

**A DIALECTICAL REPRESENTATION OF THE DE JURY AND DE FACTO LEADERS
IN FOUR OF SHAKESPEARE'S POLITICAL PLAYS**

BY

ACHAN PAMELLA

16/U/13277/GMAL/PE

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH AND
GRADUATE TRAINING IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN LITERATURE OF
KYAMBOGO UNIVERSITY**

OCTOBER, 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of this study has been made possible due to the numerous support, wise counsel and guidance that I got from various people whom I now happily acknowledge:

Firstly, I heartily thank my supervisor, Sr. Frances Nakiwala (Ph.D.), for the unrivaled guidance, counsel, encouragement and mentorship, without which this study would not have come to fruition. Sister, I am really grateful!

My deep appreciation also goes to my other ‘family’ at Lango College—especially the former Head teacher, Mr. Alfred Okello, who paved the way to my graduate studies; all esteemed colleagues in the Department of English for the patience during my absence: thank you all, and forever thanks!

Deep gratitude also goes to Dr. Cyprian Adupa of the Department of History, Archaeology and Heritage Studies, Kyambogo University, whose recommendation availed me the opportunity to be a Teaching Assistant in the Department of Foundations of Education, Kyambogo University, an opportunity through which I managed to raise funds to support my graduate studies.

In a very special way, I would like to express my gratitude to my family for the unwavering support throughout the course of this study: sincere thanks to the love of my life, Mr. Robert Caesar Opudo and my children; my lovely sisters, Christine Oluka, Ameso Rose Oluka and Joy Oluka, and dear father, Mzee Oluka James for the unrivaled support.

May the good LORD ALMIGHTY bless you all abundantly!

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my beloved husband, Mr. Robert Caesar Opudo, and our lovely children, namely, Alungo Macrina Pearl, Aluko Jovia Elsie, Omara Jerome Justine and Anyango Joana Victoria, and the rest of the Oluka family.

Thank you all for being there for me—through thick and thin!

DECLARATION

I, Pamela Achan, declare to the best of my knowledge and belief that this study, titled, “A Dialectical Representation of the De Jury and De facto Leaders in Four of Shakespeare’s Political Plays”, is a product of my own efforts, and that it has never been submitted to any institution of learning for any formal award. All the cited sources have been acknowledged.

SIGNED: DATE:.....

PAMELLA ACHAN

APPROVAL

We the undersigned University Supervisors have read and approved the dissertation titled “A Dialectical Representation of the De Jury and De Facto Leadership in four of Shakespeare’s Political Plays”.

SIGNED: DATE:

REV. SR. DR. FRANCES NAKIWALA AMBROSIA, (PhD)

(PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR)

SIGNED: DATE:

REV. SR. DR. TEREZA NAMIREMBE, (PhD)

(POST VIVA VOCE SUPERVISOR)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
DEDICATION	ii
DECLARATION	iii
APPROVAL	iv
ABSTRACT	vii
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.3 Scope of the study.....	9
1.4 Definitions of Key Terms	10
1.2 Statement of the Problem	11
1.6 Research Questions	12
1.7 Literature Review	13
1.8 Justification	26
1.9 Theoretical Framework	26
1.10 Significance of the Study.....	28
1.11 Research methodology	28
CHAPTER TWO	30
PRESENTATION OF THE PROS AND CONS OF SHAKESPEARE’S DE JURY KINGS IN <i>MACBETH, RICHARD II, HENRY IV: PART 1</i> AND <i>HENRY IV: PART 2</i>..	30
2.1 Introduction.....	30
2.2 Strengths of the De Jury Kings	30
2.3 Weaknesses of the De Jury Kings	40
CHAPTER THREE.....	54
ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST DE FACTO KINGS IN THE FOUR SHAKESPEARES POLITICAL PLAYS	54
3.1 Introduction.....	54
3.2 Political Virtues of De Facto Kings.....	54
3.3 Weaknesses of De Facto Kings	63
CHAPTER FOUR.....	74

LESSONS DRAWN FROM THE REPRESENTATION OF SHAKESPEARE'S POLITICAL CHARACTERS	74
4.1 Introduction.....	74
4.2 Lessons Drawn	76
CHAPTER FIVE	97
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	97
5.1 Introduction.....	97
5.2 Findings and Conclusions.....	97
5.3 Recommendations	99
REFERENCES	100

ABSTRACT

This study is a critical examination of the dialectical representation of the concepts of De Jury and De Facto leaderships in four of William Shakespeare's political plays, namely, *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV, Part 1* and *Henry IV, Part 2*. The study had a threefold objective: to examine the dialectical representation of the De Jury leadership/kings in four of Shakespeare's political plays; to explore the dialectical representation of the De Facto leadership/kings in four of Shakespeare's political plays; and to draw the lessons from the dialectical representation of both De Jury and De Facto leadership in the four political plays of William Shakespeare. The study was majorly library-based and applied qualitative approaches, such as critical analysis of both primary and secondary sources of data were employed to decipher the dialectical representation of both De Jury and De Factor leadership in the aforementioned political plays of William Shakespeare. The study drew on from Jacques Derrida's deconstructionist literary theory which involved a polemic reading of the four political plays in the critical examination of Shakespeare's representation of both De Jury and Defacto leadership. The findings of the study showed that both De Jury and De Facto leaderships have both strengths and weaknesses. In the two leadership modes, 'performance' and 'legitimacy' are essential qualities for successful leadership. Hence, of the two methods of acquiring and maintaining power, the dejury and the defacto style of leadership are complimentary. Finally, the study recommended that future literary scholars should examine the place of the Shakespearean "Histories"—political plays/drama—in the discourse of Twenty-First Century global politics and governance, since they espouse pertinent issues on politics and leadership that keep to be reflected in the contemporary global world.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

William Shakespeare dialectically represents the De Jury and De Facto modes of political leaderships/kings in four of his political plays also known as, Histories namely: *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV, Part 1* and *Henry IV, Part 2*. The dramatist reveals both leaders have difficulties in maintaining peaceful tenures. He who comes to power through heredity may be deposed as well as the one who acquires the throne by the aid of the people. Both may find it difficult to command or manage the people for various reasons. The study queries who then should be the qualitative kind of leader and how should the leader attain legitimacy and maintain a peaceful regime? To explain these queries, the study employs Jacques Derrida's deconstructionist perspective, especially his notion that meaning in a language literary text is multiple is never static, but rather with a tendency to keep evolving across both time and space.

1.1 Background to the Study

William Shakespeare remains a towering figure in the global literary canon in that he continues to exert unrivaled influence, reverence and popularity even an incredible four hundred years after his death acknowledged by equally great writers in the English literary tradition, especially Ben Johnson, who in, "To the Memory of my Beloved, the Author Mr. William Shakespeare" (1623), lavishes praise to William Shakespeare as not being of "an age, but for all times", among other dedicatory praises in the poem. Shakespeare's legacy to society, and indeed, to human life, remains immensely great, and not least is his political wisdom, especially perspectives on the question of leadership and governance. His works, especially, his political drama texts Histories such as *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV, Part 1* and *Henry IV, Part 2* demonstrate his remarkable espousal of the timeless adage that man, by nature, is indeed, a political animal.

Noteworthy is the fact that Shakespeare's political plays portray a wide array of leaders with varying qualities of leadership and their methods of both acquiring and maintaining political power. This study, thus, focuses on two leadership types, namely, De Jury and De Facto, which were very common during both the medieval and renaissance periods in the political history of Great Britain. Important to note also is how both the de jure and the de facto leaders acquired power: the former gained political power through heredity, while the latter were either self-made or chosen by the people. The de jure kings believed that their status guaranteed them unbound power and unquestionable allegiance, and therefore, they were very confident though complacent. The de facto rulers, on the other hand, were hard working and popular.

They were conscious that their legitimacy was determined by their subjects. They aimed to win and sustain the favor of the populace who determined their legitimacy.

The central query of the study is: which of these modes of acquiring power seems to be working? Shakespeare's presentation shows that both modes have pros and cons, and the study has interested itself in the critical analysis of Shakespeare's representation of the de jure and de facto leaders in the aforementioned four of his political plays written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with a view of identifying the qualities that make good and stable leadership.

Before and during Shakespeare's time, according to Shamsi Farzana (2016), in "Kingship as a Divine Right in Shakespeare's *King Richard II*", there was an orthodox belief that a king who descended from the line of kings ruled by divine right, hence, he was God's representative a lawful king, or simply a king de jure. It was, therefore, sacrilegious to rebel against or even depose the de jure king, no matter how bad he was, as he was regarded divinely-commissioned to rule. Hence, a bad king was considered to be God's scourge to the masses for an apparent act of transgression to God. The people were therefore supposed to be patient until God would

change him. To explain the theory of Divine right of the De Jury King during the Mediaeval and Renaissance periods, Shamsi, cited the following literature which stated that The divine right of kings or divine-right theory is a political or religious doctrine of royal and political arena. It further says that a king/queen is not bound by any authority on earth. He gets the right to rule right from God's will. And so he cannot subject to the peoples will. The nobility or any other class with the regard of some especially in protestant countries -the church, in this belief, it is God who can judge an unjust king. This doctrine shows that anyone who tries to overthrow the monarch or put strictness on his privileges goes against God's will and so it is sacrilegious (41).

In the above quotation Shamsi's explains the origins of advocacy for the divine legitimacy of the de jury kings or leaders. The king was to be regarded an appointee of God and, therefore, to be respected at all times by the people he led. No matter the flaws (if any) he possessed, it was between him and his installer, God. In short, the de jury king was some sort of "untouchable" being with an overwhelming divine-legitimacy that was far beyond human reproach.

Much as the above was a general belief among the English people in both the Mediaeval and renaissance periods, Shakespeare's political plays show that there was a contrary view: a de jure king had to justify his legitimacy by his performance, as often times people complained and even assassinated ineffective de jure kings. In fact, weak and inept kings were rebelled against and replaced by de facto kings who were chosen by the people on individual "merits". There was always tension between deposing the non-performing, but legitimate king and accepting him as a scourge from God. Although there was that strong belief that the God-chosen king a de jure king/leader should not be deposed, but tolerated, Shamsi (2016) further argues that on one hand Shakespeare's political plays appear to support "usurpation" of political leadership, calling it a necessary evil a country like England must suffer in case of a bad King. On the other hand,

however, Shamsi argues that a strong and efficient king without legal right to the throne a de facto king/leader cannot be accepted, no matter how inept or weak, a de jure king is overthrown. No wonder, in his political play, *Richard II*, Shakespeare's character approve and disapproves the deposition of Richard a lawful monarch, despite his glaring ineptitude.

Both de jure and de facto leadership modes are well illustrated in Niccolo Machiavelli's sixteenth century treatise on statecraft and political wisdom, known as, *The Prince*. Machiavelli enumerates the advantages and disadvantages of both types of kings. On the one hand, Machiavelli says the de jure king sits pretty on the throne because his hereditary legitimacy is not questionable, and that such a king has no rivals and no claimants for benefits. The de facto king, on the other hand, does not have this prerogative as he is always monitored by those who brought him in power. His legitimacy partly comes from the goodwill of the people, his ability to silence or award the flatterers and partly from his cunningness. To be in power long, the de facto king has to destroy the forces that brought him into power. However, by destroying them, the de facto king inevitably creates enmity that eventually causes his downfall.

In his article Ethan Gibson (2019), in a journal article, "How Art Thou a King?: Machiavelli and the Failure of Shakespeare's *Richard II*", asserts that a ruler should invoke both fear and reverence. But the fear should be moderate, so that even if he is not loved, he won't provoke hatred as well. Richard fails on this principle and ultimately deposed. Similarly Macbeth fails on the same principle in that he invokes more fear than friendship so he was beheaded by Macduff because of creating enmity.

The de jure king had detractors as well. If he sat back and relaxed, he would be ousted by the watchful Machiavellian leaders who would use the power of the disgruntled people. The thrust of this research is how a leader should acquire and keep power given that both styles of leadership

have loopholes. I am querying why Shakespeare's political plays capture all these tensions by dramatizing the pros and cons of each type of leadership.

As earlier stated, the study focuses on Shakespeare's representation of the de jure and de facto leaderships in four of his political plays, namely, *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *King Henry IV: Part 1* and *King Henry IV: Part 2*. De jure leaders were leaders who came to power or throne by virtue of inheritance and were considered as God's appointed. The English people believed that a son of a king would be king because God willed so. The de facto leaders on the other hand came to power either through manipulation, usurpation or he was aided to power through the support of the population, who determined his legitimacy.

The 16th century was a time of political turmoil following Machiavelli's recommendation on political success. The English had started to query the proper way of acquiring power and maintaining it.

In the selected Shakespearean political plays the two types of leaders are represented in a dialectical way which is worth of exploration. Shakespeare represents the de jure king as graceful, God appointed, peaceful and one that does not fear any invasion. But at the same time, the dramatist depicts the de jure king as a lawless, complacent one who sinks too deep in self-confidence. These vices render his performance poor in all aspects.

On the contrary Shakespeare represents the de facto king as one who is man or self-made. He is a very active king who delivers. But he is beset by uncertainties and lacks God's grace to sit comfortably on the throne. Such a leader often come to power after killing his opponents and as such he has developed enmity with many people. To hold power long, such a leader must destroy all who oppose him and those who supported him to climb up the ladder of power.

The central question is of the two kings: the Dejure and the Defacto Kings which of these two kings is an effective leader? This question will be answered through the analyses of these leaders in the respective plays. Furthermore, the analyses will be informed by Machiavelli principal on state craft and the deconstruction theory.

1.1.1 Synopsis of *Macbeth*

Macbeth is one of Shakespeare's tragedies believed to have been published for a stage performance in 1603. The action canters on Macbeth, a brave Scottish general, who starts off as a defender of the Scottish kingdom, but falls from grace to grass because he received a prophecy from three witches that he would, one day, be "Thane of Cowdar", and later king of Scotland. When the first prophesy comes to pass immediately after Macbeth Macbeth gains false confidence that he can get the crown as well. However, the hope of becoming the king is shattered when King Duncan announces his heir to the throne as Malcom, the prince of Cumberland who happens to be young. Consumed by 'political ambition,' Macbeth there and then contemplates on taking the nearest shortcut to kingship by killing the King. Spurred on by his wife, Macbeth takes advantage of the king's courtesy visit to him, to murder the Scottish king, Duncan, as a chance would have it the Prince of Cumberland, heir to the throne escapes thus creating a vacuum for the throne. Subsequently, Macbeth, the next of kin assumes the Scottish throne. As a king in power, he becomes extremely insecure and ends up murdering those whom he suspects will become a stumbling block to his throne. Macbeth kills people such as Banquo to ensure that the throne does not leave his house. He kills members of Macduff's family. Scotland becomes an unbearable place for human existence, so many Scottish people flee to England. While in exile, Macduff mobilizes an army from England and with the support of Malcom plus other generals wage besiege Macbeth's palace and behead Macbeth.

1.1.2 Synopsis of *Richard II*

Richard II dramatizes the tragedy of King Richard II who becomes a British monarch through direct heredity. Shamsi (2016) picks details from the “Holinshed chronicles” of England, Scotland and Ireland (1398-1400) that says King Richard was the son of Edward, the “Black prince” (40), who ascended to the throne when he was eleven years old. Richard becomes very confident about his hold on the throne, owing to the belief that a hereditary king cannot be overthrown. In the presence of Richard, Henry Bolingbroke blames Thomas Mowbray of financial embezzlement and of a plot to kill his uncle, the Duke of Gloucester. Bolingbroke and Mowbray’s relationship is so strained that they almost fight, only for Richard to stop the combat. Both are banished from the kingdom: Mowbray’s banishment is for life, whereas Henry Bolingbroke’s initial ten years’ banishment is later reduced to just six. This was to the disgruntlement of Henry’s father who later dies out of frustration; King Richard takes advantage of John Gaunt’s death to steal Henry’s property after the father’s death. Bolingbroke returns from exile to protect his estate. He courts the commoners with kind words. His return therefore creates excitement among the masses who are oppressed by Richards’ Dictatorship. The King levies heavy taxes on the people to fund his selfish wars. Some of the king Richard closest allies like Hotspur, Northumberland, Worcester disserts him because they too are sick of his deficiencies. The likes of Hotspur, Northumberland, Worcester and others go to welcome Bolingbroke as savior and pledge their allegiance to him. King Richard is deposed, imprisoned and is eventually executed by one of Henry’s men known as sir Piers Exton.

1.1.3 Synopsis of *Henry IV: Part 1*, and *Henry IV: Part 2*

Henry IV: Part 1 and *Henry IV: Part 2* are about Henry Bolingbroke who after deposing King Richard takes over the throne assumes the name as King Henry IV. In his reign as king, we see him saddened by the son Prince Harry who has joined wrong company who get involved in

dubious acts like robbery, gambling and drinking, Harry is contrasted with Hotspur who is depicted as his age mate. Hotspur is portrayed as a brave young man who is victorious in fighting rebels and has held captive of some scots as prisoners making his father Northumberland proud as opposed to the King's frustration in the son (Act 1 scene 1). The king also faces rejection and defiance from his subjects like Archbishop, Mowbray, Worcester, Hotspur, Northumberland who were once his henchmen that helped him raise to power. The enemies who were once his allies plot to unseat the King claiming the King has distanced himself and has broken the oath, he promised them. This plot is led by Hotspur and misguided by Worcester which leads to his death at Shrewsbury. Prince Harry strikes him in an attempt to rescue the father after they had reconciled and promised to change into a better person. The play ends with a seriously sick king, Henry Bolingbroke.

In *Henry IV: Part 2*, which is an immediate sequel to *Henry IV: Part 1* that ends with a battle at Shrewsbury, the king's forces march against the rebels in the North. The news from Travers as pertains the death of Hotspur reach Northumberland the father who was sick at the time when Hotspur wages war. He is so much grieved at the son's death together with Lady Percy the daughter in-law. Northumberland seeks revenge by re-organizing himself for war. The Archbishop, Mowbray mobilize for war also, Sir John Falstaff a company mate of Prince Harry together with a few friends such as Bardolph do some good service at Shrewsbury by attacking the king's enemies, as reported by the servant to the Chief Justice, hence weakening the enemy forces. The king so much troubled by the ongoing wars seeks to have peace. Just as in part I Westmoreland comes in to negotiate peace as the King had sent him and he is later joined by Prince John of Lancaster who promises to respond to their grievances with speed. They agreed to a secession of hostilities. The rebels are defeated by a treacherous trick of granting them

amnesty. The rebels are later arrested and charged with treason. The good news reaches the King who is worn out with troubles. Instead of being delighted, his health fails him and is taken to his chamber to rest. Harry the wild prince comes in takes the crown thinking the father is dead but the King regains and asks for a moment with his son whom he later blesses with a crown after assuring the father king Henry of reformation. Eventually he dies, Prince Harry is then crowned as King Henry V. Falstaff and his friends, Shallow, Pistol, Bardolph and the Page come to London for Prince Harry's coronation as king Henry V expecting favor from the old-time companion Hal. But the Prince dismisses them. For the king had turned away from his former self and no longer needed those who misguided him in his youth. Subsequently, King Henry V banishes Falstaff and his cohorts who were intent on misleading him. In being crowned as a king, Henry promises to be a father and brother of his subjects, to love them and care for them. He promised to convert their fears into happiness, Act 5, Scene 2.

1.3 Scope of the study

The study focuses on the four political plays of William Shakespeare which majorly represent the subject of leadership in question. What constitutes a good leader? Should the leader be de jure or de facto?

The dramatic texts include: *Macbeth*, *Richard II* and *Henry IV: Part 1* and *Henry IV: Part 2*.

These were basically used as an aim in analyzing the principle of good leadership as a result of the leaders' weaknesses for the purpose of averting future coups.

These texts served as primary source for the illustration of the consequences of weak leadership on both the De Jury and the De Facto leaders. Later other critical works, researches served as secondary sources in illustration.

1.4 Definitions of Key Terms

De Jury Leaders: According to website grammatist.com, these are leaders by right, the God given birthright to lead or govern.

De Facto Leaders: According to Alan Jay Zaremba, in his book, *Crisis Communication: Theory and Practice* (185), A de facto leader is someone who essentially becomes a leader despite the fact that someone is designated or normal leader.

Leadership: This study upholds John. W Gardener's definition of leadership as a "process of persuasion or example by which an individual or leadership team induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by a leader and his or her followers".

Revolution: Chalmers. A. Johnson, in a book, titled, "Revolutionary Change", defines revolution as a social change that involves intrusion of violence in civil social relation.

Protagonist: According to Amorita Sharma (116), in *The Sterling Dictionary of Literary Terms*, protagonist is a term for the chief/main character in the action of literary work who is usually opposed by an antagonist.

Mythodrama. This study upholds Richard Oliver's perspective on Mythodrama as a genre of writing/literary work that employs great stories, usually (but not always) by William Shakespeare, that serve as a mythic case study of leadership themes or challenges.

Usurpation: In the *Ecclesiastical law* (1842, Vol 4.) by Richard Burn LL. D, it is the unlawful or violent seizure of a throne, power or an illegitimate or controversial claimant to power. In a legal perspective, the term is used to refer to the unconstitutional possession of political power, authority and influence that undermines the de jure leadership/king.

Deposition: The act of removing someone important from a powerful position.

Divine right of kingship: This is used in this study to refer to the theory of the kings' God-given birthright to govern, free of any human reproach, irrespective of their flaws and ineptitude.

The Renaissance Period: It means rebirth of knowledge that stretched between the 14th and 16th centuries according to David Thomson.

Procrastination: In the Oxford Students Dictionary, the term is defined as a delay in doing something that you should do; usually because you do not want to do it (564).

Exile: In this study, the word exile was used to mean banishment and excommunication of a person on grounds of transgression, such as, betrayal and disloyalty, as a punitive mechanism.

Assassination: According to Merriam Webster, it was defined as murder by sudden or secret attack often for political reasons

Monarch: In this study, the word was used to refer to a king or queen that serves as a sovereign or head of state, or a ruler of a kingdom. In this study, monarchial authority can either be by de jure or de facto.

Integrity: A tendency to act on moral/ethical grounds, especially in the face of a compromising situation.

Sacrilege: In this study, sacrilegious acts include acts of moral and cultural transgressions that are highly punishable by the enthroned law.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

A close reading of Shakespeare's selected political plays; *Macbeth*, *Henry IV: Part 1* and *Henry IV: Part 2* and *King Richard II* and other related literatures reveals that the concept of political legitimacy is polemic. The plays on one hand reveal that heredity is an essential quality for successful and peaceful leadership. On the other hand the plays show that heredity does not

guarantee longevity and peaceful tenure on the throne and neither does performance on the side of a usurper ensure his sustainability and peace in the regime. The central question is; what more could be done by each leader in their different modes of acquiring power to guarantee peace and long tenure in his or her regime. Therefore, this research examines how a leader should attain, sustain power and peace in his governance.

1.5.2 Specific Objectives

Therefore, the specific objectives of the study were:

1. To examine the dialectical representation of the De Jury kings in *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV: Part 1* and *Henry IV: Part 2*.
2. To explore the dialectical representation of the De Facto kings in *Macbeth*, *Richard II* and *Henry IV: Part 2* and *Henry IV: Part 2*.
3. To scrutinize the major lessons drawn from Shakespeare's representations of both De Jury and De Facto kings in four of his political plays.

1.6 Research Questions

The study was guided by three research questions, namely:

1. How does Shakespeare represent the weakness and strength of the de jury king/leaders in *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *King Henry IV: Part 1* and *Henry IV: Part 2*?
2. How does Shakespeare represent the strength and weaknesses of the De Facto kings/leaders in the four political plays.
3. What major lessons could be drawn from Shakespeare's presentation of both the De Jury and De Facto Kings/leaders in the four selected political plays?

1.7 Literature Review

The theme of leadership in Shakespeare's plays and in general has been widely studied. In the literature review I considered his plays and other researches of some scholars as resources.

The issue of leadership is important world over, often times people do not pay much attention to it and its likely consequences. In the Renaissance period which means rebirth of knowledge that stretched between the 14th and 16th centuries, there was a growing spirit of revolution and according to David Thomson, that spirit was a reaction against the establishments of the time, notably, the influential and powerful Roman Catholic Church, the despotic monarchical system of governance and the unduly-privileged nobility class which was documented by remarkable French thinkers, philosophers and men of letters.

In France the kings and ministers were in dilemma, and according to Thomson (1957), the situation was heading to a revolution since the king and his ministers with all their effort could not appease the middle class and the peasants in their demand for a greater share of political power and smaller taxation share without the destruction of the earlier on rights by which the nobles and the church monopolized all the lucrative/ juicy and enticing offices in the state. The second half of the 1830s witnessed the outbreak of revolutions in many European nations, such as, France, Belgium, German, Italy, Switzerland and in Poland" (165). There was an outbreak of civil wars in Spain and Portugal that ended in 1840. These revolutions were pretty unlike uprisings masterminded by the military because they were liberal in nature and spearheaded by the wealthy middle class. However, like any other uprising, the revolts were motivated by the desire to bring the established political leadership in touch with the common people. It should, however, be noted that in as much as the French revolution sparked other revolutions across

Europe, it was not the event of a single month or year, but its impact was felt as far as the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

According to Denis Richard (1977), the history of the 19th century was shaped by two revolutions, the French and the industrial revolutions. The French revolution, short and packed with drama, sent ideas of liberty and equality coursing like strong wine through the veins of Europe. These are the ideas which inspired men for a century or more afterwards to demand for a voice in their nation's affairs. This therefore points to the fact that the industrial revolution played the bigger part of the social transformation. The leaders at that time, according to Denis Richards, had the qualities of being strategic and intuitive thinkers who perceived change as a progressive that required a critical understanding of many things, as opposed to mere opportunism among the agitators of change and architects of revolutions. There were vital communicators who appreciated the importance of negotiation among dissenting parties in the institution that different levels, talent developers, innovation enablers who were aggrieved in many ways with the status quo advocated for both creativity and innovation. All these led to total transformation and also change in leadership in which the voice of the populace could be heard.

Today's leadership in Africa, generally, and Uganda in particular, has many loopholes because in choosing leaders many majorities of the people, in most cases do not consider the qualities of a good leader at the time of voting. For instance, in a survey done by *The Daily Monitor* team in Uganda during the 2021 presidential elections, titled, "What will Influence Voter's Decision in 2021 Elections" (31st July, 2020), Mr. Simon Nangiro, head of civil society organizations in Karamoja, was less enthusiastic about the elections, citing the candidates' tendency to give money to the electorates in return for political support as an impediment for electing valuable and capable leaders. He also argued that some electorates are taken up by the rhetoric of the

campaigners. Others are taken by looks. There are those who go by emotions or the family background of the campaigner. Consequently, people end up being led by leaders who cannot guide them for they can neither sustain the power nor care about their welfare.

Terry Eagleton (1986), said those who knew less of Shakespeare could be scantily of the know that his plays value social order and stability. The issue is that these two aspects of Shakespeare are in probable battle with one another. For a solidity of signs, each manifestation is an essential part of any social order (100). Yet it is all this which Shakespeare dramatically, cleverly and strikingly put into question. He goes on to say Shakespeare's conviction in social orderliness is susceptible by the very language in which it is expressed. It would seem, then that the very act of writing implies for Shakespeare's philosophy at odds with his political view. This is a highly awkward predicament and it is not astonishing that much of Shakespeare's plays is dedicated in finding out ways of resolving it (Eagleton 101).

Henry Kelly (1970) alleges that the history plays depicts patterns of sin and vengeance across the generation and highlights out that all appropriate accreditation in the plays themselves are part of the characterization of their speakers rather than an outlook to which the plays consent (36).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) says Shakespeare's major intent in the play Richard II is to show in king Richard the traits which made him incapable to rule, to display his intense futility in handling the public affairs, to present a play boy politician copying inefficiently with men seriously intent on the business of achieving what they want (52).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) in the article *leaders* adds that Richard is a victim of a type of kingship that is archaic. By his utterances and deeds, he brings that vision so vividly that Bolingbroke and others come up and oppose his vision (63-64).

Dowden (1912) in the *Introductory Studies of the Reveal Plays of Shakespeare* notes that life is to Richard II shows, a series of images, and to put himself into accordance with the advantageous requirement of his position. This is Richard's top need. He is likened to playing any part gracefully which he is called upon by situations to execute. But when he has the aesthetic sati drained the pleasures to be derived from the situation of life, he becomes an a novice in living not an artist (23).

By contrast Bolingbroke, composure and potent figure. There is nothing immeasurable in the character of Bolingbroke. However, he is a strong bound character. When he has achieved the aim of his ambition, he still aspires, but he doesn't hope towards anything above and far than that which was set before him. His ambition was then to have a grip on which he has energetically seized (28).

With the glorious image portrayal of Bolingbroke visa vises the tainted picture of Richard II. Does Bolingbroke also hold firmly his position as a usurper without threats? Wilders, Paul N, Siegel (1978) in the *Gathering Storm* emphasize that Shakespeare's interest in the history is that human beings are a product of their own actions. He contends that Elizabethan audiences did not have to be convinced about the need for order and obedience, they had to have a feeling of satisfaction to the utmost with what they had already accepted ((36).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) say; good leaders are product based i.e., result-oriented. In our world today one's achievements capture the attention of the people. Their visions and aspirations attract attention and pull people toward them. Intensity coupled with commitment is magnetic. And these extreme personalities do not have to force people to be drawn. They know what they are doing that, and are likened to a child absolutely taken up with creating a sand castle, for they

draw others in (42). This therefore doesn't call for a leader to relax whether he is a hereditary king.

Regarding Bennis and Mannus argue that the "Divine right of kings" has an ancient and vulnerable history. Saul, David and Solomon were "God's anointed" and were God's representative on earth. Some of the Roman Emperors proclaimed themselves to be divine in Medieval England. Even after Magna Carta, The English Monarch had tremendous power, yet the English people could always be trusted to show that a sincere admiration for the monarchy is analogous with a uniquely barbaric treatment of the monarch (51).

John Neville Figgis (1970) in the *Divine Rights of Kings*; despite the divine rights, God save the king- but God should also help him if his subjects should find him incompetent when need arises. Figgis says that many times since Richard II died at Pomfret, the English people can always be trusted to demonstrate the force of English sentiment for persons who have left their country to their country's own good (67).

Valeria Caggiano (2018) in his analysis of Richard II, says Richard is defined as a capricious character, a non-definite identity undecided in his choices and weak, without any strong sense of leadership. At the beginning Richard appears to be powerful but at the end of his parable, he reveals all his weakness, his body politic has crumbled (116).

Harry Berger agrees with the above when he cites John Halverson's (1994) claim that Richard was un aware of his contribution to the play's insult of being God's appointed; he does strongly believe in the divinity of his kingship. However, Richard also attributes his down fall largely onto be entirely the work of traitors and he pities himself. Berger goes on to say Shakespeare hence substitutes Holinshed royal victim with a complex character of Richard who seems to go

out of his way to get victimized and blames his victimization on others. If Richard is actively deceitful in his own undoing, if he is the usurper silent partner, if he plays a role of him being deposed, than Bolingbroke knows, then the depiction of Bolingbroke is entirely changed. Bolingbroke remains a usurper but he too awkwardly becomes Richard's victim in a way that he regrets his actions after deposing the King and vows to go for a pilgrimage for he has taken over from a divinely ordained King.

It is interesting to note that these Shakespearean leaders ranging from Richard, Duncan, Macbeth, Henry IV do not stay in power for long. According to Hersey and Blacardhs (1982) research has in the past years vividly supported the notion that there is no one best style of leadership. It is crucial for the leader who want to be successful and necessary to have a range of style at his or her disposal (33).

Shakespeare therefore in the histories shows conflicts in the mortal heroes who are kings. By trying to show the instability in different regimes, i.e the defacto and the dejury leaders we are left with the question of how a leader should attain, sustain stability and peace in his or her regime.

Veit Etzold , in his critical essay, "Power Plays: What Shakespeare can Teach on Leadership", acknowledges Shakespeare as both a great playwright and also a world psychologist, who, with great interest, would have looked at the markets and boardrooms both during and after the crisis, but would not be astonished by all the intrigues caused by both the small and big power plays by male managers and executives who no longer dressed as the kings and dukes of Shakespeare's era, but rather were identical to the immortal heroes of Shakespeare in their success, their victories and their defeats. King Lear clings to power for so long and ends up giving it to wrong

persons (8). Therefore the question is, what can current leaders positively borrow from Shakespeare's leadership modes in order to improve on the areas of their weaknesses?

Apoorva Bhardwaj (2014), in his essay, "Shakespeare on Leadership, Communication and Management: Implications for Cross-cultural Business Contexts", offers Shakespeare's perspectives on leadership and governance through his protagonists. His argument is that the Elizabethan dramatist depicts leaders with whom readers can easily identify. In his plays, Bhardwaj contends further, that Shakespeare dramatizes leaders whose tendency to use their positions, authority and influence for "supreme-entitlement", at the expense of their subjects, came with huge costs.

The above is greatly true especially for the de Jury leaders. An example is King Richard II, who has taken his leadership for granted and make himself comfortable, to the disgruntlement of the people whom they serve or lead. King Richard overtaxed his subjects.

King Henry's change from a soft people oriented to touch and rare King leave alone a cruel one is for political expedience. This remarkable congruity to the political thoughts espoused by Niccolo Machiavelli in his political treatise, *The Prince*. Machiavelli remarked that anyone who comes to power with the help of the great has to maintain himself in a more difficult way in comparison to the one who becomes a prince with the support of the populace. This is simply because the former will find himself with people who appear to be his equals and so he cannot command or order them around (39).

Accordingly, the leader may be at constant loggerheads with those great and in the long run enmity is created and this will negatively affect those who aided him to strike back or to reorganize themselves for a coup just as the Percy clan tried to fight back but lost the battle after prince Harry killed the gallant Hotspur.

Today's leaders can draw a lot from the way Shakespeare presented the leaders in most of his political plays. The wars and coups that we have experienced in this 21st century arises from leadership gaps that are not farfetched from Shakespearean time especially through the protagonist, the characters he uses in order to relay his message across. According to Apoorva Bharadwaj in his Journal *Shakespeare on Leadership Communication and Management*. Believes Shakespeare was not only communicating to the leaders at his time only. His idea cuts across even to the current generation of leaders. Whom I believe have borrowed a leaf on leadership. They expect complete submission from those they lead and at some time span correction. This is clearly true for there is a saying the 'the boss is right' and so there is a fear to critic even if the person is wrong. So, Apoorva highlights it. In the end they get trapped in their messes leading to their downfall. Shakespeare expects leaders in their different capacities to draw a lesson or two in his plays presentation which will eventually make them better leaders.

John W. Gardner (1990), in his essay, "On Leadership", views leadership as a process of persuading an individual or a team in pursuit of the objectives held or shared by the leader and those he is leading (Gardner). He, however, stresses that leadership should not be confused with power (2) In his view, leaders always have a certain degree of power embedded in their ability to motivate others, and yet there are many people with power (authority), but without leadership credentials (3). Ernst H. Kantorowicz (2016), in *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*, presents the duality of the king's body. That is, the belief that a legitimate or de jure king is partly divine, and partly human—the king is human by nature and divine by grace. This is in agreement with Julia Andrea Milica (1957), in "Royalty and Divine Right in William Shakespeare's Histories, *King John* and *Richard II*" (quoted in Baldwin Smith, 1975). He states that when James was enthroned the English monarch, he always validated his claim on

the English throne a divine right. As the kings believed they were chosen by God, like God, they did not feel bound to obey human laws. In other words, whether the king was good or bad, they felt they were leading on God's behalf, hence, there was no plausible reason in the overthrow of legitimate king by a citizen or a group of people. Therefore, kings were seen as divinely-installed and could not to be overthrown by either parliament or popular revolt since all these acts in this light of legitimacy portrays a betrayal of God's will. However, with that legitimacy, the Kings misused it to the disgruntlement of the people whom they serve or lead and end up being overthrown by De Facto leaders.

In *Richard II*, Shakespeare dramatizes the several attempts at protecting the king by enabling him correct his behavior or at least try to find a justification for his improper acts before accepting a deposition. According to Julia (2012), she said that Henry Bolingbroke needed to rely on the fact that Richard, despite his divine right, he did not befit being king and it was more disastrous to the country than him being the anointed King (473). Bolingbroke had to look at other gaps in Richard's leadership such as being corrupt, over taxation, being aloof, among others.

Basing on the French Revolution of 1789, France was governed on a monarchy-instituted feudal system that clearly stipulated the feudal relationships between king, aristocracy, clergy and all the rest of the population known as the third estate. David Thomson (1957), in "Europe since Napoleon" asserted; the kings right to govern was based on the same foundation of the rights and exemption of those who are privileged. Hence to invade this exceptional and archaic system meant even attacking the royal power and yet the king's power was considered unquestionable and there was no public authority with an assigned right to control or refute the power of a king to rule the way he wants (26-27).

Nevertheless, with all privileges, some of the monarchs were overthrown like in the reign of King Louis the 16th characterized by the infamous wife Marie Antoinette's extravagance and the notorious frivolity. She used her position and influence to thwart any projects of reform. Creating dissatisfaction among the underprivileged. I therefore concur with Thomson who said that if the privileged orders had been convinced to surrender their administrative and judicial privileges and their fiscal immunities, the situation may not have escalated to bloodshed and violence. (29). This is the same with King Richard.

Apoorva Bharadwaj (2014), in "Shakespeare on Leadership, Communication and Management: Implications for Cross-Cultural Business Contexts", further heightens the weakness of Shakespeare's political leaders. Apoorva argues that King Richard II believes in his title as English monarch is divine-installed as to expect unflinching compliance from his subjects. This divine-legitimacy of kings is also exemplified by King Lear who, even after giving away his kingdom to his "Pelican daughters" Goneril and Regan still carries the delusion that he is still with kingly power/authority, and so is Antony who believes that power does not come from the Romans, but rather is enshrined in him and can be used as he wished. Meaning the kings didn't care much about the repercussion of their leadership style. As long as one is enthroned, he thinks it is a done deal and so doesn't lead according to the people's expectations. They are later faced with challenges like opposition.

Niccolo Machiavelli (1532), in *The Prince*, sends a signal in his letter addressed to Prince Di Piero De Medic regarding power acquired through foul means by citing Agathocles, the Sicilian who, instead of seeking favors, attained military power and success through a careful military stratagem. Although this feat was achieved with heavy costs, he was able to hold on it for a long

time. Such methods, according to Machiavelli, may gain empire but not glory (13). For the sake of power, Machiavelli even recommends wickedness and cruelty.

He argues that it is difficult for those ruling by cruelty to maintain their estate. Therefore, in attacking the state, the attacker should scrutinize closely all the negativity which are essential and do them at once to avoid repeating it daily. By continually being in good terms with the people one rules, they will be able to feel secure and he will win over them by benefits. He who does the opposite due to laxity or evil advice, will always be forced to keep a knife in his hand. He cannot rely on his people and they too cannot come close to him because of the repetitive wrongs (14).

In fact, Chapter Three (3) of *The Prince* offers an illuminating “advice” to leaders to be politically watchful by saying:

The doctors say that the beginning of a severe fever is easy to cure but difficult to detect in the course of time not having been either detected or treated in the beginning, it becomes easy to detect but difficult to cure. This happens in affairs of state, for when evils that arise have been predicted [which only wise men can do] they can be quickly dealt with (4).

Machiavelli in other words calls for assertiveness and watchfulness as far as leadership is concerned. When a leader detects a danger or a problem, he can easily apply check and balance and find a solution than waiting for an ‘eruption’ to occur.

Unlike King Henry V, other Shakespearean Kings like King Macbeth, King Duncan, King Richard II, King Henry IV, do not retain their power for long.

King Henry V Tries to motivate his soldiers by instilling in them zeal to face risky situations that are challenging in nature, so he lures them with offers such as rewards other than using power.

This concurs with Richard Oliver and According to Richard Oliver, Julie verily (2008) in her essay Rehearsing Tomorrow's Leaders. The Potential of Mythodrama. When he said that many things are learnt that are relevant in respect to leadership in Henry's journal but key to it was his multi-faceted nature of his tasks where Henry's success emanated from him playing more than one role. (140).

Owing to the fact that he misspent youth, King Henry V aimed at establishing a reputable behavior, hence winning respect of his followers thus enabling him to unite them to a common legitimate purpose. This then led them to France to reclaim the land that belonged to England as a team. He too uses disguise as a way of identifying with them. He therefore uses his leadership skills to avert the challenges and the obstacles on his army's path

In Shakespeare's time, according to my analysis, both the De Jury and De Facto leaders were patched up with both weak and strong points, but were not on ground for long as a result of their personal weakness and if they had not under looked some and were more assertive, perhaps they would have not been overthrown.

Therefore, it is against the above background that the research is to dwell on. The research is to base on what did the De Jury and De Facts leaders in Shakespeare's play not do well, for a revolution to take place and what should they have done to consolidate their power.

The major issue is on the character weakness and the strength of other leaders that could be borrowed to balance their leadership for effectiveness in leadership. Apoorva Bhardwaj (2014) in a "Journal of Creative Communication" said:

If we scan Shakespeare's play, we find that some of the greatest persuasive speakers in literature, Henry, V mark Antony and Portia, use verbal adroitness for persuasion and argumentation (108).

According to him, some of those are qualities that a good leader should have, however I don't think persuasion alone can retain a leader into power, without other failings in character and that is why some of those leaders like King Duncan, Macbeth, and Richard II couldn't hold power for long.

The leadership in Shakespeare's plays not only apply in England but also World over. Some leaders have lost power including Kings in our century not because they wanted to but because of individual weakness. Richard Oliver, Julie Verity identifies some good aspects of leadership. He suggested that a leader should be an embodiment of openness, courage and have compassion necessary to enhance trust and positive relationships in and out of the organization. (141).

Verity goes onto add that having presence and authorizing in leadership is the result of a more complex bundle of skills, including hearing, seeing, touching, gaining trust and being open.

Bhardwaj (2014), said in his journal Creative Communication essay that authentic leaders are set to work, be objective to what is important and adopt well to meet new situations. The soldiers had a quality of emotional intelligence, are aware of their weaknesses and strength. They too are in position to elevate others for they deemed it right to follow other paths not because they are forced but because they feel it necessary. They protect, preserve their people and culture in a good way. Thus, building a basis for long term success and high performance, consistently inspire through hardships and are committed to see a changed world for the better (143).

In Shakespeare's political plays, apart from King Henry V. the rest of the leaders didn't have all the above qualities which the research will look at deeply to add on to the findings.

1.8 Justification

Judging from the above reference, it is important that a more focused study should be made, first by looking into personality of the de jure leaders, both in their strengths and their weaknesses.

Secondly to focus on the weaknesses and strengths of the de facto leaders and coming up with the lessons to be learnt as far as leadership is concerned before just generalization of the principles of a good leader.

1.9 Theoretical Framework

The study will be informed by the theory of deconstruction. In literature, deconstruction is a form of philosophical and literary analysis derived mainly from the work which began in the 1960s by the French philosopher Jacques Derrida. This theory questions the fundamental conceptual distinctions or oppositions in western philosophy through a close examination of the language and logic of philosophical and literary texts. This means that a literary text can have different meanings.

Deconstruction is oriented towards opening, expanding, amplifying and complexifying texts. According to Nicholas Royle, in the chambers dictionary 1993 edition, as cited in an anonymous letter, defines deconstruction as a method of critical analysis applied especially to literary texts which questions the ability of language to represent reality adequately, the critic asserts that no texts can have affixed and a stable meaning and that readers must eradicate all philosophical or other assumptions when approaching a text.

Silverman in a journal of new world science academy by Gooney A and Gooney K (1989) defines deconstruction as the reading of texts in terms of their marks, traces or in decidable features, in terms of their margins, limits or frame works, and in terms of their self-circumscription or self-delimitations as texts, (223).

The question is not looking for their meaning or its component parts or its systematic implications but rather by marking off its relations to other texts, its contexts, its subtexts. (Leitch 122) maintains that deconstruction aims at stopping a static approach to reading a text and promotes different interpretation to a text. It aims to decipher the stable truth of the work. The theory of deconstruction aims to give freedom to a text so that a different language could stem out of it and stand on its own, (Kearney 223). This brings out a fact that there is no fixed meaning to a text.

Therefore, deconstruction is a strategy of critical questioning directed towards exposing unquestionable metaphysical assumption and internal contradiction in philosophical and literary language. Deconstruction often involves away of reading that concerns itself with decentering- with unmasking the problematic nature.

In deconstruction, the text meaning differs from reader to reader. Shakespeare talks about leadership as if he is promoting de jury on one hand, but on the other hand, he is interested in both. In Shakespeare's work using deconstruction. We see that a text has various meaning. Shakespeare gives good qualities to a man who is bad. This therefore shows that one has to be both black and white.

Shakespeare also deconstructs the idea of time. Despite the fact that Shakespeare wrote his plays in the 16th century, his plays on leadership seems to cut across to the 21st century. Shakespeare a great psychologist of the world according to Veit Etzold (2012), on "What Can Shakespeare Teach on Leadership", said Shakespeare could have as a visionary looked ahead of time in terms of leadership, this is because the big men, leaders of the time, managers, executives who do not dress like the kings and dukes of Shakespeare's plays can be identified with the immortal heroes of Shakespeare in both their victories and downfalls.

This study used deconstruction theory in the analysis of the De Jury, and De Facto leadership qualities. You cannot narrow down the legitimacy of a King. The meaning of a text is complex and multiple. There are loopholes in each leaders and good in all. So what constitutes legitimacy is both. For example, in *Macbeth*, Shakespeare seems to portray character weakness of Duncan but at the same time does not promote or justify Macbeth's intention of killing Duncan.

1.10 Significance of the Study

The study is significant in that it offers a unique Shakespearean perspective on the question of leadership and governance from which vital lessons can be drawn to improve contemporary politics, governance and leadership in the twenty first century globalized world.

1.11 Research methodology

This research is basically qualitative research. It is library-based research on the four plays which is *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV: Part 1* and *Henry IV: Part 2* as my primary sources and other literatures related to the area of study acted as secondary sources.

I have used the textual analysis method which involved a polemic reading of the texts, looking into the personality of both the dejury and the defacto leaders through the analysis of the character traits. This was done through the scrutiny from what other characters say about them, what they themselves say and what they do.

Firstly, in the character trait analysis, I drew the positive character traits of the dejury leaders. Traits that make them stay in power or win them favor from the populace. Secondly, I analyzed the weaknesses in their characters as presented in the text.

Thirdly, I also looked into the positive traits of the defacto leaders as presented through what they say, do and what others say about them. This was followed by examining the negative

attributes of the personalities of each of the defacto leaders that was a contributing factor to their downfall.

The data collected from the scrutiny of the personality traits of both the dejury and defacto leaders was subjected to a critical analyses and interpretation using deconstruction as propounded by Jacques Derrida. The chapters followed the objectives of the study which are: Chapter One is the Introduction and Background of the Study which includes, background to the study, statement of the problem, objectives, scope of the study, definitions of key terms, justification/significance, literature review and theoretical frame work.

This was followed by Chapter Two which analyzed the dialectical representation of De Jury kings in *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV: Part 1* and *Henry IV: Part 2*.

Then followed by Chapter Three which analyzed the dialectical representation of the De facto leaders in *Richard II* and *Henry IV: Part 1*, *Henry IV: Part 2*, and *Macbeth*.

Next is Chapter Four which is a critical analysis of the lessons drawn from Shakespeare's presentation of the two leadership styles, De Jury and De Facto. Finally, Chapter Five which is about the conclusion and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

PRESENTATION OF THE PROS AND CONS OF SHAKESPEARE'S DE JURY KINGS

IN *MACBETH*, *RICHARD II*, *HENRY IV: PART 1* AND *HENRY IV: PART 2*

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the de jury kings in the plays, *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV: Part 1* and *Henry IV: Part 2*. I have selected three de jury kings: These kings are King Duncan, King Edward the king of England and Richard II. These kings have strength and weaknesses or call them pros and cons that I seek to analyze in this chapter.

2.2 Strengths of the De Jury Kings

The first de jury king is King Duncan. King Duncan as a king with divine right is represented as a graceful, peaceful, secure, trusting, rewarding king. He is gracious in that he rewards his subjects generously. For example, he rewards Macbeth with promotion as soon as he demonstrates royalty by fighting hard to ensure that the Norwegian rebels are suppressed. While congratulating Macbeth on his victory, Duncan says; 'I have begun to plant thee and will labour to make thee full growing.' (I: 4 ll. 29-30). In these lines Duncan expresses his readiness to nurture Macbeth into leadership.

More evidence of Duncan's rewarding tendencies is seen when the king becomes excited about Macbeth's victory and even before Macbeth arrives at his palace, Duncan sends Ross to greet Macbeth the Thane of Glamis, with another honor of being the Thane of Cowdar. Macbeth then gets two titles. In Act 1, Scene 2, Duncan was heard saying:

No more that thane of Cowdar shall /Deceive Our bossom interest. Go pronounce
/his present death /And with his former /title greet Macbeth. (Act 1.2.ll. 65-68,
.13).

The quotation above shows that Macbeth is to take over from Macdonwald as the Thane of Cowdar because Macdonwald had connived with the Norwegian rebels to attack Scotland. This promotion or reward is as evidence of Duncan's generous heart. He recognizes Macbeth as being hard working, after winning the battle against the Norwegian rebels and secures Scottish boundaries.

Duncan's gracefulness is further portrayed by Macbeth when he soliloquizes about giving up the killing of Duncan. He says to Lady Macbeth:

We will proceed no further in this business: /He has honored me of late; and I have bought /Golden opinions from all sorts of people /Which would be worn now in their newest gloss, /Not cast aside so soon (Act I: VII Line 31-35 p.41).

The citation above shows that Macbeth recognizes the moral integrity of Duncan as a king. Duncan has honoured Macbeth. In addition to being rewarding, the king is well talked about by people. This can be attributed to his being law abiding. As a divine right king, he does not consider himself to be above the law. .

Another of the strength of King Duncan is that he trusts his people. For example, King Duncan had entrusted the Northern part of Scotland to his lieutenant the Thane of Cowdar. In Act 1.4, Duncan confesses the absolute trust he had put in the former Thane of Cowdar;

There's no art to find the minds /Construction in the face. /He was a gentleman on /Whom I built an absolute trust (ll 13-16).

The king who rules by God's grace finds it difficult to suspect people of being evil basing on their looks because he judges people by their actions not looks which are deceptive. As the adage goes, 'never judge a book by its cover.' As a good king, Duncan had trusted his former chief. However, he ended up by being betrayed by Macdonwald the thane of Cowdar who deceived the

King into believing he was a loyal servant. The Thane of Cowdar connived with the Norwegian rebels to attack the boarder of Scotland. Thanks to the intervention of Macbeth another Scottish General and a Thane that saved Scotland from being colonized by Norway, Macbeth's achievement is well documented by the bleeding Sergeant who in Act 1 scene 2, The Captain describes Macbeth's art in fighting as follows:

For brave Macbeth- well he deserves that name/Fortune with his brandished steel,
which smoked with bloody/Execution, like valour's minion carved his passage till
he faced/The slave; which ne'er shook hands, nor bade farewell to him till He
unsealed him from the naves to the chaps and fixed his head/Upon our
battlements. (ll 16- 21)

The citation above brings out the bravery of Macbeth as a warrior for he managed to wage war until the enemies of Scotland were defeated.

The king's quality of trusting is further seen in Duncan's paying a visit to Macbeth, with his heir, both unguarded. King Duncan even spends a night at his subject's place. All was due to the fact that his heart was clean and he trusted easily. Seen from another perspective, this strength of Duncan later turns out to be as a weakness that leads to his being murdered at Macbeth's home by Macbeth, a man he trusted.

Ernst Kantorowicz belief in the duality of kings, that is to say the king is partly divine and also human, gives the legitimate kings like Duncan confidence, owing to the fact that kings are chosen by God, are like God and so know that their security is guaranteed and could not be overthrown. Therefore, Duncan's over trusting stems from the fact that he knew he was a legitimate king and therefore saw his position as not being under any threat. It is that oversight that led to him being murdered.

Andreca Julica (2012) in her article "Royalty and Divine Rights" also concurs with Kantorowicz on the theory for it viewed that the legitimacy of the king's authority as ascending from "above"

has played a great role in ensuring maximum respect and obedience from the people he rules. That authority also ensured protection of the king no matter the decisions he took. (142). ironically it created a lot of laxity on King Duncan that he did not even see his death coming so soon. He was killed by one of his most trusted loyal Macbeth.

King Duncan is further presented as a man of good virtue. He is depicted as peaceful, graceful and has no reason to fear. The King is not tyrannical and doesn't kill except the enemies of Scotland. In Act 1, scene 4, Macbeth in a monologue says:

This Duncan has borne his faculties, /So meek hath been so clear in his great/Office that his virtue will plead like angels.

In Act 2 scene 2, Macbeth finally justifies the reasons for cancelling the plot to kill King Duncan. He argues that he has no intention to kill the king, and remarked that it was only his overwhelming ambition which overleaps itself and falls on the other side.'

Even, after the killing of King Duncan, in Act 2 Scene 2, Macbeth becomes so remorseful for killing a divine right King. Macbeth says that not even the water of the ocean can wash out the blood from his hand. By this he means his sin is incurable. It is a sacrilege indeed. Macbeth relates his fears that the two young men in the king's chamber had probably seen his "hang man's hands". He also laments that he had wanted to pray because he was in need of God's mercy but lo and behold, he could not even say "Amen" when he tried to do so the "Amen' the prayer got stuck in his throat" yet he was in most need of prayer. Shakespeare portrays Bolingbroke's yearning for prayer in form of holy pilgrimage after the death of Richard II. This situation explains the importance of a de jure king they are really special kings.

Shakespeare further shows the benefits accruing to the dejected king by the manner of lament for King Duncan when he dies. In Act 2.3, Macduff eulogizes Duncan in these words; “a most sacrilegious murder had broken open the Lords anointed temple and stole hence the life of the building.” Macduff’s words point to one fact, that King Duncan is an anointed servant of God. This is why killing him is considered sacrilegious. He was divinely appointed. This is why he is referred to as the House of God. As a king, he is a giver of life because he mediates between God and the people. Therefore, the act of regicide committed by Macbeth is an abomination.

When Macduff flees to England to seek for help in ousting the tyrannical Macbeth from power, he meets with Malcolm the son to the fallen king and laments about Duncan to the son as follows; ‘thy royal father was a most sainted king.’ This remark too, points to the de jure king as a man who led by the grace of God.

This is why after Macbeth kills King Duncan an anointed servant of God; his life is not the same. Whatever Macbeth does prove he has fallen out of grace. For example, first Macbeth sheds the blood of the innocent guards. Next, in Act 2, scene 2, Macbeth tells lies that the king is in his chamber when actually the king is dead., Macduff calls on to see the king, Macbeth unashamedly, tells him: “I ‘ll bring you to him” and leads him to the door of the king’s chamber well knowing that, the king is already dead.

Naked greed for power drives Macbeth to murder Banquo arguing that the latter’s sons should not succeed the throne Act in act 3 scene 1 giving reason that the weird sisters hailed Banquo father to a line of kings and upon his head, the witches placed a fruitless crown. Line 60-61. For this, Macbeth is haunted by the ghost of Banquo. Finally, the state of unrest and more or less madness prompts Macbeth to consort with the witches. The equivocation of the witches hastens Macbeth’s downfall. Macbeth also deserts the wife. Lady Macbeth becomes unwell.

Macbeth's wife, Lady Macbeth suffers a strange disease for masterminding the plot to kill Duncan. Out of too much guilt for example, in Act 4 scene 2, Lady Macbeth hallucinates about Duncan's blood; 'here's the smell of the blood still; all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand. Oh! Oh! Oh!' lady Macbeth. This is an indicator of guilty of the fact that her and the husband killed the innocent people. The effect on her is too much that she now sleepwalks. The doctor too becomes confused on how to diagnose the sickness when he tells the lady in waiting in Act 5, scene I, that the disease is above his practice as a doctor yet he was of the knowing those who have sleep walked and died peacefully in their beds. This means that lady Macbeth is suffering from psychological torture and the doctor suggests that she needs more of divine than the physician. This means that she needs God's intervention more.

Shakespeare further supports the case of the de jure kingship by depicting a parallel view of the king of England. We do not see much of him in the play, except being mentioned of as the king who hosts Malcom the son and heir to the fallen king Duncan, when he flees to exile for refuge. Malcom shares with Macduff that this king of England is a divine right king who has special attributes; he is represented as a secure, peaceful and with divine power. According to Malcom the king has virtues like piousness, hospitality and healing. His hospitality is expressed by a Lord who talks to Lenox about the whereabouts of Malcom and Macduff by saying:

The son of Duncan, from whom this tyrant holds the due of birth, lives in the English court, and is received of the most pious Edward with such grace that the malevolence of fortune nothing takes from his high respect. /Thither Macduff is gone to pray the holy king upon his aid. /To wake up Northumberland and war like Siward that by the help of these (with him above to ratify the work) we may again give our tables meat, sleep to our nights (Act 3:6 line 24-34).

From the above, we see Macduff as to have gone to the King of England to seek the king's aid in overthrowing Macbeth's reign so that Scotland can recover its lost peace.

This king of England is further portrayed as a king who can heal mysterious sicknesses by a mere touch because he is divine. The king's power springs from his being a representative of God. In Act 5, scene 3, the doctor testifies to the healing powers of this divine right king by stating that:

There are a crew of wretched souls that stay his cure. /Their malady convinces the
great assay of art but at his touch, /Such sanctity has heaven given his hand.
(II 141-143).

Similarly, Malcom describes the de jury king as follows:

A most miraculous work in this good king, /Which often since my here remain in
England, /I have seen him do. How he solicits heaven; himself/Best knows; but
strangely visited people, all swoln and /Ulcerous, pitiful to the eye, the mere
despair of surgery /He cures, hanging a golden stamp about their necks, /Put on
with holy prayers; and 'tis spoken to the succeeding /Royalty he leaves the
healing benediction (Act IV.III).

Furthermore, Malcom in his conversation with Macduff, in act IV scene 3 reveals that the king has a heavenly gift of prophesy and sundry blessings hang about his throne that speak him full of grace. (Lines 155-158). Thus, this King who is identified as Edward the King of England is described as a benevolent ruler who is loved by God and his subjects. He did not have to fight for power; hence he is not insecure about losing it.

Furthermore, Shakespeare uses contrast to highlight the gracefulness of the de jury king. In contrast, Macbeth is represented as a murderer thereby making his subjects to fear him, so he is not favored by God. Shakespeare tries to bring the issue of morality or role of a good king. Only a morally virtuous king can bring healing and make his people to benefit and hence an overall health to the nation.

By inference, King Duncan can be likened to the king in England, whose presence brings healing and comfort to the lives of his subjects. After the death of Duncan, there is no peace except for lamentations. Banquo says the house is robbed of its life. The king of England too is a source of life, comfort, peace and healing to his subjects as seen when Malcom tells Macduff about the virtuous part of the king.

Another de jury king is Richard II. He is represented as a very confident and complacent king. King Richard becomes king by virtue of his inheritance and all powerful. He is the eldest son of King Edward III's eldest son. So he is a legitimate heir to the throne. Richard is mortal with some failings which contribute to his being deposed as a King. Despite the fact that he has a lot of shortcomings, he too has his strength though much of his strength is shown during his deposition and imprisonment as a dramatic figure. At the beginning of the play we see some of his benefits too as a de jury king

At first in the beginning of the play, Richard exhibits qualities of a good king like being a listener, and a fair judge. Linn Michael D, A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays also clearly brings it out when he says;

For a modern audience, Richard II first appears as a good king /Because he has a gift of pageantry. He uses words well and acts /Very well the role of king in public, yet for Shakespeare's audience, /Richard was a bad king whose deposition was perhaps inevitable /But whose murder was avenged only by half – century of civil war (78).

According to the above citation, Linn attempts to bring out the fact that Shakespeare represented Richard as a good king, a man who could speak well but later from Shakespeare's representation of king Richard, he brings out his weaknesses that almost overshadowed the good part of the king. Thereby proving that he is not fit to rule.

In Act I scene I, King Richard is presented as a fair judge. This is seen in his doubt of Bolingbroke who has a case against Mowbray of fraud and treason. He is not satisfied with the accusation and thinks it is out of malice but he consults his uncle John of Gaunt who also confirms that he too has seen Mowbray as a danger. "As near as I could sift him on that argument on some apparent danger seen in him aimed at your highness no inveterate malice." line 12-14.

Richard does not base on one side alone. "Call them to our presence." Act 1:1 line 14. Despite listening to Henry's accusation, he too wishes Mowbray, to defend himself. "Ourselves will hear the accuser and the accused freely speak" (I:1, pg. 3).

Shakespeare presents him as a peaceful king, who listens to the two parties speak. When Richard asks Mowbray about Henry's accusation, Mowbray insists on proving his innocence by allowing them to be tried. He is adamant, full of rage and doesn't want peace. However, as a man of peace, the King tells the two to end the argument without bloodshed. 'Let's purge the choler without letting blood. Forget, forgive, conclude and be good.' Act 1:1 line 153-156. Despite his plea, Lord Marshal prepares them for a fight and the King stops that act. He interrupts the combat this as he states in act one scene three;

For that our kingdom's earth should not be soiled /With that dear blood which it has fostered. /And for our eyes do hate the dire aspect of civil wounds ploughed up with neighbors. (Act 1, Scene 3).

The king in the citation above knew the consequence of a duel, it could lead to bloodshed. Blood that is shed especially innocently tantamount to a curse not only to the killer but also to the nation since the king had willed the battle. The king had to immediately stop the combat from fighting.

Just like Macbeth is disturbed after the killing of King Duncan, we see Bolingbroke too disturbed at King Richard's death. Having been murdered by Sir Piers Exton, one of Bolingbroke's men, in Act 5 scene 6, Bolingbroke expresses his disappointment when he says; "Exton I thank thee not, for thou has wrought a deed of slander with thy hands upon my head and all this famous land."

Despite Exton defending himself saying he did the killing because it came from the king's (Henry IV) mouth. The king shows his disappointment in his reply that though he did wish Richard dead, he hates the murderer. And because of that, he banishes Exton. "With Cain go wander thorough shade of night and never show thy head by day or by night." Act 5:6 line 43-44

In order to atone the blood of the slain king, King Henry suggests going for a pilgrimage:

Come mourn with me for what I do lament. /And put on sullen black incontinent.
/I'll make a voyage to the Holy land. /March sadly after, grace my mourning here
in weeping after this untimely bier (Act 5:6 line 47-52).

But on the political scene Shakespeare tries to show that no matter how bad a king may be, there was no justification in trying to separate/deposing a divinely ordained King from power. This is seen when the King's uncle hesitates to have him deposed simply because he is a divinely ordained King. The sacred position of the King was protected with an aim of correcting his behavior. Despite his weaknesses the Uncle Gaunt had to stand by him instead of the banished son. He does not revenge even for the brother's death simply because as a human being, he cannot question God's will. In Act 3 scene 2, Gaunt blames his brother's death on God and not Richard because according to him Richard is God's substitute and deputizes him in his presence. He remarks that if Gloucester was killed wrongfully, then let it be heaven to avenge and not him. (ll 38-42)

2.3 Weaknesses of the De Jury Kings

Despite this apparently glorious sanctified image of the de jury kings, Shakespeare shows the shortcomings of the de jury kings. For example, by bringing in the loopholes for losing power, one of them is having absolute trust in his people. A case in point is King Duncan.

Despite King Duncan's virtues, there are various ways in which Duncan as a king is portrayed as weakling in the brief time he is seen in the play. Being politically naïve is one major aspect highlighted in *Macbeth*. He has a civil war along the border of his country which he knew nothing about. In Act 1:2 the sergeant reports what he saw in the battlefield, with regard to Macbeth's performance. The sergeant relates as follows:

As sparrows, eagles, or the hare the /lion. If I say sooth, I must report /they were as cannons overcharged/with double cracks; so they doubly /redoubled strokes upon the foe except/they meant to bathe in reeking wounds, /or memorize another Golgotha. (ll 35-41).

In Act 4 scene 3, Ross also reports how the disloyal traitor the Thane of Cowdar assisted the Norwegians to spur rebellion but in the end, victory fell on them (the scots). For any King, this would be a sign of weakness for it signifies that he has no control over his own people. Therefore, King Duncan's lack of control over his people does not make him a good Shakespearean candidate in leadership. Lalley James C (1990), in his dissertation, "Lessons in Leadership; in inference to Duncan argues that:

A Shakespearean leader is not just a visionary dreamer, he must be a man of action. He translates vision into political plans and projects. He must set out to do something and do something significant. Fight a major battle, regain lost kingdom, gain new lands and glory and often in the world of Shakespeare these plans involve war. (50)

However, Duncan sits and relaxes. He simply hears of a battle won in his own kingdom which he knew nothing about. He does not go to the battle field; he simply receives a report of what is happening there. To Shakespeare from the above citation, King Duncan is proved weak.

Another aspect of Duncan weakness is his over trusting, which does not only contribute to a civil war but also to the loss of his life. A case in point is trusting Macdonwald the Thane of Cowdar with managing the northern part of Scotland. As stated before, this is a man whom Duncan had put absolute trust. But Macdonwald ends up betraying Duncan when he connived with the Norwegians. He assisted the Norwegians to spur rebellion but for the timely intervention of Macbeth, Scotland was saved from the attack. In Act 1:2 the sergeant reports 'But the Norwegian lord surveying vantage with furbished arms and new supplies of men began a fresh assault.' The bleeding sergeant continues to report as he praises the brave Macbeth who dared to fight Macdonwald. He says:

For brave Macbeth- well he deserves that name, disdainful /Fortune with his brandished steel, which smoked with bloody /Execution, like valour's minion carved his passage till he face /The slave; which ne'er shook hands, nor bade farewell to him till /He unsealed him from the naves to the chaps and fixed his head /Upon our battlements. (Il 16- 23)

Commenting on Duncan's laxity, Linn D stresses Machiavelli's words in *The Prince*, "a prince cannot be morally perfect in an imperfect world without affecting his own destruction." pp78. If the king had known that the world is not as perfect as it seems before him, he would have been careful and no wonder he was betrayed by his so called 'trusted loyals'. The king's naivety of personality can be confirmed from his own words when Macbeth tells him about Macdonwald's death. He said it is difficult to read one's mind by simply looking at their appearances. Act 1:4

The king like any man finds it difficult to read one's mind in the face, meaning that looks are deceptive. As the adage goes, 'never judge a book by its cover.' The king over trusted and he ended up being betrayed.

One would think that Macdonwald's treachery would have alerted him into not banking much trust in his loyals. Ironically the King remains trusting people absolutely. For instance, he invests all his trust in Macbeth again, whom he sees as the worthiest loyal servant. He over trusts Macbeth to an extent that he pays him a visit at his home and spends a night at Macbeth's place. King Duncan talks to Lady Macbeth 'fair noble hostess, we are your guests tonight.' Act 1:6. Macbeth too when deliberating on to kill or not to kill the king confirms the presence of the king at his place:

The King is at my place in double trust, /First as I am his kinsman and his subject
/Strong both against the deed then as his host (ll 24-25).

It is this naivety of Duncan, reflected in over trusting people that gives the ambitious Macbeth the chance to seize the nearest cut to the throne by murdering Duncan.

Another loop hole for losing power is the old age dotage. As an old man, he easily gets excited on hearing about a won battle by his generals. And hurries to reward Macbeth with promotion before Macbeth arrives to the palace. He sends Ross to greet Macbeth the Thane of Glamis, with honourship of being the Thane of Cowdar. Macbeth then gets two titles. The king then orders the execution of Macdonwald the traitor. In Act 1:3 Duncan says that what Macdonwald has lost, noble Macbeth has won. The news coincided with the supernatural premonition on Macbeth being Thane of Cowdar and later king. Macbeth decides to pave his way to the throne by murdering the king.

It is the same old age excitement which makes Duncan the king name the heir to his estate before his death, as Malcom the eldest son as prince of Cumberland. This premature decision makes Macbeth plan to seize the shortest cut to the throne. Macbeth becomes more assertive on what to do to eliminate that from happening or him becoming a future King.

In King Duncan, Shakespeare presents a good but artless leader. Duncan was not vigilant. He was short sighted in running the affairs of his kingdom, Duncan over entrusts the affairs to his loyal like Macdonwald the Thane of Cowdar. In act 1:4. Duncan confesses to Macbeth who had just returned from saving the northern part of Scotland from invasion that he had put absolute trust in Macdonwald; "he was a gentleman in whom I built an absolute trust." Macdonwald ends up betraying him by conniving with the rebels to invade Scotland. This over trust is further seen in going to visit the castle of Macbeth without his army protecting him. Macbeth takes advantage of the king lacking protection. In fact, the blue eyed man of the king later he turns into 'a green snake in the grass' by plotting to kill the king and executing him in order to take over the throne.

Both Duncan tendency to over trust and his getting easily excited show that he is not politically watchful. He as a King plans to visit Macbeth in his palace and intends to spend a night there. Yet it is not advisable for a king to sleep at a subject's place, Moreover, un guarded. He did not really think twice of his decision which eventually led to his untimely death as he was murdered from the very home of the man he trusted.

The dramatist uses contrast to highlight Duncan's lack of political watchfulness. Unlike his father, Malcom seems aware that appearance can be deceptive. In act one scene seven, Malcom decides to go into exile immediately after the father's fate citing that the same people who killed Duncan could as well seek for them. Malcom's political watchfulness is seen further in act 4

scene 3, when he still doesn't trust in Macduff when he comes to see him in exile. Because Macduff was a most loved by Macbeth and he loved Macbeth too. Malcom thinks he has come to harm him, line 12-15. Malcom therefore, tests Macduff to ascertain whether he is a good man by probing him on why he left the loved family behind:

I have lost my hopes, /why in that rawness left you wife and child. /Those precious motives, those strong knots of love- /without leave taking? I pray /let not my jealousies be your dishonours, /but mine own safeties; you may be /rightly just, /whatever I shall think (ll 24-31).

Not until he is sure of Macduff's sincerity, does he disclose to him their plan of seeking aid in order to overthrow the tyrant Macbeth. Donalbain just like his brother Malcom, too is politically watchful, he says in Act 4, scene 1, "there's daggers in men's' smiles. The nearer in blood, the nearer bloody". Meaning a man can never be trusted. Even a closest friend or relative can be treacherous and dangerous. Therefore, this cautions on being extremely careful even to those so close. After the death of the father, he decides to take off for his safety.

Like Duncan, another de jury King Richard is portrayed as a king with weaknesses. Although the king ascended to the throne without any queries as discussed earlier under advantage of a de jury king, Richard exhibits some weaknesses namely;

Henry Bolingbroke, the King's cousin accused Thomas Mowbray of high treason, murder and a conspiracy which involved death of Richard and Henry's uncle the Duke of Gloucester. King Richard instead of acting quickly as a king with vested powers in handling the situation, delays to give feedback and lets a duel between the two lords to take place as a way of deciding who is right and wrong.

The king is hesitant in decision making, call it procrastination. He first agrees that Mowbray and Bolingbroke fight a duel to end their feud. No sooner had he agreed than he stopped the fight and decides to banish the two which was a big mistake signaling his own weaknesses that precipitated the crisis of his end of reign. His indecisiveness in forbidding the resulting duel and the hasty banishment of Mowbray and Henry shows his weakness as a leader.

This indecisiveness was an element of shortsightedness on his part. Hardly had the herald announced the beginning of the fight, when King Richard changes his mind to stop the fight and banishes both. Harry was banished for ten years which was later reduced to six years and to Mowbray, he was to be exiled for life. Therefore, it becomes so confusing as to who is right and who is wrong, who is a treacherous and who is an embodiment of justice and by doing so, the king's power becomes questionable. He therefore perpetuates his own deposition since in his hesitation, he fails the expectation people have in him as a divinely ordained king to uphold justice and to punish treason and to side with the righteous. Richard undermines his own position which seemed secure through inheritance.

As David Thomson put it in his book *Europe since Napoleon* (1957), p 26-27. David talks about the privileged positions of kings by saying that the right to rule was based on the rights and immunities of the privileged orders. Therefore, to attack that structure implied any other rank including royal power which was not accepted because a king was given autonomous authority and hence no populace or masses could stand in his way to govern as he chose. (26-27). For that matter Richard never consulted his elders for better governance and neither did the elders like Gaunt his uncle interfere with his governance even if they saw that something was amiss with the way King Richard handled his kingship. This stems from the fact that the king's authority was

absolute. That absoluteness made Richard to govern as he chose leading to his downfall. especially when he decides to banish Harry.

The decision to banish Harry his cousin brought sorrow in the heart of his uncle John of Gaunt. This is due to the fact that he deprived him of his son and heir to the throne. In act 1, scene 1, Gaunt expresses fear that he may never see his son's return when he says; 'My inch taper will be burnt and done, and blindfold death not let me see my son.' lines 123-124.

Another weakness of King Richard as an administrator is revealed in his poor judgement. The banishment of Mowbray for life before he is tried, hurt Mowbray so much for he says he had learnt his native language for 40 years and now with going into exile, his tongue will be of no use. In Act 1:3 Mowbray laments about the consequence of his banishment on his language when he says:

The language I have learnt these forty years, my /native English, now I must forgo
and now my /tongue's use to me is no more /than an unstrung viol or harp (ll
159-162).

His cry creates empathy among the readers for we don't know if justice prevailed in the king's decision. In other words the truth was never established because in Act1 scene 3, Mowbray still confessed his innocence even before banishment, when Bolingbroke forces him to confess Mowbray says:

No Bolingbroke, if ever I were traitor, /My name be blotted from the book of life.
/And I from heaven banished as from hence. /But what thou art, God, thou, and I
do know /And all too soon, I fear, the king shall rue. /Farewell my liege. Now no
way can I stray- /Save back to England all the world's my way (ll 201-207).

Because of this injustice, King Richard becomes insecure after the banishment of both Mowbray and Bolingbroke citing a possibility of the two meeting in exile. The king becomes suspicious of a possible retaliation and thereby he decides to subject them to an oath of never meeting to

conspire against him. “You never shall, so help your truth and God. Embrace each other’s love in banishment” (Act I.III).

Richard’s weakness as a king hail partly from his shallow interpretation of the divine rights of kings. He believed in absoluteness of his authority from birth a Tudor concept of the divine right of kings which is based upon the laws of God and nature. Consequently, Richard does not take the responsibility of looking after his subjects. He becomes accountable to none but himself doing things that please him most.

Another aspect of the king’s weakness is abuse of power. He is greedy and extravagant. Since he lacks the checks and balance as far as his leadership is concerned, the king levies heavy taxes on the poor and also over taxes the rich, an act which was fatal and could not be tolerated. For he ends up being hated as the populace will see him as wasteful. Linn Michael cites Machiavelli’s words in the Prince where Machiavelli asserts that for anyone to behold the name of liberal among men, it was needful to have a good life in so much as a prince and that life shall lead him to waste all his revenues and in a long run will lead to tarnishing of one’s reputation. This gives an explanation why a ruler should be careful about financial matters and not concern himself with liberality;

Of liberality, heavily to burden his subjects, and become a great /Exactour and put in practice all those things that can be done /To get many. Which begins to make him hateful to his subjects /And fall into every one’s contempt ... (59).

Machiavelli is trying to bring about money as an important factor in either building or ruining a leader. A leader who is wasteful with resources shall in the end impose a heavy burden on his subjects as a way of making amends. This may not go well in the long run and instead will invite hatred from the people he leads who might decide to fight against the wasteful regime and that

will mark the end of the king's reign. Among some of the weakness of king Richard that led to his downfall was being greedy and robing the poor.

In Act 1, scene 4, Richard's greediness is exposed when Bushy reports Gaunt's illness to the king. Instead of the king being sympathetic to his uncle, King Richard quickly wishes him death. This ultimately makes him inconsiderate. It all arises simply because he was extravagant and wants money to fund his rebellious wars in Ireland. "our coffers with too great a court and liberal largess are grown somewhat light." Says the king as he is told of the rebels by Green. Richard is so greedy and no wonder John Gaunt a dying man predicts Richard's failure as king.

In Act 2 scene 1, Gaunt describes Richard's excessive greed as follows: He "retires betimes that spurs too fast betimes with eager feeding. The food doth choke the feeder Light vanity, insatiate cormorant..." (ll 31-38.)

In Act 2, scene 1, Gaunt further talks of sleeping the England which he has watched and it haunts him. He tells the king that although he, Gaunt is sick, Richard is sicker. England is Richard's deathbed though he is too sick. At his death bed, "O no, thou diest, though I the sicker be. Thy deathbed is no lesser than thy land." Gaunt further tells the king that he is more of a "land lord of England and not king in (ll. 114), for he has betrayed his royal inheritance.

Despite all the warning Richard, blinded by his overconfidence, greed and inconsideration, the king grabs Gaunt's possession upon his death in order to finance his war; Richard confesses: "Towards our assistance we do seize to us the plate, coin, revenues and movables where of our uncle did stand possessed." (ll.160-163). As a result of grabbing Gaunt's property, the king grows increasingly infamous among his most trusted loyal and subjects.

Another weakness of Richard is that as a de jury king, he enjoys being flattered and being praised by the people. Because he is sure of his tenure on the throne, he takes things for granted. He does not choose wise friends who would positively and critically advise him where he is going wrong. His flatterers are: Bushy, Bagot and Green. Their names suggest they are green caterpillars living in the Bush and are devourers of every fruit in the garden of England. These three men cost Richard his kingdom. Linn Michael cites, a quotation from 'The Mirror for Magistrates' to sum up Richard's vices as follows:

A kyng that ruled by all lust that forced not of virtue, right /Or lave but always put false flatterers most in trust ensuing /Such as could by Richard's uncle clawe by faithful counsayle. /Passing not a stave for nayntenaunce whereof, my realne I poide /Through subsidies, sore fines, loans, many a prest. Blank charters, /Others, shiftes not known of olden for which my subjects did sore detest.

The above passage points to the fact that Richard, though King de jury, did not have any trace of virtue. He was greedy and selfish with no love in his heart. What mattered to him most were those friends who flattered him. He granted them blank Charters so they may collect taxes. Richard pushed the good advisers off. The king becomes increasingly unpopular.

Julia, interprets Gaunt's argument cited above that the rotten character reputation of the king is perpetuated by the hypocritical and the king's favorites and not his individual weaknesses.

In Act 2, scene I, Gaunt laments at the presence of flatterers near the king, for he knows that their closeness to the king and their flattery will lead to the destruction of the king;

And thou, too careless patient as thou art /Commits' thy anointed body to the cure /Of those physicians that first wounded thee; /A thousand flatterers sit within thy crown /Whose campus is no bigger than thy head. /and yet, encaged in so small a verge, /the waste is no whit lesser than thy land, /o had thy grandsire with a prophets eye /seen how his sons should destroy his sons (ll 98-106).

From the above, Gaunt seems to argue that it is the flatterers who are close to the king end up misleading the king. In Act 2 scene 1, Northumberland re affirms Richard's closeness to the flatterers. "The king is not himself but basely led by flatterers, and what they will inform, merely in hate" ll 241-243. Bolingbroke in Act 2 scene 3, concurs with Gaunt and Northumberland about the flatterers. He cites Bushy, Baggot and Green as "caterpillars of the commonwealth/ which I have sworn to weed away." He knows that they were also a factor in leading the King astray and thus will pay for it.

Fooled by the notion of divine right kingship, King Richard II takes power for granted, resulting in hurting so many, like the Duke of York.

In Act 2, scene 1, Duke of York expresses his anger at King Richard as follows. "Not Gloucester's death, nor Herford's banishment, nor aunt's rebuke, nor England's private wrongs have ever made me sour my patient cheek." (Ll. 165-167.)

He is annoyed by the seizure of Gaunt's property hence denying Henry of his inheritance.

In Act 2, scene 1 Northumberland tells Willoughby and Ross that before God it is a shame that such wrongs are borne in Richard, a royal prince and many more of noble blood in this declining land. But goes on to say the king is not himself but basely led by flatterers. This statement corresponds to the comment made by the Duke of York when he tells Gaunt, in his dying bed, that he should vex not himself, nor strive not with his breath for all in vain comes counsel to the king's ears. The king during his deposition occasionally has a reflection of self-pity, he too is aware of the challenges that now face him as a king even though he continues to remind the people present of his divine right. In Act 2 scene 1, shows Richard is only concerned with luxury and fashion.

Shakespeare's Histories starting with *Richard II* and ending with *Henry V*, keenly brings out the role of a king. England's search for a perfect king led to the exploration of the many facets of kingship showing both their strength and weakness of the men who filled that position. By a careful scrutiny of them, Shakespeare presents the King as a physical, emotional and psychological being.

In taking his position for granted, Richard opens the English throne to be usurped by Bolingbroke who made himself popular among the commoners. This usurpation precipitates all the unrest that troubles England later.

In her book, *Royalty and Divine Right in William Shakespeare's Histories King John and Richard II* Julia Andrea Millica contends:

Though Richard II's deeds seem to justify the decision to depose him, through the way in which Shakespeare handles the historical truth, it seems that such an extreme action against a divinely-ordained king is not considered appropriate and is bound to have tragic consequences for the future generations, as a warning for Shakespeare's contemporaries who would envisage such a possibility.

The above citation highlights that though a de jure king has weaknesses, according to Shakespeare, his deposition is not warranted because of being a divine rights king for negative consequences will arise from overthrowing a divinely appointed king.

However, despite king Richard being a legitimate king, he was preoccupied with prestige, power and glory coupled with his lack of judgment causing his downfall.

York discusses King Richard's downfall in Act 5 scene 2, Showing the extent of the masses' reaction at his downfall. Richard loses out with the masses as the masses are presented as indifferent to the king's deposition when York says:

Even so, or with much more contempt /Men's eyes did scowl on gentle Richard.
/No man cried 'God save him' /No joyful tongue gave him his welcome /Home
but dust was thrown upon his sacred head (II 26-31).

The citation brings out the fact that the populace was already tired and had contempt for King Richard's regime and so nobody cared for his deposition instead he was humiliated.

Shakespeare presents King Richard II as another artless leader. The king relaxes a lot simply because he was assured of his divine immunity to the throne and heavily surrounded himself with wrong friends for advice. The king thought everything was okay including the affairs of the state. He rejected wise counsel and enjoyed flattery. The king as an artless man of war, does not plan early enough to save money as a state for security purpose. The news of Irish invasion catches him by surprise without the finance to wage war. King Richard resorts to seizing Bolingbroke's inheritance, a move that later cost him his throne.

According to James C (1990), Richard failed to realize that times had changed where bad leadership would no longer be tolerated from a reigning monarch who used his position to extort money from the people. Richard's failure to recognize a change in the society setup of his time, cost him his life as well as the throne. The king was caught ill prepared by the Irish rebels and now thinks of levying heavy taxes and seizing Gaunt's wealth in order to finance his wars. This also comes about by choosing wrong people. As a leader, he should seek wise counsel instead of flattery. For flattery makes you only want what you want to hear and not the reality that seem detestable to the ears. In chapter 23 on the issue of flattery, Machiavelli says a prudent prince should choose wise men in his state and only given freedom to speak to him on what he has asked about and nothing else. This will eliminate gossip and flattery, (p 94.). Flattery cost King Richard his throne. He relied on Bushy Bagot and Green for advice.

Had the king not seized Bolingbroke's inherited wealth, he would not have been deposed. It was now to the extremities when he did such a thing. This therefore made the populace to feel empathy towards Bolingbroke and hence their support to him in easily sailing to the throne.

In a nutshell, the dejury kings namely; Richard, Duncan, and king Edward are dialectically represented as divine rights kings who enjoyed the automatic legitimacy with the benefits that accrued from it like peace, security, ruling by God's grace. With the exception of king Edward, king Richard and Duncan are overthrown due to shortcomings in their character and political craftsmanship for example being artless, not politically watchful, over trusting, of which if checked could not have led to their downfall.

CHAPTER THREE

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST DE FACTO KINGS IN THE FOUR

SHAKESPEARES POLITICAL PLAYS

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the strengths and weaknesses of Macbeth and Bolingbroke as de facto kings in the selected plays. As stated before, the de facto leaders are those who come to power by force or merit. One would expect those who come into power by force to be terribly deprived. But as it is usually the case, Shakespeare represents all his characters with grey lines. In this chapter I will be discussing the vices of these kings as well as their political virtues.

3.2 Political Virtues of De Facto Kings

One of the de facto kings is Macbeth in Macbeth. He becomes king by murdering Duncan and taking over power thereby starting a process that leads to his short-lived reign. It is important to examine the strengths and weakness of Macbeth. For it is through these that one gets to know the potency and flaws of the de facto leader. There are two sides of Macbeth before committing the tragic deed and after the murder of Duncan

Before committing the tragic deed, Macbeth is portrayed as a man who works hard to merit the throne. As a hardworking soldier during the reign of King Duncan, Macbeth manages to suppress the Norwegian rebels and defeated them. King Duncan had over trusted Macdonwald as Thane of Cowdar, for managing the northern part of Scotland. The unfaithful Thane connived with the Norwegian rebels to overtake part of Scotland as reported by the wounded Scottish soldier in Act 1 scene 1. This is why Macbeth took it upon himself to ensure that he defends the kingdom even without being instructed. This action of defending the kingdom reveals a Macbeth who is patriotic, hardworking and active. These are strong qualities of a de facto leader. De facto leaders tend to be hardworking for they merit rather than inherit power

Another quality of a de facto ruler which is exhibited in Macbeth is being kind and good hearted. In Act 2, Scene 5, Lady Macbeth attests to Macbeth's angelic behavior; "I fear thy nature. It is too full of the milk of human kindness to catch the nearest way" (Ll 14-18). To be praised by a depraved woman like Lady Macbeth confirms that Macbeth is a good man who can love the people he rules. There is an African proverb that says "people only see houses and roof tops of the house but it's the people who live inside that knows the soot hanging from their roofs." Lady Macbeth knows the husband's goodness, making it a contributing factor converting him into a murderer. Actually, it is Lady Macbeth who spurs on the husband into committing the horrendous crime.

Shakespeare represents him as a man of high qualities. Macbeth has self-control. Even after he had conceded on his own that he wants to kill Duncan he can still exercise self-control by telling himself that it is not right to kill. He is strong, reasonably resolute. For example, he has the courage to pursue his goal to an end. He was able to overthrow the rebels, which made the Scots to succeed. In fact, the scene was likened to a Golgotha, where Jesus the Lord shed blood to save mankind. He has the ability to discern what is right and wrong. It is these and other qualities that make Macbeth qualify to be a de facto king. Symbolically representing that blood was everywhere as a result of massive massacres. Victory was achieved. And to prove more of his confidence, he never feared whatever repercussions would befall him following the threat of being invaded by the soldiers from England. "I bear a charmed life which must not yield to one of woman born." Act 5 scene 8, (ll 12-13). With that in mind, it gave him false confidence not to accept the realities of life, that anyone can defeat him. Despite not having much support from the subjects, he vowed to fight on instead of surrendering which led to his eventual defeat.

Another virtue of Macbeth is loyalty to the establishment. This makes Macbeth a good candidate for kingship. In Act I scene 7. Macbeth is a man of balance reasoning. He can restrain his ambition. This is seen as he hesitates in the plan to kill the king:

We will proceed no further in this business; /he hath honoured me of late and I have bought /golden opinions from all sorts of people /which would be worn now in their newest gloss /not cast aside so soon (Act 1:7).

We see from the above Macbeth's hesitation in plotting to kill Duncan because there is nothing evil, he sees in the king to warrant his murder.

Macbeth confesses to his ambition. This is an attribute of being honest with his feelings. Macbeth says that what he plans to do is being pushed by ambition. When he says in act 1, scene 7, he has no spur to prick the sides of his intent. He says it is only the vaulting ambition which overleaps itself and falls on the other.

Unfortunately, it is this very ambition that now turns Macbeth into an evil man. That is to say a murderer. When his wife assures him of the possibility of killing Duncan, he welcomes the plan and he eventually kills King Duncan on the day he visits him and sups at his home. The killing of King Duncan proves to be a bitter cup for Macbeth. Weighed with guilt, Macbeth laments there is no way he can erase whatever he has done permanently. In Act 2, scene 2, Macbeth relates to his wife as follows "Will all great Neptune Ocean wash this blood clean from my hand? To know my deed; were best not know myself guilty". Macbeth is too ashamed of his action. He regrets the deed. Ironically, much as the murder is committed in secrecy, Macbeth's tragic deed smells even to other people. For example, in Act 3, scene 1 Banquo expresses concern that he fears Macbeth "played most folly for it". (L16-7)

Having become king by his own hand rather than God's, Macbeth has to work hard to keep his throne. He becomes politically watchful, as opposed to King Duncan. As a watchful Machiavellian leader, he kills Banquo because it was prophesied that the latter would beget kings. He is determined to kill relentlessly, defend and work for his title as king. For instance, in Act 3. Scene 4, Macbeth confesses, "I am in blood stepped in so far that, should I wade no more?" for this reason, he decides to consult with the weird sisters. In this way, Macbeth abandons God and entrusts his self-made kingship to the devil for he wants to ensure the tenure of kingship

Macbeth is also filled with anxieties. He feels insecure for the witches prophesied a fruitless crown upon his head, a fact that Macbeth never wanted to hear. He seeks/ consults the witches for the protection of the future for he had already gone far in the murders as a defense mechanism to his crown as king

The dramatist further shows that self-made kingship is full of hardships and never to be trusted. For instance, the witches to whom Macbeth turn for protection of his throne speak in double tongue thus giving him false confidence and they plan it.

Hecate the leader of the witches tells the other witches basing on the strength of their allusions to draw Macbeth onto his confusion. In Act 3, scene 5 the witches say that Macbeth shall spurn fate, scorn death and bear his hopes, bore wisdom, grace and fear and they all know security. (II.27-31.) Because Macbeth is preoccupied with protection of his self-made kingship, he has no wit to discern that the witches speak double tongue.

Macbeth's high level of political watchfulness leads him into killing whoever he saw as a threat to his crown. Macbeth feels insecure and thinks that elimination of those he sees as a threat is the

only way out. In him Shakespeare depicts a faithful student of Machiavelli as Linn Michael D, cites that a leader should eliminate all members of the house that formerly ruled and all the immediate successors to the throne of leadership. Linn brings out Machiavelli's recommendation on a successful leader. Machiavelli advocates that a leader has to either be too soft on his subjects or be hard on them but not both, "Half measures are to be avoided." Machiavelli seconds cruelty as essential since it is better to be feared than to be loved. (78).

Machiavelli seems to suggest that being radical is the best way to rule, being radical or cruel has a negative impact on the masses for it creates fear, once fear is instilled in the populace, ruling them becomes easy,

we see cruelty in Macbeth when he hires the murderers to kill Banquo and his son Fleece because the witches prophesied in his presence about Banquo getting a line of kings though Banquo will not be king. He goes ahead to pursue Macduff and family because he was told to be aware of Macduff for no man borne of a woman shall harm him.

Macbeth's insecurity is further heightened after being told to beware of Macduff in Act 4, Scene

2. He therefore plans the killing of Macduff when he says:

But yet I'll make assurance double sure and /Take a bond of fate; thou shall not live, that I /May tell pale hearted fear it lies and sleep in spite /Of thunder' (ll: 83-86).

In relation to the above in Act 4, scene 3) Macbeth then hatches a plan to invade Macduff's castle, Fife plans to kill Macduff's wife, his children and other people who may not be fortunate to live. (150-151).

Macbeth 's political watchfulness takes him as far as the end of the play where even when Macduff tells him with concrete evidence that he should give up the fight, he does not give into Macduff but fights to the end.

In a similar manner, Shakespeare presents another de facto King Bolingbroke who later becomes Henry IV as a self-made king. He is a usurper. He takes over the crown by deposing king Richard II, his cousin. Bolingbroke like Macbeth is a royal but not the rightful heir to the throne though he justifies it by right line of blood coming from the good lord Henry III.

According to Linn Michael D (1962); Henry IV possesses many of the qualities necessary for a good king as opposed to King Richard II. He has a sense of justice and sympathy to the poor. He is interested in the welfare of England. That he is a promoter of justice and has respect for the rights of the subjects, a quality necessary to maintain dignity and the crown. He goes on to say that he still didn't over burden the people with taxes nor was he wasteful nor sensual. His only misfortune was lack of a legitimate claim to the throne.

That Bolingbroke as a fighter of injustice is further portrayed before his banishment. For instance; by trying to show concern for England to see that justice prevails through bringing Mowbray to book. He does so by accusing him to the king of the murder of Thomas Woodstock the duke of Gloucester, and also of fraud. Bolingbroke accuses Mowbray for being so evil and wicked, a false traitor and likely to cause harm Bolingbroke goes on to say that Mowbray pretends to be so good, he denies plotting the murder of the duke of Gloucester's death. Act II.I. (ll 85-105).

In Act 2, Scene 3, Richard the king has no popular power to back up his position. This situation gives room to Henry Bolingbroke's return to England rebelling against the king's order of

banishment up to a certain period of time. Bolingbroke's justification of his return is based on claiming back what was duly right to him, his inheritance:

As I was banished, I was banished /Hereford. But as I come, I come for Lancaster.
/Will you [York] permit that I shall stand on /damn'd /A wandering vagabond; my
right and loyalties /Plucked from my arms perforce and given away /To upstart
unthrifths? Where was I born? /If that my cousin king be king of England /It must
be granted I am duke of Lancaster- /What would you have me do? I am a subject,
/And I challenge law; attorneys are denied me /And therefore personally I lay my
/Claim to my inheritance of free descent (Act 2: Scene 3).

Bolingbroke justifies his return from banishment to seek justice for himself. Justifying a right to claim his inheritance from the late father Gaunt that was denied him by King Richard II.

Another virtue of Henry IV is his conviction that power belongs to the people. For instance, having noticed how Richard the de jure King disregards the people by despising them and levying them with heavy taxes, Henry courts the people by bowing down to them. He shows his love by bowing to their level, listening to their concerns and interacting freely with them. The major difference between the de jure king Richard and the de facto King Henry IV is in their understanding of where real power resides. Much as Richard is confident of his divine right power, In Act 1, scene 6, Richard comments with concern that Henry has managed to win the support of the people when he says:

He did seem to dive into their /hearts with humble and familiar /courtesy; what
reverence he did throw /away on slaves, wooing poor craftsmen /with the craft of
smiles (lines 24-28).

Shakespeare similarly represents Prince Harry just like the father. The Prince has the capacity and capability of interacting with lower class people in their own level. We see much of that when he was in East cheap. The Prince's mates were commoners who engaged in dubious

activities like robbery, heavy drinking. Some of his mates were Falstaff, Bardolph, Poins, Peto, Gads Hill etc. in East cheap. Falstaff is more of a surrogate father to Prince Harry. He is corrupt. According to Linn D. (1962). Harry just like Falstaff see the pompous and ceremony of court life as vanity. Linn sees Harry as having a magnetic quality to uphold royalty of his subjects. A quality he has inherited from his father king Henry IV, who is responsible, self-disciplined and knows how to act prudently.

The above statement is to prove that Harry despite knowing that the father was King, was not taken up by the pomp with which comes being a son to the king. And instead lived among the lower people of society most especially Falstaff whose life rotated around gambling. Similarly, king Henry's coming to power was through courting the commoners, the low life for he knew that power resided in their hands. This was a big push up factor that eventually saw him deposing the reigning king Richard

The goodness of King Henry is articulated well enough by Linn Michael D, when he makes an analytical study of Henry IV and Richard on who is a better leader; Linn says:

Henry is neither deceived by the flatterers who seek his good /Graces nor impressed by the fence sitters who are unwilling /To choose between Richard and him. He only knows he has /The physical power necessary to gain the crown. He is able to /Use it discretely. (12).

All in all, Linn is trying to show that Henry, a de facto leader deserves to rule by virtue of his simplicity. Especially the love of the commoners

Like Macbeth, King Henry ascends onto the throne by force. He is represented by Shakespeare as saddened by death of the King Richard and the dubious manner in which he was killed. His sadness is reflected when he refrains Exton from appreciating the murder of King Richard.

Henry does not thank him because the killing of the king is a deed of slander committed with hands that now weighs heavily upon King Henry's head and the entire famous land. Henry continues to say that though he did wish him dead, he hates the murderer. One can deduce, from this above statement, that Henry killed Richard in his soul because he really wanted him dead. Henry banishes Exton the murderer for two reasons; One, Henry feels guilty so he wants to show the public that his hands are clean. Two, to protect himself because Exton would one time remind him of how he had expressed his desire to see Richard dead. The public would blame him for killing God's anointed king; the de jure king.

It is the same sense of guilt that makes him vow to go to the holy land to atone for his sin.

Another virtue of Henry as a de facto king is being peaceful and able to negotiate. This is evidenced in the first and second part of the play Henry IV. When the king is faced with enemies who want to wage war against his reign out of dissatisfaction, especially the Percy clan, King Henry holds peace talks with those fighting him. Henry sends Worcester to deliver to them the message of peace; "We love our people well, even those we love That are misled upon your cousin and will they take the offer of our grace every man Shall be my friend again, and I will be his." Henry's option to negotiate rather than fight enables him to keep the kingdom in unity and in peace. Henry believes that his legitimacy comes from the people. The closer and friendly he is to them the more chances he has to succeed in his kingship. This does not mean that Henry is weak. Henry as a de facto king knows when to use his power. In Act 5 scene 1, When he sends his negotiation, he also sends a threat that if his cousin will not abide with the advice, Henry is capable of using his power to rebuke offenders: "But if he will not yield Rebuke and dread correction wait on us, /And they shall do their office. So be gone we will not now be troubled with reply we offer fair, take it advisedly."

In the above passage, Henry gives his attackers an option of choosing peace or war. All in all, these kings were artful.

3.3 Weaknesses of De Facto Kings

However, Shakespeare's play depicts de facto kings, with many virtues such as the ability to perform, negotiate, coming closer to the people they lead, knowing the character of the people they lead and perhaps many others. The de facto kings have faults / shortcomings, too, that make it harder to maintain and sustain power.

Let us take one by one of the de facto Kings under this study. Take Macbeth, for example: The most outstanding shortcoming of Macbeth is his ambition for power. In the play, Macbeth confesses that he has no reason to spur him to kill King Duncan, save for his overweening ambition. This is the real weakness that causes Macbeth's fall from grace to grass. For instance, although he provides eight strong reasons against killing King Duncan. Macbeth falls from grace to grass because of his ambition: "I am settled and bend up each corporal agent to this terrible feat/Away and mock the time with fairest/ false face must hide what false heart doth know" (Act 1, Scene 7). The above quotation shows that Macbeth though pressed hard by his wife to kill Duncan; he had already made up his mind to killing the king.

The ambition for the throne or instant success is seen when King Duncan announces his heir to the throne as his son Malcom. He is surprised and wonders 'prince of Cumberland!' Macbeth voices his evil plan. "That is a step I must fall down or else overleap for it lies in my way." Macbeth is full aware that his intent for violence in order to become a King quickly is evil. This is why he prays that the "stars should hide you're his ambition so that no one may see his black/and deep desires for power (1157-60). Surely anybody who knows the godly relationship between King Duncan and Macbeth would be surprised about Macbeth's lack of common sense.

The unsuspecting king sets a stage for Macbeth when he offers to sleep at Macbeth's home that night.

When the witches pronounce him Thane of Cowdar and King in future, it heightens his ambition especially when he realizes that part of the prophesy is true as per Ross's message from the King to tell him of his promotion.

Macbeth in Act 1 scene 5, on receiving the message of promotion delivered unto him by Ross from the king as being the thane of Cowdar, he becomes too excited knowing that his dream of becoming a king is instant as per the prophesy of the weird sisters. Macbeth says:

Great Glamis! Thy letters /Have transported me beyond this /Ignorant present and
I feel now /The future in the instant' (35).

Due to his excessive love of power, Macbeth needs Kingship as fast as possible. This ambition is spurred on more by the wife, Lady Macbeth who is even not strong enough to commit a murder but has the capability of persuading someone to commit the murder for her. She does so by telling him [Macbeth] not to alter favor because to do so is to fear. Therefore, she tells Macbeth to leave all the rest to her. Act 1 scene 5.

Macbeth's choice to use the sword rather than the love to sustain the power highlights a greatest weakness of de facto leadership. Macbeth becomes crueler because of his insecurity about holding the throne long. Machiavelli in his book the Prince warns that he who comes into power by the sword may not be able to avoid violence. Machiavelli cautions that he who does otherwise either from reluctance or evil advice is always forced to keep the knife in his hand.

P.14. Shakespeare demonstrates this fact with Macbeth a de facto leader.

De facto leaders assume power by shedding blood. This path has four major disadvantages; first, they seem to shed more blood. So, they become serial killers to safeguard power. This is what happens with Macbeth. Before he sits on the throne, he kills two other people. Second, because they have no legitimacy, de facto kings have to kill more people to save their power as Machiavelli says on issues of brutality. Third, de facto kings create enemies easily. The people they have to kill the survivors who turn against the killer. Macbeth is finally killed by the people whose people he killed. Macduff forms an army with the English and so Macbeth loses the throne. Fourth, the de facto king becomes uncomfortable after killing due to divine retribution. In Act 3 scene 4, Macbeth is haunted by the ghost.

Owing to the fact that Macbeth is not a de jure king and has no God's grace, in times of trouble, he has to seek counsel somewhere else, regarding the tenure of his throne. Macbeth descends into the underworld to clear his uncertainty about his tenure on the throne. He also wants to ensure that his children will succeed the throne. He becomes excessively insecure and jealous at Banquo. In Act 3, scene 1, Macbeth reflects as follows: "They hailed him father to a line of kings/And upon my head they put a fruitless/And a barren scepter in my gripe. Thence/To be wrench with an unlineal hand/ No son of mine succeeding" (60-64)

This insecurity makes Macbeth heartless and bloody [murderer]. Consequently, in Act 3 scene 2, he plans the execution of Banquo in the following remarks: "it's better thee without than he within" (ll. 14-15) Macbeth becomes insecure especially at Banquo's presence for the weird sisters had prophesied him not to be a King but will beget Kings. He openly discusses his fears with the wife and the wife responds that it is safer to be that which they destroy than by destruction dwell in doubtful joy (ll 6-7).

Furthermore, Macbeth plans the elimination of those he sees as a threat as the only way out, the witches tell him to be aware of Macduff. 'Beware of Macduff,' and so Macbeth plans the killing of Macduff due to insecurity after being told to be careful;

King Macbeth goes on to say he will raid the castle of Macduff, Fife and kill with the sword Macduff's wife, his children and all the entire family. Act 4 scene 3.

Macbeth's reign as a De facto King is characterized as restless. There was no peace and security in Scotland. In Act 4 scene 3, ll 4-6, Macduff relates to Malcolm that "each new morn, new widows howl, new orphans cry, new sorrows strike heaven on the face." (ll4-6). That information gives the state of affairs in Scotland. Commenting on this statement, Linn Michael D; says that it is in accordance to Machiavelli's also warning that a prince must not kill wantonly, he must employ cruelty judiciously" this is sarcastic though because no killing however judicious will lead to peace, almost humanely for example to discourage or prevent disorder in the state that would be harmful to the majority of the people. Unfortunately, Macbeth chose on one extremity which is cruelty, bringing unrest in the country. He loses popularity among the subjects.

Macbeth kills until he is termed as a devil. In Act 4 scene 3, Macduff tells Malcom that not in the legion of horrid hell could come a devil more damned in evils to top Macbeth" (ll: 55-57) In Act 5, scene 1 Macduff refers to Macbeth as a "Hell Hound." In Act 5 scene 2, Anans tells Lenox, Menteith, that in Macbeth, people follow his instruction but not out of love. Meaning he has become a tyrant (117-119). In Act 4 scene 3, when Ross flees to England, he too tells MacDuff: "Alas poor country; almost afraid to know itself it cannot be called our mother, but our grave." Ross recounts further that the people who used to smile are now sighing, and groaning

and shrieking. Every day there are fresh sorrows and people listen to dead men's knells and there are scarcity of flowers in people's gardens because of so many burials (II 164-173.)

The situation described above is in line with Kantorowicz Ernst notion of the King's two bodies. Macbeth slayed a rightful King to the throne. This is why his reign is bloody. He has to shed blood to keep the throne

However, despite Macbeth's ambition alone and fear of the future propels him to commit atrocities, Shakespeare does not depict him as being totally black nor totally white but he a mixture of both.

Another aspect of Macbeth's weakness is his inability to see through the gimmicks of the witches. Macbeth's character was corrupted by his ambition, his wife's influence and as a result he could not tell a lie from the truth, an equivocal statement from a straightforward one.

Macbeth confesses, "I am in blood" It is for this reason that he consorts with the witches to keep his power thus seeking external powers. But apparently the supernatural wisdom instead misguided him by speaking in double tongue, giving him false confidence and the insatiable urge to kill those along his way in order to retain power. His actions don't win him favor but instead drifts his people apart to flee into neighboring countries. Macbeth's reign as king appears all the more flawed when compared with Duncan's reign. For instance, after the murder of King Duncan, Macduff who always was loyal and a patriot to the rightful King was not convinced of Macbeth's innocence and he sees him not deserving title of king. After discovering about the murder, he is sad and does not even go for the coronation of Macbeth and refuses to be a part of his court. When there was so much chaos in Scotland under the Kingship of Macbeth,

characterized by insecurity as a result of dubious murders, Macduff flees to England to solicit for help in mobilizing to form a coup in which Macbeth is finally ousted.

According to Machiavelli in his book *The Prince* concerning those who obtain principality by wickedness says:

It is impossible for those who continue to be cruel to /Maintain their control, hence in seizing the state, /The attacker ought to examine closely all those injuries /Which are necessary and to do them all at one stroke /So as not to have to repeat them daily. Thus, by not /Continually upsetting the people, he will be able to make them /Feel more secure and win them over by benefits. He who does /Otherwise either from reluctance or evil advice is always /Forced to keep the knife in his hand, he cannot rely on his subjects and /They cannot attach themselves to him because of the continued /And repeated wrongs (14).

Machiavelli in his letter to Prince De Piero De Medic sends a signal to the likes of Macbeth and other de facto leaders who obtain power by radical means to desist from that. No wonder Macbeth's relationship with the wife deteriorates in the interest of keeping power. He loses his wife lady Macbeth to sleep walking. She suffers a malady that the doctor could not treat as a result of being psychologically traumatized owing to aiding the husband in committing the murders or being a witness to them. He lacked the ability to save his wife's life. When Macbeth is told of the wife's death, his indifference is noted when he says she should have died hereafter.

Macbeth is insecure and ends up making radical decisions which could not contain him in power. He vows to fight till the end because of pride yet according to Machiavelli a prince must fight, followed by a united people (p.78). Macbeth is no longer united to his people yet a saying goes 'united we stand and divided we fall'. Consequently, chances were high that Macbeth will lose the battle simply because his kingdom was already divided. Soldiers with the aid of King Edward of England are sent to Scotland and Macbeth is overthrown in a coup and murdered by

Macduff. He beheads Macbeth as a retaliation to the killing of his family and presents the cut off head to Malcom and this marks the end of reign of a usurper and the coming in of the rightful / legitimate king. Finally, with the death of Macbeth at the end of the play is evidence enough that good has triumphed over evil, which credit goes back to Duncan who despite his weaknesses, had his strength outweighing his weakness in his death with the final defeat of Macbeth.

Shakespeare presents Bolingbroke (Henry IV) in a manner similar to that of Macbeth as a man of weaknesses as well. Although Bolingbroke starts off as a caring and humble man, qualities that impress the commoners and nobles to support him to kingship, once he sits on the throne, he somehow grows horns. He becomes hard heartened, proud and unforgiving. For example, when in Act 1 scene 3, the Percy clan demand the release of Mortimer. Henry IV becomes adamant about it. He looks at Mortimer as a traitor especially to the lives of those he led to fight the great magician Glendower. He rhetorically asks “shall our coffers then be emptied, to redeem a traitor home? Shall we buy treason?” “And indent with fears when they have lost and forfeited themselves?” (Act 1 scene 3) and he swears never to release him. Henry even indicates that he is aware that Mortimer is imprisoned in “the barren mountains” and so he approves of his starvation and swears that he will never forgive him. The king reaffirms his hard resolution by ordering Hotspur never to mention the name of Mortimer again. Although Hotspur was the key man in deposing and killing the murderous and corrupt King Richard II, and had never regretted what was done, Hotspur is stunned by Henry IV’s callousness. In fact, Hotspur regrets the death of the deposed king Richard and he begins to see King Henry as a pain he is to contend with. In Act 1, Scene 3, Hotspur reflects as follow: “God pardon it, have done to put down Richard, that sweet lovely rose and plant this thorn, this canker Bolingbroke” Consequently, Hotspur begins

undermine Henry IV a once desirable king of the people who has now become so proud and aloof.

But according to Machiavelli's recommendations, Henry's aloofness is inevitable. As a de facto King, he attained power by the help of the Mortimers whose weakness he knows very well. To keep his power, Henry has to discard all the ladders to or else they will become a nuisance. He has to kill Brutus and all his sons so to speak. This is controversial but it is a bone a de facto leader must contend with. One cannot kill one's friends and still remain friends with the people whose people he has killed.

Another controversial situation that Henry has to face is the death of Richard II. His sense of guilt haunts him to the extent that he attributes every misfortune he gets, on the death of the former king. For instance, in Act 3, scene 2, for waywardness of his son, the king laments that the people who are giving his son company and the prince seems to fit in their society. "Tell me else could such inordinate and low desires such poor, such bare, such lewd, such mean attempts accompany the greatness of thy blood and hold their level with thy princely heart."

Henry believes that Hal's lewd behavior is God's punishment because he deposed the de jure King and had him persecuted in the towers. The king is actually disappointed in the son Prince Harry. King Henry is worried that Harry gives him hard time and he does not isolate himself from the commoners now that he is a royal. Ironically, it was this mixing freely with the commoners that enabled Henry to get power. The prince later takes on the throne from the father as King Henry V. It is this same quality that enabled Henry V, to be a good leader. This is another controversy that a de facto leader has to face. He has to appear to be one with the people because power belong to the people. However, he has to learn to be loyal

Since power corrupts, Henry IV distanced himself from those that assisted him to power. For example, the likes of Hotspur, Northumberland, Worcester and Archbishop. His greatest allies have now turned to be enemies. In their rebellious nature they claim the King did not fulfill their promise to them, he is a hypocrite, and he distances himself from them and does not give them a listening ear. In Act 4, Scene 1, the Archbishop laments that he finds his griefs heavier than their offences and castigates the weakness of the king in power by saying:

By the rough torrent of occasion /and have the summary of all our griefs /(when time shall serve) to show in articles /which long ere this, we offer'd to the king, /and might, by no suit, gain our audience; /when we are wrong'd and would unfold our griefs, /we are denied access unto his person, /even by those men, that most have done us wrong (Act 4, Scene 1).

Because of the allies increasing grievances against their king, they back up Hotspur a gallant son to Northumberland who is ranked of the same age as the king's son Prince Harry to disappoint the King. It is very clear in Machiavelli's *The Prince*, (1995) when he talks of civil principality. Machiavelli said that those who comes to power through the assistance of the great, finds it difficult to maintain their status quo since he will find himself surrounded by those who are almost his equal and as such, he can never exercise his full authority over them. (p.36). This is evidenced in *King Henry Part I* whereby the rebel faction which is the Percy clan are in constant loggerheads with King Henry because they aided him in the overthrow of King Richard II. They therefore support Hotspur to destabilize the government of Henry.

The rebels do so not because they have England at heart. Linn in p 152 says "the rebels have no interest in the welfare of the kingdom except selfishness in their plans to curve England into three states." Hotspur does so by first refusing to release the prisoners he managed to capture from the rebel forces trying to fight the government. Hotspur promises to release the prisoners in exchange for Mortimer who is captured by the king. However, the king is adamant to release

him, this could be owing to the fact that before King Richard II died, he had cited him to be the next heir to the throne to the hearing of some members of the Percy clan.

Northumberland, Worcester urge on Percy to wage a war so that Mortimer could be reinstated. Mortimer is a brother-in-law and so that would mean a direct benefit to them.

Fortunately for the king, the son Prince Harry begins to detach himself from the wrong group and goes to check on the father. He comes in handy as the kingdom was under attack and the king's position is being threatened. The king Henry IV is never able to come out of the guilt of having committed a sacrilege through deposing his rightful king, despite being a better ruler. Hotspur wages war however the king tries to negotiate for peace by sending Worcester to sweet talk him out of war but Worcester being a double minded person does not give him the right information but instead urges him on. The king sends more army and Hotspur is outnumbered leading to his own death at Shrewsbury being slain by Prince Harry and so claims the honour and comes to lime light. This is so because before Hotspur's death, he was greatly admired for his zeal and as a gallant man of war in comparison to the Prince who had become a black sheep of the family. And now that Hotspur was no more, the prince felt his position not threatened anymore as he had this to say:

I am the Prince of Wales; and think /Not Percy, to share with me /In glory
anymore /Two stars keep not their motion in /One sphere; /Nor can one England
brook a /Double reign, of Henry Percy /And the Prince of Wales (Act V.VI).

In the above citation, Prince Harry is now comfortable that Hotspur is no more for he is dead. He says his glory is no longer under any threat and will never be shared.

Despite the glorious nature presented of defacto kings Macbeth and Henry IV as hardworking, watchful, they could not hold power for long simply because they were beset by the mode of

gaining power. An example is Bolingbroke. Those who aided him in getting power, became a threat to him and even plotted his overthrow. Macbeth came to power by shedding blood of an innocent king and thus becomes haunted. The defacto kings didn't live according to the expectations of the people thereby creating enemies who made their tenure to the throne short lived. Pointing to the fact that power belongs to the people.

CHAPTER FOUR

LESSONS DRAWN FROM THE REPRESENTATION OF SHAKESPEARE'S

POLITICAL CHARACTERS

4.1 Introduction

As discussed in the previous chapters, Shakespeare represents both types of leaders dialectically. Whether de facto or de jure kings they all have virtues and faults. The dramatist appears to ask a fundamental question: which kind of leader can hold power successfully, and peacefully and for a long time? The question appears to have been addressed by Gardner John (1990) says; we must not confuse leadership with power. Leaders always have some measure of power rooted in their capacity to persuade but many people with power are without leadership gifts. Their power derives from money or the capacity to inflict harm or from control of some piece of institutional machinery or from access to the media and we must not confuse leadership with authority which is simply legitimized power (2). He says leadership requires major expenditures of effort and energy more than most people care to make (2-3). This is why some of these leaders like Duncan, King Lear, Macbeth, Richard II or Henry IV could not hold power for long without facing resistance in one way or another. Examples from the plays show that the kings were at first liked by masses but unfortunately, individual weaknesses lead to their downfall. Gardner's discussion focuses on the fact that leaders ought not to relax but work hard. Individual weakness in terms of laxity is also a cause of loss of power. Julia Andrea Millica in her journal *Royalty and Divine Right in William Shakespeare's Histories* king John and Richard II, supports Gardner's view when she observes that:

In *Richard II* there is no clear contrast between an evil King who has to be deposed and a good and heroic savior of the Kingdom in the person of Henry Bolingbroke. There is no such contradiction in terms of good and evil and the characterization is made rather in political terms which of them is more skillful in

handling the political matters in such a way as to convince others of their cause. (14).

According to the citation above, there is no difference between Richard and Bolingbroke. They both have weaknesses that halt their prosperity.

Richard the Second has been characterized a complacent king. He takes the populace for granted and levies heavy taxes on them. He believes the people will just pay and keep quiet because he is a de jure King. Because of his infallible power, the king also gives favors to his sycophants by giving them blank vouchers for collecting taxes. This gives them a chance to collect as much money as they want. King Richard also uses his power as a de jure king to grab the property of his uncle, John of Gaunt after the latter has passed on. In doing all these things, Richard is confident that his subjects will not complain nor attack him because a de jure king is untouchable.

Furthermore, Richard as de jure king, distances himself from the people save his flatterers. He thinks that he is above the ordinary people.

Bolingbroke, on the other hand becomes king by courting the commoners who have been sidelined by King Richard II. Bolingbroke closes the gap between them and the king. He extends greeting and curtsies to the masses. When the king grabs Bolingbroke's land, the latter becomes more popular among the people.

However, when Bolingbroke assumes the throne, he forgets the commoners and in fact, sidelines them. For example, he blames his son for mixing with commoners. In Bolingbroke's speech in Act 3 scene 2, "a little more than little is by much too much," he is warning his son Harry to make his appearance rare so as to attract respect and love from the populace.

4.2 Lessons Drawn

The fact that both the virtuous and the cunning do not necessarily make good leaders in Shakespearean political plays, could lead one to draw some lessons which can be recommended to leaders in practice as well as upcoming leaders in line with Machiavelli's statecraft book *The Prince*.

Virtues of the Machiavellian leader include being moral with a high level of integrity. A good leader should on one hand be according to the expectations of the people. In the context of the divine-right theory of kingship, the king has to descend lawfully. Such a king will be ruling by God's grace. A case in point is the King of England referred to in the play, *Macbeth*. This king as Malcolm describes him, as a perfect example of an English moral leader and as a benevolent leader whom God loves and his subjects too love him. In Act 4, Scene 3, Malcolm says that such a king is bestowed with: "With this strange virtue/ He has a heavenly gift of prophesy/ and sundry blessing hang upon his throne." Such a king has the power to heal strange diseases by mere touching of the people.

Another case in point is King Duncan whom Shakespeare represents as a moral and virtuous king. Duncan as a king was peaceful, trusted his subjects and even rewarded hard working generals like Macbeth. His virtues are outstanding. From Macbeth's point of view, in Act 1:7 "Duncan has born his faculties so meek, has been so clear in his great office and that his virtues will plead like Angels." Macbeth concludes by saying: He has no cause that necessitates him to kill Duncan save his vaulting ambition. Thus although Macbeth kills Duncan, he had already confessed that there is no justification in murdering a virtuous king.

The king of England is a morally virtuous king and he has the healing gift from God to which, his subjects benefited from and hence an overall health to the nation. He is contrasted to Macbeth

who sought after witches for shortcuts as his major interest was power. The witches told him what he wanted to hear though Macbeth was not aware that they were speaking in double tongue. So, in order to achieve his ambition, of gaining power, he becomes a bad leader and resorts to murdering any one he saw as a threat to his ambition.

Another leadership practice drawn from Shakespeare's representation of political leaders is procrastination. Avoiding procrastination is of advantage If there is any matter of urgency. Quick decisions have to be made and delay in decision can create a setback. For example, in Act 1 scenes 1 and 2, King Richard II delay in issuing judgment cost him a throne. His indecisiveness is seen at the point where Mowbray and Bolingbroke are about to battle. This comes about when Bolingbroke accuses Mowbray of treason. The king calls to their hearing and Mowbray denies the accusation and so opts for both Mowbray and Bolingbroke to fight a duel so that the stronger one will win the case. As a king, that was unrealistic because a duel cannot be a decider on whether one is innocent or guilty. Instead, he should have probed them further on listening to them and would have also passed on judgment there and then as a king without delaying issues. The king decides to cancel the duel and instead issues banishment on both, without even getting the truth of the matter.

The unfair banishment accompanied by his little failings like corruption, extravagance made Bolingbroke to be seen as a savior of the kingdom by the already disgruntled people. Bolingbroke consorted with the commoners hence winning the hearts of the masses. Because Richard was greedy and overtaxed the poor. The king made his deposition eminent.

A Machiavellian leader must be both approachable and unapproachable to his people. These virtues are crucial in power sustainability. Christopher Cosan and Reina, (2017) in the journal article; Leadership Ethics of Machiavelli's Prince, concur with the fact that the good will of the

people plays a big role in sustaining a leader into power. According to French and Raven Machiavelli recommends:

that the good will of people is the firmer source of long tenure of power. The good will of the people reinforces the importance of seeking soft bases of power rather than the hard bases of power. p.287.

The critics further quote Machiavelli's words to support the above view as follows:

If a prince builds his power upon the people and if he knows how to command and if he is courageous, doesn't despair in difficult times and maintains the morale of his people by his spiritedness and the measures that he takes, he will never find himself let down by them and he will realize he had laid sound foundations of his power (287).

Machiavelli appears to suggest that being approachable is a good but on the other hand one may in some instances need not to be approachable.

A leader should be feared and respected at the same time. On cruelty and mercy and whether it is better to be loved than feared or the contrary, Harvey C (1990), argues that to maintain his subjects limited and pious, a leader should not mind about the repercussions of being cruel for with very few examples he will exercise mercy in comparison to those who for the sake of too much mercy comes unrests to which murders or robberies may crop up,(P. 65-66.) King Duncan was not a cruel leader and for that matter, he wasn't feared. He was not even aware of the affairs of the state including being un aware of even the enemies of Scotland. It is the generals like Macbeth who took it upon himself to defend his country from the invasion of the Norwegian rebels, a weakness on Duncan as a king. Macbeth took advantage of his humble character to assassinate him and take up his throne.

It is difficult for one to have the two qualities put together. However, he goes on to say it is much safer to be feared than to be loved. However, Machiavelli as quoted by Harvey c. (1990); says; “A prince should nonetheless make himself feared in such a mode that if he does not acquire love, he escapes hatred because being feared and not being hated can go together very well” (66) King Henry IV possessed both. Though he was feared he wasn’t hated. He led his subjects well except for a few complaints from the members of the Percy clan claiming he wasn’t giving them attention. They had also their selfish ambition of reinstating Mortimer their in-law in power. The king promised to settle their grievances later on and granted them amnesty if they drop their plans to wage war. However, they refused to agree to the secession of hostilities and eventually they were defeated when Harry killed Hotspur at Shrewsbury.

A leader should be liberal without having serious extremities. However, Harvey C, in his book quotes Machiavelli who says that it is good to be liberal but most times it hurts for if it is used virtuously as it should be used, it may not be recognized and one may not escape the infamy of its contrary. Accepting people’s opinions and rights of individuals is fine. This can be likened to democracy. For example, Richard simply worked with the advisers who only flattered him. As a king he could not come up with decisions of his own. In act 1 scene 4, Green reminds King Richard of the rebels in Ireland and suggests to the king that it must be managed before it becomes disadvantageous. King Richard agrees to his proposal and thinks of how to acquire much money to facilitate the war. Richard plans to seize Gaunt’s property on top of levying heavy taxes (Act 2 Scene 1). This move hurts his subjects and it, eventually cost him his throne.

According to Machiavelli, “There is nothing that consumes itself as much as liberality; while you use it, you lose the capacity to use it and you become either poor or contemptible.” (64-65). Therefore, Machiavelli warns the prince to guard against being contemptible and hated since

liberality will lead him to either. Richard becomes contemptible before his people because of being too liberal. In Act 3 scene 2, Scroop tells King Richard that the populace is against him:

So above his limits swells the rage of Bolingbroke, /Covering your fearful land
with hard bright steel /And hearts harder than steel, whitebeards have armed
/Their thin and hairless scalps against thy majesty; boys /With women's voices
strive to speak big and clap /Their female joints in stiff unwieldy arms /Against
thy crown (ll:110-116).

The above shows that the people's hearts had been hardened against King Richard and they are in support of Bolingbroke. The populace is against the king's leadership.

In *Macbeth*, Shakespeare represents a self-made leader who is similar and contrary to Machiavellian recommendations. As a Machiavellian, Macbeth is watchful all the time. He kills Banquo because it had been prophesized that Banquo would beget Kings. So he kills Banquo to ensure that succession would not be diverted from his house. He kills the guards to hide evidence. Macbeth further surprises the castle of the Thane of Fife, to prevent any opposition to his power. For the same reason, Macbeth consorts with the witches to control the longevity of his tenure on the throne. Unlike King Duncan who put absolute trust in people and tells all his secrets openly, Macbeth is secretive. He plans to kill Banquo without telling his partner of greatness.

However, Macbeth loses on other platforms of Machiavelli. The same Machiavelli recommends that a good leader be respected and loved. Macbeth does not have the good will of the people in helping him to be sustained in power. Instead of being a protector of the people, Macbeth became a killer. As a result, his subjects resented him. After the killing of King Duncan at Macbeth's home of residence, some people immediately suspected foul play. These included the two sons of Duncan. Malcom the son to Duncan and heir to the throne, Donalbain his brother.

The two sons think it is unsafe for them and decide to flee to neighboring countries for refuge. In Act 3, Scene 1, Banquo too was not convinced during the coronation and suspected foul play as cited in his monologue:

Thou hast it now: king, Cowdar, Glamis, all, /as the weird women promised; and I fear /thou play'dst most foully for't; yet it was said /it should not stand in thy posterity, /but that myself should be the root and father /of many kings.

(Act 3, Scene 1)

In the above citation Banquo is suspicious of Macbeth's quick rise to kingship. Despite the prophesy of the witches that Macbeth will be king, his crown was fruitless, for the fruitful crown goes to Banquo who was told that he will beget kings. Therefore, Banquo thinks he may have killed Duncan in order for the prophesy to come to pass.

Similarly, Macduff refused to follow Macbeth to witness his coronation at Scone Macbeth's reign becomes gruesome and Macduff flees for his life. And because of cruelty, Macbeth does not have the support of his prominent subjects like Anans, Lenox, Menteith, Ross and Macduff. These flee to England and report to escape the bloody condition at home. In fact, Macduff relates to Malcom that Scotland is no longer his home but his graveyard. So the Scottish are not proud of their mother country that is characterized by sighs and groans. The loyalists then decide to join forces in England for the coup in Scotland in which Macbeth is beheaded and his reign comes to an end. This kind of end is in line with Machiavelli's recommendation that although a leader must kill in order maintain his power it is this very practice that makes the leader lose out

King Richard too loses the throne because he does not have the support of the populace. Richard surrounded himself with the sycophants and neglected the rest of the people. Richard was too confident of his divine appointment that he did not solicit support from the people. This is

evidenced in Act 3, scene 2, when Aumerle report regarding the strong support Bolingbroke had gained from the people. Richard is overconfident by his response:

Not all water in the rough rude sea /Can wash the balm off from an anointed king.
/The breath of worldly men cannot depose /The deputy elected by the Lord. /For
every man that Bolingbroke has pressed /To lift shrewd steel against our golden
crown, /God for his Richard hath in heavenly pay /A glorious angel. Then if
angels fight, /Weak men must fall for heaven still guards the right (Act 3.2 ll. 55-
62).

The quotation above brings out the self but false confidence of King Richard in his regard to leadership. He knows he is a legitimate king and hence cannot be ousted from power.

King Richard's overly confidence comes from his belief in divine right of kingship. He takes advantage of it and becomes greedy and inconsiderate. For example, he overtaxes the subjects hence burdening them. He seizes Bolingbroke's property of inheritance; "towards our assistance do we seize to us the plate, coin, revenues and moveable where of our uncle Gaunt did stand possessed." In Act 2, scene1, the king needed to finance his Irish wars in his conversation with York and so took advantage of Gaunt's death to steal what rightly belonged to his son Bolingbroke as his inheritance. After the capture of the three sycophants of Richard: Bushy, Green and Bagot. Bolingbroke relates that Richard listens more to these men than to anybody else Bolingbroke knew them as wrong advisers; "Myself a prince of fortune from my birth, nearer to the king in blood, and near in love. Till you did make him misinterpret me" Act 3 scene 1. The king could not listen to good counsel. Only flattery mattered as cited in Act 2 scene 1. "Vex not yourself, nor strive not with your breath for all in vain comes counsel to his ear," this is said by York to his dying brother Gaunt when Gaunt wanted to advise the king. with these kinds of acts, the king grows increasingly infamous even among his trusted loyal and subjects who end up joining forces with the returned Bolingbroke what at this point in the play has become so

powerful as a result of the people's support; According to Scroop's report to Richard in Act 3 scene 2, the king has lost the support of the masses:

Thy very beadsmen learn to bend their bows /Of double- fatal yew against thy state; /Yea distaff-women manage rusty bills /Against thy seat both young and old rebel /And all goes worse than I have power to tell (L1 116-120).

The above shows the state of affair, the raging wild atmosphere and brings out the fact that the king has become unpopular. Consequently, people join Bolingbroke to oust King Richard II from the throne.

Another good lesson that can be drawn from Shakespeare's political characters is that a leader should be watchful and monitoring in all the affairs and activities of his kingdom. He should not just sit and wait for the affairs of his state to be run by others without close monitoring. Lalley James C (1990), in "Lessons in Leadership: An Analysis of Five Shakespearean Characters, Richard II, Henry V, Coriolanus, Mark Antony and King Lear", says that:

The Shakespearean leader is not just a visionary dreamer, /he must be a man of action. He translates vision into political /plans and projects. He must set out to do something and do /something significant. Fight a major battle, regain lost kingdom, /gain new lands and glory and often in the world of Shakespeare, /these plans involve war (51).

The above quotation brings out the need for a leader to be an active and a visionary. Such a leader who can transform his nation. If battles are necessary, he should engage in them and be able to expand territories.

Harvey Mansfield (1998) also concurs with the above in his article, "A Translation and with an Introduction, *The Prince* Nicollo quotes Machiavelli as follows: "a prince who has no army but has the art of war will prevail over one with an army but without the art." p. xxi. This statement means that a leader should not only be a skillful fighter or warrior but also a schemer. The latter

skill will enable a leader to be wise as far as security is concerned and can plan accordingly. He can command his forces and be alert on how to handle an eventual attack or invasion. This means close monitoring of the affairs and activities shall be done. On the contrary, one with an army but without the art of war will heavily rely on fighters and advisers, thus creating a high possibility of a coup to such a government. For that matter, that is why King Duncan lost power to the active Macbeth. He was not a man of war or venturing in wars, a loophole Macbeth took advantage of as a general to assassinate him since he was not even conscious of his own security by visiting and sleeping at Macbeth's place without being heavily guarded.

King Richard was not a visionary leader. He did not seek wise counsel as far as his governance was concerned but instead consulted his friends the flatterers thereby putting his subjects and nation at stake. Because of the nature of the friends the king surrounded himself with as advisers, they do not caution him on his reckless spending, extravagance and overburdening the masses through over taxation. Even when the king is looking at the move of seizing Gaunt's wealth in order to finance his war in Ireland, the advisers simply could not foresee the impending danger of his actions, a move that Bolingbroke used as a justification for his return. The masses welcomed him and aided his coming to the throne. And when Bolingbroke came to power, among the persons he vowed to deal with are Bushy, Bagot and Green that he termed them as caterpillars of the common wealth which he swore to weed away for they were also a factor that misguided the king, letting him astray. This made his kingship to be unpopular. James C (1990) relays the character of Richard as follows:

His [Shakespeare's] main purpose is to exhibit in Richard the qualities which unfitted him to rule, to show his exquisite futility in dealing with public affairs, to present a play boy politician coping ineffectually with men seriously intent on the business of getting what they want to contrast the man of imagination who lives into himself with men of the world who adapt themselves to events. (52).

Richard was not a vigilant king; rather, he was one who lived an extravagant life without thinking twice of a possibility of being ousted of the throne. He believed in divine immunity and did not seek the wise counsel of the elders but continued to have his 'reliable' friends Bushy; Bagot and Green who misguided him through flattery. This prevented him from being a better leader. He wasn't watchful enough to detect impending danger arising from his poor leadership. The gardener in Act 3, Scene 4, uses the symbol of the garden to describe what has become of the garden in England:

When our sea walled garden, the whole land, /Is full of weeds, her fairest flowers
chok'd up /Her fruit- trees all un prun'd, her hedges ruin'd /Her knots disordered
and her wholesome herbs /Swarming with caterpillars (Act 3, Scene 4).

According to the passage cited above, England is like a neglected garden overgrown by weeds and its fruits misappropriated due to negligence of its attendant. Consequently, the people have lost confidence in their king. By the time Richard realized, it is too late for most of the masses have rallied behind Bolingbroke, since they see in him a savior to their situation and the kingdom at large and nothing could be done to stop it.

One other lesson to be learnt in Richard II is that power corrupts. With the loftiness that comes with it, powers makes people drunk and therefore forget about people (subjects). A good example is King Henry IV as discussed earlier. The king was represented as a man who has courted the commoners by interacting freely with them and also fought for the poor before him being king. Later as a king, he distances himself from them. Ironically, the king becomes unhappy with the son Prince Harry for interacting with the commoners. And not helping in the affairs of the kingdom.

In Act 1, Scene 1, King Henry expresses his unhappiness to Westmorland about Hal in comparison to Percy. He remarked that as he sees Percy being praised for being a gallant soldier, in his son he only sees chaos and dishonor and therefore wished that at birth where children lay, there should have been some exchange in which his son would have been Percy and Northumberland should have had Hal as their son (Act 1, Scene 1).

From that it shows the king's disappointment in his own son and wishes Hotspur were his own child Hotspur was depicted earlier as hardworking and a gallant fighter. On the contrary, the king's son, Harry most of the time hangs out with the commoners. This has greatly distressed the king. In Act 3, Scene 2, the king intimates that his having an irresponsible son could be God's punishment for killing the former king. King Henry says:

I know not whether God will have it so /for some displeasing service I have done /that in his secret doom out of my blood, /he'll breed revengement and a scourge for me (Act 3, Scene 2).

The king believes God is avenging by giving him a disgraceful son for the evil he could have done. Perhaps the evil of overthrowing a legitimate king and his eventual murder.

This study aimed to meet three objectives; the first was to examine the dialectical representation of the de jure kings in *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV, Part 1* and *Henry IV, Part 2*. The second objective is to examine the dialectical representation of the de facto kings in *Richard II*, *Macbeth*, *Henry IV, Part 1* and *Henry IV, Part 2*. The third objective was to draw leadership lessons from the two types of leaders.

With regard to objective one, the studies discovered that the benefits accruing to the king de jure range from security, peacefulness and grace, all of which base on the fact that the king is not elected by people but by God. Such a king is considered to be God's representative. The de jure

kings who enjoyed the mentioned privileges are; king Duncan, the King of England and King Richard II.

Duncan is a man of many virtues. He is represented as peaceful, graceful and has no reason to fear. The King is not tyrannical and doesn't kill except the enemies of Scotland. Macbeth, in a monologue in Act 1 scene 7, Macbeth says: "This Duncan has borne his faculties /So meek hath been so clear in his great. Office that his virtue will plead like angels." In Act 2, Scene 2, Macbeth concludes later that the only reason he has for wanting to kill the king is his ambition and not because the king is bad. He says, 'I have no spur to prick the sides of my intent but only vaulting ambition which overleaps itself and falls on the other side.'

Another de jure king in Macbeth, is the King of England. We do not see this king in the play. He is only mentioned as the king who hosts Malcom the son and heir to Duncan, when he flees to exile for refuge. According to Malcom, the king of England is portrayed as a divine right king. According to Malcom the king has virtues like piety, hospitality and healing. His hospitality is expressed in Act 3, Scene 6, by a Lord who talks to Lenox about the whereabouts of Malcom and Macduff. He says that Malcom who has been deprived of his birthright as his father's successor by a tyrannical Macbeth now stays in England and has been well received by Edward with such hospitality despite his high title of a king of England. It is there that Macduff too has run in search for help from the king and also to stir up Northumberland and war like Siward of which by their help they are hopeful that they will overthrow Macbeth and be able to regain their stability and peace. (ll 24 -34).

In the words cited in the quotation, Malcom is praising the King of England for his infinite virtues: He says, that this king can heal mysterious sicknesses by a mere touch. This is so because he is divine. Because he is God's lieutenant, he gets the power of healing from God. In

Act 4 scene 3, the Doctor testifies that “There are a crew of wretched souls that stay his cure. Their malady convinces the great assay of art but at his touch, such sanctity has heaven given his hand” (ll. 141-143).

The above observation re- affirms Malcom’s account to Macduff: With reference to the King of England, In Act 4, Scene 3, Malcolm says:

A most miraculous work in this good king, /Which often since my here remain in England, /I have seen him do. How he solicits heaven; himself /Best knows; but strangely visited people, all swoln and /Ulcerous, pitiful to the eye, the mere despair of surgery /He cures, hanging a golden stamp about their necks, /Put on with holy prayers; and ‘tis spoken to the succeeding /Royalty he leaves the healing benediction (Act 4, Scene 3).

According to Malcom a good leader should seek God. In Act 4 scene 3, Malcom further says that if the king is good, he will have a heavenly gift of prophesy and sundry blessings hang about his throne that speak him full of grace (ll155-158.) To this effect, King Edward is described as a benevolent ruler who is loved by God and his subjects. He represents the virtues of a dejure king. The description King Edward contrasts with the portrayal of a self –made king, Macbeth who desecrates kingship by killing people so he can protect his kingship.

By inference, King Duncan can be likened to the king in England. In Act 1 scene 3, Duncan is depicted as a generous king who welcomes his generals back from the battle field and rewards them. For instance, he promotes Macbeth and honors him with a visit. Moreover, when Duncan dies, Macduff describes him as “the life of the house and the father of the people.” Macbeth, too, has to think twice before killing him because Duncan is known to be a virtuous man.

Like the king of England, Duncan epitomizes the benefits of being a de jury king, one appointed by God and rules on behalf of God. Such kings are confident because their power is not contestable

Similarly, Richard is a de jury king and he is represented as a man who has become king by virtue of his inheritance and all powerful. He is the eldest son of King Edward III's eldest son. So he is a legitimate heir to the throne.

However, the two de jury kings: Duncan and Richard dialectically represented. They are mortal with some failings which contributed to their being deposed. Despite the fact that they have automatic legitimacy, they are overthrown due to shortcomings in their character and political craftsmanship all of which have been discussed in chapters two and three.

Linn Michael D (1962), in "A Study of Kingship in Shakespeare's History Plays", asserts that:

For a modern audience, Richard II first appears as a good king because he has a gift of pageantry. He uses words well and acts very well the role of king in public, yet for Shakespeare's audience, Richard was a bad king whose deposition was perhaps inevitable, but whose murder was avenged only by half – century of civil war (23).

The de jury king did not have any shadows of removal from power. Nobody could dare condemn such a king. If he erred, it would be God punishing the people. Those who attempted in the removal of a de jury king faced repercussion because they apparently removed an "anointed servant" of God—God's representative on earth.

The events in the plays analyzed above support what Linn says. Namely that all who dare depose the de jury King have no peace. In Act 2 scene 2, after killing of King Duncan, Macbeth becomes too guilty for what his hands have done by saying that even the water of the ocean cannot wash out the blood from his hand. By this he means his sin is incurable. It is a sacrilege

indeed. Macbeth confirms his sinfulness when he says he could not pray. The prayer got stuck in his throat because he had killed a holy one of God.

Duncan is a good and gracious man. No wonder when he dies, people lament for him including Macduff who said these words on seeing the body of Duncan, “a most sacrilegious murder had broken ope the Lords anointed temple and stole hence the life of the building.” Act 2 scene 3, 67-69. In the quotation, we get to know that king Duncan is an anointed servant of God, divinely appointed and therefore legitimate in his Kingship. His virtues pleading like angels are an indication of his good nature. Therefore, the act of murder by Macbeth is sacrilegious.

When Macduff flees to England to seek for help in ousting the tyrannical Macbeth from power, he meets with Malcom the son to the fallen king and laments about Duncan to the son. “Thy royal father was a most sainted king.”

This all points to the king as a man led by the grace of God. That is why when Macbeth kills King Duncan an anointed servant of God, he is said to have committed a sacrilege and indeed whatever he does proves he has fallen out of grace. For example, Macbeth’s wife, Lady Macbeth suffers a strange disease for masterminding the plot to kill Duncan. Out of too much guilt for example Act 5, scene 2, Lady Macbeth says; “here’s the smell of the blood still; all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand. Oh! Oh! Oh!” Lady Macbeth is guilty of the fact that her and the husband killed the innocent people. The effect on her is too much that she sleep-walks. The doctor too becomes confused on how to diagnose the sickness when he tells the lady in waiting in act V.I that the disease is beyond his practice yet he had known those which have sleep walked who had died peacefully in their beds. This means that lady Macbeth is suffering from psychological torture and the doctor suggests that she needs more of divine than the physician. This means that she needs God’s intervention more.

Similarly, when King Richard is killed, the usurper does not feel settled. He is not happy at the sudden death of the king and the manner in which he was killed. His unhappiness is seen when he tells Exton the murderer that he does not thank him for what he has done because the killing of the king is a deed of slander committed with hands that now weighs heavily upon King Henry's head and the entire famous land. And continues to say that though he did wish him dead, he hates the murderer. Meaning he did not want the king to die in any man's hand by being killed. Instead, he could have wished the king to have died a natural death. And because of that he decided to banish the murderer. He too vows to go for a pilgrimage in order to atone the guilt and also mourn for the fallen king (Richard II).

Owing to the deposition and murder of King Richard, King Henry is out of peace. He believes God is punishing him in the son for what his hands have done. In Act 3, Scene 2, the king attributes his disappointment in the son to be God's punishment. King Henry says:

I know not whether God will have it so /for some displeasing service I have done.
/That in his secret doom out of my blood, /he'll breed revengement and a scourge
for /me but thou dost in the passage of my life make /me believe that thou art only
mark'd for the hot /vengeance, and the road of heaven, to punish my
/mistreadings. Tell me else could such inordinate and /low desires such poor, such
bare, such lewd, /such mean attempts, such barren pleasures, /rude society, as
thou art match'd withal, /and grafted to, accompany the greatness of thy /blood
and hold their level with thy princely heart (Act 3, Scene 2).

King Henry believes God is punishing him for what his hand has done especially in the overthrow and murder of a legitimate king Richard.

Considering all these benefits, of a de jure king, one would think Shakespeare was advocating the maintenance of the status quo that is gaining political power through heredity rather meriting the position of power.

According to the second objective, Shakespeare represents de facto leaders in a manner that convinces us that leadership should go to those with virtue on one hand. For example, having virtues like being hardworking, vigilant, and the love for people. Macbeth is portrayed as hardworking to merit trust. As a hardworking soldier during the reign of King Duncan, Macbeth managed to fight the Norwegian rebels and defeated them. The King had over trusted Macdonwald as Thane of Cowdar in keeping the northern part of Scotland and he ended up conniving with the Norwegian rebels to overtake Scotland as reported by the wounded Scottish soldier, so Macbeth took it upon himself to ensure that he defends the kingdom even without being instructed. This action of defending the kingdom reveals a Macbeth who is patriotic, hardworking and active. These are strong qualities of a de facto leader.

Another quality of Macbeth is being kind and good hearted. Lady Macbeth attests to Macbeth's behavior in Act 2 scene V.as follows:

Glamis thou art and Cowdar shall be, /What thou art promised. /Yet do I fear thy nature. /It is too full of the milk of human kindness /To catch the nearest way. (II: 14-18.).

Lady Macbeth is a bad hearted woman. Ironically, she testifies that her husband is a virtuous man. This means that Macbeth is a good man who can love the people he rules. In Chinua Achebe's novel *Arrow of God*, a saying goes that "people only see houses and roof tops of the house but it's the people who live inside that knows the smoke and fire in it. Meaning that lady Macbeth knew the husband's goodness, making him a good candidate for kingship.

In a similar way Henry is seen as hardworking with the love of people According to Linn Michael (1962) says, Henry IV possess good leadership qualities needed for a king in comparison to King Richard II. He has a sense of justice and saves the poor. He is interested in

the welfare of England. King Henry is just and upholds respect for the subjects. He is also dignified, considerate and doesn't impose heavy taxes on his people and above all not wasteful. His only misfortune was lack of a legitimate claim to the throne.

Bolingbroke as a fighter of injustice is further portrayed before his banishment, by trying to show concern for England to see that justice prevails through bringing Mowbray to book. He does so by accusing him to the king for the murder of Thomas Woodstock the duke of Gloucester, and also of fraud.

Bolingbroke doesn't trust Mowbray. He knows he is a hypocrite. From outward appearance Bolingbroke says that people think he is a good man but inwardly he is a traitor and dangerous when he says:

Mowbray has received eight thousand nobles in name /Of lending for your highness soldiers, the which he hath /Detained for lewd employments, like a false traitor and an /Injurious villain, further I say and further will maintain upon /His bad life to make all this good that he did not plot the duke /Of Gloucester's death sluiced out his innocent soul /Through streams of blood (Act II.I.I: 88-105)

In other words, Bolingbroke seems to suggest that Mowbray has a mistaken identity and should be arrested for the murder of Gloucester and not to be trusted anymore.

Henry is down to earth, he courts the people, loves the poor and interacts freely with them. Which means he easily fits in any situation for example lowering himself to associate and interact with the commoners, this was a trick for him in gaining favor and popularity. For power resides with the people. Richard did observe his closeness to the populace, Richard acknowledged that Bolingbroke had become a darling to the masses when he said that he seemed to have captured their hearts deeply. He was familiar and courteous. The poor and the slaves were wooed by his smiles. (Act I, scene 5, ll: 24-28).

Prince Harry just like the father, has the capacity and capability of interacting with lower class people in their own level. We see much of that when he was in East cheap. The Prince's mates were commoners who engaged in dubious activities like robbery, heavy drinking. One of his mates was Falstaff, Bardolph, Poins, Peto, GadsHill etc. in east cheap. Falstaff is more of a surrogate father to Prince Harry. He is corrupt.

Linn D cites the fact that Hal is a down to earth prince. A royal who has lowered himself and not live like a king's son. He is responsible, a quality he inherited from the father;

Hal like Falstaff is able to see the vanity of the pomp and ceremony of court life and has a magnetic quality that holds the loyalty of his fellows. He as a ruler has inherited from his father a sense of responsibility, self-disciplines and power to act prudently (113).

However, Shakespeare does not let the darker side of the de facto kings go unchecked. He brings out leaders who use cunningness and cruelty to get power. A good example is Macbeth

Macbeth's choice to use the sword rather than the love of the poor to sustain the power highlights a greatest weakness of de facto leadership. Macbeth becomes a serial killer in order to safeguard his power. Macbeth becomes insecure especially at Banquo's presence for the weird sisters had prophesied him not to be a King but will beget Kings. He openly discusses his fears with the wife and the wife responds that it is better to be safe by destroying those who pose a threat to his office than by destroying oneself in doubtful joy. (II 6-7).

In Act 3 scene 1, Macbeth openly discusses his fears and insecurities of being a king but without continuity in his bloodline. This is because the witches uplifted Banquo as being a father to a line of kings. He becomes so traumatized by the fact that none of his son will succeed him as a king. "And upon my head they put a fruitless crown. (II: 60-64)

He becomes excessively insecure and jealous at Banquo. This therefore makes him heartless and becomes bloody [murderer]. He plans the execution of Banquo. By him saying that he rather has Banquo out of his sight than him being present. (Act 3, scene 5, ll.14-15.) Macbeth feels insecure and thinks that elimination of those he sees as a threat is the only way out, the witches tell him to be aware of Macduff. 'Beware of Macduff,' and so Macbeth plans the killing of Macduff due to insecurity after being told to be careful:

But yet I'll make assurance double sure and /Take a bond of fate; thou shall not live, that I /May tell pale hearted fear it lies and sleep in spite /of thunder (ll: 83-86).

In Act 4 scene 3, Macbeth vows to surprise the castle of Macduff, after hearing that the latter has fled into exile on account of Macbeth's reign of terror. Macbeth indeed seizes upon the thane of Fife and executes Macduff's wife, his off springs and those he finds present. Therefore, Macbeth's reign as a De Facto King had a lot of loopholes. There was no peace and security in Scotland. Macduff tells Malcom in Act 5, scene 3, ll 4-6 Pg.129 "each new morn, new widows howl, new orphans cry, new sorrows strike heaven on the face." That information gives the state of affairs in Scotland. However, Linn goes on to say Machiavelli also warns that a prince must not take pleasure in people's suffering. He ought to be cruel but should be expedited judiciously- for it will discourage or prevent unrest in the state and that would be disastrous to the rest of the populace. Unfortunately, Macbeth chose on one extremity which is cruelty, he evoked fear in the subjects and we see that he had resorted to murdering those who threatened his kingship bringing unrest in the country. Thereby losing popularity among the population leading to his subsequent overthrow. In Act 5, scene 3, Macbeth is termed as a devil and Macduff tells Malcom, "not in the legion of horrid hell could come a devil more damned in evils to top Macbeth" (IV. III line 55-57 p. 13). In Act 5 scene 4, Anans tells Lenox, Menteith, that Macbeth, is paying the price for his

incessant murders. He is no longer loved. “Those he commands move only in command; nothing love.” (ll 118-119). This shows that Macbeth had lost the love from the people due to his cruelty and selfish ambition.

In Act 4 scene 3, When Ross flees to England, he gives Macduff gives an overview of the state of Scotland under the reign of Macbeth. He exclaimed at the state of the country. He called it poor and expressed his shame in calling Scotland their mother country. This is so when he equates his country to a grave. The inhabitants of Scotland no longer smile but live in pain for he said that it is full of sighs and groaning. This therefore is characteristic of a violent environment. (ll 164-173).

The above therefore shows that Scotland is not worth of human living. It is a dead country as there is no peace, insecurity. The once glorious Scotland is no more.

In conclusion, according to Machiavelli’s advice that says a leader should come to power by unopposing authority for example through heredity. However, even if he is appointed by unopposing authority, he should work hard to satisfy the expectations of all the people. In this way he will be following Machiavelli’s recommendation that a prince should lead by people.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter focused on the conclusions and recommendations of the study in line with the research objectives. Considering the dialectical presentation of both the De Jury and the De Facto kings in *Richard II*, *Macbeth*, *Henry IV: Part 1* and *Henry IV: Part 2*, the researcher sought to query the best way of coming into power and the mechanisms of maintaining a peaceful tenure of that power.

5.2 Findings and Conclusions

As discussed in this study, the plays reveal that both types of leaders/Kings have virtues and faults. A de facto King is a performer. He is popular and concerned about the welfare of his people. These are desirable qualities for leadership is all about service.

However, the de facto leader is beset by his methods of coming into power and the methods of maintaining the power. If he comes into power by the people's consent, he becomes the slave of either the kingmakers or the flatterers. He has to do what they want and this drags the establishment into negative liberalism. Failure to please the people may result into factions. A case in point is Bolingbroke, in *Henry IV: Part 1* where those who supported the king to get power (king-makers) turn against him for not granting their desires.

On the other hand, when a de facto ruler comes into power by killing the former ruler, he is going to be haunted by this bloodshed. The supporters of the former leader will revenge and the de facto leader will be forced to counter revenge. The subsequent wanton shedding of blood will make people rethink of displacing the de facto leader, thus leading to continuous political

mayhem. This situation is exemplified in Macbeth who is beheaded by the relatives of the people Macbeth killed.

The plays discussed show an alternative form of leadership, the de jure King/ruler. This kind of leader comes into power peacefully because the law supports his coming into power unopposed. His method of getting power has several benefits. One, he rules without opponents. He has the peoples support especially if the people love the one this leader has succeeded. Because he has not threat to his tenure of power, he will sit comfortably on the throne. He will love and trust the people he rules. Cases in point are the hereditary rulers like: King Duncan who can put absolute trust in his lieutenants. Another hereditary ruler who sits comfortably on the throne is King Richard II.

However, the de jure king as discussed tends to enjoy too much freedom and forgets to be watchful of the activities in his kingdom. They also tend to be overconfident and this makes them forget their bound duty to care for the people they lead. The worst scenario is when their overconfidence leads to abuse of their subject. A case in point is King Richard II who uses his position as a de jure king. He levies heavy taxes on the subjects to support the wars. The king wages these wars to bring coffers in his own pocket rather than the treasury of the kingdom. Furthermore, the king uses his unopposed power to kill people, to send them into exile and to confiscate their property.

Given this dialectical scenario, one might say that perhaps the virtues of the de facto king should be adopted by the de jure ruler to balance the ways in which leadership is achieved, managed and sustained. The law is required to make one a leader but this leader should not take power for granted. He has to support his tenure on the throne by being hardworking, participatory, politically watchful, and also have the people he rules at heart regardless of their statuses. Of the

two methods of acquiring and maintaining power, discussed, none of them can be complete. Both the de facto and de jure style of leadership are complimentary. As the commoners say in *Julius Caesar*, Act 1, Scene 2, the good points of the dictator Caesar should be given to the ideal leader Brutus to complete the picture.

5.3 Recommendations

This study recommends as follows:

1. That future literary scholars should examine the place of the Shakespearean “Histories” or political plays/drama in the discourse of Twenty-First Century global politics and governance, since they espouse pertinent issues on politics and leadership that keep to be reflected in the contemporary global world.
2. Shakespearean political drama texts/plays, also known as, “Histories”, should be included on both the undergraduate and graduate curricular so that students appreciate Shakespeare’s contribution to leadership and governance.

REFERENCES

- Alan Jay Zaremba, (1984). *Crisis Communication: Theory and Practice*. Armonk New York London. England.
- Amorita Sharma, (1998). *The Sterling Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
- Anonymous chambers dictionary, (1993). *edition [http/ link.springer.com](http://link.springer.com)*. last visited on 24 -09.2020.
- Anonymous, <https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc-diss>
- Beardsworth Richard, (1996). *Derrida and The Political*. Routledge, London.
- Bennington Geoffrey, (1989). *Deconstruction is Not What You Think*. Omnibus volume. Academy editions. London.
- Bhardwaj A, (2014). *Shakespeare on Leadership, Communication and Management: Implications for Cross-Cultural Business Contexts*. *Journal of creative Communication*, 9(2), 161-184.
- Bough John, (1993). *Husserl and The Deconstruction of Time” in review of metaphysics*.
- Chalmers. A. Johnson, (1982). *Second edition Revolutionary Change*. Stanford University Press, California.
- Christopher, Cosan and Reina, (2017). *Leadership Ethics of Machiavelli’s The Prince*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Clement M. Eyster, (1679-1685). *Drama as a Political Instrument*. USA Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cornville. Corrigan, P, (1999). *Shakespeare on Management*. Kogan page, London.

David Thomson, (1966). *Europe since Napoleon*. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

Dickens A.G, (1991), *The English reformation*. Pennsylvania State University press, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Dowden Edward, (1912), *Introductory Studies of the Reveal of Plays of Shakespeare* Vol. 4 Macmillan and Co. Limited. Sr. Martins Street , London.

Eagleton Terry, (1986). *William Shakespeare; Re reading Literature*, Oxford Blackwell.

Editors of Encyclopedia. Divine Rights of Kings/ Definition History and Facts. Britannica. [www. Britannica.com.top](http://www.Britannica.com.top).

Ethan Gibson, Simon Fraser University, (2019). *How Art Thou a King? Machiavelli and The Failure of Richard II*. Simon Fraser University. [https://journals lib.sfu.ca/index.php/s/c/uwc](https://journals.lib.sfu.ca/index.php/s/c/uwc).

Eugene Jennings, (1960). *An Anatomy of Leadership*, Harper Newyork.

Evans, J. Claude, (1991). *Strategies of Deconstruction: Derrida and the Voice*. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis.

Forgeng, Jeffrey L, (2010). *Daily life in Elizabethan England*. Santa Barbara Greenwood Publishing Group, California.

Fr. Chola Ben, Brain Urungi et al, (2018), *Leadership for Christian Leaders Since 1956* issue no 578.

GRK Murty, (2019). *Leadership Lessons from Shakespeare Plays*, Cambridge Scholars publishing Lady Stephenson library, Newcastle.

Harvey C. Mansfield, (1990). *The Prince Nicollo Machiavelli” Second Edition, Translated and with an Illustration. Henry V, Coriolanus, Mark Antony and Lear*. 1990 Dissertation, Loyota University Chicago.

[https://graduate way.com](https://graduate.way.com). Last visited 8th Jan 2020.

<https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc-diss>.

John Halverson, (1994). *The Lamentable Commedy of Richard II English Literary Renaissance*

John Neville Figgis, (1970). *Divine Rights of Kings, Gloucester Mass*, Peter Smith.

Julia Andrea Milaca, (2012). *Royalty and Divine Right in William Shakespeare’s Histories King John and Richard II*. Bdd-A197@2012 Editura universitatii, Alexandra Joan Cuza”

Kantorowicz Ernst, (1957). *The Kings Two Bodies: A study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton University press, New Jersey.

Kelly Henry Ansgar, (1970). *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeares Histories* Cambridge M,A ; Harvard University Press.

Lalley, James C, (1990). *Lessons in Leadership; An Analysis of five Shakespeare Characters, Richard II, Henry V, Coriolanus, Mark Anthony and Lear*.

Lawlor, Leonard, (2019) (Ed). *Jacques Derrida' the Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* full 2019 edition) Edward n Zalta edition (ed) URL<[https:// plato.stanford.edu/archives/full](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/full). Last visited sept 2020.

Linn, Micheal D, (1962). *Study of Kingship in Shakespeare's History Plays*. Graduate Student Theses, Dissertation and Professional Papers 3718 [https://scholarworks. Umt edu/ etd/3718](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/3718).

Lorena Stuparu, (2015). *The Medieval Idea of Legitimacy and The King's Two Bodies*. Trivent Publishing

Micheal Maccobby, (1981). *The Leader*, Simon and Schuster, Newyork.

Munter M, (2011). *Guide to Managerial Communication*. New Delhi: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Nicollo Machiavelli, (1532). *The Prince*. Italy Antonio Blado D'asola.

Nicollo Machiavelli, (1995). *The Prince*. Translated by David Wooton Hacket.

North house peter guy, (2015), *Introduction to Leadership*. Michigan university USA.

Paul N Siegels, (1992). *The Gathering Storm, Shakespeares English and Roman History Plays; A Marxist Analysis*, Red Words, London.

Richard Burn, LL. D, (1842). Vol 4. *The Ecclesiastical Law*. London.

Richard Kearney, (2005). *Deconstruction, Good and the Possible*, Taylor and Frances Group, Newyork.

Richard Oliver, Julie Venty, (2008). *Rehearsing Tomorrow's Leaders, The Potential of Myth Drama Business strategy series,*

vol.9.issue.3pp.138143.1doi.org/10.1108/17515630810873375

Richards, Denis, (1977). *An Illustrated History of Modern Europe 1789- 1984.* 7th Edition London Long Man group ltd.

Royle, Nicholas, (2000). *Deconstruction: A Users Guide.* Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Sage publications <http://11crc.sagepub.comBooks> Berghan. Beginning of Hamlet and King, Lear, A journal of social and political theory stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4180B77>

Sallies, John (ed) (1987). *Deconstruction and Philosophy.* University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Shamsi Farnaz, (2016). *Kingship as A Divine Right in Shakespeare in King Richard II.* European Journal of English and Literature. Centre for Research Training and Development. U.K.

The monitor (kampala) y.allafrica.com.

Valeria Caggiano, (2018). *Education to Leadership; Shakespear's exempla and soft skills.* Universita Degli Studi, Roma tre Department of Education, Vial del castro Ptetorio 20-00185, Rome.

Veit, Etzol, (2012). *Power Plays: What Shakespeare Can Teach on Leadership. Business Strategy Series 13.* 63-69.

Vincent B Leitch, (1983). *Deconstructive Criticism. An Advanced Introduction*,
Columbia University, Newyork,f

Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus, (1985). *Leaders*, Harper and Row publisher, Newyork.

Wilders John, (1978). *The Lost Garden; AView of Shakespeares English and Roman
History Plays.*