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Hail! Hail! This land is yours, child of my compatriot,
You shall rule over nations and their kings
You shall rule over peoples of diverse traditions
You shall even rule over the winds and the sea storms
And the pool of large rivers that run deep;
And all things shall obey you with unquestioning obedience,
And shall kneel at your feet!
O yes, oi! oi! Yet you must go by the right path.
(Thomas Mofolo, Chaka)

The strongest drink or smoke of all, however, is power. Be careful, then, to mix it well with mercy, and the reasoning of your counselors and friends, lest it overwhelm you and you become like a mad bull, who, having killed all his opponents, starts goring his defenseless cows and calves and finally charges against the walls of his own kraal and senselessly breaks his neck instead of walking through the open gate of reason.
(E.A. Ritter, Shaka Zulu)

The people always have some champion whom they set over them and nurse into greatness…. This and no other is the root from which tyranny springs.
(Plato, The Republic)

Awe is composed of reverence and dread. I often think that people today have nothing left but the dread.
(Christa Wolf, Cassandra)

The goal of this book is to better understand a special type of leadership: leadership by terror. Whether we talk about autocrats, tyrants, despots, totalitarian regimes or violent rule, the subject of terror is a contemporary problem, though this generation did not invent it. Indeed throughout the ages autocratic governments have been more the rule than the exception; democratic forms of government have been relatively rare. In the recent past, despots such as Joseph Stalin, Adolf Hitler, Mao Zedong, Pol Pot, Idi Amin, Nicolae Ceausescu, Joseph Désiré Mobutu, Kim Il-Sung, and Slobodan Milosevic, replaced Caligula, Nero, Tamerlane, Vlad the Impaler and Ivan the Terrible; and these leaders have themselves been followed by the likes of Saddam Hussein, Fidel Castro, Kim Jong Il, Muammar Qaddafi and Robert Mugabe. Although some of these leaders have been lionized as nation-builders in spite of their atrocities, they stand out as examples of the kinds of horror...
humans can bring to other humans, many having murdered millions. They stand as horrendous examples of how to inflict human misery and suffering. Hitler, Stalin, Mao Zedong and Pol Pot in the previous century were grandmasters of bloodshed, leaving tens of millions of dead in their wake.

What makes the existence of such violent leaders particularly disturbing is that it seems so inevitable: the history of absolute, totalitarian regimes is a long one, with no apparent beginning and no end in sight. We like to think that the world is growing more civilized, and yet the crop of potential new despotic leaders is burgeoning. The explanation is disturbing: studies of human behavior indicate that the disposition to violence exists in all of us; everyone has a Shaka Zulu in the attic. Lord Acton’s dictum, ‘All power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely’, is truer now than ever. Humankind appears to be the only member of the animal kingdom that has the potential for mass murder, and we realize that potential with disturbing frequency. Given the psychological make-up of the human animal, we must assume that there are untold numbers of tyrants in the making among us, who will be revealed if and when the opportunity for power arises. The human tendency to lionize leaders and excuse their excesses encourages an endless line-up of new candidates for fame and glory.

In engaging in a study of this human tendency toward tyranny, I took an elaborate journey that not only included such fields of study as psychoanalysis, developmental psychology, psychopathology and the psychology of groups, but also spanned philosophy, history, sociology, anthropology, ethology, political science and management. Working at the boundaries of these various disciplines proved to be fruitful in obtaining insight into the complex human phenomenon of terror.

Because prevention requires knowledge, and change requires insight, an understanding of the psychology of terror can be seen as a modest step toward preventing despotic leaders and totalitarian regimes from coming to the fore. Such an understanding will help us find our way through what remains a largely unexplored domain. It will for example give us insight into the unusual relationship between leaders and followers in totalitarian regimes, help us deal more effectively with potential and existing tyrants, and give us tools of prevention. As an additional benefit, making sense of the tyrant’s inner theatre will contribute to a better comprehension of leadership generally, helping us to grasp what both effective leadership and ineffective leadership are all about.

TERROR AND ITS VICISSITUDES

My definition of ‘leadership by terror’ is leadership that achieves its ends and gains compliance through the deliberate use of violence and fear. It is the use
of arbitrary power beyond the scope permitted by law, custom and tradition. The lust for power pushes true despot beyond the boundaries of their mandate to rule, causing them to abandon respect for human rights and individual freedom and to behave in ways that prevent others from living their lives with dignity and self-respect. In a nutshell, tyrannical leadership is the arbitrary rule by a single person who, by inducing a psychological state of extreme fear in a population, monopolizes power to his or her own advantage (unchecked by law or other restraining influences), exercising that power without restraint and in most cases contrary to the general good. Despots hamper justice, fair process, excellence and the development of the human potential of a population (Arendt, 1973; Boesche, 1996; Chirot, 1994; Glass, 1995; Herschman and Lieb, 1994; Reich, 1990; Robins and Post, 1997; Walter, 1969).

Clarifying Confusing Terminology

In contrast to many other writers, I use the terms ‘dictatorship’, ‘despotism’, ‘tyranny’ and ‘totalitarianism’ somewhat interchangeably. The polemics of the various nuances of these terms is not the objective of this study; classification is a topic unto itself. I will simply mention briefly that some writers have made an effort to classify nondemocratic forms of government, putting at one extreme traditional, relatively benevolent authoritarian regimes and at the other extreme totalitarian governments of the Nazi and Soviet variety.

Totalitarianism

At the most dangerous extreme of the control spectrum, the term ‘totalitarianism’ is used by these writers to refer to regimes under which a population is completely subjugated to a political system that aspires to total domination of the collective over the individual. Totalitarian regimes strive to invade and to control their citizenry’s social, economic, political and personal life. Such forms of government are typically permeated by a secular or theocratic ideology that professes a set of supreme, absolute values that are propagated by the leadership. Repression of individual rights and loyalty to that ideology are their salient characteristics. The overriding importance of ideology means that every aspect of every individual’s life is subordinate to the state. Because totalitarian governments want to transform human nature, they exercise thought-control and control moral education. In other words, repression is carried out not only against people’s actions but also against their thoughts.

Such regimes retain control only so long as the terror of totalitarianism does not ease up. Thus any objection to governmental control is viewed as a danger
Lessons on leadership by terror to the regime, a threat to its delicate equilibrium. As a result, such regimes are more likely than others to ‘eat their own’ – that is, to do away with (by exile, imprisonment or death) government supporters tainted by the merest suspicion of rebellion. These regimes need the sacrifice of an endless stream of new enemies to retain their focus (Arendt, 1969, 1973; Boesche, 1996; Friedrich, 1954; Friedrich and Brezezinsky, 1965). This is the category into which I would place Shaka Zulu and his reign of terror.

Authoritarianism
Authoritarian regimes, on the other hand, are perceived by those who make this distinction as being less intrusive. Although repression of the populace takes place, there is no intrusive ideology. Such regimes do not profess the benefits of a future utopian state; they do not want to transform human nature. The goal of authoritarian leadership is much more mundane: retaining power. Authoritarian rulers want to keep the riches and privilege that come with holding on to power, and they exert whatever level of repression that takes.

Although both types of regime can be extremely brutal to political opponents, in an authoritarian state the government’s efforts are directed primarily at those who are considered political adversaries. The government lacks the desire (and often the means) to control every aspect of each individual’s life, and thus intervention in the day-to-day life of the citizenry is limited. Grounded in greed rather than ideology, authoritarian leadership does not claim to represent a specific historical destiny or possess the absolute truth; it is not in the business of creating a new type of social life or a new kind of human being.

Under the guise of promising social reform, authoritarian leaders seize power only to enrich themselves and their friends, ruling with brutal terror and arbitrary force for enrichment only. The amassing of wealth, the betrayal of social reforms, the development of a military power base, and rampant paranoia are characteristics associated with authoritarianism.

Riding the Waves with Despots
Whenever people gather in groups, there is the potential for the abuse of power. Would-be despots are everywhere, although they thrive best in the fertile ground of tribal or nation formation. The turbulence of the formative period makes people anxious, and anxiety prompts them to search for strong leadership. The prevalence of human anxiety explains why totalitarianism and leadership by terror have been with us since the dawn of time. The early civilizations that grew up along great rivers such as the Nile, the Tigris, the Euphrates, the Yangtze, the Yellow and the Ganges clamored for leaders to give their public waterworks a modicum of centralized direction. As we will
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observe in the course of this book, however, centralized leadership can easily become perverted. Looking back into history, we can see how ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, China, India, and the pre-Columbian Central and South American cultures positioned an absolute ruler at the center of the ruling bureaucracy. We can also follow the rise and inevitable fall of such regimes.

Much has been said and written about absolute rulers. Philosophers in particular have tackled this subject. Plato, for example, was one of the earliest recorded observers of tyranny. Tyranny evoked for him associations of disharmony and disease, and he viewed tyrants as individuals governed by out-of-control desires. According to Plato, ‘drunkenness, lust, and madness’ differentiate the tyrant from other people. A tyrant ‘becomes in reality what he was once only occasionally in his dreams, and there’s nothing, no taboo, no murder, however terrible, from which he will shirk. His passion tyrannizes over him, a despot will be without restraint or law’ (Plato, 1955, p. 348). In other words, tyrants act out in the light of day what most of us only dare to dream about at night. Plato concluded that to act on such dreams – to satisfy one’s darkest desires – leads the tyrant into an unending, spiraling cycle of desire, gratification and more desire.

Most students of totalitarian regimes acknowledge that leadership by terror involves the application of violence. As Niccolò Machiavelli (1966) advised cynically half a millennium ago, ‘Men must either be caressed or else annihilated.’ Machiavelli, who was one of the first statesmen to build a political science based on the study of humankind, saw no alternative to love and violence as motivators. But tyranny goes beyond the ‘simple’ violence of, say, execution; it evokes images of madness and sadistic desires run amok. Tyrants would do well to remember the Chinese proverb ‘He who rides a tiger cannot dismount’, because they create behavior that gives a wild and uncontrollable ride. They hurtle roughshod over anything that dares to cross their path. And yet their violence is likely to be their own undoing in the end: as the saying goes, ‘He who lives by the sword will die by the sword.’

The terror and violence that characterize tyranny take two forms: outwardly directed and inwardly directed. Both forms often lead to mass murder and genocide. Outwardly directed terror is used to intimidate or even exterminate enemies outside one’s borders. Typically, enemies are viewed by despots as forces of darkness that need to be destroyed by a force of light. They are described with derogatory remarks and depicted by tyrannical leadership as less than human. This dehumanization makes the administration of violence more palatable to members of the enforcement arm of the government. After all, it is only the enemy – no more than a subspecies – upon whom violence is inflicted.

Leadership by terror is particularly devastating when it is directed – as it often is – not only outward but also inward. Inwardly directed terror heightens
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considerably the fear and anxiety of living with totalitarianism. Characterized by violent acts against the despot’s own population, inwardly directed terror results in subjugation of the citizenry, classification as a subspecies of one part (or multiple parts) of the population, loss of various freedoms, and ultimately the suffocation of the mind. A reign of terror is superimposed on the conventional systems of power and authority.

The ability to enact terror – whether against an external enemy or against one’s own people – is viewed by many tyrannical leaders as a sign of privilege, a special prerogative. To despots, boundaries of acceptable behavior apply only to others. Living in a narcissistic ‘soup,’ having little concern for the needs of others, despots perceive few restraints on their actions. They believe that ‘divine providence’ (however they construe divinity) has given them power over life and death. In other words they believe that they have the right to act as they do. This sense of entitlement is especially frightening when it spreads: the specific psychology or psychopathology of a leader can become institutionalized (as with Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot and Bin Laden), loosing demons on the population at large, so that the common people come to support the distorted and dangerous ideology articulated by the leadership.

Leadership by terror succeeds only in the hands of a despot skilled at the fine art of boundary management. If terror is taken to its extreme and executed too forcefully, there is soon nothing left to terrorize; the ‘objects’ of terror are destroyed. If, on the other hand, terror is applied too lightly, it does not result in the desired compliance. Maintaining the devilish bond between the terrorized and the tyrant requires a delicate balancing act: traditional mechanisms in society need to be modified but cannot be destroyed.

My journey into the rocky terrain of leadership by terror has raised many questions for me. For example, what kind of psychological processes make a society (or portion of society) more susceptible than others to political terror? What can be said about the peculiarities of regimes that engage in tyrannical practices, and what processes and levers do such regimes use to maintain terror? What is the role of leadership in creating tyrannical regimes? What can be said about the personality make-up of the despotic leader? How do early developmental experiences contribute to the tyrannical mind-set? What is the nature of the psychological dynamic between the healthy leader and the democratically led? And between the pathological leader and the terrorized led? What can be said about the psychology of a group willing to participate in violent, destructive behavior?

In referring to the tyrannical mind-set, this is not to say that traumatic childhood experiences inevitably result in psychopathology. Human development is a complex interface of genetic predisposition, birth order, family status, the history of a child’s successes and failures, serendipity – and, for the unfortunate few, trauma. Development follows an innate timetable that
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determines successive maturational sequences depending on the above-mentioned factors.

Given the devastating consequences of leadership by terror, all these questions warrant careful investigation. I approach that investigation here through the tale of Shaka Zulu. His story will help us decipher the psychodynamics of terror.

HERO FIGURES AS MYTHIC REPRESENTATIONS

Although Shaka Zulu will be our vehicle into the terrain of terror, and as such is representative of tyrants everywhere, he is not just another name in the world’s list of disreputable leaders. Although he has been portrayed as an example of barbaric despotism and as the creator of a semi-celibate people-slaying juggernaut, he has also been glorified (to some extent rightly so) as a true nation-builder. Leading from the front, he gathered many dispersed and warring tribes and built them into a single cohesive entity – the Zulu nation. Within a period of 12 years, this warrior-king (called by some ‘the Black Napoleon’ and by others ‘the African Attila’) conquered a territory larger than present-day Western Europe, unifying the tribes of southern Africa. Due to his efforts, the Zulu influence eventually extended from the Drakensberg Mountains in the west, to the Indian Ocean in the east, to the Transkeian territories in the south, to the southern regions of what is now Swaziland and Mozambique in the north. Shaka’s attempt at nation-building had a tragic ending, however: the nation he built was eventually torn apart, he and his successors were humiliated, and most of their land was taken over by European settlers (a state of affairs that is only now gradually being redressed).

Because Shaka Zulu was not a one-dimensional leader, but a blend of good and evil in which evil eventually won out, he can as well stand in our stead as in that of tyrants everywhere. Our study of him will give us a better grasp not only of tyrants, but of the major motivational needs of humankind generally – of the rational and irrational forces that drive each of us. In Shaka we can see a reflection of many of these needs: strivings for love, solidarity, power and autonomy alongside of needs to dominate, to control, to envy, to hurt and to destroy. It is those complex needs, projected on the vast stage of Africa, that both enabled him to be a nation-builder and brought him to his knees.

Reviewing Shaka’s history will help us enter the mind of the absolute ruler, investigate the nature and causes of violence and destructiveness in human society, and explore the making of a totalitarian state. As a leader, Shaka can be viewed as the quintessential tyrannos – a Lydian word used to describe a cruel and oppressive ruler in ancient Greece. In him we will see the
megalomania, the paranoia, the underlying insecurity, the tactics of terror and the flawed reality-testing that characterize most despots. His case will demonstrate that tyrannical leaders are driven to do what they do by the psychological forces that dominate their inner theatre.

The Romantic Imagination

Shaka's life story touches humankind's romantic imagination. It is a tale of ordeal, exile, exposure, destitution and humiliation – all common elements of romantic fantasy. The existence of these themes makes it hard to distinguish between what is myth and what is reality. Compounding the difficulty of distinguishing between fact and fantasy is the fact that stories told about Shaka's birth, childhood and early career have their origin in the oral tradition, with all its embellishments (Stuart, 1976, 1979, 1982, 1986, 2001; MacLean, 1992). As the oral tradition took written form, many of those poetic embellishments, along with the ideological influences of the day, made their way into history. This problematic interface between oral and written traditions keeps Shaka enigmatic today (Bird, 1888/1965; Cope, 1968; Delegorgue, 1847; Fuze, 1921/1998; Fynn, 1950; Gibson, 1911; Golan, 1990; Haggard, 1882; Hamilton, 1998; Isaacs, 1836; Knight, 1995; Kunene, 1979; Laband, 1997; Mofolo, 1981; Ritter, 1978; Rycroft and Ngebo, 1988; Stuart, 1927; Thompson, 1967; Webb and Wright, 1978; Worger, 1979; Wylie, 1993). Because of all the mythology that surrounds his persona, he remains the most talked about and the least understood of all African kings.

Myths and legends are an essential part of every culture. These stories are first passed down orally from one person to the next; only later (in a culture that knows the written word) are they committed to writing. While myths tend to be sacred stories, legends generally center on real people, places and events. The tale of Shaka, with its larger-than-life hero symbolism, contains both elements: it portrays Shaka as savior and soldier. Shaka's life story is metaphor as well. Shaka is a bearer of meanings: he symbolizes the aspirations of a people; he represents the birth of a nation; he stands for power and independence. He also served during his lifetime as a means of defending against anxiety, fear and despair. Through his life story – the reality and the fantastic embellishments alike – we can retrace the trials and tribulations of life in general. We can engage in a mythic journey like the one Shaka himself took, because many of his life themes – alien as they may seem to us at first – resonate deep inside all of us.

The psychoanalyst Otto Rank pointed out the power of such resonance, noting that some individuals elevated by culture to heroic status touch the deep recesses of our minds. He also noted that the hero's journey often follows a predictable outline:
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The hero is the child of most distinguished parents, usually the son of a king. His origin is preceded by difficulties, such as ... secret intercourse of the parents due to external prohibition or obstacles. During or before the pregnancy, there is a prophecy, in the form of a dream or oracle, cautioning against his birth, and usually threatening danger to the father. ... As a rule, he is surrendered to the water, in a box. He is then saved ... by lowly people. ... After he has grown up ... he takes his revenge on his father, on the one hand, and is acknowledged, on the other. Finally he achieves rank and honors. (Rank, 1932, p. 65)

Imagination or Reality?

Given their universal structure, myths and legends (particularly in primitive society) are not just stories; they are a reality lived. With their symbolism and metaphor, they are products of imagination in response to stressful situations. Because they are successful at relieving stress, they are relived throughout the ages. As they are repeated through the generations, they help in sense-making – that is, in trying to interpret what otherwise would be a bewildering world (Levi-Strauss, 1955, 1969; Malinovsky, 1926). Some myths and legends are pre-scientific attempts to interpret what happens in the physical world around us. They help us understand the metaphysical dimension, explain the origins and nature of the cosmos, validate social issues and, on the psychological plane, address themselves to the innermost depths of the psyche (Campbell, 1949).

The universality of the events described in myths and legends – the repetitiveness of their structure (as in Rank’s ‘formula’ for the hero, above) – makes these stories the expressed products of our unconscious. These tales are like dreams expressed in the public domain – dreams that, like private dreams, emerge from the unconscious mind (Freud, 1900). As shared, institutionalized dreams, they become moral tales to a society. This power of myth in the figure of Shaka Zulu was picked up both by the Zulu Inkatha movement and by Afrikaner right-wingers.

THE PROJECTION OF FANTASIES

Myths and legends are important for cultural identity formation, but they have a downside as well: the mythopoetic imagination taints whatever real story the life of a particular hero represents. That has certainly been the case with Shaka Zulu’s story. People interested in Shaka have tended to project their own fantasies onto him, in order to enhance the desired identification (Wylie, 1992). In the case of Shaka the poetic imagination has taken over, and he has become different things to different people.

Some writers – most of them white – have portrayed Shaka Zulu as a person possessed by animalistic drives, madness and violence, a savage and bloodthirsty despot who kept his people under control through sheer terror.
Others have presented Shaka as symbolizing the forces of order over barbarism. To these latter writers, he is a symbol of inviolate law, an individual in total self-control. They argue that the gruesome reputation that has been cultivated by other writers is totally unwarranted, that Shaka has been the victim of deliberate acts of character assassination by whites for political purposes.

For many black writers, Shaka has become a symbol used to explain the origin and destiny of a people. They argue that Shaka needs to be viewed in the context of his time and culture. Given the harshness of the time he lived in, his aggression and ruthlessness were essential to his victories over rivals and enemies. He would not have been able to build a nation, in that time and place, had he not used extremes of force. People who put forward this perspective point out that, in light of his accomplishments, he should be seen as a successful nation-builder, a visionary leader who created order and social security where chaos once reigned.

As these contrasting views attest, Shaka’s image is infinitely manipulable. Many people interested in Shaka seem to be less concerned with revealing his actual past than with creating a coherent account that fits their particular objectives. In other words, they project their own meanings on the material available. As a result the real Shaka has been all but lost. With so many people endlessly reworking him as a symbol or myth, projecting their fantasies onto him, he has become a profoundly ambiguous, mysterious figure. It is difficult now to distinguish between propaganda and reality, to separate psychological truth from historical truth. Probably we never will. In the context of this book, however, the question of what he was really like is less important than what he stands for as representative of a whole line-up of despots.

To some extent, of course, the contrasting views of Shaka Zulu do reflect the real person. As was noted earlier, he was a man of daunting complexity, a person not easily labeled – a cruel despot, but also at times a brave and generous leader. That complexity leads us to wonder whether he destroyed for destruction’s sake or whether he destroyed in order to construct. In any case, as he attempted to deal with the complexity within – to shape his own identity, as it were – he touched and changed the lives of countless Africans. Those changed lives became elements of the cultural myth surrounding the ruthless leader. Thus Shaka, in creating his own personal identity, created a political and national identity for the Zulu.

Problems of Countertransference

The contradictions as presented in the ‘texts’ that exist about Shaka – texts that include not only purportedly historical accounts, but also myths, legends and symbols – place a special burden on any author hoping to add to the
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Shaka literature. Because this is a book dealing with the relationship between personality, leadership practices and despotism, I will focus not on verifying or disproving specific events but on revealing patterns of outlook and behavior as recounted by many different sources. I will highlight those events that provide the most insight into Shaka’s personality and leadership style.

As a psychoanalyst using all the therapeutic and scholarly tools available to me, I will try to listen to what Shaka has to say, to observe his behavior and to understand why he did what he did. The danger in trying to ‘diagnose’ his behavior is that psychological diagnosis inevitably results in reductionism – that is, oversimplification of the enormous complexity of human behavior. Furthermore, as we all discover in the course of daily life, the better we know a person, the more difficult it is to put a label on him or her. Consequently I will ground my modest attempt at diagnosis, at understanding Shaka’s intrapsychic and interpersonal processes, in the larger context of societal forces. In other words I will study the environmental context within which behavior occurs.

In identifying themes that provide us with insight into Shaka’s inner theatre – themes such as narcissism or paranoia – I cannot hope to arrive at the objective truth about him; I can only identify what feels true. And yet that perceived truth may be truer than any fact. Because a theme by definition implies repetition (just as a motif in music returns again and again), it tells us more than a discrete action does. Each theme that comes to the fore in Shaka’s life serves as a window into his personality and helps to explain his public actions. Taken together, these themes tie together what would otherwise be an enigmatic character engaged in enigmatic activities. We choose our life-themes – though rarely consciously, of course – as a way of making sense of our own existence and gaining mastery over our unpredictable environment.

It is impossible for any researcher (or reader) to interpret a historical person – to listen, observe, feel with, and attempt to understand that person – without projecting his or her own meanings on the material available. This phenomenon, known in the context of psychotherapy as ‘countertransference’, is inevitable in historical studies of this kind (Devereux, 1978; Loewenberg, 1982). Consciously or unconsciously, researchers are influenced by the people they decide to study. I will combat that influence by engaging in a process of ‘objective subjectivity’; that is, I will make an effort to detach my attachment to the material presented. In addition I will attempt to remain open to the multiple meanings any material has, rather than trying to make the material fit predetermined conclusions.

The Clinical Perspective

The psychoanalyst Erik Erikson, in his psycho-historical writings, described
quite well the hurdles that a clinically oriented student of historical leaders is up against:

\[ \text{T]he clinician turned historian must adapt himself to and utilize a new array of 'resistances' before he can be sure to be encountering those he is accustomed to. There is, first of all, the often incredible or implausible loss or absence of data in the post-mortem of a charismatic figure which can be variably attributed to simple carelessness or lack of awareness or of candor on the part of the witnesses. \ldots\text{ The myth-affirming and myth-destroying propensities of a post-charismatic period must be seen as the very stuff of which history is made. Where myth-making predominates, every item of the great man's life becomes or is reported like a parable. (Erikson, 1971, p. 198)\]

Shaka Zulu is a clinical historian’s dream. His life story is a good illustration of the psychodynamics of leadership, revealing as it does the extent to which a person’s inner theatre affects the behavior and action that are externalized on a public stage (Erikson, 1975; George, 1969; Kets de Vries, 1993; Lasswell, 1960; Zaleznik and Kets de Vries, 1975). It also elucidates how early life-events can determine a person’s character and influence behavior. Finally, it gives us at least a glimpse into the dynamics of terror – a subject that is tragically topical.

In analyzing Shaka Zulu’s personality and behavior, I will use a clinical perspective (Kets de Vries, 2000). What does this mean? I will try to understand the role that conscious and unconscious conflict played in the making of his personality. I will look at his strengths and weaknesses and seek to understand how those affected him. I will apply concepts of developmental psychology, family systems theory, cognitive theory, dynamic psychiatry, psychotherapy and psychoanalysis (particularly object relations and self-psychology) in an effort to untangle the relationship between child and man, between personal peculiarities and public acts.

Discussing Shaka Zulu without putting him into the context of time and place would limit our comprehension of psychological issues. Therefore when appropriate I will offer information about cultural themes. To prevent oversimplification I will pay attention both to the sociopolitical situation of Zulu society at a certain historical period, and to the group, interpersonal and intrapsychic forces affecting Shaka. Tying Shaka’s behavior patterns to psychological theories and to recorded history will help us gain a better understanding of historical, cultural and psychological change; and it will help us deconstruct the psychological forces that make for despotic regimes. By his example (both positive and negative) Shaka will teach us several crucial lessons on leadership. He will remain elusive to the end, however, an enigma protected by myth and the passing of time.