



Political Power and State Authority in Shakespeare's Hamlet

Md. AtiqurRahman Mamun¹

Associate Professor, Department of English, Dhaka International University,
Email: mamunatiq@gmail.com

Professor Mohammad Shah Alam Chowdhury²

Adjunct Researcher, RMC
Spectrum International University College, Malaysia
Email: shah@siuc.edu.my
Orcid ID: 0000-0003-0348-5739
Scopus ID: 60819374000

Mohammad Mehedi Hasan³

Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Dhaka International University
Email: mehedihasan.polit@diu.ac
Orcid ID: 0000-0002-6357-7742

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23340988>

Keywords:

*William Shakespeare,
Hamlet, Political
Power, State Authority,
Sovereignty, Political
Legitimacy,
Surveillance,
Corruption,
Governance*

ABSTRACT: William Shakespeare's Hamlet explores in depth the moral consequences of political corruption, governmental power, legitimacy and surveillance. The play is often described as a tragedy of revenge, psychological ambiguity and existential crisis, but the political portions of the play provide a comprehensive depiction of the link between ethical obligation and sovereign authority. The drama is set in the Danish court and depicts a polity destabilised by the illegal seizure of the throne, secret murder of a king and exercise of authority over the political institutions for personal gain. Hamlet's resistance exposes the tensions between the desire for justice, political loyalty and moral conscience. Claudius's taking power brings up fundamental questions concerning the legitimacy of power. Shakespeare describes the state as a political system which can be corrupted when power is removed from moral ideals. This is seen in the themes of eavesdropping in the court, lying in diplomacy, use of the military to control the populace and the silencing of any dissenting voice. In this dissertation I investigate the establishment, preservation and dissolution of political authority in Hamlet through the political theories of sovereignty, Machiavellian statecraft and Foucauldian surveillance. It believes that the tragedy is not simply a judgement of individual political misbehaviour but an indictment of the institutional and moral basis of democratic government. Finally, the play implies that political power cannot survive when it is based on lying, violence and suppression of truth.

1. Introduction

The extreme examination of human consciousness within the moral responsibility, political ambition and institutional corruption is one of the most noticeable features of English literature in the study of William Shakespeare's Hamlet which was written at the end of the seventeenth century. The setting of the play is in Denmark. The play opens with the sudden fall of the king, Hamlet, and his brother's ascension to the throne, Claudius. Over time the normal passing of the torch turns into a deep political crisis that involves a loss of trust, assassinations, cheating, intelligence-gathering, and other cunning political maneuvers. For Shakespeare, the royal court plays two roles: the arena for political maneuvering in which the line between public duty and private interests is increasingly blurred, and a political weapon used to win the game.

Hamlet is a revenge play in the old-fashioned sense of the word, but not only in the revenge of Hamlet for his father, there are greater political implications. The assassination of the state's previous monarch upsets the moral and institutional structure of the state. What the structure built by Claudius to become powerful has concealed is its corruption of its own origins. What appears stable is the dirtiest of all origins of the structure built by Claudius to gain power. This way, Hamlet's political situation is connected with his doing nothing. His personal suffering begs the critique on the immoral flaws of the ruling mechanism. The fearfulness in the beginning of the performance is really remarkable. There have to be more corrupt elements in Denmark than can be accounted for by political deals, the Ghost can only assume, judging by his regular interactions with guards. Consider this a very succinct summary of the relationship between "political discontent" and "moral deterioration" to paraphrase Marcellus from Shakespeare's "Hamlet." The problem of rottenness is personal and structural: a chaotic kingdom is an issue of the systems, which govern it. At first, Claudius is presented as a competent leader, making problems with Shakespeare's conception of the state power more challenging. He speaks to the court, solves diplomatic issues, responds to the threat from the young Fortinbras and attempts to keep Hamlet in check. Even if he is political, his incompetence doesn't diminish the impossible legitimacy of his authority. Political philosophy of every age is this problem! Administrative effectiveness and legitimacy. Is a ruler legitimate if the only basis for his legitimacy is an act of power? But in Hamlet the solution of this problem is remains ambiguous. He knows that there is corruption within the court but he is unsure of what to do. His inaction, his musings, his theatrics, his crushes on politically unswayed men, and his eventual ruthlessness all convey that he does not want to be the enemy without adopting his ideologies, unhygienic behaviors, and methods of battle morally. Studies show that Hamlet's political power was a fluctuating set of opposing institutional power and public legitimacy and ethical responsibility. By Claudius' secret murder, Hamlet's opposition, Polonius' spying and Fortinbras' rise, Shakespeare shows us the brittle nature of a nation where political power is separated from justice and responsibility. Thus the tragedy fires the readers mind too, but not just on the characters of particular rulers and kings.

2. Research Objectives and Questions

The present study aims to study the representation of political power and state authority in Hamlet of William Shakespeare. It explores the connection between political opposition, corruption, monitoring, legitimacy and sovereignty in the Danish court.

The investigation is organised in the following main questions:

1. How does Claudius' rise to power reflect the difference between flesh of the flesh and blood of the blood?
2. Surveillance, manipulation and coercion as a means of government control in Shakespeare.
3. How is Hamlet's rebellion a battle between loyalty to the government and his conscience?
4. What is the meaning of the play's conclusion in light of the premise of securing a political order and of the legitimacy of government?

These questions open the way to a political explanation of the tragedy, one that considers the institutional settings in which authority operates and the individual actions of its agents.

3. Methodology and Theoretical Framework

In this essay I employ qualitative textual analysis to study the important speeches, theatrical exchanges, political decisions, and symbolic imagery in Shakespeare's Hamlet. The play is discussed within the framework of early modern political thought and certain modern ideas of power. The first theoretical approach is that of sovereignty and political legitimacy. Jean Bodin's Six Books of the Commonwealth (1576/1992) regards sovereignty as a distinguishing trait of political authority. Bodin's argument does not clarify Shakespeare's dramatic purposes, but it does provide a valuable conceptual framework for separating the rightful exercise of sovereign power from the mere possession of sovereign power. Claudius possesses the reins of state and the throne but the ethical underpinning of his monarchy is damaged by the manner in which he came to power. A second view is taken from Niccolò Machiavelli's The Prince (1532/1998), which discusses the relationship between political survival, strategic calculation and successful leadership. Claudius's management of the court is like strategic statecraft, he maintains his place

by rhetoric, diplomacy and planned deception. But Shakespeare demonstrates the destructive power of political manipulation when it is used to serve personal ambition at the expense of civic responsibility.

A third perspective draws on Michel Foucault's analysis of surveillance and punitive authority in *Discipline and Punish* (1975/1977). Foucault's framework is especially interested in the Danish court where one observes, interrogates and manipulates one another. The historical setting of Shakespeare's play is different to the present disciplinary regimes that have been explored by Foucault yet the idea of surveillance is useful in understanding how political power works through controlling behaviour and producing information. These frameworks are underpinned by an exhaustive study of Shakespearean criticism, especially the work of Stephen Greenblatt on self-fashioning and political culture in the Renaissance (1980) and Margreta de Grazia on the evolving critical and historical identity of Hamlet (2007). Cumulatively, these viewpoints enable the play to be viewed not as a mere psychological or retribution tragedy but as a dramatic interrogation of political turmoil, legitimacy and power. The research does not claim that Shakespeare was seeking to foresee present-day political attitudes. Rather these theories provide interpretive tools to analyse the political mechanisms displayed in the theatre.

4. The Crisis of Sovereignty and the Legitimacy of Claudius's Rule

The political crisis of Hamlet is set in motion by the passing of the sceptre from King Hamlet to Claudius. Claudius comes to power by the secret murder of his brother. The death of the previous king should have meant a seamless transition of power. The throne thus becomes the site of a fundamental contradiction: the sovereign is also responsible for the disintegration of the moral and legal order that sovereignty is supposed to uphold. His first speech to the Danish court is a nice blend of the rhetoric of public responsibility and his own authority. His succession and marriage to Gertrude are shown as sensible decisions made in reaction to the needs of the realm and he acknowledges the death of his brother. His speech is a fable of continuity, as if the state has successfully weathered a time of mourning. The rhetorical skill of this speech indicates its political importance. Claudius comes to learn that power is not only in physically sitting on the throne, but also in being recognised as ruler by important people at court. He is seeking to canalize a series of ethically irresponsible behaviors as a political process seemingly inescapable. Underlying tragedy, a story that concerns a gap that is masked by seemingly legitimate legal action and illegal action. Claudius has mechanisms at his disposal with which to rule, such as the ruler in the royal court; diplomatic communication; and power of command. However, his strength is built upon a crime, something that cannot be combined with moral responsibilities in being a king. In this sort of warfare, a strong and just head is hard to recognize. The thing about Claudius is that he works, he isn't a number. He can cue in to Hamlet, the way one processes information and instruct others to perform for him. But, even that doesn't make his power moral. The political issue is altered from a contentious succession, to one of Justice with the Ghost's disclosure that Claudius murdered King Hamlet. The irregular situation has upended, challenged the equilibrium of power in the state and made their private family legacy public. Therefore, the murder is not just a case of personal betrayal. The political system that administers the kingdom is under challenge. Shakespeare's treatment of succession also gestures at early modern concerns with the continuity of the dynastic line. The body of a sovereign is a sign of the existence of an individual and the continuance of the state. And with the dramatic change of government, it's hard to say where the king's interests end and the kingdom's begin. Thus the rule of Claudius is an exemplary illustration of how political order can survive for a long time in the face of the disintegration of its moral base. The truth can only be suppressed to keep the apparent stability of the court. Yet it goes on. Shakespeare is not just criticising a villain but a political system which uses power to cover up misdeeds.

5. Political Performance, Rhetoric, and the Construction of Authority

Political power is performative in Hamlet. Claudius knows that a king must have an appearance of competence, calmness and sensitivity to the requirements of the state. In his speeches, his political choices and his ceremonial events, his responsible kingship is manifested. The ethical values of leaders and the image they present to the public is particularly apropos to the task of performance in reference to the case of the political leader. The court uses a formal language and conducts well-rehearsed presentations. Claudius made his own choices because they were rational for Denmark, for the need for political stability and the necessity of politics. Also, he used the collective pronouns. In this sense he endeavours to see that his own interests are in line with those of the government. An important political question is raised, as to

what extent public discourse is authoritative and what extent it is a front for private will. In Shakespeare, one observes that political speech may as well persuade as be neutral. The judiciary can recognise the outward signs of legitimacy but cannot recognise the compulsion which is the basis of the administration. Hamlet's idea of political life is based on the conflict of what is and what isn't. So, he has "that which passes show" (1.2), meaning that internal form (as opposed to external or presentational form) distinguishes the first category of displays from the second. It starts at the point of personal distress and it also exposes a greater chasm between genuine and deceptive moral issues. So Claudius' authority is created in two different ways of performativity. He is the ceremonial ruler, a monarch. But the reality behind the role is veiled by his standing as a killer.

He is owned as the genuine ruler of the very same court in which his scam is performed on the stage. A dramatic answer to this puzzle is found in the play-with-the-play of Act III Scene ii. Hamlet prepares for the travelling performers to stage a play that would mirror the Ghost's account of King Hamlet's death. He hopes Claudius's answer will reveal what lies underneath the political bravado. The performance is a political investigation of another sort. Claudius' interruption of the play reveals Hamlet's guilty conscience. The story demonstrates how dramatic enactment can disclose the boundaries of formal power. The monarch may regulate the official activities of the court, but he cannot control entirely the interpretations that are generated by theatrical representation. At the same time, Shakespeare does not argue that theatrical representation is a straightforward replacement of formal justice. Hamlet discovers evidence of Claudius's emotional response, but the political strife is not instantly resolved. The monarch's power is still there, and the machinery of the court administration is there for the most part today. The event thus exposes the potential and limits of political thinking. May be however if it is found to be true it does not mean accountability. A corrupt political order can survive in the face of moral incongruity.

6. Surveillance, Information, and the Mechanisms of State Control

One of the main forms of political authority in Hamlet is monitoring. The Danish court distinguishes itself in its calculated distortion of information, clandestine communication, interrogation and surveillance. Leaders do not boss others around, they attempt to discover others' wishes and control their behaviour. The main character is Polonius. He is a sovereign advisor, and he believes that observation is a key weapon for interpreting political behaviour. He sends Reynaldo to spy on Laertes in Paris; he tries to ascertain what is wrong with Hamlet several times. His mindset demonstrates the political culture known by "trust in distrust" not in "trust in trust. Polonius's approach posits that one has to take people's verbal statements off their public registers to understand them. Their personal actions must be monitored, guided, and even coerced. If it is a system like that, a world is set up where human relationships and human communications become an adjunct to politics. Similarly Claudius uses Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to find out why Hamlet is behaving so strangely. The prince is their friend. This is the knowledge of the king. The episode depicts the court as using personal relationships as a tactic to accomplish political goals and closeness as a method to conduct surveillance. This arrangement also illustrates the fragility of loyalty in authoritarian settings. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are not just self-sufficient companions attempting to assist Hamlet, they are also symbols of the king's attempt to diminish a potential danger. Their engagement reveals how political power can inscribe ordinary social ties in its methods of control. Foucault's scrutiny of surveillance sheds light on these occurrences. In *Discipline and Punish* (1977) Foucault investigates the possibilities of observation and the level of control of conduct through observation. The Danish court, likewise, is a space where characters expect to be watched and behave accordingly. Other characters hunt for signs of a hidden purpose in Hamlet's playing. Hamlet becomes furious. But Hamlet's madness makes the monitoring act complicated. He deliberately makes signs that are not completely obvious and hard to read. His behaviour shows that surveillance does not always produce reliable knowledge, but might instead lead to confusion, misinterpretation and further measures of control. The political significance of surveillance is most visible in the moment in which Polonius and Claudius hide to listen in on Hamlet's discussion with Ophelia.

Their sly observation turns a personal relationship into a political experiment. Hamlet's behaviour is scrutinised for what it may suggest about the origin of his malaise. This episode also points out the ethical consequences of monitoring. Ophelia gets caught up in a scheme contrived by male authority, and her personal relations are used as tools in an investigation over which she has no control. So the court's hunt

for information destroys the possibility of real relationships. The political uneasiness that Shakespeare's monitoring ultimately presents itself as both a symptom and a mechanism of. Claudius watches over Hamlet because he fears the consequences of the prince's knowledge and the fact that the court is unaware of it further increases the suspicion that needs further observation. Power feeds on itself : suspicion breeds observation , observation creates more suspicion , and real trust slowly erodes .

7. Political Corruption and the Moral Responsibilities of Kingship

Shakespeare's treatment of government corruption lies on the dividing line between civic duty and selfish ambition. A sovereign was expected to protect the realm, administer justice and keep the government stable. Claudius, for his part, uses the might of the state to protect his own reputation. His confession in Act 3, Scene 3 reveals the extent of the gap between his political success and his moral status. Claudius realises the seriousness of his sin, but cannot forsake the benefits it has given him. He claims that his sin is coupled to the benefits he reaps, implying that the thirst for political power cannot be disentangled from moral corruption. The setting of the prayer is quite important as it shows that Claudius is aware of the ethical dimensions of his actions. He knows the magnitude of his sins, yet he will not renounce the crown, or the marriage he has gained with it.

But the error of his ways lies not just with ignorance but with his failure to transfer ethical responsibility to political gain. This difference makes corruption difficult to convey. Claudius can reflect himself but can not transform. The leader who orients his actions with no moral considerations without any consequences forfeit political knowledge. In his subsequent plot against Hamlet, too, he is an example of the transformation of public power to personal protection. Claudius, rather than go through proper political channels or an open investigation, sends Hamlet to England where he is to take his life. So the state's diplomatic relations turn into a weapon of assassination. The program states that corruption derives from one leader. Claudius' misbehaviour is dependent on other people being responsive, and the creation of political institutions.

The outcome is a systemic risk, in that the state's resources are used for reasons diametrically opposed to the obligations of governance. Hamlet's grumbling about Danish ethics should be seen in a broader political sense. The corruption in the court cheapens loyalty, obedience, justice and civic obligation. In such conditions political institutions may still perform their official duties but may not realise their moral aims. The Shakespearean tragedy asks an issue of political theory: is a government legitimate in its authority if its institutions are built to retain bad behaviour rather than to fix it? The answer in the play is certainly unclear. The rule of Claudius shows that political efficacy and continuity of governance cannot compensate for the erosion of justice.

8. Hamlet's Resistance: Moral Conscience and Political Responsibility

The major moral challenge of the piece is Hamlet's opposition to Claudius. The Ghost reveals to him how King Hamlet was murdered, and the prince seems obliged to revenge his father. But the political implications of revenge make his mission more complex than simply personal dedication. Hamlet's relation to the state is unique, because he is the dead king's son, and, therefore, belongs to the royal family. His opposition also undermines the stability of the political system, undermining the authority of the governing king. Does allegiance to the existing order equal to collusion in injustice? Can violent resistance help to re-establish legitimate authority? The famous soliloquy of Hamlet that begins with the words "To be, or not to be" (3.1) is generally read as a rumination on suicide, suffering and being. But the speech also shows the connection between political activity and moral reflection. Hamlet reflects on the duties of life in a world of organised cruelty, injustice and oppression. His beliefs are situated within a larger consciousness of social and political suffering as 'the oppressor's wrong' (3.1). The prince's dilemma is not, therefore, one of personal indecision. It is a product of his recognition that action occurs in a morally ambiguous world, in which the repercussions of resistance cannot be entirely known. His lateness has been too often looked on as a mental deficiency. But it could also be understood as trying to establish a boundary between wanton violence and political activity in the right sense. Hamlet will not act till he is sure that Claudius is guilty. Suspicion, therefore, or hereditary animosity, is not enough to condemn a King. The Murder of Gonzago is a play that is an example of Hamlet's attempt to understand the truth by methods of observation. Rather than kill Claudius outright, he arranges a situation where the king's reaction will prove

Claudius guilty. This suggests the objective is to make evidence-based political judgements. But the purposes for which Hamlet acts are morally dubious. His pretended insanity, his exploitation of others, his predisposition to falsehood are a reflection of the deeds he accuses in court. His resistance is not outside or beyond the political culture of corruption, but conditioned by it. Another example of the repercussions of acting without full understanding is the murder of Polonius. Hamlet attacks, not identifying the supposed person hidden behind the arras. Another murder is an example of how opposition to a corrupt government can generate its own injustice, when moral certainty outstrips hard fact. Thus Hamlet's opposition is not only an example of political courage. It's not rejection. It portrays how the conflicted moral resolve has to be held amid "neglecting" of the "unfair power". According to Shakespeare, political opposition is essential when times grows tough to bring a dirty underbelly of the system to light, but it can also be risky as it mirrors the darkness and violence of that stronger than ever system.

9. Ophelia, Gertrude, and the Gendered Distribution of Political Power

The treatment of women also tells us something about the political organization of Denmark. Ophelia and Gertrude are at different positions within the royal and familial systems, but both are affected by a political system controlled by male dominant people. Gertrude's marriage to Claudius has implications that transcend beyond her personal life, as it helps to consolidate the political position of the new monarch. Her ascension is staged as a stable and acceptable transition through the public performance of Claudius's marriage. Hamlet is deeply affected by her remarriage, but the union also exposes the relationship between the royal household and the legitimacy of sovereignty. Gertrude's precise knowledge of Claudius's guilt is not clear. Shakespeare cannot establish that she was complicit in the assassination. Her political importance is partly derived from the ambiguity of her situation, as she is a member of the ruling household and a figure whose understanding of the moral state of the regime is still a matter of controversy. Ophelia's experience is another facet of political power. She is the object of the opposing claims of Polonius, Laertes and Hamlet, each of whom wants to control her actions. Her relationship with Hamlet involves courtly research, and she is used as a tool to find out the prince's intentions. One classic example of this unequal distribution of agency: the moment in which Polonius and Claudius see Hamlet and Ophelia. The authorities choose the form of the contact, its political aim and the meaning of the behaviour that ensues. The court's search for information takes precedence over Ophelia's emotional experience. The tragedy's critique of a political climate where individuals are replaceable in quests for power is further aggravated by her later psychiatric collapse and death. The court's manipulation leads to the ruin of the relationships and forms of trust that are fundamental to daily life, even when her pain cannot be linked to a single political source. This leads to a gender-sensitive reading that enhances the political significance of Hamlet. Power is not only shown in the drama in terms of military power, political manoeuvrings and kingship. It also illustrates the operation of authority in personal relationships and families in structuring the possibilities open to those with little institutional power. The treatment of Ophelia and Gertrude shows how political misdeeds have consequences that reach much wider than the succession to the monarch. It deals with vulnerability to the influence of great personalities, the significance of private conduct and the allocation of agency.

10. Military Power, Foreign Relations, and the Limits of Danish Sovereignty

The political problems of Hamlet are not confined to the court of the king, but extend to the relations of Denmark with the neighbouring states. Fortinbras' presence provides a larger geopolitical dimension, where the internal conflict is used as an opportunity for outside interference. Denmark is preparing for possible war at the start of the play concerning Fortinbras's claim to land. Fortinbras, he is pleased to hear good news, but Claudius is too diplomatic to accept it and tries to divert him by using the power of the Norwegian king. He realizes that Claudius has considerable political acumen, and a need for security. There's also a contrast between inner doubt and fieldwork that seemingly exists in the Fortinbras subplot. Fortinbras connotes the restoration of the political honour and organised military action while Hamlet is called upon to deal with the moral and political consequences of the revenge. Shakespeare does not describe militarised ambition as risk-free but his behaviour offers a different kind of royal duty. In Act 4, Scene 4 Hamlet's meeting with the captain of the Norwegians makes him rethink the relationship between thought and action. The sight of Fortinbras's men gathering to conflict for a territorial purpose that looks to be very modest further heightens Hamlet's awareness of his own delay. But the contrast raises questions about the importance of actions committed in the name of honour, reputation or inherited rights. The

military dimension is essential in the last scene. The royal dynasty eliminated, Fortinbras arrives in Denmark and takes his place in the new political system. His presence shows how the disintegration of domestic authority can affect the exterior sovereignty of the kingdom. The slow reform of the Danish institutions, however, does not mean the final transfer of political power. Instead, a series of deaths follow that strip the state of its principal controlling figures. The tragedy thus points to a disturbing prospect: if internal authority is delegitimised and fails to overcome its contradictions, the political order may be recreated by the intervention of an outsider claimant. Fortinbras's entrance alone does not prove a perfect governance structure. His military achievements and assertion of power continue to be interpreted politically. But his rise helps to illuminate the link between national independence and domestic legitimacy. Where private conflict consumes the major institutions of a state, the political position of the state becomes subject to change. Shakespeare thus draws a link between the security of the state and the virtue of kingship. Ultimately, Claudius's crime on a personal level has ramifications beyond the royal family and the political leadership of Denmark is changed.

11. The Final Catastrophe and the Possibility of Political Restoration

The last act of Hamlet brings the play's competing modes of political authority into direct collision. Claudius's plot is revealed as he tries to kill Hamlet in a fake sporting event. The poisoned weapons and poisoned cup expose the regime in which political action is inseparable with clandestine violence. The ultimate disaster is the destruction of the major members of the Danish ruling dynasty. Claudius is killed, Gertrude drinks the poisoned wine, Laertes is fatally wounded and Hamlet takes the poison himself. Political corruption has lasting consequences, for the means of sustaining authority are the means of destroying those who depend on it. The ending deeds of Hamlet expose the guilt of Claudius; they are not, however, an overall political reform project. The prince manages to reveal the hidden crime to the world but dies before he can introduce a new kind of government. Thus the restoration of political order is not identical to the truth. It is essential because Horatio is given with the job of explaining the events to those who will inherit the political future. His version has the ability to inhibit Claudius' version from being the only public version. But interpretation is not necessarily a question of fairness. And the coming of Fortinbras brings the promise of new political stability.

He acknowledges the special nature of the deaths and participates in the reconfiguration of the power structure. This helps his claim as Hamlet accepts Fortinbras as a possible heir. The ending is deliberately complicated. The viewer can expect order to be restored under Fortinbras' rule, but there is little indication as to the ethical nature of the future leader. The play does not imply a complete constitutional solution, nor does it imply that the systemic issues that lead to Denmark's dilemma have been dealt with. Then the restoration of authority is conditional. The deaths of both the corrupt and the innocent individuals bring home the high human cost of political failure. Fortinbras' rise implies that a new political settlement may be more the condition of stability than a moral refashioning of the current one. The end of Shakespeare's play can be interpreted as the belief that the destruction of a tyrannical ruler will certainly create a just society, but this sense is not to be understood as a simple endorsement of the notion that anarchy will inevitably lead to democracy. The political system cannot be restored by killing one person. The issue at hand is how to create an authority that can ensure continuity, ethical accountability and public trust.

12. Discussion: Political Power, Legitimacy, and Ethical Governance

The literature cited above supports the notion that Hamlet's rendering of the nature of political authority is a dynamic process of legitimation, representation, information, and coercion. His tactics of expression, diplomacy, intrigue, and even friendly killing are his tools of power. These devices allow him to make use of his strength, yet they also point to the fragility of a system which cannot withstand the exposure of his original crime. The incident highlights the contrast between power and authority. The emperor Claudius might enjoy access to the state's organs, but his actions act against the morality of his rule. Hengeley says that Shakespeare is asking who is the rightful king, who is realking. If Shakespeare is asking the question, who is the rightful king, who is real king, then Hengeley is right. The play shows that political corruption is not an officer's private affair! Claudius's rupture at the courtheretical intrigues are raised, suspicion grows and alliances are broken, and more blood is shed. Institutional corruption occurs when institutions created to serve the pursuit of the public order are used for private ends. A good aspect of this shift that is really very illuminating is observation.

Through collecting facts on Hamlet the judiciary recovers some clarity from the political. But their acts are causing more unease and confusion. As they say, there is a rising and clear pattern to how political power goes wrong: it doesn't encourage clear dialogue and accountability, rather than checking and pressuring. One challenge to be overcome is Hamlet's insurrection. He is attempting to conquer a crime lord, but it has ended up causing him more problems than ever for the nation and in its death tolls. Opposition is not necessarily synonymous with goodness in Shakespeare. The meaning of the resistance is the moral values that it represents. The performance is offered as another example of the political authority transforming the structure of societal life. Those who are more interested in gaining political knowledge are shown in the example of Ophelia's treatment how political understanding may be imposed on the individual person through institutional processes. Gertrude's tale is a classic case of the private versus the public, and the politics behind Royal marriages. In the end, Fortinbras proves that the repercussions of a country's political shortcomings can manifest themselves in many ways.

The Danish authority has disappeared and a new leader is coming. The incident raises the question of whether the new approach would constitute any real legal monitoring. All these traits combined suggest that Shakespeare's political perspective is neither a simple endorsement of monarchy nor a full repudiation of sovereign authority. The play addresses the conditions that lead to the corruption of power and the difficulties of restoring political order once the corruption has set in the governing system. Hamlet is pertinent in today's society as it provokes critical consideration on the relationship between the common welfare, institutional legitimacy, responsibility and governance. There is no political necessity, given the constitutional structure is already in place; rather, it is a demonstration of the consequences of personal ambition overriding moral obligation.

13. Conclusion

William Shakespeare's Hamlet, a political play, raises questions about sovereign power: its moral obligation and its basis. Claudius' usurpation, manipulation of the court, extensive eavesdropping and the final demise of the royal line of Denmark show how fragile political authority is when it is disassociated from justice and responsibility. The extent of just power and good rule is Claudius. Even if he metaphorically has a moral underpinning to his leadership, his private humiliation intrudes on his public claim to power over the institution. All of his efforts to maintain control of the government through rhetoric, spying, and silent acts of brutality will only add to his demise of the government he is attempting to undo. However, his resistance also demonstrates the challenge of resisting authority that is experienced when you use something you lack authority over in the same way that you execute something you don't. Still, his struggle also illustrates that resistance to authority is a challenge when you do something you're opposed to in a style that looks like the thing you're resisting. He is hindered in his search for truth by the political climate of shallowness and lies; yet his confusion and aggression reveal that not everything good comes from confrontation with good means.

Thus, political opposition to the tragedy is ethically risky. One can witness this in the play through the figures of Ophelia and Gertrude, the effects of governmental corruption on family life and on the distribution of personal agency in these characters. Meanwhile, as Fortinbras enters the scene, the internal issues in Denmark are connected to the broader global repercussions of bad leadership. Hamlet believes that political success (forget all terms of coercive power) is unable to shape the balance of a state. Moral ties between power and accountability are good governance. Good governance is one where institutions are effective in safeguarding justice, rather than in hiding injustice. When the state is but a political instrument for ending political aims, political principles cannot be truly related to her, and instability can threaten the whole society. Why Shakespeare's tragedy endures, he knew that at times when a state is in distress, often "its" guiding ideas stand in distress as well. Hamlet is such an example of the destructive consequences of illegitimate authority; it invites readers to ponder questions of political power and the legitimacy of and expectations on accountable, sustainable governance.

References

1. Bodin, J. (1992) *On Sovereignty: Four Chapters from The Six Books of the Commonwealth*. Edited and translated by J.H. Franklin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1576).
2. deGrazia, M. (2007) *Hamlet without Hamlet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1975).
4. Greenblatt, S. (1980) *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
5. Machiavelli, N. (1998) *The Prince*. Translated by H.C. Mansfield. 2nd edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1532).
6. Shakespeare, W. (2003) *Hamlet*. Edited by A. Thompson and N. Taylor. London: Arden Shakespeare, Third Series.