



Open Access

Al-Irfan (Research Journal of Islamic Studies)

Published by: Faculty of Islamic Studies & Shariah
Minhaj University Lahore

ISSN: 2518-9794 (Print), 2788-4066 (Online)

Volume 08, Issue 16, July-December 2023,

Email: alirfan@mul.edu.pk

الحرفاء

LEADERSHIP IN UTOPIA AND DYSTOPIA A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PLATO AND MACHIAVELLI

ASMA HAMID

Lecturer, Govt Graduate College for Women ,Gulberg, Lahore
imasmahamid@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Plato and Machiavelli are two important figures in the history of political thought. Regarding the concept of leadership, the views of both thinkers have been discussed in every age. Although the two thinkers have different positions on the concept of leadership, there is agreement between the two thinkers on some points. Plato talks about the philosopher king, who is a figure of wisdom and high moral values. Philosopher King constructs state and society according to high values based on these same high qualities. Plato's state is called Utopia. This state is difficult to establish in real life. Regarding morality and human nature, Plato has a positive point of view to such an extent that the Philosopher King makes the entire society a figure of moral values. Plato's Philosopher King emphasizes the internal affairs of the state and the maintenance of the moral force of society more than the external affairs. Unlike Plato, Machiavelli formulates his political thought keeping in view the practical facts of life. His prince is a ruler with the ability to solve real political problems. He focuses on the stability of the state, solving the problems of the people, providing them with a better living environment and security, even if he has to compromise on moral values. Machiavelli does not think it is bad to sacrifice religion, moral values and women for political purposes and stability of the state. Machiavelli's prince is not limited to internal affairs only, but his focus is also on the external affairs of the state. Contemporary political leadership can also be understood according to Plato and Machiavelli's concepts of leadership.

Keywords:

philosopher king, reason and justice, reason and virtue, individualism, utopia, aristocracy, discipline of history, good and just, good and evil, intelligence and creativity, realpolitik.

Introduction

Plato's Republic is considered one of the foundational texts of Western political philosophy and his ideas on the ideal state, justice, and the role of the philosopher-king continue to influence political thought to this day. Machiavelli's The Prince, on the other hand, is often seen as a seminal work in modern political theory, particularly for its emphasis on the realities of power and the importance of practical political considerations over abstract moral principles. While their ideas may differ in many ways, both Plato and Machiavelli have had a significant influence on political philosophy and continue to be studied and debated by scholars today.

Similarities:

No.	Plato's Leadership	Machiavelli's Leadership
1	<p>Plato's reflection on politics can be seen as a search for a just society, in which the philosopher-king, guided by reason and virtue, rules for the common good. (Reeve, 2006:145)</p> <p>His work is influenced by the political turmoil of ancient Athens and the decline of the city-state, as well as the Socratic legacy and the philosophical tradition of his time. Plato idealizes the political order. Plato raises fundamental questions about the nature, purpose, and limits of political authority, and their relevance to our times remains a subject of debate and interpretation. (Christopher et al, 2022:133)</p>	<p>Machiavelli is concerned with the practical problems of political power and stability, as Italy was torn apart by foreign invasions, internal conflicts, and the weakness of its rulers. His work reflects the Renaissance context of humanism, individualism, and the revival of classical learning, as well as his own experiences as a diplomat and historian. Machiavelli analyses the reality of political order and seeks to provide a guide for effective action. Machiavelli raises fundamental questions about the nature, purpose, and limits of political authority, and their relevance to our times remains a subject of debate and interpretation.</p>
2	<p>Plato develops political order through extensive study</p>	<p>Machiavelli develops political order in The Prince by</p>

of history. He refers to the man named Solon, who was known for his reforms of the Athenian constitution in the early 6th century BCE, which sought to mitigate the conflict between the aristocracy and the emerging middle class. (Plato, 1985:97)

utilizing the disciplines of history to provide ethical guidance for princes. In the dedicatory letter of the book, Machiavelli indicates that his understanding of politics was informed by his extensive study of ancient history. (Mark et al, 2019:115)

- 3 Plato saw the importance of having a good leader to improve society, rather than solely relying on the system or regime of society to solve social problems.

Machiavelli recognized that a flawed leader could lead to a flawed society and that a good leader could help bring about positive change.

- 4 Plato has a significant role in the history of political philosophy. The work of Plato is the footnote of all the philosophies that appear after him.

The work of Machiavelli is a footnote of modern leadership. (Whelan, 2004:188)

- 5 Plato's leadership was regarded as antiliberal due to his series of philosophical theories.

Machiavelli's thought is regarded as antiliberal and considered a typical tyrant or "teacher of a tyrant.

- 6 Plato recognizes the challenges that a leader faces when trying to implement policies that are beneficial but may not be immediately accepted by the people they govern. In the case of Plato, this is reflected in the need for the philosopher-king to use the "noble lie" as a means of promoting social cohesion and ensuring that the citizens of the

Machiavelli recognizes that a leader may need to use deception or other tactics to maintain power and ensure the stability and success of the state. While their approaches may differ, both philosophers acknowledge the importance of strategic thinking and practical considerations in the realm of politics. (English, n. d.:101)

city are willing to fulfill their roles within it. (Giovanni, 2007:494)

- 7 Plato was skeptical about the ability of the masses to understand the complexities of politics and governance. Machiavelli believed that leaders must use various tactics to maintain power and create a stable society, even if those tactics are not always perceived as "good" or "just" by the people. (Benner, 2009:472)
- 8 In terms of the loop of regimes, Plato recognized the potential for regimes to degrade or cycle through different forms. Plato saw this as a natural consequence of the failure to maintain virtue within a society, Plato did not believe that the regime itself can prevent this cycle. In terms of the loop of regimes, Machiavelli saw it because of the mistakes and weaknesses of leaders. However, Machiavelli believed that a strong and effective prince can slow down or even reverse the cycle of regimes. (Machiavelli, 2021:215)
- 9 Plato categorizes humans into three folds. In the Metal myth, Plato divides people into three distinct categories based on their inherent qualities or traits. Those with bronze and iron souls are deemed to be artisans and hence belong to the lowest class. Silver souls are those who are destined to be soldiers and belong to the middle class. The highest class, and the rarest of all, are those with golden souls who Machiavelli also categorizes humans into three folds. His classification of human brains: the first type of brain is useless, the second type is adequate for understanding what is explained to it, while the third type can understand good and evil in themselves and is endowed with ingenuity or creative potential. This hierarchical classification suggests that only a small minority of people possess the

are destined to be leaders and philosophers.

highest level of intelligence and creativity and are therefore most suited for leadership roles. (Hamideh et. al, 2013:130)

Machiavelli emphasizes the importance of recognizing the potential of different individuals and using them in ways that best serve the interests of the state.

Contrast:

No.	Plato's Leadership	Machiavelli's Leadership
1	In terms of their approach to political leadership. Plato believes in the inherent goodness of humans and that they can be educated and guided towards the right path. He advocates for philosopher-kings who are wise and just and rules to promote the common good.	Machiavelli, on the other hand, has a more cynical view of human nature. He believes that people are inherently selfish and that a leader must rule of law and force to maintain power and stability
2	Plato writes about the state in which he advocates for a complete overhaul of society and the establishment of autopian state in which everyone has their needs met and is happy.	Machiavelli writes about the state in which he is more focused on the practicalities of governance and the realities of the world. He is concerned with the maintenance of power and stability in a chaotic world and offers pragmatic advice on how to achieve these goals. (Machiavelli, 1965:65)
3	Plato's philosopher-kings are primarily concerned with maintaining the internal order	Machiavelli's prince is not only concerned with maintaining order within the

and virtue of the city, and his responsibilities are more focused on ensuring that the citizens live virtuous and harmonious lives. While there is some discussion of external relations in Plato's works, it is not a central concern in the same way as it is for Machiavelli. (Chousalkar, 1986:122)

state but also with external relations and the pursuit of power and glory for the state. This is evident in Machiavelli's emphasis on the importance of military prowess and conquest as well as his advice on how to handle relations with other states. (Machiavelli, 2012:64)

- 4 Plato believes that the ideal leader should always act virtuously and justly, even if it means sacrificing his interests for the good of the city. He argues that the justleader will always seek the common good and act for the benefit of the whole community, not just for his gain. Plato's defense of this behavior is rooted in his belief that the just and virtuous life is the happiest, and that only by living by these principles can one achieve true happiness and fulfillment. (Russell, 2005:114)
- In contrast, Machiav-elli's defense of his prince's behavior is pragmatic rather than moral. He argues that the ideal leader should be willing to use any means necessary to maintain power and achieve his goals, even if it means acting in ways that are traditionally seen as immoral or unjust. (Holborn, 1982:145)

- 5 In response to Thrasymachus, Plato argues that justice is not merely the interest of the stronger, but rather the interest of the whole community. (Stauffer, 2001:69)
- For Machiavelli, the stronger leader is the interest of the whole country.

- 6 For Plato, the For Machiavelli, the

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| responsibility of the leader is to check the morality of the citizens and stop the change. Change in moral values leads the government to turn into an oligarchy. (Lodge, 2014:337) | responsibility of the leader must be able to adapt to changing circumstances and use his intelligence and cunning to out-maneuver his opponents. (George et al, 2006:127) |
|---|---|
-
- | | |
|---|--|
| 7 Plato's ideal state is focused on achieving the perfect, just society, which involves maintaining a harmonious balance between different classes and preserving the stability of the state. The philosopher-kings responsibility is to ensure that the city continues to function in this way and to promote virtue and wisdom among its citizens. | Machiavelli's ideal prince is focused on achieving practical results and improving the current state of the country. This involves being willing to take actions that may be seen as immoral or cruel if they are necessary to achieve the prince's goals of stability and glory. Machiavelli's focus is on achieving the best possible outcome given the current state of affairs, rather than striving for an unattainable ideal. (Machiavelli, 2008:33) |
|---|--|
-
- | | |
|---|--|
| 8 Plato's ideal society is a utopia that exists in a realm of ideas and is impossible to achieve in the real world. (Alan, 2010:110) | Machiavelli's ideal society is a practical improvement in the current society. |
|---|--|
-
- | | |
|--|---|
| 9 Plato's leadership focused on maintaining a perfect society | Machiavelli's leadership focused on developing the current society towards a better future. |
|--|---|
-
- | | |
|--|---|
| 10 Plato's ideal society is based on the concept of justice and the idea that every individual has a natural role to play in society and that the | Machiavelli's ideal society is based on the idea of power and the need for a strong leader who can maintain order and protect the |
|--|---|

- philosopher king is the most just and wise ruler who is best suited to govern the city.
- 11 Plato's philosopher king is a visionary who sees the city as a reflection of the soul and seeks to create a harmonious society based on the principles of reason and justice. (Tastan, 2023:29)
- 12 The philosopher-kings are someone who is not only virtuous and just, but also possesses a deep understanding of philosophy and can use that knowledge to govern wisely. This is because Plato believed that the ultimate goal of politics was to promote the well-being of the citizens and that this could only be achieved through the rule of a just and wise leader. Plato's philosopher king is focused on creating a just and harmonious society. (Wellman, 2003:280)
- 13 Plato deals more with the internal character of the leader
- 14 Plato believed that a just and virtuous leader, specifically a philosopher-king, is essential in creating and maintaining a just society.
- 15 Plato believed that the
- state's interests, even if it means using immoral means to achieve those ends. (Ledeen, 2007:120)
- Machiavelli's prince is a realist who understands the harsh realities of politics and is willing to make tough decisions in the interest of the state.
- Machiavelli's Prince is concerned with the development of the state and the acquisition and maintenance of power, The ultimate goal of the leader is to protect society from internal and external threats and sustain the power of leadership to the maximum extent.
- Machiavelli deals with the international responsibilities of the prince
- Machiavelli believed that a strong and effective prince is necessary in ensuring stability and security within a state.
- Machiavelli saw the

- regime itself is crucial in creating and maintaining a just society. He believed that a just society requires a just regime and that the regime should be structured to promote virtue and prevent corruption. (Ryan, 2012:229)
- 16** Plato focuses on maintaining the virtue of the city through the actions of the rulers. Plato's philosopher-king is more of an idealized, abstract concept.
- 17** Plato's ideal leader is focused on internal governance and the cultivation of virtue within the citizenry. Plato's philosopher king is virtuous, wise, and just.
- 18** Plato believed that only a philosopher king, who could grasp the Forms or Ideas, could create a just and harmonious society. In this sense, the philosopher king was not just a political leader but also a visionary and a creative thinker who could imagine and bring into being a better world.
- regime or system of society as secondary to the leader's abilities. He believed that a strong and effective prince can make any regime or system work and that the prince's success is more important than the particular regime or system of government.
- Machiavelli's emphasis is on physical and material success, including military strength and economic development. In this sense, Machiavelli's prince is more of a practical, real-world leader. (Phillips, 2008:7)
- Machiavelli's leadership is focused on both national and international affairs to bring peace and prosperity to the country. Machiavelli's prince is cunning, astute, intriguing, controlling, powerful, sinister underhand, devious, nefarious, manipulative, and to a degree cruel.
- Machiavelli's ideal prince is primarily concerned with external affairs, such as warfare and diplomacy. Machiavelli's prince is characterized as cunning, strategic, and to achieve his targets. He believed that the ultimate goal of politics was to acquire and maintain power and that a leader who was too

- concerned with moral principles was likely to be overthrown by his enemies.
- 19** It is seen that Plato's Philosopher King is more idealistic and focused on transc-endental and transformational leadership. (Jackson, 2018:173) Machiavelli is more pragmatic and focused on consequential leader-ship.
- 20** Plato upholder of the concept of egalitarian-ism. He believes that men and for women should be equal. Eligible women can take the post of the philosopher king. And should carry an equal burden. (Phelps, 1988:21) Machiavelli, women are the most benevolent and troublesome beings, like bees and honey always found together. Machiavelli relates fortune to women. (Pitkin, 1999:138)
- 21** Plato uses metaphors, myths of the allegory of the cave, and the divided line of the sun to establish the concept of ideal leaders of the state. (Catherine et al, 2012:33) Machiavelli uses analogies of fortune and bees with the women and fox and lion to establish the concept of the real leader of the state. (Prince, 2016:150)
- 22** Plato eradicates the emotive constituents of human beings from the ideal state. He assumes that the children of the philosopher king should have studied and been brought up collectively so the philosopher king can only do the best duty as the ruling king. Machiavelli considers the emotional side very carefully and said that laying hands on the property of people and women incurs hatred towards the prince. (Smith, 2018: 21)
- 23** Plato believes that to attain purity and virtue, we Machiavelli emphasized the importance of using

must look toward God and his teachings. According to Plato, political order should be measured against the standards set by God and not humans. (Hoitenga, 1991:161)

religion to control the masses. He believed that religion could be used to manipulate people and keep them in line, as it could be used to justify a ruler's actions and control the moral compass of the people. (Sullivan, 2020:151)

24 Plato is more focused on the cultivation of virtue and the harmonious functioning of the city.

It can be said that the responsibilities of a prince proposed by Machiavelli are more focused on the pursuit of power and glory for the state.

Both Plato and Machiavelli are important figures in the history of political philosophy; they have different motivations, views on human nature, and approaches to achieving the ideal state. It is important to consider these differences when evaluating their political thinking and the relevance of their ideas to contemporary political issues.

Both Plato and Machiavelli believed that the quality of leadership is a crucial factor in the success or failure of a society. They saw the leader as the key figure who can make a difference in the direction and fate of a society. They also recognized that even the best system or regime could fail if capable and virtuous leaders do not guide it. Therefore, they both focused on the education, training, and character development of the leader as a means of improving society.

Machiavelli recognizes the importance of virtuous behavior and the need for leaders to be accountable to their people. Therefore, his focus on power and the use of force in politics should be understood as an attempt to develop a new kind of ethics that can deal with the challenges of political life.

Machiavelli believed that a republic was a more stable and sustainable form of government than a principality, which was more susceptible to the whims of individual rulers. He saw the republican form of government as providing a greater degree of liberty to the people and promoting civic virtue, which in turn would lead to the flourishing of the state.

However, as a political realist, Machiavelli recognized that there were times when a principality might be necessary, especially in a time of crisis or instability. He believed that in such situations, a strong and capable prince could provide the stability and security needed to restore order and prevent further chaos.

The achievement of Plato is the identification of the solution to political issues such as factionalism and exploitation of morality that results in the downfall of the state

in the attainment of knowledge. The practical wisdom of leadership. Harmony of aptitude, fairness as fundamentals of the balance of political harmony, the supremacy of law, and the separation between good and corrupted government are the crucial characteristics of Plato's political leadership which influenced political thinkers till today.

The masterpiece of Plato's Republic contains a few problems due to which the ideal leader of the ideal state could not remain ideal. Plato eradicates the emotive constituents of human beings from the ideal state. He assumes that the children of the philosopher king should have studied and been brought up collectively so the philosopher king can only do the best duty as the ruling king. Plato accepted the belief of eugenics which means any child with born imperfections is not eligible to live and the state should not fulfill the needs of imperfect in a perfect society. This belief directly hit the concept of the guardian who is the most virtuous leader of the state. Plato upholder of the concept of egalitarianism. He believes that men and women should be equal. Eligible women can take the post of the philosopher king.

Another contradiction can be noticed when Plato says that philosopher kings should mate with as many women as they want. In addition to this, Plato does not mention the women's consent. The excessive practice of emotions on the one hand and suppression of natural human desires, on the other hand, is allowed to practice under the ideal and rational political leadership of Plato.

But the reason why the student of leadership should study Plato is because he challenges our established beliefs about democracy, and give a sharp criticism of tyrants, militarists, oligarchs, and the connected way of life. In the procedure, he offers a captivating normative basis for assessing true leadership and what kind of eligible true leaders must be. While presenting an extensive analysis of the basic obstacles to the practice of leadership in the existing political governments including our own. Plato is not an outdated historical curiosity, on the contrary, it shed light on a democratic and contemporary version of capitalist theory. It also guides us to understand the disappointing performance of contemporary democracies.

The extensive research on Machiavelli's leadership revealed three major themes. The first is to gain political power and more emphasis on maintaining political power. The art of war is important to gain and maintain a state. Religion is vital to the armed enterprise because men are more expected to risk their lives. The second theme is fate, chance, and change. The political leader must be ready about the matter which is not under control. The third and last idea is deception. Machiavelli holds that the opinion of the masses is important and lying is necessary to control public opinion. The axioms of Machiavelli are the result of his experience of the government of the fifteenth century. The research reveals that Machiavelli's philosophy of leadership is misinterpreted and the term widely used for Machiavelli's philosophy of leadership as 'Machiavellian' has been used as abuse since the time the book was published. He introduced the concept of

necessity in cases that appear cruel. To maintain a blossoming nation, certain acts are not just necessary or acceptable but desirable.

A famous quote “end justifies the means” always refers to Machiavelli. (Machiavelli, 1883:129) Which he never said. Machiavelli did not conform to the perfect universe of St Augustine. His unembellished realism makes him the first modern political philosopher. He maintained that myths destroy the leader. He advised leaders to perceive the factual world and not the normative world. He introduced the difference between personal and political morality. So great leaders are those who always choose the interest of the state over their own. He was among contemporary political critics who understood the mental process of personalities of political leadership. The qualities of a leader are certainly important, but it is also crucial to consider the context in which leadership takes place. A leader must understand the needs and goals of their group, and adapt their leadership style accordingly. This requires not only personal qualities such as charisma, intelligence, and integrity, but also an understanding of the larger social, political, and economic forces that shape the group's context. Effective leadership involves not only inspiring and motivating people, but also navigating complex power dynamics, negotiating conflicts, and achieving shared goals.

Plato and Machiavelli have different perspectives on the purpose of politics. Plato's Republic can be seen as a critique of contemporary forms of government and leadership, and it provides a vision of what leadership should be. Plato argues that true leaders must be philosophers, individuals who are guided by wisdom and virtue rather than by self-interest or popular opinion. He also emphasizes the importance of education and the cultivation of virtue in creating good leaders. Through his critique of democracy and his vision of true leadership, Plato challenges us to think critically about our assumptions and values, and to strive for a more just and virtuous form of leadership. Plato's view of the good life is also different from that of modern consumerist culture, which emphasizes material possessions and instant gratification.

Plato believed that the goal of politics was to achieve a virtuous life within a society, whereas Machiavelli believed that the purpose of leadership is to maintain power and sustainability in all possible ways. These ideas have endured through the ages and continue to influence political thought today. It's also true that the term "political scientist" is not entirely accurate in describing Plato or Machiavelli. While both were interested in the study of politics, Plato was more of a political philosopher, exploring the fundamental nature of politics and its relationship to the good life, while Machiavelli was an extreme political pragmatist, focused on the practical realities of acquiring and maintaining power.

Both Plato and Machiavelli recognized the importance of good leadership in shaping the direction of a society. However, they differ in their views of the role of the regime or system of government. Plato believed that a just and virtuous regime was necessary for

the flourishing of society and that good leaders could only arise within such a system. Machiavelli, on the other hand, believed that a skilled and effective leader could overcome the limitations of any regime and that the system of government was less important than the qualities of the leader. In both cases, however, the goal was to create a stable and prosperous society, and both Plato and Machiavelli recognized the crucial role that leadership plays in achieving that goal.

Philosopher Kings or Fox and Lion in Real Politics

In real politics, the idea of a "philosopher king" and a "Machiavellian fox and lion" are two contrasting but often referenced archetypes of leadership. (Prince, 2016:197) The concept of a philosopher king, or a wise ruler, just, and possesses knowledge of the highest truths, dates to ancient Greek philosophy and was famously advocated by Plato. In contrast, the Machiavellian fox and lion, as described in Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince*, is a leader who is cunning, pragmatic, and willing to engage in questionable tactics to maintain power. A philosopher king may seem idealistic and unattainable in the context of real-world politics, but some leaders have attempted to embody aspects of this archetype. (Crossman, 2012:118) For example, former U.S. President Barack Obama has been described as a "thinker king" due to his intellectualism and focus on promoting democratic ideals. On the other hand, the Machiavellian fox is often associated with leaders who prioritize their self-interest and use manipulation and deceit to achieve their goals. However, some scholars argue that Machiavelli's ideas are often misunderstood and that he advocated for a more balanced and nuanced approach to leadership. Machiavelli emphasized the importance of establishing the rule of law and maintaining the goodwill of the people, while also recognizing the need for a leader to be able to make tough decisions when necessary. Therefore, the contrasting archetypes of the philosopher king and the Machiavellian fox highlight the tension between different approaches to leadership and the challenges of balancing competing interests in realworld politics.

Plato's solution to the societal issues of his time did not lie in politics, but rather in philosophy. According to him, the focus is on the philosophy of tact acting as a catalyst/remedy for the problems of society rather than politics. (Fiala, 2022:49) He wrote *The Republic* during a time of political instability in Athens, convinced that until philosophers assume political leadership, societal issues will persist. He further explained that it is for philosophers to become rulers, or for rulers to become philosophers. Plato envisioned an "ideal state" in which competence is the main criterion for holding authority. The ruler of the state must possess the necessary abilities to fulfill their duties.

Throughout history, there have been rulers who were both naturally competent and philosophically inclined, and they demonstrated their abilities effectively during their rule/ reigns. Specifically in the context of Islamic history, there were notable leaders who successfully established an ideal state not just through theoretical or literary means but

through actual practice. While there were many exceptional figures during this period, one of them was Hazrat Umer, the second Caliph of Islam. He was a man of immense physical and intellectual stature, yet he never displayed an air of superiority over those around him. Despite ruling over a vast territory, he eschewed the privileges that came with his position as a ruler. To contrast with Plato's concept of an ideal leader, Hazrat Umer, the second Caliph of Islam, is an example of a historical leader who embodied just and selfless leadership without any negative influence from his family or material desires. (Şallābī, et al, 2007:77)

He lived a simple life, with an allowance that was sufficient for a person of average means, and he consumed coarse food and wore coarse clothing. Despite his position as ruler of a vast empire, Hazrat Umer did not allow himself to be swayed by greed or materialism. He owned only one patched shirt, and when he was once late for Friday prayers, it was due to having his sole garment washed and waiting for it to dry. The attributes of philosopher kings, as envisioned by Plato, have been attributed to certain individuals in recent history, such as Emeka Ojukwu, Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King Jr., Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, Leopold Sedar Senghor, and Ken Saro Wiwa. These remarkable figures distinguished themselves during challenging times, serving as guardians of their respective states by bringing stability to moments of crisis. Sir Odumegwu Ojukwu, for example, stood as a towering figure during the difficult period of the Biafran War, protecting the Igbo people from their enemies. He sacrificed everything he owned and was willing to die for his people.

Nelson Mandela's leadership demonstrated great courage and wisdom, as he chose to stand with his people and remain imprisoned rather than betray them and become a free man at the cost of his principles. He continued to inspire and lead, fighting against the unjust treatment inflicted upon himself and his fellow citizens. Mandela was unwavering in his convictions and remained steadfast in his willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice for his beliefs. According to Machiavelli, it is necessary to possess the cunning of a fox to detect and avoid traps. Similarly, Nelson Mandela demonstrated Machiavellian traits as a leader by recognizing the traps set for him during his imprisonment. He famously stated, "If they say you must run, insist on walking; if they say you must walk fast, insist on walking slowly" (Buthelezi, 2006:251)

Martin Luther King Jr.'s impact on the world was a result of his unwavering commitment to nonviolence in the face of aggression. He embodied courage and resilience in his fight against injustice, regardless of the personal cost. Plato and Gandhi share the perspective that to attain an understanding of the ultimate reality, one must not only engage in contemplation of that reality but also pursue ethical engagement in the practical world. Furthermore, to engage ethically in the practical world, one must also strive to comprehend ultimate reality through contemplation.

Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan, was a politician and barrister who is held in high esteem by Pakistanis as the Quaid-e-Azam ("Great Leader") and Baba-e-Qaum ("Father of the Nation"). In his book titled "The Charismatic Leadership of Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah," Dr. Sikandar Hayat examined Jinnah's personality traits through the lens of the charismatic leadership framework. Dr. Sikandar Hayat's book, "The Charismatic Leadership of Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah," outlines several aspects of Jinnah's personality in the context of charismatic leadership. (Hayat, 2008:230)

One of the key traits that Hayat highlights is Jinnah's unwavering self-confidence and commitment to the Muslim cause, specifically the demand for Pakistan. Jinnah was not susceptible to being influenced or coerced into positions that did not align with his own decisions.

Unlike a demagogue, Jinnah was a composed and rational leader who did not display emotions publicly. However, this did not indicate a lack of passion, as Jinnah held a fervent belief in the cause of Pakistan. He was a sober and levelheaded leader who remained true to his convictions. Jinnah was deeply committed to the cause of Pakistan and his passion for it was compared to Gandhi's zeal and intuition. He was known for his strategic thinking and his ability to recognize the opportunities and weaknesses of his opponents. He was considered a man of high integrity, principles, sincerity, honesty, incorruptibility, and honor by most of his contemporaries in politics. Despite his passion, Jinnah was a sober and rational leader who avoided displays of emotion in public. He was not a demagogue but a charismatic leader who was inspired by his strong convictions and unwavering commitment to his cause. Dr. Syed Hussain, a nationalist Muslim and Congress Minister who was against the concept of Pakistan, openly declared that "Though I am opposed to Pakistan, I must say that Mr. Jinnah is the only man in public life whose public record is incorruptible". He emphasized that Jinnah could not be influenced by money or position. (Hayat, 2008:77)

Upon examining the current political climate in underdeveloped countries, it appears that they face similar leadership challenges as the Athenians did. Today's leaders have displayed a lack of competence and critical thinking skills, which has had adverse effects on society, politics, and the economy. Plato's concept of philosopher-kings, where rulers become philosophers and philosophers become rulers, has had a positive impact on many countries, such as Nigeria, South Africa, Ghana, Tanzania, and India, by aiding in their development and liberation. Plato's *The Republic* has been credited with rescuing many societies and countries from difficult situations or premature extinction, which is highly laudable. In addition, Plato established the Academy, which aimed to train young men to be philosophically sound to qualify as future philosopher kings.

Plato's concept of the philosopher king as a capable ruler who can effectively handle the political, social, and economic issues of the state has found relevance in Asia. Countries such as Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, South Korea, and Taiwan gained

economic prosperity after gaining independence from colonial rule in the aftermath of World War II, and this was achieved under authoritarian regimes like the philosopher Kings of Plato. Although these countries had experienced political turmoil, they emerged with the assistance of dictatorships or one-party systems. As a result, all the Asian tigers have achieved their status through such systems of governance. In the aftermath of WWII, no state in Asia was able to achieve economic prosperity through democratic means. While European states had centuries of development behind them to support their democratic systems, third-world states had high population growth rates that posed unique challenges. Democracy alone was not enough to solve these problems; it required perfect planning and execution. This planning and execution were observed in third-world states through dictatorships and one-party systems. For example, South Korea and Taiwan received support from the US to defend the one political party that supported US interests in the region after WWII. Thus, the progress of these states was achieved through non-democratic means. The stability of their policies, without major disruptions, contributed to their economic prosperity. Similarly, Japan and Taiwan also followed similar paths to Singapore and South Korea. Japan's one-party political system, with the nominal role of the emperor, helped the country recover from the devastation and sanctions it faced after the Second World War.

In contemporary discourse, certain individuals have been labeled as Machiavellian. One of these individuals is Donald Trump, who exhibits some Machiavellian characteristics, but not all. Trump has achieved great success as a businessman by engaging in ambitious projects and leveraging his name and celebrity, always prioritizing his financial gain. (Publishing, 2016: 29) Reports have documented his tendency to bully others in business, a trait that carried over into his presidency. Trump was not averse to employing deceit when it suited his goals, and he was unapologetic about his use of falsehoods. Rodrigo Duterte, the current President of the Philippines, has adopted a Machiavellian approach in at least one aspect of his leadership. He has implemented a zero-tolerance policy towards drug and other criminal activities, which has resulted in brutal actions. Individuals suspected of involvement in these activities are executed without arrest or trial, often in a gangland-style shooting. Machiavelli argued that while it is ideal to be loved and feared if a leader has to choose, it is "far safer" to be feared than loved. Under the leadership of Rodrigo Duterte, fear is prevalent. Similarly, Vladimir Putin of Russia and Xi Jinping of China are politicians who prioritize the practical application of principles over theoretical ones, following the doctrine of "realpolitik." (Bew, 2016:85)

Machiavellianism is a term that is commonly applied to leaders who exhibit traits such as ambition, opportunism, and a willingness to manipulate the systems they work within to achieve their goals. Leaders such as Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping are often seen as Machiavellian due to their pragmatic approach to politics and their ability to

maintain a firm grip on power. These leaders are known for their determination and their ability to get things done, often at the expense of the opposition. In simple words, politicians who are willing to go to great lengths to achieve their goals are commonly associated with the label of Machiavellian.

Conclusion

A critical examination of the leadership of Plato and Machiavelli gives a deep understanding of history, culture, and politics and a willingness to challenge conventional wisdom and engage in thoughtful and reflective analysis. It develops a truly nuanced and informed understanding of leadership and its role in shaping our world. It challenges superficial aspects of leadership and understands the underlying philosophy and principles that guide a leader's actions. It is not enough to simply imitate the style or techniques of successful leaders, as their leadership context and circumstances may differ vastly from ours. We must also consider the ethical and moral implications of leadership, as well as the impact of leadership on society and the world. Despite their differences, both Plato and Machiavelli provide the philosophy of leadership with the identification of the reality that leaders of any society shape the destiny and future of the state.

The inclusive study of the philosophy of the leadership of Plato reflects that the social order which consists of reason and virtue takes to the organized state and approves all the constituents of the unity to follow happiness but not the cost of the others. A good society where each calls "it is mine" is followed by four virtues: justice, wisdom, courage, and moderation. Justice ensures each part of the social group that each 'does one work'. Wisdom is the quality of leadership and is defined as knowledge of the perceptive world, the real world, the self, and the knowledge of political far-sightedness. Courage does not include only military courage. The primary duty of a guardian is to ensure civic courage which promotes friendship and freedom, law-inspired belief, and the ability to secure the right in which a good society is established. Lastly, moderation is the characteristic of every unit of society, through which they can control and limit giving peace to society and happiness to people. These four cardinal virtues are also the virtues of just individuals. The rational faculty is primarily the leadership faculty, which attribute is wisdom, trained and nurtured by learning with fine words, which attain spiritual depths, cultivated by censored poetry and music, rule the appetitive faculty.

In the supervision of the prestigious leadership of intellect, it liberate the soul from all vices and connects to the real world. The freedom of the soul from vice is the ultimate destiny of humans in this world. "Man and city are identical," Man without souls is resonant. (Strauss, 1978:72) A virtue-less state is rotten. Men are immortal souls, one has to see the political world clearly through the intelligible mirror. They may become selfish but using rationale makes them above the animal.

Despite their differences, both Plato and Machiavelli find the peace and destiny of the regime are in the hand of the political leadership. The researcher identified that

contrary to most of the research on Plato's ideal leadership, Plato's leadership has many practical offshoots, and Machiavelli's leadership is most of the time misunderstood as Machiavellian leadership. The permanent values identified by Plato and acceptance of change in everchanging world by Machiavelli, both are essential characteristics of development of the society as Iqbal says, "A society based on such a conception of Reality must reconcile, in its life, the categories of permanence and change. It must possess eternal principles to regulate its collective life, for the eternal gives us a foothold in the world of perpetual change. But eternal principles when they are understood to exclude all possibilities of change which, according to the Qur'an, is one of the greatest "signs" of God, tend to immobilize what is essentially mobile in its nature. The failure of Europe in political and social sciences illustrates the former principle, the immobility of Islam during the last five hundred years illustrates the latter" (Iqbal, 2013: 117) The research reveals that to understand the principles and styles of leadership, the student of the philosophy of leadership must read both Plato and Machiavelli not as contradictory but as continuity of the idea of how the phenomena of leadership work in any society. Their ideas give deep insight in understanding the contemporary political thinking and leadership.

* * * * *