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SECTION I
AN INTRODUCTION

I have been studying how I may compare
This prison where I live unto the world;
And, for because the world is populous,
And here is not a creature but myself,
I cannot do it. Yet I'll hammer it out.

Richard II; V,v
Both England and the United States have maintained a rich historical tradition of placing their leaders on a pedestal. England's history maintains the "Divine Right of Kings," while the United States maintains the "Divine Right of the Presidency."

Renaissance England of 1350-1600 believed in the Divine Right of Kings within the scope of the Great Chain of Being. The chain linked England and the world to heaven through a human and earthly chain from God to earth. This chain formed a hierarchy. At the top of the chain, of course, was God. Below God, in descending order, were the angels, man, the animals and plants of the earth, and the four elements of earth, air, fire, and water. During the English Renaissance this notion of the Great Chain took on a whole new meaning. It was within each section of the chain that a separate hierarchy became established. Within the human section of the chain, the king was placed at the top, while the peasants were placed at the bottom. This "natural order of things" portrayed man as ordered according to his role in society:

The chain stretched from the foot of God's throne to the meanest of inanimate objects. Every speck of creation was a link in the chain, and every link except those at the two extremities was simultaneously bigger and smaller than another: there could be no gap.
If an important link in this chain was damaged or removed, tremors of vibration and unrest would result throughout the entire chain. A disruption in the natural order of things would take place.

It was partially out of this concept of the Great Chain of Being that the Divine Right of Kings became established. In 800, when Charlemagne was crowned Holy Roman Emperor by Pope Leo III, a new belief was born. The principle of the divine right theory placed the king underneath God. According to this theory, the king served under God, and was responsible only to him. In Renaissance England, the divine right theory gave the king even greater importance in the natural order, the Great Chain of Being. Thus, should a king be murdered or deposed, tremendous repercussions would be sent throughout the chain, as the political order of England and the natural order of the world would be disturbed.

Twentieth Century United States has created its own version of the Divine Right of Kings. That is, we have created the "Divine Right of the Presidency." Every four years, we elect or reelect a man to the office of the President of the United States who will serve as our leader and, quite likely, may help to shape a lifestyle for the nation. Yet, the president goes beyond that. The president also serves as a religious symbol for the nation. As Michael Novak states in his book, Choosing Our King:
I began with two convictions: that the presidency is the nation's most central religious symbol, and that American civilization is best understood as a set of secular religious systems.3

When we elect a man to the presidency, we engage in an event akin to religious ritual. Our identity is somewhat determined by the man we appoint.4 The president serves as the prevailing figure in American politics, in whom we may or may not place our highest expectations. Anything that a president says or does may be classified as symbolic:

A President's actions are always symbolic because he is not only an executive officer but a carrier of meaning.5

Thus, in the electronic television age of the Twentieth Century we have given royalty a new life in the presidency.

When William Shakespeare wrote The Tragedy of King Richard II in 1595 for his native England, he sought to explore the implications of the fall of Richard II and how it applied to the great chain and the divine right. How did these concepts apply? The actual fall of Richard II occurred in 1399 as England experienced crisis in civil war as it moved from the Middle Ages into the Renaissance. With the aid of Raphael Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland as his main historical source, Shakespeare examines the fall of Richard II and the rise of Richard's usurper, Henry Bolingbroke, in an historically accurate drama. Shakespeare poses to his audience a question of legitimacy versus competency: Should the active
Bolingbroke take the crown from the legitimate Richard, despite the king's obvious incompetence? If so, how will England suffer through the disruption in the natural order of things?

In the middle 1970's of Twentieth Century United States, the decline of a contemporary ruler from office took place. Richard Nixon, the thirty-seventh President of the United States resigned from his post on August 9, 1974. Faced with the possibility of impeachment, Nixon reelected only two years before by one of the largest margins in presidential election history, resigned in disgrace. Accused with crimes involving obstruction of justice, Nixon decided to vacate the White House.

Although there are probably more contrasts than there are comparisons, the differences that separate these two personalities in such ways as time and place, this paper will seek the similarities that link the character of Richard II as portrayed in Shakespeare's The Tragedy of King Richard II and Richard Nixon in the final ten months of his presidency. This comparison will involve three areas of thought: 1) Both men undergo "the pseudo-tragedy of the self-made man." Richard Nixon and Richard II are "self-made" because they had both been tested in the general area of personal struggle (particularly for Richard Nixon) and in crisis management as they sought personal control of the highest respective offices their nations had to offer. After achieving control of these positions of
rulership, both men lost control of their respective positions. Their individual plights are termed as "pseudo-tragedies" because their declines do not follow the strict pattern that composes a gradual rise to and denouement from a climax that marks the movement of the traditionally recognized Elizabethan tragedy. However, their respective declines do contain some similarity to the tragic movement.

2) A similarity exists between the abstract symbols associated with the fall of Richard II by Shakespeare and the symbols that surrounded the decline of the Nixon White House. 3) England and the United States experienced a period of disturbance following the declines of their respective leaders. England had undergone an extensive struggle for power following the demise of Richard II in the form of civil war and strife. Following the resignation of Richard Nixon, the people of the United States no longer looked upon the presidency with awe. Rather, the awe was replaced by skepticism. In other words, the presidency as a religious symbol (in the sense that "religious" is used by Michael Novak in *Choosing our King*) had been tarnished.
In winter's tedious nights sit by the fire
With good old folks and let them tell the tales
Of woeful ages long ago betid;
And ere thou bid good night to quite their griefs,
Tell thou the lamentable tale of me
And send the hearers weeping to their beds.

Richard II; V,i
In his English history plays, Shakespeare transformed historical accounts into dramas for the stage. In these plays, for the most part, he adapted Raphael Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland to prove his point:

It is clear from the chronicle plays, and from every other play where subjects are touched on that Shakespeare had a philosophy of history. His reverence for the anointed king and consequent horror at usurpation: his regard for order, and distrust of the common people as a factor in politics, have been discussed by generations of critics.6

Shakespeare exploited the history of his dramas to speak for the political philosophy of his day.7 Shakespeare's histories are political in nature. The plays examine government of both benevolent and malevolent natures as they focus particularly on the kings who lead these governments. It is from this note of "politics" that the history can be distinguished from the tragedy in Elizabethan drama. While the tragedy was built around the philosophy of "ethics," the history was built around the philosophy of "politics."8 Lilly B. Campbell writes further:

Nevertheless, the dividing line is there, and it is to this distinction between private and public morals that we must look for the distinction between tragedy and history.9

It is with this knowledge of the history play and
Shakespeare's involvement with it that *The Tragedy of Richard II* can be examined. Although this drama is labeled "Tragedy" by its author, critics have placed *Richard II* into the category of the history play. Shakespeare's source for this drama was Holinshed's *Chronicles*. *Richard II* is an historically accurate drama.\(^{10}\) It is quite likely that the *Chronicle* translation involving the plight of Richard II was felt by Shakespeare to demand all of his personal attention without any fabrication.\(^{11}\) Furthermore, *Richard II* fulfills the requirements of a history play as it goes beyond the realm of personal morality (with the decline and fall of Richard II) and into the realm of the philosophies of the body-politic (the effects of Richard's decline and fall upon England). Thus, it is with *The Tragedy of Richard II* that Shakespeare sought to employ his "philosophy of history."

*The Tragedy of Richard II* begins a Shakespearian historical tetralogy. The subsequent plays are, of course, *Henry IV, Part 1*, *Henry IV, Part 2*, and finally *Henry V*. The tetralogy from *Richard II* to *Henry V* portrays an historical movement from a period of faction and political turmoil to a temporary period of order.\(^{12}\) *Richard II* ends in civil war. This civil strife will last until stability arrives at the throne in the form of Henry V. Shakespeare incorporates the character development of Henry V (Prince Hal) into the entire tetralogy. At the beginning, Prince Hal is viewed as the wild, unruly youth.
In the end, he becomes, in Shakespeare's view, one of England's greatest kings:

Richard II does its work in proclaiming the great theme of the whole cycle of Shakespeare's History Plays: the beginning in prosperity, the distortion of prosperity by a crime, civil war, and ultimate renewal of prosperity.13

Despite its "history play" status, The Tragedy of Richard II is not removed from its tragic elements. These elements involve first, a pseudo-tragic hero (Richard II), and secondly, a character decline somewhat similar to that shown in Shakespeare's great tragedies.

Richard II serves a "pseudo-tragic hero" in the Shakespearean history. With the character of Richard, the reader views a man who is plagued by a tragic flaw in his character that partially accounts for his fall from the throne. Richard may be called a pseudo-tragic figure because his tragic flaw only partially results in his decline from the throne. In other words, Shakespeare does not hold Richard II solely responsible for his personal decline because other factors are involved.14

Furthermore, the movement of events that take place in The Tragedy of Richard II follows a tragic pattern. Through the course of the drama, Richard experiences a rise in action toward a climax as the confrontation between Bolingbroke and himself begins to build. This action reaches a climax as Richard returns from Ireland to face his usurper in Act III. From the point of the climax, Richard experiences a decline in his character after he
is removed from the throne by Bolingbroke and is then forced to face him in the removal proceedings at Westminster. Before his death in the tower, Richard's character is slightly redeemed through a tragic recognition of his own faults, and he reasserts himself accordingly. He fights Exton, the king's henchman, who has come to carry out the execution upon Richard. Richard is inspired to challenge and defy Bolingbroke's power in a fight against Exton and his men that results in Richard's own death. Despite these tragic pattern elements of flaw, rise and fall, and recognition, one must also remember that the plot only serves as a pseudo-tragic decline. The events of this history do not follow in their movement the strict pattern that marks the typical tragic decline of an Elizabethan drama. For example, as Richard faces Bolingbroke at Westminster in Act IV, Richard's use of language places Bolingbroke in an odd position, and this serves to elevate his own character:

Alack, why am I sent for to a king,  
Before I have shook off the regal thoughts  
Wherewith I reign'd? I hardly yet have learn'd  
To insinuate, flatter, bow, and bend my knee.  
Give sorrow leave awhile to tutor me,  
To this submission. Yet I well remember  
The favors of these men. Were they not mine?  
Did they not sometime cry, "All hail!" to me?  
So Judas did to Christ. But he, in twelve,  
Found truth in all but one; I in twelve thousand none.  
God save the King! Will no man say amen?  

Thus, despite its similarities to the typical Elizabethan tragedy, Richard II is classified as a history play. Despite its personal examinations of character,
it is more concerned with an entire political body. Despite its dramatic content, it remains an historically accurate work, based on Holinshed's *Chronicles*. Despite the play's tragic-like plot and development of character, *The Tragedy of King Richard II* is, at best, a pseudo-tragedy.
SECTION III
THE PERSONAL HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS OF
RICHARD II AND RICHARD NIXON

Thou dost beguile me! Was this the face
That every day under his household roof
Did keep ten thousand men? Was this the face
That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?

Richard II; IV,i
As indicated earlier, in the introduction, the characters of Richard II and Richard Nixon will be termed as self-made men. Before we look at their declines as "pseudo-tragedies of self-made men," it will be necessary to further define the "self-made" concept. In this section, we will examine their personal backgrounds with that "self-made" theme in mind. Although Richard II inherited the throne from his grandfather, he was forced to struggle somewhat in order to maintain it. For Richard Nixon, although he led a successful political career on his way to the White House, continued to view his life, and particularly, his political career as an intense struggle. The historical figure of Richard II and the contemporary figure of Richard Nixon both had to work their own way into their positions of power. Through the note of self-struggle, they can be recognized as self-made men.

Richard II

Richard II ascended to the throne of England in 1377. At the time he was eleven years of age. After Richard inherited the kingship, a council was appointed to handle the affairs of state until the boy king would be ready to assume the throne. The twenty-two-year period that marked the remainder of his life would be characterized
by his quest to take on and maintain the power of the throne, despite the vulnerability and inexperience of his young age. From his life as a boy king, Richard II was tested by the nobles who surrounded him in his personal handling of crisis management. From these tests, Richard may have sought to prove himself a worthy king to the critics who surrounded him. One of these critics was John of Gaunt, Richard's uncle and brother to Edward III (the Black Prince), and father of Richard II. Gaunt's son, Bolingbroke, became the eventual usurper of his own cousin, Richard.

In 1381, only four years after he had inherited the throne, the young Richard was faced with his first major crisis. A peasant revolt had arisen in protest against a poll tax that was established in 1379 and re-levied in 1380:

The amount fell short of what was needed and in 1380 another poll-tax was levied, and the graduation of this was not so fair; thus, it was brought home to everyone the consequences of ill-government and extravagance.17

When the consequences of poor governmental management had been realized by the peasant class, the reactions were more than violent:

In June, 1381, there was an uprising of Kentishmen under Wat Tyler and John Bell; everywhere in the southeast, manors were burnt and tax rolls destroyed; every lawyer on whom could lay their hands was put to death.18

Richard II, who was forced to face the angry rebels, promised the rebel peasants that their demands would be
agreed to, as he urged them to cease their rioting. As a result, the rebellion ended. Nevertheless, Parliament refused to agree with the reduction of the poll tax promised to the peasants by the king.\textsuperscript{19} Although young Richard managed to bring an end to the peasant crisis, he could not resolve it.

Richard II faced a second crisis as king in the form of the Lollard faction led by John Wycliffe. Wycliffe translated the Bible from its Latin text to the vernacular, English. In addition, the Lollards rebelled against Rome as they asserted that the rising nation-states of Europe should separate themselves from all Papal authority. Although Wycliffe was viewed as a heretic and a revolutionary, heretics were not punished in Richard's contemporary England.\textsuperscript{20} Therefore, Wycliffe was not harmed. However, after Wycliffe's death in 1384, the enemies of Wycliffe finally retaliated as they exhumed his body and burned it.

The third crisis for King Richard came as a dispute against his own throne. This dispute was raised against Richard by members of his own kin. Because Richard had inherited the throne at such a young age, he had come to depend upon the people who originally advised him. As a result, he was noted to be accustomed to "favorites." In turn, Richard appointed these "favorites" to positions of his court. This spoils system of Richard's came to be known as "The Court Party." The opposition against
the Court Party was led by Richard's uncle, Thomas of Gloucester, and by Richard's eventual usurper, Henry of Bolingbroke. As a result of the opposition to the Court Party, Richard was forced to end his system of favorites in favor of a more equitable approach.21

For a period of time following the Court Party confrontation, England began to enjoy prosperity as the Renaissance began to take definite shape. People began to earn wealth under the new capitalistic trade of the Renaissance. At the same time, literature blossomed forth from such authors as Chaucer, Langland, and Wycliffe. In 1394, Richard's Queen, Anne of Bohemia, died. It was speculated that her demise "removed thereby the excellent influence of her peace-loving nature from the affairs of the nation."22 In 1396, Richard's reign was believed to have begun its historic decline as he travelled to Paris to marry Queen Isabella:

In 1396, Richard went to Paris and married Isabella, a child at that time of eight years, daughter of Charles VI of France. While in Paris, Richard's head seems to have been turned by the splendor and luxury of the French Court, and he resolved to return to England and institute the same regal splendor in London. From that time dates his decline.23

In July of 1397, Richard took a swift course of action against the nobles who had been protesting against his policies of kingship. Richard called a session of Parliament together at Westminster. After they had gathered, Richard deployed 4,000 archers to surround the gathered
body. At arrow-point, Parliament was literally forced to take action upon Richard's demands. Richard forced Parliament into carrying out charges of high treason against the English nobles Gloucester, Arundel, and Warwick. As a result, Arundel was beheaded, Warwick was exiled for life to the Isle of Man, and Gloucester was murdered following his dispatch by guard to Calais. Richard had suddenly taken the powers of his reign from that of a boy king to a new extreme. 24

The action depicted in Shakespeare's history play comes to life in December of 1397, as a quarrel breaks out between the Duke of Norfolk (Mowbray) and the Duke of Hereford (Bolingbroke). It is apparent that the argument began over a conversation between the two men concerning the murder of Gloucester. Bolingbroke argued that the murderer was King Richard. Richard referred this quarrel to a court of chivalry. On September 16, 1398, Norfolk and Hereford were scheduled to settle their dispute by means of combat. 25

Thus, the course of history has brought us into the period of time utilized by William Shakespeare in The Tragedy of Richard II. In studying the events leading up to 1398, Richard is seen as a man who was forced to mature at an early age for obvious reasons. In other words, Richard did not age naturally into the position, but was forced to grow up quickly in order to attempt to manage the crises of national government. Once Richard
had ascended the throne, he was forced to prove himself as a leader of England. Richard, in essence, became a self-made man, rather than a king of natural inheritance. In each epoch of his personal story, Richard is tested by the crisis he is forced to face. In return, he acted legally or illegally in order to meet the demands of the given situation. As a result, Richard has been aged and tempered as a king forced to act under the critical scrutiny of those who surrounded him. Richard did not act as a king during the most relaxed time in English history. He was king during a distinct time of change. The Renaissance was emerging, while at the same time peasant rebellions burst upon the scene. Literature was reborn in England, while at the same time literature was used to question the sovereignty of the Catholic Church and the Divine Right of Kings. Richard II was not a boy king who was immediately accepted, but he was forced to prove himself.

Richard Nixon

If there is one word that can best describe the period of Nixon's life from his birth up until the point that begins his final ten months in the White House, the one word would be: "struggle." Richard Nixon's life story involves a movement from humble beginnings into what has been called the world's highest title, the President of the United States. In 1962, Richard Nixon published
his autobiography, *Six Crises*. This autobiography involved a first hand description of six major events that highlighted the Nixon character. In other words, Richard Nixon, despite his success in political circles, views his life as a struggle through a series of crises. Nixon looks for the struggles or difficult periods in his own life as an opportunity for improvement. Nixon, a severe self-critic, believed in meeting each crisis straight on, mastering it, and then moving on. Richard Nixon is the self-made man who worked his way up from middle class America to become the President of the United States. Richard Nixon did not inherit the presidency, but struggled through the system and through one crisis after another to eventually become the President of the United States.

Richard Milhous Nixon was born January 9, 1913 in Yorba Linda, California to his parents, Frank and Hannah Nixon. In 1922, when Nixon was nine years of age, he and his family moved to Whittier, California, where Nixon's father began a business at a country store. As a schoolboy, Nixon was an exceptional student. Nixon's early excellence in study would continue through his graduation from the Duke University School of Law. At home, Nixon was influenced by his Quaker heritage as well as by a firm belief in the Protestant work ethic. The following passage exhibits an example of the daily routine:

Dick Nixon was a 'serious' boy, as the feature writers noted when his early life was at issue. Frank Nixon could hold forth in the family store,
but Hannah drove herself and her family. Her day would begin at the first morning light, and the boys rose with her. The family ate breakfast together, saying their prayers and reciting Bible verses. The chores fell most heavily to Dick when his older brother, Harold, was invalided by tuberculosis. For Richard, then, there was school, there were Quaker services of midweek and three times on Sunday, there was work at the store, there were violin and piano lessons. Years later Donald Nixon would say, 'None of us had too much time to play. Dick has had a lot to make him serious.'

Nixon attended high school for his first two years at Fullerton High School, then transferred to Whittier High School for his junior and senior years. From there, he attended Whittier College. Nixon continued to perform well academically at Whittier, in addition to participating in a variety of extracurricular functions. From Whittier College, Nixon graduated with top honors in his class and moved on to the Duke University School of Law. In 1937, he received his law degree and made the decision to return to Whittier.

It is in an examination of his college and law school years that one may view the importance of struggle and crisis management as a major theme in the Nixon personality. In college, Nixon participated in student government, debate, drama and football. Although Nixon may not have been the best in all of these categories, however the effort definitely existed for Nixon in anything he pursued:

School gave Richard chances to test and to rehearse ways of acting he would later bring together in a political style. Most obviously, he learned there that hard work could bring success.
He brought home good report cards, graduated second in his class from college, third from his class in law school. He got ahead in school, he says, 'not because I was smarter but because I worked longer and harder than some of my more gifted colleagues.'

In law school, Nixon's long hours spent in the law library earned him the nickname of "iron butt" from his fellow students. Nixon was, indeed, a struggler and his years devoted to his education in college and law school would show this trend at an earlier stage of his life. Nixon believed that hard work could equate him with anyone of any talent. He was not afraid to put forth the extra effort.

In the summer of 1937, Richard Nixon began work in Whittier with a local law firm. As he sought work with Whittier civic organizations, he met Patricia Ryan, who would later become his wife. The couple was married June 21, 1940. When World War II began for the United States at the end of 1941, Nixon sought active military duty. He finally signed with the U.S. Navy on September 2, 1942, and was later sent to the South Pacific. Afterward, he was reassigned to Alameda, California, where he served as a contract negotiator. When the war ended, Nixon returned to California where he would start a career in politics.

In 1946, Richard Nixon conducted his campaign as he sought election to the United States House of Representatives. Nixon ran for the Twelfth Congressional District
seat for the state of California. His opponent was Jerry Voorhis. Nixon ran as the Republican candidate against the Democrat who had managed to maintain his seat for ten years despite the large percentage of conservatives in his district. Nixon challenged the incumbent and won. Moreover, the theme of personal hard work and struggle remained consistent in the Nixon practice:

He saw his victory as a 'tremendous achievement' and 'the result of three factors: intensive campaigning; doing my homework; and participating in debate, with my better-known opponent'—nothing there of collaboration, team effort, reliance on any other person. 29

Thus, following the election victory over Voorhis, Nixon was given a new challenge in the form of Washington, D.C. Nixon and family traveled to Washington at the end of 1946. For Nixon, it was the beginning of an entirely new struggle to overcome:

It did not take long for the Washington Post to pin a label on Nixon: 'The greenest congressman in town.' The superlative may have been invidiously meant, but it was accurate. Though Nixon was no hayseed, there was a wide-eyed quality about his early meanderings on Capitol Hill. Photographs taken of him betray it. His eagerness to do the right thing showed in his eyes and in his manner. His clothes were provincial, as former legislative colleagues still recall, but the externals were surely deceiving. For Nixon could feel, as he did, that the Quaker boy from Whittier was now moving in fast company. But he was shrewd enough to understand that Congress could be his oyster if he applied to himself the same rules that brought him success in high school, college, law school, and the Navy. 30

In 1952, only six years after his arrival at Washington, D.C., Richard Milhous Nixon was nominated on the
first ballot with Dwight D. Eisenhower from the Republican Party as candidates for vice-president and president, respectively. Despite accusations concerning illegal use of campaign funds that eventually culminated in the famous "Checkers Speech," Nixon stayed on the ticket. Eisenhower and Nixon were victorious in November, 1952.

In 1960, following the end of eight years of the Eisenhower presidency, Richard Nixon sought and won Republican candidacy for President of the United States. As the Republican candidate, Nixon faced a young John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Four years younger than Nixon, Kennedy defeated him in one of the closest races of presidential electoral history. The highlight of the campaign featured a series of debates between Kennedy and Nixon involving both foreign and domestic issues. It was the first of these debates that has been viewed as the difference in the election. It was the first debate, televised nationally, that featured a pressed, dressed, and well-spoken Kennedy versus a wrinkled, pale, and stuttering Richard Nixon, who needed a shave.

In 1968, Richard Nixon returned to the political limelight following a six year absence from it. Following the defeat by Kennedy, Nixon returned to California to seek the office of Governor of California in 1962. Nixon's opponent was Edmund "Pat" Brown. Nixon lost. Nixon returned to face opponent Hubert Humphrey in the 1968 Presidential Election. Humphrey ran in the footsteps of Lyndon
Baines Johnson, who had decided not to seek another term in office. By 1968, the issues had definitely changed from that of 1960. The United States had become a victim of the Vietnam War abroad, and racial, as well as student anti-war protests on the domestic front. Nixon sought election on a vague campaign platform that stood for peace, both at home and abroad. On January 20, 1969, Richard Milhous Nixon was inaugurated President of the United States.

In 1972, Nixon was reelected in a landslide defeat of Senator George McGovern. Nixon won with one of the largest margins in presidential campaign history, although the Vietnam War had not yet ended. Nixon won despite the continuing student protests that aided in launching McGovern's campaign.

On June 17, 1972, five men were arrested by a security guard in the Democratic Party Headquarters of the Watergate Hotel in Washington, D.C. The five men were arrested for burglary. That simple arrest began what we know now as Richard Nixon's decline from office. The controversy raised over the Watergate arrests was soon added to by other controversy concerning Nixon's affairs in illegal campaign contributions, wiretapping, as well as the secret bombing of Cambodia. President Nixon had become exposed. The period of history that marks Richard Nixon's second term in office also marks the decline of Richard Nixon from the office he committed his entire life to attain.
After reviewing the political career of Richard Nixon, it is important to remember that the theme of personal struggle remains constant. Nixon views his own life as a battle through one crisis, the ability to rise above it, and then to move on to the next challenge. In his book, *The Presidential Character*, James David Barber describes Nixon as an "active-negative" type:

What thread of character ties these events together in a pattern? Nixon believes that he has derived from his crises a series of 'lessons' primarily concerning the emotional dangers of politics and the proper techniques for countering them. He does not develop directions, goals, or movements toward improvement; he discovers lessons. Nixon is proud of his self-criticism, cherishes his stance as 'my own severest critic.' The lessons life has revealed to him are exemplified in the chapter epigraphs for *Six Crises*, such as 'The ability to be cool, confident, and decisive in crisis is not an inherited characteristic but is the direct result of how well the individual has prepared himself for the battle,' and 'Going through the necessary soul-searching of deciding whether to fight a battle, or to run away from it, is far more difficult than the battle itself.' These are his equivalents--expressed, interestingly, in pathological terms--of the 'principles' other active-negative Presidents have found so revoking.31

Nixon, indeed, was the self-made man who struggled through the peaks and valleys of his life all the way to the American Presidency. Nixon's life to this point marks a sixty year period of continuous labor and struggle. In his autobiography, *Six Crises*, he describes his own life as one epoch of crisis, soon to be followed by another. As was Richard II, Richard Nixon had been aged and tempered as man and president, forced to act under the critical
scrutiny who surrounded him. In addition to this, Nixon found his harshest critic in himself. Nixon became a president who believed firmly in his office and its ruling power. Nixon also believed that any crisis could be surmounted through struggle. However, it was during Nixon's final ten months in office that both the president and the dream he represented, would be questioned most seriously by the people of the United States.

Richard Nixon and Richard II both fit into the category of self-made men because neither man naturally inherited the power of his office or position. The attainment of power required struggle for both men. For Nixon, the struggle became an integral part of life, an obsession. The proceeding section will further examine the natures of Richard II and Richard Nixon as self-made men.
SECTION IV
THE PSEUDO-TRAGEDIES OF THE SELF-MADE MEN

O, no, thou diest, though I the sicker be.

Richard II; II,i
Thus far in this thesis presentation, we have distinguished the history play from the tragedy. From that distinction, the term of pseudo-tragedy has been derived. As a basis for comparison, *The Tragedy of King Richard II* and Richard Nixon's final ten months in the White House have been termed pseudo-tragedies of self-made men. In the previous section, the personal historical backgrounds of both men have been examined with the self-made theme in mind.

The object of this section is to continue further into the study of pseudo-tragedy and how *The Tragedy of King Richard II* and Richard Nixon's final ten months can fit into this concept. In addition, we will continue to examine the self-made theme and its place in the pseudo tragic development.

In the previous section, we examined the "self-made" theme by studying the aspects of struggle and crisis management for both men. In this section, we will further examine the self-made aspects by studying Richard Nixon and Richard II as men who were conditioned by their environments, who eventually became products of the society that surrounded them.

In order to look further into the notion of pseudo-tragedy, we will attempt to define this term by examining
some of the traditional components of the Elizabethan tragedy. These components include: 1) the tragic hero, 2) the tragic decline or the falling action of the play, and finally 3) the conclusion of the falling action whereby the tragic hero arrives at the end of his decline and is given a new perspective on his own position as it has been caused by his tragic flaw. Therefore, The Tragedy of King Richard II and Richard Nixon's final ten months in the White House will be compared on the basis of the following three pseudo-tragic elements: pseudo-tragic hero, pseudo-tragic decline, and the resolution of pseudo-tragic decline (the arrival at disgrace for Richard II and for Richard Nixon).

The first element of study involves the pseudo-tragic hero. In the traditional dramatic pattern of movement of Elizabethan tragedy, the tragic hero serves as the protagonist, plagued by a tragic flaw in his character. Because of this tragic flaw, the protagonist (central character) is placed in a major conflict that eventually results in his own downfall and subsequent demise. Richard II and Richard Nixon do not fit precisely into this strict definition of the tragic hero. However, as previously studied in the second section of this thesis, The Tragedy of King Richard II and Richard Nixon's final ten months in the White House are not removed completely from the elements that compose the Elizabethan tragic hero. Therefore, these two men will be compared and contrasted as
pseudo-tragic heroes.

The second element of study involves the pseudo-tragic decline. In the Elizabethan tragedy, the events that followed the climax of the play's major conflict composed the falling action or tragic decline. As pseudo-tragic figures, the character of Richard II and Richard Nixon experienced their own versions of tragic decline. Because these versions of tragic decline do not fit precisely into this strict definition of falling dramatic action (as characterized in the Elizabethan tragedy), the character of Richard II and Richard Nixon will be compared and contrasted according to their pseudo-tragic declines.

The third element of study involves the resolution of the pseudo-tragic declines toward their individual arrival at disgrace. In the typical dramatic movement of the Elizabethan tragedy, the tragic hero concludes his experience of the falling action that marks his own tragic decline. Richard II and Richard Nixon concluded their pseudo-tragic declines in personal disgrace. Richard II, the former king, is imprisoned in the tower at Pomfret Castle to await his execution. Richard Nixon concluded the final ten months of his presidency as the first President of the United States to resign his post before his term in office had concluded.

The Self-Made Men

Shakespeare's The Tragedy of King Richard II and
Nixon's final ten months in the White House serve to illuminate the decline and fall of two self-made men. They both worked to attain and control the highest positions their countries had to offer. Yet, they both fell from that pinnacle of power, and thus faced their respective declines. Before examining the pseudo-tragedies of the men themselves, it is necessary to examine further their respective natures as self-made men, conditioned by their environment, then as products of the society that surrounded them.

Before continuing further in the study of the self-made concept as a basis for comparison between the character of Richard II (as depicted by Shakespeare) and Richard Nixon (in the final ten months of his presidency), it is necessary to qualify the self-made characteristics as they apply to King Richard. As expressed earlier, Richard II was not a Fourteenth Century ruler who inherited the throne at an adult age. Because he ascended the throne at the age of eleven, Richard was forced to mature through his years of puberty as a king, attempting to prove himself accordingly. On the other hand, Richard Nixon serves as the epitome of the self-made man according to its more naturally accepted Twentieth Century United States definition. Nixon worked his way upward from the humble beginnings of his childhood. Richard II was born into the ruling class of his nation as the legal heir to the throne. The purpose of this study (the comparison of the two men
through the self-made theme) is not to force similarities between two dissimilar historical figures. Instead, the object of this study is to examine the possible areas of common ground, if they do exist, as shared by these two men under this self-made theme.

Richard II was the son of the Black Prince. Thus, King Richard was challenged to live down a legacy he had no responsibility for:

Nor did it seem that the harshness of his fate was merited by the sum of his misdeeds. Like Henry VI, he was the peace-loving son of a father whose glory had been to scourge the French, and the Black Prince's memory was a heavy burden to him. His enemies saw him in an image that was not his own.32

In addition to the legacy left behind by his father, Richard was also forced to face the jealousy of his own uncle, John of Gaunt. Gaunt felt the throne of England was rightly his own, instead of that of his brother's son. Throughout Richard's kingship, Gaunt stood as a serious critic of Richard's throne. In Richard II, Shakespeare carries Gaunt's role as a critic to Gaunt's deathbed:

Landlord of England art thou now, not king, Thy state of law is bondslove to the law...33

This quote served as a continuation of Gaunt's earlier statement; "O, no, thou diest, though I the sicker be."34

Richard Nixon was not the son of a prince, nor was he the son of a millionaire. Nixon was the son of a middle class country store owner. To find his way into the presidency, Nixon viewed his own life as a series of struggles.
Along the way in his political career, he was given a critic as was Richard II. Richard II was under the constant scrutiny of John of Gaunt; Richard Nixon was under the constant scrutiny of the press:

He could not understand why the press and the opposition continued to see him as a kind of Jekyll and Hyde—the enormously well-informed and conciliatory Vice President and the gouging political infighter.35

In addition to the pressure that came from newspapers such as The Washington Post, Richard Nixon suffered from not being a glamour figure in the news. Nixon's success came about by his own hard work. Nixon was never viewed as an attractive figure in his political pursuits. He was always ill at ease in front of cameras and never given the label of a photogenic showman.36 Because of this handicap, Richard Nixon failed to captivate the hearts of the American people:

Richard Nixon lacked the grace of reading hearts. He knew only the political surfaces of the people, as well as any man.37

Therefore, if Richard II and Richard Nixon were affected by their societies as they fought their way through the system, and if they were the products of the societies that shaped them, what are their respective natures in The Tragedy of King Richard II and in Nixon's final ten months in the White House? Because Richard II and Richard Nixon had finally fought their way through their respective systems to control the highest positions of their countries, both men relied upon the power of their individual offices.
Richard II maintained that the king was invincible, as was his right under the Divine Right of Kings:

Not all the 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 hath press'd
to life 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.38

Richard Nixon maintained his rights throughout the entire Watergate investigation under his personal claim to executive privilege. According to Nixon, the president has been given special powers above the law. It was during the Civil War that Abraham Lincoln withdrew the rights of habeas corpus. It was during World War II that Franklin Delano Roosevelt interned Japanese Americans. Nixon pointed out that his predecessors had used executive privilege as a means of protecting national security. He asserted that by withholding taped conversations sought by the Watergate Special Prosecutors that had been recorded in the Oval office, he was simply doing the same.

Richard II and Richard Nixon were two men who fought the legalities of the system to control their respective offices. Once they controlled their positions, they relied upon the powers invested in those offices to keep them there. They were no longer forced to use the normal channels because their respective positions held them above that. They, in fact, believed they had transcended the system.
The Pseudo-Tragic Heroes

As indicated previously, The Tragedy of King Richard II is not classified as a Shakespearian tragedy, but as a Shakespearian history. As previously established, it is the tragedy play that generally deals with the philosophy of ethics, while the history play mainly concerns itself with the philosophy of politics. Therefore, just as The Tragedy of King Richard II does not fall into the same category as Hamlet, the character of Richard II does not fall into the same tragic hero category as does the character of Hamlet. However, The Tragedy of King Richard II has not been removed by critics from its tragic elements. Thus, The Tragedy of King Richard II is a pseudo-tragedy. In addition, Richard II can be coined a "pseudo-tragic hero." It is on this notion of a pseudo-tragic hero that another comparison can be made with that of Richard Nixon.

Previously, it was discussed that the struggles of these self-made men had led them to a position that, as they believed, allowed them to transcend the system through which they had struggled. It is with this belief that one may find a tragic flaw. Both men became the victims of their own false beliefs in the powers of their posts. In the end, they both lost their positions.

Traditionally, the Shakespearian character of Richard II has been viewed as the epitome of weakness in character. However, when one examines more closely, the character can be viewed as the epitome of abuse of power. The follow-
Every one (sic) has said that Richard is a study of weakness of character. But the study is much more complicated than that easy statement would infer. The character of Richard, as freshly conceived by Shakespeare, is originally gentle, good because untempted, imaginative, loving. He is a fantastic, careless dilettante (sic) of life, luxurious by nature, easily excited, easily depressed, weak of will, of conscience, and of reason. As long as he was in a private gentleman's position, and when he first was King, before he fell into the hands of flatterers and luxury, his character was inoffensive, nay more, full of easy charm and poetic sensibility; his weakness did then no harm; his vanity amused him but did not injure the state; his slight touch of wild genius made him lovable. He is the Queen's 'sweet Richard,' her 'sweet guest.' But when he becomes King, he is tempted by power he thinks irresponsible, and by a horde of parasites who play on his idea of himself and his position till he thinks he is lord of the world. And then, his love of luxury, his weakness and light vanity make him their victim. All his good qualities, for the time, are overwhelmed.39

It is Richard's actions that provoke Bolingbroke's retaliations. Following Gaunt's death, Richard orders that the money of Gaunt's estate be seized by the government for the purposes of an expedition to Ireland to suppress an Irish rebellion waged against English domination. Although the expedition led by Richard proves to be a miserable failure,40 Richard's problems have only begun. Richard will return to England only to discover Bolingbroke's return and the usurpation of his throne as well.

In 1972, with his landslide victory over Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, Richard Nixon enjoyed the peak of his popularity as a president. It was, at this point, that many believed Nixon to be the master
of the art of politics. However, Nixon did not arrive at this position by luck or chance. Nixon arrived at the presidency in the climax to a political life that he personally viewed as a series of long struggles and crises. These struggles included criticism by the media in his handling of the Alger Hiss Case, the humiliation that accompanied the "Checkers Speech," and the critical scrutiny that descended upon his "five o'clock shadow" during the first of the Kennedy-Nixon debates.

Despite the public's disfavor of Richard Nixon, he did manage to become President of the United States. Nevertheless, the "Nixon dislike-syndrome" had its effects upon him. Nixon's ego left him with a sense of alienation from the world around him. He had been the target of critical public scrutiny, and did not want to be put in that position again. It was from these struggles that Nixon had become more than aware of his political enemies. As a president, Nixon believed he could utilize the power of his office that transcended the everyday system. His executive powers could, in fact, be used against his own enemies:

Nixon's fear seems often to be corroborated by events. In his portraits, his enemies are very powerful; the odds are always on their side. Yet paranoia, even when accurate, leads to miscalculation. Trying to build impenetrable protection, with preemptive espionage against his foes, his administration vastly overreached. His symbolic stature crumbled through errors of his own; his estimate of his enemies' power was exact.
Richard Nixon's abuse of presidential power as described above is accurately exemplified by the controversy that surrounded key conversations that had taken place between Nixon and White House aides that had been taped by a tape recording device installed in the Oval Office. In the summer of 1973, the existence of the tapes had been confirmed by Alexander Butterfield, a White House aide. Butterfield was testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee, chaired by Senator Sam Ervin.

Following Butterfield's testimony, Special Watergate Prosecutor Archibald Cox sought access to the taped conversations. Nixon refused to yield the tapes. The dispute was taken to court. It was this dispute that culminated in the Saturday Night Massacre. On the evening of October 20, 1973, Nixon ordered Attorney General Elliot Richardson to fire Special Prosecutor Cox. Richardson refused, and resigned. Nixon appointed General William Ruckleshaus, and promptly ordered him to fire Cox. Ruckleshaus refused, and resigned. Finally, a third party was appointed and agreed to fire Archibald Cox. Cox was then relieved of his duties. Nixon's rationale was as follows:

Nixon, however, was an old warrior who believed he could fight off the subpoena with his combativeness... An earlier target was Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox, whom he had appointed to investigate the Watergate break-in. When Cox, however, had to go further into the case than Nixon, for good reasons, wanted him to, he fired Cox in the now-famous "Saturday Night Massacre" of October 20, 1973.43

On October 23 and 24, 1973, forty-four bills concerning
the Watergate investigation were drafted and promptly introduced. Twenty-two of these bills introduced in Congress called for an impeachment investigation.\textsuperscript{44} Thus, Nixon's decline from office had effectively begun. Why did Nixon tape these key conversations? Nixon, a stickler for office detail, insisted that his White House staff take meticulous care in the practice of fact-finding and record-keeping. Furthermore, Nixon kept in these tapes harsh remarks against his enemies. The tapes contained remarks that he could not say to their faces:\textsuperscript{45}

We receive the impression that Nixon was entirely consumed by his emotions. ('Eaten up with himself' might be a better expression.) He couldn't forget the snubs, the injuries he had received throughout his life, and he was now giving it back, word for word.\textsuperscript{46}

Thus, it is the illicit use of monarchical and executive power that serves as a possible basis for comparison between Richard Nixon and Richard II. For the purposes of this thesis, we will label these separate examples of abuse of power as part of their pseudo-tragic flaws. Because both men believed they had transcended their respective systems of government, and, in a sense, believed themselves to have transcended the law. The "acting out" of these beliefs, in turn, resulted as the beginning of the end for them both. In \textit{The Tragedy of King Richard II}, Shakespeare focuses in on Richard's abuse of Gaunt's estate. Following the death of John of Gaunt, Shakespeare exposes the shallowness of Richard's disparate character
as he seeks to use the power of his position for his own advantage:

The ripest fruit first falls, and so doth he:
His time is spent, our pilgrimage must be.
So much for that. Now for our Irish wars:
We must supplant those rough rug-headed kerns,
Which like venom where no venom else
But only they have privilege to live.47

As Richard II abused his power to foreclose on Gaunt's estate, Nixon abused the powers of his office in firing Archibald Cox to protect the tapes. As a result of these actions, Bolingbroke began his retaliations against Richard, and impeachment proceedings had been instigated against Nixon.

Their Pseudo-Tragic Declines

Although Shakespeare's Richard II and Richard Nixon may share a common ground with the flaws that mark the beginning of their declines, the individual nature of their respective declines from their high positions differ. In The Tragedy of King Richard II, the character of Richard passively accepts his decline, while Richard Nixon bitterly fought the impeachment proceedings against him. It is the character of Richard II who assumes a passive role; it was Richard Nixon who assumed an active role.

When Richard II returns to England following his defeat in Ireland, he must face his usurper, Bolingbroke. As Shakespeare dramatizes this return, one may note an obvious change in Richard's character. As he departs for Ireland and leaves York in charge, Richard is portrayed
as the stern, greedy man who promptly seized Gaunt's estate for the Irish invasion. When Richard II returns to England, defeated by the Irish and about to be deposed by his rival, Bolingbroke, Shakespeare emphasizes three changes in his character. To begin with, Richard shows more of his gentle side that has been discussed earlier. Secondly, Richard uses vivid poetry to express his lamentations as a broken man. Thirdly, Shakespeare presents Richard as a man who desperately looks to the past for the now faded notion of the Divine Right. The following excerpt from Act III provides an example of these changes:

What must the King do now? Must he submit? The King shall do it. Must he be deposed? The King shall be contented. Must he lose The name of King? A' God's name, let it go. I'll give my jewels for a set of beads, My gorgeous palace for a hermitage, My gay apparel for an almsman's gown, My figured goblets for a dish of wood, My scepter for a palmer's walking staff, My subjects for a pair of carved saints, And my large kingdom for a little grave, A little little grave, an obscure grave; Or I'll be buried in the king's highway, Some way of common trade, where subject's feet May hourly trample on their sovereign's head; For on my heart they tread now whilst I live, And, buried once, why not upon my head?

It is with Richard's change of character that one views a self-pitying, hopeless wretch who has accepted his own doom gracefully, and without a fight. Bolingbroke, at this point, has changed as well. When Bolingbroke returns to the scene, he is also of a different nature. He is more self-contained, and has placed his passions against Richard aside.
The play's climax occurs during the confrontation between Richard and Bolingbroke at Westminster during Richard's deposition. At Westminster, Richard takes the wind from Bolingbroke's sails, and his glory away with it. Richard, with extensive use of poetry in Act IV, yields the crown to Bolingbroke in a gentle, self-pitying way that sets Bolingbroke up as the villain:

Ay, no; no, ay; for I must nothing be; Therefore no no, for I resign to thee. Now mark me how I will undo myself: I give this heavy weight from off my head And this unwieldy scepter from my hand, The pride of kingly sway from out my heart; With mine own tears I wash away my balm With mine own hands I give away my crown, With mine own tongue deny my sacred state, With mine own breath release all duteous oaths. All pomp and majesty I do forswear; All manors, rents, revenues I forgo; My acts, decrees, and statutes I deny.

Because this is a deposition ceremony, Richard wishes to make as much ceremony of it as possible. However, Richard takes the spotlight from Bolingbroke and emphasizes his own deposition, rather than Bolingbroke's rise to the throne. In the end, Richard may not have succeeded in actively preventing his usurper from taking the throne; however, Richard's passive-aggressiveness did succeed in taking the glory from Bolingbroke.

It will be written in the history books of the future that Richard Nixon did not allow his presidency to go down without a fight. Following the "Saturday Night Massacre" of October 20, 1973, the months that remained in Nixon's term in office marked a period of bitter struggle
for Richard Nixon as he attempted to avoid resignation or impeachment from office.

The majority of the struggle proceeding the Saturday Night Massacre dealt with the recorded White House conversations between Nixon and his aides. Despite a number of subpoenas that had been sent to the White House in an attempt to seize the tapes, Nixon managed to temporarily avoid these court orders on the grounds of protecting national security. On April 29, 1974, as a compromise, Richard Nixon appeared on national television to announce that he would release edited transcripts of the taped conversations, sought by the Watergate Special Prosecutor, that had taken place in the Oval Office. Nixon stated that he would supply these transcripts to the House Judiciary Committee.

Despite the public release of the transcripts, Watergate Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski continued to pursue the actual tapes. On May 24, 1974, Jaworski filed an appeal directly to the Supreme Court for a ruling on his subpoena. Three months later, on July 24, 1974, the Supreme Court ruled in a unanimous decision, ordering Richard Nixon to submit the sixty-four tapes sought by Jaworski's office. The controversy over the tapes had concluded and Nixon had lost.

In the last days of July, 1974, following the Supreme Court ruling in favor of Leon Jaworski, it had become clear that the impeachment proceedings against Richard
Nixon were taking shape. On July 27, 29, and 30, 1974, respectively, the House Judiciary Committee, chaired by Peter Rodino, passed the first, second and final articles of the impeachment legislation. Included in this legislation was the first article that formally charged President Nixon with obstruction of justice in attempting to cover up information pertaining to the break-in at the Watergate Hotel on June 17, 1972.

The final blow came down upon the Nixon Administration as Richard Nixon released the transcripts of three conversations that had taken place June 23, 1972. It was these three conversations that composed the famous "smoking gun" tape. The transcripts were released on August 5, 1974, only four days previous to the date he would resign from office. However, it is doubtful at this point that Nixon had made definite plans to resign:

Having regarded Watergate at first as a 'third-rate burglary' and later as a 'blip on history' or 'the broadest but thinnest scandal in the history of American politics,' Nixon would certainly, I felt, be heard to argue in the future that it paled in the light of his other political and international accomplishments. Even in extremis, he had conceded nothing. When, on August 5, he had released the 'smoking pistol' tape of June 23, 1972, in which he had instructed his chief of staff, H.R. Haldeman, to use the C.I.A. to blunt the F.B.I.'s Watergate probe, he had said this latest evidence 'does not justify the extreme step of impeachment and removal of a President.' And in his resignation speech, he had sounded more like a Chief Executive who had lost a close vote over dam projects than one being ridden from office because of grave abuses, claiming that while he would like to continue to battle 'it has become evident to me that I no longer have a strong enough political base in the Congress to justify continuing that effort.'
Although Nixon may have believed that the office of the President maintained the power to order the use of the Central Intelligence Agency for domestic purposes (that is, to slow down an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation), the nation did not. Richard Nixon resigned from the office of the President of the United States on August 9, 1974.

The difference that lies between Richard II and Richard Nixon as their individual declines came to pass is a difference of passivity versus activity. Richard II allowed Bolingbroke to usurp the kingship, but not without a lament that managed to steal the glory away from Henry. Richard Nixon fought a losing battle until the day he resigned, because he did not believe that he had committed an impeachable offense.

Their Arrival at Disgrace

As both men were once the powerful rulers of their countries, Richard II and Richard Nixon both arrived at disgrace. Richard II assumes a passive role during his decline (as it is depicted in Shakespeare's drama), while Nixon assumed an active role. Their individual arrival at disgrace mark a role-reversal. Before Richard II is executed, Richard suddenly assumes an active role in fighting the henchmen who have come to kill him. On August 9, 1974, after a few parting words to his personal staff and the press, Richard Nixon resigned his post to Vice
President Gerald R. Ford. In other words, Nixon had passively surrendered, and his long battle was over.

In Act V of Shakespeare's Richard II, the character of Richard changes once more, as he re-assumes an active role against his political enemy Bolingbroke. While on his way to Pomfret Castle to await the execution in the tower, Richard meets with his queen in the final act of the drama. In this conversation, the Queen (Isabella) conveys to Richard her personal disgust over his weak submission to Bolingbroke:

What, is my Richard both in shape and mind
Transform'd and weak'ned. Hath Bolingbroke depos'd
Thine intellect? Hath he been in thy heart?
The lion dying trusteth forth his paw
And wounds the earth, if nothing else, with rage
To be o'erpowr'd; and wilt thou, pupil-like,
Take the correction, mildly kiss the rod,
And fawn on rage with base humility,
Which art a lion and the king of beasts?55

Richard finally takes these bold words to heart as he awaits execution in the tower. Richard begins to better understand his situation following the encounter with his spouse, and his slight tragic recovery has begun. Richard gradually becomes aware of his weaknesses, faults, and his ignorance. Whereas, Richard spoke before in long poetic lament, Shakespeare has changed Richard's language to short, "to-the-point" sentences. Thus Richard has re-assumed an active role:

Although he is always self-regarding in his griefs, he has sufficient insight to realise what he has lost, and his suffering is transmitted into an outraged patriotism and an affront to the idea of royalty. Anointed and consecrate,
he feels as no one else can the dreadfulness of what is being done to him, or what, in the final moment of his renunciation, he is doing to himself.56

In the fifth scene of Act V, Richard challenges his executioners. Unfortunately, despite a gallant effort on Richard's part, Exton kills Richard. However, before they arrive, Richard stands to curse Bolingbroke in a rage:

So proud that Bolingbroke was on his back!
That jade hath eat' bread from my royal hand;
This hand hath made him proud with clapping him.
Would he not stumble? Would he not fall down,
Since pride must have a fall, and break the neck
Of that proud man that did usurp his back?
Forgiveness, horse! Why do I rail on thee,
Since thou, created to be aw'd by man,
Wast born to hear? I was not made a horse;
And yet I bear a burden like an ass,
Spurr'd, gall'd and tir'd by jauncing Bolingbroke.57

Thus, it is only before his death that Richard has become aware of things as they really are. This scene serves to show that he is finally aware of what Bolingbroke has done to him, and more importantly, what he has done to himself.

August 9, 1974, marked Richard Nixon's last day as President of the United States. The night before, Mr. Nixon had appeared on national television to announce his resignation from office. Finally, the struggle for his office had come to an end, and he had lost.

Before his departure for California, Nixon shared a few moments with his White House staff. Later on, he shared a few moments with the White House press agents
who had gathered to hear some final thoughts from the man who was on his way out. Perhaps, it was at this time that the nation was giving its president a chance to redeem himself, before resigning his post. As Richard II became aware of his tragic flaw, and came to understand the situation that surrounded him as he sat in the tower of Pomfret Castle, it was now Nixon's turn to experience tragic recognition. On his last day in office, Richard Nixon spoke these words:

Always remember, others may hate you, but those who hate you don't win unless you hate them, and then you destroy yourself.58

Following his final remarks, Richard Nixon and his wife, Pat, boarded a helicopter waiting on the White House lawn to be flown to Andrew's Air Force Base. From there, the former First Family boarded Air Force One, to return, once again, to California.

And that is all. While Richard II's termination ended in a battle to the death, and a civil war to follow throughout England, Richard Nixon's term in office ended quietly, and without incident. There was no civil war that followed in the United States, no political executions. Richard II's struggle for his position ended in violent activity. Richard Nixon's struggle for power ended in peaceful passivity.

Is there a period of tragic recognition for the character of Richard II and the real Richard Nixon? Do both men experience the catharsis through reflection over their
individual situations, and do they resolve to change? In the Shakespearian drama, Richard undergoes a period of tragic recognition in his active speech that expresses his anger toward his enemy, Bolingbroke. He then goes on to change his passive ways as he challenges his killers to battle:

The devil take Henry of Lancaster and thee! Patience is stale, and I am weary of it.59

Before his death, Richard slightly purges himself. Did Richard Nixon undergo a similar catharsis? Some would say yes, while others, no. Nixon did purge himself in that he recognized what brought about his own downfall, his abuse of executive privilege in order to act out his own contempt for his enemies. However, did he act upon those reflections? Did he act upon those reflections by, perhaps, apologizing to the people for any wrongdoing he had committed? In the Nixon-Frost Interviews of 1977, interviewer David Frost gave the former President his chance to apologize. This was Nixon's reply:

Yep, I...I let the American people down. And I have to carry that burden with me for the rest of my life.
'My political life is over.
'I will never yet, and never again, have an opportunity to serve in any official position. Maybe I can give a little advice from time to time.
'I can only say that in answer to your questions, that while technically, I did not commit a crime, an impeachable offense...these are the legalisms. As far as the handling of this matter is concerned, it was so botched up.
'I made so many bad judgments, the worst ones, mistakes of the heart rather than the head, as I pointed out.
'But let me say, a man in that top judge...top job, he's gotta have a heart.
'But his head must rule his heart.' 

Did Nixon actually make an apology? For those who sought an admission of guilt, and an apology for criminal wrongdoing, they were disappointed. For those who sought an admission of guilt and an apology for poor judgment, they had received their apology. Richard Nixon understood what he had done to the people. Yet, he made no recognition of his own criminal wrongdoing (the illegal use of executive privilege). Nixon continued to believe that he, as president, did not commit a crime by ordering the Central Intelligence Agency to slow down the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as the "smoking gun" tape had proven. Therefore, the recognition of his main flaw was virtually non-existent.

As we review the events of Richard's final downfall (through Shakespeare) and Nixon's resignation from office, and apply these events to the elements of pseudo tragedy, it is evident that Richard's plight ended in a battle to the death, while Nixon's battle ended in peaceful acceptance. Richard II ended his passivity and lashed out against the actions of his usurper, Bolingbroke. Richard Nixon ended the long controversy of the Watergate investigations by quietly bowing out of office. In addition to the description of their arrival at disgrace, we have examined the possibility for any self-recognition of flaw that brought about their downfalls. Richard II does experience a recognition analagous to the tragic recognition that
conventionally takes in the Elizabethan tragedy; Nixon did not.

**Summary**

In this section, we have examined the individual plights of Richard II and Richard Nixon according to what we have named as "pseudo-tragic elements." After continuing the examination of self-made comparisons, we studied the pseudo-tragic heroes of Richard Nixon and Richard II as men, conditioned by their respective societies, who had believed they had risen above the law in their ruling positions. Furthermore, we have examined these false beliefs in their offices as the partial causes of their downfalls (their pseudo-tragic flaws). Finally, we have looked at the nature of their declines and their arrival at disgrace (the conclusion of the falling action).

The _Tragedy of King Richard II_ serves to portray the human drama of a king who falls from power. Although it is not classified as an Elizabethan tragedy, it is related to the tragedy in style. In 1974, the United States and the world witnessed the human drama of Richard Nixon's departure from office. In this section, we have attempted to compare the Shakesperean drama to Nixon's decline from office as the pseudo-tragedies of the self-made men.
"I gave them a sword. And they stuck it in. And they twisted it with relish. And I guess, if I'd been in their position I'd have done the same thing."

Richard Nixon, from the Frost-Nixon Interview

So proud that Bolingbroke was on my back!
That jade hath eat bread from my royal hand;
This hand hath made him proud with clapping him.

Richard II; V,v
Symbols play an important role in our society. We use symbols both in religious worship and secular practice. In religious worship, the sign of the cross serves as a symbol for Christianity. In the baptismal rite of Christian faith, water has been viewed as a symbol for cleansing a person of his or her original sin. In secular practice, symbolic ritual, not unlike that of religious worship, takes place. As discussed earlier in the introduction to this thesis, Michael Novak discusses in *Choosing Our King* the significance of the presidency as a symbol for the United States. In Fourteenth Century England, the role of the king was more closely linked with the significance of religious worship. We have discussed the king's role, under divine appointment, according to the theory of the Divine Right of Kings. In the Fourteenth Century, the king represented his nation as a secular symbol as well as a religious symbol.

Symbols serve to represent a person, God, a religion, or institution in an abstract way. A cross is more than a logo to Christianity. A national flag is more than a banner to the citizens of a country. Symbols help people to identify themselves and their beliefs. They give us, in mysterious ways at times, a sense of who we are and what we are about.
In The Tragedy of King Richard II, William Shakespeare captures the vivid imagery that symbols serve to represent. He applied the imagery of these symbols to the situation that surrounded Richard II in his decline and fall. In this section, we will examine the symbolism of Shakespeare's "clothing" imagery, "garden" imagery, the men of Richard's inner circle, and the imagery of the Divine Right of Kings as a deteriorating belief of the people of England.

In 1974, the resignation of Richard Nixon from the presidency reminded us as a nation of some of the symbols that serve to represent the aspects of Richard Nixon and of his presidency.

The object of this section is to examine the contrasts and possible comparisons between the symbolism of Shakespeare's use of imagery in his dramatization of the fall of a king and the images and ideas that have been viewed as the symbols of the Nixon presidency.

The Symbolic "Wearing" of Leadership

In The Tragedy of King Richard II, Shakespeare uses the clothing imagery to ask his audience if there is more to a king than the clothes that he wears. In other words, do the clothes necessarily make the man? In Act IV, Scene I, as Richard yields the parts of his royal garments to his usurper, Bolingbroke, it is quite obvious that an exchange of kingship must involve more than the simple "handing over" of the royal garb. Richard II was indeed
guilty of wearing his royalty figuratively in much the same fashion as he wore his crown and scepter, literally. In a sense, Richard Nixon was also guilty of "wearing" his position, but in a different way. Richard II wore his position and flaunted it as a model would flaunt a dress. Richard is depicted in *The Tragedy of King Richard II* as a man who relished the pomp and circumstance that accompanies royalty, yet he maintained no depth of responsible leadership behind it. Richard Nixon wore "the clothing" of his presidency not to flaunt, but to hide himself. Because Nixon had attempted to sell himself to the people in many different campaigns for election, he had learned that he should show them not necessarily himself, but a personality they would prefer. As president, Nixon continued this philosophy. Nixon "wore the clothing" of his presidency to mask his real personality in favor of a personality of which he felt the public would approve.

As one reads *Richard II*, it becomes quite clear that Shakespeare did not regard Richard as the very best of kings. As the following passage will show, Shakespeare had good reason:

The distinction that Shakespeare makes between Richard and Henry (Bolingbroke) is integral to this ideal of kingship, and lets us know that Richard was a man who never achieved complete self-understanding. Character and upbringing only fitted him to think of himself as a king. It was his great strength, and ultimately his means to some kind of victory over his enemies. Looking back at the past, he created an image of himself as more royal than he had ever been; exaggerating his gifts as an artist in the hope
of gilding his failure as a king. He knew that he had failed, without ever understanding why. He never discovered that his office implied a duty. 61

Because Richard ascended to the throne at the age of eleven, it can be implied that Shakespeare attempted to exhibit Richard as a king who never grew up. He was never given the chance to grow up. In the remaining dramas of his tetralogy, Shakespeare will show a remarkable contrast to Richard in the Character of Prince Hal, who "grows up" to become Henry V. In his drama, Shakespeare wanted to show his audience that Richard maintained only a child's view of kingship. Thus, Richard was unable to meet the demands of good judgement and effective action required by his position. As a result, Richard became a miserable failure.

In Act I of Richard II, it becomes quickly evident that Richard has a flair for the royally dramatic. Richard does not end the dispute between Bolingbroke and Mowbray until after he has allowed the argument to move to the jousting field, and only before the contest is about to take place. In this highly dramatic action, Shakespeare makes it evident early in the play that Richard is a man who flaunts his power of office:

The main point of the tournament between Bolingbroke and Mowbray is the way it is conducted; the point of Gaunt's parting with Bolingbroke is the sheer propriety of the sentiments they utter; the portents, put so fittingly into the mouth of a Welshman, are more exciting because they are appropriate than because they precipitate an event; Richard is ever more concerned with how he behaves, with the fitness of his conduct
to the occasion, than with what he actually does.62

For Richard, it does not matter what he does as a king, as long as he looks good while doing it. Therefore, Richard acts only for the sake of appearances. Underneath the cloak of royalty, there is nothing. It is quite clear that Richard enjoys the wearing of his kingship.63 Yet, "He is a king by unquestioned title and external grades alone."64

Richard Nixon was a leader who wore his office in the form of a mask as a way to hide his true identity. Nixon was not a leader who ruled by his conscience. Rather, he ruled by the conscience of public opinion and made decisions based on positions taken by the majority.

When Nixon returned to politics in 1968, he returned with the desire to convey an image that was truly pleasing to the public eye. In so doing, as the following passage shows, he was no longer the man making the decisions:

The cynicism of building a phony T.V. image was matched by the hypocrisy of Nixon's stand on the issues. Long regarded as America's number one political weathervane, Nixon promised 'new leadership' while at the same time using polls to decide which positions were the most popular.65

As the preceding passage would indicate, it was not Richard Nixon who was leading the nation; it was the nation that led Richard Nixon. Richard Nixon, in essence, acted out views that were not necessarily his own in reality. Nixon resorted to acting as means of covering up his own opinions and emotions.66 As an actor, Nixon con-
ducted himself conservatively while in the public eye. His restricted manner prevented the public from seeing anything they might not like. Perhaps it is because of this reason that Nixon was not a photogenic figure in the news. His ill-at-ease presence in front of the television camera followed him into the presidency. As the following passage shows, Nixon's restriction of his own views actually reflected in his awkward appearance on the television screen:

Observing his body movements, we find that his unfree, uncertain, and hesitant arm movements mask his aggressive inclinations. Trying to repress these feelings, he gives the impression of freezing. His gestures become rigid and uncoordinated, all giving the illusion that in his whole appearance he is immobile.67

Richard II, as he is depicted by Shakespeare, and Richard Nixon can both be viewed as actors for the mere sake of appearances. The clothing imagery of The Tragedy of King Richard II serves to point out that the royal garb helps Richard as he flaunts and savors the fact that he is the king. Although Richard may look and act like a king, he fails to prove himself worthy, by his actions, of the throne of England. In essence, Richard Nixon proved himself as an actor in that he became so preoccupied with giving his public an image to approve of and vote for. Because he has done this, it is likely that the American public has never seen the real Richard Nixon. In effect, the clothing of the Nixon presidency is simply a mask to hide any true emotion or feeling.
The Garden and the Cancer

Shakespeare's image pattern of the garden serves as the most powerful use of imagery in The Tragedy of King Richard II. In Act III, the gardener delivers a speech that sums up the significance of the garden imagery:

... O, what pity is it
That he (Richard II) had not so trimmed and
dress'd his land
As we this garden! We at time of year
Do wound the bark, the skin of our fruit trees,
Lest, being over-proud in sap and blood,
With too much riches it confound itself;
Hath he done so to great and growing men,
They might have liv'd to bear and he to taste
Their fruits of duty. Superfluous branches
We lop away, that bearing bows may live;
He had done so, himself had borne the crown
Which waste of idle hours hath quite thrown down.68

The analogy presented is a simple, yet powerful one: the gardener is to the garden as the king is to England. Under Shakespeare's use of imagery, England, in its miserable condition under the rule of Richard II, is symbolized by a garden that is infested by the malignancies of weeds and caterpillars. It is on this note of malignancy that we now look to the decline of Richard Nixon from the American presidency. In his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee during the summer of 1973, former White House Aide John Dean stated that the Nixon Administration had been overrun by what he called a "cancer." In this part of Section III, we will examine a possible comparison between the garden imagery employed by Shakespeare and the cancer referred by John Dean as a symbol of deterioration to the Nixon Administration in its waning months.
The comparison is being made on this note of malignancy and deterioration. As Richard II's kingdom becomes overwrought with weeds and caterpillars as portrayed by Shakespeare's garden imagery, Richard Nixon's administration fell victim to a spreading cancer that would eventually destroy it.

The garden, a place of quiet solitude and beauty, is compared by Shakespeare to England. When the garden is infested with noxious weeds, it is the duty of the gardener to control the infestation. In much the same way, it is the duty of the king to control civil strife in England:

> Why should we in the compass of a pale
> Keep law and form and due proportion,
> Showing, as in a model, our firm estate,
> When our sea-walled garden, the whole land,
> Is full of weeds, her fairest flowers chok'd up,
> Her fruit trees all unprun'd, her hedges ruin'd,
> Her knots disordered, and her wholesome herbs
> Swarming with caterpillars?69

Because England is the garden, it is naturally assumed that England is in a state of turmoil as the garden's poor condition is described. As the following passage shows, England is suffering from the malignancies that are eating it alive:

> The imagery of Richard II reinforces structure and meaning. . . England is a garden mismanaged by her royal gardener, so that weeds and caterpillars (e.g. Bushy, Bagot, and Green) flourish.70

John Dean originally spoke of the cancer at a time when the Nixon Administration was gradually falling apart. When Nixon set out to begin his campaign for reeelection
in 1972, he had one objective in mind: to be reelected in spite of all costs. As a result, the effort of the Committee to Reelect the President paid off in November of 1972. Richard Nixon was reelected to office by one of the largest margins in presidential campaign history.

Nixon employed a network of inner circle people who were committed to the Nixon reelection campaign. These men were committed to a Nixon victory and were prepared to carry out almost any task in order to make it a reality. Yet, it was their zealousness that backfired. The Watergate burglary, the cover-up of it, and the immense investigation that followed resulted in catastrophe for the Nixon Administration.

As Richard II is symbolized by Shakespeare as a gardener to his state, perhaps Nixon could have been viewed as a doctor to his administration. The cancer described by John Dean was spreading and Richard Nixon knew it.

The members of Nixon's inner circle were being indicted on criminal charges. In addition, Nixon's popularity was gradually dropping in the national opinion polls. To avoid additional negative attention from falling upon the administration, many of Nixon's closest aides were forced to resign from their positions, one by one. In the interviews with David Frost, Richard Nixon recalled his thoughts on the resignations of White House Aides John Erlichman and H.R. Haldeman:
'I said, 'You know, John, when I went to bed last night... I hoped, I almost prayed, I wouldn't wake up this morning.' Well, it was an emotional moment. I think there were tears in our eyes, both of us. He said, 'Don't say that.' We went back in. They (Haldeman and Erlichman) agreed to leave. And so it was late, but I did it. I cut off one arm and then cut off the other arm. Now I can be faulted. I recognize it. Maybe I defended them too long. Maybe I tried to help them too much. But I was concerned about them. I was concerned about their families. I felt they ought to have a chance at least to prove that they were not guilty. And I just didn't want to be in the position of just sawing them off in that way.71

And "saw" them off he did. Nixon, by asking Haldeman and Erlichman to resign, knew that he was losing his closest and most trustworthy aides. These men, who pursued what they felt to be the noble goal of reelecting their president, put their jobs and their reputations on the line to do it, and lost. The cancer that eventually destroyed the Nixon Administration began as the simple cover-up of a burglary. Yet, Nixon was not only losing the men of his staff, as the next part of this section will help to show, he was losing a part of himself. The investigations of the Watergate burglary and subsequent cover-up were gradually turning up new evidence against the Nixon Administration. The malignancy of Watergate was eating away at the Nixon presidency. The Nixon administration was dying. Yet, Richard Nixon could do nothing about it.

The key word for comparison between Shakespeare's garden imagery in The Tragedy of King Richard II and "the
cancer" referred to by John Dean is malignancy. The malignancy of civil war and strife in England is symbolized by the unkempt garden. The malignancy of the Watergate investigations to the White House could be symbolized by the image of a spreading cancer. In turn, both England and the Nixon Administration were deteriorating from these malignancies.

The Trimmers of the Commonwealth and the Inner Circle

In addition to his focus on the garden imagery as a whole, Shakespeare also focused in on the caterpillars of that garden—the trimmers of the commonwealth: Bushy, Bagot, and Green. According to Holinshed, Bushy, Bagot, and Green were the members of the loyalist faction that supported Richard II. Bushy, Bagot, and Green enjoyed the ride on the king's coattails as Richard came to enjoy wealth and prestige as king. As a result, the trimmers received a generous share of the percentage. In the end, they aided the ruin of Richard II. These men who made up King Richard's inner circle of advisors, as they are depicted by Shakespeare, bring to reality an important symbolic similarity between Richard II and Richard Nixon. Just as "the trimmers of the commonwealth," Bushy, Bagot, and Green play an important role in Richard's pseudo-tragic decline, the members of the Nixon Administration played an important role in Nixon's decline, yet with an ironic twist. While Bushy, Bagot, and Green survived from their
need to control King Richard, Richard Nixon survived from his need to control other people. As the cancer gradually destroyed the Nixon Administration, Richard Nixon was losing the people who helped to satisfy his need to control those who worked under him.

As mentioned earlier, Richard II is depicted by Shakespeare as a man of many emotions. He is seen as easily excited and depressed. In Act III, following his return from Ireland and confrontation with Bolingbroke, Shakespeare emphasizes the vacillations of Richard's character at the moment of crisis. In one moment, Richard is prepared to rally against his enemy:

Thou chid'st me well. Proud Bolingbroke, I come To change blows with thee for our day of doom.72

In the next moment, Richard mourns a quickly self-admitted defeat to Bolingbroke:

Go to Flint castle. There I'll pine away; A king, woe's slave, shall kingly woe obey.73

A man as emotionally unstable as Richard would obviously be vulnerable to many flatterers. As mentioned previously, Richard became a victim to flattery. His vanity became bloated and his real personal qualities were pushed to the side.

Bushy, Bagot, and Green were such flatterers. In Act III, Bolingbroke confronts these men for their misdeeds before he sends them to the executioner:

You have misled a prince, a royal king, A happy gentleman in blood and linaements, By you unhappied and disfigured clean.74
The trimmers of the commonwealth felt they had a great deal to gain with the rise of Richard. But by controlling Richard through their use of flattery, their fortunes would end with Richard's abrupt fall from the throne. E.M.W. Tillyard compared these characters of the Shakespearian drama to similar characters that fit in with the "pattern" of morality plays:

One of Shakespeare's debts in Richard II is to 'Woodstock;' and this play is constructed very plainly on the Morality pattern, with the king's three uncles led by Woodstock inducing him to virtue, and Tressilian Bushy and Green to vice.75

Richard's inner circle of flatterers proved only to be the parasites of Richard's short-lived fortune. They set him up by coaching his vanity to a point where the king no longer looked upon royalty as a duty and responsibility. Instead, the kingship to Richard had become a mere image. Is this exclusively the fault of Bushy, Bagot, and Green? Of course not. Richard is a character of free will and cannot be excused for the choices he makes. However, Bushy, Bagot, and Green played a role in Richard's downfall as they thrived on his emotional instabilities. They are the members of Richard's inner circle, and it is obvious that Richard trusted them, even though they had taken complete advantage of him.

As the survival of the trimmers depended upon their control of Richard II, the partial survival of Richard Nixon depended upon his need to control the people around
him:

Another aspect of Nixon's psychological makeup was his lifelong need for total control over those around him. To consolidate and strengthen his presidential power, he had appointed in 1969 an 'inner cabinet,' a group of men totally loyal to him. This inner cabinet was in part comprised of young, ambitious men unknown to the public, some of whom had come from advertising firms, such as J. Walter Thompson (H.R. Haldeman, Ronald Ziegler, Dwight Chapin). (sic) Then there were John Dean, John Ehrlichman, David Young and Egil Krogh. A few joined the inner group after 1969. Others, belonging to an older generation, included John Mitchell, Henry Kissinger, Alexander Haig, Raymond Price, Leonard Garment, Charles Colson, and Spiro Agnew. They were all men of his own choice, 'his people,' whom he thought he could rely on or manipulate. In establishing his complete authority, Nixon was to make them and others his victims.76

Because of Nixon's constant desire to maintain control and to stay ahead of events, he needed a White House staff that would act as mere extensions of his own mind and body. As mentioned earlier in an excerpt from the Frost Interviews, Nixon equated his loss of H.R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman to the loss of his own left and right arms. Throughout his childhood and into his adult life, Nixon possessed an intense hunger for facts. His appetite for knowing everything strengthened during his presidency. He knew that he could not stay ahead if he were alone, although he probably would have preferred to. Therefore, Nixon's inner circle was composed of ultraloyalists who acted quickly upon his demands. Through his own staff, Nixon sought to control the country. His desire to run everything was evident in his own obvious distrust of
the United States Cabinet:

Although he said that the Cabinet could run the home front, in fact his cabinet was notoriously weak. Through wiretapping, 'enemies lists,' the White House 'plumbers,' the soliciting of illegal campaign funds, and many other illegal acts, he personally assumed more and more control of domestic affairs. The tighter his control of the country, the less he thought he had to fear.  

In other words, the security of staying "on top of things" was worth any price to Nixon. When the price included illegal acts, Nixon's men carried them out. When investigations into alleged White House activities turned into court indictments, the members of Nixon's staff began to drop like flies. One by one, Nixon was losing the men of his ultraloyal staff. With each resignation of another inner circle member, Nixon was gradually losing his ability to stay on top of things in American politics. His "hyper-control" of his administration was gradually disintegrating.

The symbolic comparison of inner circles between Richard II and Richard Nixon serves to point out that both inner circles played important roles in both declines. Richard Nixon was the man in control while Richard II was the man under control. The trimmers of the commonwealth manipulated Richard II with their flattery and they thrived upon his occupation of the throne. Richard Nixon acted out his need to control people upon the members of his inner circle. He gave the orders and his aides carried them out. As a result, the illegal acts of his White
House aides turned into self destruction for the Nixon Administration.

The Symbolic Deterioration of Old Systems and Beliefs

The events that surround The Tragedy of King Richard II and the decline of Richard Nixon from office involve more than merely the fall of two national leaders. In addition to the decline of men, there is also the decline of two symbolic ideals. King Richard represents the divinely-appointed king. President Richard Nixon represented "the American political survivor" who fought his way through the system to eventually become President of the United States. The Tragedy of King Richard II symbolizes an attack upon the traditional theory of the Divine Right of Kings. Richard Nixon's decline represented an attack upon the survivor.

The Tragedy of Richard II symbolizes an attack upon the traditional theory of the Divine Right of Kings. As it was discussed in the introduction to this thesis, the theory of Divine Right holds that the king serves directly under God, and is divinely appointed to his post. Richard was the legitimate ruler under the Divine Right. Although he obviously was not a competent ruler, the conflict takes place over the problem of legitimacy versus competency. King Richard places a great deal of faith in the Divine Right theory. He not only trusts in it, he throws himself upon it:79
Not all the water in the rough rude sea
Can wash the balm from an anointed king;
The breath of worldly men cannot depose
The deputy elected by the Lord.80

The demise of Richard marks the end of an era. The era of the divinely-appointed king included all of the romantic courtly trimmings of Medieval life. The reign of Richard II marked a tumultuous period in English history. England, at this time, was a nation rocked by unromantic, peasant rebellions and civil wars. Despite its long tradition, the theory of Divine Right alone did not provide the answers for civil strife. Therefore, the fall of Richard II marked the swap of the so-called divinely-appointed ruler in exchange for a more competent and active leader. Richard II marked the end of an age in England that would never be seen again. Not even the splendor of the Tudor period could quite recapture the splendor of the period that ends with Richard.81

Richard Nixon's decline from office represented an attack upon the survivor in pursuit of the American dream. Nixon's humble background did not give him the best starting point for the goal of the presidency. The road to the White House was for Richard Nixon a long period of struggle. On his way there, Nixon was driven by the will to succeed and move upward. In his book, *Nixon Agonistes*, author Garry Wills compares Nixon's survivor philosophies to the doctrines of Norman Vincent Peale and Dr. Billy Graham. As Wills describes, the "Nixon survivor philosophy" is not only a religion, but a way of life geared toward suc-
'To do better.' There it is. Success is God, and Peale is its prophet. So is Billy Graham, who says: 'Too many Christians have taken a most sinful and damaging pride in being poverty-stricken.' . . . If prayer leads to success, then failure comes from lack of prayer. If success is a spiritual state, so is failure. When Graham was sent to bed by a virus in 1968, he asked one of his fellow workers, 'Can you think of anything that I've done in my life, anything at all, to deserve these sicknesses?' Cause and effect.82

This philosophy became Richard Nixon's religion at an early stage of his life. He realized that if he could challenge and survive the system, he would become President of the United States. Yet, as Nixon succeeded and worked his way up the political ladder, Nixon further realized that in order for him to succeed in being elected to the presidency, he would have to give the people what they wanted. In other words, Nixon came to believe that in the political realm, ideas and values must survive as do the candidates. Throughout his political career, Richard Nixon may have been the same man, but he maintained a variety of political ideals. These ideals changed as the people changed. Nixon changed with the times to give the people what they desired in a president.

Richard Nixon ascended to the presidency in 1968, during the peak of student protests against the Vietnam War. Oddly enough, although protests were waged against the war, protests by students were also aimed at the "phoniness" of their own parents. The youth of the United States
protested against the same "survivor philosophy" that Nixon represented. As Garry Wills writes:

He is the least authentic man alive, the late mover, tester of responses, submissive to 'the discipline of consent.' A survivor. There is one Nixon only, though there seem to be new ones all the time--he will try to be what people want. He lacks the stamp of place or personality because the Market is death to style and he is the Market's servant. His aim has always been the detached mind, calculating, freed for observing the free play of political ideas, ready to go with the surviving one. This makes him stand for all that the kids find contrived, what they call 'plastic.' They are the opposite; plunging, ready to take risks. They move up as close as they can to each experience, flow out to it, undergo it for its own sake; only in this way will it be known, tested, given proper weight in their intensely private evaluative process, their inner market.83

In order for Richard Nixon to become President, it meant that he would have to master the American political system. In order for Richard Nixon to master the American political system, he became the servant to what Wills describes as the "Market" of ideas. Yet, despite his political mastery, Richard Nixon resigned from office in disgrace.

Nixon's decline from public office represents the decline of the man who believes in the American dream. Traditionally, Americans have followed a personal directive to succeed and to move up in society. Richard Nixon followed the same course; he sought to master the system and was ironically punished by the same society that encouraged this "mastery ethic," as the following helps to demonstrate:
Our culture supports the ego of such a human type. It is the culture of will. And action. Of self control, of mastery, of the exertion of the power of the head over the movements of the body. Master of the earth. The triumph of the spirit, of the will.  

As described in Section III of this thesis, Nixon, the self-made man, believed that he could handle any difficult situation or crisis if he applied himself directly to the situation. In fact, he looks back upon the crises of his life as definite opportunities for self-improvement. Nixon viewed himself as a survivor because he made it through the rough periods of his life with greater knowledge and ability after each crisis than he possessed upon going into each crisis. 

The Tragedy of King Richard II and Richard Nixon's final ten months in the White House serve to symbolize the deterioration of old systems and beliefs. Richard II's fall from power symbolizes the faded concept of the divinely appointed ruler. Richard Nixon's decline from the White House represents in part the fall of the American political survivor. In their respective declines, Richard II and Richard Nixon were more than fallen leaders. They also symbolized by their declines from power the fall of two major symbolic ideals.

Summary

The object of this section has been to examine the comparisons and contrasts between the symbolism of Shakespeare's imagery in The Tragedy of King Richard II and
the images and ideas that have been viewed as the symbols of the Nixon presidency.

Symbols bear great importance in our society and are not merely representative of everyday occurrences. To the nations of England and the United States, the fall of Richard II and the fall of Richard Nixon both carried a great deal of symbolic meaning. Shakespeare pursued this idea and portrayed these symbols of King Richard's fall in his drama. In this section, we have compared some of Shakespeare's symbols to the symbols that serve to represent the decline of Richard Nixon from office. We have examined possible comparisons of the two on the notes of clothing of leadership, malignancy and deterioration, the influence of political inner circles, and the deterioration of old systems and beliefs.

Michael Novak points out in *Choosing Our King* the importance of symbolism in presidential leadership. As Shakespeare did in 1595, we continue to apply symbolism to the presence of leaders in our nation. Leaders are symbols. They have been so in the past and will continue that tradition in the future.
As full of valor as of royal blood:
Both have I spill'd. O would the deed were good!
For now the devil, that told me I did well,
Says this deed is chronicled in hell.

Richard II; V,v
As discussed in the introduction to this thesis, a period of civil disturbance existed for England and the United States in the aftermath of the fall of Richard II and the resignation of Richard Nixon. Following the overthrow of Richard II, the War of the Roses began. Following the resignation of Richard Nixon from the office of the President, the citizens of the United States viewed the proceeding occupants of the White House with a new skepticism, and had taken steps to keep them under control. What is the basis for similarity? The object of this section is to discuss the aftermath of Richard II and of Richard Nixon, as well as the effects of the aftermath of both of these fallen leaders upon their respective countries. A similarity exists in that disturbance followed both men's absence from office in their respective countries. In England, of course, the disturbance was violent. For the United States, the disturbance that followed Watergate and the Nixon resignation was of a mental nature. The key word is "disturbance." This section will examine the nature of both disturbances, as they proceeded the decline of two separate and distinct national leaders.

William Shakespeare took the classic world view of Elizabethan England to heart in many of his dramas. As discussed in the introduction, the English believed in
the validity of the Divine Right of Kings within the scope of the Great Chain of Being. Therefore, Shakespeare believed that if a king is taken from a throne that rightly belongs to him under divine appointment, the natural order will be disturbed. The characters of Shakespeare's *The Tragedy of Richard II* forecast the doom that awaits England following the overthrow of their king. Because these characters know that the natural order has been disturbed, they fear the future and the results that it will bring. As also stated in the introduction to this thesis, the presidency stands as a religious (again, in the sense that "religious" is used by Michael Novak in *Choosing Our King*) symbol in the United States. Although civil war did not follow Richard Nixon's resignation from office, the American view of the presidency had grown more skeptical. In other words, the grace and majesty that had surrounded the White House had suddenly become blemished in the eyes of the public.

Although Richard became the victim of Bolingbroke's upheaval, it is obvious that England has also become a definite victim. Although strife was in the future for England, Shakespeare employs the tragic events of *Richard II* as part of a seemingly natural cycle. As stated earlier, *Richard II* is the first play of a tetralogy that depicts the movement of a nation from domestic peace to civil war, with an eventual return to domestic peace. According to Shakespeare, there is no doubt that England
will suffer. However, prosperity will return.

How will England suffer? In the fourth act of The Tragedy of Richard II, the nobles forecast a gloomy picture as they describe the civil war that will soon divide their country:

Disorder, horror, fear, and mutiny
Shall here inhabit, and this land be call'd The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls. O, if you raise this house against this house, It will the woefullest division prove That ever fell upon this cursed earth. Prevent it, resist it, let it not be so, Lest child, child's children, cry against you 'woe!' 87

In this passage, Carlisle is predicting the events surrounding the War of the Roses. This prediction, as it is dramatized by Shakespeare, serves to inform the audience of the tumultuous future that awaits Bolingbroke's England. As a result of Richard's death, Carlisle dramatically predicts a bloody civil war between two sides in a quest for the throne, one that will continue for generations to come, and will divide England more than it has ever been divided before. Following Richard's deposition, a bitter struggle for power will split both country and family:

The murder of Richard, the blood of every noble, slaughtered to clear the path of Bolingbroke to the throne, cry for vengeance. The dragon's seed is sown. It springs up finally into the armed men of the Civil War, when father slew son and son the father. 88

Despite the strength of Bolingbroke's character and despite his competency as a ruler, Shakespeare implies that even he will not be able to fill in the vacuum created
by the murder of a divinely-appointed king. Bolingbroke is only human and will not be able to settle the natural order through his mortal powers.89

When the United States Constitution was drafted, the founding fathers of 1787 sought to form a system of government ruled by the people, rather than by a king. Despite their efforts to avoid another encounter with King George III, the office of the President of the United States has been refashioned through the course of American history as a position similar to kingship. The position has been refashioned by both the people and by the men who have occupied the position itself. Michael Novak writes:

Royalty— the human heart ceaselessly reinvents it. It brings unity and simplicity to the image of government, power at a single source. Television has only heightened the ancient hunger.90

Because government is easily understood by the common people if it is placed in terms of one man, Americans have identified their government through their president. In addition, the American public has held a romantic view of the presidency. Furthermore, we associate the office of the presidency to the romantic figures of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and John F. Kennedy. Every four years, the American Presidential Elections draw larger voter turnouts than do the elections for state and local political officials and representatives. Because we have felt these were good men who aimed toward
the good of the country, Americans have placed their trust in the President of the United States. Even in the nuclear age, many Americans have continued their trust in the man who holds the power to push "the button."

The President arouses waves of 'power,' 'being,' 'superior reality,' as if where he is is history. It is true that the president's hand is on the button of destruction. Life and death are in his hands; honor and dishonor too. What he does affects the daily life of each of us in ways which doctors could scarcely even dream. His office is, in quite modern and sophisticated form, a religion in a secular state. It evokes responses familiar in all the ancient religions on the world. It fills a perennial vacuum at the heart of human expectations.91

When Richard Nixon resigned from office on August 9, 1974, the American "presidential dream" had ended. Perhaps only for a period of time, Americans questioned their trust in the President. The events surrounding the Watergate investigation damaged the nation's implied trust in the presidency.92 Americans suddenly realized an actual danger that existed within that office.93

Following Nixon's resignation, actual steps were taken by Congress to act on this newly discovered fear of the presidency. For example, the War Powers Act of 1974 was passed into law. This new legislation was proposed to control presidential powers toward the deployment of military forces. The War Powers Act transferred a portion of presidential power to Congress. Why was this bill passed? Americans began to fear the amount of power entrusted to one man. The Nixon experience made them aware
of that fear:

Unable to trust anyone, Nixon created an imperial presidency that corrupted the power of the Chief Executive far beyond that of any earlier President. While previous Presidents used and misused power, Nixon went further than any of his predecessors. He came to rule as if his power were a 'divine right.'

Therefore, when the people had awaken from their sleep in 1974, the presidency was no longer viewed as the same secure office of American leadership. What seemed to have been a natural order, a natural trust, had been disturbed. A movement for power began in Congress to control the imperial presidency. Thus, the story of Richard Nixon and Richard II both involve a disturbance in the natural order. While the United States benefitted from the disturbance that made them aware of the possible unforeseen dangers of the executive office, England suffered from a bitter civil war. Both disturbances were created by a vacuum. When the leaders vacated their positions, struggle and disturbance followed. Thus, a disturbance in the natural order of things came to pass.
The shadow of your sorrow hath destroy'd
The shadow of your face.

Richard II; IV,i
In the second section of this thesis, we discussed Shakespeare's adaptation of historical accounts for the stage. As Shakespeare transformed Holinshed's Chronicles into historical dramas, it is evident that Shakespeare maintained a political philosophy to motivate his writing. For example, Shakespeare believed that the ruler (king) of a nation served as an important link in the Great Chain of Being to aid in the preservation of the natural order of things. With these thoughts in mind, several questions may be posed regarding Shakespeare's own view of The Tragedy of King Richard II. These questions include: What is it that makes a good ruler? How does a nation benefit from a sound political leader? Should Richard II have been deposed from his throne? How was Richard II partially responsible for his own fall? What relationship can be made between these thoughts on Richard II and Richard Nixon's decline from office?

What is it that makes a good ruler? With the character of Richard II, the audience views a man of great thoughts and emotions, but of little action. With the character of Henry Bolingbroke, the audience views a man characterized by quick, decisive action, but of few thoughts and emotions. By presenting complete opposites in the characters of Richard and Bolingbroke, Shakespeare merely suggests that
the good ruler is one who takes the middle route:

But the poetry of Richard is all a part of a world of gorgeous tournaments, conventionally mournful queens, and impossibly sententious gardeners, while Bolingbroke's common sense extends to his backers, in particular to that most important character, Northumberland. We have in fact not only two characters but two ways of life. 95

Therefore, the good ruler, as we interpret through Shakespeare, combines the sensitivities, thoughts, and passions manifested by Richard with the expedient, decisive action of Bolingbroke.

How does a country benefit from the leadership of a sound political ruler? Shakespeare envisions the value of good political leadership as the difference between chaos and order. In the garden scene of the third act, Shakespeare, through the character of the gardener, discussed the skills required by a leader as he compares them to the skills used in the garden:

... We at time of year
Do wound the bark, the skin of our fruit-trees,
Lest being over-proud in sap and blood,
With too much riches it confound itself. ... 96

As the gardener utilizes his proper skills to maintain the garden, his skills are guided by the wisdom of experience and the foresight to do what is best for the garden. If the garden is compared to England, the same must be true for the ruler. In order for the king to act in the best interests of his country, he needs to master his political skills. By taking advantage of his political skills, a leader can take effective action. Furthermore,
a leader should maintain an overall goal or a complete plan for his political activities. Through both, a leader's skills are working toward a complete purpose.

A nation is given the chance to prosper under a ruler of these capabilities. As a man who serves through proper activities and proper sensitivities, Shakespeare maintains that the king actively preserves his important link in the Great Chain of Being, as he helps in preserving the natural order. Richard's incompetence as a leader partially contributed to his own fall as a king. As a result of his fall, civil war had begun in England. As we interpret through Shakespeare, a king works for the good of the nation through the use of his skills. Order is maintained, and a nation prospers. A nation cannot do the same if it is torn by civil war and domestic strife. In effect, Richard's incompetence contributed toward the disturbance in the natural order.

Should Richard II have been deposed from his throne? On the surface, it may appear so, but Shakespeare leads us to look further. On the surface, Richard is a man of thought while Bolingbroke is a man of action. Richard is a weak ruler while Bolingbroke seems to be strong and decisive. Below the surface, Richard maintains qualities that Bolingbroke lacks. Richard is a man of greater sensitivities while Bolingbroke is strictly a man of the facts:

Richard is more interesting to us as a man than Bolingbroke, more capable of grief, more tender in his personal relationships, more in need of being understood.
Aside from personal character, did Richard deserve to be deposed in Shakespeare's eyes? The answer is no. E.M.W. Tillyard writes further:

In doctrine the play is entirely orthodox. Shakespeare knows that Richard's crimes never amounted to tyranny and hence that outright rebellion against him was a crime. 99

In fact, Shakespeare serves to give further emphasis on this matter. In The Tragedy of King Richard II, Shakespeare does not dramatize a scene in which Bolingbroke formally accuses Richard of any crimes committed. 100 In Shakespeare's mind, Richard was not worthy of deposition.

How was Richard II partially responsible for his own fall? Although Shakespeare wanted his audience to pity Richard and the fall of his weak character, 101 Shakespeare does not excuse him for failing to act against Bolingbroke. 102 In addition, one cannot pity Richard for actively using the money of Gaunt's estate for the expedition to Ireland. 103 It was Richard's activity that provoked Bolingbroke's return and consequent rebellion. Furthermore, it was Richard's passivity that allowed Bolingbroke easy access to the throne.

What relationship can be made between these thoughts of Shakespeare upon the fall of Richard II and Richard Nixon's decline from office? In 1969, President Richard Nixon entered the doors of the White House as a virtual master of the American political system. Furthermore, Nixon entered the executive office with the goal in mind
of bringing a lasting world peace to the final third of the Twentieth Century. From an interview with Richard Nixon in 1968, David Frost writes:

I had asked candidate Nixon how he would like most to be remembered, he had responded, 'As having made some contribution to a kind of world in which we can have peace in this last third of this century.' In his inaugural address he had repeated this theme, noting that 'The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker,' proclaiming his intention to 'lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil and onto the high ground of peace that man has dreamed of since the dawn of civilization.' To a nation torn by war and racial bitterness, he had pledged to 'bring us together.'

However, Nixon departed his post in 1974 without having realized the above-mentioned goals. Indeed, Nixon had taken steps toward peace with his visit to China in 1972. He also aided American-Soviet relations through his close diplomatic relationship with Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev. Furthermore, Nixon became president with a mastery of the American political system and the apparent desire to guide this skill toward a definite goal. Therefore, it is apparent that Richard Nixon met the requirements for good leadership (action guided by thought) as we have already interpreted from Shakespeare. Nixon sought to use his political skill and mastery to find the seemingly sincere goal of peace for the Twentieth Century.

Despite his noble intentions as a president, Richard Nixon resigned from the presidency in disgrace. Although Nixon had mastered the art of American politics, he became
over-obsessed with his desire to remain ahead of his opponents in political circles. In 1972, his hunger for the defeat of his opponents seemed to have grown out of control. Because the object of the time was to reelect Nixon despite all costs, illegal acts had been committed. Nixon and his staff were exposed in the controversy that surrounded the Watergate investigations. Eventually, the obsession to stay ahead in politics destroyed Richard Nixon. David Frost writes further:

Richard Nixon succeeded in 'bringing the country together' only in the belief that he was guilty of high constitutional crimes and misdemeanors, and in fulfilling his pledge of peace and unity by resigning his office.¹⁰⁵

As we have interpreted in Shakespeare through his portrayal of the opposites of Bolingbroke and Mowbray, we have derived two important qualities of good leadership. In the first place, the good ruler maintains the ability and political skill to act swiftly and effectively. Secondly, a good political leader maintains the sensitivity of thought necessary for the proper establishment of goals. By establishing these goals, the political leader dedicates his skills toward a definite purpose. From the accomplishment of these goals, the entire nation benefits. In looking at Richard II based on the information thus far, it is evident that he lacked both qualities necessary. He may have possessed a sensitive mind, as Shakespeare portrays him, but his vulnerability to the flattery from the people around him (Bushy, Bagot, and Green), prevented him from
using his mind in finding an overall purpose. This mental incompetence, of course, is in addition to his lack of skill in action, the skill maintained by Bolingbroke. Richard Nixon maintained both political skill and apparent directive. However, Richard Nixon's self-destruction came about by his obsession with the desire to dominate the American political scene.

Shakespeare apparently held a set political philosophy on the subject of good national leadership. This philosophy motivated him in his writing of The Tragedy of King Richard II as well as in his other historical dramas. The Tragedy of King Richard II was written in 1595 and it examined the human and political ramifications that surrounded the fall of a Fourteenth Century English monarch. Although Richard II and Richard Nixon may be worlds apart in their contrasts, a president of the Twentieth Century, like Richard Nixon, must possess the same leadership qualities that were important to leaders of the Fourteenth Century. Thus we are given a possible basis for comparison.
SECTION VIII
CONCLUSION

Great King, within this coffin I present
Thy buried fear, Herein all breathless lies
The mightiest of thy greatest enemies,
Richard of Bordeaux, By me hither brought.

Richard II; V,vi
It has been stated many times before that history has a tendency to repeat itself. When William Shakespeare wrote *The Tragedy of King Richard II* for his native England in 1595, perhaps it was his hope that leaders of the future would look to and study his portrayal of the fall of a king. From his drama, these leaders would be given an insight to the consequences of abuse of leadership for both ruler and nation. Yet, in the year 1974, a story, not unlike that of *The Tragedy of King Richard II*, came to a pseudo-tragic conclusion.

In *The Tragedy of King Richard II*, Shakespeare portrays a man who was given the throne to his country while he was at a young age. In the examination of his personal background, we have studied the self-made aspect of his struggle toward controlling the full power of his kingship. As a king, he was forced to lead a quickly changing England, as it was beginning its period of the Renaissance. As a man, Richard II was influenced and shaped in part by the society that surrounded him. As a victim of flattery, he was manipulated by the people who worked closely with him. In Shakespeare's dramatization of Richard II and the period in time that marked his fall from the throne, we see Richard as a man who maintained a false belief in the powers of his kingship. After Gaunt's death, Richard
wrongfully used the money of Gaunt's estate for his Irish expedition. After Bolingbroke's return from exile and subsequent usurpation of the king, Richard clings to his stake to kingship under the theory of divine right. However, King Richard does nothing to prevent Bolingbroke's rise to the throne. Although there are a number of factors that contributed to Richard's fall from power, it is his false perception of the powers of his own royalty that stands as the greatest contributing cause (his pseudo-tragic flaw).

In the study of Richard Nixon, we see him as a man who began from humble Quaker beginnings and worked his way upward. As a self-made man, he lived a life and political career that he personally viewed as never-ending struggle, although his experiences were, on the whole, extremely successful. In 1969, Richard Nixon took control as the President of the United States. In 1972, Richard Nixon sought reelection to his office with the help of a circle of men who were extremely dedicated to the cause, despite all costs. After the Watergate break-in and the start of the investigation that followed, Richard Nixon involved himself in a conspiracy to obstruct justice by using the power of his post to slow down the investigation. He ordered the dismissal of Special Watergate Prosecutor Archibald Cox because Cox had become too persistent in obtaining from Nixon recorded conversations that had taken place in the Oval Office. Shortly thereafter, the process
for impeachment started and Nixon's decline from power began to take shape. Richard Nixon's main flaw of character, like that of King Richard II, was his own false beliefs in the powers of his office. As president, Nixon believed that his executive powers had placed him above the law. His resignation from office on August 9, 1974, had proven that he was mistaken.

In this thesis presentation, we found a possible basis for comparison between Richard Nixon's final ten months as president and *The Tragedy of King Richard II* in three different areas of thought: 1) Both suffered the pseudo-tragedy of the self-made man; 2) The symbols and images that surround Richard's kingship, as presented by Shakespeare, are somewhat analagous to the symbols and images that had been associated with the Nixon administration; and 3) The countries of Fourteenth Century England and Twentieth Century United States were disturbed by the decline of their leaders.

In addition to these three areas of thought, we have interpreted William Shakespeare's thoughts on the character requirements for good leadership from his own portrayal of King Richard's fall. In turn, these thoughts have been related to Nixon's final ten months in the White House. From these interpretations, we understand that good leadership is composed of political skill and the wisdom of experience to guide the skill intelligently. King Richard II failed to maintain either quality, while
it is possible that Nixon maintained both. However, Nixon's desire to dominate in American politics eventually resulted in his self-destruction.

The leaders of nations are not only heads of government, but also symbols to the people they govern. With the role of ruler comes the prestige and power to the political leader. In addition, come the requirements for sound, effective, and thoughtful leadership. The people of a nation look to their leaders as a source of confidence and security. They looked to leaders in that fashion during the Fourteenth Century as they do now. When a political leader breaks the confidence of the people through the abuse of his governing powers, and if that abuse results in his own downfall, a disturbance in the political and natural order of things will definitely come to pass.

In the nuclear age of the Twentieth Century, the leaders of the world have assumed, perhaps, the roles of greatest importance. Because they can order atomic destruction at any time, the world now depends, more than ever, on these leaders for sound thought, judgement and action. In effect, the actual survival of the world may hinge on the decisions of only a few men.

Shakespeare and many other writers have professed a philosophy of political leadership through some of their works of literature. Because history does have a tendency to repeat itself, the time has come for the world to study the works of these men.
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