A MODERN-DAY TALE

SHAKESPEARE’S MIND FOR THE FUTURE
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The 16th-century England reflected in the plays of William Shakespeare was a time of economic upheaval, paradigm shifts in business, social inequality, and terrorism, themes painfully familiar to any 21st-century observer. Throughout his career, Shakespeare deftly used his art to mirror the leadership errors that threatened to plunge Elizabethan England into chaos.

Now, as we near the 400th anniversary of the playwright’s death, we ask: are we making the same mistakes today, and, if so, what can we learn (and do differently) to improve the outcome?
“We know what we are, but know not what we may be.”
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The world of today through the prism of 400 years

The leadership styles of the rulers who dominate some of William Shakespeare’s most successful plays range from the “divine right to rule” of King Richard II to “the autocratic leader” of King Henry IV and then “the people’s hero” of King Henry V, who learns from his mistakes and becomes a collaborative, inspiring, and innovative leader.

In the opening scene of Shakespeare’s *Henry V*, the playwright uses a character called Chorus to set the scene, asking the audience to imagine that they are part of the mighty kingdoms of England and France, standing in the vast French countryside with huge armies of men and horses around them, in order to help them forget the small, cramped reality of the theatre.

This publication asks you to visualize the challenges of leadership in today’s world through the lens of 400 years ago — a time of constant turmoil, when the authority of leaders was regularly challenged.

While the people may have wanted change, the rulers did not — unless it benefited them in the form of power and wealth. Shakespeare saw these problems and spoke out about them in his plays, inviting censorship and at times putting his own and his company’s welfare at risk.

In order to protect himself and his team, he disguised these issues by placing them into a different period of history, or satirized them through comedy or tragedy.

As we once more find ourselves in a time of disruptive change, we are seeing the archetypal “hero CEO” of yesteryear morphing into “the human CEO” of a more creative era. While chief executives are still expected to be inspiring and heroic leaders, their leadership teams, boards, employees, customers, and stakeholders also expect them to be more authentic, approachable, collaborative, and “human.” At the same time, they must be confident and authoritative when it comes time to make the call — a style of leadership we might call “collaborative command.” In this publication, we look at what Shakespeare says about leadership and its relevance to the leadership challenges of today.

**Act I** reflects on the three leadership styles that Shakespeare develops in his plays and their relevance to today’s leaders, using insights from research conducted by Heidrick & Struggles.

**Act II** reveals the Shakespeare we don’t know, an innovator in business as well as art, putting in place structures that generated wealth for himself and his colleagues while mitigating operational risk and personal harm.

**Act III** presents John Bell, the founder of Bell Shakespeare, talking about his leadership and the relevance of leadership in the performing arts to the corporate world.
What we learn from the times of William Shakespeare as well as his plays and his own innovative business structures is that it is impossible to resist the forces of change. Change must be welcomed with an open mind and a willing heart. New leadership styles must be developed that can accommodate and facilitate the new ideas upon which progress depends.

Throughout much of Shakespeare’s professional life, from his first play in 1590 until his death in 1616, England’s rulers went to great lengths to overcome new challenges with old thinking. They preferred suppression to inclusion, persecuting deviations from whatever polity or faith prevailed at the time.

Shakespeare was born during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, who ruled for 45 years and was seen as a great queen despite being under constant threat from domestic and foreign enemies. Yet in her fear, she executed for treason the Earl of Essex, her one-time favorite.

In Elizabehn England, as in our 21st-century world, the ruling class was never sure of its stability or support. Such were the schisms that continued to divide society due to leadership failures; true democratic reform did not take place for more than 200 years, until the passage of the Reform Act in 1832.

The enduring quality of Shakespeare’s plays rests on his ability to never cast judgment but, through his characters, to ask questions. He leaves his audiences to determine for themselves what they think. While it is clear in retrospect that he did not much favor King Richard II or King Henry IV, he describes their characters and leadership styles, rather than judging them good or bad.

This practice not only engaged and delighted audiences but also ensured that Shakespeare kept his head when all about him were losing theirs. By cleverly illustrating leadership deficiencies through drama, Shakespeare not only built a prosperous business but escaped the fate of others, including fellow playwright Christopher Marlowe, who met with a violent end for his outspoken political views.

So how do the questions that Shakespeare raises about the leadership styles of earlier kings resonate with our views on what makes a good leader today? This question is especially relevant in our age, when declining tenure rates and levels of public trust suggest that corporate leadership has not kept pace with increased expectations.

The fault is not in our times, but in ourselves

While an autocratic leader may have a place in a crisis, or to achieve a temporary stability, this style unravels when the way forward becomes murkier. In times of doubt, the answer is never to work the old levers harder or to shout to be understood when the listener doesn’t speak your language. The solution is to slow down, listen more, consult widely, and create management structures that allow new ideas to flourish.
Research by Heidrick & Struggles in *The Success Formula: How Smart Leaders Deliver Outstanding Value*, by Professor Andrew Kakabadse, and interviews with more than 150 chief executives in *The CEO Report: Embracing the Paradoxes of Leadership and the Power of Doubt*, with the University of Oxford’s Said Business School, assert that when it comes to leadership, it is not just diversity of people in terms of gender, nationality, age group, or culture that is needed but a true diversity of thinking that will help global business find new pathways to growth.

Change is painful. It involves giving up comfortable old ways and habits. It is often said that the only thing we learn from history is that we do not learn. But at a time when answers are not easily forthcoming, we need to do what Shakespeare did and ask questions. The key to honesty is objectivity, as leaders allow the facts to emerge as they will so that new narratives become clear and can be safely adopted by all.

In his plays, Shakespeare gives us enough color and raises sufficient questions about his three main leadership styles, “divine right to rule,” “autocratic,” and “people’s hero,” for us to make a judgment on the one we favor.

History tells us that different times, situations, and cultures lead people to favor different leadership styles, and we have seen all three styles emerge in global business in recent years. Yet we can still see their outlines in the characters of Shakespeare.

### Divine right

Richard II believed he was the anointed king who was entitled to rule, even if he had little sense of direction and was prone to lose touch with reality. His impulsive and injudicious behavior quickly led to him alienating his subjects and losing his authority.

We see the downside of “divine right” in the issues that bedevil some family business dynasties and conglomerates today, or in corporate management, in leaders who tap a favored insider on the shoulder and pass the baton with little or no objective scrutiny, only a sense of entitlement and hubris.

In the 1980s, IBM was almost destroyed by hubris but learned to renew itself by abandoning its “divine right” to lead the computer industry. What saved Big Blue and prevented it from “sleepwalking off a cliff,” as its new CEO said when he arrived to start the turnaround, was a change to an evidence-based culture. By consulting with its stakeholders, employees, customers, suppliers, and others, the company developed a radar for big shifts in its industry and identified new opportunities for growth. While IBM faces new challenges today, few would argue that, at a time of crisis, when it almost missed the switch from mainframes to personal computers and then to services, IBM had to adopt new leadership and shape a new culture.

### The autocrat

King Henry IV was autocratic in his manner. He seized power from Richard, and his style was authoritarian, which created conflict rather than healing after the tensions of Richard’s reign. Henry became paranoid and distant, as his anxieties and guilt over his treatment of Richard grew. He did, however, have an eye for succession and was able to die peacefully knowing his son, Prince Hal, would take over.

Today, as in Shakespeare’s time, autocratic leaders drive strategy through the force of their personalities. Autocratic leadership usually comes to the fore when the strategy is not evidence-based but based on intuition or drawn from a chief executive’s prior experience (“fighting-the-last-battle” syndrome). Such leaders often suffer from the blindness that comes from being right often enough. In short, they have come to believe their own publicity.

Arguably, such were the leaders who brought down the Royal Bank of Scotland in the biggest bank bailout in British business history, and who led the failed takeover by HP of the computer giant Compaq in the United States. These leaders disregarded evidence-based strategies and instead relied on their own judgment of “perceived value.”

---

During our research in Australia, one senior executive told of another strategic failure by an autocratic leader: “The CEO’s friends in the top team and on the board supported his idea, and those who attempted to challenge were browbeaten into submission. The line managers did not dare say a word, and yet they all knew that a new service offering to the market was going to fail. In this case, it was a vigilant press and media in Asia and Australia that brought the failing strategy to the attention of the board. What happened? We, the general managers, got the blame.”

3 The Success Formula, Chapter 1, “Understanding value,” page 13.

The people’s hero

King Henry V united his troops with common purpose at the Battle of Agincourt before leading them to victory (against all odds) through a series of innovative moves and canny strategy. However, his progress to hero king required considerable leadership and personal development. From his early years as a larrikin and an irresponsible young man, he learned that to be a successful leader, he had to be a team builder who motivated people to follow him as they believed in him.

Henry V may well be the man of our hour. He illustrates the competencies required in today’s volatile and uncertain economic climate, when the role of business and the expectations of society on leaders have shifted dramatically — even as the clamor for positive results grows louder.

He is the leader who faces oblivion as he leads an exhausted army of 6,000 foot soldiers against a fresh, armored force of 30,000 horsemen. How does Henry V master his complex and volatile environment?

• He relies on evidence, gathering information about the mood of his army by walking in disguise from tent to tent the night before the battle.

• He focuses on building a strong team by bringing together an unlikely group of misfits and molding them into a disciplined force. People who did not accept his values, such as Falstaff (exiled as a drunken rogue) and Bardolph (executed for thieving) were dealt with accordingly.

• He is an inspiring chief, using motivational speeches to build inclusivity and direction. His objective is to make his motley group behave like a tightly knit team able to face any challenge.

• He is an innovator, adopting the latest technology: the longbow, which cut down many of the opposing French early in the battle, and sharpened pikes, which impaled their horses at the first charge. As a result of this battle, future English armies made even greater use of the longbow.

• He is an accomplished strategist, making sure he chooses the battleground, forcing the French into a narrow corridor between two wooded areas to diminish their numerical superiority.

• And he has luck on his side — a vital quality in battle, as in business. It rained on the day of the battle, and his opponents become quickly mired, their heavy armor weighing them down and anchoring their feet in the mud, making them vulnerable to sword, dagger, and pole-axe.

Pointedly, Henry V aligns and engages his troops before revealing his strategy, not the other way around. It wasn’t a case of “strategy first, and everyone get on the bus,” but a leadership style that first builds trust, then alignment and engagement, then discipline, and then, and only then, flawless execution of the plan.
Many of today’s high-performing leaders have similar attributes. They are open-minded, comfortable with being uncomfortable, and not put off by opposition. As one prominent global chief executive told us: “I learned to be more open-minded by living in different countries as well as changing industries. I also adapt to different styles. You need to look through style to understand what really are the drivers of the business and which people can be successful. You don’t have a cookie-cutter view of talent when you do your assessments. We have board members with many different backgrounds … If someone’s challenging, I don’t start off with a defensive attitude, ever.”

Our research has found that value delivery based on evidence trumps perceived value or an intuitive strategy. Value is derived from consultation with some of the most knowledgeable people in the business (your staff and your team) and is driven by alignment and engagement. Diversity of thinking is a critical component as ideas are gathered and “the troops” in the organization are consulted. Once they are engaged with the purpose (victory in the battleground of the marketplace), the strategy, whatever it may be, can be executed with power and passion.

What if we can’t see the future?

If success may be defined as preparation meeting opportunity, how do leaders, from King Henry V to modern chief executives, prepare for disruptions they cannot see and seize opportunities not yet obvious?

More than 150 global chief executives we interviewed ahead of the recent World Economic Forum, in Davos, Switzerland, for The CEO Report broadly agreed that traditional approaches to strategy no longer apply. Several spoke of eliminating the conventional three-to-five-year planning cycle in favor of repeating, 100-day exercises.

Recognizing that chasing certainty is futile, leaders are catalyzing “not knowing” into a force for innovation. In the words of one CEO: “A certain level of professional doubt should be the quality of any good leader. If you’re in the clear, you’ve probably missed something.”

Doubt sharpens the senses, makes leaders more alert, and provides the clarity to spot apparently innocent and unrelated trends.

Similarly, the executives we interviewed identified a quality called “ripple intelligence” that we find in many successful leaders. These executives have a keen sense of the one unexpected splash or activity within their business, or outside of their industry sector, that could create a huge impact as the effects (or ripples) spread outward.

To quote one CEO we interviewed, who understood the impact of digital technologies on financial services ahead of Asia’s currency volatility of the late 1990s: “We could see a few people causing the collapse of several currencies. … As those economies crashed, we shut down all the selling in those markets. … We made quite a lot of money that year, when the rest of the industry lost its shirt. It’s what you have to do; you’re looking at all the angles.”

It may not always be possible to find polymaths with over-the-horizon radar and perfectly rounded leadership skills, but it is possible to ensure a leader’s team is complementary and fitly framed together, able to help engage and align a corporate culture to match the company’s vision and purpose.

In uncertain times, perhaps the only certainty is that we all need to develop a mind-set of diversity and openness and a willingness to look beyond the obvious. In the words of Henry V: “All things are ready, if our minds be so.”

---

4 The Success Formula, Chapter 2, “Diversity of thinking” pages 32–33.
5 The CEO Report: Embracing the Paradoxes of Leadership and the Power of Doubt (Heidrick & Struggles, with the University of Oxford’s Said Business School), pages 4–5.
7 The CEO Report, page 12.
by James Shapiro

We tend to imagine Shakespeare working solo, scribbling away alone in some garret, much as he appears in that entertaining movie Shakespeare in Love, earning an independent living by writing, selling, and ultimately publishing his plays. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Contrary to popular belief, Shakespeare wasn’t paid for writing Romeo and Juliet or Hamlet and earned only a pittance when his plays were printed. His literary success and economic well-being depended instead upon his role as a shareholder in a joint-stock company, of which he was an investor and leading member for two decades, ones in which he excelled as an innovator — both creatively and in terms of the business of theatre — navigating the complex challenges that included an increasingly competitive marketplace, censorship, plague, fire, domestic instability, and the threat of foreign invasion. While Shakespeare is celebrated today as an autonomous literary genius, he would have seen himself quite differently: as a member of a talented team, one that worked long days together, year in and year out, and responded with boldness, flexibility, and foresight to fresh challenges.

Building the infrastructure for an entertainment industry

At the time that Shakespeare was born in Stratford-upon-Avon in 1564, no writer in England could earn a living without the support of wealthy aristocratic or royal patrons. Professional theatre, what there was of it, remained a marginally profitable business. Strolling players toured from one town to the next, in search of a venue and a paying audience, for there were no permanent playhouses and hadn’t been in Britain since the Roman occupation. Actors were considered of low social status, vagabonds who were subject to being whipped and sent on their way by local authorities.

That situation changed dramatically a few years after Shakespeare was born. At that time, of the nearly 5,000,000 inhabitants of a largely rural and agrarian England, roughly 150,000 lived in a compact area in and around the walled City of London, a number that would swell to almost 200,000 by the end of the 16th century. This meant that there was a critical mass of potential playgoers. Seizing on that potential, visionary investors began converting inns into playing spaces and then constructing large purpose-built theatres. A thriving entertainment industry took root. The creation of these privately owned theatres proved to be a crucial innovation, without which Shakespeare’s dramatic output would have been impossible.
All told, in and around London between 1567 and 1642, twenty-three theatres were built. Seventeen of them were outdoor amphitheatres, while the six others were smaller indoor theatres. None of these buildings were designed to last for more than a few decades, so no more than seven or eight were standing at any one time. Two of the earliest and most important playhouses, erected in the mid-1570s, were The Theatre and The Curtain, where Shakespeare got his start as both an actor and a dramatist. The investors who built and owned these earliest playhouses divided the box-office receipts with the players who performed in them.

The sheer number of theatres, and the financial investment behind this construction boom, suggests that Elizabethan Londoners were theatre-crazed. The outdoor amphitheatres could hold as many as 2,500 or perhaps even 3,000 spectators, each of whom paid a penny (roughly the cost of a loaf of bread at that time) to enter and stand or a few pennies more for a seat. The smaller indoor theatres held perhaps 400 to 500 privileged playgoers, and their prices started at sixpence, so the box-office potential was fairly similar. Even a conservative guess would suggest that the average Londoner went to see a play at least once a month, some many times more than that. There was a great demand for new plays, as many as twenty a year for each playing company, which were then worked into the repertory of old favorites, as patrons of London’s theatres expected the actors to stage a different play every day. This demand in turn meant new career possibilities for a generation of ambitious and talented young men (acting and writing was almost exclusively done by young men), who were now able to make a living as freelance writers, paid six pounds a play, at a time when a day laborer earned ten pounds a year and a schoolmaster twice that amount.

The joint-stock theatre company

London’s primary business organizational structure at the time was the long-established guild, which dated back to the 10th century. But an emerging commercial enterprise like the professional theatre did not work well within the cumbersome and rigidly hierarchical structure of the guilds. The newer model that Shakespeare and his fellow actors turned to instead was the joint-stock company, coming into favor as those with capital turned to foreign trade, whose huge rewards required significant investment at a time when lending at interest was technically illegal (though that didn’t stop some, including Shakespeare’s father, from practicing what was considered usury). The earliest English joint-stock company engaged in trade was probably the Company of Merchant Adventurers, chartered in 1553. This innovative corporate structure would allow for the rapid expansion of foreign trade, culminating in the charter to the powerful East India Company in 1600. It would also provide an invaluable model for England’s professional actors. The first and most significant innovation, then, in which Shakespeare participated was investing in and helping to steer a new joint-stock company called the Chamberlain’s Men, which was formed in 1594.

Shakespeare would thrive as one if its founding members and shareholders. His initial share to buy in, the same £70 the seven other sharers each invested, was considerable. How Shakespeare came up with this sum, whether he borrowed the money or handed over his earlier plays in lieu of cash, is not known. It meant that he now received one-eighth of the half-share of all box-office earnings. The partners were all expected to act (and hired additional actors to round out the cast of fourteen or so performers for the typical play). They also took care of all other demands: bookkeeping; providing and upgrading costumes and props; running concessions; dealing with the authorities; and buying new plays. In all likelihood, Shakespeare’s main contribution was supplying two or three new plays a year.
His company would be a great success story. Unlike rival companies, which often (as we know from surviving records) dissolved or came to blows (sometimes fatal ones), the Chamberlain's Men proved to be an exceptionally harmonious team. When one of their original members and comic stars quit five years after their formation, they sustained the loss and quickly went about finding a replacement. From their generous bequests they left to each other in their wills, we can sense just how tight-knit this company remained, for decades. The founding members who remained in the company, including Shakespeare himself, reaped significant profits and all died wealthy. It proved to be the most successful theatre company in Elizabethan and Jacobean England and — judged in terms of talent, repertory, and profits — perhaps of all time.

**Actor-owned playhouses**

Five years after their formation, and clearly thriving, Shakespeare and his fellow shareholders determined that the status quo was not good enough. For one thing, they remained dependent on their landlord at The Theatre, and likely chafed at surrendering to him half of the profits. When their landlord decided that he wanted to convert the building to other uses, they faced the possibility of eviction. They knew, though, that while their landlord owned the property on which the theatre sat, they owned the structure itself. They met this challenge aggressively, arriving at the site of the playhouse armed to the teeth when they knew the owner was away for Christmas. A team of carpenters hired for this venture dismantled the expensive timber frame, loaded it on wagons, and transported it away. The following summer it would be rebuilt across the Thames in Southwark, on an empty plot that they had rented, and rechristened The Globe Theatre. Their old landlord sued the Chamberlain's Men, but unsuccessfully. If not for their bold move, the course of English drama would have been markedly different.

Shakespeare's personal fortune was enhanced as well, for, in exchange for an additional investment in the building and maintenance of the new theatre, he was invited to become its part-owner. For the first time, actors owned the theatre they played in, and from now on Shakespeare earned his money from two revenue streams: shareholder in a company and part-owner of a very successful playhouse. The move was also (and no doubt intentionally) a blow to the company's main rival, the Admiral's Men, who performed at The Rose playhouse, a stone's throw from where The Globe was erected. Within a year, the Admiral's Men would abandon the neighborhood and move to London's northern suburbs. As successful as The Globe Theatre proved to be, playing was highly profitable during the warmer and sunnier months that ran from late spring through early autumn. Recognizing that, in 1608 Shakespeare's company acquired another playing space, the intimate and candlelit Blackfriars Theatre, built in the heart of London, allowing them to perform indoors during the inclement winter months, and outdoors at The Globe during the summer ones. Shakespeare would be a part-owner of this theatre as well.

By then, the branding of his playing company was complete. A decade earlier, one playhouse experience was pretty much like another. No longer. The shift can probably be dated to the turn of the century, when the Chamberlain's Men branded themselves as different and more upscale by abandoning the jig — a bawdy singing and dancing act — that had followed every Elizabethan play and would continue to be wildly popular in other outdoor playhouses. While Shakespeare's company was flexible and responsive to what audiences wanted, they steadfastly refused, in contrast especially to the playhouses in the northern suburbs, to pander to audiences; they preferred to challenge them with plays that broke new ground. Perhaps the best example of this can be found in Shakespeare's two greatest plays: *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. There were in fact older and popular Elizabethan plays called *Hamlet* and *King Leir* already on the boards. Shakespeare chose to revisit each of these stories, undertaking a gut renovation of these increasingly dated plays, offering in his own *Hamlet* and *King Lear* more knotty, timely, and rewarding dramas, ones that spoke with greater insight and urgency to his increasingly sophisticated audiences.
Innovative responses to crises and competition

It would be a mistake to imagine Shakespeare's story as a steady and uninterrupted march from one success to another. Far from it. Given the instability of the times, he and his fellow shareholders faced repeated setbacks, and it is worth looking at the ways in which they responded to the most challenging of these. Theirs was far from a risk-free investment.

The Spanish, whose Great Armada had been foiled in 1588, threatened invasion repeatedly over the course of the next decade and, had they succeeded, would have put an end to England's heretical theatres. Shakespeare and his company also had to walk a careful line between government censorship and providing audiences with the information they craved. There were no newspapers in Shakespeare's day, and, other than royal proclamations and public sermons, there were no competing ways of obtaining news or exploring pressing social and political concerns. It is no coincidence, for example, that so many of Shakespeare's histories and tragedies of the 1590s explore the problem of political succession at a time when the unmarried Queen Elizabeth was approaching her end (and had forbidden any explicit discussion of who would be the nation's next ruler).

With no clear successor to the throne named, England faced the possibility of civil war or foreign invasion. That crisis was averted when Queen Elizabeth was peacefully succeeded by King James of Scotland. The regime change turned out to greatly enhance the fortunes of Shakespeare's company. Their stability and accomplishments during their first decade paid off, as did their connections to powerful figures in the land, for the Chamberlain's Men were chosen to be James's own playing company, renamed the King's Men. This new status provided them with important political protection as well as visibility at court (though very little in the way of financial support: they made their money from public performances and were paid only a token fee for playing at court).

Censorship remained a peril for any professional dramatist. Shakespeare managed to write the politically topical plays that audiences craved, but unlike his rivals — including Ben Jonson, Christopher Marlowe, and John Marston — he never fell afoul of the authorities when doing so. Yes, plays put on by his company (including one about an assassination attempt on the life of King James called the Tragedy of Gowrie) were pulled from production; yes, the company was called in to explain why they had performed Richard II on the eve of an unsuccessful coup, but they talked their way out of trouble; and yes, Shakespeare was forced to change the name of the comic hero of Henry IV from Oldcastle to Falstaff (having apparently angered an influential descendant of Oldcastle at court), but these were minor setbacks, quietly and successfully handled.

Deadly outbreaks of plague were a more serious threat to the health and livelihood of Shakespeare and his fellow actors and would cut substantially into profits. The Chamberlain's Men had in fact formed as a group in the immediate aftermath of an outbreak of plague in 1592–93 that killed 10,000 Londoners. While they were fortunate that the next decade remained largely plague-free, a terrible outbreak occurred in 1603 — wiping out as much as a seventh of the city's population. Lesser outbreaks would recur for the next eight years, leaving the theatres closed for extended periods, sometimes a year or longer, for though the authorities didn't know what caused plague, they saw that it spread quickly in crowds and so closed the playhouses when there were more than thirty or forty recorded deaths from plague in a week. Shakespeare's company responded by touring the safer provinces. Their cash reserves meant that they were able to ride out closures that badly weakened some of their competitors (especially the children's companies, which couldn't tour and who for a time had become a major threat to their dominance).

Another setback was self-induced. When Shakespeare and his fellow investors had built The Globe Theatre, they had covered the roof with thatch rather than with more expensive (and less flammable) tiles. It would prove a costly decision. In 1613, during a performance of Henry VIII, a cannon was fired from the stage that set the thatched roof on fire. While nobody was hurt — and the
valuable playscripts were rescued — The Globe burned to the ground. It took a significant capital investment on the part of the co-owners to rebuild it, but that was swiftly done. Since we have no record of Shakespeare's involvement with his company after this date, he may well have decided at this time to sell back his share and retire rather to reinvest so heavily in a new building. The rebuilt Globe, like other playhouses in London, stood until the 1640s, when the puritanical Parliament, with the nation edging toward civil war, decided to put an end to public playing.

**Literary innovation: Flexibility and risk-taking**

When discussing how Shakespeare's writing changed over time, it is tempting but misguided to isolate innovations that derive from his literary interests from those that derive from the economic and competitive demands of the theatre world. Biographers like to speculate that the changes in the trajectory of Shakespeare's works stem from his volatile emotional state: he was in love when he wrote *Romeo and Juliet*, depressed when he wrote *Hamlet*, and so on. There is considerably more evidence that the changes in his style over the years owe more to his recognition that if he didn't respond to what audiences wanted, his popularity and the economic health of his company would suffer. One of Shakespeare's undervalued gifts was his ability to recognize when creative innovations were needed to keep up with, if not co-opt, competitors in a fairly ruthless literary marketplace. He did so in small and large ways. Two examples must suffice. When Ben Jonson's popular satiric comedies threatened to displace Shakespeare's romantic comedies, Shakespeare responded by introducing satiric and Jonsonian characters like Jaques in *As You Like It* into his work and by making his comic worlds darker and edgier. And Jonson was also invited to write plays for Shakespeare's company.

Shakespeare's response to two up-and-coming young dramatists of the early 17th century, Thomas Middleton and John Fletcher, offers an even more telling example of his adaptability. The former was skilled at writing citizen comedy, the latter at tragicomedy (increasingly popular genres in which Shakespeare had not excelled). Shakespeare chose collaboration rather than confrontation and teamed up with Middleton to write *Timon of Athens* and with Fletcher to write three late plays: *Henry VIII*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and the now lost *Cardenio*. In doing so, Shakespeare not only responded to the changing tastes of his audiences but also helped secure a stronger role in his company for talented young writers. Fletcher would later succeed him as the company's principal playwright. Unlike his great fictional hero, Henry V, Shakespeare was able to pass on what he had learned, ensuring the continued success of his company. He was rewarded by his partners seven years after his death, in 1616, when two of the original shareholders — John Heminges and Henry Condell — immortalized Shakespeare by seeing into print thirty-six of his plays, half of which had never been printed before, in the remarkable volume, the *First Folio* of 1623.
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The journey

We started Bell Shakespeare in a circus tent on a hot summer’s night in Sydney in 1990, with our first season consisting of Hamlet and The Merchant of Venice. My vision, and the strategy that resulted from that vision, was to create a company dedicated to producing the plays of William Shakespeare in a way that was meaningful and exciting to contemporary Australians.

Today we have achieved our goal of being viable and successful enough to continue performing, but it is always going to be a balance between the creativity and the financial aspect of the business. In a quarter of a century, we have firmly established ourselves as Australia’s only truly national theatre company, specializing in the immortal plays of Shakespeare and his peers, including Marlowe, Jonson, and Molière, whose masterpieces bear comparison with the man acknowledged as history’s greatest playwright.

Leadership

Neither the divine right of Richard II nor the autocratic style of Henry IV is going to work well, certainly in an arts organization, because people just will not tolerate that.

You want to have your door open and be talking to people in the organization, in the office, or in the rehearsal room in a very personal and down-to-earth way. The way I stay in touch is to be one of the gang: acting as well as directing and getting out on stage and leading from the front is a way of staying in touch. Getting directors out there with the other actors on stage is a bonding exercise.

In executing our vision for a project, in our case a play, you need someone in the rehearsal room who is the captain of the ship. But the leader is always looking for opinions, alternatives, and suggestions, listening to them all, throwing them in the mix, and then making the final decision.

Evidence gathering is critical to gaining credibility as a leader. We make sure everyone feels they have had their say and no one has been denied a voice, but not just for the sake of window dressing or democracy. When you listen properly as a leader, you find that people have a lot of interesting ideas and feedback, even from a quick discussion that you wouldn’t have solved by walking around the room by yourself.

The leader has to have an obvious passion for what he or she is doing. I notice that a lot of people have everything except the passion. We all know of charismatic dictators, who can be dangerous, but business today really
needs people with a healthy kind of zeal and passion
that people are attracted to and want to follow — a
contagious optimism.

Integrity is critical. If you lose your good name or your
reputation, it’s very hard to keep working in this business,
and people won’t want to work with you. We are extremely
conscious of good practice and looking after people
and making sure we have a very good reputation in the
industry for being fair, honest, and caring.

Nobody has a divine right to lead. It must always be
earned, or you will be overthrown. In the arts, as in
business, we need to know our stuff. Hubris leads to
loneliness and isolation, followed by paranoia and a
distancing from the very people who can make you
successful. To presume you have any “right” at all is highly
dangerous. You need to keep earning the people’s trust.

On the rehearsal floor, it is still a matter of negotiation and
give-and-take. You must let everybody have a go at how
they want to express themselves. Autocratic rule is never
very productive in the long run. It might be a short-term
fix, but it doesn’t last.

But even when you have earned respect through being
collaborative, people are still looking to you for strong
leadership. After canvassing everyone’s opinion, there still
has to be a tough decision made, and you’re the one who
has to make it and not shy away from it.

The team builder

Apart from the obvious success factor of constant change
and innovation, which is a given in the arts, the secret to
our success is that we specialize in developing a culture
that looks after people properly.

Leaders today need to make the effort to get around and
talk to everybody, to develop new ideas, and to encourage
the sort of loyalty, energy, and enthusiasm needed to
grow and prosper. At Bell Shakespeare, we really foster
that goodwill and make sure everybody feels heard and
respected. Developing a collaborative culture is key, and
you do that by being inclusive and motivational with
your team.

This is our real strength — collaboration, and a non-
autocratic way of working. Of course we have a structure
in the office and position descriptions, so people know
who they are reporting to and what their responsibilities
are. But we encourage as much autonomy as possible
and as much collaboration as possible between all the
various departments.

I’ve only ever had to sack two people in my career at Bell
Shakespeare — that’s only two in 25 years. I don’t like the
idea of firing people, but in those cases the decisions were
clear. Running a business is much like casting a play. You
choose people appropriate to the role, and if you miscast
it, it will go off the rails. We always say that casting is 90
percent of the success of the show, and I think that applies
to any organization, in terms of who you pick for each role.

What we look for is people skills — their willingness to
work as a team. Our Actors at Work program consists of
two teams of four actors traveling around the country,
inspiring young minds with school-friendly adaptations
of Shakespeare’s genius. When we recruit those actors,
we have to look beyond their talent to whether they will
get on together. Will they pull their weight? Will they be
flexible, adaptable? These things are as important as their
acting skills if the team is going to be successful.

Innovation, risk, and change

If you are not moving forward and doing something
challenging and innovative, you are going to become
stagnant. But the trick is to be on top of public taste, which
can move rapidly in another direction before you realize it.

Even the most experienced producers and directors must
continue to take planned risks, so we watch very carefully
what other industries globally are doing and what the
media are saying. We need to stay ahead of trends as
much as we can to determine what people will pay money
to see.

20 Shakespeare’s Mind for the Future
I’m not in the pop scene, so we make sure we employ people to bring that energy into the company and stay close to what young audiences are looking for. We have just produced *Romeo and Juliet* for schools, and it’s highly successful. Everyone said it was like watching a teen movie, so we were right on the money with that one — it was just the right production for the right audience.

It is important that I work with a diverse range of actors, directors, and staff who have all sorts of influences that I don’t have. We also work with schools and teachers, so we are always in touch with what young people are thinking. Change is the key to our world. My vision for interpreting Shakespeare for Australians led us down a number of paths that were not always met with public acclaim. The board and I recognized this and changed our approach, without abandoning our vision.

Our seasons began to include a heavier mix of Shakespeare’s popular plays, but not forgetting the not-so-well-known ones. We presented non-Shakespeare plays; broadened our audience by segmenting the market and introducing different ticket offerings; brought in professional voice coaches and choreographers; identified specific groupings of donors friendly to our cause; and reconstructed our performance model. All these strategies have helped us bring about the changes that our market, our audiences, and our stakeholders have demanded.

Risk is always with us, because there’s never enough money to do everything we want to do. Sometimes we take risks that may not in themselves make money but that get us attention for other things that do. And we put in place management structures to mitigate the risk. But if you don’t take risks, then nothing is going to happen.

It’s not about making an increasingly large amount of money but ensuring that we stay afloat and produce exciting work. It’s always an interesting tussle. We still have to convince our board that an idea can be a good investment and not a waste of money. We need to keep refining our business practice and getting people on the board who are able to ask the hard questions.

Our world is ever-changing. We continually need to innovate. But balancing the risk is all-important in the arts, where money is in short supply, competition is fierce, and public tastes are fickle.

**Continuous learning**

Leaders must be constantly learning and developing their skills. I have made continuous learning a key part of my leadership.

Going to see other companies’ performances and reading widely is a big part of it but also just going to art galleries, listening to music, going to concerts, and feeding the mind with creative material. I find a lot of inspiration from contemporary art, for example. You draw on a wide range of material almost subconsciously. The main thing is to constantly get out of your safety zone.

We are increasingly finding that much of what we do in the arts has a relevance to the corporate world. Frankly, I’m intrigued by just how interested the corporate world is in wanting to learn how we run our organization. We have learned from very good corporate people, who have taught us how to trim our sails and put together business plans. But we have something to teach them as well — the use of voice and presence, how to inspire teams with powerful language, and the lessons of leadership drawn from Shakespeare’s timeless plays. We have had great success sharing these ideas with our corporate partners.
**Succession**

The board and I have worked hard at finding and developing my successor in recent years. We wanted to ensure we had the right person and that person had sufficient time to work with me as co-artistic director to fully integrate with the company. That part of the journey is now complete, and the company will move on without me.

Bell Shakespeare's core mission remains the same as it was in 1990: to reinterpret the beautiful words, complex themes, raw emotions, and profound ideas found in each Shakespeare play and to show their connection to modern Australians — wherever they live and whatever their background.

As I stand down as artistic director of Bell Shakespeare and hand over to Peter Evans, whose own career spans 20 years working in some of the country’s leading arts organizations, I know I’m leaving the company in good hands to continue fulfilling that mission.

All the world’s a stage, and all the men and women merely players. We have our exits and our entrances, and I am privileged, in my time, to have played many parts. Corporate leaders may look at their careers and find that they, too, are playing many parts and that our collective success and longevity depend on being aware that we’re only as good as our last performance or our last review.

**About the author**

**John Bell** is founder of Bell Shakespeare, the Australian performing arts company which has taken the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries to 2.5 million people, and whose education programs reach up to 80,000 students and teachers a year.
“To thine own self be true.”
_Hamlet_, Act 1, Scene 3

Leadership is a major theme running through all of Shakespeare’s plays. He seems to have been fascinated by the burdens of leadership and the complexities and compromises with which a leader has to deal every day. In the _Richard II–Henry V_ “hollow crown” tetralogy, leadership is a pressing concern, and the various kings and pretenders to the throne display a multitude of leadership styles.

Authenticity and integrity are key leadership qualities in an age of transparency, where companies are also more aware than ever before of their role in the community. Shakespeare’s kingly characters often stumbled as they struggled with their hubris and authoritarianism.

In the following speeches, our three kings, Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V, reveal their true characters and their leadership styles — the divine right to rule, the autocratic, and the people’s hero — that we have discussed in this paper.

**Richard II (1367–1400)**

**Divine right to rule**

“The breath of worldly men cannot depose the deputy elected by the Lord.”

_Richard II_, Act 3, Scene 2

Richard II inherited the throne in 1377 at the age of 10 when his grandfather died. Richard was the last in the main line of the House of Plantagenet. He was deposed by Bolingbroke (who became King Henry IV) and sent to the Tower of London in 1399, at the age of 32. He died the following year, probably of starvation, in a castle in West Yorkshire. Shakespeare portrays Richard II as a weak leader, impulsive, entitled, and injudicious. Here is a vignette from _Richard II_ (Act 3, Scene 2) that shows his leadership style:

**KING RICHARD II**

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.
For every man that Bolingbroke hath pressed
To lift shrewd steel against our golden crown,
God for his Richard hath in heavenly pay
A glorious angel. Then if angels fight,
Weak men must fall, for heaven still guards the right.

_Richard II_ (Act 3, Scene 2)
Immediately after King Richard delivers that defiant speech, he receives news that he has lost thousands of his supporters to Bolingbroke. Extraordinary insight soon follows, as Richard bemoans his inevitable fate (Act 3, Scene 2):

**KING RICHARD II**

For God's sake, let us sit upon the ground
And tell sad stories of the death of kings:
How some have been deposed, some slain in war,
Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed,
Some poisoned by their wives, some sleeping kill'd;
All murdered. For within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king
Keeps Death his court; and there the antic sits,
Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp,
Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
To monarchize, be feared and kill with looks,
Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
As if this flesh which walls about our life
Were brass impregnable; and humoured thus,
Comes at the last and with a little pin
Bores through his castle wall, and farewell king!
Cover your heads, and mock not flesh and blood
With solemn reverence. Throw away respect,
Tradition, form and ceremonious duty,
For you have but mistook me all this while.
I live with bread like you, feel want,
Taste grief, need friends. Subjected thus,
How can you say to me I am a king?

*Richard II* (Act 3, Scene 2)

When it comes time to give up his crown to Bolingbroke, Richard throws a tantrum, swinging wildly between meek acceptance and wounded outrage. Finally, he ends up in prison, bitter, alone, and fantasizing about his life — both the real and imagined versions (Act 5, Scene 5):

**KING RICHARD II**

Thus play I in one person many people,
And none contented. Sometimes am I king;
Then treasons make me wish myself a beggar,
And so I am. Then crushing penury
Persuades me I was better when a king;
Then am I kinged again, and by and by
Think that I am unkinged by Bolingbroke,
And straight am nothing.

*Richard II* (Act 5, Scene 5)
Henry IV (1366–1413)
Autocratic leader

“I will henceforth rather be myself, mighty and to be feared…”
Henry IV, Part 1, Act 1, Scene 3

Also known as Bolingbroke, Henry IV was the same age as Richard, and they grew up together, cousins and playmates. Unhappy with Richard's rule, Henry usurped the throne from him in 1399. Shakespeare portrays Henry IV as an authoritarian, paranoid, and a distant leader. Here is a vignette from Henry IV, Part 1 (Act 1, Scene 3) that shows his leadership style:

KING HENRY IV
My blood hath been too cold and temperate,
Unapt to stir at these indignities,
And you have found me, for accordingly
You tread upon my patience. But be sure
I will from henceforth rather be myself,
Mighty and to be feared, than my condition,
Which hath been smooth as oil, soft as young down,
And therefore lost that title of respect,
Which the proud soul ne'er pays but to the proud.
Henry IV, Part 1 (Act 1, Scene 3)

When Richard II was king, Bolingbroke put together a coalition to oust Richard and install himself on the throne. This coalition included the powerful Percy family, who helped Bolingbroke secure the north of the country. As soon as Bolingbroke became Henry IV, he started neglecting his former allies. Shakespeare gives us a scene in Henry IV, Part 1 (Act 1, Scene 3) in which Henry shows his singular lack of diplomacy. He goes head-to-head with the Percy family over their tardiness in giving up prisoners from the battlefield. Rather than listen to their reasons, he lays down the law — hard:

KING HENRY IV
Send us your prisoners, or you will hear of it!
Henry IV, Part 1 (Act 1, Scene 3)

Young Harry Percy (aka Hotspur) is furious that the king has forgotten the Percy family’s good work in service of the crown. In Act 4, Scene 3 of Henry IV, Part 1, he claims the following:

HOTSPUR
My father and my uncle and myself
Did give him that same royalty he wears;
And when he was not six and twenty strong,
Sick in the world’s regard, wretched and low,
A poor unminded outlaw sneaking home,
My father gave him welcome to the shore.
Henry IV, Part 1 (Act 4, Scene 3)

But, according to Hotspur (later in the same scene), once Bolingbroke ascended the throne, the new king:

HOTSPUR
Disgraced me in my happy victories,
Sought to entrap me by intelligence;
Rated mine uncle from the council-board;
In rage dismiss’d my father from the court;
Broke oath on oath, committed wrong on wrong,
And in conclusion drove us to seek out
This head of safety; and withal to pry
Into his title, the which we find
Too indirect for long continuance.
Henry IV, Part 1 (Act 4, Scene 3)
King Henry V (1386–1422)
People’s hero

“We few, we happy few, we band of brothers.”

Henry V, Act 4, Scene 3

Henry V is the eldest son and heir of King Henry IV. Prior to becoming king, he is known as Prince Hal or Harry. He inherited the throne at the age of 26, after his father’s death, and went straight to war to reclaim the throne of France. Shakespeare portrays him, for the most part, as an inclusive, inspiring leader. However, Henry V is also one of Shakespeare’s most complex leaders — a flawed human being with excesses, vanities, and a troubled past. He doesn’t act much like a leader in his early years, preferring to hang out down at the pub with Falstaff and a bunch of questionable characters, committing crimes, getting drunk, and not doing any work. In Act 3, Scene 2 of Henry IV, Part 1, Hal’s father gives him a stern talking-to, revealing exactly what kind of leader he thinks the young prince should be. He tells Hal that when he (Bolingbroke) was angling for the crown, he kept himself distant from the people:

**KING HENRY IV**

Had I so lavish of my presence been,
So common-hackneyed in the eyes of men,
So stale and cheap to vulgar company,
Opinion, that did help me to the crown,
Had still kept loyal to possession
And left me in reputeless banishment,
A fellow of no mark nor likelihood.
By being seldom seen, I could not stir
But like a comet I was wondered at;
That men would tell their children, ‘This is he.’
Others would say, ‘Where, which is Bolingbroke?’
And then I stole all courtesy from heaven,
And dressed myself in such humility
That I did pluck allegiance from men’s hearts,
Loud shouts and salutations from their mouths,
Even in the presence of the crowned king.
Thus did I keep my person fresh and new.

*Henry IV, Part 1 (Act 3, Scene 2)*

He claims that a leader should be seldom seen, mysterious. Hal is the opposite of that — a man of the people — and that background is what inspires him to encourage his troops at the Battle of Agincourt years later. The night before the big battle, Hal, now King Henry V, sees that his army is demoralized. They are tired, hungry, cold, and overstretched. The English are hugely outnumbered by the French. So he decides to go among his troops in disguise to get some 360-degree feedback — the honest picture of the state of his troops. Henry doesn’t like what he hears, and in fact almost gets into a fight with one of the soldiers who unknowingly criticizes his policies. He gives a speech about the burdens and difficulties of leadership (Act 4, Scene 1). The speech begins:

**KING HENRY V**

Upon the king! Let us our lives, our souls,
Our debts, our careful wives,
Our children and our sins lay on the king!
We must bear all. O hard condition,
Twin-born with greatness, subject to the breath
Of every fool, whose sense no more can feel
But his own wringing! What infinite heart’s-ease
Must kings neglect, that private men enjoy!
And what have kings, that privates have not too,
Save ceremony, save general ceremony?

*Henry V (Act 4, Scene 1)*
One of the difficult decisions Henry has to make is how to deal with his former friends, now that he is king and they are still committing petty crimes. When Captain Fluellen informs the king that his old friend Bardolph has been hanged for robbing a church, Henry gives an unequivocal response:

**KING HENRY V**

We would have all such offenders so cut off: and we give express charge that in our marches through the country, there be nothing compelled from the villages, nothing taken but paid for, none of the French upbraided or abused in disdainful language; for when lenity and cruelty play for a kingdom, the gentler gamester is the soonest winner.

*Henry V (Act 3, Scene 6)*

Does this show strong, principled leadership, or cruel, inflexible leadership? Is he imitating his father in this moment, or has he finally “grown up” and taken a moral stand?

Eventually Henry decides that he must encourage, not browbeat, his troops, that he has a destiny to fulfill and must grasp the mantle of leadership boldly and inclusively. He gives an inspirational speech (Act 4, Scene 3) that brings the team together, and ultimately they win the battle:

**WESTMORLAND**

O that we now had here
But one ten thousandth of those men in England
That do no work today!

**KING HENRY V**

No, my fair cousin:
If we are marked to die, we are enough
To do our country loss, and if to live,
The fewer men, the greater share of honour.
God’s will, I pray thee wish not one man more.

**RATHER**

Rather proclaim it, Westmorland, through my host,
That he which hath no stomach to this fight,
Let him depart; his passport shall be made
And crowns for convoy put into his purse.
We would not die in that man’s company
That fears his fellowship to die with us.
This day is called the feast of Crispian.
He that outlives this day and comes safe home
Will stand a-tiptoe when this day is named
And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
He that shall live this day and see old age
Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,
And say ‘Tomorrow is Saint Crispian.’
Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars,
And say ‘These wounds I had on Crispin’s day.’
Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot,
But he’ll remember, with advantages,
What feats he did that day. Then shall our names,
Familiar in his mouth as household words,
Harry the King, Bedford and Exeter,
Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester,
Be in their flowing cups freshly remembered.
This story shall the good man teach his son,
And Crispin Crispian shall ne’er go by,
From this day to the ending of the world
But we in it shall be remembered,
We few, we happy few, we band of brothers.
For he today that sheds his blood with me
Shall be my brother; be he ne’er so vile,
This day shall gentle his condition.
And gentlemen in England now abed
Shall think themselves accurs’d they were not here,
And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any speaks
That fought with us upon Saint Crispin’s day.

*Henry V (Act 4, Scene 3)*
The ode to leadership

Before Agincourt there was the siege of Harfleur. In this speech, King Henry V uses powerful language to rouse his troops and push them on to their first great victory. These famous lines (Act 3, Scene 1) form the supreme motivational speech of all times. It has been much used by every type of leader over the centuries and still today stirs those who hear it to ever-greater achievements:

**KING HENRY V**

Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more,  
Or close the wall up with our English dead.  
In peace there’s nothing so becomes a man  
As modest stillness and humility,  
But when the blast of war blows in our ears,  
Then imitate the action of the tiger;  
Stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood,  
Disguise fair nature with hard-favoured rage;  
Then lend the eye a terrible aspect;  
Let pry through the portage of the head  
Like the brass cannon; let the brow o’erwhelm it  
As fearfully as doth a galled rock  
O’erhang and jutty his confounded base,  
Swill’d with the wild and wasteful ocean.  
Now set the teeth and stretch the nostril wide,  
Hold hard the breath and bend up every spirit  
To his full height. On, on, you noblest English,  
Whose blood is fet from fathers of war-proof!  
Fathers that, like so many Alexanders,  
Have in these parts from morn till even fought  
And sheathed their swords for lack of argument.  
Dishonour not your mothers; now attest  
That those whom you called fathers did beget you.  
Be copy now to men of grosser blood,  
And teach them how to war. And you, good yeoman,  
Whose limbs were made in England, show us here  
The mettle of your pasture; let us swear  
That you are worth your breeding,  
which I doubt not,  
For there is none of you so mean and base,  
That hath not noble lustre in your eyes.  
I see you stand like greyhounds in the slips,  
Straining upon the start. The game’s afoot:  
Follow your spirit, and upon this charge  
Cry ‘God for Harry, England, and Saint George!’

*Henry V* (Act 3, Scene 1)
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