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Abstract
Charisma and charismatic style of leadership has been a topic of much debate and critique. Charismatic leaders can transform organizations by motivating members to higher levels of commitment and performance by inspiring them with an appealing vision that is highly discrepant to an unsatisfying status quo. However, there is also a “dark side” to charismatic leaders. They can increase risk levels to organizations and threaten the well-being of members. The personalized need for power, negative life themes, and narcissistic tendencies of personalized charismatic leaders can lead to unethical and destructive behavior. Charismatic leaders are perceived as heroes that are able to use their personal allure to lead others and charisma is considered to be used for honorable reasons. The paper challenges Weber’s approach of charisma, and, through the application of a methodological approach of a critical literature review and qualitative analysis of short case studies, the study proves that charisma is a quality that can be developed, taught and acquired through training like any other skill. As charisma regards relationships between people, and, charismatic leadership relationships between a leader and his followers, since it can be developed and acquired by ordinary, the paper shows that charisma can also be manipulated and abused, so charisma can be used for less-than-honorable reasons and thus the ‘dark side’ of charisma. This contradicts the prevailing definitions and positive connotations of charisma and point out the danger of a person learning how to be charismatic. The issue of compromise of morals and ethics by leaders, who use charisma as a tool, is explored in the paper, and, recommendations are provided of how the dark side of leadership can be avoided.

1. Introduction
Charisma is hard to define and since the term is rather intangible, there is no universal definition of it yet (Khurana, 2000). However, scholars have attempted to define charisma several times (Plutov, 2012). Most of the existing definitions agree on charisma being a trait that entices people to follow, as it is perceived as a magnetism, which attracts attention and fascination (Horcher, 2015; Neumeyer, 2015: 4). Max Weber, a 19th century sociologist from Germany, mostly influenced this view, which is accepted until today. According to the scientist, charisma is of divine origin (Weber, 1978: 241) and a ‘gift of grace’, which allows the leader to captivate others (Greer, 2005: 28). Hence, a charismatic person is perceived as extraordinary (Adair-Toteff, 2005: 191). However, Weber avoids clarifying where charisma actually comes from (Epley, 2015: 9), which leads to the conclusion that charisma can actually be taught instead only being innate.

Charisma and charismatic style of leadership has been a topic of much debate and critique since the recent past. Charisma by its virtue is abstract and hence the prevailing definitions have turned out to be ambiguous and insufficient to completely encapsulate the true meaning of what charisma is. This paper aims to develop a critique around Weber’s definition of charisma where he describes it as of something that isn’t accessible to the ordinary and that one is born with it. The paper challenges Weber’s perspective of charisma and proves that charisma is a quality that can be developed, taught and acquired like any other skill with training (Antonakis, Fenley and Liechti, 2011). Or that sometimes charisma is more of a relationship between the leader and his followers, which makes him appear more charismatic (Takala, 2010). Further the paper comes to a logical end as to how charisma, because it can be developed and acquired by ordinary, can also be manipulated and abused. That there is a dark side of charisma and the compromise of morals and ethics by leaders, who use charisma as a tool, will be explored in the paper.
The paper uses the methodology of literature review for research and is a piece of inductive study, which is qualitative in nature. The limitations of this method of research are however subjected to selectivity bias and also due to time constraints.

Charisma as a virtue is analysed as per Weber’s definition of charisma where he says that it is a quality that is innate to an individual and not accessible to the ordinary. Various authors have defined charisma as some virtue which is ‘gift of grace’ and almost extraordinary (Adair-Toteff, 2005: 191). The so-called ‘divine origin’ of charisma is rather questionable and is further explored (Epley, 2015: 9). The paper further analyses as to how charisma can be acquired and developed like any other skill. Individuals can be made to appear more charismatic by a certain theoretically designed intervention (Antonakis, Fenley and Liechti, 2011). There are certain techniques to master the art of charisma and be perceived as more charismatic called the Charismatic Leadership Tactics (CLTs), which are discussed in detail with examples of leaders who make use of them.

Also, charisma rather than being an innate quality is rather a process, a process of developing a relationship between a leader and his followers that in turn defines the leader. The feeling of charisma is psychologically attached to belief of the followers and is not related to the leader as such. It can sometimes be in the eyes of the beholder, where due to a situation a person is perceived to be more charismatic, example of Nelson Mandela is used to prove so (Vught, 2013).

Logic would imply that if charisma is accessible to the ordinary and can be developed, it also can be abused and can pose to be dangerous. It can have a dark side to it too. There have been cases in history where great leaders have used charisma as a tool to get power with disregard for morals and ethics. Great leaders posing tremendous charisma who were successful in their endeavours weren’t necessarily ethical (Paschen and Dihlsmaier, 2014: 16).

Thus this research attempts to challenge Weber’s definition of charisma in the aspect that it isn’t accessible to the ordinary. It proves using relevant research in the field that individuals can be trained to appear charismatic. That there is misuse and abuse of charisma by the leaders who seem to be charismatic by training, to get what they want by compromising ethics thus giving charisma a dark side, much to the surprise of Weber’s definition which believes it is to be of ‘divine origin’.

2 Methodology

This paper applies literature review and analysis of short case studies. Literature review is defined as “a systematic search of published work to find out what is already known about the intended research topic.” (Robinson & Reed, 1998: 58). It allows the identification of gaps and weaknesses in the prevailing literature (Bless, 2000: 20). Furthermore, it also helps in critiquing the existing findings in order to suggest further research.

Since the paper aims at a critical approach of the existing and prevailing definitions on charismatic style of leadership, the methodology of literature review was chosen so as to:

- To investigate how previous authors have defined and analysed key concepts.
- To give a sense of perspective to our work.
- Demonstrate critical analyses of existing works.

Furthermore, on the one hand the following literature review will make recent research findings become apparent (Webster et al., 2002: 15), on the other it will discover, whether further research concerning the topic is needed, as weaknesses and shortcomings of previous literature will become apparent. The review also helps to explore the particular research question more precisely (Denney et al., 2013: 219) in order to provide an overview of the current context of the explained and discussed topic (Ridley, 2012: 2).

There are several limitations of literature reviews as a research methodology. For instance, in order for a review to reach objectivity the authors will use different inclusion and exclusion criteria to screen potentially relevant studies. However, this process inevitably includes subjectivity in the screening process, especially when numerous researchers are working on the same study, as every author interprets the included criteria differently (Mallett et al., 2012: 449). As a result, conclusions might be misleading due to selection bias or subjectivity whilst consulting the discussed studies.
Additionally, relevant literature, information or studies might be unintentionally excluded from the review due to a lack of knowledge or other reasons, which include time or resource constraints. This means that a high number of relevant and pertinent studies might be missed (Mallett et al., 2012: 449).

Lastly, in order for a literature review to reach reliable and pertinent conclusions, the review process is particularly time-consuming and resource intensive. That is because literature reviews focus on particular questions and are very specific. However, due to short timescales for delivery despite of a desire for breadth in research, literature reviews often struggle with time constraints, which might result in incomplete research findings (Mallett et al., 2012: 450).

3. Charisma & Charismatic Leadership

3.1 Prevailing definitions of Charisma according to Weber

Charisma is hard to define and since the term is rather intangible, there is no universal definition of it yet (Khurana, 2000). However, scholars have attempted to define charisma several times (Plutov, 2012). Most of the existing definitions agree on charisma being a trait that entices people to follow, as it is perceived as a magnetism, which attracts attention and fascination (Horcher, 2015; Neumeyer, 2015: 4).

This view is mostly based on one of the first definitions of charisma, which was provided by Max Weber, a 19th century sociologist from Germany (Plutov, 2012). Until today, Weber’s definition of charisma is viewed as the groundwork for how we might think about and understand charisma or charismatic leadership, respectively (Epley, 2015: 8).

Weber defines charisma as “a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such, as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a ‘leader’” (Weber, 1978: 241).

Charisma as a trait of a leader is therefore something irrational, personal and rather temporary. It is especially unusual, since the possessor of charisma is perceived as extraordinary (Adair-Toteff, 2005: 191). From this it follows, that a charismatic leader is someone who possesses exceptional qualities. The resulting power is legitimised and based on outstanding personal characteristics. As a result, followers accept the leader's mission and directives for action and behave loyal and obedient (Conger et al., 1987: 637; Bouguerra, 2013). Furthermore, the leader is regarded as ‘The God-sent master’ with a ‘divine mission’ (Takala, 2009: 45). The followers validate the leader and the relationship between the leader and his governed is established through the followers belief in the extraordinary qualities of the leader (Hava et al., 2012: 14). Consequently, charisma is a ‘gift of grace’, which allows the leader to captivate others (Greer, 2005: 28).

It can be concluded, that a charismatic leader, who is god-sent, extraordinary and a gift of grace is first of all regarded as ‘good’, which is the reason why followers will believe in their particular leader. Hence, Weber was convinced that followers believe in an authority or leader, because they perceive him or her to be good, just or right (Epley, 2015: 8). How else could you expect a leader of divine origin to govern?

As mentioned above, there have been several attempts since Weber, which tried to define charismatic leadership more concretely, but to date no generally agreed upon definition exists (Greer, 2005: 28). However, “as extensive research in recent years has shown, charisma is the result of specific nonverbal behaviors, not an inherent or magical personal quality” (Cabane, 2012: 4).

These findings and suggestions are not particularly new, since Weber had already mentioned in his definition that charisma can also be impersonal and therefore might change from a “unique gift of grace” to “(a) transferable or (b) personally acquirable or (c) attached to the incumbent of an office or to an institutional structure regardless of the persons involved” (Weber, 1978: 1135). Scholars and researchers today take up on this and emphasize more and more on the fact that charisma is objective (Epley, 2015: 9).

Consequently, this development suggests that against Weber’s phrasing, which describes charisma as “not accessible to the ordinary person” (Weber, 1978: 241), the occurrence of charisma is in fact less exceptional, than originally described by the sociologist. It can be concluded, that from this point of view, charisma itself remains an extraordinary trait, which is yet accessible to the ordinary person. Hence,
Charisma or the charismatic leader himself cannot be regarded as of divine origin or as god-sent anymore. Instead, this means that any ordinary person can be equipped with particular traits needed in order to become a charismatic leader. Therefore, despite still being an exceptional and extraordinary trait, charisma is actually learnable and qualified for being taught (Lasko et al., 2002: 170).

Thus, the majority of charismatic personalities are actually able to work hard on their charisma in order to advance it. Over time, leaders like Steve Jobs have gradually improved their appearance and the public usually gets to know them on the peak of their charisma. Therefore, it is hard to believe, that charismatic leaders weren’t always as impressive (Cabane, 2012: 4f.). Weber who avoids clarifying where charisma, the gift, actually comes from actually indirectly undermines the possibility of charisma being taught. Epley (2015: 9) even states that the origin of charisma in Weber’s explanation seems somewhat elusive: “is it genetic, learned, or acquired by some other process?” Weber furthermore explains that it might also come from certain mental or physical states induced by drugs or diseases (Epley, 2015: 9).

Summarized, Weber acknowledges the fact that charisma can be impersonal, transferable and personally acquirable. He furthermore gives no clear answer to the question where charisma comes from and even states that it can be induced by drugs or diseases. Hence, charisma loses its divine origin, which makes the charismatic person in the lead vulnerable in the sense that he is now unable to be a purely good, just or right authority. The fact that charisma can actually be taught, be it through a teacher or through mind-altering drugs or diseases, leaves room for abuse. This leads to the conclusion that since charisma can be taught, it can be taught incorrectly and furthermore develop a dark side. Therefore, Weber’s original definition of charisma is incomplete and does not cover each aspect or spectrum of what actually defines the term.

3.2 Charisma: Gift of the Gab or Taught/Acquired?

There has always been an extensive debate surrounding the possibilities of whether charisma is innate, i.e. whether a person is born with it or is it a quality that can be acquired or developed or taught. According to a research it is proven that individuals can be made to appear more charismatic by a theoretically designed intervention (Antonakis, Fenley and Liechti, 2011). The research also talks about the influencing tactics used by charismatic leaders referred to as the charismatic leadership tactics (CLTs) and that any individual if trained in the area of the CLTs can demonstrate the characteristics of being charismatic. The concept of CLT’s will further be elaborated in the paper. As a component of leadership, charisma has been subjected to much definitional confusion (Yukl, 1999).

But recent studies in this area has uncovered that charismatic leadership is learnable. About 65% of individuals who received training in the CLTs got above average ratings as leaders as compared to 35% who were not trained. The next section will deal with tactics in detail.

3.2.1 Charismatic Leadership Tactics (CLTs)

Training managers a particular set of charismatic leadership tactics has a positive impact in improving their charisma and thus their effectiveness as leaders. In the study, the researchers assigned a sample of managers from a big Swiss company to either of the two, a training course in charisma and no training. The training included lectures on principles of charismatic leadership, which also included watching scenes from the movies for e.g.- Dead Poets Society. The co-workers assessed the managers before and after the training, which continued for 3 months. The co-workers who were assessing the managers were unaware of the training (Antonakis, Fenley and Liechti, 2011).

In another study, the researchers video recorded the speeches of a group of students before and after the training. The speeches were then assessed and rated on charismatic content. It was observed that training improved the students’ charisma and their perceived effectiveness as leaders.

Thus, the question that arises is what skills were exactly being imparted? The researchers found an extensive list of Charismatic Leadership Tactics (CLTs). As discussed, the word charisma means ‘a special gift’. But if one uses the CLTs correctly, it can convince people to think that you have this gift (Antonakis, Fenley and Liechti, 2011).

The most important ones will be discussed below (Antonakis, Fenley and Liechti, 2012).

The usage of stories and anecdotes: The best remembered parts of a speech are often personal stories. They help in connecting with and engaging the listeners. One way of using a story to motivate the
subordinates would be to make it an inspiring one in a crisis situation. Inspiring stories help in reassuring and boosting the morale of the team.

The display of moral conviction: When an individual says, “this is the right thing to do”. It often shows or at least gives an illusion of honesty and integrity as a leader.

Communicate confidence: The leader needs to explain as to why he is worth of having you as followers and not someone else.

The usage of metaphors: Leaders often use metaphors like “We brought our competitors to their knees”. Metaphors are often tools to show off how smart the leader is. Martin Luther King Jr. was a master in using metaphors. In his historic speech, “I have a dream” he compared the US constitution to a promissory note, thereby guaranteeing the unalienable rights of liberty, life, pursuit of happiness to the people and then noted that America gave its black citizens “Bad cheque”. Instantly the public realised what it meant to receive a bad cheque. The message was thus crystal clear and easy to recollect.

Stress on collective sentiments: This demonstrates to the audience that the leader is concerned about the welfare. Often seen as “We will be stronger” in speeches.

Body language: Specific gestures like putting your thumbs up, raising arms, inflating your chest communicates authority and gives an illusion of being more important.

Facial expressions: Nodding, smiling, and looking calm are the facial expressions, that the audiences unconsciously mimic and this makes them feel better in the presence of the leader.

Usage of rhetorical questions: Leaders often frame their sentences in a way that they make their vision appear as if they belong to the audience. E.g.- “Why should you expect this from me?”. Charismatic leaders use rhetorical questions to boost engagement. For example, the founder of the Body Shop Anita Roddick, made use of rhetorical questions to kick start a social responsibility movement which earned brownie points for the company- “How do you make business kinder? How do you embed it in the community? How do you make community a social purpose for business?” this tactic can be used to boost the morale of the employees as well by asking, “So where do you want to go from here?”

Keeping animated tone of voice: Leaders often use an animated tone to keep the audience captivated throughout their speech.

Setting high expectations for oneself and followers: Charismatic leaders bring out passion and inspire their followers by setting high goals. For example, Mahatma Gandhi’s almost impossible and moral aim of freeing India from the clutches of British Empire in a non-violent manner reinvigorated passion in the hearts of Indians. The key to achieving seemingly unrealistic goals is to also convey confidence in achieving them. It is not possible unless the leader gives in his heart and soul into the vision and achieving the strategic goal.

Contrasts: They aid in clarifying one’s position; this is done by putting it in front of the opposite thereby creating a dramatic effect. Reason and passion are merged together to give a propounding effect. Example would be John F. Kennedy’s “Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country”. Contrasts as a CLT is a simple tactic to master and use.

It was a belief that charismatic individuals are born in a certain way, that they are persuasive, extroverted, and naturally expressive. However, recent studies have proven that charisma is not all innate and that it is a learnable skill or it is rather a set of skills that have been put to practice since antiquity. Research in the laboratory as well as the field have indicated that any individual who is trained in “Charismatic leadership tactics” can evolve to be more trustworthy, influential, and leader like in the eyes of the followers. The believed that one cannot be an effective leader because one is not naturally charismatic doesn’t hold true. The managers who were having lowest initial charisma rankings in the studies were able to significantly bridge the gap between them and their peers to whom the CLTs came naturally. Thus, CLTs can transform an individual from a task-oriented leader to more charismatic in the eyes of his followers.

There is a more relevant study conducted recently by Frese, Bimel, and Schoenborn (2003), taught the aspects of CLTs to working managers. They concluded that many of the CLTs can be taught and manipulated for e.g. a laboratory experiment was conducted where some of the markers of charisma were manipulated for example communicating high expectations, using non-verbal influencing tactics.
Leaders who are charismatic are usually very skilled communicators, being able to connect with the followers on a deep emotional level. The use of CLTs can help a leader to be more verbally eloquent. At the same time a leader in order to be charismatic has to connect with his core character, being as honest as possible. For example, Ralph Waldo Emerson, founder of ‘The Transcendental Club’ had a great charismatic presence as he spoke from the heart, never giving up on his beliefs for adulteration. The charismatic style of leadership is used to bring about a difference in the sub conscious level, and satisfying employees expectation of a strong leadership. As more and more leaders look for the charismatic edge, it is important to understand that as a leader, the leadership style should be more of a balanced one. Charisma should be incorporated with those skills that place equal importance to the individual’s health and innermost heart felt desires. The fusion of emotional and spiritual being is paramount to the success of an individual as a leader (Biviano, 2000).

3.2.2 Charisma is a process

It is very recently observed in current theories of leadership that charismatic leadership is a process in which the leaders are seen as a member of the community rather than as a member in charge of his followers (Takala, 2010). It is rather a relationship between the leader and follower that defines a leader. The legitimacy of charismatic leader and as such charisma is psychologically linked to the belief of the followers and in fact not so much is attributed to the leader as such. Thus, charisma is not something that is superhuman or that transcends routine life. In fact, organizations have often shown proof that charisma and this style of leadership is often routinized and can also imparted.

There is because of this tight relationship between the charismatic leader and his followers that there exists manipulation and a dark side to it. Charismatic leadership is a style of leadership that is based on emotions. Weber in fact termed it as irrational. The leader-follower in the case of Osama Bin Laden was very tight and thus his charisma could convince his followers of his powers. In this case, the leader has power over the followers but the followers to exercise power on their leader and thus power becomes legitimated. The followers will only follow when their values are in sync with the leader’s. The relation is thus interactive in nature. Weber characterized charisma as ‘gift of grace’. However, it is seen that charisma is usually seen by followers who are in distress in a leader who is there in a situation at the right time. The illusion of charisma can be created by displaying extraordinary enthusiasm towards distressed followers in a way that they feel he is extraordinarily qualified. Charisma is thus a process between the leader and his followers rather than a gifted quality (Takala, 2010).

3.2.3 In the eyes of the beholder

Charismatic leadership has not got to do everything about just the person. Rather, it has to do something with the situation. One can think of the humble gardener played by Peter Sellers in the movie, ‘Being There’. He lands at the top position in American politics by sheer coincidence as he conveys to the public wisdoms about how the garden can change with seasons. The fellow politicians and the public fall for these traits of his and perceive him as the saviour of the nation. Thus, charisma is sometimes in the eyes of the beholder as shown by psychological research and not innate in a person as stated by Weber (Vught, 2013). This can be explained using a case in point of Nelson Mandela.

3.2.4 The case of Nelson Mandela

Most of the people in South Africa and world were convinced of the fact that racial discrimination was undesirable and needed to be abolished just when Mandela was released from the prison. Thus he became the poster boy for anti-racial discrimination struggle. To add to it was his tremendous esteem and his forgiving nature, which was just what the world was waiting for at that time in terms of a political change of sorts. Thus he was lucky in a way that he was in the right place at the right time and due to the situation was perceived as a charismatic leader, maybe in an ordinary situation he would have been perceived as an ordinary transactional leader (Vught, 2013).

Psychological research has stated that in a crisis situation people tend to gravitate towards wanting a charismatic leader but in a normal situation they prefer to have a task oriented leader (Choi and Yoon, 2005).
3.2.5 Being an outsider

Research indicates that outsiders are perceived to have more charisma. At a situation when people are looking for a change desperately, charismatic leadership becomes important in bringing about a change or a revolution. Charismatic appeal of Mandela was amplified as he was absent for about 27 years from the political scenario in South Africa and given the crisis, he fitted the bill perfectly being an outsider and having a clean reputation. People perceived him as charismatic and someone with the gift of the gab, as also defined by Weber when he defined charisma. However, what most people do not know was that since his childhood, Mandela received ample training in leadership and most lessons came from his adoptive father. The leader of the tribe in South Africa adopted Mandela. The tribal leader, his father, was very diplomatic and concerned about welfare of the countrymen. Mandela saw this as his father solved the problems of different people from all walks of life. Diplomacy was a quality he acquired through these experiences. Thus, when we stay that Mandela was a charismatic leader, one has to take into consideration his personality but also his upbringing and the desperation of the people who needed a leader in that crisis situation who were looking for someone like Nelson Mandela to be their saviour. Thus, charisma is not just an innate quality but the circumstances can also dictate it (Vught, 2013).

3.3 Charisma as a dangerous tool

In order to better understand this following chapter, it will start with a quick and succinct definition of leadership, charisma, morality and ethics. According to Paschen and Dihsmaier (2014), leadership is an inevitable and central phenomenon of our lives. It is a goal-oriented social relationship that means causing other people to follow in an intentional and regular manner, which requires the capability to incur “costs” for others or power (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 3-5). Furthermore, it is also important to note that not only “leadership is not necessarily good, nor does it necessarily cause good things to happen”, but also “ethical questions are important in leadership, still leadership takes place independently of ethics” (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 7). Adding to this, these authors also defend that “Charisma in itself is neither good nor bad”, reiterating that great leaders can be responsible by catastrophes or advancements for mankind (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 29). What we ought to discuss here is, therefore, that charisma being it a “not God-given” (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 30) characteristic can very well be used for unethical and tragic ends. Thus, meeting with the main argument of this chapter and paper: the abuse of charisma as a tool that culminates in its dark-side.

In pursuance of this, it is also relevant to introduce two very complex and different concepts: morality and ethics. For the purpose of the present paper, morality shall be regarded as norms that are accepted, shared and practiced in a society, thus governing behaviour at a specific frame of reference of time and context, meaning that, what can be “moral in one society can be regarded as immoral in another” (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 214). Ethics, on the other hand, shall be observed as “the contemplation of the principles that govern behaviour that goes beyond morality”; it is independent of any frames of reference; it searches for generally applicable principles of behaviour and introduces the “conscious self-restraint” concept that prevents a person from doing whatever they could (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 2014-215).

Building on these concepts, this paper explores further by presenting philosopher Immanuel Kant’s idea of the “universal Laws” based on categoric imperatives, or “unconditional moral laws that applies to all rational beings and is independent of any personal motive or desire” (The Free Dictionary). The universal laws are going to be quickly explored presently. "Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law without contradiction” (Kant, 1993: 30), this can be interpreted as if a person thinks they are acting upon something that is morally correct to them than it is morally correct to everyone in a similar situation (Sober, 2006). Defending again, how morality depends on a frame of context and that it is subjective.

“Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end” (Kant, 1993: 36), meaning that we shouldn’t treat people as means to an end they did not consent to rationally (Sober, 2006). This second universal law exposes the fact that to use people as a means “is to involve them in a
scheme of action to which they could not in principle consent to” (Anscombe, no year). Consent requires choice, and when a person is oblivious to the other’s motives of action it is breaking this law; for example in cases of deception and coercion (Anscombe, no year). Moreover, one should respect each other’s ends in the fullest way, however “people’s wants are many, diverse and often incompatible” (Anscombe, no year). Given this, one can deduce that what is moral for one won’t be moral for everyone. The same way that because one considers their actions moral does not make them ethically correct.

What was previously explored is relevant to the present paper because of its connection to the charismatic leader. Charismatic leadership requires power, and part of charisma is the ability to inspire trust through suggestive power (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 35). “Charismatic leaders are able to sell themselves as saviours from precisely the “fears” that plague their followers at the given time and situation” (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 38), thus generating trust, becoming like a vicious circle of trust and power. This “charismatic relationship contract” (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 40) between the leader and the followers can only happen if there is trust, and this means that people are willing to surrender degrees of freedom giving themselves to the cause/common goal. Furthermore, “leadership without morality is a recipe for disaster” (Jacobsen, 2009: 30), meaning that if leaders, specially charismatic leaders, do not possess the sense of morality and abide the previous explained Kant’s moral laws there is a chance that that leadership will have catastrophic outcomes such as the case of Germany’s former leader Adolf Hitler. Hitler “was not exactly honest or over scrupulous in selecting and interpreting the facts” to justify his wrongful actions, and with his extreme interpretations he tried to legitimize morally and ethically questionable actions (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 106). Moreover, given that “charismatic leaders undergo a history of development that makes it easy to understand why they are then at some point able to form charismatic relationships” (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 50) and the fact that morality also depends on a specific frame of reference of time and context as well, explains why charismatic leaders were perceived as such in past but such may no longer be the case. Again, with a quick reference to Hitler, his propaganda in the past was based on then current events and socio-economic context, by making those promises to the people, the then chairman of the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei won the democratic elections.

Although this paper has no intention of exploring such facts, it is pertinent to point out that Hitler was such a charismatic leader to the point where people would “erupt into a frenzy of nationalistic pride that bordered on hysteria”, shouting from the top of their lungs, feeling like they belonged to the leader “with body and soul” and only calming down with the reminder that Hitler counted on their obedience and loyalty (Heck, 2001: 23-24). Adding to this, there is also the fact that every single move the then chairman of the National Socialist German Workers’ Party did was within a democratic system that presented opposition and was, at that time, a multi-party system, culminating with his election, by the people, as Chancellor. Building on this abuse of charisma it is also relevant to point out the case of Jim Jones, an American cult leader, “who fuelled by his narcissistic personality, deceived and abused his trusting followers right up until their unfortunate mass suicide in the late 1970s” (2015). Much like Hitler, this leader too started by defending causes that during that specific time frame seemed moral and ethical. Jones “promoted racial equality in his church at a time when that wasn’t widely common, and he had this vision of a peaceful utopia” (2015). It can be deduced that the moral and ethics of the charismatic leader are extremely significant. On the one hand “if they are well-intentioned towards others they can elevate and transform an entire company” (Parrish, 2014) or country like the example of the Mandela case; on the other hand “if they are selfish and Machiavellian they can create cults” (Parrish, 2014) and tragic outcomes like the example of Jim Jones and Hitler.

However, it is also significant to notice that the dark side of charisma does not happen solely on national/international scales, it also happens in corporate and small businesses, with corruption and abuse of power exposed more and more often; for example, “corruption within Enron, WorldCom, Tranz Rail and other organizations” (Jacobsen, 2009: 30).

It can be, therefore, concluded that “the greatest criminals in the history of mankind were, in a certain sense, successful leaders, even if their actions cannot be called ethical” (Paschen and Dihsmaier, 2014: 16), meaning that in order to get to a position of power where they could choose to do what they could and wanted, failing to follow Kant’s universal moral Laws, they relied on their charisma as a tool to
get there. Thus abusing it by misusing it in an opposite view or set of interests of the people, in the case of a country; or, in the case of a company, opposite to its workers, managers and everyone involved.

4 Conclusion

Charisma is an intangible term that has been hard to define, and there is no universal definition to it. The most common line of thinking on charisma is that it’s a trait that entices people to follow, and its magnetic quality attracts attention and fascination. Weber’s definition of charisma is viewed as the groundwork for how we think and understand charisma and charismatic leadership.

Extensive research suggests that’s against Weber’s phrasing as “not accessible to the ordinary person”, which means that any ordinary person can be equipped with particular traits that can make him a charismatic leader.

The influencing tactics used by the charismatic leaders referred to as the charismatic leadership tactics (CLTs) can be used to train individuals to make them more charismatic. CLTs are the tactics that can be used to make any individual more trustworthy, influential and leader like in the eyes of the followers. Charismatic leadership has not got to do everything about just the person, but rather the situation also plays a pivotal role in the projection of a charismatic leader, for example- Nelson Mandela became the poster boy for anti-racial discrimination struggle, coupled with his tremendous self esteem and forgiving nature was exactly what the world was waiting for at that time.

However, it is vital to understand that leadership doesn’t always lead to good things. Great leaders can be responsible for catastrophic disasters. Ethical dimension is important in the context of leadership, especially in charismatic leadership since a part of charisma inspires trust in the followers.

Since we know that charisma is a learnable trait through the use of CLTs and other techniques, it can also be used by individuals to propagate their personal agendas. They can then turn out to be disastrous to the mankind, if unchecked. The greatest criminals in the mankind were in a way also very successful leaders, even if their actions were unethical. A man could use charisma as a tool to achieve his goals, and therefore it’s important to use it wisely. Of course, it has also to be considered that despite all of the adverse consequences of the dark side of charismatic leadership, not every negative charismatic leader is doomed to failure. There are many examples of narcissistic charismatic leaders who established political empires, founded prosperous companies, or initiated new religious sects and retained control of them throughout their lifetimes.

Charisma can be a relationship between the follower and the leader, and not just the virtue of the leader as opposed to the popular belief that a person just embodies it. How much of it is true? Do the circumstances play a role in affecting the charisma of an individual and is it a case of an ordinary individual being at the right place at the right time? Also, since charisma is a dangerous tool, how can it be contained?
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