Charisma:
A study of the forcefulness of the individual in society

by

Kaeleigh Schroeder

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

Acknowledgements

This thesis was the result of a collision of efforts of many people, and events that coincided perfectly. As a result, I would like to thank a number of people. First, thanks to my thesis advisor, Chuck Axelrod, for the free reign you gave me with this topic and the willingness to listen and offer constructive advice. Thanks also to my second, Dan Albas, and my external, David Stymeist, for agreeing to be on my committee. I have enjoyed being taught by both of you during my university career and it meant a great deal to me that you saw me through this process.

Special thanks to Jen Dengate, my editor and comedy relief; without your eye on this thesis, it would have a great deal more commas than it already does. Thanks also to my parents, who were always willing to step in and help me in other areas of my life so I could concentrate on my academic work, and my boyfriend Barney Geddes, who provided diversions when my writer's block could not be budged. Thank you to my other friends and family for providing an ear, a shoulder, or a good laugh when I needed one.

Thank you to the administrative support in the Department of Sociology. Without you, I would have never gotten anything administrative done efficiently. Thanks also to my other professors throughout the years I have been a student at the University of Manitoba; this thesis is the culmination of all the teaching I have received and every course I took made me into the student I graduate as from this program.

Abstract

The concept of charisma, while gaining greater usage in contemporary society, is under-researched and often misused. This thesis discusses the classical theoretical conception of charisma, beginning with Max Weber, and provides three empirical illustrations of charismatic leadership in the fields of religion, politics, and the media.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

This thesis is a discussion on charismatic leadership. One of the forms of legitimate authority as established by Max Weber, charisma as a concept had nearly disappeared from common speech in the twentieth century when it experienced a massive resurgence, becoming nearly commonplace, ironically. This reemergence of an obscure religious concept has gone largely unremarked upon, with academics content to leave a complex and ephemeral idea alone. This research attempts to address that dearth of academic discussion with first, a review of classical conceptions of charisma including Max Weber's benchmark theorizations. To this, I will add contemporary theorists' ideas on charisma that, although a small body of literature, adds valuable details to Weber's initial discussion, by this time fairly outdated.

With these guidelines for recognizing charismatic leadership, I examine three leaders who have been called "charismatic" by the general public, and attempt to demonstrate each leader's fitness for that description. By selecting each leader from a different social institution, I have addressed the potential for charisma to exist in any field, and by adding the media to two more conventional fields, politics and religion, I have attempted to speak to the growing dominance of media in contemporary society. These three leaders are not meant to provide a conclusive picture of charismatic leadership, but merely demonstrate three personalities and leadership styles that have been widely considered charismatic.

Because charisma is a relational concept, that is, it exists between two or more people as a relationship between those people, it is important to consider leaders who have been labeled "charismatic" by the public already. The recognition of charisma is a crucial element of the development of charismatic leadership and the establishment of the charismatic movement.

This thesis researches a concept that is notoriously difficult to define as compared to the other types of authority discussed by Weber. By combining a number of theorists' work on charisma I hope to clarify and refine the definition of the concept, and by applying it to historical figures I hope to provide concrete illustrations of an abstract concept that has experienced a renaissance in recent years without perhaps a proper understanding. I will then provide a discussion of all three leaders together, touching on the concept of charisma as a pure type versus its existence in the concrete world, the role of the audience in charismatic leadership, and the role of the media, an issue of growing importance. Charismatics, always more interesting to the public than traditional or bureaucratic leaders, draw in the curious and those who consider themselves in need of a change. With the media's obsession with "the next big thing" charismatic leaders and media exposure go hand in hand, a development that could never have been foreseen by Weber when he first wrote about charisma over one hundred years ago.

2. Definitions and Conceptual Outlines

2.1 Classical Conceptions

Max Weber is the classical theorist most often connected to charisma, and also the one who spent the most time developing the concept as a type of legitimate authority, alongside his conceptions of traditional and rational legal, or bureaucratic, authority. Weber's writings focus mainly on traditional and rational legal authority due to their stable and conventional nature, but his discussions of charisma have proved valuable to contemporary writers looking for a starting point with this volatile idea.

He lays out a number of definitions of charisma throughout Economy and Society (1978). During his discussion of legitimate authority, he directly delineates three pure types of legitimate domination:

> 1. Rational grounds – resting on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (legal authority).
> 2. Traditional grounds – resting on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them (traditional authority); or finally,
> 3. Charismatic grounds – resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him (charismatic authority).
>
> Weber 1978: 215

This is his first reference to charisma, and in the following section detailing each type, Weber defines charisma as "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities" (1978: 241). This is more comprehensive than his other definition of

charisma in the section on religious groups, which divides charisma into primary and secondary charisma. Primary charisma refers to a gift that is inborn in an individual, while secondary charisma indicates a charismatic gift that is developed from artificial means in an individual who is assumed to have a dormant "germ" of charisma (Weber 1978: 400). This distinction between types of charisma is largely extraneous; whether or not the charisma is inborn or acquired, Weber is adamant in insisting that recognition *on the part of those subject to authority* is the key for the validity of charisma (1978: 242).

Recognition of charisma in a leader is given with the appearance of proof of charisma, a miracle or revelation that assures those subject to authority that the leader is indeed possessed of charismatic authority. Weber again stresses that with the charismatic proof comes recognition and support from the masses; it is the duty of the audience to acknowledge and support the leader as a charismatic. But it is not typical of charismatic leaders to wait complacently for recognition: "No prophet has ever regarded his quality as dependent on the attitudes of the masses toward him" (Weber 1978: 242). Here is seen an inkling of the character of a charismatic leader, which is not Weber's concern, and will be discussed later on.

Because charismatic legitimacy is the duty with which the audience is entrusted, it is important that legitimacy is maintained in their view. Without events such as miracles, the idea that the leader is still supported by his or her god or possessed of his or her powers begins to flag. Most importantly, if the leader's actions fail to benefit his or her followers, they are unlikely to continue

their support of the charismatic image of the leader. With the desertion of the leader, charismatic authority evaporates; there is no legitimate charismatic authority without the recognition by the audience and the continued proof of that authority by the leader.

The beginnings of charismatic leadership stabilization are seen with the formation of what Weber calls the *Gemeinde*, or charismatic community, an "organized group subject to charismatic authority" (1978: 243). Despite the formality of the definition, the community administration is not technically or formally trained, and they are chosen based on charismatic characteristics. There are none of the trademarks of formal staffing; no hiring, firing, or hierarchies, and the leader exercises his or her charismatic ability when the administrative staff falls short. It is important to note that these characteristics are a pure type formulation and may not necessarily be found in practice.

Because of the instability of charismatic leadership and the *Gemeinde*, funding is acquired in two possible ways: voluntarily and involuntarily. Voluntary income for the charismatic community includes gifts in the form of donations, endowments, bribery, and honoraria, as well as begging, while involuntary income, which is more typical, involves "booty" and extortion, by force or otherwise. The pure type of charismatic leadership is directly opposed to economic considerations, and the nature of charisma as a "spiritual duty" means that "it disdains and repudiates economic exploitation of the gifts of grace as a source of income, though…this remains more an ideal than fact" (Weber 1978: 244).

An essential difference between traditional and charismatic leadership, both of which being revolutionary forces, which will become important later on is that traditional leadership effects change in individuals from the outside inwards, starting with life situations and finally altering attitudes. Conversely, charisma may begin with an internal change and work outwards, resulting in a new orientation toward the world (Weber 1978: 245). In a number of places, Weber notes that charismatic following and internal change springs from despair or suffering, hope or enthusiasm (1978: 242; 245), or essentially when an individual is open to a revolutionary experience and a challenge to the traditional and bureaucratic forms of authority that govern him or her.

The routinization of charisma is a topic to which Weber devotes a good deal of writing, despite the conflict inherent in that idea. "Routinization of charisma" implies that charisma itself is routinized when in fact it is what has been established *with* the charismatic leadership that is routinized. Weber acknowledges this when he says that "in its pure form charismatic authority has a character specifically foreign to everyday routine structures" (1978: 246), and he points out that the character of the charismatic relationship is dramatically altered with the onset of permanence, and yet he insists on the use of the concept of the routinization of charisma. This may be because he wanted to emphasize the charismatic roots of the transformed relationship, or because he thought that despite the altered nature, charisma still plays a part in more permanent structures. Despite either of these reasons, it is still important to note that it is not charisma itself that is routinized, but that which exists that

was created by the charismatic leader's authority and the actions of the followers who acted according to their support of the legitimate authority.

That distinction being made, the two primary reasons for the transformation of charismatic leadership are the ideal and material interests of administrative staff, disciples, and party workers, or of followers. The administrative staff, disciples, party workers, and others have a stronger motive for seeing their own positions become stable; followers are looking for the continuation of the community they have helped create and maintain, but the other group of supporters have dedicated their lives to organizational roles for the benefit of the charismatic leader and the furthering of the charismatic agenda. When the leader can no longer lead for whatever reason, the followers are faced with the problem of succession. Weber outlines a number of solutions which lead into other types of authority: searching for a new leader based on specific criteria, pursuing the course of traditionalization; revelations from supernatural origins, such as oracles, where legitimization is based on the technique of selection, a form of legalization; designation of a successor by the administrative staff or by the predecessor him or herself; or the depersonalization of charisma and the transformation of personal charisma into hereditary or office charisma (1978: 247-249). Because charisma is unstable, the length of time that a charismatic community actually exists is fairly short; the leader must also act as close to accordance with the pure type of charismatic leader as possible to perpetuate the community spirit of faith and enthusiasm. As well, the pure type of *Gemeinde* exists as much as possible on gifts and

"booty" as income and these sources of income are likely to be exhausted in a short period of time. Eventually, the movement either shifts toward a transformation or it will disintegrate, for without regular economic structure, administrative staff are unlikely to be able to maintain their primary roles in the movement.

What is consistent throughout Weber's discussion of charisma is that there is a distinction between the pure type of charisma and charisma as it appears in social situations (see p. 1115 or p. 1119). Weber repeatedly draws out differences and makes allowances for charisma when it seems to deviate from the purest type. Pure charisma refers to the concept in its purest form, the farthest away from other types of authority; in practice, charismatic authority tends to be fluid, tinged with traditional or bureaucratic authority in some places, and not always hitting all of the points that Weber highlights as being crucial to the pure type.

Despite the appearance of clarity in Weber's definitions of the concept of charisma, one of the criticisms of his work is that the category of charismatic authority functions more as a catch-all for extraordinary leaders and events than anything else. Indeed, Weber comments that in primitive communities, all non-traditional elements are charismatic ones (1978: 1133), a sweeping statement referring to early man's apparent reliance on the supernatural as the cause of many things. Pointing out that the occurrence of charisma lessens with the rise in dominance of the other two forms of authority, Weber seems to be suggesting that legitimate authorities function like a pie split three ways,

wherein charisma gets what is left over when bureaucratic and traditional authority have taken their share. “As domination congeals into a permanent structure, charisma recedes as a creative force and erupts only in short-lived mass emotions with unpredictable effect, during elections and similar occasions” (Weber 1978: 1146).

When outlining the connections between charisma and religion, Weber brings in most of the same points as he does in the discussion of charismatic authority, drawing a clear connection between charismatic authority and religious groups. He most often discusses charisma’s connections to religious and political authority, although it has expanded beyond these arenas in recent times with the explosion of the use of the concept in connection with almost everything.

2.2 Contemporary Conceptions

Because Weber has written extensively on the concept of charisma, when contemporary writers address the topic they frequently use his work as a basis for their own, whether to critique and contrast or to simply build upon. There is a surplus of writers who have appropriated the concept of charisma, but few are able to add helpful ideas to Weber's original conceptions on top of exemplifying charisma in various situations.

Stephen Turner, countering assertions that charisma is irrational, presents an argument for rational risk assessment in his 1993 piece, "Charisma and Obedience: A Risk Cognition Approach." Before addressing Weber's conceptions, he tidily summarizes the concept of charisma before Weber's treatment:

1. The *charismata* are given to individuals;
2. They are diverse, and include gifts of "deed" and "word;"
3. Gifts of teaching, or "word," have their effects through recognition by believers; and
4. The sole common element of *charismata* is their source, the Holy Spirit. (Turner 1993: 240)

As demonstrated by these points, charisma had strong religious roots from which Weber branched into the political as well, however Turner speculates that Weber used charismatic authority as a residual category for instances that did not fit into the other two categories of traditional and bureaucratic authority, simply because they had a common element of "extraordinariness" (1993: 240). He points out that Weber never truly explained the reasons why someone might become a follower of a charismatic leader; where Weber's idea

was that charismatic authority is held based on the belief that the extraordinary is sacred, Turner posits that charismatic authority is held based on a rational risk assessment on the part of an audience member: "Submission, the acceptance of authority, is by definition not 'rational' … without any *metanoia* or internal change" (1993: 247). As Weber discusses, charisma's revolutionary power touches the attitudes and "insides" of followers (1978: 1116 – 1117), and this *metanoia* is what Turner builds upon for his formulation of the audience member (the state of the individual preceding "follower") and his or her acceptance of charismatic leadership and transformation from audience member to follower.

Turner does not disagree with the two basic premises of charismatic leadership, first that the claims of the leader justify his or her authority, and second that that authority is recognized by audiences (1993: 243). He outlines the cycle of charisma, a perpetual generation of charisma produced by "promises begetting tests and producing benefits [for followers], thus producing more charisma" (1993: 244). In this way, as long as the requirements of each point of the cycle are fulfilled, the charismatic career is uninterrupted. The question is whether the tests passed and benefits conferred are extraordinary; without that qualification, the line between charismatic and other mundane forms of authority is blurred and the charismatic authority collapses into another form. Outside of this simple cycle is the key to Turner's risk assessment theory though: the leader's ability to effect inimitable change in society, which

causes *metanoia* in audience members, making them followers of the charismatic leader.

This risk assessment theory hinges on the idea of internal change based on rational reassessment of risk parameters. An individual, in this instance an "audience member," has certain accepted risk parameters that he or she uses to determine his or her own actions. Should someone (Turner designates this individual the "hero") go beyond these actions in an inimitable way, his or her actions now open up a world of possibilities. But due to their incomparable nature, these possibilities can only be realized through the hero (Turner 1993: 247). Here, the audience member can choose to follow the hero in order to share in the benefits and new possibilities; in this arrangement the audience member submits to the charismatic authority of the hero. The key change, the *metanoia*, produces a follower out of an audience member, an individual who submits to the authority of the charismatic leader and is willing to "do what is needed to share in the benefits of this new world of possibilities" (Turner 1993: 247). The internal change, in this case, is a rational readjustment of risks taken; the original conception of risks that the follower holds is reassessed in light of possibilities created by the hero, the charismatic leader. Another important factor in the choice to submit to the charismatic leader is that the world of possibilities opened up by the charismatic leader is preferable to that of the ordinary life of the audience member. In this world lies the benefits factor of the charismatic cycle that ties followers to expectations of charismatic authority. Turner is still quick to note that submission to charismatic authority is not a

fully rational experience: "The chance, the shock to the person's expectations, may have strong 'emotional' effects. Therefore, it should be no surprise that the lived decision is 'emotional' rather than 'rational'" (1993: 248). The third part of the charismatic cycle, the test, maintains the image of the charismatic leader as indispensable to the follower; once the follower's risk perceptions have been adjusted, they become used to their new possibilities and the extraordinariness of the leader is lessened. The leader needs to continue to prove his or her importance, and this is why tests are a crucial support to charismatic authority and leadership.

Stephen Turner thus contributes a practicable theory from the perspective of the audience member in the charismatic relationship, an oft-neglected angle in the body of charismatic research. With Weber's focus on charisma itself, he fails to address *why*, and the process through which charismatic leaders gain followers. With his emphasis on the duty of followers to recognize charisma, this is a crucial component of charismatic authority. The risk element is an interesting addition, but anticipating that, as Weber states time and again, charismatic authority in its purest forms is completely against tradition and bureaucracy, choosing to follow a charismatic leader will often be a risky undertaking. And as Turner adds, the charismatic leader cannot just succeed; he or she must be *extraordinary* in his or her success (Turner 2003:1).

In his reconsideration of the concept (2003), Stephen Turner addresses a contemporary problem with charisma: its commonality.

> The term has been widely appropriated. 'Charisma' is the name of a line of yachts, the stage name of a female movie star, the name of a German

> modeling agency, a Colorado on-line game developer, an Antiguan web-hosting company, a British record company, a Swiss rock band, a southern California company that designs floats for parades, and an exotic car rental establishment in Yorkshire, among many other uses. (2003: 2)

Herein lies the concern with charisma and the extensive reach of the media. With the capacity to give nearly anyone their 'fifteen minutes of fame,' the audience that was previously drawn to magnetic and powerful personalities may now be drawn to any beautiful person on television, or foolhardy stuntman with a webcam. The difference between fickle media attention from the masses and the submission to genuine charismatic authority lies in the ability of the potential leader to generate extraordinary success in passing tests that relate to his or her claim to legitimacy, and in doing so, create an inner transformation that makes followers out of mere audience members. Turner draws an example from the popular culture of the 1980s with the singer Madonna and her revolutionary adaptation of clothing to reflect her attitudes (Turner 2003: 15 – 16). Despite the tendency of the popular media to throw the term "charisma" around, the clear difference between a passionate young dancer and, say, Madonna, is that potential for *metanoia*, inner change that creates followers out of a crowd with the representation of new and different possibilities.

Turner ends his reconsideration of charisma on rather a grim note with the conclusion that charisma, instead of fading out with the domination of traditional and bureaucratic authority (as Weber predicted [1978: 1146]), has instead been appropriated as a cultural concept and is now ubiquitous (2003: 24). On the contrary, the *word* is everywhere, but the legitimate authority is

every bit as rare as it has always been; more so now that the task of digging through the dross of popular culture's so-called charismatics is an issue.

In his 2003 treatment of the concept of charisma, Turner touches on an idea that Philip Rieff uses as one of his central building blocks: the interdict. Where Turner discusses Franz Steiner's ideas on taboo and interdicts as risk-defining, Rieff brings the interdict in as "that fundamental motivational form of all culture by which men feel what it is they are not to do, the very basis for the conduct of their lives" (Rieff 2007:7), set up against the therapeutic, which is an anti-type of charisma. The therapeutic, one of Rieff's main conceptual developments, offers freedom from interdicts, whereas the charismatic is "innovative resolver of ambivalences by the introduction of new interdicts into our lives" (2007: 5). His heavily religious discussion presents faith as obedience to specific cultural interdicts and guilt as disobedience; the faith/guilt order is the setting for the generation of charisma (2007: 60). Unlike Weber, who sets stability, tradition and bureaucracy, and order in opposition to charisma and disorder, Rieff says that "discipline may be postulated as the extension of personal charisma" (2007: 28), because interdicts are created by a charismatic authority. Faith is equated with obedience, and the faithful are disciples, following the discipline of the charismatic leader. Weber says that discipline is rational, and the "force of discipline … eradicates personal discipline" (1968: 28), while in Rieff's opinion, discipline stemming from the obedience to interdictory commands is an indicator of the effects of charisma on followers. The obvious example is the Christian Ten Commandments, which begin most

often with "shall not," setting limitations on how the followers of Moses, and thus God, were to live their lives.

Rieff also touches on the issue of the charismatic relationship when he says that charismatic leaders have an inner determination prior to and independent of recognition by followers (2007: 126). This initiative is key to charismatic authority, because the charismatic leader chooses his or her people; the people do not choose the leader. Here, Rieff argues that the leader chooses the people; the "initiative" he refers to is that of the leader to spread his or her message to a group of receptive listeners. If the people choose the leader, then he or she is not a charismatic. However, if the people do *not* choose the leader, then he or she is also not a charismatic. The unique situation of the charismatic leader choosing his or her followers, from an inside perspective, indicates that the magnetic personality of the charismatic leader will draw followers regardless of political process. The first two situations imply that politically speaking, the leader candidate has not proven desirable enough to actually be chosen as a leader. From inside the potential relationship, the candidate does not appeal to the people enough to draw them in and create a following; the candidate simply does not have the natural or divine endowment of charisma.

Although Rieff's treatment of the charismatic relationship brings it firmly back to its Judeo-Christian roots and refuses to budge, he contributes some useful definition to what the charismatic leader provides his or her followers; Turner's references to "benefits" are helpful but vague. However, Rieff's conception of charisma is a strange mix of authority types, with Weber's ideas of

charisma being against tradition and bureaucracy falling by the wayside in favour of almost the opposite: the therapeutic, an image of no boundaries or rules, is set against the charismatic, who sets interdictory limits for followers and creates disciples with his or her discipline. Despite being a unique interpretation of charismatic authority, his insistence on a strong religious focus limits the external validity of his ideas, and few of those ideas are compatible with Weber's core theory and Turner's additions and reinterpretations. Still, the concept of the interdictory commands as the task of the charismatic leader fits with Turner's image of the charismatic follower as a rational thinker, a departure from the stereotypical irrational, fervent follower.

In sum, the concept of charisma is indeed complicated, with differing opinions on whether followers are rational or irrational, or what charismatic authority even stands for. For the purposes of this research, charismatic authority is, first of all, defined as Weber initially outlined: "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities" (1978: 241). However, that is not the final word. Charismatic authority may begin with an inner quality, but also must be recognized by audience members of the potential leader's choosing. The audience members must also choose to submit to the charismatic authority, and this causes an internal change, or metanoia, transforming audience members to followers under the charismatic leader. The charismatic leader is not only

responsible for proving his or her charisma with extraordinary success in tests set before him or her, but also responsible for providing benefits for his or her followers. The leader provides benefits for his or her followers, and also a discipline unique to his or her leadership, setting it apart from, and sometimes directly against, traditional and bureaucratic authority.

2.3 Roots of Charisma

While Weber discusses many of charisma's characteristics, and others elaborate on them as well, the emergence of charismatic leadership is often not as thoroughly described. Turner's argument for risk rationalization takes into account the transformation of the audience member into a follower of the charismatic leader, but he does not incorporate the social circumstances under which this transformation may take place. Carl Couch focuses on this aspect of the charismatic relationship in his 1989 book *Social Processes and Relationships*.

While so many other theorists are focused on the charismatic leader, Couch firmly adheres to the charismatic *relationship* and its emergence in society. Although most of his discussion neatly complements Weber's work, there is a distinct difference in their conceptions of charisma: while Weber presents charisma as a form of authority, Couch is adamant that charismatic relationships <u>do not</u> grant the leader authority, and these relationships <u>are not</u> established by extraordinary qualities. The existence of extraordinary qualities, he argues, is a *consequence* of the charismatic relationship, and not the foundation (1989: 204-205). Clearly this differs greatly from Weber's conceptions of charismatic leadership, and while this research will be retaining his original idea of charisma as a form of legitimate authority, it is useful to keep Couch's suggestions in mind. Due to alterations in charismatic relationships as the concept becomes more popular, it may be that Couch's definition will fit modern charismatic relationships more accurately.

Despite opposing ideas about charisma as a form of authority, Couch's work fills the spaces that Weber's discussion left open. The following statement functions effectively as the thesis for his argument: "Charismatic relationships tend to emerge when there is widespread dissatisfaction within a population" (Couch 1989: 205). From here, he lists four main elements that are present when a charismatic relationship emerges: articulating dissatisfaction; new solidarities; new consensualities; and programs of action.

Articulating dissatisfaction is necessary for individuals before they can realize that they have similar concerns. Many individuals have difficulty properly articulating their problems, and then when they do, there are numerous concerns which amount to nothing more than "diffuse grumbling" (Couch 1989: 206). However, when someone is able to articulate *common* dissatisfactions within a group, as well as explain reasons behind them in such a way that others agree, a relationship begins to take shape. Effective leaders are able to transform the <u>private, personal</u> dissatisfactions of the audience into <u>public, shared</u> ones (Couch 1989: 207). It is not enough that common dissatisfactions are established; they set the stage for the next element that Couch discusses: new solidarities.

With the audience now aware that others share their feelings and concerns about society (or parts of society), members begin to act together. They respond in unison to the speaker; the speaker and audience begin to establish a relationship, with the speaker attending to the responses the audience made to his or her speeches, and the audience responding in

nonverbal and verbal ways to the speaker's sentiments. The speaker's task is to act as a catalyst for creating unity out of the diversity of a disorganized crowd (Couch 1989: 209). To facilitate charismatic encounters, speakers have sometimes had their close followers orchestrate meetings, occasionally removing audience members who diverged from the ideas expressed by the speaker. Audience members with differing ideas tend to weaken the solidarity of the audience and allow reflections upon the speaker's arguments, which break down the charismatic relationship (Couch 1989: 211). Not only do audience members build a relationship with the speaker as they share in his or her ideas, but they build a relationship with other members as they watch each other respond to the speaker; audience members often respond in concert to the speaker's sentiments with groans, cheers, or tears. Because of the precarious position of the speaker in relation to an audience, it is important that the speaker correctly interpret these responses. The speaker's goal is to appear identical to the audience members he or she speaks to, while still expressing his or her importance by remaining in a different position (Couch 1989: 212).

Once the speaker has established him or herself as a successful leader, he or she must begin to redefine reality. The activity of articulating dissatisfactions is focused on the past, whereas the institution of the charismatic relationship means that the leader will begin to construct new definitions of reality. Couch cites Adolf Hitler's redefinition of the German defeat in World War I; instead of the fault lying with Germans, Hitler transferred it to the Jews, successfully redefining reality for the large audience with which he had established a

relationship (Couch 1989: 212). This new view of the future often gives followers a new sense of morality, and they now see themselves as opposed to the immoral out-group, those not following their leader. Compounding this solidarity is the fact that the opposition often believes the leader's redefinition of reality is irrational (Couch 1989: 213). Relationships between supporters of the establishment and members of the movement begin to break down due to mistrust because neither side can agree on whose definition of reality is correct. In many cases these conflicts escalate and even break out in civil wars. As in the example with Hitler, history can testify to the scale of these conflicts.

Programs of action, the fourth element Couch discusses, are necessary to advance the redefinition of reality and impact existing social structures. The truly effective leader projects a viable future, but despite this, exactly how members of the movement are to attain this future is not specified. To entice followers, the future is often painted as a utopia, attractive and desirable; without this, Couch maintains that the movement will have few ramifications for the existing social structure (1989: 214).

With these four elements, a charismatic relationship is likely to develop. Like Weber, Couch points out that charisma is unstable and volatile; Couch reasons that the inherent instability "stems from the intense asymmetrical solidarity generated, the imputation of god-like qualities to charismatic leaders, and the fact that the projected utopia is never achieved" (1989: 215). This "I am God" syndrome (1989: 214) means that the charismatic leader has special rules outside of the set prescribed for the majority of members of the movement. He

illustrates this clearly with Reverend Jim Jones, who started out Peoples Temple insisting that he be addressed by name, and by the end of the movement in 1978, would only allow followers to call him Father (1989: 215), among many other rule restrictions pertaining to sex, social relationships, and money. The "I am God" syndrome, mixed with practical problems created in the attempt to establish the projected future, can shift the charismatic relationship to a tyrannical one. This transition may be accompanied by purges in the organization as the leader looks to focus the blame for a lack of utopian social structure on someone other than him or herself.

The charismatic relationship, and its potential tyrannical advancement, is mutually constructed, but still asymmetrical. Despite being created between two or more people, the would-be leader has to balance the paradox of being the same yet distinctly different as the audience to which he or she appeals. Without being different (and superior), the leader would not be worth following; however, without being the same, the leader would not be able to draw the audience members to identify and support him or her. As well, Couch argues that the charismatic relationship is uniquely dyadic; a conventional dyadic relationship is commonly made up of two people, whereas this one is an individual on one side and an audience on the other side (1989: 216).

Also like Weber, Couch says that the charismatic relationship is unstable, a transit point for a relationship on its way to another stage (1989: 216). However, his conception of a pure type of charisma involves the formation of a relationship with one person as the focal point, but in order for the movement

to advance, the focal point becomes a leader, someone capable of issuing orders and expecting them to be carried out. As soon as the relationship matures to the point where the leader directs the collective, the pure nature has been transformed and steps toward implementing the movement's objectives may be taken; Couch comments that a division of labour is necessary to plant crops, build roads, and generate unity (1989: 216).

When the charismatic relationship transitions into the tyrannical relationship, its purity (especially in Weberian terms) is sacrificed by the use of coercion to maintain the relationship. The relationship's asymmetry becomes exaggerated; power is no longer exchanged, but held by the focal point (the leader), and used to subjugate his or her followers (Couch 1989: 218). Pure tyrannical relationships have no moral boundaries, and the tyrant is free to do as he or she will with his or her followers. Couch outlines the circumstances for the emergence of tyranny:

> (1) both parties acknowledge that one party can do violence to the other without the target's being able to reciprocate in kind; (2) the more powerful party indicates a willingness to do violence to the other if compliance is not forthcoming; (3) both parties recognize that the more powerful party has the ability to keep the weaker party under surveillance; and (4) the superordinate programs the future and organizes the behaviour of the subordinate. (Couch 1989: 219)

In this way the transition from charismatic to tyrannical relationship becomes clearer: because one party, the followers united as one in a dyadic arrangement, has already acknowledged the superiority of the other party (the charismatic leader), it is a smooth transition into exercising that power in a tyrannical manner. Turner has already discussed the internal change that takes place when

an audience member becomes a follower (1993: 247). What Couch adds here is that with this internal change, and the alienation of the supporters of the establishment who could provide useful contrast and perspective for the charismatic leader's redefinition of reality, the members of the movement have now firmly entrenched themselves in a relationship with the charismatic leader. By cutting ties to differing social systems, followers are vulnerable, allowing themselves to believe only one definition of reality, which can potentially turn threatening with the emergence of a tyrannical relationship.

Still, Couch points out that tyrannical relationships are mutually constructed: "if the victim refuses to agree that the would-be tyrant has the ability to do violence to him, a tyranny cannot be established" (1989: 219). Even if the victim dies due to the exercise of power by the leader, if the victim has not conceded to the leader there is no establishment of a tyrannical relationship. This is also the emergence of martyrdom. As before, the example of Hiter's Nazi Germany is cited as a transition from charismatic to tyrannical relationship; the welcoming slogan at the concentration camp at Auschwitz, "Arbeit macht frei" ("Work makes you free"), is akin to Couch's example of a tyrant's cliché, "Idle hands are the devil's workshop" (1989: 221).

Tyrannical relationships are important mutual social constructions of which to be mindful when discussing charismatic relationships because of their potential social impact and extent. Successful tyrants may not be content to maintain one small group but may look to spread their influence, wreaking

havoc on the society and culture in which they are located by attempting to force their redefinitions of reality on others who do not share them.

Couch's perspective on from whence charismatic leadership arises in social situations helps to bridge gaps left by Weber's focus on the leader and his or her personality. Because of the nature of this research, the social context of charismatic relationships will be relevant to the subsequent sections of this discussion. The leader's personality is still an integral part of the relationship; the wrong personality will not draw in and inspire audience members to become followers, for instance. The social complications of this, the tyrannical relationship that Couch discusses (1989), are reflected psychologically in the potential for the narcissistic personality disorder.

Narcissus is known for being so in love with his own reflection that he fell into a pool of water and drowned. This sort of self-absorption, among other traits, has been termed the narcissistic personality, and is now included in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) IV, published in 2000 and the current edition of the DSM at the time of this research. The DSM-IV defines the narcissistic personality disorder as "a pervasive pattern of grandiosity (in fantasy or behavior), need for admiration, and lack of empathy" (PsychNet-UK 2005), and includes a list of nine identifiable characteristics, the presence of five or more indicating a potential narcissistic personality. Because of the nature of narcissistic personalities, it is possible to be considered a high-functioning narcissist, someone who retains the characteristics of the disorder but is able to function capably in society. Traits such as believing him or herself

to be special and unique, being interpersonally exploitative, and being envious or believing others are envious of him or herself (PsychNet-UK 2005) can exist to varying degrees in many people without the existence of a narcissistic disorder. Herein lies the difficulty in classifying many charismatic figures as narcissists.

Although narcissism seems like a disorder tailor-made to fit many charismatic leaders, especially the most famous or infamous leaders like Adolf Hitler or Jim Jones, not only do professionals caution against applying labels such as this to anyone without appropriate assessments (PsychNet-UK 2005), but symptoms included in the narcissistic personality disorder classification may also appear in conjunction with other disorders. Because leaders like those mentioned above are the most common to be associated with charisma, often it is taken as a negative quality, as is narcissism. As Masterson points out,

> the term 'narcissism' has recently become so linked with one form of psychopathology that it is often overlooked that a normally developed or healthy narcissism, one definition of which is the libidinal investment of the self, is vital to a healthy adaptation. (1981: 3)

When narcissism becomes problematic, or disordered, is when it becomes the most obvious and has the most impact on functioning skills. With three broad levels of functioning ranging from effective accommodation to borderline disorder (referring to borderline psychosis) and four or more variations on how narcissism is expressed (Masterson 1981: 8), it is with trepidation that any label should be applied, especially as a generalization. This is not to say that some charismatic leaders may not be narcissistic, or have characteristics ascribed to

such behaviour. Simply avoiding narrowing the scope of research by grouping all leaders into one behavioural category is more beneficial for allowing the research to lead, instead of preconceived notions about behaviour.

In both Couch's work and the preceding discussion on narcissism, social and psychological elements of charismatic relationships are taken into account. Because the nature of this research is social, and the focus is on the group at large rather than thought patterns, processes, and inward behaviours, the application of the work on narcissistic personality disorders will be limited; however, it is still important to include it for the possible implications it may have for the leader of the charismatic movement. What this research aims to avoid is the medicalization of charisma, the potential for charisma's import to be lost in a sea of DSM classifications. Thus, no leader here will be deemed narcissistic in this research unless citing another author, simply to stay away from overshadowing the concept with psychological designations. The social context for the emergence of charisma will be revisited in detail with each charismatic leader discussed in the following sections, with a focus on the shifts from charismatic relationships that Couch anticipates (1989: 216) and Weber dwells on (1978).

2.4 Charisma and Popular Culture

As previously discussed in Stephen Turner's consideration of the concept of charisma, popular culture and media exposure have both played large parts in the resurgence of the use of charisma. Unfortunately, and perhaps because the concept is so common in contemporary vocabulary, few scholars have critically examined the use of charisma in the popular media in recent years aside from Stephen Turner (2003).

Turner revisits his discussion of the concept of charisma with a sharper and more analytical eye, and makes clear allowances for the transition from the concept's religious roots to popular culture's use of it for "role models who break new ground" (2003: 6). The gravity of the concept as being bestowed by God gives way to a more entrepreneurial definition, applied to anyone who looks to stand out from a crowd and make a name for him or herself by doing something different. In Turner's words, "charisma seems to collapse into personal style, but in a world in which the old interdicts have lost their power, style itself becomes a matter of experimental success in the face of social danger" (2003: 6). This statement essentially sums up the dilemma of charisma in popular culture and the media. With greater exposure, larger audiences, and more types of media, extraordinary qualities are being discovered at a greater frequency than ever before. Paradoxically, *new* extraordinary qualities tend to overshadow previously discovered ones, so that what was once 'breaking new ground' becomes 'going over old ground.' Once what was socially dangerous has become socially accepted, those pursuing personal style will hunt for what is

new and different. In an ironic twist, bringing old trends back into the public eye carries an element of social danger, and thus the resurgence of trends after being dismissed as no longer stylish perhaps twenty years before.

In academia, charisma as a concept has been thrown open to encompass nearly everything; such examples include the dubious field of urban charisma discussed by Hansen and Verkaaik (2009), sonic charisma (Oosterbaan 2009), and charismatic comets (Olsen and Pasachoff 2009). Hansen and Verkaaik admit that "we use the term 'charisma' liberally here by extending it to larger, and non-human, entities such as cities, sites, objects, and collectivities…Charisma is no longer an inalienable quality of a select few individuals" (2009: 6). Succinctly, the authors dismiss the very heart of charisma, the uniqueness, in favour of applying the concept the same way the adjective 'magnetic' is applied. It appears that the "democratization of the aspiration to charisma" (Olsen and Verkaaik 2009: 7) has now altered the accessibility to charisma from a dusty academic concept to a hot new commodity for which the general public longs. It would seem that others who could not fathom the roots of the idea are embracing what Turner feared: that the conversion of charisma into a popular cultural term would slowly leach away the original meaning of the concept.

Most often when the term 'charisma' is used in contemporary culture, it is not referring to a leader like Adolf Hitler, but to someone who, for example, dances well on the reality contest television show So You Think You Can Dance. Charisma is more likely applied to <u>any</u> extraordinary talent or characteristic instead of one more akin to something supernatural or superhuman. In the

current culture of celebrity and popularity, any particular characteristic that stands above others may be classified as charismatic, whether or not it inspires any of the internal and social changes that a charismatic leader is theorized to do. A contestant dancing a choreographed routine especially well is doubtful to cause the *metanoia* that a potential charismatic leader is purported to incite in audience members.

Turner's example of Madonna as a charismatic icon is a good illustration of the alteration of charismatic expectations; a popular singer initiating risky clothing and attitude changes is in stark contrast to the more antiquated image of a raging demagogue convincing thousands of followers to kill their opposition. However, it is becoming the more expected image in light of the prevalence of media in everyday life. For instance, Facebook, a social networking site; Youtube, a video broadcasting site; and Wikipedia, an online learning commons are all routinely accessed in the course of daily life of many people searching for answers to obscure questions, humourous video clips, or connections to old acquaintances. With the high accessibility of media outlets, and the ease with which an individual may publish his or her potentially extraordinary talent, the estimation of fifteen minutes of fame tends to be a little long given the possibility that so many new 'charismatics' will emerge every few seconds via any possible medium.

On the other hand, strong cultural leaders such as Madonna or Michael Jackson, trailblazers who garnered long-term fan bases, are not as common as it might seem. Despite the circumstances that might give rise to handfuls of

charismatics, audience members tend to still only choose to follow a select few. For example, in the late 1990s female pop singers became en vogue, harnessing the image of the not-so-innocent pubescent woman. Britney Spears, Jessica Simpson, Mandy Moore, and Christina Aguilera emerged at the forefront of this genre, and yet only Britney Spears managed to collect the following and the dramatic risk readjustments that suggest her as a charismatic pop symbol. As noted by the examples of Madonna and Michael Jackson, Britney Spears also endures the paparazzi following and media exposure that imply public interest and admiration, or perhaps scorn, depending on the section of audience. Figures made popular by the media are often continually targeted by the paparazzi, to the icons' detriment.

Despite the appeal of charisma, its new "portable and shareable" (Hansen and Verkaaik 2009: 8) definition seems to lend it a certain 'potluck' quality: now one can bring charisma anywhere, pass it around, and share it with whomever one desires. Although an obscure academic concept finally has the mass cultural appeal of which scholars have dreamt, Turner's critique of the popular culture's enthusiastic acceptance of charisma may ring true: "charisma has become mundane, or everyday, and has lost its special force not because it has become rare but because it has become commonplace" (2003: 24).

3. Considerations for Charismatic Examples

3.1 The Reverend Jim Jones

The following section discusses the Reverend James Warren Jones, better known as Jim Jones. I will not include editorializations and value judgments on Jones's actions as a charismatic leader unless specifically relevant to the discussion at hand; declarations of his 'evil' lend nothing to a sociological discussion. The section on the background of Jim Jones is an attempt to be as succinct as possible, and as a result, many complicated and intricate cause-and-effect events leading up to November 18th, 1978 are summarized or omitted in the interest of maintaining a focus on Jim Jones, himself. Although peripheral events did influence him a great deal, to recount all of them would take more space than allowed. See the cited sources for extended and detailed discussions of the events surrounding Jones and Peoples Temple.

3.1.1 Background

James Warren Jones was, in a number of ways, born into the out-group, a minority in the 1930s American Mid-West.[1] His father, James T. Jones, had sustained mustard gas injuries in World War One and was unable to hold down a regular job. As such, his mother Lynetta Jones, a woman who had once held aspirations of business and advances for women in the workplace, bussed to a factory every day to provide for her family. As a toddler in Lynn, Indiana, Jim wandered unsupervised in his yard next to the railroad tracks and throughout

[1] Jones's early biographical details can be found in *Gone from the Promised Land* (Hall 1987) and *Raven* (Reiterman 1982), among others.

his neighbourhood, where neighbours often looked after him until Lynetta returned home. In a society where wealth and appropriate social roles helped secure status, Jim Jones was at a disadvantage with his ill father, bold and boisterous mother, and his poor economic standing. But this did not hinder his quest for belonging, which initially took the form of "cussing out" his elders outside the pool hall for small change. Their uproarious laughter urged him on and he found a foothold as a speaker early on, if only of profanity. The other side of his character, the pious churchgoer, still searched for a niche.

After attending a number of different churches in the area, Jones settled on one just outside of town, a Pentecostal church that embraced an expressive and vocal style, and welcomed him enthusiastically into their congregation. Early on, Jones was even put in the pulpit to try his hand at speaking. Lynetta was inclined to overlook her son's religious inclinations, which she did not share, but when he began having nightmares, she firmly withdrew him from the church. His religious development did not falter; he began holding his own services for peers, sometimes for long periods of time, in the loft of his garage.

Jones stood out from other children in school in a number of ways, one being that he eschewed sports, preferring to immerse himself in books. This key difference set a trajectory for his teen years that culminated in an early high school graduation in Richmond, where he moved with his mother when she separated from his father. Sixteen year-old Jones, who was working at the hospital in Richmond as an orderly, enrolled at Indiana University and lived in campus housing while diligently courting Marceline Baldwin, a nurse a few

years his senior. Despite concerns on the part of Marceline's parents that Jones was too young and possibly immature, they wed in 1949 (Reiterman 1982: 36) after a short courtship and began a somewhat nomadic existence, moving from place to place while Jones shifted from academic paths to various jobs with seeming restlessness. To the surprise of his in-laws, Marceline announced to her parents one evening that Jim was joining the ministry; he had appeared to push himself farther away from the church, exploring dangerous and highly unpopular Communist beliefs. With the frenetic pace with which Jones pursued all of his interests, he threw himself into the ministry, later saying that he had to 'infiltrate' the church and work from inside religion to spread his own Communist beliefs. He attended any number of Pentecostal services, healings, and conventions to tighten his grasp of the ways in which Pentecostal ministers work, and in due course Jones developed his own knack for inducing faith. The first time he tested his ministerial power was at a convention where an elderly female pastor foresaw that Jones would be a well-traveled prophet whose ministry would begin that very night, whereupon he began calling out names of people and laying on hands in the name of the Lord, causing the crowd to shout and praise Jesus (Reiterman 1982: 45). Jones had found his niche at last, and with this foothold in the Christian faith, his reputation spread as he went to more conventions and held more services, not only calling out names and phone numbers but performing healings as well.

With the expansion of his congregation, Jones bought a small church building in Indianapolis, hired assistant pastors Jack Beam and Archie Ijames,

and began to make a name for himself and his church, the Peoples Temple Christian Church, affiliated with the Disciples of Christ (Hall 1987: 53). He opened his own home and bought a second house to serve as nursing homes, started a free restaurant and social service centre (Hall 1987: 52), and adopted two Korean orphans, Lew Eric and Stephanie. Around this time, Marceline also became pregnant, giving birth to the couple's only 'natural' son, Stephan Gandhi Jones. Jones created a reputation of selfless contribution for the Peoples Temple, always willing to pitch in and help wherever the congregation was needed without pushing their beliefs on others. His most inflammatory goal was the total racial integration of the Temple, which he sought with his customary single-mindedness.

When Jones had initially been offered a position at the Laurel Street Tabernacle, he turned it down due to the all-white church board members' attitudes toward his Black congregation members. He was insistent on racial integration in a time when schools in Indiana were still segregated and Blacks, one-fifth of Indianapolis at the time, lived in only one area, the poorest and most run-down of the city. To prove his commitment to his Black congregation members, not only did he engage a Black assistant pastor, Archie Ijames, but he and Marceline also adopted James Warren Jones, Jr., a Black baby. Later, when their adopted daughter Stephanie was killed in a car accident that also took the lives of four other Temple members (and which Jones allegedly prophesied), Jones made a point of having her buried in the area of the cemetery reserved for Blacks, arguing that "'If that's where you put minority people and Jews…then

that's where we all go'" (Hall 1987: 47). As well, when Jones, exhausted and ill, was admitted to a hospital, the assumption that he was Black because his physician was Black landed Jones in the all-Black ward. When a helpful nurse assured him he would be moved, he instead insisted that the hospital be integrated, which drew yet more press to himself and his cause (Hall 1987: 56).

Despite Jones's outward appearance of activism and self-sacrifice, episodes throughout his life thus far had made some wary of him. One of his few friends from Lynn, Donald Foreman, could count a number of these: Jones had shot at him a number of times, and while working together at the hospital in Richmond, Jones had bullied Don into a number of unpleasant tasks, such as the incineration of a gangrenous leg (Reiterman 1982: 33). Jones's roommate in college had been woken to find Jones poking him with a hatpin through the mattress (Reiterman 1982: 36), and when Marceline's cousin Ronnie Baldwin lived with the Joneses for just over a year, a series of incidents led a frightened Ronnie to refuse to be adopted by the couple (Reiterman 1982: 39-42). Marceline would also complain of feeling lonely, neglected, subordinate, and later that she had no private space, when Jones moved more and more people into their Indianapolis house. The roles Jones had developed as a small child, "an innocent…a playground recluse and a sometimes mischievous high achiever and bookworm…a holy terror...[and] a roguish little natural leader" (Reiterman 1982: 15) were being polished and honed to serve a number of his purposes, and that of his congregation as well. By a number of accounts, Jones rarely slept

and was always thinking about his church, coming up with new ideas to share with his assistants, even in the middle of the night.

The church continued to expand and Jones and his family took an extended stay in Brazil, testing out the area for a possible relocation of the church during Jones's physician-recommended leave of absence (Hall 1987: 59). However, with Jones's presence and attention elsewhere, Peoples Temple began to slowly disintegrate; disagreements drove congregation members and even two of his associates away from the Indianapolis church, and Jones returned in 1964 to scoop up his followers and relocate them to a place where they were less likely to experience the effects of fall-out from nuclear weapons: California (Hall 1987: 62-63). Less decisive followers were left in Indiana, and a solid, if somewhat smaller, congregation sold off property and moved to the Redwood Valley area.

Once settled in California the Temple began to focus on expansion and good works, buying buses and a church building in San Francisco to spread their reputation. Whirlwind bus tours on the weekends had members going from Los Angeles on Saturday, back to San Francisco for Sunday morning, and home to Redwood Valley for Sunday evening, or to conventions in other locations. Jones's integrationist rhetoric was still causing discrimination for his followers among their peers outside of the church, but recruitment trips to San Francisco and other urban centres tapped into a Black population that was neglected by current organized religions. Disenfranchised and lower class Blacks were not the only new members; alienated affluent Whites and Blacks found places in a

church that touted its members as “America’s refuse” (Hall 1987: 71). Members with social connections were transferring their skills to Peoples Temple’s cause; Jones gained a valuable ally in Timothy Stoen, a young lawyer who would handle much of the Temple’s legal affairs in the years to come. Around this time, Jones publicly declared his love for Carolyn Layton, the estranged wife of member Larry Layton (Reiterman 1982: 171). While Carolyn and Jim maintained their relationship until the end of their lives, Jones also remained married to Marceline to keep their family together. As Stephan Jones recounted, “my father claimed that Mom [Marceline] was a very emotional woman, perhaps a mentally ill woman” (Jones 2003) and insinuated that Marceline might have to be institutionalized. He warned their children that she would try to take them away if she left (Reiterman 1982: 124) which upset them and made them unresponsive to Marceline’s attempts to get them to leave the Temple with her. Unwilling to leave her children, Marceline stayed with Jones and continued to manage some Temple business along with other higher-level female members like Carolyn Layton. Jones allegedly took other mistresses, and encouraged members to use sex to share the experience of the church (Reiterman 1982: 119; Hall 1987: 112), setting an example by having sexual relations with numerous female and male members of the Temple to create a different moral atmosphere and break down and re-forge relationship boundaries. He also preached about sex and had his members discuss their sexual experiences in detail (for example, Reiterman 1982: 178).

Not only did Jones's unorthodox sexual relationships influence Peoples Temple doctrine, but his drug use began to take hold at this point as well. Jones's claims of persecution had begun in Indianapolis with mystery assailants putting ground glass in his food and threatening his children. While the origins of some of the incidents seemed suspect, the enduring discrimination from society outside of Peoples Temple lent enough credence to Jones's claims that members were not inclined to question incidents. Feelings of paranoia had Jones seeking out different drugs to function at the high level he was used to maintaining, and drugs such as Quaaludes became staples of his medicinal collection. Claiming he was receiving B_{12} shots, Jones would be injected in front of Temple and family members by Carolyn for years; the effects of these shots were not what a vitamin injection was capable of inducing, and calling them vitamin injections may have deceived other members, but not close family (Jones 2003).

Despite drug use and dubious sexual relationships, Jim Jones still worked hard for Peoples Temple, forging political connections in San Francisco and elsewhere. His congregation continued to grow exponentially and as it did, Jones assigned some of the "burden" of his visions to a select group of members referred to among the general congregation as "Staff." Instead of Jones having to remember things about each member, such as Social Security or telephone numbers, now his assistants would take notes about members, go through their trash, and find pretexts to enter members' houses and glean information for Jones to use later. Also included in this duty was to note the members who went

against Jones's guidelines for living as Peoples Temple members, and singling them out for punishment. This action would lead to some of the more inflammatory accusations against Peoples Temple by the public, including relatives and school-aged members' teachers, of verbal and physical abuse among Temple members. Not only would Jones single out and berate members verbally, but physical punishment, consisting of paddling or "boxing matches," would also be recommended for morally wrong behaviour such as stealing or lying (Hall 1987: 122-123).[2] This public discipline was coupled with "catharsis" sessions where, as one member recounted, members were encouraged to

> "stand and get off his chest everything that was in any way a hindrance to fellowship between himself and another member or between himself and the group, or the leader even…it opened the clogged channels for the flow of love." (Hall 1987: 121)

The unorthodox Temple practices combined with some of Jones's own personal habits created a target for the press, who began digging for information on the new religious sect making such an impact in California. Articles fell on both sides of popular opinion, either supporting or tearing down Peoples Temple for any number of reasons. Press attention, most notably the negative consideration, gave Jones fodder for more persecution theories. However, the eye of the press was not the most crucial element in Jones's changing outlook. Timothy Stoen and his wife Grace, both high-ranking members of the Temple, initiated a deadly series of events with their son John Victor Stoen, born in 1972.

---

[2] Hall notes that the element of loss of control that characterizes private child abuse by parents was absent from Temple practices; children were disciplined in a "highly regulated" manner (1987: 123).

Children were born to Peoples Temple members despite sexual proscriptions that seemed to contradict each other constantly. John Victor Stoen was one of these children. After Tim and Grace were married in the church in 1970, Grace had come to realize she was running far behind in the competition for Tim's attention and affection, losing to Jim Jones and Peoples Temple. Despite her feelings of frustration and humiliation, she became pregnant and gave birth to a son, citing Tim as the father on the birth certificate. Shortly after that, Tim signed an affidavit that became crucial in the coming years, essentially stating that he asked Jim Jones to father a child by his wife, Tim being unable to perform this task (Hall 1987: 127). The document was signed by Tim and witnessed by Marceline Jones, and became the legal basis of Jim Jones's claim that John was indeed his son. John's colouring, similar to Jim's olive tones and black hair, could also have come from his mother; Grace was also dark of hair and eye, with darker skin tones. With the issue of paternity vague and irresolvable, Grace's attempts to claim her son in the years after she left Peoples Temple became difficult and entangled in legal red tape.

Grace Stoen was not the only relative of a Peoples Temple member who was becoming concerned with what was going on behind closed doors. A coalition called Concerned Relatives was formed, and a campaign to investigate Peoples Temple was launched, but United States government officials shuffled around letters written about the Temple until they were filed away and for the most part, forgotten.

By this time, Jim Jones had become extremely sensitive about any media attention and negative press, which consisted of rumours about Temple practices and horrendous stories from defectors, continued to support his notion of persecution, albeit not as strongly as he preached to his attentive congregation. Jones began introducing the idea of "revolutionary suicide," a term coined by former Black Panther Huey Newton (Hall 1987: 136). Newton meant the term to refer to "incessant struggle against oppression no matter the odds" (Reiterman 1982: 375), a no-surrender fight against opposition. Jones instead interpreted the term as "self-destruction in the face of the enemy" (Reiterman 1982: 374), an action with none of the activist spirit of Newton's original conception. The integration of suicide in Jim's sermons led to what would eventually be termed "White Nights": tests of loyalty for members during which they would be led to believe they were dying, one way or another. The first test consisted of the planning commission, Jones's inner circle of members, drinking wine which Jones announced, after it had been drank, was poisoned (Reiterman 1982: 294-295; Chidester 2003: 131). After a few hours, Jones announced that it was just a test, and no one would die. He had successfully introduced his most loyal members to a mechanism that would later prove to be their undoing.

Growing paranoia about persecution from government, Concerned Relatives, and press, coupled with increasing drug dependence and a plan for a destructive end to mark their place in history, began to make Jim Jones eager to find another place for Peoples Temple where they could live in peace, free from

discrimination. Despite some favourable political liaisons and a growing congregation, in 1974 Jones sent an advance team of Temple members to an abandoned commune site outside of Georgetown, Guyana, to create a utopian settlement where members would be given a "fresh start...free to live openly the true socialist principles of the church" (Reiterman 1982: 246). However, the settling process was grueling work for members who were trying to create a recognizable living space from dense South American jungle. By 1977, Jones had resigned from his post with the San Francisco Housing Authority and moved himself and the bulk of the Temple into Jonestown, their expanding community in Guyana, while other Temple members remained in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Georgetown.

Removed from most outside restraints, Jim Jones became more and more irrational, speaking almost day and night over the sound system set up through the community and keeping his followers up for long periods of time. The Communist slant of Jonestown was reflected in elite members' diligent pursuit of Soviet support and later, a potential new settlement site when the Concerned Relatives became more and more insistent that members were being held in Jonestown against their will. Jones's plan to live in the jungle in peace had failed; increasingly persistent legal efforts on the part of the Stoens to retain custody of John Victor Stoen, now in Jonestown, became central to Jones's feelings of oppression. He refused to leave Jonestown on the basis that he would be detained and forced to hand over John Victor, and as he reiterated often, to separate Peoples Temple was to destroy it, and members would die before

allowing one of their number to be taken away (Hall 1987: 218). September 1977 brought an extended White Night: an arrest order issued for Jones for contempt of court after he ignored a summons from the Guyanese Supreme court threw the community into a frenzy. Jones claimed he had been shot at and that Jonestown was surrounded and about to be converged upon by mercenaries hired by the Guyanese army as well as Tim Stoen, who had defected by this time. The entire community was kept on alert by Jones for six[3] days, and prepared at any time to commit their revolutionary suicide and lay down their lives (Reiterman 1982: 360-372). The crisis abated when Marceline Jones relayed the message that Guyanese forces would not invade Jonestown or arrest Jones.

Jim's health was getting worse, and with it, his reliance on drugs. He had been diagnosed with coccidiomycosis,[4] and he also complained of fevers, high blood pressure, and other pains (Reston, Jr. 1981: 281-286). With the death of Lynetta Jones in December 1977 (Hall 1987: 248), White Nights and catharsis sessions became more common, free time dwindled, and long classes about the Soviet Union, current events, and Russian language took up still more time (Reiterman 1982: 390-391; Reston, Jr. 1981: 179). Jonestown as a utopia was for some a terrible lie, although it appears that others still held fast to their belief that Jim Jones was the head of a wonderful community under persecution from the American government and the Concerned Relatives group.

---

[3] Reston Jr.'s account of the September crisis describes the "stand-off" as being seven days long (1981: 168).
[4] This is commonly known as valley fever, a fungal infection in the lungs (Hall 1987: 254).

Congressman Leo Ryan's planned visit to Jonestown triggered panic in the settlement, despite the attempts to convey an attitude of simple observation on the part of Ryan and the press that planned to accompany him. The fact that some of the Concerned Relatives were also coming on the same visit created an association in the minds of Jonestown loyalists that was dangerous (Hall 1987: 260-262); Ryan had unwittingly chosen a side, and it was the wrong one. The visit to the actual community, at first delayed by Temple members on specious grounds, finally took place on November 17th, 1978. Despite the members' careful coaching, the visit seemed to go well, with Ryan lauding Jones for his work and the entire Jonestown project (Hall 1987: 270). However, one of the reporters was slipped a note from a Peoples Temple member that requested help escaping Jonestown and when Jones was confronted with this the next day, as well as the defections of others, he became distraught. Although he allowed them to leave, as the delegation was preparing to drive back to the small airstrip outside of Jonestown a Temple member appeared with a knife and attacked the congressman, but was subdued by Jones's lawyers Charles Garry and Mark Lane. With the defectors, the media, and the political visitors on their way to the airport, the situation at Jonestown began to turn dark. All members were called to the pavilion where Jones was sitting, and preparations began for another White Night, with one important distinction from the other trial runs: this time, when the Fla-Vor-Aid was prepared in a large vat, it now contained potassium cyanide (Hall 1987: 282). As Jones talked to his congregation about laying down their lives and the end that awaited them if they did not, a select group of his

followers had driven out to the airstrip behind the truck containing the visiting party from America. They, along with one false defector, Larry Layton, opened fire at the airstrip, killing four of the Americans, including Congressman Ryan, and one Temple defector (Hall 1987: 279), and injuring others. Jones, urging his followers toward the "potion," declared that after the shootings, " 'there's no way to detach ourself [*sic*] from what's happened today'" (Hall 1987: 282), and that there was no other option except for revolutionary suicide, as he defined it. The ever-present tape recorder gives an audio account of Jonestown's final White Night: followers both arguing with Jones against the suicide and praising him for ending his, and by proxy their suffering, all overtop of haunting organ music and the increasingly upset wails and cries of children being fed the poison-laced drink. Accounts on how many members died at Jonestown vary; on the tape, Temple member Christine Miller argues that 1,200 members should not have to die (Hall 1987: 283), whereas initial reports put the death toll just over 400, theorizing that hundreds had escaped into the jungle (Hall 1987: 292-293). Others estimate the count more accurately at 912 (Hall 1987: 288) or 913, one murder (Annie Moore, Carolyn Layton's sister) and 912 suicides (Reston, Jr. 1981: 16; Reiterman 1982: 571). Other deaths connected to the Temple include Sharon Amos, a Temple operative in Georgetown, her three children, and one man.[5] Regardless, the events of November 18, 1978 brought about the end of Peoples Temple and marked the last act of the Reverend Jim Jones.

[5] Others theorize about deaths of people connected to the Temple that occurred after November 18, 1978 (see Hall 1987: 290-291).

3.1.2 Discussion

The preceding background on Jim Jones and Peoples Temple is designed to provide a brief sketch of the man and his organization with an eye toward applying the previous theoretical frameworks. To this end, I will begin by discussing the parallels in Jones's actions with Max Weber's discussion on charisma.

Initially, Jones was an outsider. He had no family background in religion, and in fact his mother appeared fairly agnostic, although impartial to her son attending religious services. He did not even decide on an affiliation until later in his childhood when he seemed to settle on the Pentecostal denomination of Christianity. Yet he joined the ministry in his late teens despite indications that he was Communist and did not believe in God. Jones illustrates Weber's assertion that charismatic leaders emerge from outside traditional power groups. Not only did he appear to follow the beginnings of the calling to be a prophet, he also began to act like one, claiming that he was blessed with the nine gifts of God, also known as *charismata*. The same night his daughter Stephanie was killed in a car accident with four other Temple members, he prophesied to his congregation that a few of their number would not return (Reiterman 1982: 63-64), and he also foresaw a nuclear explosion that was a sign to move to California, an alleged safe zone (Hall 1987: 63). Clearly there is no way to validate some of his prophecies, and others have been nullified with time, such as the exact date of the nuclear holocaust that came and went in 1967, but

because his followers accepted the validity of his prophecies, external validity is largely beside the point.

The followers that accepted Jones's authority were devoted to him and to his cause, and took care to try to follow his rules, however often they contradicted each other. His followers also believed strongly in his superhuman abilities; his picture was sold across America for healing purposes, as well as pieces of his robe and vials filled with healing oil (Reiterman 1982: 168-169), and due to his exceptional qualities, even these tokens were claimed to confer power on the owner. Jones also performed faith healings, helping afflicted members pass cancerous growths (which looked suspiciously like chicken livers as time passed), learn to walk again, and regain their sight and hearing. Again, the question of authenticity is not the issue; because it is the impact that these faith healings had on followers and not whether they were genuine, it is not necessary to debate their validity, for which there is evidence on both sides of the argument.

The recognition of Jones's charisma was provided time and time again by his congregation upon viewing the success of his healings, and also events such as healing himself after being shot, and being able to eat broken glass with no side effects. Not being harmed by attempts on his person proved to his followers that he had a superhuman quality; not only that, but being able to heal oneself is indeed a miracle. The support he was able to provide for himself from the Bible allowed him to claim endorsement from God, even if he himself later threw down the Bible and denounced the "sky god." As well, this support from the

Bible allowed Jones to validate himself in the eyes of many followers whose upbringings were based in Christianity and whose ideas of religion were thus structured. Without the link to Christianity as a base for Jones's belief system, he may have had a much more difficult time with the acceptance of legitimate authority, especially as a large religious sect.

Jonestown can be considered a representation of *Gemeinde*, the charismatic community. Jones had already stabilized his charismatic leadership considerably by the time he induced his followers to move to Guyana, but Peoples Temple's community in Redwood Valley also served as a template for Jonestown, with communal housing and meals. As well, funding for the church was provided by its members; deeds to property and vehicles and heavy tithes helped provide many things for church members, although Jones managed to hoard most of the money and spend very little on, for instance, food and medical supplies for Jonestown.

The use of Turner's notion of *metanoia* is supported by Hall, who notes that

> by falling in with Jones, the people who joined Peoples Temple in the Indianapolis days joined the prophet's cadre in confronting the compelling dilemmas of capitalist society in the modern era: race, class privilege, and the threat of nuclear annihilation. In essence, they underwent *metanoia*, a radical break with their previous worldviews. (Hall 1987: 62)

Here, exactly as Turner predicts with the charismatic relationship, the followers undergo an inner change, a "radical break" as Hall says above, which allows them to realign their worldview and expectations with those of their leader, Jim

Jones. In this case, issues of race, class, and nuclear threat were the ones that were affected, but in years to come, the issues of sexuality and sexual relationships, as well as conformity to religious dogma would also be confronted. Christians who watched as Jones threw the Bible down and jumped on it, and screamed profanities at the Lord were pushed toward an internal change if they were to stay in Peoples Temple; clearly these actions do not conform to those of a conventional Christian leader.

As Jones challenged more and more of what his followers were accustomed to, in a number of ways, he must have precipitated a number of internal changes within them. For instance, affluent Whites were pressured to sign over their property, were maligned for privileged upbringings, and were even assigned Black romantic partners in the interests of race integration. Men who were unaware of any homosexual tendencies had Jones tell them they had homosexual thoughts, and then insist that he have sex with them. These actions, so radically different from the ideas held by members, challenged their preconceived notions of society almost daily, and yet the majority of members continued to accept and internalize Jones's ideas, still recognizing and submitting to his authority. In the eyes of those who no longer submitted to Jones's authority, Jones's charismatic leadership now carried tinges of well-disguised tyranny. The guns and guards at Jonestown symbolize a shift in Jones's worldview that most members may have accepted as a measure of protection, but for defectors guns and guards were an effective coercive tactic, designed to quell resistance by a display of power. As well, rumours that Jones

had a double that occasionally stood in for him (Hall 1987: 292-293) had members in America concerned that Jones would seek revenge, especially since he had said during other discussions of his plan for revolutionary suicide that he would stay behind to explain the action to the world. Supporting this was the fact that Jones did not, in fact, "drink the Kool-Aid," as the popular expression goes. He was shot in the head in what appeared to be and was ruled as a suicide, although Jones was right-handed and the shot was left-handed (Reston, Jr. 1981: 16).[6]

Despite potential mental confusion caused by lack of sleep and poor diet, it appears that Temple members in Jonestown, as they were instructed to administer the poisoned drink to their children, followed orders without great resistance. The question of whether they were coerced, whether they agreed to the action through a series of radical internal changes, or were simply too tired to fight and argue, is open to debate, although it will not be addressed in this research (see, for instance, Yates 2009). The cursory examination of a few bodies by the medical examiner in Guyana provides proof that at least some of the bodies carried needle marks from behind, which indicates that they did not inject themselves. Still, on the final recording from Jonestown, members applaud Jones for his decision, remark on how glad they are to be leaving the world, and agree with the decision not to leave their children behind. Not all

[6] It may have been that he planned to live through this last White Night, although it is also estimated that he may have died from natural causes as soon as ten days after his death on November 18th, 1978 (Reston, Jr. 1981: 286).

members came forward to comment, potentially showing that members who did comment were not coerced.

Evidence to support *metanoia* in the followers of Jim Jones is extensive, but it amounts to deep-seated changes in loyal followers. Members who defected were no longer a part of the charismatic relationship with Jones, but his refusal to relinquish his hold on them shifted their relationship to a tyrannical one, coercion taking the place of willful submission to Jones's authority. It is because these defectors are outside the bounds of legitimate charismatic authority that they are subject to coercion; to members still inside the Temple, and who supported Jones's authority, coercion was not necessary because they were a part of the charismatic relationship of their own volition.

Couch uses Jones as an example of the trajectory of the charismatic relationship, and the shift from charismatic to tyrannical relationship.[7] Initially, a leader rises from the public, shared dissatisfactions of an inarticulate group; in this case, a series of groups with different reasons for choosing Jones as their leader. Blacks appreciated his integrationist sentiments, while Whites, who were in a position of power and might not have been attracted by the message of integration, still enjoyed his preaching style and Pentecostal approach. The new solidarity created among the entire group finds a number of diverse groups united behind a single man, responding in a collective way to his efforts. By holding up defectors or members who had broken rules as examples, Jones was

[7] This is viewed from *outside* the charismatic relationship. If the follower continues to support the charismatic image of the leader, he or she will not enter into a tyrannical relationship with the leader. Once the charismatic relationship is ended, there is then potential for a tyrant-victim relationship.

also able to unify his congregation against a common figure; his ideas about Peoples Temple persecution also functioned to this end. By finding an enemy that equally threatened the entire group, Jones was able to bring each member closer together and provide a largely unified front.

Although Jim Jones appeared approachable to all, he also remained at least one step above every member, although he took pains to remind them that he was still one of them on occasions where they required a deeper unity. Jones broke sexual taboos and also taboos surrounding food and drink, his family had nicer clothes and a nicer car than other members, and he was almost always on a raised platform and, in Jonestown, a special chair, set apart from the congregation. However, on the final day in Jonestown he reminds his followers that although someone else shot Congressman Leo Ryan, "as far as I'm concerned, I killed him" (Hall 1987: 286). Symbolically aligning himself with the shooter demonstrated to his followers that Jones was willing to go through whatever they had to, possibly more, as he had for years preached about the burdens he carried for them and had often passed out due to errant members' actions. As Couch also points out, the establishment often disagrees with the opposition's definition of reality, which was certainly the case with Peoples Temple and the American government, for instance. Interestingly, the American government *also* disagreed with another oppositional group's definition of reality, that of the Concerned Relatives. Having two oppositional groups rife with contradictory statements that appeared untrustworthy delayed the government's response to any potential threats in Jonestown, and even when

Congressman Ryan did visit the settlement, the level of security was low so as to appease Jones and his followers, but also proving that the government did not view Peoples Temple as a dangerous situation.

The program of action outlined by Jones, the utopia in the Guyanese jungle, absorbed a number of years and did come to fruition; in other words, it was a viable plan, necessary to initiate change. Without Jonestown, it is possible that the momentum of Peoples Temple would have been significantly different. However, further internal changes experienced by a small number of members gave rise to the dissolution of the charismatic relationship among them and the replacement of that relationship with a tyrannical one when it became clear that Jones would not relinquish power over his members.

Members who defaulted on rules in the Temple found out just how quickly corrective action could be taken. It became all too clear that Jones did not even have to initiate punishments; after a while, members would initiate punishments on errant peers and Jones, playing the part of saviour, might step in on behalf of the deviant. The power in his coercion was that Temple doctrine, taught to all, demanded compliance, and with the breakdown of the nuclear family and encouragement to report *any* member who broke rules, no follower would be safe from possible punishment should they deviate. Jones did not have to watch all of his followers constantly because none of them were sure whom they could trust in the Temple without their actions being reported.

Despite the potential for a tyrannical relationship at any point during Peoples Temple history because of the nature of Jim Jones and his teachings, not

all members experienced this relationship. Some members who never had cause to be disciplined did not need to test the limits of their freedom within the charismatic relationship, and even if they did, inner change may have allowed them to view disciplinary action as deserved.

Jones's actions become difficult to classify from a subjective standpoint because although from outside of the relationship it is possible to theorize about the nature of the relationship he had with his followers, in reality, each individual relationship differed and applying a blanket conception does not do justice to the complexity of the group. To some, Jones was Father or Dad, beloved and benevolent, beset on all sides by adversity and bearing up under a burden too heavy for him to carry alone. To others, Jones was a drug addict, a liar, and a devious manipulator who would use any means to achieve a desirable end. To still others, Jones was a cherished leader who had gone astray in recent years but who still held the helm of a movement that carried causes dear to members' hearts. Some members witnessed the tyrannical whims of Jones in his position of power, while others saw their charismatic leader having to punish an errant follower, which, although hard on him, was necessary for the good of the movement. Thus, the differences between the views outside versus inside the charismatic relationship become clearer: from outside the relationship, without experiencing what the actors are feeling, it is possible to say that Jones's relationship with his followers shifted from charismatic to tyrannical, although it appeared to move fluidly between the two depending on events surrounding Jones. From inside each relationship that Jones had with each follower, whether

or not he or she maintained the charismatic image of Jones or saw him as a petty tyrant is debatable; other followers who agreed with his choice overwhelmed the few followers who questioned his decision to commit suicide, which at least provides some insight. For Marceline Jones, for instance, it is possible to suggest that she saw him as a charismatic fallen from glory; she had observed his beginnings as a budding Communist suddenly filled with the Holy Spirit, and witnessed his innumerable infidelities, his manipulation of their children to trap her within the Temple, and his uncontrollable drug use and failing health. Did his actions suggest tyranny from time to time? Certainly. Did Marceline continue to submit to his authority without direct coercion? Yes. She still saw his authority as legitimate, although his hold on her sons and daughter may have played a large part in her decision to go to and remain in Jonestown despite her disillusionment with her leader in the Temple.

It is arguable that no one but each individual can determine whether he or she is in a charismatic relationship, but Jones's transition from charismatic leader to illegitimate tyrant appears particular to each follower he had. Whether he actually remains only a tyrant is dubious, and certainly the considerable death toll at Jonestown proves the strength of his authority. As a whole, Jones's charisma carried himself and Peoples Temple farther than conventionality would have, but on a smaller scale, the breakdown of fundamental relationships such as husband-wife and parent-child relationships by communal living quarters and reassigned romantic partners created an atmosphere where often all each member could rely on was his or her relationship with Jones. Once away

from Jonestown, it required considerable energy on the part of a member to maintain that level of connection to Father; Sharon Amos was just such a member, whereas Stephan Jones, Jim's own son, resisted the authority of his father while at Jonestown and while in Georgetown refused to follow the plan for revolutionary suicide. As a majority though, it is clear that the strength of Jones's charismatic authority knew few bounds, and his followers were obedient to his will even unto death.

3.1.3 Conclusion

As a religious figure, Jim Jones may be compared to any number of prophets in the arc of his career and some key points. His charisma derived from his ability to meet the needs and exceed the expectations of a number of groups, providing a unified voice for a diverse population who found a solution to their unarticulated problems in the same place. He was good looking, young, masculine yet sensitive, a strident supporter of progressive ideals, and extremely articulate, combining a series of speaking styles to express himself. In short, he could be many things to many people simultaneously; as Reiterman (1982: 15) noted, his various roles served him well in assorted situations.

Jones's charismatic leadership drew in a congregation of people searching for answers they believed he would provide. In their establishment of a charismatic relationship with him, they went through various degrees of *metanoia*, inner changes that adjusted their worldviews and standards to better suit their expectations of Jones. He anticipated this change and constantly tried

to surpass their projections, and by doing so, consistently proved his charisma to them. Although it took a number of forms, was supported in different ways, and appeared to shift to tyranny or coercion to members who tried to push the bounds of their relationship with him, Jones's charisma remained in evidence, for some members, to the very ends of their lives.

3.2 Former Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau

Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Canada's 15th Prime Minister (first elected in 1968 and then re-elected in 1980), has left a lasting impact on the country he governed, through his policies but even stronger through his personal style and what has repeatedly been labeled his charisma. As a prime minister, Trudeau stood out from his predecessors and his running mates in the way he dressed, the way he behaved, and the ideas he had; "substance behind the style" describes the intelligence and political maneuvering Trudeau fronted with modern dress trends, high class tastes, and a catalogue of world experience developed firsthand in his travels. In a decade of political, social, and cultural change around the world, Canada was not immune to its own shifts. Trudeau spoke to a generation coming into its own and others looking for the sense of leadership they had been missing.

3.2.1 Background

Born third into a working-class family on its way up, Joseph Philippe Pierre Yves Elliott Trudeau was characterized as a weak and shy boy whose boisterous father, Charles Trudeau, pushed him early on to confront and conquer his own battles.[8] Suiting action to words, Charles Trudeau founded the Auto Owners Association and sold it to Imperial Oil in the 1930s, a time of depression for many Canadians but a time of prosperity for the Trudeaus. Coming into money

[8] Trudeau's early biographical details can be found in his own writing, *Memoirs* (1993), or in *Trudeau and Our Times, Vol. One: A Magnificent Obsession* (Clarkson and McCall 1990).

furthered Charles Trudeau's luxurious lifestyle but did not save him from succumbing to pneumonia when Pierre was just 15 years old. With a secondary private school education from College Jean-de-Brebéuf, Trudeau went first to law school in Montréal, then to Harvard and on to Europe, searching out an education outside of law, which he discovered was not to his liking. His political views leaned far to the left during World War Two, but ranging outside of Quebec served to shift his more radical ideas on socialism and fascism toward a more neutral ground.

Traveling during his educational career gave Trudeau a desire for more, and he journeyed extensively across Europe and Asia during the late 1940s and early 1950s, growing a beard and wearing robes and a turban. While his contemporaries from law school were settling into family life and conventional employment for the most part, Trudeau was being arrested in the Middle East and trekking through the People's Republic of China on foot with little baggage. When he finally returned to Canada, he joined a friend at the Asbestos mine strike and made impassioned speeches to the workers.[9] His political stance still somewhat left, he and a few friends created the *Cité Libre*, a journal publishing their political ideas and musings.

Prior to Trudeau's entrance into the Liberal party, he had scorned many of their current policies and members, yet still disapproved of the Conservatives and the old, stagnant notions that reflected none of the changes that Canadians

[9] This stand would pit Trudeau against Maurice Duplessis, the premier of Québec, and cause him a great deal of difficulty in obtaining jobs he desired, until Duplessis' death.

were experiencing. Despite being somewhat calmer and less turbulent than its neighbour to the south, Canada was still facing numerous issues: Quebec's Quiet Revolution had stirred up separatism and was continuing to create controversy in the east, while the baby boom during and after World War II had given rise to a new generation coming of age. The shift from rural to urban populations also spelled vast changes for new families and ways of life. Canadians now wanted someone in power who would reflect the new progressive changes in their society, and Lester Pearson's retirement from office gave voters a chance to find that leader.

When Pierre Trudeau joined Pearson's Liberals in 1965 with two of his friends, it was to the shock of the readers of *Cité libre* and many others, although he explained that it was a case of the end justifying the means, and assured everyone that his ideals would not budge (Clarkson and McCall 1990: 92-93). Taking a position as the prime minister's parliamentary secretary at his friend Jean Marchand's urging, Trudeau began to make a name for himself in a party he had only reluctantly joined to bring about some of the changes he desired. His reputation for being more laid back and fashionable was publicized when Conservative leader John Diefenbaker criticized Trudeau's choice of clothing at an unexpected vote; Trudeau's sandals and sport coat were in sharp contrast to Diefenbaker's attire, described by Clarkson and McCall as being "like a country lawyer of sober intent on his way to read the lesson at a Baptist church" (1990: 102). Trudeau insisted that the best way to sate Québeckers about their place in Canada and the permanence of French as one of Canada's languages was to

create a patriated constitution and charter of rights. This earned him a press conference where journalists provoked an outburst more characteristic of his father than the refined personality his mother had raised (Clarkson and McCall 1990: 106). Trudeau's temper marked him as unique to many Canadians in a political climate of ambiguity and equivocations, and it would also serve as a reminder of the intensity of his dedication to both his ideals and his position.

With the promotion to the post of Pearson's justice minister and the amendment of the Criminal Code with respect to abortion and homosexuality, Trudeau became famous for the line, "The state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation."[10] Taking a stand and passing legislation on two issues that were becoming prominent in both Canadian and American society turned heads in Trudeau's direction for better or for worse. Coming directly after Pearson's announcement of his resignation, Trudeau's sudden popularity with progressive Canadians pushed his name forward as a candidate for prime minister.

3.2.2 The 1968 party election and prime ministerial campaign

The party leadership campaign trail was somewhat different for Trudeau than the others; his opponents had been carefully crafting their platforms for months before Trudeau declared himself a candidate for party leadership in February 1968, although he had been receiving media attention for months before this. With increased coverage, Trudeau showed a side of himself for which voters

[10] The fact that this was borrowed from an editorial by Martin O'Malley, published earlier in the week (Clarkson and McCall 1990: 107), did nothing to diminish its impact or memorability in the minds of the public.

clamoured: a choreographed "fall" down a flight of stairs, mobs of women reaching out to touch him, and his well-known response to the question, "How much do you want to be prime minister, Mr. Trudeau?" – "Oh, not very much" (Clarkson and McCall 1990: 110-111).

This phenomenon, the status of celebrity accorded a Canadian politician, became known as Trudeaumania. Litt elaborates on a link between the fame of the band The Beatles and Trudeau's popularity with the word "mania": "The very word 'mania' evoked scenes of sexy male stars inspiring fanatical adoration from young women whose groupie antics deviated from social norms" (2008: 40-41). This image of Trudeau as a sexual object, fueled and built up by media attention, was also akin to the way Americans had viewed former President John F. Kennedy, who had been assassinated only years before and whose death resonated with the youth that were now able to vote for a Canadian leader who could be just as contemporary and good-looking. Now, not only did Canadians have a candidate who differed markedly from his opponents and past prime ministers, but they also had a candidate who could project the image that Americans had and Canadians secretly wanted: the country personified in a modern, well-dressed, well-educated man with sexual prowess, good tastes, and political leadership.

Because no leader exists in a vacuum and each, when evaluated so, is considered popular according to the markers of his or her own time, it is important to note that Trudeaumania existed on a foundation of 1960s culture, or counterculture. Canada, being separate from her more boisterous and rushed

neighbour to the south, had experienced the more popularized elements of the 1960s in a diluted way; the psychedelic rock and bohemian clothing existed alongside more traditional trends, and Canada was only able to live, for the most part, vicariously through America's involvement in the Vietnam War, the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and John F. and Robert Kennedy, Woodstock music festival, and the Summer of Love in 1967. While these things shaped America in the 1960s, they still affected Canadians a great deal, and while America seemed progressive, with civil rights activism and the invention of oral contraception, Canadians were concerned about appearing "backwards" and untrendy. With Pierre Trudeau declared as candidate for prime minister, a figure emerged who carried a number of characteristics valued in the 1960s: he was young;[11] he had sex appeal, by being both handsome and a bachelor; he had modern style, as evidenced by his Mercedes, his clothing, and his hair; and he had "substance under the style," a sharp political mind that was passionate about his ideals and not afraid to show it, as demonstrated at a ministers' constitutional conference where he debated with Québec premier Daniel Johnson and successfully carried the day (Clarkson and McCall 1990: 110). In short, Pierre Trudeau symbolized many things that Canadians did not know they wanted until they saw him; once he became a candidate for prime minister, the voting public was sure that he would be just the thing to combat years of

[11] While actually 48 at the time, he was publicized as being 46 [Litt 2008: 40] and his image projected his behaviour as paralleling an age group even younger than his own.

being overshadowed by American zest and zeal (Peacock 1968: 3; Stevens 2000: 18).

The substance Trudeau carried behind the style emerged as his true strength as he swiftly navigated party politics. Before declaring himself a candidate in the party leadership race, he stubbornly refused to show interest in the position, not wanting to compromise his work as Minister of Justice, which involved a number of difficult amendments to outdated legislation (Sullivan 1968: 237-238). With the behind-the-scenes work of a number of efficient and dedicated men, Trudeau began to gain national exposure in the media long before he declared his intent to run, and also due to the efforts of these men, Trudeau's mistakes were transformed into well-timed opportunities for platform speeches (see Sullivan 1968: 252). His calm and pragmatic approach to hot political issues impressed his colleagues and drove his reputation within the political sphere. To outsiders, his style fuelled Trudeau's appeal, but those who dealt with Trudeau politically got a taste of where his power really lay.

His rise to leadership inside the party was marked in the general public by a swelling of Trudeaumania; after Trudeau dissolved the cabinet and declared an election in 1968, he put to the test his political prowess and ability to speak with authority on difficult political issues facing Canadians. His opponents included Robert Stanfield, whom the Conservatives had elected to replace John Diefenbaker in September 1967 and Tommy Douglas, formerly of the dissolved Co-operative Commonwealth Federation party, of the New Democratic Party. Both of these candidates represented what Canada was

already familiar with: a straight-shooting image of a self-possessed leader. Stanfield was also known as "Honest Bob" (CBC Digital Archives 2009a) and Douglas was known for his wit and unaffected oratory style (CBC Digital Archives 2009b), both in contrast to Trudeau, who was reputed to be a "swinging bachelor" with expensive tastes. He displayed a racier, more independent image than either of his Anglophone opponents, who came off looking stolid and boring in contrast: "In an article entitled 'Okay, he's no swinger, but . . .' Maclean's proclaimed that its correspondent peered 'beneath the austere, Calvinist, patrician image of Robert Stanfield and [found] an austere, Calvinist patrician" (Litt 2008: 42).

Despite his image potentially doing more for him than his platform, Trudeau's political ideas contributed both to his image and to his success in the leadership race. He stayed strongly federalist on what was becoming known as 'the Québec issue,' advocating integration of French language and culture into Canada as a whole and arguing against a separatist agenda (Clarkson and McCall 1990: 110; Litt 2008: 38). As well, his work on the amendment of the Criminal Code with regard to abortion and homosexuality reflected not only his projected ability to tackle sticky political issues and push them through to conclusion, but also his progressive views on topics again relating to sex, and the liberation thereof. Both of these ideals had been publicized while he was still minister of justice, and his prime ministerial platform brought in the concept of "participatory democracy":

> 'Basically, what we try to do in government is to sit down with the people and discuss the facts of the situation . . . Politics . . . It's a way of working

> together; it's a way of looking for solutions together.' (Peacock, as cited in Lit 2008: 47)

Trudeau's description of this idea sounded beneficial to all but posed a problem to the electorate based on the sheer size of the country, not to mention its diversity with respect to almost everything. But participatory democracy represented the possibility of a sense of unity in a country that, from east to west, changed dramatically and thus was largely too dissimilar to agree on almost anything.[12]

Still, despite Trudeau's personal style and his political ideals, Trudeaumania was centred on the publicity he garnered and without the media, the craze that accompanied his elections in the 1960s might never have existed. Unlike his fellow politicians, Trudeau was more photogenic; Clarkson and McCall assert that "television cameramen photographed him as though he were a male Garbo" (1990: 111), again invoking a celebrity image, in this instance film star Greta Garbo. Even before Trudeau officially declared himself a candidate, the news media were pointing the public's gaze toward him (Litt 2008: 35-36). Not only that, but the incredible popularity of television meant that political maneuverings in Ottawa were now also happening in Canadians' homes, and the better a candidate could project himself on television, the bigger a boost to his image in the eyes of the voters. Trudeau began appearing on television even before he was a candidate, and his televised debate with Premier Johnson about

[12] After Trudeau's reign in office had ended, this would be evidenced by the failure of first the Meech Lake, and then the Charlottetown Accords, both of which appeared to drive the country further apart, and the failures of which are attributed to his intervention (Marsh 2010).

Québec's status in Canada was an example of his federalist ideals that the everyday citizen could now observe. Trudeau and his campaign became a series of phrases and images that voters could mentally access with ease, whereas his rivals, while known on some issues and in some areas, had none of the widespread attention that Trudeau was receiving. To the phrase "The state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation" he added "Just Society," "participatory democracy," and "Oh, not very much" (the last in reference to his desire to be prime minister). Images of Trudeau in his Mercedes, running from excited fans, printed on T-shirts and placards, somersaulting down a flight of stairs, and holding his ground in front of protesters who were throwing bottles and stones even as his contemporaries fled, created a stockpile of visual references to his character: modern, desirable, popular, and determined. The media bookmarked events and arranged them in such a way that the character of Trudeau was projected as offering something for every voter who empathized with any of his publicized characteristics. They shared his refined and contemporary side, and they also shared his rougher, more temperamental side, each a reflection of his parents (Clarkson and McCall 1990: 106), and both appealing to different sections of the public.

Marshall McLuhan famously said about Trudeau that "'the medium [can't] take a real face. It has to have a mask'" (Saywell, cited in Clarkson and McCall 100: 112). Hunt argues that this identification of Trudeau's television-ready political career can be evaluated in terms of a 'branding' of Trudeau, and the initial phase of the branding, "[making] a name synonymous with a certain

lifestyle or, to be more precise, a cluster of lifestyle preferences" (2002/2003: 87-88). As Trudeau became known for his devil-may-care attitude and his stance on national unity, his challengers simultaneously became identified with a character opposite of his, a bland, staid, rural image trumped by Trudeau's colourful, dashing, urban look. In between political footage, the media also covered his vacations and outings; Canadians received clips featuring Trudeau diving, skiing, and canoeing, giving further credence to his well-rounded personality and his physical prowess and fitness. It also afforded swooning ladies a view of their prime minister in his bathing suit, again emphasizing his virility and contradicting his rivals' images, leading Tommy Douglas to say later that "an election is not a beauty contest. An election is not a parlour game" (CBC Digital Archives 2009c). Trudeau himself said of Trudeaumania that the emotive aspect of the craze might have obscured his political ideas, and felt that "there were expectations being created that I wouldn't be able to fulfill" (CBC Digital Archives 2009d), which certainly may have arisen from the way that the media built up his image in light of, and contributing to, the public's adoration of him. The reciprocal relationship between the media and viewers or readers was such that the media publicized Trudeau's exploits, the public digested them and demanded more, and the media continued to provide, a classic relationship of supply and demand. However, Trudeau's comment points to an interesting contrast in publicity versus reality.

Despite the widespread media popularity of Trudeau and the hype of Trudeaumania, Litt argues that "the term Trudeaumania spiced up coverage,

creating the impression that [the media] were on to something more than a successful political campaign by a popular politician. It was misleading, however, insofar as it suggested a widespread social contagion" (2008: 45). Although his Liberals won a majority government, the balance to Trudeaumania, appropriately dubbed Trudeauphobia, drove more than fifty percent of Canadian voters to choose another party in 1968 (Litt 2008: 45). Newton's law of motion, to every action there must be an equal and opposite reaction, appeared as true of Trudeau's campaign as anything else; the strength with which the media touted their favourite candidate pushed away voters to which Trudeau did not appeal, and created a strong dislike of his image, his ideas, and his character.

Robert Stanfield and Tommy Douglas, Trudeau's Anglophone opponents in the 1968 election, spent long hours laying groundwork for their respective platforms, and speaking to crowds of potential supporters. With the introduction of Pierre Trudeau, a man whose media image differed radically from theirs, Stanfield and Douglas saw their political contributions minimized in a flood of media attention directed to fuel Trudeaumania, a term coined to explain the celebrity-like status awarded the Liberal candidate who, in a few short weeks, had taken the prime ministerial office. Trudeaumania symbolized the energy and excitement with which the media and the participating public grabbed onto a candidate they saw as representing the changes the world, and more specifically North America, was undergoing at the time. Trudeau was projected as someone who made progressive political choices, dragging Canada

forward out of the 1800s, a move Canadians especially appreciated with the celebration of their centennial in 1967. Whether or not Trudeau was all of the things he was projected as being in the media became moot; the image of a sexy young man taking charge of Parliament and moving Canada forward became the look of his 1968 candidacy, a look supported by footage of mobs of enthusiastic females swarming around him.

In the end, Trudeau's charisma as proclaimed by the media became a focus for the 1968 election, which had Canadians ill-prepared for his government and supported Trudeau's suspicion that supporters may not have been listening to anything he said.

3.2.3 Other Considerations

After coming to office, Trudeau's charisma was overshadowed by his bureaucratic leadership. Litt includes a "plot line" graph of Trudeaumania (2008: 49), which marks the "afterglow" as coming in just one month after he was elected and "regrets" establishing themselves around October 1968, right before he added yet another line to his repertoire, this one a considerably less favourable contribution to his character: "Why should I sell the Canadian farmers' wheat?" The comment, which was allegedly a rhetorical question that he went on to answer (Wilson-Smith 1996), has gone on to plague his career and provide evidence of his political arrogance for those who already disliked him. Litt's trajectory ends before the October 1970 enactment of the War Measures Act during what is historically known as the October Crisis, which

dramatically altered the view of Trudeau in the eyes of many. The Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ)'s kidnapping of Pierre Laporte and James Cross caused Trudeau to put into action the War Measures Act, which overrides rights and freedoms of Canadian citizens. Images of tanks in the streets and rumours of police brutality provided a background for another famous line added to Trudeau's repertoire from an interview by CBC reporter Time Ralfe: "Just watch me" (for example, Zolf 1998: 57). This line, also isolated from the interview in which it was featured, became symbolic to those who disliked Trudeau as a measure of his willingness to trample the rights of ordinary citizens to get what he wanted.[13] Trudeau still exhibited the charisma that hearkened back to the Trudeaumania days: his pirouette behind Queen Elizabeth the Second; his marriage to Margaret Sinclair, a woman twenty-two years his junior; the birth of sons on Christmas Day 1971 and 1973; and the ever-present rose in his lapel, projecting the debonair image of a confident man in charge. Largely though, Trudeau's charismatic rise to office was blended with an increasingly less favoured bureaucratic image that saw him lose to Joe Clark's Conservatives in 1979 as his estranged wife danced at Studio 54. He came back as prime minister in 1980 and finally pushed through the Constitution and Charter of Rights he had been advocating, but resigned in 1984, surfacing only to offer opinions from time to time.

---

[13] The rest of the interview features Trudeau restating his will to flush out FLQ dissenters and find Laporte and Cross; Cross's release was later negotiated, but Laporte was found dead in the trunk of a car, having been strangled after an escape attempt left him injured (Clarkson and McCall 1990: 122-123; Smith 2010).

His charisma was given an unexpected public reprisal in 2000 when Trudeau passed away at the age of eighty. The period of national mourning was uniquely divided: it "idealized Canadian *emotional* unity in remembering Trudeau, while simultaneously acknowledging the *political* dissent and division that he inspired" (West 2008: 792). Although Canadians were not all supporters of Trudeau, they were united in remembering his impact on the country, as well as the certain nostalgia that accompanied those memories. The media attention he received in death provided almost a renaissance of his Trudeaumania charisma; indeed, West titles her article analyzing the media coverage of his death and funeral "Trudeaumania II" (2008). With Trudeau now committed to Canada's history, his imprint on every part of Canadian politics until his death can be observed, and his 1968 election marks Canada's only experimentation with a politician who rose charismatically to triumph as this country's leader.

3.2.4 Discussion

Although Trudeau is known as a charismatic leader, his charisma carried him into a place of bureaucratic authority where his charisma was second to his political power. As Weber and others have been quick to point out, charismatic authority is transitory and unstable, and the routinization of that which has been created by charismatic authority is necessary for the existence of that leadership. Trudeau's qualities, while not particularly hard to find among the Canadian population, were unique to electoral candidates in the 1968 prime ministerial election and drew crowds because of that distinction. It would not be

hard to find a young and sexually confident young man with Liberal inclinations and good taste in clothing and cars in Canada; however, finding someone who fit this description among politicians capable of running for prime minister may have been more difficult. These qualities were coupled with his attained bureaucratic authority to produce a leader who carried in his own charisma, and not merely that of the office.[14]

As well, Trudeau initially came from the outside; he was well-to-do and he was politically inclined, but in this case, he was a political convert and an outspoken one at that. In 1962 his comment "'I am concerned…with the anti-democratic reflexes of the spineless Liberal herd'" (Lewis et al. 1998) summed up the scorn he felt for the Liberals, and he was also known for making negative comments about many of his later colleagues. The distance he cultivated with many of his peers compounded his outsider status when he first joined the Liberal party; Trudeau was known for being independent, although he still had many acquaintances and social connections. The very things that created his charismatic image also cultivated his outsider position: he acted younger than most of his colleagues, he dressed more modern, and he was unmarried but still a favourite with numerous females, a contrast from his more conservative family-man opponents, at the very least. These personal qualities ended up being the only outsider qualities he maintained, as his election to Liberal party

[14] Charisma of office refers to the extraordinary qualities conferred on one who inhabits a particular office, outside of his or her own personal qualities. An example of this could be Stephen Harper, who currently occupies the prime ministerial office but cannot be said to have any personal charisma.

leader in 1968 shifted him from outsider to the ultimate insider: the prime minister of the country.

In terms of Weber's emphasis that "no prophet has ever regarded his quality as dependent on the attitudes of the masses toward him" (Weber 1978: 242), Trudeau is unique, inasmuch as his followers ascribed the term 'charismatic' to him and while he did not attempt to dissuade them, he also did not use the term in regards to himself. In his memoirs, he modestly downplayed the impact that Trudeaumania may have had, saying that he "had to believe, too, that the phenomenon was part of the spirit of the times…the mood of the country was still one of festivity and I happened to be there to profit from it" (Trudeau 1993: 100-102). Trudeau may not have tried to rely on the charismatic reputation created by the media, but he did not appear to alter his character to change or enhance his charisma. He consistently both endeared and repelled the electorate with his bold and stubborn political style, appearing arrogant at times and confident at others, a style he had cultivated as a young boy and carried all his life.

Clearly, Trudeau did not retain the same image of carefree charismatic that the public thought they had elected, despite still retaining his personal charisma. This could be in part because, as Trudeau reasoned, the electorate was buoyed by the changing mood of Canada and imparted qualities on him that he did not possess. Those who interacted with him on a personal level knew a different Trudeau than the one projected for all other Canadians, were more likely to treat him at as an acquaintance (either business or social) rather than a

celebrity figure, and were able to interact with him alone, away from the media circus that surrounded his rise to prime minister in 1968. This conflict between the image of Trudeau projected in Trudeaumania and his genuine personal charisma may potentially be an offshoot of media interference in the charismatic image; the media projected an image of Trudeau akin to that of a pop star, but it takes a deft politician to run a country, and those not familiar with his political style may have been left at a loss when Trudeaumania faded.

Much of Weber's other work on charismatic authority becomes extraneous with reference to Trudeau simply because, although he did somewhat rely on the favour of the Canadian people to obtain office and remain there for sixteen years, when the tide of feeling changed toward him during his term, Canadians were still governed by the same prime minister; the *Gemeinde* was largely non-existent, and the routinization of charismatic systems irrelevant because Trudeau was a prime minister, which already had all the trappings of bureaucracy in place and was surrounded by a large community, not of charismatically affected followers but of members of parliament and other politically minded employees.

Turner's discussion of risk evaluation has more relevance to Trudeau's style of charisma. Potential voters who were positively inclined to his campaign were likely to undergo an internal change, affected by the differences between him and his contemporaries. Although Trudeau rarely had any charismatic tests per se, his stockpile of catchy phrases and archive of photo and television footage was large and easily passed the test of being contemporarily valuable, a

selling point among more fair-weather voters. Ironically, his views on the role of women in the home were remarkably *not* contemporary, Trudeau wishing for a wife to provide companionship in lonely evenings at home, and raise a family.[15] Despite the potential conflicts these views might have caused with second-wave feminists, during Trudeaumania many women may have found their involvement in politics encouraged by media shots of Pierre, looking trim, young, and handsome next to balding and out of shape contemporaries.

The real crux of the existence of Trudeau's charisma, under Turner's theory, is whether Trudeau passed tests exceptionally well, and whether he conferred extraordinary benefits on his followers. In this case, it may be argued that the benefits were a condition of his election, and in some cases, extrapolated from his charismatic image. Voters may have imagined 'the way things would be' when Trudeau took power, which might have differed markedly from the reality of his government. Trudeau passed tests such as political debates with relative ease, but in the eye of the eager public, the real tests were "'The Image,' 'Sex Appeal,'
'Youth Appeal,' 'The Face,' and 'The Clothes'" (Litt 2008: 35), and Trudeau passed those with flying colours, unlike his peers. Because of the way his prowess in these areas impressed the electorate, it may be asserted that assumptions based on how a person with similar traits would act were attributed to Trudeau and thus his government of Canada should he come to

[15] However these views were eclipsed by not only his "swinging bachelor" status but also later by his choice of wife, a woman who did provide a family for Trudeau but who was young, fashionable, beautiful, and well-known for her unorthodox behaviour as the wife of the prime minister.

power. The extraordinary benefits potentially available to followers, in this case Canadians, ranged from projecting an image internationally that would parallel America's when John F. Kennedy was in power, and thus, draw in residual charisma, to a vast political overhaul that would see out the stagnant regimes of the past and help Canada adjust to a rapidly changing world and society. Almost all politicians preach change about some issue, and Trudeau was certainly no different, although his charismatic image may have contributed more change to his platform than his speeches. His words spoke about policies and ideals, but his style spoke to a younger and more liberal generation that was looking for someone like it to sit in office.

With this case of charisma, it becomes clear that the charismatic relationship is a delicate thing to behold, and Couch's formulation of the charismatic relationship as a dyadic relationship may require adjustment when applied to Trudeaumania; in political charismatic relationships, the shape is often triadic, with the third point being made up of, in this case, the Trudeauphobes, those who were strongly opposed to Trudeau's campaign and did not vote for him. Although they may not directly contribute to the development of the charismatic relationship, in the case of the 1968 election, the Trudeauphobes were a group created out of Trudeaumania as a balance, and their actions did fuel certain aspects of the craze. For instance, during a speech, obnoxious and disruptive protestors almost caused a violent reaction among Trudeau's supporters, but words from Trudeau about preventing violence

caused the dissenters to quiet down, the speech to continue, and Trudeau's reputation to be bolstered in the eyes of his fans (Trudeau 1993: 103).

Couch's four-point theory of charismatic establishment is met in Trudeau, if in a somewhat more mundane fashion than more eccentric charismatics such as the Reverend Jim Jones. Trudeau became a popular candidate for prime minister by articulating the dissatisfactions of a large and restless generation, although turning private, personal issues to public, shared ones became the real test of Trudeau's leadership due to the vastness of Canada and the diversity of its peoples. However, the "mania" caused by Trudeau seemed to override differences in his supporters, at least during the period of his charismatic election. Trying to weed out dissenters in the crowds to which Trudeau spoke was next to impossible, but comparably speaking, Trudeau's supporters were an overwhelming presence at his rallies and speeches on the campaign trail. Trudeau's platform, his new solidarity, was the Just Society and Québec's acceptance into the Anglophone-dominated country, and his actions as Minister of Justice helped set the tone for the types of issues he would address, and the way he would address them. During the 1968 prime ministerial election, the in-group, Trudeaumaniacs, and out-group, Trudeauphobes and non-supporters of Trudeau, defined reality in different terms, and certainly were prone to hostilities; Trudeau referred to Québec-based nationalism as "The Wigwam Complex" (Hunt 2003: 97), and those who disliked him called him everything from homosexual (referring to his work in decriminalizing homosexuality) to a Communist, a heavy insult for Conservative Canadians,

coming at a time when the Cuban missile crisis was fresh in the public's minds and the Cold War had been dragging on for almost two decades. But mudslinging is common in political campaigns and politics in general, and the definitions of reality that emerge from candidates are rarely as revolutionary as Couch's cited example of Hitler. As well, the program of action may frequently be included in the projected new reality as part of the platform. Trudeau spoke passionately of a Constitution for years, but it took his coming out of retirement to take office again in 1980 for that projected future to come to pass.

Still, it is easy to pick out elements of a charismatic relationship in Trudeau's candidacy. He drew large crowds when he spoke publicly, where the crowd would voice support for his proposals; instead of Trudeau having to read the crowd in a complex way and respond accordingly, his listeners would attend with expectations in mind and encourage the ideas they heard and liked, reconfirming the appropriateness of the speech's subject matter. Trudeau and his crowd fed off of each other, and his confidence, which bordered on and at times appeared as arrogance, eloquent speech, and swift turns of phrase gave him an edge over his competitors. His physical appearance drew in and attracted viewers and his style of presentation held them in place, even if his platform may not have appealed to them.

Interestingly, although Couch anticipates that charismatic leaders naturally enough may cross into the realm of tyranny, the "I am God" complex did not appear to emerge with Trudeau, perhaps because he had been confident in the public eye his entire life and arrogance was an offshoot of this, but also

because of the checks in an established office such as prime minister. Trudeau, while bold and at times sarcastic and critical, was prevented from going beyond the reach of his office, not only by his personal advisors but specifically during the campaign, by himself. If he were serious about the race, which he was, presenting a God complex to voters would have been a sure way to fail. Citizens want a strong leader, but a delusional leader presents difficulties that many find problematic, to say the least.

Likewise, calling Trudeau narcissistic is largely useless. Frequently labels such as this function to ostracize the labeled, and his opponents may have called him narcissistic to make him appear disordered, but there is no overwhelming evidence of the accuracy of such an attribute. Many political leaders are confident or arrogant, and many in the public eye often lament their lack of privacy and seek independence out of the spotlight. To classify Trudeau as potentially narcissistic exaggerates characteristics that, while common in many, appeared highlighted in the media as prevalent. For instance, the "Just watch me" comment implies a steely resolution to see events solved in the manner in which Trudeau determined, and this single-mindedness to his solution, repeated innumerable times in the media, turned an ordinary characteristic into a hyperbole. In essence, the application of a term such as "narcissistic" depends on one's view of the individual, in the absence of a qualified expert's evaluation; if one is not favourably inclined towards Trudeau's policies and ideas, one might call him narcissistic in his manipulation of his image and personal life. However, if one is a supporter of Trudeau, one will be more inclined to attribute, for

instance, the eternal presence of the rose in his lapel, to a mere self-confidence and whimsy toward life than to disordered behaviour. As with 'charisma,' the term 'narcissistic' has the potential to be misapplied.

Although Trudeau's rise to power in 1968 marks, for many, an instance of charismatic leadership, when examined under the lens of theory it can be seen that his political career at this point meets charismatic leadership guidelines but to a much more mundane degree than, say, the Reverend Jim Jones, or Adolf Hitler. While Trudeau did come from outside his party when first assuming power and maintain outsider behaviours, he was still politically inclined. As well, his charismatic leadership as projected by the media lasted a very short time before being overshadowed by the everyday machinations of political office; being under the public eye with an elevated level because of his charismatic status allowed the media to leap at the chance to deflate the reputation they had created. They were inclined toward any action that would either destroy or confirm his charismatic relationship with the public, and published material to support either his rise or fall. This highlights the role the media began to play in the establishment of the charismatic relationship. However, his personal charisma remained and allowed him to cement his reputation as one of Canada's most remembered, respected, and pivotal prime ministers.

Another element that may have played into Trudeau's charismatic image in the media was residual charisma from America's beloved president John F.

Kennedy; his assassination in 1963 rocked both America and Canada and left an empty space in the American society that was not filled by the swearing in of Lyndon Johnson. Because Kennedy's charisma was still in positive existence at the time of his death, he did not experience the cresting and falling of charisma and positive public attitude to the extent that living leaders have, and so is often remembered fondly and still as a charismatic leader. The parallels drawn by many Canadians with the rise of Trudeau granted him a reflection of Kennedy's glory and reputation, even though Trudeau made no effort to seek out an image akin to Kennedy's. Often called Canada's Kennedy (Litt 2008: 43), in the media, Trudeau evoked images of the same style and celebrity as the deceased American president, with the added elevation of appearing as progressive and fashionable as an American while still being Canadian. Canadians itching to appear as "with the times" as Americans, while still drawing distinctions between themselves and their trigger-happy southern neighbours, were eager to celebrate Trudeau as a personification of that paradox.

Trudeau is a unique illustration of charismatic leadership in that he has a double image of charisma: one image, the wave of Trudeaumania that ebbed after his prime ministerial election in late 1968, was fuelled by media coverage and attracted the general public who were not drawn in by his second image, that of a powerful political figure, a commanding speaker with strong ideas. Because of this duality, it appears as though his charisma peters out in Litt's examination of Trudeaumania (2008), but this is a result of the fickleness of the media, the fading of the exuberance from Canada's centennial the year before,

and possibly the normal aftermath of an election, when the public finally gets to see their elected leader in action. Trudeau's personal charisma was born out throughout his leadership in the way that he governed, both in his successes and failures, long after the mobs of screaming girls had gone home.

3.3 Oprah Winfrey

From humble beginnings, through a tumultuous childhood and adolescence, to the lofty pinnacle of "Her Highness" (Ulrich, 2006), a media mogul who commands an incredible amount of resources across a massive audience not only in America but worldwide, Oprah Winfrey has come a long way over the span of her fifty-six years. More than just her uphill struggle to her current place as television's most popular talk-show host, Winfrey, known everywhere by her first name as both person and brand, has built an empire, expanding her influence through her "book club, Web site, magazine, radio channel, personal growth tours, YouTube channel, Facebook page, and forthcoming cable TV network" (Peck 2010: 8). She has not been on this journey alone; for every step, Winfrey has been under the scrutiny of other media in a number of ways for any reason they could find. Her struggles with weight have been centre stage, accompanied by her race, her gender, her financial dealings, her philanthropy, her sexual partners, and any and all of the rumours of her past that any reporter could dig up. The more popular Winfrey gets, the more criticism she receives for every action she takes in any sphere of life; recently she has been under fire for opening a girls' school in South Africa, and in the 1990s an offhand comment about the Texas beef industry during a mad cow disease outbreak had beef moguls suing Winfrey for defamation after their futures plummeted (Wilf and Illouz 2008: 73).

Researching Oprah is relatively easy due to the nature of her popularity and fame, what Wilf and Illouz call "a biographical icon – a persona that is

known for the details of her personal life" (2008: 75). Almost anything written on Winfrey draws on her biography in a casual way, as if to denote that her life is public knowledge. In this way, it becomes difficult to separate the public from the private, and Winfrey's life from her business, which may be what makes her such a popular figure. As a result, although specific citations direct the reader to a particular source for Winfrey's biography, or parts of it, many sources contain pieces of her life before and during her reign as a media mogul.

3.3.1 Background

Oprah Winfrey was born Oprah Gail Winfrey in Kosciusko, Mississipi (Morgan 1986), and lived with her grandmother until she was 6 years old. Her name is a misprint of a Biblical name, Orpah (Taylor 2002), which has become her trademark in all of her enterprising endeavors. When she moved to join her mother, Vernita Lee, in Milwaukee, she began suffering sexual abuse at age 9 by a cousin and later by her mother's boyfriend (Harrison 1989: 46), which caused her to act out as an adolescent. When her mother attempted to send her to a juvenile detention home at age 13, she was turned away because it was full and instead sent to live with her father, Vernon Winfrey, in Nashville, Tennessee. His strict rules and emphasis on education caused Winfrey to excel in school and earn a full scholarship to Tennessee State University as a prize for winning an Elks Club oratorical contest. She also won Miss Black Tennessee in 1971, showcasing another facet of her talent that would see her on television as an anchor at just 19 (Morgan 1986).

Winfrey tells the next part of the story as a demotion due to her inability to mask her emotions on camera: she was bumped from co-anchor on WJZ-TV in Baltimore to a co-host on "People Are Talking," a morning show on the same network. It was an intervention by the general manager of WLS-TV in Chicago that saw her take the position of host on "AM Chicago" in 1984, and within a short period of time had caught and surpassed Phil Donahue, previously the leading talk-show, in the ratings. The show was then renamed "The Oprah Winfrey Show" in 1985 and has seen success in the ratings since it began (Morgan 1986).[16]

3.3.2 The Oprah Winfrey Show

With Winfrey's success from the inception of her show, and her work as a biographical icon, she has blurred many of the lines that separate her private and public personas. One of the ways this has been the most obvious is with the use of her weight struggles as an issue with which to relate to viewers. In Morgan's article in 1986, Winfrey is cited as weighing 190 pounds. With the Optifast diet plan and a strict caloric intake of only 400 calories a day, Winfrey achieved a weight of 142 pounds and a dress size of ten, celebrating her new image by hauling a wagon of animal fat weighing 67 pounds on stage in November 1988 (Howard 2009: 106). But her weight began to rise again and within a year she weighed 168 pounds, sharing in her journal (later published in a book with her personal trainer Bob Greene) that she felt disgusted and upset

[16] A full account of Winfrey's biography is available at, among other places, biography.com: http://www.biography.com/articles/Oprah-Winfrey-9534419.

(Howard 2009: 109). This start to the back-and-forth battle with her weight saw Winfrey at her lowest weight on the cover of the fashion magazine *Vogue*, a coveted position for which she was told to lose 20 pounds, in 1998. This new weight was achieved through strenuous exercise; Winfrey trained for and ran a marathon prior to her *Vogue* appearance and published *Make the Connection* with Bob Greene, the trainer who helped her achieve her goal weight. However, shortly after her cover photo shoot, she began to gain weight again and soon invited Dr. Phil McGraw on her show after she witnessed his confrontational communication techniques as a trial coach during her stay in Amarillo, Texas while being sued by Texas beef moguls for defamation (Howard 2009: 114). McGraw and Winfrey formed a "good cop bad cop" team, with McGraw's blunt approach providing a counterpoint to Winfrey's gentle and confiding manner. After a health scare in 2001, Winfrey again embarked on losing weight in a healthy way, using diet and exercise in a program constructed by her trainer, which she published in 2003 in her magazine (Howard 2009:119).

Winfrey's weight struggles have been a point of discussion for tabloids and news sources, as well as herself and her audience, but whoever is talking about it, Winfrey is still able to use her weight as a way to parallel herself with her fans, drawing empathy from many who have gone through similar battles with weight, dieting, and exercise with mixed results.

Also from the start of her program, Winfrey's race has been front and centre in a number of different ways. First of all, she was touted as a success story, with many sources (for instance, Morgan 1986; Harrison 1989) delving

into her biography as a contrast for her popularity in a racist society.[17] After Winfrey had become a household name and the public had become used to seeing her show, criticism began to emerge about the way she handled her race: was Winfrey "forgetting" she was Black? Proponents of this viewpoint were amused and vindicated during an incident in 2005 when Winfrey was refused entrance to the Paris store Hermes, and rumours began circulating that a clerk cited "difficulties with North Africans" as the reason she was turned away (CNN 2005).[18] Other issues of race include the way Winfrey acts as a racial liaison to her audience, the majority of which is white; dialogues of race include Winfrey as mammy, a provider for white children (metaphorically cast as her audience) and a neglectful and lazy mother to her own children.[19] Winfrey walks the fine line of presenting herself as a Black woman who is still relatable to millions of white women across the world, and in this way not only shares her Black heritage and style with her audience but also makes them feel as if they are accepted by a minority with which they have a very negative history. Stanley provides a different point of view on this duality, saying "although we [critical black female spectators] are immensely proud, we sense an erasure of the black woman, both historically and culturally, in Winfrey's relationship with her

[17] As a result of this consistent exposure, Winfrey's early years and career before her own talk show became widely circulated and have attained nearly mythic status when read in context with her success and her philosophies for living.

[18] Later these rumours were denied, and a spokesperson simply stated that Winfrey had come after the store had closed and was asked to return the following day during business hours.

[19] Stanley (2009: 45) notes that Winfrey is difficult to align with the traditional mammy image because she benefits from her services, while the mammy does not.

mainstream audience" (2009: 48). This points to a difference in the white and black women view Winfrey's show and Winfrey herself as an icon, as racially charged dialogues are drawn on in interpreting her actions.[20] Yet over 80% of her viewers self-identified as white only ten years ago (Kay 2009: 53), and the appeal to white audiences has been a bone of contention for many academics.

Not only does Winfrey appeal to whites, but she also appeals overwhelmingly to women; 72% of her audience was made up of women in 2001 (Kay 2009: 53) and has maintained that majority since the show rose to popularity in the 1980s. Winfrey's construction of her public persona has been largely aimed towards female viewers, in that she is the latest in a long line of female talk show hosts beginning in the 1960s, and similar to her predecessors, she utilizes a talk pattern characterized as unique to women, using self-disclosure, interaction norms, and listening behaviours to imply friendship with her audience (Haag 1993: 116). These techniques, exemplified in her personal biography made public, her emotive interviews filled with personal contact, and the close and isolated 'station' on stage where the interviews with Winfrey take place. By stepping away from a talk show set where guests are all seated onstage, with the interviewee closest to the host, Winfrey cultivates an intense focus on the guest and also establishes intimacy by reducing the amount of physical space between herself and her guest. Haag also points out that "female

[20] Not all of Winfrey's viewers have the same conflict over racial dialogues; Haag cites one woman who, when interviewed for Haag's research, gushed, "Oprah is me we're both black, we're the same age, we treat people the same way. That could be me" (1993: 116). This level of self-identification suggests that, far from feeling alienated, Black viewers may use Winfrey and her lifestyle as an ideal image for which to strive.

same-sex friends are more likely to simply engage in talk which is unaccompanied by any other activity than are other dyads, which in turn facilitates higher levels of self-disclosure and intimacy" (1993: 118), and Winfrey practices this facet of "girltalk" with ease. Her style of talk, employing a series of voices to impart her moods (Haag 1993: 119), accompanied with her fearless use of personal contact[21], utilizes a set of behaviours classified by many as appealing to females, and Winfrey's comments to the press about her manner support the image of this persona as her 'real' character: "Vulnerability is the key; people appreciate when you can be honest" and "I understand my commonality with the human experience. We all want to be happy, we have sad times…I can say, 'Look, I have been there'" (Morgan 1986) are comments Winfrey herself made early on in her career about her show style, and her then-executive producer said in 1989 that "she gets on camera and asks the questions ordinary people would ask" (Harrison 1989). With her down-to-earth style that aims to draw female viewers in from their seats in the audience and at home, Winfrey has managed to garner 51.4 million viewers and magazine readers weekly (Ulrich 2006: 192). Clearly, her techniques are targeting the right market. Even marketing her name appeals to females; Winfrey's hottest competition when she began her show in 1984 was Phil Donahue, a male talk

[21] Harrison notes that with Winfrey's weight loss, "she maintains a far greater distance. The touch of a woman with perceived sexual allure is scarier, more charged, dangerous" (1989: 54). With Winfrey's weight fluctuations, her levels of personal contact may have changed, but her initial establishment of closeness when her show began has helped project the same atmosphere of intimacy throughout the show's career, even if Winfrey herself keeps a greater distance from her guests.

show host who, although he used many similar techniques, appeared condescending (Kay 2009: 54) and "more powerful and authoritarian on the air, more in control of the proceedings" (Haag 1993: 118-119). While Winfrey's show, titled *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, encourages use of her first name, Phil Donahue's show, called simply *Donahue*, relies on the more male technique of calling one's friends by their last names as a show of informal camaraderie, which females do not identify as a female behaviour.

Not only does Winfrey elicit confessions with her intimate and comforting style of interviewing, she provides revelations about herself, further endearing fans to her and helping to establish a trust bond. The most famous incident of this is Winfrey's public disclosure of sexual abuse on-air during a show on incest and domestic abuse in 1986, when a guest on her show, when discussing her own molestation as a child, triggered Winfrey's sensational admission of abuse. Winfrey, in tears, requested a station break, and later reported that hundreds of callers had flooded the station with their own confessions (Morgan 1986). Wilf and Illouz point to this example as part of Winfrey's persona of the "failed self": "Oprah has been made famous not despite her failed self but because of it – because she could claim to have experienced sexual abuse, weight problems, relationship problems, like many of her viewers" (2008: 75). This failed self is a projected image constructed of ways in which Winfrey has not succeeded, many of which are ways in which her audience has also not succeeded. By drawing on empathy, Winfrey manages to minimize her success while at the same time using it as a platform to display ways in which

she has not yet succeeded and is engaged in ongoing struggles with any number of issues with which viewers are also dealing.

In 1994 Winfrey announced that she would be departing from the talk show's traditional format, saying that she would "cease focusing on dysfunction and start emphasizing positive topics" (Peck 2010: 8). By distancing herself with an increasingly 'trashy' genre that fell prey to scores of shows featuring paternity test results, such as Maury Povich's show *Maury*, and knock-down drag-out fights, such as *The Jerry Springer Show*, Winfrey began to draw out a subtle distinction that would blossom into a massively profitable industry. Instead of peddling the outliers of society for a voyeuristic public, Winfrey began to focus on what has been termed New Age philosophies; these positive-outlook strategies, combined with Winfrey's own biography, have led her to be compared to Horatio Alger in any number of publications (for instance, Haag 1993: 117; Stanley 2009: 40; Kay 2009: 56; Peck 2010: 9). Winfrey's spirituality is best summed by "you get out of it what you put into it" (McGrath 2009: 125), a quote from Winfrey herself in 1994 that has stood her in good stead during the incorporation of an individualistic brand of spiritual living, focusing on personal accountability and individual will. Peck's research (2008, 2010) provides the context within which this sort of spirituality took root. Political, economic, and religious shifts in America in the 1980s and 1990s caused the rise of a petty bourgeoisie with the dominant values of

> competitive individualism – due to the isolated nature of professional labor – and a commitment to meritocracy. As a class, it tends to favor expanded decision making and opportunities for promotion, but it is less

> inclined to support major structural transformation of society. (Peck 2010: 11)

Peck refers to Winfrey as a "spiritual guru" (2010: 9) and "almost a religion" (2010: 11), also citing others who call her a "prophet" and an "oracle" (Peck 2010: 8; see Avins 2000).[22] The equation of Winfrey with the style of spirituality that she preaches has led to the distortion of the boundary between where Winfrey stops and the message of go-it-alone spirituality starts, leading to articles with titles such as "The Church of O" in *Christianity Today* (Taylor 2002). The article asserts that "Oprah's brand of spirituality cannot simply be dismissed as superficial civil religion or New Age psychobabble" (Taylor 2002), and that because of the mix of beliefs that Winfrey packages together, her 'religion' is not actually spiritually fulfilling for those fans that care to take it up.

Not only is Winfrey herself considered "almost a religion" but her incorporation of New Age philosophy the Secret, involving the Law of Attraction that holds that "like attracts like" and doing good deeds attracts rewards, has dovetailed nicely with her strong focus on the individual and personal change (Peck 2010: 8). Peck's discussion of Winfrey's episodes addressing issues such as "Women Who Love Too Much" and "Obsessive Love" emphasizes the ways in which Winfrey orchestrated guests, callers' and audience members' comments, and her own behaviour to continually draw focus to how women were only responsible for themselves, their own behaviour, and could never seek to

[22] For a much more detailed analysis of Winfrey's show in context with greater social shifts in American politics, economics, and religion, as well as social movements such as the anti-feminist movement, see Peck's (2008) book *The Age of Oprah: Cultural Icon for the Neoliberal Era*.

change others but only themselves (2008), even before her show's overhaul in 1994. By consistently minimizing links between societal issues and personal issues, Winfrey appeared to put freedom and choice in the hands of her viewers, but also blamed them (directly or indirectly) for their own problems and their own failures to resolve those problems with personal change (Peck 2008: see pg. 56 onward). Although these episodes are from very early in Winfrey's show, her more recent episodes are full of religious connotations aligning spirituality with personal growth and achievement. The theme of her show, Live Your Best Life, pushes her fans to push themselves: "it is obvious that Winfrey has tapped that spiritual hunger that makes people ask, 'Is this all there is?'" (Avins 2000). While Winfrey herself has said she is "defined by my spirit, which comes from a greater spirit" (Avins 2000), she deliberately keeps related statements vague enough to avoid direct correlations with the Christian faith she was raised within and thus sidesteps any difficulties that organized religion and its associated tenets would impose upon her show. "To her audience of more than 22 million mostly female viewers, she has become a postmodern priestess—an icon of church-free spirituality" (Taylor 2002), and her use of humility and modesty helps to reinforce the trust and affection her viewers and fans have for her, and the faith they place in her choices and the messages from her show and the other media she uses.

3.3.3 Oprah Winfrey's other media

Due to its overwhelming success, *The Oprah Winfrey Show* has branched out from simply a television show into other media: Peck lists her "book club, Web site, magazine, radio channel, personal growth tours, YouTube channel, Facebook page, and forthcoming cable TV network" (2010: 8), which will be called the Oprah Winfrey Network, as arenas for Oprah-brand information, discussions, and products. *O, the Oprah Magazine*, a textual version of Winfrey's ideas and promotions, began in 2000 and supported the same message Winfrey stressed during her show: self-empowerment, motivation, and personal success (Gibbons 2009: 277-278). The magazine is able to reach a wider audience than the show since now potential fans that work during the broadcast can now partake in Winfrey's self-help techniques through the printed word. Gibbons (2009) asserts that Winfrey uses *O* to "brand' self-empowerment in general. In this process of branding, any product or idea that appears in the magazine is labeled 'Oprah'" (278), and for better or for worse, products and practices included in the magazine will come to be identified with Winfrey when considered. In this way, Gibbons argues that Winfrey's branding of self-empowerment parallels the use of Panopticism and Foucault's ideas on self-policing (2009); those who actually read and enjoy the magazine may no doubt have a different view of Winfrey's use of media. The use of regular columns and consistent themes in the magazine mirrors both the television show and Winfrey's web site, oprah.com, which is an interactive expansion on the magazine that has many of the same features, but also allows users to explore online forums, clips from past shows, and many other facets of self-help that

would constitute too much material for a printed item. By adjusting to the internet-savvy demands of the 21st century, Winfrey has proven not only herself but also her subject matter to be adaptable to the needs of a younger generation than her initial audience from the 1980s.

Related to this is the infamous Oprah's Book Club, a segment that has been reincarnated over the past years to feature 63 books from its inception in 1996 to 2009 (oprah.com 2008). Started with contemporary authors and later revamped with classics, and again with memoirs, Winfrey's book club has given rise to what has been dubbed "the Oprah effect" (Wyatt 2004), the massive spike in book sales that stems from Winfrey's endorsement of a book. The book club has been susceptible to as much drama as the rest of the television show, however; when Winfrey chose Jonathan Franzen's book *The Corrections*, an offhand comment the author made about some of her other choices being "schmaltzy" had Winfrey cancel his appearance and her loyal fans up in arms (Kirkpatrick 2001). Even more extreme was the choice of James Frey's work *A Million Little Pieces*, touted by his publishers as a memoir and later discovered to be embellished or fabricated in many parts. Initially Winfrey defended Frey, but after an outcry from her audience, she changed her opinion, inviting him on the show only to expose him to a panel of angry and critical columnists who verbally attacked him, with encouragement from Winfrey and booing from the audience (Peretz 2008). With these two examples, the power of Winfrey's endorsement is illustrated as a mighty boon to many writers, but also a great hardship to those who displease her. Winfrey's selections themselves initially

carried a common thread as well, that of the American Dream achieved by individual triumph over adversity (Pereira 2009: 194) but this theme dissolved and Winfrey, after a two-year hiatus of the book club, announced that the focus would be switching to classics instead of contemporary authors.

3.3.4 Oprah Winfrey's cohort

Winfrey, even as she wields power in the field of book sales, tends to boost her regular guests to autonomous fame as well. A plethora of experts in as many fields have become household names for those who watch *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, and their expertise has leaked into her other media, even expanding into independent television shows such as the *Dr. Phil Show*, featuring the tough-talking Phil McGraw that Winfrey initially introduced with a segment called "Tuesdays with Dr. Phil" on her own show. As well, *Dr. Oz* is now broadcast during the day, featuring Dr. Mehmet Oz, a cardiac surgeon who, supplemented by personal trainer Bob Greene's advice on *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, provides overall health advice that is generally "sound [and] high-quality" (Kosova and Wingert 2009). Rachael Ray, a chef who appeared on Winfrey's show to high ratings (Benson 2005), garnered more publicity and her own talk show as well as magazine, although alleged rumours of a feud between Ray and Winfrey have fuelled the fires of Ray's critics, who dislike many of her techniques and mannerisms (Pellettieri 2005).

Still, Winfrey's clout has the ability to push ratings, sales, and trends in a way that baffles many of her detractors. What this talent rests on is hotly

debated, but an article in the Philadelphia Inquirer may have hit on an important difference between Winfrey and her peers: "in the public imagination, she is a truth-teller, a filter between us - the vulnerable, badly informed, gullible, consumerist public - and the stuff everyone else wants to sell us" (Derakhshani 2010). Winfrey does not merely "spin" the truth, she speaks it; in a world of consumer capitalism, Winfrey appears as the one person that the public can trust. When she endorses something, it is worthwhile to investigate. When something to which she has put her name ends up being fraudulent, in the case of *A Million Little Pieces* for instance, she rallies on behalf of her audience to uphold her reputation and put the wrongdoer in his or her place, proving that her fans' faith in her is justified. Winfrey operates as an island of truth, goodness, and caring in a sea of what the media often represents the as falsehoods, evil, and isolation of fame and fortune.

3.3.5 Discussion

Oprah Winfrey, more than the other charismatic figures discussed in this thesis, has developed a relationship with the media that has not only perpetuated her charismatic influence, it may have in fact been the first to suggest that Winfrey has charisma. Because her involvement in the media is unique to her and impacts her leadership style a great deal, it is worth considering in the context of other charismatic leadership theories.

The continual comparisons of Winfrey and Horatio Alger by any number of writers emphasize Winfrey's "rags to riches" story, and the fact that most who

know anything about Winfrey can recite facts from her biography that involve her childhood in poverty, her sexual abuse, and her triumph over adversity to become a successful Black female billionaire help to cement Winfrey's status as the underdog who came out on top. Her self-empowerment message is all the more well-received because of her own background and, using herself as an obvious example of the power of positive thinking, personal growth, and seeking truth, Winfrey is able to lead others to live their best lives, as her current message proclaims.

Even critics of Winfrey are quick to note that the public has made her what she is today, pointing out the mutually constructed element of charisma. Winfrey's at-home and studio audiences provide enthusiastic testimonials of positive transformations, effectively drowning out dissenters. With transcript evidence from Winfrey's earlier shows, Peck (2008) consistently demonstrates that problems that might have been considered in a larger social context are instead reduced to the level of the individual. Instead of considering the social roots for problems such as welfare mothers for instance, the audience is led into blaming women on welfare for their own situations, despite the fact that Winfrey's guests who are on welfare are not the embodiments of the stereotypes the audience reviles them as being (Peck 2008: 92-94). Still, this is again examining the charismatic relationship from the perspective of neither the follower nor leader; Peck is clearly a critic of Winfrey's and not a fan. Fans of Winfrey not only enjoy her shows and other media, but flock to hear her speak and rush to defend her from detractors. This is clearly seen in the flood of

publicity a new "tell-all" book on Winfrey has received; author Kitty Kelley laments her lack of interviews from media moguls in America, and supporters of Winfrey tell the reported gossip to "leave Oprah alone" (Crosbie 2010; Havrilesky 2010) and quit digging for flaws when "she demonstrated, by example, how, with enough hard work and determination and brutal honesty, you can pull yourself up out of a bewildering past and live a whole new life" (Havrilesky 2010). Winfrey's fans perform the function of suppressing alternate conceptions of her, and even Winfrey herself has diffused many of the potential skeletons in her closet by announcing them herself, often in ways that draw empathy and trust from her followers.

But Winfrey's fans are not the only ones who acknowledge her charismatic abilities. Taylor, even while writing an article casting doubt on Winfrey's religious themes, sums up the appeal neatly: "Then it happens. The theme music rolls, the audience erupts, and she appears, gliding in on the arm of Dr. Phil, radiant in a yellow pantsuit, gorgeous hair, that hey-girl-how-you-doin' smile, *that voice*" (2002). Those who are concerned or irritated by her subject matter, or could care less, still cannot deny her appeal, especially in person, as Taylor's description outlines. Winfrey has mastered the onscreen persona that attracts millions, and she knows it: "'Vulnerability is the key; people appreciate when you can be honest'" (Morgan 1986). She has also earned the grudging respect of many who dislike her "ministry," for the same reasons her fans revere her: her overcoming childhood obstacles to reach a lofty goal, and her philanthropic work that benefits millions. Winfrey's Angel Network is a charity

to which many viewers donate, and has provided aid to victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita in America, and built a school and provided supplies to South African children in need, all to help beneficiaries "live their best lives" (oprahsangelnetwork.org 2010). Because Winfrey is involved in so many things, there is the possibility of disliking one of her endeavors, such as her show, but still appreciating her philanthropic work; in this way, she draws a larger following than would have been possible years before, when she was only the host of *The Oprah Winfrey Show*.

The pure type of charismatic leader as outlined by Weber provides authentication of his or her charismatic legitimacy often using magic. Winfrey's provision of gifts that range in extravagance provides a contemporary analogue to magic as proof, in that her wealth knows few bounds and can often provide magical experiences for those with considerably less money. For instance, Winfrey has given her audience members Kindles, which are electronic book readers (Okrant 2010: 190), as well as Pontiac G6s (on separate episodes) (Associated Press 2004). Her gifting is usually on a smaller scale, but still serves to remind the audience of her generosity, her freedom with funds for those who are loyal, and, in the case of larger, more lavish gifts, "'no dream is too wild, no surprise too impossible to pull off'" (Associated Press 2004). To be sure, this is hardly magic in the conventional sense. While a gift is not magical, for the audience who received Pontiac G6s, Winfrey (or her staff) was responsible for filling each seat with a person who needed a new vehicle, and arguably, may

have viewed the provision of a $28,000 car for free as miraculous.[23] As well, Winfrey has been known to surprise other guests or those who write in with life-changing gifts; on a 2003 episode entitled "Princess for a Day" Winfrey surprised four women in unique ways that provided valuable augmentation to their lives. For instance, one "princess," a schoolteacher, was treated to a brand new wardrobe, which was paraded into the studio on models while she sat in a "throne" on centre stage with a crown on her head (Lofton 2006: 600). Each woman was understandably ecstatic about her gifts, and as Lofton puts it, "every guest is similarly sanctified and reified, blessed and made bountiful" (2006: 601).

The media have undoubtedly played a role in supporting the image of Winfrey as generous in her philanthropic miracle work. Winfrey only has to do one action, but thousands of websites, hundreds of newspapers, and even television newscasts may cover it, thus amplifying the event beyond its initial range of coverage and the reach of word-of-mouth. Even gossip blogs[24] rush to post about Winfrey, creating potential for larger discussions about her actions than a pool of viewers could generate.

---

[23] As a contrast to Winfrey's generosity, the tax incurred by the gift of the car was $7,000 to each recipient. CNNMoney.com reports that "the Harpo [Winfrey's production company] Spokeswomen said winners had three choices. They could keep the car and pay the tax, sell the car and pay the tax with the profits or forfeit the car" (2004). The juxtaposition of caring, generous Oprah with a greedy, money-hungry government is one that must have played in the minds of her dismayed fans.

[24] The term "blog" is a shortening of "weblog," which refers to sites that are "a mixture in unique proportions of links, commentary, and personal thoughts and essays" (Blood 2000). The most common of these are written like journal entries.

Related to the online attention that Winfrey receives daily is the creation of the online *Gemeinde*, a more interactive and fluid version of the more conventional conception of a charismatic community. The authority over the community is certainly of a different sort; it is more likely maintained by a Webmaster (someone who maintains a website), but more immediately by other members of the community, in the Panopticistic manner discussed earlier. If there is a posting in a Winfrey-related forum that appears to be negative, other members of the forum will lash out at the individual who posted, reasserting their identities as congruent to Winfrey's ideals and contrasting themselves against the Other who differs from their views.

Winfrey's charisma can also be attributed to her unique position in society as what Hall refers to as a para-social personality. Winfrey cultivates para-social relationships with her viewers, projecting a sort of "intimacy once removed" (Hall 2003: 650), a constructed closeness that functions in the place for some as a social relationship. This in turn creates the illusion that viewers *know* Winfrey, an illusion encouraged by her: referring to her by her first name; seeking books at the bookstore that she, like a good friend, has recommended; doing the same exercise routine that her trainer has developed; eating the same foods as she says she eats; and so forth. Not only do viewers have the ability to "follow along" with Winfrey's life in this way, doing things "with" her as friends do things together, but they may also share issues that she has experienced or is currently experiencing: weight fluctuations; sexual abuse; feeling neglected or

needy in relationships; drug problems; feuds with friends; and a variety of other issues that Winfrey has put into the spotlight and featured on her show.

An important qualification of this para-social relationship is that Winfrey is the same as everyone, she is every woman, but at the same time she is different. If she were replaceable, she would never be as valued, but her special combination of personal history, magnetic qualities, and viewer appeal has carved her a particular niche among American leaders. Couch notes that a leader's value stems in part from his or her ability to make him or herself appear the same, and yet different in a way that allows him or her to represent the crowd, now united behind one leader (1989: 212). So it may be with Winfrey; her top spot in television ratings for her time slot and her emergence as the most familiar name in higher-caliber talk shows (separate from the "talk rot" of the early 1990s from which she sought to differentiate herself) demonstrate that she is finding a large cohort who agree with her articulation of their private, personal dissatisfactions. Certainly in the 1980s when she began, as evidenced in Peck's (2008; 2010) writings, Winfrey was concerned with negative relationship issues plaguing women during a time of reassertion of conservative social norms, more restrictive government spending, and the shift of women from the home to the workplace. As Winfrey has shifted her topics, she has reflected larger social trends and also audience members' desire to affect change in themselves and not sit through reminders of life situations in which they had little in common. As well, Winfrey's use of topics not only raised awareness of issues viewers may not have know about, but may have created

self-fulfilling prophecies; Okrant discusses an episode about infidelity that, although she had never been concerned about extramarital affairs on the part of her husband, still raised slight concerns on her part before she was able to dismiss them (2010: 161-162). This suggests that Winfrey's shows may create problems where there previously were none, based on the premise that her shows most often deal with personal, psychological, or individual issues that one must confront and resolve in order to grow.

Still, Winfrey's community of viewers and fans constitutes a massive force, and they are often united in their support of Winfrey's ideas and products. The "Oprah effect," the term created to describe such a force's impact in the market, is only one illustration of the commercial influence that Winfrey embodies. The translators of Leo Tolstoy's classic *Anna Karenina* expressed their disbelief at the Oprah effect as it affected their book sales:

> The couple learned of the selection on May 31, when their editor at Penguin Books, Caroline White, called them at their home in France with the news that Penguin was increasing its press run by 800,000. ''I said, '800,000 of what?' '' Ms. Volokhonsky said in a telephone interview on Friday. The name Oprah Winfrey ''was for me totally unknown,'' she added. ''I didn't understand what it could possibly mean. We're glad if we sell 20,000 copies of a book in a year.'' (Wyatt 2004)

The incomprehension of the Oprah effect on the part of people not involved in the "Church of O" is understandable; Winfrey's place in American society is unprecedented by any other media moguls. Not only does Winfrey have a number of terms coined containing her name,[25] but she is consistently held up

[25] "Church of O," "the Oprah effect," "Oprah'd it out of me," used to refer to getting someone to confess to something (Taylor 2002), and "Oprahfication," a

as a truth-teller, the one person the public can trust; if Winfrey puts her name to something, it has to be good. The trust placed in Winfrey is one of the ways in which she leads. In a market full of millions of choices for consumers, Winfrey is able to help make decisions easier for her followers, and clarify procedures and new trends with which they might not be familiar.

Winfrey does not particularly seek to establish a utopia, a place in which her followers can work towards living, but rather attempts to urge followers toward creating that utopia inside them through personal growth. Winfrey's techniques, ordinarily social in the pure type, are extremely individual; whereas Couch's ideal charismatic leader is pushing for social change, Winfrey almost always seeks to avoid it. Although her charity, the Angel Network, provides aid to large groups of people, Winfrey herself usually directs her televised efforts to one person or family at a time, providing a focus for her audience. Affecting large-scale social change is often not considered. Recently, a slight departure from this may be seen in her campaign for "no phone zones," a cell-phone ban in vehicles. This has the potential to create larger social change, but still was begun as a reaction to reports of accidents caused by drivers using cell phones ("America's New Deadly Obsession" Jan 21, 2010). Her charismatic relationship with her followers, and the trust that augments that relationship, allows Winfrey to encourage her followers to champion the same causes she does, and live the same way she does, even if viewers are simultaneously aware that Winfrey is a billionaire who does not share many of the same demographical

---

term the *Wall Street Journal* used to describe "public confession as a form of therapy" (as cited in Taylor 2002).

characteristics as they do. Herein lies a clever projection on the part of the media.

By aligning herself with the majority of her viewing audience, Winfrey allows them to make intuitive leaps that complete a picture of Winfrey being "just like them." In reality, Winfrey has 51.4 million weekly viewers and readers as of 2006, 35 Emmy Awards for her television show[26] and has a large staff that do everything from apply her makeup to make her food. She wears Christian Louboutin, Manolo Blahnik, or Jimmy Choo shoes for her shoes, among other brands, which can cost between US$500 and US$14,000 per pair depending on the brand and style (Ellis 2009, whatitcosts.com), clearly above what most of her audience can afford or would consider buying. Yet Winfrey is able to convey the image of her authentic self as being outside these trappings, just a regular woman with regular problems who goes to work like many of her fans, needs help picking trends to follow, and loves some of the finer things in life as a way of projecting her character.

Robyn Okrant, a middle-aged woman who followed Winfrey's recommendations and tips for a calendar year and recorded the results in her blog, demonstrates the ultimate instance of living Winfrey's life. In fact, her blog is called Living Oprah, and has been published as a book (2010). Okrant chronicles the challenges of doing all the things Winfrey recommends on her show, from buying ergonomic gardening tools to Celine Dion tickets, making

[26] Winfrey stopped submitting *The Oprah Winfrey Show* for Emmy Award consideration after the show's ninth Emmy Award ("Behind the Scenes at Harpo Studios" Jan 1, 2006).

cookies with chickpeas to exercising daily as part of her "Best Life" contract. Although her experiment is ultimately successful, she deals with contradictions such as frequently buying suggested products while being told to "de-clutter" her life and apartment, and pledging (along with Winfrey) to abstain from alcohol only to see Winfrey drinking champagne on her show a few episodes later. The experiment underlines a number of difficulties that "living Oprah" can cause, such as massive demands on time and consistent regulation of many aspects of life, as well as illustrating the number of areas that Winfrey exerts influence in daily life. Her website, oprah.com, also speaks to this: tabs along the top of the homepage list "spirit, health, style, relationships, home & garden, food, entertainment, money, and world" as being areas in which Winfrey has either shows, articles, tips, or other forms of information, and at the top edge of the page, links to *O Magazine*, Oprah Radio, OWN TV, Oprah Store, Book Club, and Angel Network allow visitors the freedom to access any and all of her other media (2010). Winfrey's reach has demonstrably gone outside television viewers and now includes radio, products, magazines, and an entire network, to be launched in the near future. Not only that, but her ideas in terms of followers' lives have expanded as well, from simply relationship advice in the 1980s to nearly every aspect, as displayed on her webpage. Even more intimate personal details are covered; Okrant describes an episode of *The Oprah Winfrey Show* that details the "perfect shape" of excrement. This extreme coverage of followers' lives allows them to willingly let Winfrey make almost all of their day-to-day decisions for them based on her advice and endorsements. Leading in just one

area would be restrictive; instead Winfrey has opinions about everything, in every area, projected through nearly every media source. In this way, she also emphasizes her para-social relationship with followers; like a friend, Winfrey has guidance on many things, and serves in many capacities, not just as a relationship counselor. If one needs advice about what kind of shoes to wear with a particular outfit, Winfrey has it. If one is wondering how to deal with anxiety, Winfrey has tips. Okrant illustrates this by typing in search words, such as "anxiety" in one instance, on the oprah.com site and following the recommendations that are retrieved by the site (2010).

By operating as friend and counselor, Winfrey leads her followers with a generous and caring personality, managing to isolate her financially successful business self from her helpful girlfriend-next-door persona. She projects the image of a rags-to-riches success story, encouraging personal growth and betterment by example, and offering leadership in every aspect of life. Fans are drawn in by her manner, her style choices, her generosity, and her willingness to listen, and based on their faith in her, follow her voluntarily, with absolutely no compulsion. This style of leadership, while different from Jones, has grounds in Weber's research and indeed has been examined in regards to others as well.

Because Oprah Winfrey exercises charismatic authority in an emerging and expanding field, the evidence of her charismatic leadership shows that she rarely issues commands in the style of Jim Jones's leadership. Weber discusses the style of Winfrey's leadership in his section on the prophet, which is a slightly contentious issue. The first problem with considering Winfrey as a prophet

arises from the definition Weber provides of prophet: "a purely individual bearer of charisma, who by virtue of his mission proclaims a religious doctrine or divine commandment" (1968: 439). Because Winfrey specifically distances herself from particular religious doctrines, even while synthesizing a number of elements from various religious systems, it is perhaps an overgeneralization to say that she carries a religious doctrine. Her shows and website features on spirituality are vague and open to personal interpretation, and avoid aligning her with a particular religious tradition. Still, following a precedent set by Decosmo (2003) in her piece on Bob Marley as a prophet figure, it is not out of reach to consider Winfrey in the role of prophet. Decosmo discusses how, although Marley fit with the dictionary definition of prophet,[27] a key element of his acceptance as a prophet stemmed from followers' acceptance of him as a prophet, as Weber notes as well (Decosmo 2003: 63). Her basis for applying Weber's prophet charismatic writings to a non-religious figure rests on the premises that his personality and behaviour, as well as his unique position straddling religion and politics, are not antithetical, as well as similarities drawn between Marley's public statements and lyrics and those of Hebrew prophets (Decosmo 2003: 60). She largely avoids discussing the connection between religious doctrine and prophets as established by Weber, but nonetheless establishes a link between Marley and the role of prophet. In this way as well, Winfrey may be considered to play the role of prophet, for a number of reasons.

[27] She cites the Random House Dictionary definition as thus: "a spokesperson of some doctrine, cause, or movement" (Decosmo 2003: 63), completely void of religious connotation.

First, she believes that she was called to her role as leader by a divine power (Harrison 1989: 28). Second, although she avoids affiliating herself and her media with any particular religious body, she still combines a number of religious elements in her message of spiritual well-being. Although this is somewhat of an expansion of the original concept of prophet as conceived by Weber, it ties neatly into the last point of support for Winfrey's role as prophet: her style. Weber discusses the prophet in contrast to a number of other roles, but also details the role of prophet, dividing it into two styles, exemplary and ethical. The ethical prophet, the style with which Jim Jones is clearly associated, is that of command and obedience, "an instrument for the proclamation of a god and his will" (Weber 1968: 447). Because this is often how Weber details charismatic authority in his writing, it is the first style of prophet that comes to mind, with examples like Jesus and Zoroaster. However, the exemplary prophet, that in the style of Buddha, is not concerned with obedience. There is no proclamation of a divine mission, only the goal of teaching others to travel the same life path as that of the prophet (Weber 1968: 447). This is clearly Winfrey's goal as well. She does not command but suggests according to her own preferences, and her audience, eager to follower her path, treats her suggestions as valid life choices.[28]

[28] As well, Buddhism is a religious system without a god, dissimilar to Western monotheistic traditions. Winfrey's interest in spirituality, syncretic religious systems, and a lack of godlike figure suggests that should her spiritual hodge-podge be seriously considered a religion, perhaps it would be that of a godless tradition.

Thus, it is not the concept of charisma itself that changes, but the style of leadership from that which we are familiar, the ethical prophet, to a more subtle style, the exemplary prophet. Although this research does not concern itself with the discussion of prophets as a central focus, because prophets are individual bearers of charisma, something akin to a subtype of charismatic leader, their distinctions may be applied to charismatic leaders as well. The distinction between ethical or exemplary prophet leadership styles demonstrates this applicability.

What is most emphasized from an academic perspective is the degree to which Winfrey represents the trend of the therapeutic in American society; a trend, about which Philip Rieff was adamant, has dissolved the charismatic. By his reasoning, Winfrey could not function as a charismatic leader because her role in the therapeutic framework would nullify any charisma she might possess. This is a massive conflict from Rieff's perspective, yet one that again underscores the difference between ethical and exemplary leaders. In fact, Winfrey does consistently introduce new interdicts, giving her followers "shalt nots" with which they may guide their lives. She fits the role of charismatic, yet operates as a leader of the therapeutic movement in America. Yet another contradiction Winfrey illustrates, but one that gives cause to consider the removal or muting of religious elements in the concept of charisma.

For most, it has become difficult to move through day-to-day society without encountering an element of Oprah Winfrey's massive media empire. Reading the newspaper brings one inevitably to a mention of her, walking through a book store may bring one to a rack of books with "Oprah's Book Club" seals displayed proudly on the covers, and her talk show runs without fail during daytime television slots, just after shows hosted by professionals she has helped establish as celebrities. Winfrey's omnipresence in today's media is not what has made her a charismatic leader, but it is a direct result of that leadership. Winfrey presents a style of charismatic leadership congruent with Weber's conceptions of the exemplary prophet, by leading by example and not by command. She offers guidance and advice on her talk show, website, and radio channel, and speaks for her audience routinely when questioning guests as she vocalizes private, personal dissatisfactions and issues. Winfrey unites a demographic that has hitherto lacked a leader: the white, middle-class woman. It seems paradoxical that such a group, purported to function as a massive piece of advertisers' target market, should not have a common voice, but until Winfrey's talk show, women appeared to be represented by any number of smaller and less easily heard voices. With the advent of Winfrey's talk show, women found a loud, opinionated voice that was asking the same questions they were, and finally receiving answers. Because her talk show audience is made up of 72% women and 80% whites[29] (Kay 2009: 53), it is reasonable to assert that Winfrey has articulated not only the dissatisfactions of this demographic but

[29] Figures from 2001.

also their fears, their hopes, and their aspirations. That is not to say that Winfrey speaks for *every* woman. There are clearly those who disagree and dislike her message, but Winfrey is overwhelmingly viewed as the voice for females, and particularly those in the middle and upper classes, due to the style choices she often supports. Women in low-income families may watch Winfrey, but becoming as involved with her causes and community appears to be difficult without a reasonable disposable income. Though not without her share of ups and downs, experienced in the spotlight, Winfrey has managed to play each and every one of her life events as a graceful, confident woman, setting an example for generations of inspired American females who hope to achieve a measure of the success that Winfrey celebrates. Her lofty status ensures that none may lead like she, a discussion that has surely been had innumerable times since she announced her show would be ending its 25 year run in 2011, and yet Winfrey can still appeal to each woman in her living room as a good friend, a shoulder on which to cry, and hand she will extend with which to help.

4. Discussion

4.1 Pure types and their counterparts

As previously outlined, the pure type of charismatic leader is an abstract, a theoretical guideline with which to compare individuals in the concrete world. Max Weber developed the pure type as a way of working towards hypotheses, but not as hypotheses themselves: "in its conceptual purity, this mental construct (*Gedankenbild*) cannot be found empirically anywhere in reality. It is a *utopia*" (Weber 2007). Still, by focusing on a few of the traits associated with the ideal type of charismatic leader, it is possible to estimate which of the three individuals previously discussed actually come closest to the pure type.

Each leader came into their respective positions from outside a more conventional advent to that position. The outsider status is more clearly associated with the pure type because the dominance of personality is set off more clearly when other types of dominance are not applicable. Jim Jones, who began as a poor white boy, came to be the wealthy leader of a congregation made up of mostly Blacks, while Pierre Trudeau, a radical mix of political ideas, joined the Liberal party only months after badmouthing it in public. Oprah Winfrey, who started out a poor Black woman with a history of abuse and promiscuity, overcame these challenges to win a scholarship to a university and become America's daytime sweetheart, with 51.4 million weekly readers and viewers and an audience made up of 72% whites.

When these leaders spoke, their audience listened and obeyed: Jones is considered responsible for not only between two and three hundred followers

moving from Indiana to California in the 1960s when he relocated his church, but also the deaths of over nine hundred congregation members, as well as Congressman Leo Ryan and others who were murdered by Jones's followers. Trudeau encouraged voters to go to the polls for him and held office for sixteen years as a result. Winfrey announced a pick for her book club, and sales soared. These last seem, especially in comparison to Jones's control, mediocre or mundane, but what is important to note is that in the field in which each leader is located, he or she had (or has) the potential to issue commands and expect relative obedience. Winfrey's exemplary style deals more in suggestions but still issues them decisively and clearly, as Okrant (2010) demonstrates.

Each leader has "exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character" (Weber 1978: 215) to a greater or lesser degree. Jones demonstrated his sanctity in elevating himself to the level of deity in the eyes of his followers, one that took on the suffering of his followers and was persecuted for his beliefs. Every time a follower defected, Jones would fall ill, using guilt manipulation to not only keep his followers obedient but also to convince them that he indeed suffered for each and every one of his flock. He preached a worthy message to his audience, one of living in peace in a beautiful jungle utopia, free from persecution from the American government and the evils of the world, projecting himself as the blessed leader of the movement. Indeed, reports later surfaced of Jones's plans to outlive the White Night, remaining behind in the world to make sure the actions of his people were explained in the right way

and not misunderstood.[30] This potential heroism, while never realized, helped add to the image of self-sacrifice, caring, and selflessness Jones cultivated. Trudeau portrayed more of an exemplary character, but this was relative to his opponents and set in context. Clearly "Honest" Bob Stanfield could be assumed to have more exemplary characteristics, as reflected in his nickname, but in 1968 and 1969, the public considered Trudeau's behaviour and his contemporary values and ideas evidence of truly exceptional character. Although many became disillusioned with him after he took power, Trudeau continued to stand fast in his ideals, championing the idea of a Constitution and Charter of Rights that eventually came to pass while he was in office in 1980 to 1984, long after his charismatic shine had been overshadowed by the dullness of bureaucracy. Winfrey seized the reins of power in 1984, a time when America was looking to more old-fashioned values and ideas (see Peck 2008), and she helped shape generations of women after her own image: a woman who had pulled herself up by her bootstraps to achieve something great. While Winfrey had a tarnished past, she uses her biography to help bolster her now-pure image of an individual always looking to better herself within the constraints of society. Her projected character is one of strong moral conviction and truth, and these are traits that her audience not only values and appreciates in her, but also at large, seeking to cultivate a similar character within themselves. The sanctity of her image is fluid, drawn on in appropriate situations and muted in

[30] One might speculate that this is why Jones was found shot instead of having drunk the poisoned Fla-Vor-Aid; perhaps in his attempt to remain behind after everyone else had died, one of his followers disagreed with him.

others, but most importantly it is often on behalf of her audience; Winfrey represents all of her followers in many of her questions to guests, or in the choice of products she chooses to feature. When a guest has done something that Winfrey might not agree with, the questions that follow are on behalf of the entire audience, who, it may be assumed, is just as upset or confused as Winfrey.

In many ways, these three leaders have personified the character that Weber hypothesizes to be attached to a charismatic leader, even if at times the execution of these characteristics appears more from the point of view of someone in the charismatic relationship than from outside. But this is the key difference between the two: what an individual within the relationship sees will be markedly different from someone without. Nowhere is this clearer than in charismatic relationships experienced between Jones and his followers. Retrospectively and from outside the charismatic relationship, few people could understand how Jones could draw in and continue to maintain charismatic relationships with so many people when he was deemed "evil." He appeared manipulative and controlling, with ludicrous and far-fetched ideas. Yet many people still held fast to the notion of Jones as their caring, long-suffering father who just wanted the best life for all of them and was constantly impeded by conspiracies and capitalism. Even as less extreme examples, those who disliked Trudeau and do not like Winfrey cannot identify with those who did or do, simply because they cannot understand the appeal.

All in all, it is difficult to see which leader most closely resembles the ideal charismatic leader. Jones may arguably be the closest to Couch's

conception of a charismatic leader, with the elements of "I am God" arising and the emergence of a tyrannical relationship[31] from the perspectives of some, but this discrepancy may not be on the part of the other two leaders. With the concept of charisma being "claimed" by the secular world and largely stripped of its religious connotations, it has been used in ways other than those theorized by the aforementioned classical authors. Certainly Weber, or even Couch, could not have conceived of blogs discussing the charismatic power of leaders. The application of charisma as a type of authority to an increasingly diverse group of individuals may not be due to their shift *from* the pure type, but rather the greater inclusion of the exemplary type of leader and thus an absence of commands. A charismatic leader's movement can only gain momentum and widespread support if it is accepted by society, and with more suggestion and less command, it may be that *metanoia* experienced by followers is less extreme and more compatible with followers' existing lifestyles. A figure like Jones might not even be considered sane, let alone charismatic in today's society, where a figure like Winfrey most certainly would not succeed in the 1950s, for instance. The ideal type, while an abstract concept, may need to be reevaluated to make allowances for the shifts in society since it was initially conceived.

[31] Couch's discussion is potentially a conflict of interest on this point due to the fact that he wrote it using Jones as an example.

4.2 Authority or relationship: is there a difference?

Is Couch's disagreement with Weber on the use of classification of the charismatic bond between follower and leader more than just a semantic difference? Allowing for the two conceptions to co-exist for the purposes of this thesis, it appears as though a difference emerges between the two ideas other than Couch's distinction; the term 'relationship' implies a more mutual experience whereas the term 'authority' suggests obedience and a firm separation between leader and follower. But does this distinction actually exist? What is more likely is that, rather than there actually being a difference between the degree of charismatic bond, with relationship being a more relaxed style of leadership in the manner of Winfrey and authority more akin to Jones's leadership, the *styles* are what differ. This was first discussed in regards to Winfrey's suitability as a prophet figure, and here it becomes important to revisit in regards to the way in which charisma as a concept now features in Western popular culture.

It is not the degree to which one is under the sway of a leader, but the way in which he or she leads that makes the difference. The ethical style of charismatic leader may be confused with an authoritarian figure due to the command and obedience elements. These elements are what have been featured prominently in most charismatic leadership research, and are commonly considered to be integral parts of a charismatic relationship. However, considering the exemplary style as counterpoint to the ethical style answers more questions than setting up degrees of charismatic bond. For instance,

demonstrating earlier how Weber's description of the exemplary prophet represents Winfrey's charismatic leadership style is more conclusive than trying to establish how she does not in fact exercise authority. Winfrey does indeed exercise authority, yet she does so in a different manner than Jones, who is a quintessential ethical prophet figure. Due to the extent that Jones' leadership has already been described, I will not elaborate further except to add that because Jones was so clearly recognized as a charismatic leader, the fact that this style is ethical is no coincidence.

The ethical prophet is by and large that with which Western society is most familiar with, being founded on monotheistic religions with a heavy focus on Christianity. Weber uses Jesus as an example as an ethical prophet, and in his discussion on charismatic authority again often points to Jesus. Because this connection is established and emphasized, and because Weber's work provides a baseline for all other research on the concept of charisma, the focus most often lies with ethical prophets. With the spread of media, the increase in immigration from Middle Eastern and Far Eastern countries to Western countries, and the mainstream focus on multiculturalism, exemplary prophet figures are beginning to feature more commonly in Western society. Religions such as Buddhism, which do not share a monotheistic focus, still contain prophet figures but in the absence of a divine commandment, they instead carry a focus on the right path to follow through life. The prophet in this case does not command, but suggests in a manner that appeals to followers and allows them to make their own choices while still submitting to charismatic authority. Of course, if they truly

submit to the charismatic leader, they will make the choices he or she proffers, but the distinction remains: ethical prophets demand obedience, while exemplary prophets suggest.

Rather than the difference in charismatic leadership residing in a degree of emphasis from relationship to authority, the real distinction lies between ethical and exemplary prophet styles. Still, not all charismatic leaders are easily separated into one category or another, and in the absence of clearly defined styles it is enough to say that a leader is charismatic. The prophet is a charismatic individual, but not all charismatic individuals are prophets and thus the ethical versus exemplary distinction is not always required.

4.3 The role of the audience

The differences between audience members of each leader were not so great; that is, until they became followers. The vilification of Jones's followers as "crazy" or "brainwashed," essentially cast in the role of the Other to ease the collective conscience of those who ignored repeated warnings about Jones, was a knee-jerk response to an extreme situation that ended in tragedy for many. Still, the people who joined Peoples Temple were looking for guidance and leadership, a cause that appealed to them, and a person to help them find their ways in a world full of injustice and contradiction.[32] The followers for Trudeau or Winfrey could be said to be similar in their interests as those who followed Jones. It is important to establish this point, as many people assume that because of the manner of the Peoples Temple's end, those followers were somehow different than other Americans or Guyanese. But Trudeau was elected because he promised change and progress, a departure from the stale government of the past, and Winfrey rose to popularity while preaching inner growth and change with the help of numerous experts and the encouragement of a large audience. People vote "with their feet" in that they will go to the leader they like the most, and in the case of all three leaders, audience members were drawn to each leader for what the leader represented and how that resonated with each individual person. The degree to which each charismatic leader was

[32] For a detailed discussion on followers and how Jones appealed to them, *Alternative Considerations of Jonestown* has a large collection of writings from followers and their families. See also research on Jones and Peoples Temple.

or is involved in each follower's life varies greatly according to the leader and his or her style of leadership, as demonstrated by a comparison of leaders.

Jones's followers had almost every aspect of their lives dictated for them, while Trudeau's received little life instruction from him. Winfrey's followers have suggestions about nearly every life issue that they can follow or disregard, in the exemplary style. In this respect, Jones and Winfrey draw more parallels than Trudeau and either leader; Trudeau's supporters decided to follow him because of the degree to which he represented them, and not because of the ways in which he offered specific life changes. From the time Peoples Temple members woke up to the time they went to sleep, Jones had a hand in almost every single action they performed, no mean feat considering the Temple had over one thousand members. Winfrey has managed to top this, providing life guidance through herself or one of her experts to a worldwide audience that is potentially immeasurable. Because she provides examples instead of commands, she has established a para-social relationship with millions of people worldwide, across multiple generations and social classes.[33] It is extremely challenging to issue commands over the media and investigate whether or not one's followers have obeyed; the exemplary style of leadership is uniquely suited to dissemination through media as Winfrey uses it. Many of her viewers enjoy her friend-like appearance and mannerisms, and appreciate her

[33] Admittedly, it is more likely that Winfrey's followers are largely middle and upper-middle class, due to her product endorsement and her appeal to a posh middle class lifestyle that most lower class people cannot afford.

advice as an offshoot of this capacity; Winfrey is like a well-informed and well-connected friend, instead of a billionaire "queen" of her own media empire.

Successful leaders pay attention to tactics that work. Winfrey's "best friend" image has been carefully maintained for nearly twenty-five years, and Jones's image as father and leader, when not being built up by him, was supported almost unconsciously by hundreds of his followers. Still, each leader adjusted his or her image to reflect changes among their followers. When Winfrey adjusted her talk show's mandate in the early 1990s, she made it appear as though by her choice, yet had she not shifted to a more positive lifestyle approach, she likely would have been swept away into the "trash talk" genre and forgotten. Jones's adjustment from friend and leader to father and leader more likely came from him and not his followers, but was well-received by his congregation and indeed drew a massive amount of new members who were attracted by his strong leadership and charismatic style. The point here is not that the audience *makes* the charismatic leader, but that it helps *shape* the leader; clearly those in power are content to be so, and to maintain their power they read the likes and dislikes of their followers and interpret them into leadership changes that can be accommodated into their existing style. Winfrey's progression from "talk rot" to positive life change programming was an about-face, but still logical given her initial subject matter and the style of her peers. Had she instead switched to a televangelism format or a hard-hitting political panel format, she would have estranged thousands of viewers. Her adjustment to her new subject matter was approved by followers and drew in

still more, allowing her to expand into other areas related to that, which helped her succeed initially.

What followers discovered in each leader attributed to the success of that leader. Jones's followers clamoured for spiritual guidance, and his firm administration allowed them to feel reassured and safe while in his care. Their support in the relationship helped maintain his largely unchallenged position of leader until his death, at which point Peoples Temple ceased to exist as a movement. Each leader dominates a field in which people yearn for direction and at the very least, a helping hand from time to time. Because of the capability of each leader to provide for their followers in beneficial ways, while offering a genuine and charismatic style of leadership, followers are encouraged to maintain their relationships with each leader. To date, the only leader who has ceased to provide for his followers was Trudeau, at which point they stopped voting him into power. The same thing cannot be said of Jones because up until the moment of his death, he provided his followers with what they requested, including a manner of death that suited many of them due to their altered beliefs about the world and their lives in it without Jones. Winfrey is currently providing her followers with what they need, and working to expand her influence through a television network even as she has announced the end of her talk show in 2011.

The role of the audience in each of these charismatic leaders' reigns is that of support, encouragement, and validation. The audience consistently supports and perpetuates the image of the leader as charismatic until the

audience no longer feels that they benefit from the relationship, and cease their endorsement. It is interesting to note the difference in involvement of the leaders in their followers' lives; Trudeau's control only extended to the political realm, and he was only able to manipulate voters' opinions of him, while Jones's control eventually became complete, with his charismatic leadership running all aspects of his followers' lives. Winfrey sits in the middle of that spectrum, with her exemplary charismatic touch pushing followers to change in a variety of areas from spirituality to home décor.

4.4 The role of the media

Only in the recent past and present has the media exercised the sort of power to which we are now accustomed; at the beginning of the twentieth century the newspaper was important and the radio a novelty, and at the end of that century, the Internet was becoming a necessity for many North Americans while computers were becoming commonplace. With this shift in the popularity, form, and location of media, it is not surprising that charismatic leadership should be disseminated through the media. Comparing the media's treatment of each charismatic leader provides an illustration of first, the popularity of the leader on the national stage, and second, the importance of the leader's mission in the public eye.

Jones, the leader of a minor religious sect in a time when cults and new religions were springing up everywhere, received the smallest media coverage of all three leaders while he was alive. Attempts to stir up the media on the part of detractors were met with veiled threats from Peoples Temple members and a lack of evidence, which supported negative images of Jones and his followers, and their practices. Without evidence, most negative media on Jones and the Temple appeared to be bluster and ill will, as the Temple was known for good works in the community. Only towards the end of Jones's time in America did the media begin to be an inconvenience, picking up on many of the little struggles he had worked to keep out of the public eye. The positive press potentially balanced the negative until after November 18, 1978. The news media consistently published stories on the so-called Jonestown massacre for

months as news continued to surface about Peoples Temple and what exactly went on in Guyana where followers were without casual access to communication with America. Books were published on Jones, Jonestown, and Peoples Temple starting as early as 1980 and continuing through the decade, and there are numerous websites maintained with media on Jones and Peoples Temple, both negative and informative.[34] The most notable impact that Peoples Temple has had on the media is to install the phrase "drink the Kool-Aid" as a cultural shorthand for buying into an ideal, a movement, or an action completely, a total commitment of oneself (Gardner 2008). The phrase denotes fanaticism and blind loyalty, a distortion and misunderstanding of the events of Jonestown but the common interpretation of them, and the media have continued to use this phrase despite the general lack of correct information on Jones, Jonestown, and Peoples Temple. Because of the dearth of information on Jones and Peoples Temple prior to November 18, 1978, it is not surprising that Jones's legacy is a phrase denoting insanity, yet it helps convey the level of coverage and depth the media devoted to Jones and his church.

Trudeau observed the attention he garnered from the media and used it like the tool it was; by taking advantage of having the public eye on him in a

[34] There is a blog run by Tom Kinsolving called "Jonestown Apologist Alert" that vigilantly posts anything construed as positive (or not negative) press on Jonestown, and meticulously tears it apart (http://jonestownapologistsalert.blogspot.com/). In contrast, family members of those who were at Jonestown as well as survivors run a website called "Alternative Considerations of Jonestown & Peoples Temple" that provides readers with an insight into their thoughts and feelings about Jones, Jonestown, and Peoples Temple both immediately after and to this day (http://jonestown.sdsu.edu/).

positive light, and being aware of the observation, he was able to project a favourable image of himself into the media. This was all for the aid of building a fan base from which to draw voters, so Trudeau's phrases that are now stock when discussing him, such as, "The state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation," are remembered because of the widespread circulation by the media. The image of him with a rose in his lapel sits in the media alongside shots of him pirouetting behind Queen Elizabeth II, canoeing in a buckskin jacket, and with his wife, swinging one of their sons by his arms, all images which have been printed many times. Trudeau worked the media to his advantage, and he was suited to it as well; shots of him under bright lighting accented his cheekbones and eyes, giving him a rugged and exotic look that his opponents could not match (Clarkson and McCall 1990: 111). Conversely, being in the public eye so much did not afford him much privacy, and he had to work hard to find solitude. As well, when his sarcastic and critical wit showed itself, the media were quick to publicize reactions to it, and consistently took his words at face value, despite the effect it had on his reputation.[35] When the media turned against Trudeau after his election and as a result of several political actions that displeased the general public, there was little Trudeau could do but rely on a minority of newspapers who employed acquaintances of his to continue their positive press and wait out the waves of unpopular attention. Just as the media showered him

[35] This is best exemplified in the Saskatchewan wheat farmer issue where Trudeau is recorded as saying, "Why should I sell your wheat?" What was not addressed in the media was that this was a rhetorical question that Trudeau followed up with an explanation (Wilson-Smith 1996). The ill will that followed the explosion of this incident in the media caused a Western Canadian backlash that would never abate.

with praise when he was the favourite of the campaign race, they could change their attention to name-calling and written destruction of his political and personal affairs.

Winfrey's media attention is subtly different than the attention Trudeau received. While she still receives negative press, it is much quieter and phrased differently than her other press; most of the negative press Winfrey receives is featured in personal blogs, gossip websites, or tabloids, and not mainstream news. Positive or upbeat news items are much more common, extolling her latest project or media venture. Winfrey's position in the media is unique because she is part of the media, and owns media outlets such as her show, her magazine, her production company, her radio channel, and soon her network. Thus Winfrey is able to manipulate a great deal of the product her media sources generate, and she is unlikely to allow them to feature damaging coverage of her. As well, because of Winfrey's connections in the media industry, it is well known that she is not a woman to cross; there is no better example of this than the James Frey incident detailed earlier. Even without Winfrey's sway in the media, her fans are quick to defend her and lash out at her naysayers.

Even without Winfrey's manipulation of media, she has been well broadcast. Her position as a biographical icon has allowed her popularity to function as a product of her life, which means that each life event she has becomes news. Weight fluctuations, ordinarily only whispered about, became

front-page news on any number of magazines,[36] and she harnessed that press to identify with her followers about their own weight problems, drawing parallels between her life and theirs even as she became more and more different. Today Winfrey uses her established media circulation to continue to portray the image of America's trusty girlfriend on the inside, a departure from her billionaire, childless, husbandless reality. Although she appears to be just the same as her viewers, her tastes are still more expensive than most viewers might be able to afford (see Okrant 2010). But through successful media manipulation, Winfrey is able to appeal to millions of women who wish to convey a similar image through similar lifestyle, décor, and fashion choices.

Not only does Winfrey choose the persona she projects in the media, but she is able to control how much of herself her followers absorb as well. The cover of *O Magazine* has always had Winfrey on it, her image is in the banner at the top of the webpage oprah.com, and everything she develops is named after her, including her production company, Harpo Productions, which is "Oprah" spelled backwards. With the constant circulation of her image in conjunction with her products and ideas, it is unlikely a follower or even a casual viewer will fail to make the mental connection. By being omnipresent in the media, both in name, image, and output, Winfrey manages to be many things to many diverse groups of followers, who are united by her and her "ministry."

---

[36] This may have set the trend of analyzing all celebrities' weights, and may explain some of the gossip industry's interest in celebrity weight fluctuations. Covers of gossip magazines featuring too skinny or too fat celebrities have become commonplace, potentially due to the effect Winfrey had on the media with her own weight issues.

Another effect of the increase in media exposure in contemporary society is the magnification of charisma. Whereas in the 1970s Jim Jones was more of a local figure than a national one, today Winfrey has been syndicated in 141 countries globally (Oz 2009) and can be found in or on any form of media. In this way Winfrey might appear to be a greater charismatic leader than Jones, but this is inaccurate considering the expansion of media and the issue of power and control, which each leader wields and wielded differently. Addressing the role media plays in charismatic leadership is a consideration for further research, and certainly one that is relevant to contemporary society and, if the prevalence of media continues, future generations as well.

It is erroneous to try and determine who is or was the most charismatic leader, when essentially each leader is separate from any other even though their leadership styles may all be considered charismatic. Simply because Winfrey has greater media presence, simply because Jones created a utopia, simply because Trudeau gained a voting majority does not make any of these leaders greater than the other. One characteristic of charismatic leadership that sets it apart from traditional and rational-legal authority is its incomparability. Comparing traditional authority figures is possible because they are all members of a static and routinized form of authority. Due to charisma's unstable and volatile nature, each leader tends to be best considered alone, as a product of his or her society and in context, but apart from other leaders. What works for Winfrey and her followers would not have worked for Trudeau, or for that

matter, charismatic leaders found previous to the twentieth century. Thus, it is enough to say that each leader is charismatic, but not to place one above another in a sort of ranking system; charisma as a concept is unquantifiable in this manner.

4.5 Limitations and implications

Because this research only covers three charismatic leaders, it is hardly a conclusive discussion of the existence of the phenomenon of charisma. The conclusions drawn here about the three leaders under examination are unlikely to be generalizeable to many others due to the exceptionally small sample. Using this research, it is possible to speculate about charismatic leadership and other charismatic leaders, but the information and analysis in this discussion are somewhat restricted to the three figures herein.

As well, being that few theorists discuss charisma as a concept, and even fewer in contemporary writings, it fell to myself to generate much of the discussion from only a few published authors. Although I am aware also of the limits this places on classical and other theoretical considerations of charisma as a concept, I am confident that the representation of the idea in theory has been more than adequately discussed by the theorists included here. That is not to say that the concept may not be expanded in light of the contemporary popularity of charisma in the current vernacular; I am merely satisfied with the initial conception of charisma as a relationship and form of authority.

This research carries implications for not only future investigation but also future developments on the world stage. *Maclean's* featured an article titled "The return of Hitler" discussing the need for a strong leader in countries lacking guidance and validation in the world, and shifts toward reading Adolf Hitler's writings as a way of seeking the strength and leadership he provided for Germany while in power (Englehart 2010). Hitler's unexpected rise in

popularity over sixty years after his death is a testament to the control and power he exhibited as a charismatic leader, and also a grim portent to the type of leader desperate and needy countries may seek. By selectively ignoring some of Hitler's tenets, such as anti-Semitism that resulted in the deaths of upwards of six million Jews, some groups are minimalizing the effects that another leader in the same tradition might have. Analysing world social and political trends alone warrants the development of a larger body of literature on charisma and charismatic leadership; clearly this type of leadership is valued in society, and becoming more familiar with what the concept means in contemporary society is not only a step toward filling in a poorly developed body of literature, but also a step toward educating ourselves about potentially dangerous national leaders.

The expansion of the concept of charisma is beneficial for academics but it also carries implications for other fields. Research into the impact of media on charismatic leaders and their leadership would prove valuable with the omnipresence of media today, and the call for strong leaders will undoubtedly be spread through the media, drawing on a much wider audience than in most of the twentieth century and having the potential for even greater social upheaval than before. Contrarily, the media's potential to unite may also be used to the good of society, should a leader arise who has the welfare of the world in mind. It is one-sided to assume that charisma may only be used to the detriment of society, and the possibility remains that a worthy charismatic leader might arise just as easily as a tyrannical leader.

5. Conclusion

Throughout this thesis, I have attempted a number of things. Initially, by reexamining the concept of charisma, its development and evolution, I hoped to clarify the usage of the concept. By applying it to individuals recognized by the general public as charismatic, I hoped to evaluate the fitness of that application, as well as examine disconnects between the usage of the concept and its suitability. It has been recognized in contemporary society that the concept of charisma is more freely used than ever before, and this conversion into the mainstream vernacular from an obscure academic notion was also a point of interest.

With the incorporation of contemporary theorists' work with Max Weber's classical conception of charisma as a source of legitimate authority, I have expanded the guidelines for the use of charisma as a concept, and the recognition of it at present and in the future. I feel that this is valuable given the shift of charisma from a concept with religious overtones to one that is now freed from those constraints and used more commonly in a variety of applications.

In light of the way that charisma as a concept has shifted and been adapted to the shifts in the world at large, it is important to take stock of and reassess what makes up the concept. As researchers, we are better served with an up to date tool, and attempting to evaluate charismatic leadership using ideas that have not been refreshed for almost one hundred years leaves us with a most definite lag in appropriate academic assessments. Rather than struggle

with outdated measures, I have consolidated recent research with classical work to form a more comprehensive picture of what represents charisma in contemporary society, and how we may recognize it.

Although three leaders form an impossibly small sample size, I have argued that charisma as a concept is not generalizeable regardless, and thus the research and conclusions drawn from it are limited but not without importance. As a demonstration of the newly strengthened definition of charisma as a concept, the three leaders discussed here provide illustrations of three varying degrees of charisma, both in fields, in levels of power and control, and in manifestation. By observing the progression of charisma from a concept applied to obscure fanatics and religious figures to a concept now used casually to refer to everyone from media moguls to dancers, I have demonstrated the necessity of monitoring change in the concept. What Rev. Jim Jones, former Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and Oprah Winfrey have illustrated in this thesis is not only the variety of forms that charismatic leadership may take, but also how its prevalence in the media and general society has increased dramatically. This gives rise to a separate line of questioning that would be valuable to pursue both for the discussion of charisma and the area of media studies, as well as political studies. The impact that the media has not only on the dissemination and acceptance of charisma in a leader has changed considerably with the advent of the Internet, and a lack of research in this area leaves much to be discovered.

Still, charismatic leaders will always alter our lives, both currently and through the past, as proven in only one instance by the resurgence in popularity of Adolf Hitler's writings and ideas. Strong charismatic leaders are a force with which to be reckoned, providing hope and guidance for their followers and causing social change in both small and big ways. The most difficult of Weber's forms of legitimate authority to study, charisma remains the most mysterious and intriguing to all who observe and are attracted or repulsed by it.

References

Associated Press. 2004. "Surprise! Oprah gives entire audience new cars." *Todayshow.com*. September 13. Retrieved May 3, 2010 (http://today.msnbc.msn.com/id/5989964/).

Avins, Mimi. 2000. "Flocking to the Church of Oprah." *Los Angeles Times*. June 25. Retrieved April 30, 2010 (http://articles.latimes.com/2000/jun/25/news/cl-44508).

Blood, Rebecca. 2000. "Weblogs: a history and perspective." *Rebecca's Pocket*. September 7. Retrieved May 3, 2010 (http://www.rebeccablood.net/essays/weblog_history.html).

CBC Digital Archives. 2009a. "'Honest Bob' promises more progress." May 29, 1960. Retrieved April 24, 2010 (http://archives.cbc.ca/sports/provincial_territorial_politics/clips/13498/).

CBC Digital Archives. 2009b. "A new brand of Canadian social democracy." January 1, 1935. Retrieved April 24, 2010 (http://archives.cbc.ca/politics/parties_leaders/topics/851/).

CBC Digital Archives. 2009c. "Anti-Trudeaumania." December 29, 1968. Retrieved April 24, 2010 (http://archives.cbc.ca/politics/prime_ministers/clips/696/).

CBC Digital Archives. 2009d. "Trudeau on Trudeaumania." January 16, 1994. Retrieved April 24, 2010 (http://archives.cbc.ca/politics/prime_ministers/clips/198/).

Chidester, David. 2003. *Salvation and Suicide: Jim Jones, the Peoples Temple, and Jonestown* (revised edition). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Clarkson, Stephen and Christina McCall. 1990. *Trudeau and Our Times: Volume 1. The Magnificent Obsession*. Toronto, ON: McLelland and Stewart Inc.

CNN.com. 2005. "Luxury store apologizes to Oprah." June 22. Retrieved May 1, 2010 (http://www.cnn.com/2005/SHOWBIZ/TV/06/22/oprah.apology/).

CNNMoney.com. 2004. "Oprah car winners hit with hefty tax." September 22. Retrieved May 3, 2010 (http://money.cnn.com/2004/09/22/news/newsmakers/oprah_car_tax/?cnn=yes).

Couch, Carl J. 1989. *Social Processes and Relationships: A Formal Approach*. Dix Hills, NY: General Hall, Inc.

Crosbie, Lynn. 2010. "To Kitty Kelley: Leave Oprah alone." *The Globe and Mail*. April 27. Retrieved May 2, 2010 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/arts/lynn-crosbie/to-kitty-kelley-leave-oprah-alone/article1547285/).

Decosmo, Janet L. 2003. "Bob Marley: Religious Prophet?" Pp. 59-75 in *Bob Marley: the man and his music*, edited by Eleanor Wint and Carolyn Cooper. Kingston, Jamaica: A r a w a k publications.

Derakhshani, Tirdad. 2010. "Oh woe! No O." *Philadelphia Inquirer*. March 25. Retrieved March 29, 2010 (http://www.philly.com/inquirer/magazine/89094882.html).

Ellis, Lisa. 2009. "What It Costs for Jimmy Choo Shoes." *What It Costs*. Retrieved May 4, 2010 (http://fashion.whatitcosts.com/jimmy-choo-shoes.htm).

Ellis, Lisa. 2009. "What It Costs for Manolo Blahnik Shoes." *What It Costs.* Retrieved May 4, 2010 (http://fashion.whatitcosts.com/manolo-blahnik-shoes.htm).

Ellis, Lisa. 2009. "What It Costs for Christian Louboutin Shoes." *What It Costs*. Retrieved May 4, 2010 (http://fashion.whatitcosts.com/christian-louboutin-shoes.htm).

Englehart, Katie. 2010. "The return of Hitler." *Maclean's* April 21. Retrieved April 21, 2010 (http://www2.macleans.ca/2010/04/21/the-return-of-hitler/1/).

Gardner, Phyllis Abel. 2008. "What Does Kool-Aid Really Mean?" *Alternative Considerations of Jonestown & Peoples Temple*. Retrieved May 7, 2010 (http://jonestown.sdsu.edu/).

Gibbons, Damiana. 2009. "Oprah Winfrey's Branding of Personal Empowerment." Pp. 277-292 in *The Oprah Phenomenon* (updated edition), edited by Jennifer Harris and Elwood Watson. Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press.

Haag, Laurie L. 1993. "Oprah Winfrey: The Construction of Intimacy in the Talk Show Setting." *Journal of Popular Culture* 26: 115-121.

Hall, John R. 1987. *Gone From The Promised Land: Jonestown in American Cultural History*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Hall, R. Mark. 2003. "The 'Oprahfication' of Literacy: Reading 'Oprah's Book Club.'" *College English* 65(6): 646-667.

Hanson, Thomas Blom and Oskar Verkaaik. 2009. "Introduction – Urban Charisma: On Everyday Mythologies in the City." *Critique of Anthropology* 29(1): 5-26.

Harrison, Barbara Grizzuti. 1989. "The Importance of Being Oprah." *New York Times Magazine*. June 11, pp. 28-30, 46-47, 54, 130, 134, 136.

Havrilesky, Heather. 2010. "Kitty Kelley, leave Oprah alone!" *Salon*. April 13. Retrieved May 3, 2010 (http://www.salon.com/entertainment/tv/heather_havrilesky/2010/04/13/leave_oprah_alone).

Howard, Ella. 2009. "From Fasting toward Self-Acceptance: Oprah Winfrey and Weight Loss in American Culture." Pp. 101-124 in *The Oprah Phenomenon* (updated edition), edited by Jennifer Harris and Elwood Watson. Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press.

Hunt, Wayne. 2002/2003. "The 'Branding' of Trudeau." *London Journal of Canadian Studies* 18: 87-101.

Jones, Stephan. 2003. "Like Father, Like Son." *Alternative Considerations of Jonestown & Peoples Temple*. Retrieved April 10, 2010 (http://jonestown.sdsu.edu/).

Kay, Linda. 2009. "My Mom and Oprah Winfrey: Her Appeal to White Women." Pp. 51-64 in *The Oprah Phenomenon* (updated edition), edited by Jennifer

Harris and Elwood Watson. Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press.

Kirkpatrick, David D. 2001. "'Oprah' Gaffe by Franzen Draws Ire and Sales." *New York Times*. October 29. Retrieved May 3, 2010 (http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/29/books/oprah-gaffe-by-franzen-draws-ire-and-sales.html).

Kosova, Weston and Pat Wingert. 2009. "Why Health Advice on 'Oprah' Could Make You Sick." *Newsweek*. June 8. Retrieved May 1, 2010 (http://www.newsweek.com/id/200025/page/1).

Lewis, Robert, Anthony Wilson-Smith, Mary Janigan, Geoffrey Stevens, Peter C. Newman, Joe Chidley, and Jane O'Hara. 1998. "Trudeau, 30 Years Later." *Maclean's* April 6. Retrieved from *The Canadian Encyclopedia* April 25, 2010 (http://thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=M1ARTM0011606).

Litt, Paul. 2008. "Trudeaumania: Participatory Democracy in the Mass-Mediated Nation." *The Canadian Historical Review* 89(1): 27-53.

Lofton, Kathryn. 2006. "Practicing Oprah; or, the Prescriptive Compulsion of a Spiritual Capitalism." *The Journal of Popular Culture* 39(4): 599-621.

McGrath, Maria. 2009. "Spiritual Talk: *The Oprah Winfrey Show* and the Popularization of the New Age." Pp. 125-146 in *The Oprah Phenomenon* (updated edition), edited by Jennifer Harris and Elwood Watson. Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press.

Marsh, James H. 2010. "Trudeau, Pierre Elliott." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved April 24, 2010 (http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=Archived Features&Params=A25).

Masterson, James F. 1981. *The Narcissistic and Borderline Personality Disorders: An Integrated Developmental Approach*. New York: Brunner Routledge.

Morgan, Thomas. 1986. "Troubled Girl's Evolution Into an Oscar Nominee." *New York Times*. March 4, p. C17.

Okrant, Robyn. 2010. *Living Oprah: My One-Year Experiment to Walk the Walk of the Queen of Talk*. New York: Center Street.

Olsen, R. J. M. and J. M. Pasachoff. 2009. "Comets, Charisma, and Celebrity: Reflections on Their Deep Impact." Pp. 41-58 in *Deep Impact as a World Observatory Event: Synergies in Space, Time, and Wavelength*. Berlin: Springer Publishing.

Oosterbaan, Martijn. 2009. "Sonic Supremacy: Sound, Space, and Charisma in a Favela in Rio de Janeiro." *Critique of Anthropology* 29(1): 81-104.

Oprah Winfrey. 2010. *Biography.com*. Retrieved May 5, 2010 (http://www.biography.com/articles/Oprah-Winfrey-9534419).

Oprah.com. 2006. "Behind the Scenes at Harpo Studios." January 1. Retrieved May 4, 2010 (http://www.oprah.com/oprahshow/The-Oprah-Winfrey-Show-Trivia).

Oprah.com. 2008. "Complete List of Oprah's Book Club Books." September 19. Retrieved May 1, 2010

(http://www.oprah.com/oprahsbookclub/Complete-List-of-Oprahs-Book-Club-Books).

Oprahsangelnetwork.org. 2010. "Oprah's Angel Network." Retrieved May 3, 2010 (http://oprahsangelnetwork.org/).

Oz, Mehmet. 2009. "*The Dr. Oz Show* names 'Core Team Oz.'" October 15. Retrieved May 7, 2010 (http://www.oprah.com/pressroom/The-Dr-Oz-Show-Names-Core-Team-Oz).

Peacock, Donald. 1968. *Journey to Power: The Story of a Canadian Election*. Toronto, ON: The Ryerson Press.

Peck, Janice. 2008. *The Age of Oprah: Cultural Icon for the Neoliberal Era*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

------. 2010. "The Secret of Her Success: Oprah Winfrey and the Seductions of Self-Transformation." *Journal of Communication Inquiry*. 34(1): 7-14.

Pellettieri, Jill Hunter. 2005. "Rachael Ray: Why food snobs should quit picking on her." *Slate*. July 13. Retrieved May 3, 2010 (http://www.slate.com/id/2122085/).

Pereira, Malin. 2009. "Oprah's Book Club and the American Dream." Pp. 191-291 in *The Oprah Phenomenon* (updated edition), edited by Jennifer Harris and Elwood Watson. Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press.

Peretz, Evgenia. 2008. "James Frey's Morning After." *Vanity Fair*. June. Retrieved May 1, 2010 (http://www.vanityfair.com/culture/features/2008/06/frey200806?currentPage=1).

PsychNet-UK. 2005. "Personality Disorder Information Sheet: Narcissistic Personality Disorder." July 2. Retrieved March 12, 2010 (http://www.psychnet-uk.com/clinical_psychology/criteria_personality_narcissistic.htm).

Reiterman, Tim with John Jacobs. 1982. *Raven: The untold story of the Rev. Jim Jones and his people.* New York: E. P. Dutton, Inc.

Reston, Jr., James. 1981. *Our Father Who Art In Hell*. New York: Times Books.

Rieff, Philip. 2007. *Charisma: The Gift of Grace, and How it Has Been Taken Away from Us.* New York: Vintage Books.

Smith, Denis. 2010. "October Crisis." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved April 24, 2010 (http://thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0005880).

Stanley, Tarshia L. 2009. "The Specter of Oprah Winfrey: Critical Black Female Spectatorship." Pp. 35-50 in *The Oprah Phenomenon* (updated edition), edited by Jennifer Harris and Elwood Watson. Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press.

Stevens, Geoffrey. 2000. "He Touched Our Dreams: People wished they could be like him." *Maclean's: Trudeau – His Life and Legacy* (Special Commemorative Edition). Pp 18-21.

Sullivan, Martin. 1968. *Mandate '68*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited.

Taylor, LaTonya. 2002. “The Church of O.” *Christianity Today*. April 1. 46(4) (9 pages). Retrieved January 26, 2010 (http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2002/april1/1.38.html).

Terry, Joseph C. 2010. “America’s New Deadly Obsession.” *The Oprah Winfrey Show* Harpo Productions, Inc. Retrieved May 4, 2010 (http://www.oprah.com/oprahshow/Watch-the-Full-Hour-Americas-New-Deadly-Obsession-Video).

Trudeau, Pierre Elliott. 1993. *Memoirs*. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart Inc.

Turner, Stephen. 1993. “Charisma and obedience: A risk cognition approach.” *The Leadership Quarterly* 4(3-4): 235-256.

Turner, Stephen. 2003. “Charisma Reconsidered.” *Journal of Classical Sociology* 3(1): 5-26.

Ulrich, Carman Wong. 2006. “The Oprah Effect.” *Essence*. October 2006: 190-192.

Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weber, Max. 2007. “Chapter 15: ‘Objectivity’ in Social Science.” Pp. 211-217 in *Classical Sociological Theory*, edited by Craig Calhoun, Joseph Gerteis, James Moody, Steven Pfaff, and Indermohan Virk. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

West, Emily. 2008. “Trudeaumania Part II: Passionate Politics in a Canadian 21st Century Media Event.” *International Journal of Communication* 2: 792-825.

Wyatt, Edward. 2004. “Tolstoy’s Translators Experience Oprah’s Effect.” *New York Times*. June 7. Retrieved May 2, 2010 (http://www.nytimes.com/2004/06/07/books/tolstoy-s-translators-experience-oprah-s-effect.html).

Wilf, Eitan and Eva Illouz. 2008. “‘Dynamic Branding’: The case of Oprah Winfrey.” *Women & Performance: a journal of feminist theory*. 18(1): 71-84.

Wilson-Smith, Anthony. 1992. “Chrétien Accused of Lying.” *Maclean’s* December 23. Retrieved from *The Canadian Encyclopedia* April 24, 2010 (http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=M1ARTM0011049).

Zolf, Larry. 1998. “Humble Arrogance: A Cautionary Tale of Trudeau and the Media.” Pp. 47-61 in *Trudeau’s Shadow: The life and legacy of Pierre Elliott Trudeau*, edited by Andrew Cohen and J. L. Granatstein. Toronto, ON: Random House of Canada Limited.