses narcissistic personalities or reflect trends of narcissistic behaviour.

In less than a hundred years, the word “narcissism” has evolved from being a term denoting a pathological condition to a commonly used word denoting extreme / mild self-adoration (Maccoby, 2007). The term ‘narcissism,’ from myth of Narcissus, denotes self-love in general use, and when the term is used for leaders it refers to those leaders who are marked for their grandiosity and extreme self confidence. J.M. Post suggests: “At one level, narcissism is nothing more than extreme self-confidence” (1993, 99-100). But self-confidence is a positive trait and it accords with Kohut’s (1966) notion that narcissism is an independent and potentially healthy process in normal development. As far as defining narcissistic leadership is concerned, there cannot be one concrete definition of the term. Psychologists and scholars in Leadership Studies have approached the topic in diverse ways. Kets de Vries and Miller describe constructive narcissists as confident, thoughtful, realistic rather than unstable, reactive, and self deceptive people (1997). Although narcissists

---

“enjoy being admired,” they explore, “they have a realistic appreciation of their abilities and limitation” (18). Various scholars suggest that confidence, charisma and optimism associated with productive or constructive narcissists are positive traits for leadership. Arrogance, self-absorption, insatiable need for recognition, superiority, hypersensitivity and anger, lack of empathy, amorality, irrationality, inflexibility and paranoia are the downsides of narcissistic leaders (Rosenthal and Pittinsky, 2006). It is a general observation that the key motivation for narcissistic leaders is the intense desire to garner power to “structure an external world” that supports their grandiose needs and vision (Glad, 2002; 25). Another important aspect is that narcissistic leaders are driven by their own personal egoistic needs for power and admiration rather than empathetic concern for their followers (Vries and Miller, 1997). They demand unquestioning devotion and loyalty from followers (Harwood, 2003). These remain, chiefly, the characteristic traits of narcissistic leaders.

Michael Maccoby in his book _Narcissistic Leaders: Who Succeeds and Who Fails_ (2007) argues that not all narcissistic leaders fail, and he cites the cases of M.K. Gandhi, Abraham Lincoln and Pablo Picasso as constructive leaders. Further, he explores that Hitler, Stalin and Napoleon show that the trend can also be self-destructive and dangerous for society. Julius Caesar is one such literary or historical character who shows growing narcissistic trends and in the process dismantles much on personal and professional fronts. In what follows, references are drawn from historical Caesar and Shakespeare’s _Julius Caesar_ and _King Lear_ for an analysis of narcissistic trends that develop among rulers. We present history stands testimony that some leaders have shown progressive narcissistic trends in their behaviour and have performed extraordinarily well. They have brought revolutionary changes and progress in society.

One the one hand, Caesar was a commoner who was highly appreciated as a great visionary and had scores of followers. He became the founder of the great Roman Empire. On the other hand, he was extremely in love with his own ‘self’ and therefore narcissistic in terms of behaviour. In highlighting extreme self-adoration which becomes a major flaw in the characters of both Caesar and Lear, the chapter takes into account its validity in the present situation and explores not all narcissistic leaders fail because of extreme self-adoration.
They may be called Heroes, inasmuch as they have derived their purposes and their vocation, not from the calm, regular course of things, sanctioned by the existing order; but from a concealed fount—one which has not to phenomenal, present existence—from that inner Spirit, still hidden beneath the surface, which impinging on the outer world as on a shell, bursts it in pieces, because it is another kernel than that which belonged to the shell in question… World-historical men—the Heroes of an epoch—must therefore be recognized as its clear-sighted ones: their deeds, their words are the best of that time… He is devoted to the One Aim, regardless of all else… But so mighty a form must trample down many an innocent flower—crush to pieces many an object in its path.

Friedrich Hegel

Historians such as Plutarch and Suetonius document a great deal about Roman leaders in their work. Plutarch’s *Lives of the Noble Greeks and the Romans* written in around the first century BC and Seutonius’s *The Twelve Caesars* (121 AD) stand testimony to the lives of several ancient rulers and offer an insight into the lives of great Greek and Roman leaders. It is evident from such historical sources that Roman leaders or rulers—before and after Caesar—were chiefly military commanders and generals. They waged wars for glory and prestige, which in turn helped them maintain their dominant position in their respective society. Thus, they are portrayed as bold and aggressive, and are believed to be holding power for prestige and glory. Roman leaders, chiefly Caesar, have fascinated scholars of Leadership Studies. Both the historical and literary character of Caesar has drawn extraordinary attention. He has been portrayed as a leader who brought about radical changes in the Roman Republic and laid the foundation of the Roman Empire.

By the time Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* (1599) was written and performed, Shakespeare had already experimented with plays dealing with the history of England, and composed plays such as *Henry IV* (1597), *Henry V* (1599), *Henry VI* (1592), *King John* (1595-96), *Richard III* (1591) and *Richard II* (1595). Prior to *Julius Caesar*, he had already written *Titus Andronicus* (1583-1593) and *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594) with a focus on Rome. He had experimented with plays dealing with history and this play marks a transition from English to Roman history. During the Elizabethan Age, the elements of patriotism and nationalism were highly celebrated. English history

---

was glorified and presented with full gusto and enthusiasm; simultaneously, Roman history offered some of the most fascinating themes that attracted the Elizabethan audience. Caesar was one of the most celebrated and well-known historical figures among the Elizabethan audience. The English audience enjoyed Roman plays being performed. Arthur Humphreys suggests that the Elizabethans’ fascination with Rome is because:

Roman History offered some of the most impressive themes available to the Renaissance, an era when political lessons were eagerly sought in antiquity-themes such as despotism and republicanism, strong rule good and bad, the stable and the unstable realm, scrupulous and the unscrupulous motives, the relations between rulers and subjects (particularly the populace) and so on. What, in general, Roman history presented was Roman arms triumphant abroad, and the Roman state stormily evolving at home…found in Livy, Caesar, Cicero, Suetonius, Tacitus, Lucan, Appian and others the record of Rome’s rise to greatness and her turbulent continuance in it (Humphreys, 1954; 253).

Hence, meeting the demands of the popular tastes of the Elizabethan audience, Shakespeare used the episode of the assassination of Caesar. The episode is derived from North’s translation of Plutarch’s *Lives of Noble Grecians and Romans* (1579) to demonstrate the fall of Julius Caesar whom the world still remembers for his great leadership skills. The assassination of Caesar has been described by David Daniell as “the most famous historical event in the West outside the Bible” (2000, 1). At an outset, Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* is a play about political killing. It is described as the tragedy of an assassin who is too honorable to succeed and could not resist the hazards of success. Moreover, Caesar’s tragedy was that he was too obsessed with his personality and placed himself above everyone. In the same manner Lear is also portrayed as a king who is obsessed with self and power he holds by virtue of his title. He places himself above his kingdom and demands complete submission to his whim.

Shakespeare introduces Caesar as a military commander whose power and glory were at its pinnacle. The play begins with the Caesar’s triumphant march and the celebration of the Feast of Lupercal. The opening scene introduces us to his growing power and popularity. Initially, he is being worshipped by the plebeians as a god; he is loved and idealized by them: “But, indeed, sir, we make holiday to see Caesar, and rejoice in his triumph” (1.1.30). This indicates how the common people
celebrated Caesar’s coronation to power. The commoners also welcome Caesar’s victory over Pompey as “And do you now strew flowers in his way / That comes in triumph over Pompey’s blood?” (1.1.50-51). Caesar is honoured and bestowed with many laurels by the commoners: “Another general shout! / I do believe that these applauds are / For some new honours that are heaped on Caesar” (1.2.134-35). Prior to this event, the Romans were so happy with Caesar’s victory that he was offered the crown three times at the festival by Antony and each time he declines it. Regarding Caesar’s victory over Pompey at the battle of Pharsalus, for which the celebration takes place, Paul K. Davis writes, “Caesar’s victory took him to the pinnacle of power, effectively ending the Republic” (1999, 59). This remains as a turning point in Caesar’s political career and earns him instant allegiance among the men he commands and allows him to ingratiate with the masses.

Shakespeare’s Caesar possesses a dual character. On the one hand, he is portrayed as a brave soldier who is not at all afraid of death. He is also loved by the commoners. On the other hand, however, he is portrayed a tyrant who is scorned by his comrades for being too authoritative. For example, when Calpurnia tries to stop him from going to the Capitol on account of her inauspicious dream, he changes his mind. And upon being asked by Decius the excuse for not attending the Senate, he responds in an authoritative tone: “The cause is in my will, I will not come: / That is enough to satisfy the Senate” (2.2.71-72). Such disinterested remark highlights his tyrannical attitude to a certain extent. Further, he changes his mind once again and finally decides to attend the Senate. He underscores the arbitrariness of his will and the extension of instability of his will and mind. But this indicates Caesar’s extreme self-confidence as he rejects all the ill omens saying: “Cowards die many times before their deaths, / The valiant never taste of death but once” (2.2.32-33).

In the play the tribunes Murellus and Flavius discuss Caesar as an overbearing tyrant, but they are chiefly portrayed as his political enemies. They are followers of Pompey, are jealous and are insecure of Caesar’s growing power. They go around the city disrobing the positive image of Caesar as “decked with ceremonies” (1.1.65) and try to prevent the commoners from celebrating Caesar’s triumphant march. They believe Caesar’s growing power needs to be checked, chiefly because they remain insecure of their position due to his rising power. Flavius, thus, states:

These growing feathers plucked from Caesar’s wing
Will make him fly an ordinary pitch,
Who else would soar above the view of men
And keep us all in servile fearfulness. (1.1.72-75)

Leadership, hence, remains highly political. Caesar’s rise to power is haunted. His authority is suddenly questioned and challenged when the commoners start giving him a higher status above all other leaders.

Cassius, the chief conspirator, repeatedly emphasizes on the uncanny nature of Caesar’s rise to power. According to him Caesar is a feeble mortal who has, incredibly, now “become a god” (1.2.116). Questioning Caesar’s authority, Cassius claims: “I was born free as Caesar, so were you. / We both have fed as well, and we can both / Endure the winter’s cold as well as he” (1.1.98-99). These words of Cassius indicate that the rise in Caesar’s power was not acceptable among his subordinates. He tells Brutus about the incident when they competed to cross Tiber and Caesar almost drowned himself: “The troubled Tiber chafing with her shores, / Said Caesar to me ‘Dar’st thou, Cassius now / Leap in with me into this angry floods, / And swim to yonder point?’” (1.2.191-94). And further, Caesar cries: “Help me, Cassius, or I sink!”(1.2.200). He tells Brutus about the time when Caesar was in Spain, he was down with a fever and was powerless: “He (Caesar) had a fever when he was in Spain, / And when the fit was on him, I did mark / How he did shake. ‘Tis true, this god did shake” (1.1.219-221). After defaming Caesar, Cassius compares him to a “Colossus,” a huge, artificial and empty construction. This is to point at Caesar’s unnatural and abnormal growth opposed to the normal phase of growth and maturity (Miola, 1985). He reminds Brutus that Caesar, who is now adored and worshipped like a god was as ordinary a human like any other Roman. Hence, jealousy remains central to Cassius’s speech. There are numerous other allusions in the play that indicate Caesar’s unconstitutional entrance to power. The story of Junius Brutus’s revolt against tyrannical Tarquin is referred in the play (1.2.158; 2.1.53) to highlight that Rome is in fact a Republic. Tyrannical ruler Tarquin was dethroned and republic was re-established. And now a single ruler violated Roman constitutional and legal traditions and signalled the degeneration of the city and its inhabitants. This was Brutus’s greatest fear and the very thought of it made him restless. This anxiety or mental turmoil was noticed by Cassius and later he exploited him against Caesar: “Vexed I am / of late with passions of some difference, / Conceptions only proper to myself” (1.2.41-43). Hence the play shows in many different ways by which Caesar’s rise to power is defamed and contested by many of his associates.
J.M. Post defines narcissism as “narcissism as nothing more than extreme self-confidence” (1993, 99). Caesar was also extremely confident of himself on account of his achievements. No doubt he was a man of great insight, who could very well understand and read people and their intentions. At the same time he was highly arrogant and possessed fragile ego. For example regarding Cassius, Caesar was not ignorant of his intentions and therefore advised Antony to be alert of him as he would prove to be very dangerous. He tells Antony that Cassius is a great observer of men, who does not indulge in games. References such as “loves no plays”, and “seldom he smiles, and smiles in such a sort / As if he mock’d himself”; and hence Caesar concludes that “Such men as he be never at heart’s ease… / And therefore are they very dangerous” (1.2.201-208) are common throughout the play. Contrarily, at the same time, Caesar claims himself to be invincible and therefore claims that he need not fear Cassius: “I rather tell thee what is to be feared / Than what I fear, for always I am Caesar” (1.2.212-213). Caesar’s extreme self-confidence, along with his arrogance, is reflected in ignoring Cassius in spite of being aware of his being potential threat to him. Narcissistic leaders are highly arrogant and extremely sensitive to criticism. They have a highly fragile ego and are easily hurt (Vaknin, 2001). Another important incident highlighting Caesar’s growing arrogance and authoritative rule is when he announces that he and “his Senate” (3.1.32) are ready to redress grievances and thereby assume ownership of the Roman legislative and judicial body. Then he imperiously refuses to repeal the decree banishing Cimber’s brother: “If thou dost bend, and pray, and fawn for him, / I spurn thee like a cur out of my way” (3.1.45-46). Caesar remains too stubborn and does not discuss the crime committed or the merits of the petition but refers to his past decision, in other words, to his will and proceeds.

The true nature of Caesar has been debatable among historians. Was he a tyrant and a dictator who wanted to hold power as the sole ruler of Rome or was he genuinely concerned about the declining Roman Republic? Shakespeare’s Caesar is a highly complex character as he is both loved and scorned. The first hint in the text on his growing narcissistic tendencies appears when Brutus reflects on human nature and the changes that might come in Caesar with his accession as the sole dictator. In the opening of Act II, scene i, we find Brutus is troubled and is in a divided state of mind. He contemplates on participating in rising against Caesar. He finds no personal reason to go against Caesar, but what troubles him was the probability of a terrible change
that might come up in Caesar after his accession to the throne. He speculates that after becoming the king, Caesar would gather unlimited power and will pose a threat for the Roman Republic. Everything happens in Brutus’s mind. In the second scene of Act I, Brutus seems to be going through an internal conflict: “vexed I am / Of late with passions of some difference” (1.2.39-40). ‘Passion’ in its original sense is ‘suffering’—as in Christ’s passion. In Brutus, it is an internal conflict—a dilemma that captures his thought for long. This was before meeting Cassius and after Casca reported Caesar’s rude behaviour in the Forum. He is further vexed and anxious. Sleepless and careworn Brutus wakes Lucius up in the first soliloquy and here the reference to ‘sleeplessness’ is a sign of unnatural disturbance in his mind that keeps him awake. There is a conflict of reason and fantasy, between passion and imagination, which vexed him continuously and disturbed his peace of mind. He imagines his prospects after Caesar’s coronation: “He would be crown’d. / How that might change his nature, there’s the question” (2.1.12-13). Hence, Caesar’s position was not only a threat to all his associates, it was also projected as a matter of concern for the Roman Republic. The question that Brutus is perplexed with is selfanswered by him as: “It is the bright day that brings forth the adder, And that craves wary walking. / Crown him? That then I grant, we put a sting in him…” (2.1.14-16). He is self-convinced that Caesar’s rise to kingship is dangerous for both self and the state.

Like a plot in real-life, everything happens in the mind, the dramatic effect of which is clearly represented in Shakespeare’s play. At the end of the soliloquy, Brutus nearly arrives at his decision in participating in the conspiracy against Caesar. He justifies the act of going against Caesar by claiming that it is generally seen that a person remains humble when she/he is aspiring to greater heights but with success and glory it is seen that she/he becomes proud and forgets his/her subordinates. Brutus could sense the rising narcissistic tendencies in Caesar and therefore comments:

But ’tis a common proof
That lowliness is young ambition’s ladder,
Whereeto the climber-upward turns his face;
But when he once attains the upmost round,
He then unto the ladder turns his back,
Looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
By which he did ascend. So Caesar may. (2.1.10-16)
Moreover, Caesar’s narcissism is anticipated in Brutus’s thought. With an understanding of Caesar’s victory comes self-realisation in him. The play has narcissistic trends displayed in the mouth of other characters and thereby employs a technique of public opinion on a leader’s personality. The provoking thought continues. Brutus is afraid that in the flush of victory, Caesar will turn his back on his old friends “scorning the base degrees by which he did ascend” (2.1.15). This was Brutus’s greatest fear. He believed that Caesar’s rise to power will lead to the fall of the Roman republic. An allusion to this fact can be found in Bacon as well; he writes: “All rising to a great place is by a winding stair” (Elliot, 1909-14; 51) and in that accent to great power, one must balance one’s opinion with those of his colleagues. Shakespeare practises it in his plays and shows that leaders need to be humble and they need to balance their attitude towards their subjects.

Maccoby claims that narcissistic leaders like to be praised and are highly reactive to criticism. They like to be surrounded by flatterers which sometimes lead to dire consequences as they may not be informed of the reality (Maccoby, 2000; 75). This proves to be fatal for leaders and the organizations they lead. It is important that leaders should be surrounded by people who praise and support them because it encourages and helps them to generate positive energies. At the same time, leaders need to be honest to themselves, i.e., they need to rely on their own intuition. Leaders who lack intuition or get digressed or who suppress their inner voice fail miserably.

Similarly, Caesar enjoyed being surrounded by his supporters. He preferred to be surrounded by sycophants, chiefly, by people who flattered him and were not his competitors:

Let me have men about me that are fat,
Sleek headed men, and such as sleep-a nights.
Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look.
He thinks too much. Such men are dangerous. (1.2.192-195)

Caesar enjoyed being flattered and failed to distinguish when he was genuinely being praised and when it was mere flattery. Decius Brutus, hence, realises that Caesar

---

11 Scholars view that Bacon’s *Essays, Civil and Moral* (1625) might have had some influence on Shakespeare’s portrayal of leaders. Bacon in his essays stresses on servant leadership. In the essay “Of Great Place”, he states, “Men in great place are thrice servants: servants of sovereign or state, servants of fame, servants of business.” He further argues that the man who gains power looses liberty and therefore he should be humble and low towards his subjects. For further reading see Bacon’s *Essays, Civil and Moral*. Ed. Charles W. Eliot. New York: P.F. Collier & Sons, 1909-14.
could be easily flattered and he uses this weakness to bring him to the Capitol where he was to be brutally killed:

I can o’ersway him; for he loves to hear
that unicorns may be betray’d with trees
And bears with glasses…
lions with toil and men with flatterers.
but when I tell him he (Caesar) hates flatterers,
He says he does—being most flattered. (2.1. 202-208)

In spite of the prediction by the soothsayer—“Beware the ides of March”—Caesar goes to the Capitol. Further, Calpurnia’s dream and other signs of ill-omen could not prevent him from the temptation of being crowned as the sole ruler of Rome. His lust for power finally leads to his destruction:

To give this day, a crown to mighty Caesar.
If you shall send them word you will not come,
Their minds may change. (2.2.93-95)

Calpurnia interprets her dream to be a forewarning for an impending disaster and urges Caesar to decline going to the Senate House, but Decius Brutus re-interprets Calpurnia’s dream in a different way to please Caesar and persuades him to move to Capitol for the day’s proceedings where he was brutally assassinated:

Your statue spouting blood in many pipes,
In which so many smiling Romans bath’d,
Signifies that from you great Roman shall suck
Reviving blood (2.2.85-88)

A similar reference can be drawn in from Shakespeare’s King Lear that advocates the ego of the aged king, Lear. The whim that Lear displays in dividing his kingdom is essential to ‘flattery’ which is shown in Julius Caesar as well. Lear announces to divide his kingdom at his whim saying, “Tell me, my daughters / Which of you shall we say doth love us most, / That we our largest bounty may extend / Where nature doth with merit challenge (1.1.49-52). The eldest daughter Goneril is

---

12 Caesar was warned by Calpurnia of some impending disaster prior to his assassination, so was Napoleon warned by his first wife Josephine. She urged him not to attack Russia as it will prove disastrous for his political career. Napoleon, like Caesar, dismissed the warning and went ahead with the attack on Russia. This attack on Russia proved to be highly fatal for his political career and paved way of his complete downfall. For further reference see Carolly Erickson’s Josephine: A Life of the Empress (New Jersey: St. Martin’s Press, 2000).
asked first to profess her love for her father king. She speaks in a sweet tone flattering Lear, “Sir, I love you more than word can wield the matter; / Dearer than eyesight, space and liberty; / Beyond what can be valued rich or rare; / No less than life with grace, health, beauty, honour; / As much as child e’er loved, or father found: / A love that makes breath poor, and speech unable. / Beyond all manner of “so much” I love you” (1.1.54-60). This was the perfect answer that became an epitome of flattery and impressed by her, Lear gives her a large part of his kingdom: “With shadowy forests and with campaigns riched, / With plenteous rivers and wide-skirted meads, / We make thee lady. To thine and Albany’s issues / Be this perpetual (1.1.62-65). He then turns to the second daughter Regan who is equally sweet in her profession of love for her father; in fact she goes ahead of her elder sister claiming, “Only she [Goneril] comes too short, that I profess / Myself an enemy to all other joys / Which the most precious spirit of sense possesses, / And find I am alone felicitate / In your dear Highness’ love…I am sure my love is / More ponderous than my tongue (1.1.71-77). Convinced and flattered by the second daughter, Lear bestows on her a large portion of his kingdom: “To thee and thine, hereditary ever, / Remain this ample third of our fair kingdom, / No less in space, validity, and pleasure / Than that conferred on Goneril (1.1. 78-81). When the youngest daughter Cordelia is invited to express her love for her father, she replies in plain terms: “Nothing, my lord” (1.1.86). Lear is extremely offended by her inability to flatter him as his elder daughters had done. He was expecting something more from the youngest daughter because she was the most beloved and therefore Cordelia’s denial in expressing her love like Goneril and Regan infuriates him. Regan and Goneril are eager to participate in the trial because words no longer depend on deeds and they may gain most by speaking best. Loving can never be tested. Cordelia refuses to fall in the same line and to participate in a game in which to speak love is everything, and her love will mean nothing in that case. To speak it would be to equate it qualitatively with love of her sisters would be, in other words, to lie. Indeed, only a lie, in the sense of only words emptied of their significance, can win. So Cordelia prefers to say nothing. But this refusal to express love in glowing words leads Lear to banish Cordelia, “Here I disclaim all my paternal care, / Propinquity and property of blood, / And as a stranger to my heart and me” (1.1.112-14). Not only her, Lear banishes all the people who try to tell him his mistake in denying Cordelia her share in the kingdom as she fails to flatter his ego. Lear wanted to listen only what he wishes to and shuns all kinds of reality and that is
why Cordelia lost his favour: “Let pride, which she calls plainness, marry her” (1.1.123). Immediately after his rash decision in dividing his kingdom and banishing Kent, we know that Lear is doomed to painful disillusionment because of his assumption.

Freud (1931) discusses narcissistic personality type in an individual whose main interest is self preservation. The person is independent and impossible to intimidate. He suggests that individuals belonging to such personality group impress others as being strong. Caesar clearly reflects certain characteristics of this type of personality. He possessed a charismatic personality as he surpassed all great men of his age. His contemporaries include Cato, Brutus, Antony, Cinna—all in some manner very successful—and even Cassius who was jealous of his aura and majesty, and approves of his grand stature. In fact Cassius was insecure of his position and found Caesar’s rising power and fame a threat leading to his ignominious end:

Like a Colossus, and we petty men,
Walk under his huge legs, and peep about
To find ourselves dishonourable graves. (1.2.136-139)

Except Brutus, all the other conspirators are motivated by jealousy and go against Caesar. Antony, in the end of the play, comments: “All the conspirators save only he [Brutus] / Did that they did in envy of great Caesar; / He only, in a general honest thought / And common good to all, made of them. / His life was gentle, and the elements / So mix’d in him that Nature might stand up / And say to all the world ‘This was a man!’ (5.5.68-72). In urging Brutus to join with the conspirators, Cassius emphasizes this contrast between Caesar’s physical weakness and his high aspirations, yet strangely enough, Brutus makes little of it. Caesar’s physical limitations play no part whatsoever in the decision Brutus finally reaches. In spite of Cassius’ clever maneuvering, Brutus seems to reach his decision independently and on the grounds very different from those put forward by Cassius. Brutus sees in Caesar a man of strong will but with hidden pride and whose fault is overtly ambitious. Brutus makes this excuse in public for killing him. That in fact becomes Brutus’s rationale. The main motive for the assassination as claimed by Brutus is to check the rising spirit of Caesar. The public is convinced that it is indeed a noble act of saving the Republic from a dictator:
Let’s be sacrificers, but not butchers, Caius.
We all stand up against the spirit of Caesar,
And in the spirit of men there is no blood. (2.1. 165-67)

The speech is not only influential, it also possesses the quality of rationalizing an evil act such as a murder or a crime. The speech portrays Caesar as highly ambitious and rationalizes the murder of Caesar as saving the nation. The funeral speech, hence, sings the glory of Caesar to control the people and employs the technique of rationalizing the cruel act so that people have to accept the change:

I say that Brutus’ love to Caesar was no less than his. If then that friend demand why Brutus rose against Caesar, this is my answer: not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more, Had you rather Caesar were living and die all slaves, than that Caesar were dead, to live all free men? (3.2.12-18)

David Shotter in *The Fall of Roman Republic* (1994) asserts that Caesar was born into a noble family that had long been in decline. Caesar advanced his career cunningly, beginning as a priest and eventually becoming Rome’s leading general. Being politically astute, Caesar made alliances with his rivals and then discarded them when it suited him. But what cannot be doubted is that he was genuinely concerned about the needs of ordinary people of Rome. He worked to bring about reforms in order to improve their condition. Shakespeare presents this aspect of his personality in the play. Antony, after the assassination, reminds the public of the favours bestowed on them by Caesar. He further excites the crowd by reminding the public of Caesar’s will.

The plebeians loved him and wanted him to rule over Rome. Caesar wanted to succeed as a dictator with the worthy goal of stabilizing the Roman republic. Theodore Mommsen comments on Caesar’s vision of reforming the republic in *The History of Rome under the Emperors* (1999): “Caesar’s aim was the highest which a man is allowed to propose himself—the political, military, intellectual, and moral regeneration of his own deeply decayed nation... (Vol 4, 541). Caesar wanted to bring about reforms and for the same reason he had intentions of taking up the crown. He could see the inefficiency of the Republican government and wanted to break the status quo.

Matthias Gelzer in his book *Caesar: Politician and Statesman* (1968) draws our attention towards the political situation of Rome during Caesar’s rise to power. He
shows that Roman political situation was highly unstable during Caesar’s times. He was one of the few Roman aristocrats who actually thought about the needs for a government. Unlike, Cicero, who thought on theoretical level, Caesar was one of the first Romans to give active consideration to the methods by which Rome and Italy could sit at the centre of a well-ordered, well-defended and prosperous empire. He could identify the problem of domestic politics, in particular, the increasing ungovernability of the republic as individual and factional ambitions promoted themselves using the opportunities of wealth and military power which the growing empire had brought in its wake. The Republic was left only in name without form or substance (1968, 127).

More or less, Caesar realized lacuna of Roman Republic and wanted its stability. He wanted to take the task of a dictator with the aim of bringing positive reforms. But what alarmed the members of the Roman nobility was Caesar’s remark that: “Sulla only showed his foolishness by resigning his dictatorship” (Shotter, 1994; 79). This statement indicates that Caesar thought of permanent supervision of the republic as a dictator. The nobles were not ready to accept him as a sole ruler or a monarch and were skeptical about his intentions. They feared complete destruction of Roman Republic under his dictatorship. The public in general loved him for the reforms he had introduced in Rome but the aristocrats were apprehensive of his growing powers and rising narcissistic tendencies.13

Caesar’s account of the Gallic wars is a record of his victories and his obsession with power. After the Conquest of Gaul, Caesar had further plans of extending the Roman rule to Britain and Egypt.14 Plutarch has explicitly commented upon Caesar’s obsession for power and glory:

Caesar’s many successes, however, did not divert his natural spirit of enterprise and ambition to the enjoyment of what he had laboriously achieved, but served as fuel and incentive for future achievements, and begat in him plans for greater deeds and a passion for fresh glory, as though he had used up

---


what he already had. What he felt was therefore nothing else than emulation of himself, as if he had been another man, and a sort of rivalry between what he had done and what he purposed to do. (Stewart, 1894; 557)

This obsession with power and temptation to rule over Rome led to Caesar’s destruction and with that there was an end of a powerful leader who could have reached to greater heights. The unfortunate end of Caesar has raised many questions in relation to the relationship of leaders with their colleagues or allies. It is generally seen that narcissistic leaders fail at the interpersonal fronts. They fail to maintain good relations with their equals because they find themselves much higher than them. This is because they are intensely competitive and even “ruthless in their pursuit of victory” (Maccoby, 2007; 123). Caesar was proud of his achievements and forgot that the nobles possessed equal power. He had shattered the power of the Republic completely and the senate had majority of his men on whom he had bestowed honour and titles due to their excellent performance in war. This was the main cause of rising discontentment among the nobles because they had seen Caesar to be one of them and now he stood much higher and showed no signs of restrain. Further, Caesar insulted many members of the old elite. This rude treatment of senators is also thematised by Shakespeare who makes Caesar announce, immediately before his assassination, that he will not disregard the laws of personal obligation: “What touches us ourselves shall be last served” (3.1.8). There are other textual evidences that indicate Caesar’s unyielding arrogance and self-absorption and lack of proper respect towards the senate members which in fact was taken to be derogatory and insulting. For example, in the first scene of Act III, when Metellus kneels down and approaches Caesar requesting mercy for his brother Publius Cimber, Caesar rejects him saying:

These couching and these lowly courtesies
Might fire the blood of ordinary men,
And turn preordinance and first decree
Into the law of children. Be not fond.
To think that Caesar bears such rebel blood
That will be thawed from the true quality (3.1.35-40)

Shakespeare presents Caesar’s real greatness and nobility only after his death through Antony’s funeral speech. The speech has received critical attention and has been enacted many a time. It is marked for its sincerity and genuineness that aroused emotions and passions in the followers to such an extent that they were ready to
avenge for Caesar’s death. The difference in the speeches delivered by the two leaders becomes evident with the reaction of the crowd or gathering. When Brutus spoke, the audience approved but when Antony spoke the crowd responded: “We’ll hear him, we’ll follow him, we’ll die with him” (3.2.214). This response of the crowd proves that Antony succeeds in persuading and motivating the crowd because he could successfully maneuver public opinion to which Auden declares to be a “successful technique” employed by an efficient leader (Kirsch, 2000; 237). His communication is persuasive and highly forceful. He begins:

Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears.
I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him.
The evil that men do lives after them;
the good is oft interred with their bones.
So let it be with Caesar. (3.2.76-79)

He repeats the phrase “honourable men” again and again to bring out the irony implanted in it. He reminds the crowd of Caesar’s achievements and his deeds in favour of the common folk:

He hath brought many captives home to Rome,
Whose Ransoms did the generals coffers fill.
Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?
When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath wept. (3.2.89-92)

Antony reminds the crowd of the festival of Lupercal where he had offered crown to Caesar three times and each time he refused. This was to make clear that Caesar was not ambitious and slowly demolishes the argument that Brutus had put forth in his funeral speech. He systematically proves that ultimately the ‘honorable men’ did wrong in killing Caesar. He wins public support because he did not criticize the honorable men:

I speak not to disapprove what Brutus spoke,
But here I am to speak what I do know.
You all did love him once, not without cause.
What cause withholds you then to mourn for him? (3.2.100-103)

Antony excites the crowd further by reminding them of Caesar’s will. Antony is portrayed as a better speaker than Brutus because he could connect himself with the crowd. The crowd could identify their feelings with Antony’s grief. He was genuine in his expressions and therefore succeeded in arousing the desired feelings or
emotions in the public. They became violent to such an extent that they killed Cinna the poet, instead of another man named Cinna who was one of the conspirators. In fact, persuasive speech is hallmark of effective leadership. There are numerous historical examples which illustrate that revolutionary changes have been achieved with powerful and persuasive speeches. The famous speech “I have a Dream” delivered by Martin Luther King Jr. on 28 August 1963 can be cited as an apt example. He forcefully argues in favour of putting an end to racism in the United States. He begins with a reference to the Emancipation Proclamation which freed millions of slaves in 1863, referring to Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address. He reminds the audience, chiefly blacks, that even after hundred years they are not free:

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice…but one hundred years later, we must face the tragic fact that the Negro is still not free.\textsuperscript{15}

Just as Antony employs the rhetorical technique of repeting the phrase “honorable men” to be more sarcastic and ironical, Martin Luther King Jr. repeats “Now is the time…” four times in speech to draw a similar effect. So is the phrase “I have a dream…” repeated eight times in whole speech. With this technique King succeeds in communicating the vision of a unified and integrated America to his audience with conviction and determination. He concludes by arousing a hope of freedom and reformation:

And when this happens, when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God’s children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, “Free at last! Free at last! Thank God Almighty, we are free at last!”\textsuperscript{16}

Another noteworthy and historically important speech is the famous “Ich bin ein Berliner” delivered by American President John F.Kennedy on 26 June 1963 in

\textsuperscript{15} For complete speech see James Echols’ \textit{I Have a Dream: Martin Luther King Jr. and the Future of Multicultural America}. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004. 3.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid. 5.
front of the Berlin Wall. The speech was delivered in response to the Cold War and the tension between the non-Communist countries, mainly West Berlin. The speech is considered to be one of the best speeches delivered, both a notable moment of the Cold War and a high point of the New Frontier. It was a great morale booster for West Berliners, who feared possible East German occupation. Speaking from a platform erected on the steps of Rathaus Schoneberg Kennedy starts with the following:

Two thousand years ago the proudest boast was *civis Romanaus sum* [I am a Roman citizen] Today, in the world of freedom, the proudest boast is “Ich bin ein Berliner”... All free men, wherever they may live, are citizens of Berlin, and therefore, as a free man, I take pride in the words “Ich bin ein Berliner!”

Kennedy uses the phrase “Ich bin ein Berliner” twice in his speech to highlight and conclude in the same manner giving his audience hope and assurance of better times to come. The speech is regarded to have left deep impact on the audience.

Successful speeches ignite the speaker further. Caesar’s growing love for power and glory for self points out the growing narcissistic tendency in his behaviour. Some historians regard him as an unscrupulous tyrant having an insatiable lust for power, and blame him for the demise of the Roman republic. Theodor Mommsen glorifies the image of Caesar. Hermann Strasburger in his famous essay “Caesar as Judged by his Contemporaries,” published in 1953, claims that Caesar’s act of starting a civil war in Rome in 49 BC was repudiated by his contemporaries, even by his followers, and was regarded almost as a sacrilege. He also points out that Caesar had no comprehensive plan of bringing about reforms or a substitute to the Republic (Zander, 2005; 60). Matthias Gelzer declares Caesar to be an active statesman who pursued transpersonal interests. Others, admitting that he could be ruthless, insist that the republic had already been destroyed and it was Caesar’s reforms that stabilized the Mediterranean world. In spite of all this Caesar is regarded as one the greatest military leaders who laid the foundation of the great Roman Empire.

---


19 Matthias Gelzer is a German historian; his *Caesar: der Politiker und Staatsman*, English translation by P. Needham (Oxford, 1968), is widely recognized as a scholarly biography. The portions discussing the early childhood and political career of Caesar have been successful in saving the image of Caesar as a far-sighted statesman.
of Julius Caesar is a much debatable character, personality, subject, and the text remains as a representative example of drawing moral and ethical lessons in the study of leadership.

III

What moves them is the terrible egotism of the artist of the brazen glance, who knows himself to be justified for all eternity in his ‘work’ as the mother is justified in her child… In all great deceivers a remarkable process is at work to which they owe their power. In the very act of deception with all its preparation, the dreadful voice, expression, and gestures, amid their effective scenario they are overcome by their belief in themselves; it is this belief which then speaks, so persuasively, so miracle-like, to the audience’ and is embraced by them.

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche

Narcissistic tendency or behaviour is not always destructive. The literature devoted to narcissism and leadership declares few narcissistic tendencies in leaders to be ‘constructive’ (Kets de Vries and Miller, 1997), ‘productive’ (Maccoby, 2007), ‘charismatic’ (Post, 1993) and ‘reparative’ (Volkan and Itzkowitz, 1984) at times necessary for bringing about revolutionary changes. Maccoby in Narcissistic Leaders: Who Succeeds and Who Fails (2007) argues that not all narcissistic leaders have failed; ‘constructive’ narcissists or ‘productive’ narcissists have left an indelible impression in history. He argues that Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi as ‘productive’ narcissistic leaders, and further Hitler, Stalin and Mao Zedong as destructive for society.

Deconstructing the idea of narcissists to be self absorbed-dreamers, Maccoby lists that contemporary business leaders such as Bill Gates, Oprah Winfrey, Steve Jobs, Andy Gove and Jeff Bezos exhibit narcissistic tendencies yet they are creators of successful companies because of their strategic intelligence mixed with foresight, ability to realise their hidden potential, potential to create a vision and charisma to motivate and genius of partnering with complementary talents. They may be described as constructive narcissists because they are guided by a strong moral conscience that motivates them to be creative and innovative. These business leaders do not fall into the trap of becoming tyrants if they are not guided by a strong urge for

---

power and position. In what follows we take examples from history and contemporary leadership to argue that even emphatic leadership fails due to narcissistic tendencies and hubristic behaviour if a leader is not guided by strong moral conscience.

Narcissistic leaders are seen as ‘great’ visionaries. They are by nature people who see ‘the big picture’. They are innovators driven to gain power, glory and fame (Maccoby, 2000). It is seen that narcissistic leaders start with a noble vision of bringing about a revolutionary change but soon if they are not cautious, they become so obsessed with their self and desire to achieve success that the needs of the followers are completely rejected. As has been the case, narcissistic leaders are driven by their own personal egoistical needs for power and admiration (Vries and Miller, 1997) rather than empathetic concern for their followers. They demand unquestioning devotion and loyalty from followers (Harwood, 2003). For example, the ‘Islamic Revolution’ (1979) in Iran under the leadership of Ayatollah Khomeini did not satisfy his aspirations for glory and fame. The revolution led by Khomeini aimed at changing the political situation of Iran by overthrowing the tyrannical Shah’s rule. Driven by the dreams for more fame and glory, Ayatollah envisions one “united Islamic Nation” under his guidance (Moin, 1999). The political, economic, and social changes, and the violence and havoc that his revolution unleashed are testimony to the strong narcissistic tendency, the hunger for power and fame, and complete absence of sympathetic concerns for the followers. Ayatollah Khomeini’s rise to power has been similar to that of Caesar’s. 21

Napoleon Bonaparte’s case is regarded as an apt example. The hero of French Revolution, Napoleon Bonaparte I was the Emperor of France and King of Italy and master of European continent by June 1812. A successful strategist and master in the art of warfare Napoleon failed due to his hubris and arrogance (Carr, 1941). Before the attack on Russia in 1812 he had thirty-five victories and three losses in war to his credit. The losses suffered were at an early stage during his military career and he did not incur huge losses. Therefore, they were soon forgotten. The attack on Russia in

1812 inspite of all the warnings by his trusted generals proved to be a turning point in his military career. With his unbound confidence given by his past successes and his callous indifference towards the rules that governed nineteenth century geopolitics, he led a campaign against Russia (Tarle, 1942; Ballard, 1971) with his whim and confidence. Napoleon attacked Russia in spite of all the warnings because he was convinced that despite all obvious obstacles, he could, through the force of will, succeed in bringing Russia under his control. His campaign was much less about the need to thwart the hostile intentions of a rival power and more about the need to satisfy a hubris-infected personality with an arrogant confidence about what great feats could be accomplished (Aubry, 1938; Tarle, 1942). He found that it was only Czar Alexander I that he had not subjugated and by doing so he would become the sole master of Europe.\footnote{Napoleon’s campaign against Russia (1812), the geopolitical situation at the time of the campaign, is based on the following historical documents: O. Aubry’s \textit{Napoleon: Soldier and Emperor}. New York: Lippincott, 1938; C.R. Ballard’s \textit{Napoleon, an Outline}. New York: Books for Libraries, 1971; E. Tarle’s \textit{Napoleon’s Invasion of Russia, 1812}. New York: Oxford UP, 1942; A. Fournier’s \textit{Napoleon I}. New York: Henry Holt, 1913; N. Nicolson’s \textit{Napoleon 1812}. New York: Harper and Row, 1985.} Leo Tolstoy captures Napoleon’s narcissism in \textit{War and Peace} (1869) in the following words: “He alone with his ideal of glory and grandeur developed in Italy and Egypt, his insane self-adulation, could justify what had to be done” (427). The French army suffered huge losses in this campaign which affected Napoleon’s military career adversely. The Russian campaign is believed to be a turning point in Napoleonic Wars that ultimately led to Napoleon’s defeat and his exile on the island of Elba (Nicolson, 1985; Tarle, 1942).

The negative side of narcissistic leaders is that they turn from visionaries to tyrants without even being aware of it. This is because they are predisposed to break the rules as they tend to possess a sense of independence from the norms that govern others. This sense of independence from norms is not only accompanied by a willingness to exploit others, it is also lack of empathy for the followers that lead to ultimate catastrophe (Kets de Vries, 1997; 342). Napoleon’s behaviour dramatically illustrates these inclinations. He consistently broke all rules of the eighteenth century delimiting the destructiveness of warfare. He encouraged his troops to loot the countries through which they passed rather than rely on provisions from France (Ballard, 1971). During the 1796-Italian campaign, he invaded the neutral Duchy of Parma in order to escape a trap laid by the Austrians. Having overrun the Duchy for
convenience, he also took hostage the governor of the capital city of Piacenze to make it easier to loot the city (Barnett, 1978; 45).

All this destruction is done because of unethical and immoral attitude towards power, glory and success visionaries develop when they develop narcissistic tendencies. Both Napoleon and Caesar are praised as great leaders and their ability to win battles as in the case of Achilles in the Trojan War. The issue of Caesar being a tyrannical ruler still remains debatable. For example, Salutati praises Caesar as “father of his country, the lawful and benignant ruler of the world” (Emerton, 1925; 110) and justifies Dante’s portrayal of Brutus and Cassius as evil and traitors. Suraez, however, condemns Caesar as a usurper of sovereign power “through violence and tyranny,” (1944, 711) lauded the assassination, and seconded Cicero’s praise of Brutus and Cassius’s courage. John Milton, like many others, takes a position between the extremes as he claims that Caesar unlawfully snatched away power and in so doing acted the part of a tyrant. Milton also expresses regrets about the assassination, respecting Caesar’s virtues and showing ambivalence towards Brutus and Cassius (White, 1931-38; 336-37). The complexity of portraying Caesar as a tyrant appears to be strong in Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar as well. For example, the word ‘tyrant’ appears numerous times in the play; the plebeians identify Caesar as a tyrant, which may be interpreted as an irony intentionally put forward by Shakespeare:

    First Plebeian: This Caesar was a tyrant
    Third Plebeian: Nay, that’s certain. (3.2.69)

The plebeian identification of Caesar as a ‘tyrant’ echoes other references. Cassius avers that suicide can put an end to “tyrants” and “tyranny” (1.3.92-99). He asks: “And why should Caesar be a tyrant then?” (1.3.103). Brutus incites the others against “high-sighted tyranny” (3.1.118). After the assassination, the conspirators proclaim: “Liberty! Freedom! Tyranny is dead!” (3.1.78). At the end of the play, young Cato pronounces himself “a foe to tyrants” (5.4.5). Yet the plebeians who confidently pronounce Caesar a tyrant soon mourn the loss of the fallen leader and seek revenge on the traitors who murdered him. Several references to Caesar also suggest the unconstitutionality of Caesar’s entrance to power in numerous different ways. The story of Junius Brutus’s revolt against tyrannical Tarquin is twice alluded to in the play (1.2.158.; 2.1.53). Cassius exclaims, “Age, thou art sham’d! / Rome, thou hast lost the breed of noble bloods! / When went there by an age since the great flood / But it was fam’d with more than with one man” (1.2.150-53). Shakespeare’s
Caesar does exhibit certain traits of a tyrant in practice. He fears plots and conspiracies, twice observing that such men as Cassius are “dangerous” (1.2.195).

Morf and Rhodewalt claim that for narcissists, the primary mode of coping with omnipresent feelings of inferiority is an unrelenting quest to gain recognition and prove their superiority (2001, 248). Even absolute power cannot match narcissists’ grandiose expectations (Vaknin, 2001). Narcissists often engage in an all-encompassing quest for recognition and superiority (Morf and Rhodewalt, 2001). This tendency is reflected in Shakespeare’s Caesar. He considers himself as a special creation, far superior to ordinary mortals. He presents himself as a man of destiny, as one uniquely fitted to assume command of Rome. Magisterially upholding one of his decrees, he declares himself to be fixed and constant like the pole star:

But I am constant as the northern star,
Of whose true-fix’d and resting quality
There is no fellow in the firmament. (3.1.60-62)

History is evident that in the same manner Stalin also portrayed himself to be the creator of new industrial and military of the world order and of ‘new Soviet Man’ (Bullock, 1992). His pronouncements assumed scriptural authority and sycophantic adulation, and self-glorification became the norm during his regime. In addition, Stalin presented himself to be fountain of wisdom. In The Foundation of Leninism, a series of lectures printed in 1924, he portrayed himself as the successor of Marx, Engels and Lenin as a Marxist philosopher (Tucker, 1973). Stalin also claimed mastery in fields such as Economics, Biology, Physics and especially Military Science where he had actually no practical training (Conquest, 1991). Adolf Hitler also envisaged himself to be creator of a whole “new Germanic civilization—the Third Reich” (Schmidt, 1951). Unlike Stalin, his grandiosity was more personalised, and he had no modesty in proclaiming his own superiority as sui generis genius. After the surrender of Czechoslovakia in 1939, he proclaimed himself as “the greatest German” (Fest, 1974). Not only Hitler considered himself to be the greatest political leader of the world, he also considered himself to be an intellectual and creative genius, and an expert in every field of studies. In 1919, he planned a massive work about the history of mankind, entitled “Monumental History of Mankind”, though the fact is that he had no training at all in history (Waite, 1977). Hitler’s act of extermination remains as an archetype of evil upon mankind. Evidences remain numerous on the narcissistic trends that these leaders portrayed.
Ron Rosenbaum (1998) aptly declares Hitler to be an evil genius. There remain numerous other modern examples as well. Grandiosity and the feeling of superiority have also been evident in the case of Saddam Hussein’s career. At one time, posters all over Baghdad showed him as the heir of Hammurabi, the great lawmaker of eighteenth-century-BC Babylon. He constantly posed himself to have descended from a noble family. In a letter sent to President Mubarak of Egypt, three weeks after the invasion of Kuwait, he claimed of belonging to a noble family that descended from the prophet Kuraishi Mohamedan family (Bulloch & Morris, 1991). Despite complete lack of military training, he claimed to be a master in the art of warfare. In the early phases of war against Iran, like an amateur he committed many mistakes. He gave ways to the professional commanders only when they confronted him as a group after several defeats (Bulloch & Morris, 1991).

The concept of narcissism can be applied to a variety of disciplines that have impact on the subject. The literature on narcissistic leadership argues both in favour and opposition of narcissistic leading. Revolutionary changes have been brought in by these leaders who have refused to accept conventional ideas and have believed in personal intuition. But the darker side is that narcissistic leaders’ admiration for power and success is driven by personal egotistical needs and they fail to empathize with the followers. It in fact leads to catastrophic results. Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar and King Lear portray, in principle, what narcissistic personalities in history and contemporary times have come to achieve and dismantle. The proper understanding of the same remains essential for scholars of Leadership Studies and future leaders who need to be tolerant in a multicultural world.
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Chapter 4

Good and Evil in Leadership: A Study of Macbeth and Hamlet

Understanding the nuances of good and evil in literary representation has been a trend in the neo-academic circle. Within the framework of Leadership Studies, the present chapter locates Shakespeare’s Macbeth (1606) and Hamlet (1600-01) central to the understanding of the concepts of good and evil in leading. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section critically introduces the concepts of good and evil and their place in leading. The second section argues that Macbeth and Hamlet are potential texts for an emphatic understanding of good and evil in leading; it highlights the ethical dimension in leading and leadership. It not only argues that the characters of Macbeth and Claudius can be represented as prototypes of understanding the dynamics of righteous and evil leaders, it also suggests that teaching ethical issues of leadership can be strengthened by an analysis of the characters of Macbeth and Claudius. The last section draws parallels with real-life cases bringing out the consequences of unethical leading.

I

The soul that has conceived one wickedness can nurse no good thereafter.

Sophocles

We are discussing no small matter, but how we ought to live.

Socrates

The Tragedy of Macbeth begins with the three witches who foretell Macbeth’s future in the form of three prophecies, “All hail, Macbeth! Hail to thee, Thane of Glamis! / All hail, Macbeth! Hail to thee, Thane of Cawdor! / All hail, Macbeth! that shall be king hereafter!” (1.3.47-49). They are portrayed as desiccated, hag-like creatures with choppy fingers, skinny lips and beards who dwell in the murk of deserts and who rejoice the upheavals of nature. They brew storms on land and tempests at sea, destroying people’s produce at home, sinking ships abroad, and in engaging in many other evil activities. They introduce the theme of the play as “fair is foul and foul is fair” (1.1.11), highlighting the relative nature of good and evil. Moreover, discourses concerning good and evil have ever perplexed writers of diverse field of studies as broad as Philosophy, Sociology, Theosophy and Literature, and Macbeth remains a prototype of the same. John Milton, for instance, directly represents the dichotomy of good and evil so central to Paradise Lost (1667) that he was claimed to have taken the


side of Satan in justifying “the ways of God to men” (Book 1, 26). The levy of good and evil is carried on throughout the poem with the interaction among Satan and his fallen angels representing evil and with God and his son in heaven symbolizing good: “Our labour must be to pervert that end, / And out of good still to find means of evil” (Book 1, 164-65). Moreover, discourses concerning good and evil have been central to renaissance writing.

The concepts of good and evil have long been a matter of debate and discussion among philosophers, theologians, sociologists, psychologists and humanists, and each discipline of studies has something unique to offer towards the understanding the nature of good and evil. For example, in Theology the terms “good” and “evil” are explained in terms of their relation to God and devil. Theologians” discuss the problem of evil in relation to divine perfection. Philosophical enquiries into the field have opened up discussions concerning the relative nature of the concepts through the classical age to the modern period. For Plato, the good is not a matter of opinion, but an object of knowledge. Knowledge of good and evil is best fruit of the tree of knowledge, “let each one of us leave every other kind of knowledge” (Jowett, 1970; 623). Socrates says at the end of Plato’s The Republic (380 BC): “and seek and follow one thing only,” and that is “to learn and discern between good and evil” (Jowett, 1970; 623). Aristotle’s view on the nature of good and evil is found in Nichomachean Ethics (350 BC). In this treatise he points out that ethics or any science that deals with good and evil can have as much precision as mathematics. Indefiniteness and even a certain amount of relativity occur when the principles are applied to particular cases.

The terms “good” and “evil,” Spinoza writes in Ethics (1677), indicate “nothing positive in things considered in themselves, nor are they anything else than modes of thought… One and the same thing may at the same time be good and evil or indifferent” (Shirley; 1992; 163). Such conclusions may come only according to the person who makes judgment of it. Therefore, Spinoza defines ‘good’ as “that which we certainly know is useful to us” (1992; 164). Apart from society he says: “There is nothing which by universal consent is good or evil, since everyone in a natural state consults only his own profit” (1992; 164). The same idea echoes in Montaigne’s essay that says: “… that the taste of good and evil depends in large part on the opinion we have of them” (Frame, 1958, 34). The impact of Montaigne is seen on Shakespeare as Hamlet comments: “There is nothing good or bad but thinking makes it so” (2.2.250).
Thus according to Spinoza, only when men together in a civil society under law can it be “decided by universal what is good and what is evil” (Shirley, 1992; 175). Concepts such as good and evil and what is good and what is bad for a society are all relative concepts and ideas, and they are subject to change according to time, place and societal developments. Thus, what is punishable according to the rules of a society is generally considered bad or evil. In general, we estimate or judge things according to our own condition and the way things affect us. Thus, keeping in view Socrates’ argument in *Theaetetus*—“in which all things are said to be relative”—good and evil become relative terms and they vary according to conditions and situations (Campbell, 1861; 38).

*The Oxford English Dictionary* (1966) defines evil as the antithesis of good in all its principal senses. But in the common use, the term ‘evil’ is denoted as something bad, vicious, ill, wicked and the phrase has negative connotations like the expression of disapproval, dislike or disparagement (332). The word goes beyond these negative connotations of ‘badness’ and has a wide range of meaning. It cannot be defined as a single idea but it stands as a broad concept housing divergent views by philosophers and theologians on its nature and characteristics. Ervin Staub in *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence* (1989) discusses evil as something that cannot be a defined as a fixed entity:

Scientific concept with an agreed meaning, but the idea of evil is part of a broadly shared human cultural heritage. The essence of evil is the destruction of human beings. This includes not only killing but creation of conditions that materially or psychologically destroy or diminish people’s dignity, happiness, and capacity to fulfill basic material needs…. By evil I mean *actions* that have such consequences (25).

Is evil an individual entity? Is it a group entity? Or is it characterized by the absence of ‘goodness’ or is it absence of ‘goodness’ in individual and society? Philip Zimbardo in *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil* (2007) suggests that “evil consists in intentionally behaving in ways that harm, abuse, demean, dehumanize, or destroy innocent others—or using one’s authority and systematic power to encourage or permit others to do so on your behalf” (5). Kant’s concept of ‘radical evil’ proposes evil as “an invisible enemy, one who hides behind reason and hence [is] all the more dangerous (Wood and Giovanni, 1966; 77). Thus, the scope of evil extends to anything ‘wrong’ that may lead to serious personal and
social consequences. Yet defining ‘evil’ is not at all an easy phenomenon; the scope of it is ever arching and ever broadening. In most cases moreover, central to evil is human action or deed. The Catholic Encyclopedia for instance discusses evil from the point of view of human welfare and proposes that evil is “what ought not exist” (Sharpe, 1909; n. pag.).

The medieval philosophy emphasises the ultimate importance of the inviolable individual. Human being is invested with a sublime dignity, and people’s actions which remain cosmic in importance, are directed to ineffable ends. Unlike other creatures, human being is endowed with a rational soul having two god-like powers, namely, intellect and understanding, with which people discover truth and will, and with which people desire good respectively. As to the relative superiority of these two powers, the scholastics are of divided opinions; some give supremacy to intellect and its function towards ‘reason’, and others to ‘will’, its function, and liberty of free choice. But in either case humans are by nature reasonable beings, who possess freedom to work out their own destiny according to their nature. It is Pelagius who emphasises more on the absolute freedom of human will and the essential nobility of human nature. St. Augustine moreover insists upon natural depravity of human will after the Fall until it is regenerated by grace.

Pelagius presupposes that every ‘man’ is born sinless as Adam and entirely competent of ‘himself’ to all good through the exercise of freedom of choice. Consequently, this “freedom is the supreme good, the honour and glory of man, the bonum naturae which cannot be lost” (Schaff, 1884; 802). The essence of all the discussions regarding will, freedom and choice is that the “true and ultimate human good must be that which satisfies specifically human aspirations, and answers to the most elevated tendencies, the intellect and will” (Wulf, 1926; 302). Both the determinist and indeterminist schools of thought agree that it is the very nature of the human will to desire good, whether impelled or merely inclined by the reasonable representation of it. If our essential nature is to do good, then why do we engage in evil or commit sinful acts? Thomas Aquinas answers that the direct
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4 For further reading see Phillip Schaff’s History of Medieval Church. New York: n.p, 1884.


6 ibid. 271-304.
cause of sin is the adherence to a mutable good, and every sinful act proceeds from an inordinate desire for some temporal good. Now one desires temporal good due to the fact that the person loves himself/herself inordinately. Consequently, love of self is the fundamental cause of sin.\textsuperscript{7} Certain actions are called human or good in as much as they proceed from reason; evil implies a privation of good, and it acts always in virtue of deficient goodness. The self-lover, therefore, who loves more the lesser good, may choose spiritual evil and many even come to sin through certain malice. The sin or the crime committed by Macbeth and Claudius can be explained from this aspect. The love of self remains so central that for temporal good they sacrifice all their virtues and goodness. Macbeth is portrayed to be a brave soldier who has fought valiantly and won battles for King Duncan. In the opening scene of the play, Macbeth is introduced by a wounded captain informing King Duncan about his achievements at the battlefield. The captain calls him “brave Macbeth” for his extraordinary military skills exhibited in the battle field. He narrates in detail Macbeth’s accomplishments in the battlefield to the King:

For brave Macbeth—well he deserves that name—
Disdaining Fortune, with his brandished steel,
...Like valour’s minion carved out his passage
Till he faced the slave [rebel, Macdonwald] (1.2.16-23)

King Duncan finds him honest and to be the noblest officer, and praises him for his bravery and valour: “O valiant cousin, worthy gentleman” (1.2.24). Macbeth proves his worth as a brave general by his strong determination and courage. Macbeth succeeds in proving his loyalty towards the crown by successfully crushing rebel started by the Thane of Cawdor with the alliance of Norwegian army:

Till that Bellona’s bridegroom, lapp’d in proof,
Confronted him with self-comparisons,
Point against point rebellious, arm ’gainst arm.
Curbing his lavish spirit: and, to conclude,
The victory fell on us. (1.2.62-66)

Hence, in the beginning of the play, we encounter the principal character Macbeth who is portrayed as ‘good’ for an act of faithfulness, in other words, for his achievements in winning a war for King Duncan. With this act of glory Macbeth wins

\textsuperscript{7} For further explanation see Thomas Aquinas’s \textit{Summa Theologica}. N.p.: Bibliolife, 2007.
the King’s favour and is rewarded with the title of ‘Thane of Cawdor’. The first prophecy by the three witches proves to be true. Macbeth till this point remains loyal towards the King. He is like any other soldier who is aware of his potentialities and capable of conceiving of ultimate and lofty ends, i.e., kingship. He knows how to be actively loyal to the King and the country, to accept duty, to promote justice, amity and piety. But he is inclined to centre his attention upon the means to those ends with the primary purpose of not attaining ultimate good but satisfying his inordinate love of self. The desire for a temporal good is so overwhelming that he chooses to take up unethical means of attaining it. Hence, the concept of evil does not arise in Macbeth till he is tempted by the prophecies, nor does it come to the front without the support of external forces. Evil is portrayed to be an inherent thing in humans that is constantly guarded by external forces surrounding a person. Similar is the case of King Claudius; his ambition was to become King, and he attains it by improper means. He murders his brother and marries his brother’s wife. After attaining his ambition he thinks he can forget the hideous means that he used for the murder, and henceforth tries to lead an exemplary life. He wants desperately to be a good king, a good husband to Gertrude, and a good father to Hamlet; however, the evil within him once unleashed cannot be controlled. He is forced into a series of other evil acts in order to hide the one act that promised him temporal good. Both Macbeth and Claudius face intense spiritual and psychological suffering on account of their inordinate ambitions and love of self.

Macbeth is actuated in his conduct chiefly by an inordinate desire for worldly honours. For example, he fights valiantly in Duncan’s service and rejoices in the successes which crown his efforts: “The service and the loyalty I owe, / In doing it, pays itself” (1.4.25-26). As he destroys the King’s enemies and as different titles, favours and honours are bestowed upon him, he is encouraged to fight harder and harder to further his glory and fame. Consequently, he reaches the point when he thinks of coveting kingship. Macbeth’s corruption is slow and is motivated by his own choice though there are several external forces implanted into action. The transformation from a brave soldier into a murderer and then a tyrannical ruler reveals that his actions were motivated by his will and choice that satisfy his ends and not by the righteousness of his actions. Macbeth contemplates on the consequences of murdering the King. He is repelled by the idea and realizes that the act of killing is extremely sinful because first he is the King’s relative, then his subject and thirdly
being a host, he should be protecting him and not participate in the killing. He faces ethical dilemma, yet he chooses to take up an action that ensures him power and position. The mental conflict continues further: “First, as I am his kinsman and his subject, / Strong both against the deed; then, as his host, / Who should against his murderer shut the door, / Not bear the knife myself” (1.7.13-16). The ethical and religious dilemma though remains crucial to his introspection, the desire to become the ruler also continues to be in his mind. Similar to that of the appearance of good and bad angels in *Dr. Faustus* (1604) Macbeth’s mind has to choose between evil and good. Macbeth is reminded of the ‘Judgment Day’ and becomes conscious of the effect of the deed: “We still have judgment here; that we but teach / Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return / To plague the inventor… (1.7.8-10). Macbeth also acknowledges the virtues of King Duncan, which will “plead like angels, trumpet-tongued, against” (1.7.19) him. He realizes that it is an evil act to kill the King who has been very kind and just to him. But the rightness of the action is suppressed by his strong urge to be the King of Scotland and he acknowledges this by saying, “I have no spur / To prick the sides of my intent, but only / Vaulting ambition which o’erleaps itself” (1.7.25-27). It was this overarching ambition, the desire to be king, that forces him to act in an evil manner. In the same manner King Claudius’s love for crown and the position that he holds are revealed only after Hamlet kills Polonius. On hearing the news he realizes that not only his life is at peril, but those things as well which he values above his soul.

Similarly, Macbeth is lured into temptation by the prophecies of the witches; he is, however, inspired by his own urge to gain and control power. This is because immediately after the first prophecy proves to be true, Macbeth thinks over the nature of the prophecy and tries to justify its authenticity by saying that had it been evil, it would not have yielded him success. On the other hand,
the thought of kingship scares him; the thought of murdering of King horrifies him and he is strongly repulsed by the idea:

Against the use of nature? Present fears
Are less than horrible imaginings.
My thought, whose murder yet is but fantastical,
Shakes so my single state of man that function
Is smothered in surmise, and nothing is,
But what is not. (1.3.136-141)

It is at this human kindness of Macbeth that Lady Macbeth believes to be an impediment in his aspirations. The natural goodness in him whose instinctive tendency to shrink away from whatever is unnatural is what Lady Macbeth calls “the milk of human kindness” in Macbeth (1.5.17). This feeling of unnaturalness of the act is repulsive to Macbeth—something not in harmony with man’s nature. Lady Macbeth fears that it may prevent Macbeth from taking the nearest way to his aspiration, i.e., kingship. Immanuel Kant in his book Religion within Boundaries of Mere Reason (1793) presents human nature to be ‘radically evil’ (Wood and Giovanni, 1966; 69). He asserts in this treatise that the root of evil is corrupt ‘moral orientation’ and an ‘evil disposition’ (1966, 95). Kant’s view on evil, moreover, has often been questioned and is found to be contradictory to the Christian doctrine of ‘Original Sin’ that claims evil to be inherited. Kant argues that the root of evil is human will and the choice of people’s action. Instead of choosing rightness, it is human nature to choose what accomplishes the ends most (1966, 87). Therefore, Macbeth and Claudius’s evil actions can be understood as result of the choices they make—inspired by their own desire to attain kingship and gather supreme power. Both of them engage in evil because it promises them power, position and status.

Kant writes that human beings are radically evil; this is because the propensity towards evil is deeply ingrained in human nature and it corrupts our power of choice at its very root (1966, 98). The evil deed cannot completely be attributed to the outer forces; the temptation of the witches or the prophecy alone is not responsible in corrupting the character of Macbeth. Rather, according to Kant’s explanation, it is subjugated in human mind itself. Kant further explains that the fundamental principle of choice depends on our satisfaction, i.e., we make the satisfaction one of our ends taking priority in the will of our actions. We thus inculcate in ourselves a propensity to make exceptions to the demand of the categorical in circumstances when such an
exception seems to be in our favour. He further suggests that overcoming radical evil requires a “change of heart,” i.e., a reordering of our fundamental principle of choice that we are responsible for. Effecting such a change, however, leaves unsettled our moral culpability for those choices that are made under the inverted maxim evil. Thus, metaphorically, Macbeth’s reaction after hearing the prophecies by the witches hints at his intentions. He had been contemplating on regicide and the witches encourage him to move ahead with the deed. Banquo remains confused to see Macbeth’s reaction to the prophecy; in fact the chances of being a king should have made him happy. Why is then Macbeth scared of “royal hope” (1.3.54)? Is it because Macbeth had been contemplating on usurpation and the witches are representative of the demonic forces within him that expose his deepest desire? In spite of the mental turmoil and ethical dilemma, Macbeth chooses to embrace the evil act because the end-goal hopes to bring him power and glory. The love of self is so great that unnaturalness of regicide is forgotten.

The problem of good and evil has ever perplexed all human civilizations. Why does a character or person choose to act evil when she/he is aware of its nature? How good is it to be virtuous in a world where everybody is competitive and everyone wills to progress at all point of time? How in other words does a person, in spite of knowing the consequences of evil, choose the wrong path? Literary representations remain central in questioning and understanding the concepts of good and evil and show the way a character or situation could be balanced. The classical notion of tragic gaiety also answers part of question. Hence, in what follows we explore the framework within which Macbeth and Hamlet introduce us to evil and we initiate a discussion furthering their scope in the present-day business world where unethical leadership has been a matter of concern. We argue that Macbeth and Hamlet are potential texts for an emphatic understanding of the concepts in leading. We not only argue that the characters of Macbeth and Claudius can be presented as prototypes of understanding the dynamics of righteous and evil leaders, we also suggest that teaching ethical issues of leadership can be strengthened by an analysis of the characters of Macbeth and Claudius.
The better angel is a man right fair,
The worser spirit a woman coloured ill.
To win me soon to hell, my female evil,
Tempteth my better angel from my side,
And would corrupt my saint to be a devil,
Wooing his purity with her foul pride.

(Shakespeare, Sonnet 144)

An evil Spirit (your Beauty) haunts me still,
Wherewith, alas, I have been long possessed;
Which ceaseth not to attempt me to each ill,
Nor give me once, but one poor minute's rest.
In me it speaks, whether I sleep or wake:

(Drayton, Sonnet 20)

Whether philosophically, literally or metaphorically, the duel between good and evil has been constantly yet dramatically represented in seventeenth century writing. In most cases, an external force remains central to ‘temptation’ or withdrawing a man of action from the righteous act. The feminine also is portrayed as an instrumental factor in accelerating the evil act. These are not just stereotypes that the seventeenth century contributed to emphatically, it has also been a way of judging the male-centred humanist universe. The concept of evil, in most cases, has been gendered and as scholars we need to see the construction of the external forces that remain operative in such cases as well the evil within us. For example, the above-mentioned sonnets play out the age-old conflict between good and evil taking woman as an embodiment of evil. They focus on the beauty of a lady as evil because it encourages the man to deviate from the path of righteousness. These dark ladies are seductresses who take the fair man away from the path of goodness. In the sonnets, the women herself is personified as evil—as the bad angel—who is on the side of the devil and is responsible for all the world’s woes. Lady Macbeth is also dramatically represented in the same light, who seduces Macbeth and lures him into his destruction.

At the outset Macbeth and Lady Macbeth plan the murder of the King for their personal gain, i.e., for kingship. The tragedy of the Macbeths is that they had no son
to inherit the kingdom.\footnote{Freud discusses in detail the cause of mental disorder in Lady Macbeth in “Some Character-Types Met with in Psycho-Analytic Work” (1916). He focuses on her childlessness that leads to disillusionment, and further the guilt of the crime leads to mental disorder. Freud on the basis of Holinshed Chronicles (1577) asserts that though the story of Macbeth is picked by Shakespeare from the Chronicle, it is mentioned only once in the chronicle that Lady Macbeth was an ambitious wife who instigates Macbeth to murder and that is to become a queen herself. There is no further reference to her subsequent fate and of development of her character. In the same manner Freud suggests Macbeth's transformation into a bloodthirsty tyrant is because of the same reason that he could not produce an heir to the throne. In Holinshed it was around ten years that Macbeth ruled after the murder of Duncan and the account highlights his transformation into a tyrant after his realization that the prophecy of Banquo may be fulfilled as in his own case. And then he plans to murder Banquo and engages in crimes one after another as dramatised by Shakespeare in the play. Though the Chronicles do not state childlessness to be the cause of transformation, Freud claims that there are enough reasons for this to be a plausible motive of transformation.} They lack the imagination to foresee and understand the consequences of the nefarious deed. Similarly, Doctor Faustus succumbs to the temptations of evil and fails to foresee the consequences of his deeds. He sells his soul to Lucifer for twenty-four years of luxurious life on Earth. The internal conflict is dramatically represented as a duel between the Good Angel and the Bad Angel throughout the play. Marlowe’s The Tragicall History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus (1604) personifies good and evil in the form of Good Angel and Bad Angel. The play portrays the conflict between the Good Angel and the Evil Angel trying to influence Faustus’ actions inviting him to discourse reason and finally evil wins the contest:

Good Angel: Sweet Faustus, leave that execrable art.
Faustus: Contrition, prayer, repentance—what of them?
Good Angel: Oh, they are means to bring thee unto heaven.
Evil Angel: Rather illusions, fruits of lunacy,

That makes men foolish that do trust them most.

Good Angel: Sweet Faustus, think of heaven and heavenly things.
Evil Angel: No Faustus, think of honour and of wealth. (452-9)

Faustus falls a prey to the temptation of the Bad Angel, embraces the Devil for material gains but by the end of the play he is found repentant and disillusioned. There remains however no way to retreat. He is damned eternally and his soul suffers torments of Hell. The play serves as a warning to the Renaissance spirit of insatiable thirst for knowledge, power and position. It also serves as a hint towards the questions of ethics and morality of people with power and knowledge.
In the first part of the play, Macbeth acts as a murderer killing King Duncan; in the second part he becomes a tyrannical ruler; and by the end of the play, the evil within him is unleashed and he goes on murdering people whom he perceived as a threat. First in this series remain Banquo and Fleance. Banquo is a threat for him on account of two reasons; firstly, according to the prophecy by the weird sisters it is Banquo who would father the future king: “Thou shalt get kings, though thou be none” (1.3.65) and secondly, Banquo is equally aware of the prophecy and suspects him of murdering the King: “Thou has it now, “King, , Cawdor, Glamis, all, / As the weird women promised, and, I fear, / Thou play’dst most fouly for ’t... It should not stand in thy posterity” (3.1.1-4). Banquo’s murder would free him of all the worries of being exposed. Macbeth is afraid of Banquo’s presence because he finds him to be his competitor. He is aware of the fact that Banquo is a man of royal nature, dauntless courage, and wisdom and can prove to be a potential threat for him: “Our fears in Banquo / Stick deep; and in his royalty of nature / Reigns that which would be fear’d: ’tis much he dares; / And to that dauntless temper of his mind / He hath wisdom that doth guide his valour /… there is none but he / whose being I do fear” (3.1.51-55). Therefore, he decides to get him and his son murdered. The murder of Fleance ends all the speculations regarding the succession to the throne according to the prophecy. But Fleance fortunately escapes the murderers attack leaving Macbeth unsatisfied and doubtful.

Claudius is moved to fratricide and then to incest because he wants to replace King Hamlet and occupy his position as king. When we are introduced to Claudius in Act I, scene ii, he expresses grief over the sudden death of King Hamlet and rationalizes his hasty marriage with his sister-in-law: “Though yet of Hamlet our dear brother’s death / The memory be green, and that it us befitted / To bear our hearts in grief, and our whole kingdom… that we with wisest sorrow think on him, / Together with remembrance of ourselves” (1.2.1-7). As an effective leader immediately after taking over as the King of Denmark, Claudius makes very clear of his awareness of young Fortinbras’s advances. He arouses confidence among his subjects that Fortinbras will not reap any advantage from the political disturbances that Denmark is going through:

Now follows, that you know, young Fortinbras
Holding a weak supposal of our worth,
Our state to be disjoint and out of frame,
Colleagued with the dream of his advantage,
He hath not fail’d to pester us with message,
Importing the surrender to those lands
Lost by his father, with all bonds of law,
to our most valiant brother. (1.2.16-23)

Claudius is moved to commit another act of cruelty after the enactment of the
play in Act III, a trap set by Prince Hamlet to check Claudius if he is actually guilty of
his father’s murder. Claudius’s reaction immediately confirms his crime. But at the
same time Claudius realizes Hamlet to be a potential threat to his life and crown.
Therefore, he orders Hamlet’s immediate transportation to England and his execution.
The earlier crimes are committed before the play begins. The writing of the letters
containing Hamlet’s death warrant is the first crime, within the strict confines of the
play, of which King Claudius is guilty. His ambition was to become king and having
attained that ambition he thinks he can forget the hideous means he used and
henceforth lead an exemplary life. But the guilt of the crime committed could not
remain hidden for long. One crime leads to another leading to complete fall of
Claudius. He is repulsed by the very thought of committing another crime and
immediately kneels down to pray and seek forgiveness for his crimes:

O! my offence is rank, it smells to heaven;
It hath the primal eldest curse upon’t;
A Brother’s murder! Pray can I not,
Though inclination be as sharp as will:
My stronger guilt defeats my strong intent
… Art more engaged! Help, angels! Make assay;
Bow, stubborn knees; and heart with strings of steel
Be soft as sinews of the new-born babe.
All may be well. (3.3.1-70)

He bows down to surrender himself to the Almighty. And similar to that of Faustus’
condition, he is scared and realizes that he fails to pray because of the cruel act he has
committed.

Macbeth’s suffering on personal fronts after the murder is pitiable. He suffers
tremendously. He is compelled by Lady Macbeth to commit regicide though he
wanted to retreat from it. After murdering Duncan, he feels guilty and finds the act
extremely sinful similar to King Claudius, and that is why he says: “But wherefore
could not I pronounce ‘Amen’? / I had most need of blessing, and ‘Amen’ / Stuck in my throat” (2.2.33-35). Not only this, he is so ashamed of himself and the act that he refuses to acknowledge himself: “To know my deed, ’twere best not know myself” (2.2.75). He is filled with grief and remorse for having committed the act and realizes that by murdering Duncan he has actually killed his inner self, his innocence, peace of mind, and significantly he is deprived of ‘sleep’ which is like a balm for an agitated mind:

Macbeth does murder sleep, the innocent sleep,
Sleep that knits up the ravell’d sleeve of care,
The death of each day’s life, sore labour’s bath,
Balm of hurt minds, great nature’s second course,
Chief nourisher in life’s feast (2.2.38-42)

It is this expression of repentance and remorse that makes the character of Macbeth human and different from the Duke of Gloucester. The Duke of Gloucester becomes Richard III after a series of killings which includes his wife, kinsmen, enemies, and many supporters, who so ever he found threatening, before the battle of Bosworth. In this battle he faces shameful defeat at the hands of Duke of Richmond who becomes Henry VII. Richard III is portrayed to be completely evil with no traces of human kindness and lacks nobility unlike Macbeth who is lured into evil by the evil forces within him and which remain beyond his control. He represents a man with weakness but not completely devoid of nobleness. Harold Goddard argues that Macbeth is at “bottom any man of noble intentions who gives way to his appetites. And who at one time or another has not been that man” (Goddard, 1960; 110).

Macbeth’s journey towards approaching evil remains slow initially; it passes through different stages. And Macbeth justifies it on many grounds, viz., the nature of his ambition, the futuristic view of the prophecies and through the involvement of external forces that led him to commit the fatal error of killing the King. The frailty in the character of Macbeth is exposed when he succumbs to the temptations offered by the three witches. Prior to the meeting with the witches, he was held in reverence among his colleagues and the King admired his manners and skills. Macbeth was loyal till he was not lured by the witches and was not aware of the future. Disloyalty, however, is unimagined till he was seduced by the prophecies of the witches and until the first prophecy is materialized. As Macbeth crosses the first boundary and proffers the first title, his character unsettles much on his personal and professional fronts. On
the professional front, it is the desire to achieve limitless power of a King; on the political realm comes agitation when he hears Malcolm is declared prince of Cumberland and hence a successor to the throne. These events unsettle much in the character of the principal subject and failing to predict what future holds for him, he surrenders to materialize the second prophecy. There, constructed as negative, this realm of personal gain unsettles much on personal and professional spaces. Failing, here constructed as immoral, to achieve a status initially, Macbeth succumbs to his personal realm, the plan of plotting the murder of the King. Macbeth is agitated when King Duncan declares Malcolm to be Prince of Cumberland and successor to the throne. He believes:

The Prince of Cumberland! That is a step
On which I must fall down, or else o’er leap. (1.4.48-49)

According to Kant, our propensity to evil comes in three different forms, which differ in grade but not in type, as each form is but a different manifestation of the same evil moral orientation (1966, 78). The first grade refers to be frailty of human nature which means when it comes to actually living up to our moral values. Even when we have recognized ideally what we ought to do, when it comes implementing this in practice, especially when it is not to our advantage, we often find our moral commitments too frail to trump other interests (1966, 80). This is what Macbeth is engaged into. He realizes the cruelty of the act, yet he commits the act of murdering because he could not detach himself from love of self, his love for the title and the power that kingship promises. One way of interpretation could be it was with the instigation of his wife that he moves ahead with the evil act. She acts as a temptress and an ally to the witches who lure him into evil. It cannot be denied, however, that it is because of his personal choice and will to engage in evil that Macbeth succumbs to commit all the crimes.

Shakespeare has presented Lady Macbeth, a loyal partner to Macbeth, who encourages him towards self-promotion. She advises him to disguise his true intentions upon the arrival of the King as: “Look like the time; bear welcome in your eyes, / Your hand, your tongue: look like the innocent flower, / But be the serpent under ’t” (1.5.62-64). She has been his guiding force, acting like a true paramour, but in the end we find Lady Macbeth who tried hard to be strong and full of evil could not bear the burden of the guilt of the sin. She turns mad and according to Freud, it was the loss of purity of mind and heart that she rushed to wash her hands. Freud writes:
“The washing was symbolic, designed to replace the physical purity by the moral purity which she regretted having lost. She tormented herself with remorse for conjugal infidelity, the memory of which she had resolved to banish from her mind” (1959; 322). Further Freud asserts that there were no signs of remorse or internal conflict in Lady Macbeth right from the beginning, but it was only after becoming queen she feels disappointed and disillusioned and at one point she says: “… Nought’s had, all’s spent, / Where our desire is got without content. / ’tis is safer to be that which we destroy / Than by destruction dwell in doubtful joy” (3.2.4-7). Freud explores the tragedy of Macbeth more in terms of father-son relationship and attributes the cause of mental disorder in Lady Macbeth to be her childlessness. It was only the passion and ambition responsible for Lady Macbeth’s pitiable state. She fails to understand her true nature. She resolves to fill in him her spirit and determination so that there can be no impediments in her husband’s progress. She exhibits firm determination in achieving what has been promised to her husband by all ways and means:

Hie thee hither,
That I may pour my spirits in thine ear;
And chastise with the valour of my tongue
All that impedes thee from the golden round. (1.5.25-28)

In another soliloquy in the same act when she receives the news of King Duncan visiting their castle, she determines to be strong and invokes the spirits to deprive her of womanly qualities of love, mercy, humility and wants no impediments in her way. Here, she represents malevolent power who subdues her feminine and maternal instincts for power and glory. She invokes evil forces to take way the softer and emotional feelings and fill in her with cruelty—an attempt to harden herself psychologically to prepare her husband for the deed:

Come, you spirits
That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here,
And fill me from the crown to the toe top-full
Of direst cruelty! Make thick my blood;
Stop up the access and passage to remorse,
… come to my woman’s breast,
And take my milk for gall… (1.5.38-46)
Kant argues propensity to evil is due to the *impurity* of the human heart and in its tendency to mix pure and impure incentives. The true motives for acting often or always are opaque, even to ourselves, and we find it difficult to ever act for the sake of moral law (Wood and Giovnni, 1966; 97). Lady Macbeth’s intention in instigating Macbeth in killing Duncan seems to be motivated by her own desire to achieve the status of queen because Holinshedd’s account writes Macbeth’s career is influenced by his ambitious spouse who encourages him towards regicide: “‘lay sore upon him to attempt’ regicide as she that was verie ambitious, burning in unquenchable desire to beare the name of a queene” (Braunmuller, 1997; 14).

Gertrude’s character remains oppositional to that of Lady Macbeth’s. She is portrayed with ‘frailty’ in her character and in her personality. Freud and Earnest Jones see her as Hamlet’s object of Oedipus complex as central to motivation of the play (Freud, 1900; Jones, 1947). They discuss her as ‘feminine’ and ‘shallow’ in the pejorative sense of the words, incapable of any sustained rational process, superficial and flighty. A.C. Bradley presents her not as: “a bad hearted woman, not at all the woman to think little of murder. But she had a soft animal nature and was very dull and very shallow. She loved to be happy, like a sheep in the sun, and to do her justice…” (1905, 167). She has definitely not been instrumental in the killing of King Hamlet. She is found guilty of incest and her over hasty marriage to King Claudius. Her lusty nature in some way takes King Claudius to reach to his ambition of becoming the King. In fact after being rebuked by Prince Hamlet in Act III, scene iv, for giving way to her passions, she promises loyalty to him and keeps to her promise till the end. In spite of being regarded by critics as dull, shallow and materialistic, she cannot be doubted to have loved Hamlet dearly.

Lady Macbeth aspires for the promised power and glory and acts immorally on account of this aspiration. Macbeth suffers on the personal front and the effect of the evil act continues to disturb him till the end. After killing Duncan, Macbeth continues to break the traditional bonds of trust and friendship. Killing of Banquo and

---

9 Charlton Lewis, among other critics, shows that Shakespeare kept many facts away of the plot from the original text. In the original Belleforest story, Gertrude was daughter of the king. To have a successor to the throne it was necessary for her to marry Hamlet. Shakespeare retained this part of the play, that after king Hamlet’s death it was very obvious that Price Hamlet would take over as the next successor to the throne. But Claudius in marrying Gertrude comes in between the line of election, “popp’d in between th’ election and my hopes” (5.2.65), an attempt to keep young Hamlet away from throne. It was Gertrude’s flaw of lust that made Claudius’ ambition possible. For further reading see Charlton M Lewis’s *The Genesis of Hamlet*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1907.
then execution of Macduff’s innocent wife and child, all these indicate the evil which he had created is now out of his control and necessitates further and further evil just like Iago who too in the end realizes that the evil in which he has engaged is now out of his control and cannot be controlled. His last words prove that finally he has lost; the evil that he has created has gone beyond his control and he stands powerless and exposed:

Othello: Will you, I pray, demand that demi-evil
Why he hath thus ensnar’d my soul and body?
Iago: Demand me nothing, what you know, you know,
From this time forth I never will speak word. (5.2.298-301)

Similarly in the last act, Macbeth realizes that there is no escape from what he has done and commands more criminal and selfish deeds. Upon hearing the news of his wife’s mental state, he shouts at the doctor to cure her: “Cure her of that / Canst thou minister to a mind diseased, / Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow” (5.2.40-42). He realizes that what is done rashly—“done the deed”—of self promotion at his wife’s instigation cannot be undone: “What’s done, is done” (3.2.11-12). Lady Macbeth’s death makes him reflect upon the nature of life and death. He is repelled by the news of his wife’s death and finds his own life futile and worthless: “To-morrow, and to-morrow and to-morrow, / ... / Life’s but a walking shadow, a poor player / That struts and frets his hour upon the stage / And heard no more: it is a tale / Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, / Signifying nothing” (5.5.16-26). This soliloquy expresses the intense spiritual suffering in Macbeth. He hints at the pointless existence of man on earth. By this time he realizes the fruitlessness of his ambition. The ambition for which he had sold his soul like Doctor Faustus has brought forth only sorrow, madness and death. He is disillusioned and understands the trap he has been put into by the weird sisters, yet his martial spirit forces him to move ahead with the war and like a valiant soldier he plans to fight: “They have tied me to a stake: I cannot fly, / But, bear-like, I must fight the course” (5.7.1-2). He derives courage to move ahead further from his despair and depravity: “I have almost forgot the taste of fears” (5.5.9). The courage to move on comes from his realisation that his ambition is nothing but a delusion, fostered by the seductive deceptions of the three witches.

By the end of the play, Macbeth is repentant and disillusioned for having committed the crime against humanity. In fact he acknowledges that Duncan is resting in peace, whom he has murdered: “After life’s fitful fever he sleeps well; / Treason
has done his worst: nor steel, nor poison, / Malice domestic, foreign levy, nothing / Can touch him further” (3.2.23-26). And on the other hand, he is going through a mental and psychological turmoil for committing the murder: “O full of scorpions is my mind, dear wife! / Thou know’st that Banquo, and his Fleance, lives” (3.2.36-37). His suffering is beyond endurance and has reached to the point when he finally realizes that the evil he has induced cannot be corrected, “Things without all remedy / Should be without regard; what’s done, is done (3.2.11-12). In the same manner Claudius is also repentant for breaking the sacred bond of familial relations. He tries to seek forgiveness and states: “My words fly up, my thoughts remain below: / Words without thoughts never to heaven go” (3.3.98-99). It all goes in vain because he still desires kingship.

Macbeth represents evil, tyranny and unethical leading whereas Duncan and Malcolm represent goodness and serve to be role model for ethical leadership. Macbeth’s struggle with his inner desire to garner power for self is a lesson to understand the use of power and its abuse. Macbeth uses power to lead by force and Duncan and Malcolm use power to restore peace and tranquility in the kingdom. King Duncan and Malcolm present prototype of good leaders. In the play good and evil are represented in the form of Duncan and Malcolm, and Macbeth and Lady Macbeth respectively. Duncan is hence represented as ‘gracious’ (3.1.66) and upon his death “renown and grace is dead” (2.3.101); after his death, Malcolm takes the charge of restoring peace and tranquility in Scotland.

King Duncan is portrayed as a kind and generous ruler, who keeps his subjects happy and rewards them justly for their services. He honours and rewards Macbeth for his bravery and feats at war. King Duncan represents an ideal leader who practices transformational leadership. He praises and calls Macbeth to be, “worthiest cousin” and honours him declaring that he deserves more than what has been bestowed upon him [Macbeth] when compared to his acts of bravery and loyalty for the state: “
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10 Historically in the Holinshed’s Chronicles, a comparison is drawn between Macbeth and Duncan. Duncan is portrayed as ruler with “soft and gentle of nature, that people wished the inclinations and maners of these two cousins to have been so tempered and interchangeable bestowed betwixt them, that where one had too much of clemence, and the other of crueltie, the meane virtue betwixt these two extremities might have reigned by indifferent partition in them both, so should Duncane haue proued a worthy king, and Makbeth an excellent capteine. The beginning of Duncans reign was very quiet and peaceable, without anie notable trouble; but after it was perceiued how negligent he was in punishing offenders, manie misruled person tooke occasion thereof to trouble the peace and quiet state of the common-wealth, by seditious commotions which first had their beginnings in this wise” (Holinshed’s Chronicles, vol. v, p.265).
Would thou hadst less deserved, / That the proportion both of thanks and payment
(1.4.18-19). Duncan is portrayed as a leader who was like a father figure for his
followers. He takes care of his subjects, nurtures them and takes responsibility of their
growth and progress. He is just and praises Banquo equally for his bravery at the
battlefield:

I have begun to plant thee, and will labour
To make thee full of growing. Noble Banquo
That hast no less deserved, nor must be known
No less to have done so, let me enfold thee
And hold thee to my heart. (1.4.28-32)

King Duncan serves to be opposite of Macbeth in context of leadership and
leading. When Duncan announces Malcolm, his eldest son to be the successor to the
throne, he makes very clear that his subjects are equally dear to him and will receive
favours and benefits according to their abilities:

Our eldest, Malcolm, whom we name hereafter
The Prince of Cumberland; which honour must
Not unaccompanied invest him only,
But signs of nobleness, like stars, shall shine
On all deservers. (1.4.38-42)

Malcolm also exhibits qualities of a wise leader. Instead of grieving over the
loss of his father and his inherited throne, Malcolm acts intelligently and decides to
leave for his safety and takes the right decision in taking refuge in England, where he
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11 Holinshed’s Chronicle reports Macbeth to be a just ruler: “Mackbeth shewing himself thus a most
diligent punisher of all injures and wrongs attempted by anie disordered persons within his realme,
was accounted the sure defense and bucler of innocent people; and hereto he also applied his whole
indevor, to cause young men to exercise themselues in virtuous maners, and men of church to attend
their diuine seruice according to their vocations” (Holinshed, 1808, vol. v, 270). He rules for about ten
years after the murder of Duncan but Lady Macbeth does not produce an heir to the throne which
makes him insecure and tyrannical. He is tormented by the thought as the prophecy of his kingship
has come out to be true, so would be of Banquo’s lineage taking up the crown. This motivates him to
order the assassination of Banquo and his son Fleance. This marks the beginning of his tyrannical rule
and many noble men are put to death on slight doubt and suspicion. Holinshed reports this in the
Chronicles as: “After the contriued slaughter of Banquo, nothing prospered with the foresaid
Makbeth: for in maner euerie man began to doubt his owne life, durst vnneth appeare in the kings
presence...there were manie that stood in feare of him, so likewise stood he in feare of manie”
(p.273). Shakespeare exploits some details while representing the story of Macbeth but some parts
are directly picked from the Chronicles. For example, in Act IV scene iii, when Macduff pleads Malcolm
to return and free Scotland from the tyrannical rule of Macbeth, Malcolm pretends to be a bad choice
and will prove worse than Macbeth in order to check his loyalty and to make sure that he is not an
agent of Macbeth.
is not only treated according to his dignity but also is extended help. Heeding his brother Donalbain’s advice—“there’s daggers in men’s smiles” (1.4.136)—he wisely tests the loyalty of all those in his confidence. For example, he tests Macduff’s loyalty in Act IV, scene iii, by pretending to be devoid of all the virtues that a good leader should possess. When Macduff expresses his grief over the pitiable state of Scotland, Malcolm swears to his own virtues and loyalty. By this time he is convinced that Macduff can be trusted as he has passed the loyalty test.

Malcolm also proves to be a good strategist as he commands the soldiers to use natural surroundings of Birnam Wood to disguise the attack on Macbeth at Dunsinane. Prior to the attack, Malcolm comments on Macbeth’s lack of loyal followers, except for those “whose hearts are absent too” (5.4.14). Macbeth is hasty in taking decisions. Whenever he doubted someone, he would have him murdered. Contrarily, Malcolm remained patient in testing his foes and then concluded about his trust. Malcolm also exhibits the virtues of his father and takes over the crown of Scotland after Macbeth is killed. His speech upon his victory reflects that now Scotland will be a safe place: “As calling home our exiled friends abroad / That fled the snares of watchful tyranny” (5.9.33-34). Further, he announces rewards for his subjects who were loyal to him, “My thanes and kinsmen, / Henceforth be earls, the first that ever Scotland / In such an honour named” (5.9.29-31). This marks the end of the evil and tyranny that the rule of Macbeth had unleashed. In the same way Prince Hamlet becomes instrumental in ending the tyrannical rule of Claudius. The play ends with catastrophic death of all major characters and young Fortinbras is announced as the new King of Denmark.

Both the plays, Hamlet and Macbeth portray the age-old conflict of good and evil, between conscience or ambition and ethics. Hamlet and Macbeth thus dwell upon the age-old philosophical question: can morals be sacrificed for ambition? And what happens when ambition becomes personal. Being ambitious is important for leaders for the organisational growth and development. But when this ambition becomes personal as in the case of Macbeth, it leads to serious consequences. An ideal leader shares his vision with his followers and does not keep it as a secret. In the present situation we do not have usurpers in the strictest sense of the term, but we have ample of instances when leaders have used power for fulfilling personal ambition, for self promotion and the result has been dangerous and sometimes
catastrophic. One of the recent cases that has emphatic catastrophic consequences is B. Ramlinga Raju’s unethical leading of Satyam Computers.

***

Satyam Computers (estd.1987), once India’s fourth largest software service company, plunged into a turmoil after Ramlinga Raju—the founder and Chairman until January 2009—stunned the world with his confession of cheating more than six million shareholders. A man who started from an ordinary position and rose to create Satyam Computers, known to the world for his entrepreneurial skills, is now known as the perpetrator of the country’s biggest corporate fraud named “India’s Enron” (Caliyurt and Idowu, 2012). After being arrested and sent in Hyderabad’s Chanchalguda jail on a number of charges including cheating, embezzlement and insider trading, Raju was granted bail on 18 August 2010. A botched acquisition attempt involving Maytas in December 2008, led to a plunge in share price of Satyam. In January 2009, Raju indicated that Satyam’s accounts had been falsified over a number of years. He admitted to an accounting dupery to the tune of 7000 crore rupees and resigned from the Satyam board on 07 January 2009 (Wheelen and Hunger, 2009). In a stunning 5-page letter detailing years of financial deception at the firm he founded, Satyam Computers Services Chairman Ramalinga Raju brought an illustrious corporate career to an undignified end.

The case of Ramlinga Raju appears to be that of a tragic hero whose fall from grace arouses sympathy and leaves us in disbelief. A leader of par excellence who is given the credit of developing Hyderabad into an IT hub that brought thousands of jobs in the region, working for Satyam was once considered special in Hyderabad. Bill Gates and other corporate dignitaries often visited the region and marveled at the work being accomplished by the company. Different heads of states including former President Bill Clinton visited the campus. Parents would forbid their children to work elsewhere because they felt it was their duty to pay tribute to Raju for what he had

---

done for the people of Hyderabad (Cohen, 2007). He was an icon for the community, and numerous books on Satyam style of leadership have been documented (Fernando, 2009).

As per close associates of the company Ramlinga Raju was humble, soft spoken and a man of highest integrity (Cohen, 2010). What went so wrong that he had to put on stake everything he had painfully earned? Earlier to the scandal, Ramlinga Raju was termed by media and various eminent people as a visionary, global business leader and a thinker (Cohen, 2007). He is a management graduate from Ohio State University and also an alumnus from Harvard Business School. He served as contributor to policy formulation, Chairman of NASSCOM (2007), member of National Executive Councils of Confederation of Indian Industry and the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry. He also served on the boards of several educational, research and non-profit institutes including Harvard Business School (Regional Advisory Board), Indian School of Business, and the Administrative Staff College of India. He was also instrumental in programmes dealing with development of society and providing opportunities to the underprivileged by setting up institutions such as the Satyam Foundation that dealt with urban transformation, Byrraju Foundation that dealt with rural transformation, and Emergency and Management Research Institute (EMRI) that provided emergency response services across India. For his positive contribution towards societal development and economic growth, he was bestowed with many awards and honours. For example, in 2002 he was awarded “Corporate Citizen of the Year” during Asian Business Leadership Summit held in Hong Kong. He was also named as the ‘IT Man of the Year’ by Dataquest in 2001 and conferred the “Entrepreneur of the Year Award” by Ernst and Young, India in 2007. With such an outstanding career and impeccable reputation, Ramlinga Raju shocked the world with his confession of forgery in the accounts of Satyam Computers. He had been manipulating the company’s accounts for seven years. His letter written to the board of directors certainly was more of a confession of crimes which in fact started as marginal manipulation but turned out to be devastating. He justifies the action to save the company from take-over:

The gap in the Balance Sheet has arisen purely on account of inflated profits over a period of last seven years (limited only to Satyam standalone, books of subsidiaries reflecting true performance). What started as marginal gap between actual operating profit and the one reflected in the books of accounts
continued to grow over the years. It has attained unmanageable proportions as the size of the company operations grew significantly…every attempt made to eliminate the gap failed. As the promoters held small percentage of equity, the concern was that poor performance would result in a take-over, thereby exposing the gap.\textsuperscript{13}

Who can believe that this was the same man Ramlinga Raju, the founder of Satyam School of Leadership in 2005 with the vision of expanding the entrepreneurial energy at Satyam to help keep pace with the ever changing global business context who could fall into such a catastrophic end? Ed Cohen had been recruited to build the leadership centre. The strategic intent behind this project was to nurture and grow leaders who could respond to real-time situations, be consistent in decision making and thus delight stakeholders, and be able to work collaboratively in a globally-networked environment (Cohen, 2010).

The act of fraud by Ramlinga Raju was equally disturbing for the employees working in the company and their families. The mental trauma faced by them is beyond expression. The uncertainties and doubts regarding the future of the company and their position in it were of serious concern. But it is not only Ramlinga Raju who should be blamed for unethical practice, the governance of the board of members is also questionable (Wheelen and Hunger, 2009). We cannot overlook the fact that Ramlinga Raju not only accepted his mistakes in the whole scandal but also suggested measures that should be taken immediately at this critical hour. His appeal to the Satyamites to stand united shows his concern for his followers:

I have promoted and have been associated with Satyam for well over twenty years now. I have seen it grow from few people to 53,000… I sincerely apologize to all Satyamites and stakeholders, who have made Satyam a special organization, for the current situation. I am confident they will stand by the company in this hour of crisis… I fervently appeal to the board to hold together to take some important steps… Merrill Lynch (now Bank of America) will stand by the company at this crucial hour… I am now prepared to subject myself to the laws of the land and face consequences thereof.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
He does echo Macbeth here, who hates killing Duncan on moral grounds yet it was the ‘vaulting ambition’ that forced him to regicide. Raju’s fear of the company’s take-over forced him to fraud the company’s accounts. The scandal has many versions; for example Kinshuk Nag in *The Double Life of Ramlinga Raju: The Story of India’s Biggest Corporate Fraud* (2009) says that at the heart of the scandal lay IT baron’s craving for land (his family’s traditional business). To satisfy it, Raju pawned his shareholding in Satyam as well as in his real estate company, Maytas Infra Limited. He allegedly siphoned off funds from both the companies. In an elaborate cover up, Raju also duped Satyam’s account books to inflate its revenue and profits, to increase the value of its shares. Raju was able to do this for eight years until the recession hit in 2008 and the bubble blew in his face. Bhupesh Bhandari’s *The Satyam Saga* (2009) highlights Ramlinga Raju’s political links with the then chief minister of Andhra Pradesh N. Chandrababu Naidu and traces the origin of the scam. The book raises issues such as corporate governance, regulatory loopholes and remedies which could serve as a guide to the corporate world.

Another scandal which may be cited here as an apt example is the Watergate scandal. It resulted in constitutional crisis in America. President Richard M. Nixon was charged of being involved in covering up facts of the famous burglary that took place in the Watergate Hotel on 17 June 1972. On 9 August 1974, facing impeachment for his role in covering up scandal, Nixon has become the only US president to resign. The scandal also resulted in the indictment, trial, conviction and incarceration of forty-three people including dozens of Nixon’s top administrative officials.15

This is not to delimit the nature of our inquiry however. Both the examples indicate the numerous scams and frauds of the contemporary world. The issue raises many questions pertaining to ethics, morality and our moral responsibility to others. Is Satyam or Watergate scandal an atypical situation, or does it represent a disturbing trend? This case also raises important questions in relation to the general notion of morality and ethics in leadership: What is the nature of morality and why do leaders need to be ethically and morally correct? Can ethical leadership be effective? Can

---

ethical or moral leadership be called good leadership? These are some questions which need to be debated in the present century when the world is driven by selfish motives and power for self occupies priority.

In the contemporary Indian leadership scenario, people such as Azim Premji (Chairman of Wipro Corporation), Narayan Murthy (Chief Mentor and founder of Infosys), Ratan Tata (Chairman, Tata Sons), Dr. Abdul Kalam (Former President of India) and late Dr. G. Venkatswamy (Chairman, Arvind Eye Care in Madurai), who have set a trend in ethical leading, have been much popular. They are hailed as emphatic leaders displaying certain values and beliefs and in taking part in community welfare (Robbins, 2011). For example, Wipro is perhaps the first Indian company to articulate a set of ‘beliefs’ to guide business conduct as early as 1970s. The company has compiled an integrity manual which is derived from the ‘Wipro values’ and defines the way Wiproites should conduct business with their customers (Fernando, 2009). So is the case at Infosys; a Code of Ethics is especially formulated for the finance professionals and whistleblower’s policy to encourage and protect employees willing to share information on fraud and who want to remain anonymous. Narayan Murthy has been a role model to foster an environment in ethical leading in his company. He takes care that the ideals of the company which include making the decision to commit to ethics, encouraging open communication, and being consistent in their approach. These are articulated at every available opportunity among the Infoscions. Infosys has set new records as far as communicating with the shareholders, stock exchanges, and the general public. Its annual report is believed to be trendsetter with respect to the disclosure norms. Its annual report is commended to be an ideal report by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States of America to be emulated by American companies (Fernando, 2010). He articulates his vision of a progressive society in his book *A Better India, a Better World* (2009), laying emphasis on good leadership and values. Dr. Abdul Kalam’s ethical leading is inspired by Dr. Homi Bhabha and Vikram Sarabhai (Gandhi, 2006). As a humanist, he has always been concerned with the equitable progress in society; the vision of a developed India by 2020 has actually set a goal in all aspects of the nation and thus we have people whose vision and decision in maintaining the personal and professional fronts have shaped the fate of the nation.

Discourses concerning good and evil in the contemporary world chiefly remain relative. A few years ago, Ramalinga Raju was considered to be an ethical
leader who had set standards for personal and professional ethics in decision making for his company. Today due to one significant yet inane error, his case is portrayed as one of the most villainous corporate frauds. In the case of Macbeth, he remains as a chief confidant of King Duncan till he plots the act of murder. Ambition in the process of the development of a character remains central in the way a character behaves or acts. Whether literary, metaphorical or real, our hopes and aspirations remain central in how we decide our personal and professional decisions taking good and evil into account to our judgment and action. Moreover, as has been the case both good and evil run parallel and our choice of action decides, at a later stage, the way we act upon the concept of good and evil. Literary characters such as Macbeth and Claudius, and contemporary leaders such as Ramlinga Raju remain prototypes of how a single-step towards achieving unconditional power decides the fate of many, and this indicates, in principle, such characters—literary, historical or otherwise—have much to offer for a proper understanding in ethical leading.
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Chapter 5
Emotions and Passions in Leading:
A Study of *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Othello*

The chapter examines the importance of emotions in managing and balancing personal and social fronts and argues that leaders or rulers require to handle their emotions and passions in an efficient manner for effective leading. We take Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606) and *Othello* (1603-04) as prototypes to understand the role of emotions and passions in social representation of life. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the role of emotions and passions in Leadership Studies. Central to the discussion of emotion and passion remain issues such as conflict of reason in personal and professional endeavor. The second section is an analysis of the characters of Antony, Cleopatra and Othello. This section argues that the fall of these leaders was inspired by their inability to control and manage passions and emotions. The third section traces parallels in real life and takes into account women characters and managers who have proved to be effective leaders by handling their emotions effectively.

I

Let’s not forget that the little emotions are the great captains of our lives and we obey them without realizing it.

Vincent Van Gogh, 1889

In modern times, emotions and passions are believed to be subjects that broadly come under the discipline of Psychology, and it is believed to have technically appeared—in the strictest sense—in the works of Charles Darwin (*The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals*, 1872) Sigmund Freud (*Totem and Taboo*, 1913) and William James (“What is an Emotion?”, 1872). The discourse of the subject, moreover, extends beyond these normalized boundaries. Its literature may be divided into two broad categories: those theoretical discussions that include scientific, philosophical, theological work and those that concretely describe the passions of particular men and women and exhibit their vigour and induce in us a vicarious experience as in epics, poems, novels, dramas and literature of biography and history.

Early references to the concepts of passion and emotion occur in several treatises of philosophical and historical importance. For instance, Plato in certain

---

dialogues (Phaedrus, 370 BC)² and Aristotle in his Rhetoric allude to the concepts in relation to subjects such as virtue and vice. Allusions to the concepts are also found in the moral theology of Aquinas and in Spinoza’s Ethics (1677), in books of political theory such as Machiavelli’s The Prince (1532) and Hobbes’ Leviathan (1651). Descartes’ treatise The Passions of the Soul (1649) is probably one of the first discourses on the subject to be separated from the practical considerations of oratory, morals and politics. Only subsequently in the twentieth century have the concepts become objects of purely theoretical interest in Psychology.

Emotions and passions are relative terms which suggest feelings or impulses. The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology (1966) defines the term ‘emotions’ as “agitation, tumult; physical disturbance; disturbance of mind or feeling; affection of the mind, feeling” (310).³ The American Heritage Dictionary defines emotions as an intense mental state that arises subjectively rather than through conscious effort and is often accompanied by physiological changes. It may be defined as a strong feeling as in the case of “the emotions of joy, sorrow, reverence, hate, and love”. Numerous such definitions for emotions exist in literature but none remains concrete. James Hillman declares that there is “a curious and overwhelming confusion” in the theory of emotion.⁴ It is an umbrella term that includes dozens of related terms. The very root of the word ‘emotion’ is motere, the Latin verb “to move” plus the prefix “e” connotes “move away”; it suggests that a tendency to act is implicit in every emotion. Therefore, we take emotions as those intense feelings which a person experiences at a point of time as a reaction to some stimulus. All emotions are, in essence, impulses to act and are instant plans for handling life. An emotion in simple terms is believed to be associated with feelings. Thomas Aquinas in Summa Theologica (1265-74), for example, identifies emotion with the impulse by which “the soul is drawn to a thing” (Sullivan, 2007; 692). He defines passions as specifically different acts of appetite or desire-specific tendencies to action. Regarding passion the earliest reference comes from the sufferings of Jesus Christ. The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology

² In the Phaedrus, Plato illustrates the emotions and reason with the metaphor of horse and charioteer. He has portrayed emotions such as anger or curiosity as irrational urges (horses) that must be controlled by reason (charioteer). For further reading see page 160 of Plato’s Phaedrus. Ed. Harvey Yunis. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2011.


(1966) defines passion as “powerful affection of the mind; outburst of anger; amorous feeling; sexual impulse; strong predilection” (656). Actually four words namely passion, affection, affect, and emotion have been traditionally used to designate similar psychological conditions. Of these, affection and affect have ceased to connote emotions although we do find them in the work of Freud; and ‘passion’ is usually restricted to mean one of the emotions, or the more violent aspect of any emotional experience. But on the whole, these words are used interchangeably. All of them, in the current use, refer to a psychological condition which every human being has experienced in moments of great excitement, especially during intense seizure by rage or fear. Further, both emotions and passions are terms which are used synonymously to connote similar psychological conditions.

The role of emotions and passions in human life plays a crucial role in human behaviour and the mode of its discussion has been two-fold: on the one hand, it questions the conflict in diverse modes of emotions that remain central to our behaviour in different circumstances and on the other hand, the conflict between passion and reason/will remain crucial in the way a character or person responds in a special circumstance. Aristotle in *Nichomachen Ethics*, owing to the conflicting nature of emotion and passion that changes our behaviour, discusses the problem and advocates policy of moderation. He claims that passions have a natural place in moral life and our aim should not be to dispossess them entirely but to keep them in their place (Ross and Brown, 2009; 165). Passions can serve reason’s purposes by restraining them from excesses and by directing their energies to ends which reason approves. The philosophical discussions acquaint us with the violence of emotional

---

5 William Harvey in his treatise *On the Circulation of the Blood* (1628) draws attention to the bodily changes accompanied with emotional experience. He writes: “The fact that in almost every affection, appetite, hopes, or fear, our body suffers, the countenance changes and the blood appears to course hither and thither. In anger the eyes are fiery and the pupil contracted; in modesty the cheeks are suffused with blushes; in fear, and under a sense of infamy and of shame, the face is pale” (Willis, 1847; 129). Thus, every emotional experience involves a bodily change which varies in degree. For example, some emotions are violent which William James calls “coarser emotions...in reverberation” and “subtler emotions” in which organic reverberation is less obvious and strong” (Lange and James, 1922; 100). Modern theories on emotions highlight organic changes in the bodily functions to be an adaptive strategy in the struggle for existence. Darwin in *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (1872) gives the same explanation and it is adopted by other evolutionists. William James writes: “The snarl or sneer, the one sided uncovering of the upper teeth is accounted for by Darwin as a survival from the time when our ancestors had large canines, and unfleshed them (as dogs now do) for attack...” (Lange and James, 1922; 105).

6 Aristotle conceives moral virtues require more than momentary control or moderation of passions; they require a discipline of them which has become habitual.
excesses which we term ‘madness’ or ‘frenzy’. Theologians of the Middle Ages such as Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109), Peter Abelard (1079-1142) and Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274), and modern philosophers such as Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) and Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) ascribe this whereas Freud and William James discuss in detail the pathology of passions, the origin of emotional disorders and the general theory of neurosis and neurotic characters as a consequence of emotional repression in them. Thus, the importance of emotions and passions in life cannot be ignored and in modern times psychologists and psychiatrists have proved that emotions are important because they are responsible for our behaviour and actions.

Leading and emotions are inextricably intertwined. Hence, the importance of emotions in leading has been a matter of much discussion in the academia (Bass and Stogdill, 1990; 136). Leading is an art of persuasion, motivation, and igniting passion to inspire followers for the attainment of a vision. Successful leading involves a leader’s ability to understand the emotions of his/her followers. There is a general agreement that a ruler whether he/she is despotic or constitutional office holder succeeds only when he/she is able to move his/her followers through their emotions as well as by appealing to reason. The theories of leadership also focus on balancing emotions on all fronts. For example, charismatic style of leading heavily depends upon a leader’s ability to tackle emotions of his/her followers. In the same manner, theorists of transformational leadership have always focussed the importance of leaders’ influence on followers’ emotional states (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Tichy and Devanna, 1986; Yammarino, Spangler and Bass, 1993).

---

7 For Freud the conflict between reason and emotion or between ego and id is not the origin of disorders rather it is the repression which results from this conflict. On one side is the ego, which “stands for reason and circumspection” and has “the task of representing the external world” or expressing what Freud calls “the reality-principle” (Strachey, 1959; 557).


9 Charisma is the special quality some people possess that allows them to relate to and inspire others at a deep emotional level. Persons possessing charisma tend to be attractive to others, to be influential and inspirational, and to be characterized as brilliant and effective communicators. Although charisma has been widely discussed in sociology, psychology, political science, communication, and other disciplines, it is a very elusive construct and has been defined in a number of ways. Currently, there is no generally agreed-on definition of charisma. Max Weber (1864-1920) discusses those leaders charismatic who by virtue of their personality or charm arouse powerful emotions in the surrounding population and inspire him or her to follow. For further reading see J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo’s Charismatic Leadership in Organisations. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 1998.
It is widely seen that, like other people, leaders derive emotional balance and human sustenance from their private lives (March and Weil, 2005). Though organizational duties are of prime importance, a leader’s personal life does consequential impact on the professional front. It is also argued and seen that the position of leadership and the demands of professional life can destroy a leader’s privacy and quality of personal life. Self becomes inseparable and there remains no private life. This is because the private life of leaders is always under scrutiny. The personal for a leader is professional as well. Followers claim a right to know the leader’s private life on the grounds of its relevance to assessing character and establishing rapport (March and Weil, 2005). Finally, the private life, if not harmonious, complicates the responsibilities of leadership. Personal motives and relations affect the actions of leaders and their judgment. Thus, a balance between the personal life and demands of professional life is important for the growth and development of an organization.

The problem of the conflict between passion and reason has been age-old. In what follows we discuss the characters of Antony and Othello who dismantle much on professional fronts due to the conflict between passion and reason. Both the plays—Antony and Cleopatra and Othello—dramatise the fall of their principal characters because of their inability to manage emotions and passions to balance their personal and professional life. We explore how Antony has proved his worth as a brave general in Julius Caesar at the battle of Phillipi, and in Antony and Cleopatra, he is portrayed as an experienced general yet incapable of controlling his passion for Cleopatra. Othello has also been a successful military leader but faces problems in his personal life due to his inability to control his overpowering jealousy. Both the plays dramatically represent the desire and fear of experienced leaders which lead to emotional confusion and inflexibility. In analyzing the characters of Antony, Cleopatra and Othello, we argue that rulers or leaders require to ascertain emotional intelligence in their personal and social career for efficient leading. Further, the fall of these great leaders was inspired by their inability to control and manage passions and emotions effectively. Further, we argue that Shakespeare’s plays Antony and Cleopatra (1608) and Othello (1603) can be used as representative texts to study the role emotions and passions in effective leading. Both literary and historical characters of Antony and Cleopatra are taken up to study the trend of emotions and passions, and the conflict between passion and reason in leadership. Othello’s overpowering
jealousy and ‘simple nature’ offer critical lessons in understanding the impact of inability to balance emotions in personal and professional fronts.

II

… bless’d are those
Whose blood and judgment are so well commingled
That they are not a pipe for Fortune’s finger
To sound what stop she please. Give me that man
That is not passion’s slave, and I will wear him
In my heart’s core…

(Hamlet, 3.2.33-37)

The question of conflict between reason and passion over decision making is age-old. Plato in Protagoras (490 BC) was concerned with the overwhelming conflict when he asked whether pleasure and fear are ultimate motives of human action (Taylor, 1976; 58). He deliberates upon the role which men’s ideals and their conceptions of the worth of things play in their lives (60). He argues that when considerations for pleasure usurp the position of reason in a man’s life, he becomes destructive of the possibility of a man thinking for himself and acting on his own behalf (65). In the same way Spinoza, in Ethics, becomes critical of Descrates’ ‘voluntarism’—the view that self-control can be achieved by determining one’s objectives through reason and pursuing them with determination. He believes that such a view ignores the impact of emotions in human life. David Hume in A Treatise of Human Nature, Book I (1739-40) denies the possibility of the conflict of reason and passion (Green and Grose, 1909; 78). He represents will as inevitably determined by passions, with reason as their slave and thereby he gives place to emotions as supreme in the act of will. Kant in The Critique of Judgment (1790), Doctrine of Virtue (1797) and Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View (1772) allows this as a possibility, but claims that will can and ought to be determined by reason, with passions subordinated to its sovereign demand. Is will, thus, inevitably determined by passions? Is it possible for reason to overcome passions? How are reasons controlled and subdued by passions and thereby act as strict internal agents of will? How do they, in combination, affect our choices, decisions and behaviour?

In The Tragedy of Mustapha (1609), Fulke Greville suggests that will, here taken as action, is inevitably divided between reason and passion. Shakespeare takes
such a division seriously and through *Hamlet* he recognizes the possibility of reason and passion being united in people’s will and purpose. Hamlet is extremely passionate about seeking revenge against his father’s murderer, but each time he is controlled by reason to look for the best possible opportunity. *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Othello* dramatically present the conflict of passion and reason. Sometimes reason takes the lead and sometimes passion overpowers reason clouding the decision-making sensibility. In the context of leading, it is seen that leaders have to play multiple roles which remain complex and composite at professional and personal fronts. Peace and harmony of personal life offer motivation and energy to the leader to do well in professional fronts. Both the plays project that the problem of personal life should not cloud a leader’s judgments and organizational decisions.

*Antony and Cleopatra* is a harmonious blend of history and tragedy, dealing with two colossal figures, one being the queen of Egypt, Cleopatra, and the other a Roman General, Antony. Derived from Thomas North’s translation of Plutarch’s *Lives*, Shakespeare presents the historical episode of Antony and Cleopatra highlighting weaknesses and sufferings of both the successful leaders. The alliance of Cleopatra and Antony initially exists for political reasons. After the assassination of Julius Caesar, moreover, Antony acts as one of the three major forces besides Octavius and Lepidus who take over Rome. His visit to Alexandria for maintaining law and order in the newly conquered territory acquaints him with the beauty and charm of Cleopatra, the queen of Egypt.

Though both the plays—*Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*—present the same character Antony centralizing his acts of leading and conquering common folks, we approach a different Antony in the play *Antony and Cleopatra*. Antony appears in *Julius Caesar* as a young and energetic general who loves sports and revelry. Brutus presents him as: “I am not gamesome. I do lack some part’ / Of that quick spirit that is in Antony” (1.2.28-29), and shows him as inexperienced: “Antony is but a limb of Caesar” (2.1.165)—who in fact forges “sports, to wildness, and much company” (2.1.188-89). By the closure, he is portrayed to be a politician whose inflammatory speech at Caesar’s funeral turns the public opinion in opposition to that of the conspirators. Finally, Antony shows his act of maturity by taking revenge of Caesar’s death by destroying all the conspirators at the Battle of Phillipi.

Antony as represented in *Antony and Cleopatra* is rather mellowed and experienced. He has the same spirit of enjoying games and drinking. When Antony
was away, Cleopatra fondly recollects the times when they were together enjoying, “Ere the ninth hour, I drank him to his bed; / Then put my tires and mantle on him, whilst / I wore his sword Philippan” (2.5.21-23). His close association with the Egyptian Queen, Cleopatra, raises questions related to his integrity and honour. He is blamed for losing his martial spirit. In fact Octavius Caesar expresses his extreme disapproval over Antony’s stay in Egypt:

Our great competitor. From Alexandria
This is the news: he fishes, drinks and wastes
The lamps of night in revel is not more manlike
Than Cleopatra, nor the queen of Ptolemy
More womanly than he…
A man who is the abstract of all faults (1.4.3-10)

Octavius Caesar finds Antony’s behaviour rather irresponsible and immature: “As we rate boys who, being mature in knowledge, / Pawn their experience to their present pleasure, / And so rebel to judgment” (1.4.31-33). Antony is presented as immature and lascivious and Caesar complains to Lepidus about Antony’s neglecting his duties: “Amiss to tumble on the bed of Ptolemy, / To give a kingdom for mirth, to sit / And keep the turn of tippling with a slave” (1.4.17-19). This is the image of Antony in Rome. He stays with Cleopatra and embraces sensual pleasures neglecting his professional duties. Antony’s behaviour is questioned among his own followers as well. Philo, a close associate of Antony, presents before us two contrasting images of Antony in the opening scene of the play. First, Antony who proves himself as a promising soldier is compared with Mars, the God of War:

Nay, but this dotage of our General’s
O’erflows the measure. Those his goodly eyes,
That o’er files and musters of the war
Have glowed like plated Mars… (1.1.1-4)

Philo fondly recollects the memory of this time with awe. However, with his association with Cleopatra, Antony allows himself to be a ‘strumpet’s fool’, the one who has submitted himself to pleasures of the body. Antony is introduced to us through his comrades. Though they love and admire him, for his close association with Cleopatra and for neglecting the imperial responsibilities he is heavily criticized. His case is taken as that of a great warrior who has lost his martial spirit owing to the nature of his bodily lust:
And is become the bellows and the fan
To cool a gipsy’s lust
… The triple pillar of the world transformed
Into a strumpet’s fool… (1.1.7-10)

Leaders have to maintain an image, because that gives followers grounds to trust them. It makes leadership authentic and lasting. With the portrayal of the public image thus they set examples for followers and any deviation from the set standard or character leads to chaos and anarchy. Hence, good character is one of the important desirable traits of leaders (Bass and Stogdill, 1990). People look up to them for inspiration and guidance. Antony’s image sets to decline among his own people because his passion for Cleopatra keeps him away from his responsibilities of a leader. For example in Act II, scene ii, Caesar charges Antony of breaching the contract of the triple alliance by not supplying aid when Fulvia along with Antony’s brother had waged a war against Caesar: “To lend me arms and aid when I required them, / The which you both denied (2.2.93-94). This sense of evasion of responsibility makes him weak in the face of Octavius. He freely admits his guilt of neglecting his duties and indulging in an affair with the Egyptian Queen, leaving away his wife Fulvia. He is apologetic and a sense of duty is evoked in the play.

Though the modern portrayal of Othello is on race, Othello is portrayed as a military general and hence a leader who is very conscious of his reputation and honour. He seems to believe in maintaining an irreproachable personal image. Though he engages himself in an action that could tarnish his image as a leader—i.e., marrying the daughter of a reputed senator, Brabantio, without his consent—he acts carefully in keeping his side clear: “I shall provulgate–I fetch my life and being / From men of royal siege (1.2.21-22). He openly admits that if he is guilty of having seduced Desdemona wrongfully, then he has no right to hold his position as a general or occupy any position in the affairs of the state. In actuality, he had not seduced Desdemona with magic power or charms, as claimed by Brabantio, rather he had won her with his merits.

The Senate turns to hear Othello and Desdemona. His account of their courtship and her statement of obedience to Othello as her freely chosen husband are testimony that love, not witchcraft, is responsible for their marriage. It cuts across age, culture and race. The Senate judges in their favour. As an authorized representative of the Senate, Othello carries royal norm to Cyprus. He takes up the
liberty of marrying Desdemona in spite of racial and cultural differences because he finds himself a worthy suitor for her on account of his excellence in his professional life and claims to have been of royal lineage: “Let him do his spite; / My services which I have done the signory / Shall-out-tongue his complaints… (1.2.17-19). Besides, it is by virtue of his character and military exploits that Desdemona started loving him: “She loved me for the dangers I had passed, / And I loved her that she did pity them” (1.3.166-67).

Moreover, Othello’s tragedy was that he gave way to passions and allowed himself to be exploited by Iago. He falls prey to his passion and ignores reason. Initially, he is represented as a commanding personage, grand, self-contained and dignified: “The noble Moor whom our full senate / Call in-all-sufficient…the nature / Whom passion could not shake” (4.1.275-77). This is what his character or personality has been before being corrupted by Iago. Iago’s outrage against Othello is less visible till the plot is completely revealed and the revenge taken.

The act by which Iago moves Othello to murder Desdemona and thus destroy him is essential for the understanding of Othello’s passion. Iago uses intelligence and wit as a weapon to destroy Othello: “…we work by wit, and not by witchcraft” (2.3.362) and his strategy is to provoke Othello to false judgments and deplorable acts by inflaming his passions and confusing his perceptions. Throughout Othello, Iago uses language to distort rather than to clarify. Working with language, he manipulates people and circumstances in order to impose false meaning and coherence on what happens. For example, Iago’s duplicity in reporting what he knows to Brabantio and Othello is the first way by which he arouses conflict between Brabantio and Othello. What he reports to Brabantio and Othello is factually true: Desdemona has eloped and Brabantio is hunting Othello. But those reports, though factual in substance, are so embroidered that they distort the reality they purport to describe. Iago infuses a description of his own response to Brabantio’s abuse of Othello:

Nine or ten times
I had thought to have yerk’d him here, under his ribs.
Nay, but he prated
And spoke such scurvy provoking terms
Against your honour, that with the little godliness I have,
I did full hard forbear him… (1.2.4-10)
These details are pure fiction but slyly embedded in factual statement. Later, Iago plots Desdemona’s fictitious adultery and presents it to Othello. He schemes to put Othello into a “jealousy so strong / That judgement cannot cure” (2.1.296-97). The cumulative consequence of his maneuvering is the corruption of Othello’s mind and his reasoning capabilities leading to his downfall from a brave military general to that of a murderer. In both his greatness and weakness, Othello shows the possibilities of human nature. That a man of nobility can fall if consumed by passion to such an extent that reason is completely sidelined. The first act of the play brings out his natural leadership when he handles Brabantio tactfully in spite of being provoked by Iago: “Keep up your bright swords, for the dew will rust them. / Good signior, you shall more command with years / Than with your weapons” (1.2.59-61). It is a terrifying reminder that even the noblest of people are prone to emotional conflict and can be victims of passion. Othello, by Act IV is a transformed man. For example, when Lodovico witnesses Othello hit Desdemona, he says:

Is this the noble Moor whom our full Senate
Call in all sufficient? Is this the nature
Whom passion could not shake? Whose solid virtue
The shot of accident nor dart of chance
could neither graze nor pierce (4.1.264-8)

What comes first? Is it reason? Or is it passion that comes first and sidelines reason? Is it reason that motivates one to act or do we act with the impulse of passion? According to Hume, reason is a faculty that grasps connection between facts, in weighing evidence for and against propositions, and in assessing the validity of arguments (Green and Grose, 1909; 85). As such it is eminently suited to engage the understanding, which is our capacity to grasp facts and truths. Reason sees what is to be seen, assesses what there is to be assessed. As such it is passive or inert. In order to move a man to action what is needed is an active principle, something that evokes desire or aversion. This Hume finds in passion: “Reason alone can never be a motive to any action of the will” (Dilman, 1981; 71). Kant criticizes Hume’s view that reason cannot engage the will directly but can only guide it by serving passions.11

10 In A Treatise of Human Nature, Book I Hume argues that for any man to act he has to be affected by what he sees or understands. He has to have likes and dislikes, and desires and aversions. What he sees or grasps would give him no reason to act unless he were already favorably or averesely disposed towards the kind of thing he comes to see or grasp. So ultimately a man’s likes and dislikes, desires and aversions are determined by the constitution of his mind, the nature of his passions so that his
After weighing all the facts that prove Desdemona has been disloyal, Othello decides to render justice and this justice is to include clemency. Desdemona is to be given the opportunity to pray and ask for heaven’s forgiveness: “I would not kill thy un-prepared spirit; / No heaven forfend! I would not kill thy soul” (5.2.31-32). It is portrayed as a state of complete emotional confusion that Othello faces in last act of the play. Feelings of rage, hatred, mercy, pity, frustration, and sadness blur his reasoning and decisions.

When Desdemona denies being unfaithful to him, his rage is re-kindled: “O perjured woman! Thou dost stone my heart, / And makest me call what I intend to do / A murder, which I thought a sacrifice” (5.2.63-65). In his oscillation of feeling he is back to the vengeful spirit in which he tells Iago: “My heart is turned to stone; / I strike it, it hurts my hand” (4.1.193-194). No more does he speak of ‘justice’ but of his ‘revenge’. Desdemona is now no longer the “sweet soul” (5.2.51) whom he adores and worships but is termed “strumpet” (5.2.75). When she entreats “but while I say one prayer” (5.2.83), he refuses her. This is what he believes to be an opportunity for salvation which he had previously offered her. He stifles her saying “It is too late” (5.2.86). At this moment Emilia pounds on the locked door to tell Othello of the attempted assassination of Cassio, who, escaped from death, can help the truth be revealed, but it is indeed too late; Othello’s soul is lost. The noise only makes him hurry in killing Desdemona.

In the same manner Antony’s retreat from the battle of Actium highlights the dominance of passion over reason. Before the battle Antony remains confident of his victory at sea against Caesar, but in the next scene the situation turns entirely different. It is shocking for his comrades to believe that Antony leaves outrageously at the peak of the fight. He leaves only to follow Cleopatra when she flees suddenly ends are simply given in the end and as such unamenable to reason. Thus, reason can guide him towards action but not make him act alone. It is in association with passions and reason, man is motivated to action. Hume was wrong to divorce judgment from the emotions in his account of the passions and to represent emotions as inevitably blind. Some emotions blind their subject to reason and cloud his thinking. For further reading see Ilham Dilman’s “Hume II: Reason and Feeling in Moral decision.” Studies in Language and Reason. London: Macmillan, 1981. 60-79.

Kant suggests that ‘will’ can be determined by passion as Hume claims, but that this is only one possibility. When it is so determined the ‘will’ is subservient. But it can also be ‘self-ruled’ or autonomous, and it is so only when it is determined by reason. Like Hume, he also thinks passions are subservient to appetite or desire. The will is determined by something external to it. He notes morality and ‘practical reasons’ also have an impact on will. For further reading see Immanuel Kant’s Metaphysics of Ethics (Trans. T.K. Abbot. London: Longmans, 1959).
from the battle field scared “like a cow in June” (3.10.14). Antony follows Cleopatra impulsively without thinking, even once, of the implications of the act. Antony’s act can be explained in terms of his passionate love for Cleopatra. He could not control his impulse, motivated by his feeling of extreme love for Cleopatra, at that moment. Antony justifies his act as:

\[
\text{Egypt, thou knew'st too well}
\]

\[
\text{My heart was to thy rudder tied by th’ strings,}
\]

\[
\text{And thou shouldst tow me after. O’er my spirit}
\]

\[
\text{Thy full supremacy thou knew’st… (3.11.56-59)}
\]

After this coward act, Antony suffers and is filled with grief, remorse and regret. He is constantly aware of the fact that at this age such act of cowardice is highly undesirable: “My very hairs do mutiny, for the white, / Reprove the brown for rashness” (3.9.13-14). He thinks of his glorious past when he fought bravely at the battle of Phillipi. Octavius Caesar who was so inexperienced now stands as a tough rival:

\[
\text{He at Phillippi kept}
\]

\[
\text{His sword e’en like a dancer, while I struck}
\]

\[
\text{The lean and wrinkled Cassius; and ’twas I}
\]

\[
\text{That the mad Brutus ended. He alone}
\]

\[
\text{Dealt on lieutenantry, and no practice had (3.11.35-39)}
\]

This action of Antony offers an insight into understanding the role and impact of emotions in our lives. It poses questions related to duties and responsibilities of being a leader. In the contemporary scenario, leaders also face some of the most perplexing moments—chiefly the dilemma and the conflict between personal feelings and professional demands. It becomes necessary for leaders to be balanced as far as emotions are concerned. Antony’s declining political career reaches its climax with his defeat at the Battle of Actium.

This event marks the beginning of decay and dissipation of a noble soldier. Antony’s passion for Cleopatra is brought out in the strongest colour, when he decides to fight at sea in spite of all the advice from his trusted soldiers.\(^\text{12}\) He fails to

\(^{12}\) Shakespeare presents Antony to be adamant regarding the battle to be fought at sea, where as the historical texts (such as Plutarch’s \textit{Parallel Lives}) claim that Antony takes up the battle by sea, forced by a woman’s (Cleopatra) will and for her sake only: “subject to a woman’s will...for Cleopatra’s sake...would needs have this battle tried by sea” (Hudson, 1909;23).
accurately assess his strengths and weaknesses. He still lives in the illusion of his past glories and victories. In spite of the warnings and advice by the experts for not fighting by sea, he decides to fight Caesar at sea. Enobarbus tries to persuade him and acquaint him with the reality that the ships are old and they do not have expert sailors:

“Your ships are not well manned, / Your mariners are muleteers, reapers, people / Engrossed by swift impress. In Caesar’s fleet / Are those that often have’ gainst Pompey fought. / Their ships are yare, yours heavy. No disgrace / Shall fall you… (3.7.34-40). Antony refuses to accept any other view and strictly instructs that the battle will be fought ‘by sea, by sea’ (3.7.41). He is supported by Cleopatra who assures him of her sixty sails. The ground of his conduct is the control exercised over him by Cleopatra. After shameful defeat at sea he is left with a self-defeated spirit. His connection with Cleopatra proves to be utterly disastrous, ruining his Roman honour and courage. The internal struggle now starts; he feels deeply degraded by his behaviour at the battlefield. He suffers from low self esteem, and he is reminded of the past glorious days in Rome when he was honoured but when Cleopatra comes weeping for what has happened at the battlefield, Antony forgets everything and cries out stating: “Fall not a tear, I say, one of them rates / All that is won and lost: Give me a kiss, / Even this repays me… / Some wine within there, and our viands!” (3.11.69-73). Enobarbus, who had been his supporter and comrade throughout, finds Antony’s behaviour highly unethical and against his honour. He does not hesitate blaming him and only him for the shame and humiliation they are facing and finally deserts him:

Cleopatra: Is Antony or we in fault for this?

Enobarbus: Antony only, that would make his will

… the itch of his affection should not then

have nicked his captainship, at such a point… (3.13.3-9)

Enobarbus finds Antony at fault because he allows passions to rule over reason and that is not expected from a leader. A leader needs to be more reasonable and should not let emotions dominate reason. But how far is it possible? A sense of self mastery, being able to withstand emotional outbursts and not be passion’s slave, is regarded as quality a leader ought to possess. A balance is required, for passions are important. Carol Neely in her feminist re-evaluation contends that at the midpoint of the tragedy, the antitheses of love and honour merge: “Passion becomes for Antony a source of heroism, and heroism becomes for Cleopatra a source of passion” (1994, 146). Antony takes up arms against Caesar for the sake of Cleopatra. He was
passionate about her and to such an extent that he was ready to sacrifice everything, including his name, fame and title.

Shakespeare’s Antony is a person for whom we are filled with admiration, sympathy and nostalgia for he represents the purest form of a lover and a soldier, trying hard to be honest in both the roles. Antony is the only man in the play who loves, and Enobarbus is the only one who sympathises with him in his passion. Antony’s perception about love is best expressed in the following lines:

Let Rome in Tiber melt
Of the rang’d empire fall! Here is my space,
Kingdoms are clay: our dungy earth a like
Feeds beast as man; the nobleness of life
Is to do thus: when such a mutual pair,
And such a twain can do’t, in which I bind,
On pain of punishment, the world to weet
We stand up peerless. (1.1.33-40)

This is Antony’s perception of love; he finds love above everything else. This is not an idle statement. He has found love and his emotions for Cleopatra are that of a sincere lover. Rome could be his, and he, for a moment at least, believes that there is no contest that love is beyond comparison and choice worthy, for the nobleness of life lies in loving.

But Antony is clearly a divided man who is uncomfortable in his neglect of his imperial responsibilities. There is a constant conflict that goes in his mind. He is passionately in love with the Egyptian queen and at the same time he cannot forget his duties as a Roman General. But ironically the desire for the Egyptian Queen is so strong that he is not able to disentangle himself from her strong bindings and the pleasures she offers: “These strong Egyptian fetters I must break, / Or lose myself in dotage” (1.2.108-110). At times he regrets for having seen her because his passions cannot anymore be controlled and his duties remain undone. And to this Enobarbus replies, “O sir, you had then left unseen a wonderful piece of work, / which not to have been blest withal, / would have discredited your travel (1.2.151-153). Though aware, passions still remain important for Antony throughout the play.

The gravest mistake that Antony commits is by marrying Octavia for the sake of political gains. He marries her for cementing the bond with Octavius, the future Emperor of Rome, and for mending the broken relations. This alliance marks the
beginning of his declining political career. Antony was aware of the fact that he could never love Octavia though he tries his best to continue with the bond. His passion for the enchanting Egyptian queen remains strong and it lasts putting at stake his political gains. Ultimately he returns to Cleopatra who offers him in return the much seeking power of love. This marks the beginning of his ruin. “The ruin is magnificent and it becomes sublime more as he falls,” says Harold Bloom in *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (1998, 556) Antony seems to be aware throughout that his involvement with Cleopatra is fatal. He knows he has to make a choice between Rome and Cleopatra and he cannot have both of them:

Our separation so abides and flies,
That thou residing here, goes yet with me;
And I hence fleeting, here remain with thee. (1.3.102-104)

Throughout the play, Antony is compared with a Herculean hero whose past exploits are praiseworthy whereas he is presently in the waning stage. One of the greatest mistakes he commits moreover is to wage a war against Caesar when he is confident that he would lose. He had lost confidence of winning after the soothsayer’s prediction. Awareness of the fact that somewhere luck was not in his favour and Caesar was lucky made him uncertain of his victory:

He (soothsayer) hath spoken true. The very dice obey him,
And in our sports my better cunning faints
Under his chance. If we draw lots, he speeds. (2.3.31-33)

Antony is hopelessly outclassed by his imperial rivalry, who has inherited the canniness of his uncle and adoptive father Julius Caesar. It seems after the series of victories and glory, Antony is tired of it and in fact tired of everything labeled Roman. He wants to lose himself in the arms of Cleopatra where he finds heaven (Kirsch, 2000; 237).

Unlike Antony, Caesar and Octavia are young but cold towards passion. In fact Caesar is completely guided by reason. The impressions he produces on us are of coldness, nullity and death. He is not a villain and is not even aware of the evil he is does. In fact he takes delight in indulging in it, separating the two lovers. On the contrary he believes himself to be the noblest of Roman of them all (Goddard, 1960; 185). He is calculating and politically cunning. His enemy is surrounded by a network of espionage while his own movements are artfully concealed. He acts with a celerity and secrecy which remain incomprehensible to Antony. His insight into the real
situation is hardly ever clouded. He orders the battle to be fought at sea with every advantage in his favour. In spite of all this Shakespeare does not let Octavius Caesar degenerate into a mere personification of power. He keeps him human by introducing a number of emotional issues. By convincing us of the sincerity of his love for his sister he multiplies many times the ignominy of his sacrifice for her because he feels that Antony degenerated by giving up his power and prestige to a ‘whore’ (Cleopatra). On the contrary he unknowingly indulges himself in an equally humiliating act of getting his sister Octavia married to Antony for purely political reasons. Caesar uses his sister as an excuse to wage war against Antony. Shakespeare presents in his plays a range of power-seeking characters such as Richard III, Cardinal Pandulph and Henry IV who aspire to reach to the highest points but fail miserably. Caesar is one of such Shakespearean characters who seeks absolute power, manages to gain supreme power, yet in the process, he loses his soul. He stands victorious as the sole ruler of Rome but ultimately stands defeated with the death of the lover (Goddard, 1960; 186).

Of Shakespearean representation of women, Cleopatra is the most subtle and formidable by common consent among critics and readers. She is the most enigmatic character Shakespeare has ever created allowing us to judge and interpret her actions in multiple ways. In fact Antony too fails to understand her. He finds her mysterious offering infinite variety:

Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale
Her infinite variety. Other women cloy
The appetites they feed, but she makes hungry
Where she most satisfies. For vilest things
Becomes themselves in her. (2.2.241-245)

Before Antony, Cleopatra had already taken two major Roman leaders as her lovers, viz., Julius Caesar and Pompey. Antony is the third lover and is completely bewitched by her charms. He forsakes the traditional Roman marriage. Even after twelve years of cohabitation, they still remain passionate about each other: “On pain of punishment the world to weet / We stand up peerless (1.1.40-41). She is an astute leader who very intelligently rules over Egypt. The three powerful Roman leaders as her lovers stands testimony to her compelling personality, physical charms and authority. As a good actress she keeps Antony in doubt and confusion, manipulating him and constantly and guiltlessly exploiting his attachment with her. Her widely alternating moods have a genuineness that astounds him. It is these charms which
attract Antony towards her leaving behind his honour. In the very first meeting, as Enobarbus describes, Antony is completely bewitched by Cleopatra’s charm and personality in the famous barge scene:

The barge she sat in, like a burnish’d throne,  
Burn’d on water; the poop was beaten gold;  
Purple the sails, and so perfumed that  
The winds were love-sick with them… (2.2.190-93)

It is now a common consent that, like Helen of Troy, Cleopatra possessed an appeal which no man could resist. In fact it is only at one place she appears to have lost her charm and that is when she runs away from the battle of Actium. That is portrayed as the most unfortunate event leading to the doom of the couple. The whole problem starts when Egypt and Rome go to war. Egypt is a sovereign country but pledges allegiance to Rome. It is a delicate balance which Cleopatra maneuvers with great skill having the most powerful leaders of the Roman world as her lovers. This reflects her negotiating ability as a leader and as a woman she uses her sexuality to get things done in her favour. The problem arises when she decides to fight a war against Rome. She can be a good negotiator, as in the past she could rule over Egypt with this skill, but when she decides to play the role of a military leader, she fails most miserably. The defeat at the battle of Actium marks the downfall of both Cleopatra and Antony.

Cleopatra enjoys exerting her sexual powers, and she enjoys having others watch her beauty. It is her high status that keeps her protected from others or she does not care as she is the queen. The way she exerts her sexuality in negotiations is subtle and even Antony is aware of this as he says “She is cunning past man’s thought” (1.2.141). She goes to the extent of trying to seduce Octavius Caesar, though not openly, but that remains another way to regain control over the whole situation and retain power. Ultimately, by the climax, Cleopatra realises that love is more important than power. She agrees with Antony that the nobleness of life is to love and finally she realizes that it is time to step down. She can no longer play the same game with Octavius. She prefers to be dead and united with Antony than living and dealing with Caesar. This is also because she knows that Octavius Caesar will be finally beaten once she kills herself. Then he will not be able to take her Rome as a captive, and she will not be a trophy for him to parade. So she stages her death beautifully, sensually and dies in orgasmic bliss, giving a call to Antony. The love of Antony and Cleopatra
certainly has an aura of animal vitality. It is more than lust for physical sex. The final test of their love is a willingness to give up everything else for it. From the leader’s point of view love is a kind of effeminacy unless it is kept within strict and decent limits. Antony’s intense passion for Cleopatra is ironically the beginning of his downfall because of the weakening of his judgment in the command of practical affairs. *Othello* on the other hand deals with the story of a brave general who becomes victim of his overpowering jealousy that destroys him professionally and on personal front.

History stands testimony that women leaders have proved to be great leaders with their determination and control over emotions. One such example is that of Catherine II (1729-1796) or Catherine the Great of Russia, also known as Empress of Russia. She is said to have both loved and killed her husband Peter III to become the Empress of Russia. Like Cleopatra she is also believed to have used her sexuality to control and maintain power. Scholars claim that she took generals as her lovers and used them for her advantage. She was known to have many lovers.  But unlike Antony who failed to maintain the balance between duties of a leader and lover Catherine was always focused on her duties as an empress. It is believed that the period of her rule, also known as Catherinian Era, is described as the Golden Age of the Russian Empire and Russian nobility. Another woman leader from contemporary political scenario who has exhibited extremely emotionally balanced leading is Hillary Clinton. In spite of the sexual scandal allegations against Bill Clinton by Kathleen Wilby, Paula Jones, Sunita Broaddrock and Elizabeth Gracen and in particular his involvement with Monica Lewinsky including the accusation of obstruction of justice did not shake her confidence to contest presidential elections in 2007. In her memoir in 2003, she openly attributes her decision to stay married to Bill Clinton as she loved him: “a love that has persisted for decades.” She further justifies herself for continuing the relationship as “no one understands me better and no one can make me laugh the way Bill does. Ever after these years, he is still the
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most interesting, energizing and fully alive person I have ever met.” 17 This scandal certainly had a deep impact on the Clintons but the way Hillary tackled the whole situation is commendable. It proves that women leaders are emotionally strong and balanced in their decision making.

Leadership Studies establishes a lot from the tales of successful yet failed leadership. Antony’s love for Cleopatra is part of his personal life but ironically a leader cannot separate himself from his followers. Antony’s love for Cleopatra remains excessive. It somehow makes him careless and licentious. It is true that leaders have a private life, but at the same time the demands of the position cannot be ignored. Antony fails because he denies his responsibilities as a leader. Self-awareness is believed to be an important trait for leaders. As represented, all the three leaders lack self-awareness. Antony decides to marry Octavia purely for political reasons and fails to realize that his passion for Cleopatra is such extreme that he can put everything at stake. In the same manner Cleopatra fails to estimate her strength and the decision to participate in the war ruins her completely. Othello too puts his faith in Iago completely without listening to his inner voice. It tells us that a leader has to sacrifice personal happiness and family for the sake of followers. History tells us Mahatma Gandhi sacrificed his personal life for the sake of his followers and the sad part is his family suffered severely, especially his eldest son Harilal. The family was always sidelined to the margins. 18 Thus, both the plays deal with the downfall of their principal characters; Antony, Cleopatra and Othello offering us insights into understanding the need to balance personal and professional life. Antony destroys his personal life for his extreme passion for Cleopatra, which in fact affects his governing decisions, i.e., his defeat at the battle of Actium. Othello’s decision for promoting Cassio instead of Iago leads to his corruption by manipulative Iago. Iago seeks revenge by plotting seeds of doubt and suspicion against Desdemona as having an affair with Cassio. Engulfed with rage and jealousy, Othello kills Desdemona and when the truth is revealed, he is repentant and so ashamed of his deed that he commits suicide. The decision affects his personal life deeply and results in his total ruin. This

17 Ibid. 39.
18 This aspect of Mahatma Gandhi’s life is dramatically portrayed by Ajit Dhalvi (1995) in his Marathi play Gandhi virudh Gandhi, where little known and highly maligned Harilal is shown as having a point of view. The same point of view appears in the film Gandhi My Father (2007) produced by Anil Kapoor, starring Akshay Khanna and Darshan Jariwala, directed by Feroze Khan.
however indicates that both are interlinked and the leader should be skilled in striking a balance between personal and professional life.

The plays also portray the effect of extreme passion. We have earlier discussed the roles emotions play in leaders’ life and behaviour. In the context of organisations, the role emotions play in the success of organisations have long been neglected by organizational researchers. The common belief is that workers should leave their emotions behind when they walk into an organisation. They fail to realise that it is emotion that decides how we perceive the world. That is why Monica Sjoonneby, Chief Consultant, TMI Development, emphasizes on the impact of positive emotions at workplace. It is these positive emotions that lead to better communication, more flexibility in thinking and more efficiency in our decision making. In the last two decades, however, researches and studies on Organizational Behavior have revealed that ignoring emotions completely at workplace is not possible and is not desirable (Ashkanasy and Cooper, 2008; Charmine et al., 2005; Fineman, 2003, 1993; Murray et al., 2006). These scholars have pointed out that the emotional dimension is an inseparable part of organizational life and can no longer be ignored in organizational researches. In fact the moods, impulses and feelings of leaders or managers affect the followers.19 Studies from various other academic fields such as Psychology (Dixon, 2003; Lewis et al., 2008; MacCurdy, 1925), Sociology (Ollilainen, 2000; Stets and Turner, 2007), Anthropology (Levy, 1984) and Neuroscience (Lane and Nadel, 2002; Damasio, 1994) have proved the unavoidable influence of emotions on our behaviour and decision making. Hence, in what follows we explore the cases of a few renowned and successful Indian women business leaders who have managed to deal with their emotions and have been successful in balancing their professional and private lives.

Many researchers of gender differences in Leadership Studies have compared women to men on the basis of inherent personality traits and socialization. The historicity of these studies not only questions the gendered nature and shows the hierarchical dimension of the scholarship, it also indicates in principle gendered leadership has been questioned and stereotyped and its canon has been challenged in the modern times. A study by D.A. Winther and S.B. Green concludes that women are less socially oriented in their style of leadership than men (1987). N.L. Harper and R.Y. Hirokawa (1988) find evidence that women utilise passive, open-minded, and nurturing strategies, where as men employ communication strategies that connote strength and power. In the past decades, transactional versus transformational approaches to leadership have indicated that transactional style is usually associated with men, and it involves exchange of rewards for quality services rendered or punishment for inadequate performance. On the other hand, women leaders prefer techniques of transformational leadership which involve getting subordinates to transform their self-interest into the interest of the group through concern for a broad goal (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Bass et al., 1996). Rosener calls this style—taken up by women leaders—as ‘interactive’ leadership. Interactive leadership involves “attempts to enhance other people’s sense of self-worth and to energise followers” (1990). This can be associated with the traits women are supposed to possess, and is often termed as feminine traits of being caring, nurturing and being deeply emotional.

Negotiations and alliance forming style of leading have been a matter of much discussion, and the issue addresses is the way women characters—historical—literary or otherwise—have negotiated and formed alliances in the past. In the modern scenario, in contemporary times, with several advances in terms of education, women have come up from being in the home front to that of undertaking the assignments of professional career. If not much, the issue addresses how within the framework of gender, sexuality and leadership, women's coming of age has been significant. Both the male characters, Othello and Antony, who have proved leadership skills and have failed in managing emotions and passions, and Cleopatra who has remained a slave to her passion, throw much light upon the subject of the leading and development. Now if we see Cleopatra’s style of leading, we find the quality of her negotiation as seen in Act V scene ii, when she tries to settle matters with Caesar in her favour. When Caesar tries to persuade her that she would not be treated cruelly: “We will extenuate
rather than enforce: / If you apply yourself to our intents” (5.2.125-26). She uses her charm and negotiating skill to convince Caesar that she would co-operate: “And may, through all the world: ‘tis your; and we, / Your scutcheons and your signs of conquest, shall / Hang in what place you please. Here, my good lord” (5.2. 134-36). Though in the end she realises her charm will not work as she had been using it in the case of Julius Caesar, Pompey and Antony and therefore puts an end to her life in a dignified manner.

Consequently, women leaders in different organizations continue to face the challenges of stereotyping and gender differences. In fact Cleopatra also hints at this in the play: “I cannot project mine own cause so well / To make it clear, but do confess I have / Been laden with like frailties which before / Have often shamed our sex” (5.2.120-23). Women leaders are generally labeled ‘overemotional’ and male colleagues sometimes find their emotional tenor “intimidating and overbearing” (Lyons and McArthur, 2007). And at times women leaders are also charged for violating appropriate executive behaviour, and on the contrary if they do not express emotions at all, they are labeled ‘emotionless’ (Lyons and McArthur, 2007). K.H. Jamieson in Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership (1995) calls this as “competence / feminity double bind” (56) where a woman risks rejection for being successful.

Indian women, in this regard, have come a long way since the country’s Independence and have proved themselves as entrepreneurs. To critique the trend, apart from doing the expected, they are up to everything that is traditionally unexpected of them. They have made the world acknowledge their leadership skills by obtaining key positions in corporate circles due to their creativity, intuition and multi-tasking abilities. For example, Kiran Mazumdar Shaw (Chairman and Managing Director of Biocon Ltd.), Indra K. Nooyi (Chief Executive Officer of PepsiCo), Gitanjali Kirloskar (President, Litertainment), Chanda Kochhar (Managing Director and Chief Financial Officer of ICICI), Shikha Sharma (Managing Director and CEO, Axis Bank), Ambika Srivastava (CEO, ZenithOptimedia), Kalpana Morparia (CEO of JP Morgan) and many others are entrepreneurs who are counted among successful business leaders. The fact remains that most of them are from high class business families or are exceptionally talented. Unfortunately, the percentage of women who have reached to the highest levels of the corporate world is not encouraging. It is abysmally low in India. But slowly we find the trend is changing in
India and we have more and more women executives aspiring for top positions. One reason for the success of Indian women leaders is that they have learnt to balance and manage their emotions intelligently and in most cases contesting gender stereotyping at workplace and home front, they have moved forward to compete along with men. They have reached to the top positions by delicately balancing home, family and career in the present decades.

For example, Kiran Mazumdar Shaw, Chairman and Managing Director of Biocon Ltd. has been a trendsetter and role model for many women entrepreneurs. With strong determination, breaking glass ceiling and reaching to the pinnacle of success, she started her own business with just Rs. 10,000 in hand and a degree in brewery. Today she is one of the richest women in India and has inspired many women entrepreneurs. Competing in a male-centred business world and breaking away from the barriers of gender differences, her journey as a woman entrepreneur signifies, in principle, that she has also been successful in reasoning and in controlling her passions. Further, the passion to break away from gendered outworldliness also indicates the way characters in everyday world need to manage emotions and passions intelligently. For Mazumdar Shaw, the journey to success was not an easy task and there were many reasons, there were many hurdles to overcome. In an article she contemplates on the hardships in her journey:

Needless to say there were several obstacles that I had to overcome in my entrepreneurial journey. For instance, I faced credibility challenges: my youthful age, my gender and my unfamiliar business model posed enormous barriers. No bank wanted to lend to me, no professional wanted to work for me, and it proved to be a real challenge to set up a business because women were considered a high risk in the business world.20

In an interview, on the organization of workplace, she takes a positive stand: “Knowledge does not have a gender divide, women scientists, women engineers, women writers have enormous opportunities to excel and succeed”.21 Biocon takes care of gender sensitivity issues, and has taken of the need of women employees. Women are not encouraged to work at odd hours and the company provides crèche for the employees’ children so that they are assured of good care while they pursue their
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20 See Kiran Mazumdar Shaw’s “Kiran Mazumdar Shaw: Role Model for Indian Women.”
http://completewellbeing.com/article/our-time-has-come/
21 Ibid.
career. She is of the view that women prove to be good democratic leaders because they are blessed with special qualities such as compassion, sensitivity and an inner strength of honesty and untiring commitment.

Indira Krishnamurthy Nooyi, Chief Executive Officer of PepsiCo, is married with two children and tries hard to juggle being a professional and a homemaker. She has made India proud by being the only Indian woman to have reached to this level. For Indira it has been a both tough and exciting experience. The faculties of IIM Calcutta recollect memories of Nooyi’s studenship days. They claim Nooyi was a very mediocre student; however, she surpassed everybody’s imagination when it was announced that she was going to replace Steve Reinemund, CEO PepsiCo in 2007. As a leader Nooyi was always confident about her leadership skills and remained calm and poised even in the most difficult situation, i.e., during the economic meltdown. This was because she firmly believed that “leaders must have fundamentally different skills” (Kretchmar, 2001; 110) and that “includes the ability to work closely with public official and to exhibit emotional intelligence towards employees” (2001, 112).

In a recent speech at Weinberg Centre for Corporate Governance, 6 April 2011, she highlights the changing roles of a CEO and suggests that as a leader of an organization people should not only focus on long-term goals, but they should also understand and maintain public and private relationships. She also emphasizes on thinking and acting globally and being open-minded. And the most important characteristic which she proposes for a leader in the present situation is emotional intelligence. It is because if you do not understand the emotional state of the people and treat them accordingly, in no time the company will face a catastrophic end which will result in its decay.

Indira Nooyi is one of the most popular CEOs and most admired leaders. This was because she touches the emotions of her employees. She makes them feel that she values them as independent persons and not as “employee number 4567” (Pandya, 2004; 3). She makes them aware of the fact that she understands they have a life beyond PepsiCo. In one of her interviews Nooyi shares her experience when she was in India at her mother’s place. She was shocked to see that her relatives simply ignored her and went in to compliment her mother and said “You brought up such a good kid” (2004; 3). She could feel the joy and pride which her mother experienced. It was then she realized that she should also let the parents of the senior executives in her company know that they too have done a great job. And she wrote to the parents
of 29 senior executives and acknowledged their contribution towards PepsiCo by bringing up such brilliant children. This is something which is most touching when a leader is not only concerned about the follower or the employee, but also about his/her family. The effect was unbelievable; she could create emotional bond with executives and their family.

Gitanjali Kirloskar is declared to be the president of India’s first professional entertainment company, Litertainment. Starting in industrial advertising in an agency launched by the Kirloskar group, Pratibha, she succeeded in bringing in the first brand account, Weekender. Soon Sansui, TVS, and Kenstar followed suit, making her the first lady of advertising. She went on to become the head of Quadrant Communications, the world’s second largest advertising agency and later on merged the in-house ad agency Pratibha with the Worldwide Interpublic Group and created media history. She got married at the age of 19 and spent early days at her family town in Harihar in Karnataka. She started working at 21 as a trainee at Pratibha and did not care if her move raised a thousand eyebrows. She had decided to prove herself as a professional. Therefore, she worked round the clock and tried very hard to balance both personal and professional fronts as well. It was very difficult and the guilt which most women suffer from, i.e., neglecting family, plagued her continuously. There was a time in her life when she was emotionally down; she thought of quitting for the sake of family (Doshi, 2011). But the realisation of the responsibilities and accountability she owed to Litertainment and other Initiative Media kept her tied to work. She took the situation as a challenge and determined not to let her ambitions die. She kept on moving with the flow. And with the support of her husband and family she managed to continue even in the most difficult times (Pratap, 2012).

In the present situation most women entrepreneurs have learnt to manage their emotions intelligently and they strive hard to balance both home and profession. Geetanjali has made Indian women realize the need to be professional to survive in today’s customer-is-the-king world. Always being sure of herself, she does not think that being a woman is a hindrance. She believes that being passionate about the work helps us overcome those stumbling gender issues.

There are numerous other examples. Chanda Kocchar, first woman boss of India’s second largest money lender ICICI, has made among top 20 most powerful women in Forbes list. As the Managing Director and Chief Financial Officer of ICICI,
she heads the Corporate Centre and is known for her dynamic leadership strategies. As Managing Director and Chief Finance Officer of ICICI, she aims at developing a strong culture of empowering employees, encouraging entrepreneurship and innovation. By following meritocracy, gender neutrality and linking rewards to performance, she tries to motivate the employees to perform the best of their abilities while providing them with a platform to realize their full potential (Raman, 2011; 38). She firmly believes that a woman does not need any special privileges to do well in any field in any particular organisation. All that is required is a level-playing field where merit is the criteria for success. Any person who is capable and hard working, irrespective of gender, would then shine through. Thus, it is only merit and hard work that counts and she promotes a culture of gender neutrality in her organization (Vishwas, 2008). Moreover, the way they balance both home and professional fronts remain central to their success in the modern-day world.

Kalpana Morparia, CEO of JP Morgan, feels it is only work that matters and being man or a woman has nothing to do with efficiency. She directly rejects gender issues in organisations claiming being passionate and committed to work is the only thing that counts. In an interview published in *India Forbes* September 2009, when Moraparia is asked about how she manages both home and professional fronts, she answers in an optimistic manner saying she loves travelling and makes best possible use of the time available in flight for reading and answering mails (2009, 35). Unlike other busy executives who have appointed secretaries to answer mails on their behalf, she takes care to answer each and every mail herself. Most women give up top positions because they demand a lot of travelling and being away from family makes them feel that they are neglecting their responsibilities. But Kalpana tries her best to manage time for family (2009, 36). Like all women entrepreneurs she too tries to manage family and office in a balanced way.

A study of women entrepreneurs belonging to different sectors tends to show something in common and they have a strong family support system which gives them freedom to pursue their career and utilize their potential. It is also seen that these women entrepreneurs have managed to use their feminine traits (viz. being compassionate, understanding, sympathetic, and nurturing) in the best possible way and have developed their unique style of leading which offer scope for taking care of emotional aspects of employees. This was earlier neglected on the grounds that
emotions weaken organisations and are not good for business, and with this they have excelled in their profession.

Presently in India the trend is changing as we have growing number of vivacious, ambitious, progressive and young women entrepreneurs. Women entrepreneurs such as Pooja Shetty (Adlabs Films Limited), Devita Saraf (Zenith Computers Ltd.), Madhabi Puri Buch (Executive Director, ICICI), Himani Modi (Modi Group) and Monisha Shah (Director, BBC Worldwide), who are continuously breaking down the glass ceiling and claiming new heights. While women are no longer the proverbial needle in a haystack in Indian corporate boardrooms, the trend is still in its infancy. A study done by CII in 2005 proclaims that only 6% of the total employee comprise women and sadly only 4% reach to senior position. But the equation is fast changing and women are taking giant strides to reach to top positions because Indian woman entrepreneurs are changing from being emotional to emotionally intelligent.

On the international scenario too there are many women leaders who have exhibited extraordinary poise. Margaret Thatcher, the first woman Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, served for more than eleven years at this position. She was leader of the Conservative Party for fifteen years, from 1975 to 1990. She was the only British Prime Minister of the 20th century to win three consecutive general elections. John Campbell in his book on life of Mrs. Thatcher declares her as “iron lady” for her uncompromising politics and leadership style. Coming from a middle class background, the achievements and success that Margret Thatcher achieved as a woman leader provide hope to women leaders around the world. Mrs. Thatcher has written two volumes of memoirs—*The Downing Street Years* (1993) and *The Path to Power* (1995) that give an insight into her life and the journey she has undertaken as a woman leader. Similarly, Catherine the Great or Empress of Russia is also known for strong and powerful leadership that brought Russia out of its conservative policies. She encouraged western education and emphasized on women education in particular. She was the founder of the Smonly Institute for Noble Girls. The Smonly Institute was the first of its kind in Russia. At first the institute admitted young girls of the noble class only, but later on girls from other classes were also taken into purview of
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education. So is the case with Hillary Clinton; her political career has inspired many young women leaders to aspire for greater feats. She has come up as a role model for women to manage and balance public and private affairs intelligently. In most cases, the way women leaders have managed their private life and political career has been of great importance and it indicates in principle women leaders, though a small population, have been successful in all frontiers of life.

Managing emotions in both home and social fronts and balancing reasons to lead an organization remain central in the process of leading. As is the case with literary representations, in everyday world people need to understand the role emotions and reasons play in home and work fronts. An understanding of the same not only helps us develop a proper work culture, it will also take us, in principle, to a new height where managing emotions and reasoning will lead us towards the creation of a better world.

\[1\] See Rafael Max’s “If These Walls... Smonly’s Repeated Roles in History.” *Russian Life*. 49.3 (2006): 19-24.
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Despite voluminous research on leadership and numerous approaches towards developing leaders / leadership skills through theories and training programmes, there exists a significant gap between theory and practice. It is important to generate a holistic approach towards the understanding of leadership. This is because leadership is not a combination of traits which if a person acquires becomes a leader or in other words leadership does not depend upon learned traits. In several cases, it is beyond theories and scientific models on leadership. The traditional approaches towards developing leadership skills considered leadership to be a set of skills, traits and personality. They remain narrow and mechanical in their approaches. For example, earlier good communication skills, impressive personality and achievement of goals by motivating followers were some of the most important requirements of an effective leader. However, the issue of leadership goes beyond these traditional traits, skills, notions and personality. In actuality, the function of leaders goes beyond goal setting and controlling functions of managers. They are required to be inspirational, charismatic and need to have the ability to awaken the latent energy and spirit of their followers. Followers seem to acquire certain amount of energy, vitality, when they have a good leader. This is the essence of good leadership.

In the present scenario, leaders ought to be different from managers because they provide meaning, direction, and above all, a sense of purpose to their followers. By doing so, leaders essentially transform people, imbuing them with a new energy. This new energy remains even after the assigned tasks are completed and long after leaders are gone. For example, Mahatma Gandhi neither possessed a very impressive personality nor were his oratory skills were outstanding, but what makes him a truly nationalistic leader is his being a visionary. He was a man of character and he earned respect by his attitude. The influence of his principles and ideals is seen in every Indian way of thinking and indeed whenever a non-violent approach is adopted against oppression and injustice, Gandhi’s name comes to the front. The influence of his teachings has never faded even after more than sixty years of his death. Under great leaders people achieve great feats
that are considered impossible. For example, Joan of Arc, mobilized the French army to win many victories during the Hundred Years’ War (1337-1453). Her feats at the war inspired even weak and non-descriptive Charles VII, to rise and throw out the English from France. This is the power of great leadership.

The subject of leadership is as diverse as past and contemporary leaders and its numerous theories. So is the case with the theoretical framework and scholars’ approaches towards their practicality. This is because the term still remains ambiguous and is interpreted in multiple ways. In the past sixty years, as many as 65 different classification systems have developed to define the dimensions of leadership (Northouse, 2010). Ralph Stogdill argues: “There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (1974, 259). Some definitions indicate leadership as a ‘group process’ (Green, 1979; Krech and Crutchfield, 1948). Others show that it as an ‘influence process’ (Bass, 1960; Cartwright, 1965) from the personality perspective which suggests, in principle, that leadership is a combination of special traits and characteristics that some individuals possess. But this is not a fixed entity and is continuously contested. Defining leadership has always been confusing and there has been no fixed definition of the term. Hence, understanding leadership will never be easy and straightforward. A single disciplinary approach has apparently failed to address all the issues concerning leadership, and hence a holistic approach towards understanding the subject is the need of our time. Therefore, Leadership Studies draws heavily from the long-established disciplines of the humanities and the social sciences. For example, from History, the study of leadership gains understanding of the complexity of human events, which offers opportunities and stumbling blocks. From Philosophy, Leadership Studies gains knowledge of moral and ethical principles that direct decision making and choices in everyday life. Leadership Studies derives a lot from the disciplines of Sociology and Anthropology. For example, issues in kinship and community, and society and influences that often shape leader-follower relationship are helpful in understanding different styles of leading. Political Science offers an insight into power and its rootedness in economic, military, and other resources, its manifestation in subtle as well as dramatic forms, its channeling and
manipulation of people, and its crucial role in the process of change and so on. All these
disciplines have enriched the understanding of the phenomenon of leadership.

Literature too has to have a unique place in Leadership Studies. It introduces
scholars in Leadership Studies to human condition beyond theories with a focus on the
vast variety of situations and circumstances that a leader might face on her/his journey.
Robert Brawer aptly states: “The values and insights we glean from serious literature
sensitize us to ourselves and, by extension, to the problems inherent in managing people
in an organization” (2000, 2). Literature is helpful in arousing awareness regarding those
issues which a person may not have experienced directly but needs to be prepared for.
The same view is put forth by Aristotle in *Nichomachean Ethics* where he claims the best
education should not only impart information but also develop our capacity to feel and
sympathize because to feel delight and pain rightly or wrongly has no small effect on our
actions (Ross and Brown, 2009; 69).

In the present study, we come across some challenging issues of life that have led
to derailment of worthy leaders. The failures and drawbacks in characters and limitations
that we address open up new possibilities for deliberations in classroom situations. For
example the issue of narcissistic leadership is illustrated by taking the example of Julius
Caesar. Both the historical character as portrayed by Suetonius and Plutarch and the
literary character that appears in Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* are drawn in to discussion
in order to show that Caesar’s downfall was due to his narcissistic leadership. At the
same time parallels are drawn with historical and contemporary leaders such as
Napoleon, Stalin, Hitler, Ayatollah Khomeini and Saddam Hussain to show that their
failed-leading was also due to their narcissistic tendencies. The issue of success and
failure of narcissistic leaders is very debatable because the traits of narcissistic leaders
such as charisma, self-confidence, creativity, breaking status quo are found in many great
leaders and they have succeeded in bringing about revolutionary changes in real-life
situations. Mahatma Gandhi, Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt are cited as
examples (Maccoby, 2007). They are productive or constructive narcissists. History is
created by these kinds of leaders who refuse to accept the conventional ideas and attempt
to break status quo. But the darker side of narcissistic leadership is that their admiration
for power and success is sometimes driven by personal egotistical needs and they fail to
empathize with the followers leading to catastrophic results. Such is the case with Mao, Khomeini, Stalin, Hitler and many others. Though productive and admirable, high narcissistic trends can bring in catastrophic results and leaders and managers need to understand the concept so as to balance their personal and professional life.

In the same manner issues of ethical leadership are illustrated by taking Macbeth and Claudius as prototypes of evil leaders. India’s biggest corporate fraud, the Satyam scandal is drawn in to the discussion to show the consequences of Ramlinga Raju’s unethical leading. Parallels are drawn from real-life leaders such as Azim Premji (Chairman of Wipro Corporation), Narayan Murthy (Chief Mentor and founder of Infosys), Ratan Tata (Chairman, Tata Sons), Dr. Abdul Kalam (Former President of India), and late Dr. G. Venkatswamy (Chairman, Arvind Eye Care in Madurai) who have been ethical in their dealings and have contributed towards community development. They become role models and inspire scores of followers. The chapter raises questions in relation to the general notion of morality and ethics in leadership. What is the nature of morality and why do leaders need to be ethically and morally correct? Can ethical leadership be effective? Can ethical or moral leadership be called good leadership? How can ethics be taught in classrooms when students have already formed their ideologies at the early stages of development? How can business and morality go together? Is Satyam scandal an atypical situation, or does it represent a disturbing trend? These are some questions which are deliberated upon and the chapter examines how the world is driven by selfish motives and power for self occupies people.

Further, decision making is a tough job and especially in case of conflicting emotions. Antony, Cleopatra and Othello are discussed as failed leaders due to their inability to manage emotions intelligently. Cases of successful Indian women entrepreneurs are evoked for discussion to highlight the need to balance emotional conflicts and dilemma in organisations for successful leading. The chapter addresses some complex issues such as the importance of self-awareness. Why is it important for leaders to know themselves, i.e., their inner self? It is true that leaders have a private life, but at the same time the demands of the position of leadership cannot be ignored. True love is the most admired thing but a leader has responsibilities towards his followers; in that case how does a person of power and status balance personal and professional fronts?
Why is it important for leaders to be emotionally balanced? Why do leaders need to maintain an irreproachable image? What can be the effect of extreme passion? How can it be detrimental for organisations and the leader? All these questions have perplexed even the best of leaders in different times. There cannot be fixed answers to them but they encourage critical thinking and provide a platform for self-reflection and sense-making. This in turn enables leaders to break out of their constraining ways of thinking. It is for these reasons literary texts are required to be introduced in Leadership Studies and Management classrooms. All these issues in leadership are discussed in fictional light and parallels are drawn with real-life cases for a better understanding of the complexities in leading. Not only this, there is lot to derive from the technique of ‘failed-leading’ and by drawing parallels from real-life situations in the light of fictional success and failures help students of Leadership Studies and Organisational Behaviour to draw parallels in real-life situations. It also gives them an understanding of handling professional life seriously. Besides the interpretation of the tragedies in the light of issues in leading, the study also includes philosophical and psychological enquiry into concepts such as good and evil, the relative nature of good and evil, emotions and passions, the conflict of passion and reason, nature of ambition, pride and arrogance or narcissism which have also contributed to a deeper understanding of leading as a process and the problems confronted by leaders in the process of leading.

Leadership Studies, hence, requires to have a holistic approach in its pedagogy. It needs to include, inclusively, literary texts—such as Shakespeare’s—in its curriculum. A sense of practicality can be developed with an introduction of literary texts and drawing parallels from real-life situations which, in turn, will develop a sense of responsibilities and learning among scholars of Leadership Studies. Both traditional and modern theoretical frameworks, along with a fictional representation of life, will certainly take the practicality of the discipline—Leadership Studies—towards practical realm and towards new heights.
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