International Journal of Language and Literary Studies
Volume 7, Issue 3, 2025
Homepage : http://ijlls.org/index.php/ijlls

Blood for the Crown: Analyzing Army Coups and Political Upheavals in Shakespeare's Selected Plays

Md. Chand Ali
Assistant Professor, Department of English, Uttara University, Dhaka, Bangladesh
chand@uttarauniversity.edu.bd

Tamanna Tasnim
Lecturer, Department of English, Uttara University, Dhaka, Bangladesh
tamanna.t@uttarauniversity.edu.bd

DOI: http://doi.org/ 10.36892/ijlls.v7i3.2174
APA Citation: Ali, M. C & Tasnim, T. (2025). Blood for the Crown: Analyzing Army Coups and Political Upheavals in Shakespeare's Selected Plays. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies. 7*(*3*).319-332. http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v7i3.2174

Received: *14/04/2025*

Accepted: *28/05/2025*

Keywords: *Military Coups, Legitimacy, Tyranny, Powerlust, Psychotrauma, Damnation.*

This research examines military coups and political problems in some of the most renowned plays of William Shakespeare, i.e., Richard II, Henry IV, Henry VI, Richard III, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, Hamlet, and King Lear. It more or less tries to see how Shakespeare defines military coups, rebellions, revolutions for power, and what effect they have on leadership, social peace, and the human mind. By reading the plays together and reading them closely, the article identifies biting political ideas such as the overthrow of kings who were believed to be godlike, the rise of those who rise to power by violence, and the danger of being so starved for power. Many people focus on Shakespeare's poetic reflections on kings and their rule, but fewer explore how Shakespeare shows that power is often defined and maintained through war and violence. This paper attempts to fill that gap by looking closely at what Shakespeare is describing as a political coup and violent takeover and rendering these into what was going on in Elizabethan England. This is achieved through the application of methods like close reading of the text, the study of history, and application of political philosophy while establishing how Shakespeare treats power, justice, and revolution. Lastly, the article introduces us to make a judgment about Shakespeare's ideas on power applications today if one considers government, justice, and what finally occurs to the rebels against today's power structure.

1. INTRODUCTION

William Shakespeare's tragic histories and plays fully reveal the fragility of political power and the ethical questions involved in its acquisition, wielding, and loss. Supporting them are the pervasive processes of military coups, insurrections, and intra-political wars. This article charts such processes in a set of selected plays—*Richard II, Henry IV, Henry VI, Richard III, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, Hamlet,* and *King Lear*. Shakespeare's fascination with political disorder, collapse of the divine right of kings, and the ambulatory psychoses of ambition and leadership reveals not only his theatrical imagination but also his rich brooding over the sociopolitical issues of his Elizabethan age.

This research is driven by a series of compulsive questions: How does Shakespeare stage army coups, revolutions, and power struggles in his tragic and historical dramas? How do the military battles represent or defy the ideals of legal rule and of divine kingship? What are the political and psychological stakes involved in the pursuit and exertion of power through the military? How does Shakespeare create a distinction between rightful and wrongful rebellion in different situations? These are the questions that inform the research hypothesis and provide a multi-dimensional structure upon which the plays are analyzed.

The primary objective of this article is to critically examine the representation of military coups, rebellions, and armed power struggles in selected Shakespearean texts. Through an exploration of both the political and psychological issues of these conflicts, the study seeks to uncover how Shakespeare debriefs the legitimacy of leadership, the morality of usurpation, and the transformative and destructive impacts of military forces on individual identity and national stability. In doing so, the article positions Shakespeare as a dramatist deeply influenced in the moral and structural foundations of power.

To carry out this analysis, the study uses a qualitative and interpretive approach based on careful reading of the texts, comparing different plays, and considering their historical background. It examines the plays closely—both in the details of language and structure, and in the larger context of history and ideas—to understand how Shakespeare takes real historical events and changes them to serve his dramatic and thematic goals.

It is based on the simple difference between lawful rule and violent seizure of power. It employs major concepts like the divine right of kings and Machiavellian politics in an effort to be able to take a closer look at how Shakespeare captures the juxtaposition of power and anarchy and justice and brutality.

The theoretical framework incorporates political philosophy, particularly the ideas of Niccolo Machiavelli to contextualize the ethical and structural dimensions of power in the plays.

However, this study looks at the main ideas in the plays and compares them with each other. It first studies each play separately and then sees how they are connected. This helps to better understand what Shakespeare says about leaders, rebellions, and changes in power. By doing this, the study finds repeated ideas, similar characters, and story patterns that show how Shakespeare talks about war, power, and who should rule.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Shakespeare's Representation of War: From Chivalry to Bureaucracy

Paola Pugliatti (2010) describes how the early modern military innovations, i.e., the advent of professional standing armies and gunpowder weapons, shaped Shakespeare's representation of political and military institutions. Shakespeare challenges the transforming nature of war and its influence on leadership and authority in dramas such as *Henry V* and Coriolanus (p. 6). War is no longer chivalric but more bureaucratic and unmooring.

2.2. Institutional Breakdown and Psychological Turmoil in Julius Caesar

Michael Rustin (2023) considers Julius Caesar a political tragedy by institutional failure and psychological sanity. Assassination is not only viewed as a conspiracy coup but also because of personal concerns and illusions, i.e., the idealism of Brutus and the manipulation of Cassius (p. 3). Coup creates a power vacuum to be occupied with vengeance and chaos.

2.3. Eroded Legitimacy and Military Succession in Shakespeare's Kingship

Tatjana Dumitraskovic (2014) refers to the questionable legitimacy of Shakespeare's kings. She speculates that political intrigue and brutality erode the moral right of kings to the throne,

causing dynastic collapse and civil war, as in *Richard II* and *Henry IV* (p. 214). Shakespeare denounces the use of the army as a method of succession.

2.4. Dynastic Instability and Familial Corruption in Hamlet and Macbeth

Alawi (2022) affirms that corrupt familial relationships trigger Hamlet and Macbeth's political crises. Usurpation, fratricide, and illegal failure of succession remind us of the disastrous effects of dynastic instability (Alawi, 2022, p. 8). The throne is rather a throne of treason than glory.

2.5. Machiavellian Power and Violent Governance in Shakespeare's Political Drama

The Shakespeare Seminar Online series (2021) presents a collection of essays on Shakespearean drama's handling of governance, rebellion, and legitimacy. The authors recognize Machiavellian and Tacitean influence on Shakespeare's political imagination, especially in *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar* (Kissel & Schulting, 2021, pp. 5–9). Power vacuums would most likely be created by violence, and this is the flaw in rule through violence.

2.6. Kingship, Misrule, and Military Power in Shakespearean Tragedy

Kingsley-Smith (1999), in her doctoral thesis, expounds on the kingship theory and the employment of military power in the founding or subversion of royal authority. She expounds on how Shakespearean tragic heroes, i.e., *Macbeth* and *Lear*, misuse power or lose power through misjudgment, exemplifying fears of divine right and popular sovereignty (pp. 147–150).

2.7. Elizabethan Anxiety and Tudor Legitimacy in Shakespeare's Histories

Rahman (2016) follows how political contexts such as the War of the Roses and the fears of Elizabethan succession affect Shakespeare's history plays. Idealization of Tudor authority has the tendency to mask overlying anxieties regarding rebellion and legitimacy (p. 22).

2.8. The Social and Psychological Burdens of Military Service in Shakespeare

Taunton (2001) examines how Elizabethan theatre, Shakespearean plays especially, portray the psychological and social impact of foreign war and military service. She explains how soldier characters are prone to perform contradictory roles of protectors and agents of home disturbance (p. 45).

3. RESEARCH GAP

While Shakespeare's treatment of government, kingship, and political legitimacy has been much debated, comparatively little has been written concerning how he depicts military coups, revolutions, and violent overthrows as political transformations. This study plugs that gap by way of an examination of Shakespeare's staging of coup and civil war politics in plays like *Richard II*, *Henry IV*, *Henry VI*, *Richard III*, *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth*, *Hamlet,* and *King Lear*. It examines how these plays reflect Elizabethan anxiety about succession, legitimacy, and instability generated by political turmoil.

Notably, the study has a psychological aspect in response. Shakespeare's portrayal of characters—such as *Macbeth's* and *Richard III*'s paranoia, *Lady Macbeth*'s guilt and strange visions, *Hamlet's* deep sadness and confusion, *Brutus's* inner conflict and regret, *King Lear's* madness and pain, *Prince Hal*'s struggle with identity, *Henry IV*'s guilt and exhaustion, *Henry VI's* emotional weakness and helplessness, and *Richard II's* sadness and loss of self—demonstrates how political ambition and power struggles are closely tied to deep psychological suffering. This convergence of political legitimacy, rebellions and individual trauma remains undertheorized in recent scholarship.

In evoking attention to bringing these converging political and psychic incidents into relief, this research satisfies an existing gap by charting the evolution of rebellion, trauma, and crises of legitimacy on various political and affective landscapes across Shakespeare's master plays.

4. METHODOLOGY

This study uses a qualitative, interpretive method based on close reading of texts to explore how army coups and political upheavals are shown in eight of Shakespeare's plays: *Richard II*, *Henry IV*, *Henry VI*, *Richard III*, *Macbeth*, *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*. These plays are selected because they all deal with views like power, rebellion, succession, and bloody invasion in leadership. The analysis manifests both historicist and political-literary approaches, with a focus on Machiavellian ideas about ruling, power, and ambition. The study focuses on Shakespeare's plays in the context of their time and discussions about kingship, authority, and military force. Primary texts are derived from modern academic editions of Shakespeare, while secondary sources undertake critical essays, history books, and journal articles that discuss Shakespeare's views on politics. This method helps uncover how Shakespeare presents power struggles, conflicts, and political change through action and characters.

5. DISCUSSIONS

5.1. Shakespeare's Presentation of Army Coups

This study examines key themes across Shakespeare's plays, analyzing each individually and then comparatively to explore how Shakespeare portrays rulers, rebellion, and historical change. Through this approach, the research identifies recurring ideas, character types, and narratives that reveal Shakespeare's treatment of military power and rightful authority. Supporting this perspective, Seo (2007) highlights Fortescue's (2011) observation that, despite covering Elizabethan military events briefly, Fortescue encouraged his military students to study Shakespeare's works, recognizing him as "truly the painter of the English army in his day" (p. 11). This indicates Shakespeare's significant role in reflecting and shaping contemporary understandings of military and political power.

During *Richard II* (1377–1399), two major military coups were formed against his rule. The first, in 1387–1388, was by a group of powerful nobles, the Lords Appellant, including Thomas of Woodstock and Henry Bolingbroke, who accused the king of misrule and reliance on wicked counsellors. They raised an army, defeated the kin's followers, and called the Merciless Parliament, in which several of Richard's followers were executed or punished, temporarily curtailing his power. (Henry Bolingbroke's rebellion and overthrow of Richard II indeed took place only a generation later, but Richard's reign had been rife with dysfunction and baronial dissatisfaction, including an attempt to take over control of the government in the Lords Appellant Crisis (see below).) The second coup occurred in 1399 when Richard exiled Bolingbroke and seized his lands. In response, Bolingbroke came back with an army, saying he only wanted his family lands, but many nobles and soldiers quickly joined him. Richard was taken prisoner and made to give up the throne, and Bolingbroke then became King *Henry IV*, bringing a significant change in who held power.

Richard II lost the crown because he was not a good king. He thought that God had anointed him as a king and did not care about what people said. He issued unfair verdicts, favoured specific individuals, and imposed more taxes, which made everyone furious. It became even worse when Richard exiled his cousin Henry Bolingbroke and seized his possessions after his father's death. Most people felt this was unfair and wrong.

In 1399, when Richard was in Ireland, Henry came back to England with an army. At first, he asserted his right only to his inheritance, but presently, he won over some of the powerful nobles who were also dissatisfied with Richard. When Richard came back, he had lost a great deal of popularity and was soon taken into custody. Parliament insisted that he abdicate the throne since he was no longer fit to rule. Henry Bolingbroke then took the throne as *Henry IV*, beginning the Lancastrian dynasty.

In Shakespeare's *Richard II*, this happens as the punishment from God for the breach in the natural order of monarchy. Richard is shown to be a haughty king who does not know how to rule with wisdom. Shakespeare also shows that while Henry's rebellion had succeeded, taking over the crown by force is not always simply right or wrong—it can be hazardous and create ethical concerns. Ultimately, Richard's fall is a lesson that a king should be cautious, fair, and in touch with his people.

Even though no record from history is sure of how *Richard II* died, he is commonly believed to have been murdered on behalf of *Henry IV* to keep him from challenging his right to the throne in the future. He was imprisoned within Pontefract Castle after having been found deposed in 1399 and subsequently died prematurely in early 1400. There are variant accounts from contemporaries of him—some explain his death as starving voluntarily or involuntarily, and others explain it as being assassinated outright. Shakespeare in *Richard II* calls murder, adhering to popular belief that *Henry IV* arranged his murder to grant himself political legitimacy and to discourage any rebellion on behalf of the slain king. While Henry publicly denied the assassination, his initial reaction of having Richard secretly buried and suppressing any martyr-like figure of the slain king shows his complicity or at least implicit approval. Richard's death, therefore, completed a dark chapter in the transfer of power, establishing Henry's legitimacy but at the same time casting a shadow of illegitimacy and guilt upon it.

Henry Bolingbroke's coup against *King Richard II* of the military was a monumental one in the history of England. Henry started rebelling initially because he was angry and wanted justice for losing his land. But soon, his rebellion took the shape of a bigger political movement, and he overthrew the king, becoming King *Henry IV*. In Shakespeare's *Henry IV* plays, we see that Henry struggles with power, honour and deciding who should be king. At first, his actions seem fair, but later, they look more complicated because Richard was an unjust ruler—gaining power through violence is hard to justify. Henry's reign was full of problems and rebellions, and his kingship was not without incident- "Henry Bolingbroke's rebellion and the overthrow of *Richard II* happened just one generation later, but Richard's rule was full of problems and unhappiness among the nobles. This included an attempt to take control of the government during the Lords Appellant Crisis" (Bradley, 2015, p. 138). The plays also revolve around his son, Prince Hal, a wild youth at first but eventually a powerful and wise king. His transformation shows how once power is taken, it needs to be brought up-to-date and well-managed in order to prosper. In contrast to his father's troubled conscience and political struggles, the cynical Falstaff challenges the heroic ideals associated with war and leadership by asking, "Can Honour set to a leg? No. Or an arm? No. Or take away the grief of a wound? No" (Act 5, Scene 1). This satirical outlook reminds us that the pursuit of power often brings real human cost, and honour, in itself, may offer little consolation to the wounded or the dead.

In Shakespeare's *Henry VI* Trilogy, *Henry VI* is depicted as a weak and indecisive king. He has no idea how to make strong decisions or overpower the people around him, especially the nobles. His weakness poses a problem since the nobles do not listen to him. Instead of taking charge, Henry allows other individuals to control him, and that causes many issues. For example, in *Henry VI,* Part 1, during the Battle of St. Albans, Henry does nothing to lead his

army. This shows how his lack of action leads to defeat and disorganization. Because *Henry VI* is weak, the nobles start to act on their own. They do not follow his authority but instead try to take power for themselves. Some of the most powerful nobles, like Richard, Duke of York, start rebelling against Henry for the throne. In *Henry VI, Part 2*, Richard publicly announces that he has a better claim to the throne than Henry- "Like Richard, Duke of York, subsequently, Henry claimed the throne not by virtue of his paternal, but of his maternal descent" (Ashdown-Hill, 2003, p. 31). This shows how the nobles, when there is no strong king, take the law into their own hands and begin fighting for power. Henry, reflecting on the fragile nature of kingship, declares, "My crown is in my heart, not on my head: / Not deck'd with diamonds and Indian stones" (Act 3, Scene 1). His words reflect his inward, spiritual view of monarchy, but they also expose his detachment from the political and military realities surrounding him.

However, "English society underwent a significant transformation in the fifteenth century, not least because of the series of violent, political confrontations we know as the Wars of the Roses" (Grummitt, 2010, ix). The conflict between the Yorkists (led by Richard, Duke of York) and the Lancastrians (led by the followers of *Henry VI*) causes a great deal of bloodshed and disarray. Both groups desire power over the throne. The rivalry creates tensions, and both groups fight throughout the plays. The conflict starts because in *Henry VI, Part 1, Henry VI* is challenged by Richard, Duke of York. This hostility between these two groups created the Wars of the Roses, a cycle of violent battles fought between the Yorkists and Lancastrians- "Thousands of people died and many more were injured fighting beneath the white rose of York and the red rose of Lancaster, and the noble families ruling England tore each other apart in a struggle that was as bitter as it was bloody" (Charles River, 2015, p. 3).

R.A. Griffiths (1984) asserts- "In terms of historiography, the region had become associated and even to a degree defined by the political aspirations of the Neville and Percy families and their affinities, especially during the Wars of the Roses. Their rivalry drew the region, despite its geographical position, into the major political conflicts of the period" (19). She also states, "Although key battles like the Battle of Towton were fought in the North of England, the causes of the war were national, not regional. He points out that the Yorkist victory at Towton became a powerful tool for political propaganda. The executions of Lancastrian leaders in Northern cities such as York and Newcastle were used to demoralize Lancastrian supporters and assert Yorkist power. Griffiths also notes that transferring lands from the Percys to the Nevilles helped the Yorkists weaken Lancastrian influence and strengthen their own control over the North" (68).

Shakespeare shows that betrayal and military coups are common during this time. Powerful nobles often fight against each other to get what they want. For example, in *Henry VI, Part 3*, Richard, Duke of Gloucester (who later becomes *Richard III*), betrays his allies and murders anyone who stands in his way to get the throne. His actions show how people use violence and betrayal to gain power. These betrayals make the situation even worse, and they weaken the country further. However, as the fighting between the Yorkists and Lancastrians continues, the country becomes more unstable. The weak kingship of *Henry VI* and the constant power struggles between the nobles led to the collapse of the monarchy. In *Henry VI, Part 3*, after the Battle of Towton, the Yorkists win, which weakens the Lancastrians. Richard, Duke of York, comes close to taking the throne. The constant fighting leaves the kingdom in ruins and makes it impossible for anyone to have control. "Suspicion always haunts the guilty mind; / The thief doth fear each bush an officer" (Act 5, Scene 6), *Henry VI* remarks, capturing the atmosphere of paranoia and fear that shadows those engaged in deceit and betrayal. In the end, the monarchy falls apart, and England becomes a country full of chaos and violence. "The weak kingship of *Henry VI* was the primary issue of his reign, contributing significantly to the

breakdown of governance and the subsequent Wars of the Roses. Unlike kings who overstepped their bounds, *Henry VI*'s inability to effectively govern created a political vacuum that could not be easily managed, leading to anarchy and power struggles among the nobility. This instability fueled the civil war between the Lancastrians and Yorkists. The legacy of his ineffective leadership was felt long after, with historians misunderstanding the root cause of the conflict, often attributing it to other factors, when in reality it stemmed from *Henry VI*'s incapacity to provide the strong leadership needed to prevent the nation's descent into chaos" (Munro, 2011, p. 24).

Shakespeare uses the wars and the rebellions in the *Henry VI* plays to show the dangers of ambition and the power struggles for political motives. The characters, like Richard of York and Margaret of Anjou, use violence and treachery to try to reach their goals. Shakespeare is warning that when people fight for power using these means, it leads to the destruction of the country as well as to their own ruin. In *Henry VI*, Part 3, Richard of Gloucester uses murder and deception to take control. This shows how dangerous and immoral it is to take power by violence and betrayal. Finally, Shakespeare's *Henry VI* plays demonstrate how power struggle, ambition, and misrule by an ineffective leader topple the monarchy. The continuous wars between the Yorkists and Lancastrians destroy the country, and the kingdom collapses. The plays are a warning about the ills of unchecked ambition and how it destroys the country and its king.

But Shakespeare's *Richard III* places on the stage one of the most infamous warlords in English history. Richard, the last Plantagenet king, ascended to the throne through trickery, cunning, and the ghastly murder of his nephews, the princes in the Tower. His accession, though politically effective, was accomplished with brutality and disdain for traditional morality. For Shakespeare, Richard's reign is a paradigm of the corruption of power. His accession to the throne through force is the last corruption of royal authority. His coup for the state to destroy his rivals is symptomatic of the Machiavellism of his dictatorship. Richard has no ideological commitment or desire for imposition of order, but instead a boundless appetite for power. Shakespeare uses Richard's cruelty as a lesson, demonstrating how power that has been gained by betrayal and bloodshed ends up being self-destructive.

"In *Richard III*, Shakespeare shows Richard as a Machiavellian character, using lies, betrayal, and violence to become king. He manipulates everyone around him, but his greed and cruelty lead to his downfall. In contrast, *Richard II* shows a king who doesn't understand Machiavellian ideas. *Richard II* makes poor decisions because he doesn't focus on power and politics, leading to his loss of the throne. Shakespeare suggests that while Machiavellian tactics can help a ruler gain power, they can also lead to trouble if not used wisely" (Ismail, 2017, p. 39). "During a time of political uncertainty and ambition, Richard III gained power by using methods that matched the ideas of Niccolo Machiavelli. As explained in R. Ganesh Kumar's article (2019), Richard was not loved or accepted at first, but he made his way to the throne through manipulation and cleverness. He pretended to be loyal, only to betray and eliminate those who stood in his way. Like a true Machiavellian figure, Richard used lies, praise, and fear to take control of England. However, after becoming king, he couldn't earn the loyalty of his nobles and people. His rule, built on betrayal, lacked the long-term plans needed to keep the kingdom strong. In the end, the same tricks that helped him rise to power led to his downfall, and with his death, the Yorkist reign ended. His life, shown by Shakespeare and discussed by scholars, is a clear example of how ruthless ambition may help someone gain power, but not keep it" (p. 39).

Richard III is depicted as a tyrannical but powerful ruler. He ascends to kingship not by right or inheritance, but by violence and terror. From the very outset, Richard declares, "I am determined to prove a villain" (Act 1, Scene 1), making clear his deliberate embrace of evil and manipulation as tools for power.

He behaves in a military dictator-like fashion and compels individuals to obey him. After the death of his brother Edward IV in 1483, Richard was appointed Lord Protector to young King Edward V. But instead of protecting him, Richard used his army to take control of London, arrest Edward V's supporters, and declare himself king. This coup by force shows how Richard used force over legal succession to acquire power. In the opening line of the play, Richard proudly proclaims, "Now is the winter of our discontent / Made glorious summer by this sun of York" (Act 1, Scene 1), using a weather metaphor to celebrate the rise of the House of York. Yet this 'summer' is darkened by his immoral rise to power.

Richard became king by lying, cheating, and killing. He showed no respect for his family. He even had his two nephews, Edward V and Richard, Duke of York, taken to the Tower of London—where they disappeared. The Princes in the Tower were Edward IV's sons and rightful heirs. After being placed in the Tower by Richard, they vanished. Most historians believe Richard ordered their murder to remove any challenge to his claim. Their disappearance caused public suspicion and damaged Richard's image, even among his allies.

Although Richard was made king, he was so in an immoral manner. He was crafty, but dishonest and cruel. Shakespeare shows that power without morals is not actual success. Richard employed untrue gossip that Edward IV's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville was illegal, making his nephews illegitimate. This allowed him to become king as the next in line. But historians believe this was a political ruse, not a legal truth. His shrewd political machinations of church and state eroded the nobility's confidence in the monarchy.

Richard destroyed the sacred image of kingship. A king should serve the people, but Richard used the throne for selfish reasons. He made people fear the crown rather than respect it. As king, Richard rewarded his followers with lands taken from others. Many nobles felt unsafe and feared for their lives. His reign lasted only two years and was marked by distrust and insecurity. This caused many former supporters to turn against him, including powerful nobles like the Duke of Buckingham. By the end, even Richard acknowledges no room for moral hesitation, declaring, "Conscience is but a word that cowards use, / Devised at first to keep the strong in awe" (Act 5, Scene 3), which reflects his moral decay and isolation.

Richard eliminated his foes by surprise and cleverness. He did not use councils or courts—he used surprise execution and arrest. One obvious case in point was the execution of Lord Hastings. Hastings was Richard's most staunch supporter but was abruptly charged with treason and was executed in 1483 without even being brought to trial. This surprised the court and demonstrated that Richard would eliminate anyone, friends or not, if he saw them as being threatening. His disregard for conscience is made chillingly clear when he declares, "Conscience is but a word that cowards use, / Devised at first to keep the strong in awe" (Act 5, Scene 3), revealing how he viewed morality as a weakness rather than a guide. In fact, Richard did not have a vision for the country. He did not aim to help the people or improve the kingdom. He only had a desire for power for himself. Contrary to *Henry VII*, who finally ended peace after decades of war, Richard gave nothing in terms of reforms or peace. He spent most of his short reign as a king defending himself and lashing out at enemies. There were no indications of a larger political or economic vision for the nation, which created increasing opposition.

Yet Richard's violent rule did not last. He lost popularity and was slain at the Battle of Bosworth Field in 1485 by Henry Tudor. His fall shows that power based on fear and murder is weak. At Bosworth, some of Richard's most significant followers betrayed him or would not fight. Most importantly, Lord Stanley (whose stepson Henry Tudor was) changed sides during the battle. Richard was slain fighting bravely, but alone. His death ended the line of Plantagenet and began the era of Tudor. Shakespeare teaches that kings who rule by deceit and murder die. Kingship must be honest, just, and for the good of the people.

When Richard died, *Henry VII* became the king and united the houses of York and Lancaster by marrying Elizabeth of York. This ended the Wars of the Roses and ushered relative peace into England. Shakespeare ends the play with Henry taking the throne, signifying that good leadership is built on unity, not on bloodshed.

Second, in *Macbeth*, the coup overthrow takes place when Macbeth uses violence and treason to take the Scottish throne. Macbeth, a battle-hardened and loyal general of King Duncan, initiates the play. By coincidence, a prediction by three witches is conveyed to him that he will one day become king, which inspires Macbeth with ambition and restlessness. "If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well / It were done quickly" (Act 1, Scene 7) reflects Macbeth's internal debate on the urgency of committing regicide to seize power. Being prodded by Lady Macbeth, he murders the sleeping King Duncan, who is a guest at Macbeth's castle. This regicide—the murder of a king—is the beginning of Macbeth's coup. "I am settled, and bend up / Each corporal agent to this terrible feat" (Act 1, Scene 7) reveals his complete physical and mental commitment to the violent act. He blames Duncan's guards for murder and engages in a game of feigning innocence. "There's daggers in men's smiles" (Act 2, Scene 3), spoken by Donalbain, shows the atmosphere of treachery surrounding the coup. When, following Duncan's sons Malcolm and Donalbain's flight in fear, Macbeth assumes the throne as king, however, Macbeth's kingship is one based on fear and more violence. "To be thus is nothing, but to be safely thus" (Act 3, Scene 1) indicates Macbeth's growing paranoia about holding onto power. He feels threatened and unsafe by anyone who poses a threat to his position of power. He instructs the murder of Banquo, his close friend, and Banquo's son because of another prophecy that Banquo's lineage would be kings. He instructs the slaughter of Macduff's wife and children as well. "Send out more horses; skirr the country round; / Hang those that talk of fear" (Act 5, Scene 3) illustrates Macbeth's transformation into a tyrant who uses terror to maintain power.

Macbeth's ambition to rise to kingship leads him to a path of paranoia, guilt, and eventually tyranny. He rules by means of violence, instability, and suspicion within his court and nation. Vacuity of achievement via betrayal is renounced by Shakespeare, and his coup, if politically brilliant short-term strategy, results in ruinous personal and political downfall.

In *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare does depict the assassination of Caesar by Brutus and Cassius, two senators who justify their act as defense of the Roman Republic. The actual Caesar was a general who, after a series of military victories, was made dictator of Rome, which led to fear of tyranny and collapse of Republican institutions. His sacrifice, intended to save the Republic, would end up contributing to bringing an age of civil war to Rome that would eventually lead to Augustus and the Roman Empire. "Liberty! Freedom! Tyranny is dead!" (Act 3, Scene 1) cried the conspirators after Caesar's assassination, announcing their coup as a heroic act of liberation. Shakespeare disapproves of the Platonic ideal of noble rebellion by the actions of Brutus. The coup overthrows Caesar, marketed as a virtuous deed to prevent tyranny, eventually leads to anarchy, further violence, and the institution of a different form of dictatorship. The unforeseen fallout of the assassination, to which the plotters were not privy,

illustrates the dangers of political ideal-motivated military coups and the stupidity of trying to preserve a republic by assassination.

Julius Caesar was an awesome Roman general. He won many wars, especially in Gaul (France now), and gained a huge popularity. After defeating another Roman leader named Pompey, Caesar was the most powerful man in Rome. In 44 BCE, he was made "dictator for life." The majority of senators believed that he wished to be a king and end the Roman Republic. The Roman Republic was a state in which no single person had all the power. Therefore, people like Brutus and Cassius were afraid that Caesar was going to take away their freedom and institute a monarchy. "Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world / Like a Colossus, and we petty men / Walk under his huge legs" (Act 1, Scene 2)—Cassius's words reflect the fear of Caesar becoming a tyrant and justifies their plot.

The military coup in *Julius Caesar* is when some Roman senators, including Brutus and Cassius, conspired and committed to kill Julius Caesar. By that time, Caesar had become overwhelmingly powerful after garnering a string of military victories and had recently been made "dictator for life." That caused most senators to feel as if he wanted to be a king and replace the Roman Republic, based on mutual power and no single ruler having total control. "The abuse of greatness is when it disjoins / Remorse from power" (Act 2, Scene 1) says Brutus, rationalizing that unchecked power leads to moral corruption and must be preemptively stopped.

On the Ides of March, March 15, 44 BCE, Caesar was assassinated in the Senate House by a group of senators, such as Brutus and Cassius. They argued that they did it to save the Republic and to stop him from becoming a king. Brutus, Shakespeare's play *Julius Caesar* says, says that he loved Caesar but loved Rome more. "Not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more" (Act 3, Scene 2) captures Brutus's internal justification. He believed that killing Caesar was not a personal act but a political one for the sake of saving the country. Brutus believed he was restraining Caesar's ambition and keeping democracy intact in Rome.

Brutus believed he was justified. He believed that Caesar was gaining too much authority and that he was doing it to save freedom in Rome. He did not desire power for himself. So, we can say his motives were pure. But he made a mistake. He had no idea what happened after the assassination. He wished it would bring salvation to the Republic, but it ended up creating many troubles. So his intention was in the right direction, but it failed. "There is a tide in the affairs of men / Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune" (Act 4, Scene 3) reflects Brutus's mistaken belief that their moment of action would usher in a better future.

After Caesar was killed, things got worse in Rome. A big civil war started. Caesar's friends and supporters, especially Mark Antony and Caesar's nephew Octavian (who later became Augustus), went to war against Brutus and the other killers. Antony gave a powerful speech at Caesar's funeral and made the people turn against Brutus. "Cry 'Havoc!' and let slip the dogs of war" (Act 3, Scene 1) shows Antony's fiery intention to incite revenge and violence. In the end, Brutus and Cassius were defeated. Octavian became the first emperor of Rome. The Republic that Brutus tried to save was gone, and Rome became an empire.

In the play, Shakespeare shows that even if people have good intentions, killing a leader can lead to worse problems. Brutus is shown as a good man who wants to do what is right, but he is also shown as someone who does not fully understand politics. The play tells us that trying to fix government problems by using violence, like killing a leader, can bring more harm.

Military coups, even when done for good reasons, often cause more violence and more powerful rulers.

Caesar was not a bad ruler, but he wanted too much power. While he brought peace and stability to Rome, he also threatened the Republic by concentrating too much authority in his own hands. He was politically strong but morally questionable. Brutus, on the other hand, truly wanted to do what was right. He loved his country and acted to protect it, but his decision to kill Caesar was a political mistake that caused more harm than good. Cassius also joined in the assassination, but unlike Brutus, he appeared more driven by jealousy and personal anger. His intentions were less noble. "I am not gamesome: I do lack some part / Of that quick spirit that is in Antony" (Act 1, Scene 2) suggests Cassius's dissatisfaction and envy towards Caesar's charisma. After Caesar's death, Octavian—later known as Augustus—took advantage of the situation. He defeated Caesar's enemies and brought peace again, but he became a true emperor, which officially ended the Roman Republic.

This shows that the military coup did not protect democracy. Instead, it led to more unrest, violence, and the rise of even more centralized power under an emperor. Shakespeare's play teaches that even well-intentioned revolutions can lead to tragic consequences if they do not have a good and well-conceived plan for what comes next.

The most important lesson from history and the play is that one cannot protect democracy by merely assassinating leaders. If one leader gets eliminated without a clear plan, everything will go haywire. Brutus and others wanted to save the Republic, but ended up helping kill it. The play teaches us that political violence, which seems honorable, can lead to a lot more war and more tyrannical leaders. Brutus serves as a tragic reminder of how good people can still make such bad mistakes. "This was the noblest Roman of them all" (Act 5, Scene 5) is Antony's final tribute, acknowledging Brutus's sincerity—but also his failure.

Although the play *Hamlet* is not a typical military coup, it does deal with the consequences of an illegal taking over of the Danish throne. Claudius murders his brother, the king, and becomes the king, unleashing a chain of violence and political corruption. As Hamlet himself bitterly observes, "The serpent that did sting thy father's life / Now wears his crown" (Act 1, Scene 5). Hamlet, the rightful heir, seeks revenge, but his acts further destabilize the Danish monarchy. The play unfolds the consequences of psychotrauma of Claudius's takeover, maintaining that a kingdom built on murder and trickery would automatically lead to internal conflict and devastation. Hamlet warns, "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark" (Act 1, Scene 4), signaling that political crime at the top poisons the whole nation. Shakespeare introduces the consequences of an illegitimate takeover as not merely corruption of morals but as a beginning for more political unrest, in which the legitimacy of the monarch comes under suspicion and the state is overridden with chaos. Hamlet's doubt and anger echo this instability: "O, my offence is rank, it smells to heaven" (Act 3, Scene 3), Claudius admits in private, acknowledging the moral rot underpinning his reign.

In *King Lear*, the political tragedy shows how power struggles lead to chaos. Lear, an old king, decides to divide his kingdom among his daughters. "Know that we have divided / In three our kingdom" (Act 1, Scene 1)—Lear announces, setting the tragedy in motion. This leads to betrayal, family wars, and even civil war. "I did her wrong" (Act 1, Scene 5)—Lear later confesses about Cordelia, revealing how misjudgment in power transfers brings destruction. Although there is no traditional military coup in the play, the family war is similar to the political power struggles throughout history. Lear's choice to relinquish his throne is problematic, similar to how military coups bring unrest. As Lear descends into madness, he

cries, "O, let me not be mad, not mad, sweet heaven!" (Act 1, Scene 5)—signifying how failed leadership unravels both mind and state. Shakespeare illustrates that if power is not wielded intelligently, both family and nation will descend into chaos and disaster. Edmund's ruthless ambition reflects this when he says, "Now, gods, stand up for bastards!" (Act 1, Scene 2)—showing how power vacuums encourage opportunism and disorder.

6. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Shakespeare's presentation of coups involving armies reflects the general trend such that toppling one government tends to beget another as a brutal or more tyrannical government. "Shakespeare's history plays function as symbols of resistance to the rule of force, war, and politics, with their critique embedded in the way kings are depicted and the situations they face" (Dumitrascovic 2). Through his plays like *Richard III* and *Macbeth*, toppling of one power through usurpation via violence and conspiracy does not promote peace and justice but solidifies a vicious cycle of fear, brutality, and turmoil. *Richard III* ascends the throne by murder and intrigue and becomes nothing but a despotic tyrant whose reign is cut down in bloodshed. Similarly, Macbeth's rise through regicide sends Scotland mad, highlighting Shakespeare's disenchantment with the repercussions of regime overthrow through military means.

Behind the plots of power stands rationalized by the subject of legitimacy as Shakespeare's compass of morality and politics. In *Richard II*, legitimacy is a divine right, while in *Henry V*, it is by merit, leadership, and national unity. Wherever it is found, legitimacy is demonstrated to be essential in maintaining political stability. Whenever its rulers are viewed as illegitimate—either by usurpation, as in *Macbeth*, or corruption of morals, as in Lear—their kingdoms at once descend into anarchy. Shakespeare thus locates legitimacy not as a political concept but as an everyday staple supporting the tranquility of society.

Another of the most dramatic consequences of political usurpation in Shakespeare's dramas is the psychological collapse of the usurpers themselves. *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear* are examples of characters who experience extreme psychological torment as a consequence of their participation in or response to struggles over power. Macbeth is consumed by guilt and paranoia when he kills Duncan, leading to his psychological and emotional collapse. Hamlet, who is not a usurper, is caught in a web of political corruption and moral uncertainty, which progressively erodes his sanity. Lear, who foolishly gave up his power and misjudged his daughters, descends into madness. So this indicates how people may suffer psychotrauma when involved in the misuse of power.

Ambition and fear are the impulses behind most uprisings and violence on Shakespeare's political stage. Men like *Richard III* and *Macbeth* are motivated by an unending desire for power and not by justice or in the best interest of the larger good. When they have acquired power, fear, whether vengeance, uprising, or God's wrath, will hold on to it. This intersection of ambition and fear produces oppressive governments and spirals of brutality, and it presents a pessimistic picture of human motive as it seeks power.

Finally, Shakespeare gives us a theory of history in cycles, in which there is a pattern of rising and decline that is echoed within different plays and centuries. Weak or inept kings are typically deposed to be replaced by tyrants whose dynasty is eventually dissolved by later revolt. From *Richard II* on, Shakespeare follows the path by which each generation must confront unfinished wars and suggests that history does not go forward in linear straight lines toward betterment but spirally in ambition, collapse, and renewal. These spirals are both reflective of the actual historical circumstances of the English Civil War and of the playwright's overall introspection regarding the nature of power and political fate.

7. CONCLUSION

Throughout Elizabethan England, where free speech was constrained, Shakespeare used allegory to challenge authority quietly, and his plays were gestures of passive insurrection. His plays—*Richard II*, *Henry IV*, *Richard III*, *Macbeth*, *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*—are full of the political and social anxieties of his time and, most of all, of those of rebellion, succession, and right to reign. Shakespeare shows how the bloody path to power—through coup and conspiracy—leads ultimately to instability. *Richard III*, *Macbeth*, and Claudius are each inner self-perceptions of the inner destruction caused by guilt, fear, and psychological breakdown from their bloody uprisings. Other than these three, the plays show the greater human and social dividends of ambition, treason, and moral decay.

In fact, Shakespeare uses historical settings in his plays to comment on the justice and leadership of his era, showing that unlimited power often leads to disorder and deep emotional suffering. These enduring tales highlight how politics, emotions, and morals are closely linked, offering valuable lessons on the risks of unbridled ambition and the fragile nature of power.

REFERENCES

Shakespeare, W. (2000). *Henry VI, Part 1* (E. Burns, Ed.). Arden Shakespeare, Methuen Drama.

Shakespeare, W. (2001). *Henry VI, Part 3* (J. D. Cox & E. Rasmussen, Eds.). Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury.

Shakespeare, W. (2002). *Henry IV, Part 1* (D. S. Kastan, Ed.). Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury.

Shakespeare, W. (2002). *Richard II* (C. R. Forker, Ed.). Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury.

Shakespeare, W. (2003). *Macbeth* (B. A. Mowat & P. Werstine, Eds.). Folger Shakespeare Library, Simon & Schuster.

Shakespeare, W. (2004). *Julius Caesar* (B. A. Mowat & P. Werstine, Eds.). Folger Shakespeare Library, Simon & Schuster.

Shakespeare, W. (2005). *King Lear* (B. A. Mowat & P. Werstine, Eds.). Folger Shakespeare Library, Simon & Schuster.

Shakespeare, W. (2009). *Richard III* (J. R. Siemon, Ed.). Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury.

Shakespeare, W. (2012). *Hamlet* (B. A. Mowat & P. Werstine, Eds.). Folger Shakespeare Library, Simon & Schuster.

Cameron, K. (2003). Medieval England: A Political History. *Oxford University Press.*

Alawi, J. M. A. (2022). The Kinship and the Political Background of Shakespeare's Tragedies: *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366457708

Ashdown-Hill, J. (2003). The Lancastrian Claim to the Throne. *The Ricardian: Journal of the Richard III Society, 13*, 27–38. https://richardiii.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/13-The-Lancastrian-Claim-to-the-Throne.pdf

Bradley, C. W. (2015). *Between Brothers: Brotherhood and Masculinity in the Later Middle Ages* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota]. University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy. https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/190467/Bradley_umn_0130E_16302.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1

Charles River. (2015). *The Wars of the Roses: The History of the Conflicts that Brought the Tudors to Power in England*. https://www.paperbackswap.com/Wars-Roses-History-Charles-River-Editors/book/1508822956

Dumitraškovic, T. (2014). The Problem of Kingship in Shakespeare's History Plays. *Romanian Journal of English Studies, 11*(1), 1–8. https://sciendo.com/pdf/10.2478/rjes-2014-0010

Fortescue, J. W. (1911). *A history of the British Army*. Macmillan and Co., Ltd. https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.210083

Griffiths R. A., The King's Council and the First Protectorate of the Duke of York, '1453–1454, *The English Historical Review*, Volume xcix, Issue cccxc, January 1984, Pages 67–82, https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/XCIX.CCCXC.67

Grummitt, D. (2010). Introduction. In J. Roe (Ed.), *Shakespeare and the Politics of Power: Machiavelli and the Early Modern Stage* (p. ix). I.B. Tauris. https://books.google.com/books/about/Shakespeare_and_Machiavelli.html?id=qX5jO6Q00b0C

Ismail, A. M. (2017). Shakespeare's Machiavellianism from *Richard III* to *Richard II*. *Journal of Raparin University, 4*(13), 37–48. https://ojournal.raparinuni2024.org/No_13/English/76.pdf

Kingsley-Smith, J. (1999). *Shakespeare's Tragedies and the Crisis of Kingship* [PhD thesis, University of Birmingham]. https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/4461/

Kissel, T., & Schülting, S. (Eds.). (2021). *Shakespeare's Politics*. Shakespeare Gesellschaft. https://shakespeare-gesellschaft.de/wp-content/uploads/SSO2021_Issue-18_Shakespeares-Politics_complete.pdf

Kumar, R. G. (2019). *Richard III – A Machiavellian*. *Literary Druid, 1*(1), 26–30. https://literarydruid.com/data/uploads/pdf/R.%20Ganesh%20Kumar.pdf

Munro, J. (2011). *The Wars of the Roses and the Weak Kingship of Henry VI*. Undergraduate Dissertation, University of Bristol. https://www.bristol.ac.uk/history/media/docs/ug-dissertations/2011munro.pdf

Pugliatti, P. (2010). Shakespeare and the 'Military Revolution'. Academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/52620046/Shakespeare_and_the Military_Revolution

Rahman, M. M. (2016). Political Atmosphere Behind the History Plays of Shakespeare. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319367808

Rustin, M. (2023). Coups D'état and Catastrophic Change: Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. Academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/91847989

Seo, D. H. (2007). *Military Culture of Shakespeare's England* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham]. CORE. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/1631781.pdf

Taunton, N. (2001). *1590s Drama and Militarism*. Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315264134