SYCAMORE FOUNDATION
LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

The Need for Ethical Leadership in a Rapidly Changing World

Professor Joel Hayward
Dean, Sycamore Leadership Academy

Sycamore Leadership Academy
Working Papers Series

SYCAMORE FOUNDATION
LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

The Need for Ethical Leadership in a Rapidly Changing World

Working Paper | January 2026

Table of Contents

© Sycamore Foundation for Global Leadership 2025

Plexal,
Here East,
Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park,
London, E20 3BS

www.sycamorefoundation.com

Author biography

Professor Joel Hayward ZDAF, BA, MA HONS, PHD, FRSA, FRHISTS is a New Zealand-born British scholar and author who serves as the Dean of the Leadership Academy at Sycamore Foundation. He previously served as Dean of the Royal Air Force College in the United Kingdom, Professor of Strategic Thought at the Rabdan Academy in the UAE and has also taught leadership and strategy at the National Defense College of the UAE.

He has held various academic leadership posts, including Director of the Institute for International and Civil Security and Chair of the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences at Khalifa University in Abu Dhabi, and Head of Air Power Studies at King's College London. He was also Director of the Royal Air Force's Centre for Air Power Studies.

Professor Hayward has given strategic advice to political and military leaders in several countries and was tutor to His Royal Highness Prince William, the Prince of Wales and Heir Apparent to the British throne. In 2011, he was elected as a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts and in 2012 he was elected as a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.

In 2016, he was named as the 'Best Professor of Humanities and Social Sciences' at the Middle East Education Leadership Awards. He is the prize-winning author or editor of eighteen books and major monographs, over forty peer reviewed articles, and many book chapters and encyclopedia entries. These are mainly in the fields of leadership, international law, strategic studies, military history, and the Islamic ethics of war and conflict.

Executive Summary

This paper explores the critical importance of ethical leadership and governance in the modern era of rapid change, global uncertainty, and intense competition.

It argues that while unethical leaders can demonstrate even remarkable effectiveness in the short term — mobilizing populations, stabilizing economies, or even achieving modernization — their methods erode trust, damage national reputations, and leave corrosive legacies that haunt nations for generations.

Reputation and legacy, therefore, are not abstract ideals but tangible assets of national power, akin to economic or military strength. Drawing on both historical and contemporary examples, including ethical leaders such as Nelson Mandela, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Angela Merkel, and Jacinda Ardern, as well as unethical but goal-achieving leaders such as Ferdinand Marcos, Mobutu Sese Seko, Alberto Fujimori, Benito Mussolini, and Slobodan Milošević, the paper analyzes the paradox that "bad people can be good leaders."

While unethical leaders may sometimes achieve profound short-term change, their unethical conduct inevitably undermines both their reputations and legacies. Ultimately, the paper calls for embedding ethical governance into national institutions as a strategic necessity for resilience, competitiveness, and sustainable prosperity.

01. Introduction

The twenty-first century has intensified the demands placed upon national leadership. Leaders today must navigate a landscape defined by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity; often referred to as the VUCA environment (Bennett & Lemoine, 2014, 27-28). Crises overlap and compound: financial instability intersects with climate-related challenges, pandemics intersect with geopolitical rivalries, and technological disruptions challenge traditional governance models. Against this backdrop, the quality of leadership can determine whether nations thrive or falter.

Traditional forms of state power — military capacity, territorial control, and a monopoly over natural resources — remain important, yet they no longer guarantee competitiveness. Instead, legitimacy, credibility, and trust have become central determinants of influence. In this respect, leadership cannot be divorced from ethics. Ethical governance underpins trust at both domestic and international levels, while unethical governance undermines legitimacy, amplifies instability, and isolates nations from global cooperation (Fukuyama, 2020, 43-45).

National reputation operates as a form of soft power. Nye (2004, 5-10) defines soft power as the ability to attract and persuade rather than coerce. Reputation for integrity or fairness enhances diplomatic leverage, attracts foreign investment, and shapes the willingness of other nations to cooperate. Countries such as Norway, Sweden, New Zealand, and Canada, for example, enjoy outsized global influence in part because of their reputations for ethical governance and respect for human rights (Transparency International, 2022).

Legacy, meanwhile, refers to the long-term institutional, cultural, and historical imprint left by leaders. Leaders who act unethically can sometimes achieve immediate or even long-term goals but they will leave behind fragile institutions, entrenched corruption, and public cynicism. For instance, Alberto Fujimori stabilized Peru's economy and defeated insurgents in the 1990s, yet his authoritarianism and corruption created institutional weakness and reputational damage that persists (Crabtree, 2011, 72-74). In contrast, Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal built institutions of social welfare that endure today, enhancing both the domestic legitimacy and international reputation of the United States (Leuchtenburg, 1995, 311-315).

Reputation and legacy, therefore, are strategic assets in their own right. They shape a nation's soft power, its credibility in international negotiations, and the resilience of its institutions over time.

Leadership studies often equate morality with competence, yet history reveals that unethical individuals can nonetheless demonstrate extraordinary effectiveness in achieving strategic goals. Ferdinand Marcos consolidated power in the Philippines and launched visible infrastructure projects; Mobutu Sese Seko maintained Western backing and stability in Zaire for decades; Benito Mussolini restored order and national pride to a fractured Italy. These were not incompetent leaders. Rather, they were highly effective in achieving their aims — at least in the short term.

But effectiveness is not the same as ethical legitimacy. Max Weber (1978, 241-245) distinguished between different forms of authority: traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal. Many unethical leaders relied on charisma or nationalism to justify their actions, yet they neglected rational-legal legitimacy that was grounded in rules and ethics. As a result, their reputations collapsed and their legacies became burdensome. James MacGregor Burns (1978, 4-6) further differentiates between transactional and transformational leadership, with the latter focused on elevating followers morally. Unethical leaders may be transformational in mobilization, but their failure to elevate morality ensures their legacies corrode over time.

The paradox is thus central to this paper: bad people can be good leaders in terms of achieving strategic political or social goals, but they cannot escape the long-term reputational and legacy costs of unethical governance.

"Leadership studies often equate morality with competence, yet history reveals that unethical individuals can nonetheless demonstrate extraordinary effectiveness in achieving strategic goals."

02. Defining Ethical Leadership and Governance

Ethical leadership can be defined as the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct among followers (Brown & Treviño, 2006, 595). It requires consistency between words and actions, accountability to both domestic and international stakeholders, and a commitment to fairness and justice.

The field of ethics provides three major frameworks that can be applied to leadership:

- *Deontological ethics*: Leaders are bound by duties and principles, regardless of outcomes. For example, Mandela's refusal to pursue retribution after apartheid, and instead to support reconciliation, reflected a deontological commitment to justice and human dignity (Sampson, 1999, 274).
- *Consequentialist ethics*: Leadership should be judged by outcomes. Roosevelt's New Deal policies can be seen as ethical because they alleviated suffering and promoted welfare, even if some measures were experimental (Leuchtenburg, 1995, 64).
- *Virtue ethics*: Leaders are judged by their character and the cultivation of virtues such as honesty, courage, and humility. Merkel's leadership style reflected virtues of prudence and responsibility (Paterson, 2018, 122).

Ethical leadership is therefore multidimensional: it is about principles, outcomes, and character.

Governance refers to the structures, processes, and traditions through which power is exercised, policies are made, and accountability is ensured. Ethical governance requires transparency, inclusivity, adherence to rule of law, and prioritization of long-term public good (Kaufmann, Kraay, & Mastruzzi, 2010, 4).

In weak governance systems, unethical leaders can exploit institutions for personal gain. Mobutu's Zaire is a classic case: institutions existed formally, but in practice they were hollowed out and subservient to his personal authority (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 148). In contrast, Roosevelt and Merkel worked within strong institutional frameworks, reinforcing rather than undermining governance.

John Gardner (1990, 17) noted that "the first requirement of leadership is effectiveness." Yet effectiveness is not synonymous with morality. Leaders like Fujimori and Mussolini were undeniably effective in mobilizing populations and achieving strategic objectives, but their immoral actions undermined their reputations and left corrosive legacies. Ethical leadership thus requires achieving effectiveness ***and*** doing so in ways consistent with principles of justice, dignity, and fairness.

03. Why Ethical Leadership Matters in Today's World

The modern world is defined by interconnectedness. The financial crisis of 2008 demonstrated how economic decisions in one country could reverberate globally. The COVID-19 pandemic revealed how the mishandling of information by one government could affect the entire international community. Climate change shows that national negligence can have planetary consequences (Fukuyama, 2020, 89).

In such a context, unethical leadership is particularly dangerous. Secrecy, corruption, and manipulation not only damage domestic trust but also create transnational risks. During the pandemic, governments that politicized science or obscured data undermined international cooperation, eroding trust in global health governance. By contrast, countries that emphasized transparency and ethical responsibility, such as New Zealand under Jacinda Ardern, enhanced both their domestic legitimacy and global reputation (Wilson, 2020, 14).

Reputation functions as a form of intangible capital in international relations. Nye (2004, 5) argues that credibility and legitimacy are central to soft power. A nation perceived as trustworthy can attract investment, tourism, and alliances. Conversely, reputationally damaged states face higher borrowing costs, trade barriers, and diplomatic isolation (Mauro, 1995, 681).

For example, Germany's reputation under Merkel as a responsible and ethical leader allowed it to anchor European Union negotiations during the Eurozone crisis, wielding influence disproportionate to its size (Paterson, 2018, 103). Similarly, South Africa's international standing improved dramatically under Mandela, who transformed the country from a pariah state into a moral exemplar (Sampson, 1999, 312).

Unethical leadership leaves burdens that extend beyond the leader's lifetime. Marcos's kleptocracy entrenched corruption in the Philippines, making it harder for successors to restore public trust (McCoy, 2009, 127). Mobutu's hollowing out of Zaire left the Democratic Republic of Congo with dysfunctional institutions that persist today (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 176). Milošević's nationalism left Serbia with reputational scars that continue to complicate its European integration (Glenny, 1996, 245).

Conversely, ethical legacies empower future generations. Roosevelt's New Deal created institutions like Social Security that remain pillars of American governance and have been widely emulated elsewhere. Mandela's emphasis on reconciliation continues to provide South Africa with moral capital despite later challenges. Merkel's emphasis on evidence-based pragmatism has set a benchmark for European leadership. Legacies matter because they shape the political culture and institutional memory that future leaders inherit (Kellerman, 2004, 68).

04. Ethical Leadership in Practice

Nelson Mandela's leadership in South Africa after apartheid illustrates the transformative potential of ethical governance. Having endured 27 years of imprisonment, Mandela emerged not embittered but committed to reconciliation. His presidency (1994-1999) was marked by a refusal to pursue retribution against the white minority, instead emphasizing national unity and the construction of inclusive democratic institutions (Sampson, 1999).

Mandela's ethical stance was grounded in principles of dignity, justice, and forgiveness. Under his leadership, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, chaired by Desmond Tutu, provided a framework for addressing atrocities without perpetuating cycles of violence (Tutu, 1999). While imperfect, this mechanism demonstrated how moral leadership can stabilize a nation emerging from conflict.

The reputational dividends were immense. Mandela transformed South Africa's global standing from pariah to exemplar. His personal reputation enhanced South Africa's soft power, enabling it to mediate regional disputes and attract investment. His legacy endures as a moral compass for South African politics, even though subsequent leaders have struggled to uphold his standards (Krog, 2008). Mandela demonstrates that ethical leadership is not only morally admirable but strategically advantageous.

Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR) provides a different model of ethical leadership: pragmatic yet principled. Taking office in 1933 during the Great Depression, which tore the heart out of the American and global economy after it began in 1929, FDR launched the New Deal, a series of programs designed to provide relief, recovery, and reform (Leuchtenburg, 1995). Critics accused him of excessive experimentation, but his overarching commitment was clear: to protect democratic capitalism by alleviating suffering and restoring confidence.

Ethical leadership does not mean rigid adherence to abstract ideals; it requires balancing competing values. Roosevelt occasionally compromised on issues such as civil rights, reflecting political constraints (Smith, 2007). Yet his overall orientation — prioritizing fairness, opportunity, and social justice — aligned with ethical principles. His leadership elevated the moral expectations of government, creating a legacy of social programs that endure to this day.

Internationally, FDR's ethical framing of World War II as a struggle for democracy and freedom gave moral legitimacy to U.S. leadership. His articulation of the "Four Freedoms" (freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear) became guiding principles for the postwar international order (Freidel, 1990). His legacy demonstrates how ethical leadership can anchor both domestic reform and global reputation.

Angela Merkel's tenure as German Chancellor (2005-2021) underscores the importance of principled pragmatism. A physicist by training, Merkel was known for her methodical, cautious, and evidence-based approach.

Yet she also demonstrated ethical conviction, particularly during the 2015 refugee crisis. At a time when populist movements across Europe opposed migration, Merkel declared "***Wir schaffen das***" ("We can do this"), opening Germany's doors to more than one million refugees (Triadafilopoulos, 2019).

Merkel's decision was controversial domestically, but it reflected ethical principles of humanitarian responsibility and European solidarity. It also enhanced Germany's global reputation as a moral leader, even as it created significant and lasting political challenges at home. Her leadership during the Eurozone crisis further reflected a balance of prudence and solidarity, emphasizing fiscal responsibility while keeping the European Union intact (Paterson, 2018).

Merkel's legacy lies not only in policy outcomes but in the reputation she cultivated: Germany as a reliable, principled, and pragmatic power. This reputation continues to shape European politics and Germany's role in international diplomacy.

Jacinda Ardern, Prime Minister of New Zealand from 2017 to 2023, illustrates the power of empathy as a component of ethical leadership. Her response to the 2019 Christchurch mosque shootings exemplified moral clarity: she immediately denounced extremism, embraced victims' families, and implemented swift gun control reforms (Vernon, 2021).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, Ardern's transparent communication and emphasis on collective responsibility fostered high public trust. Her empathetic style was not a weakness but a strength, enabling compliance with stringent health measures (Wilson, 2020). Internationally, her leadership enhanced New Zealand's reputation as a model of humane and effective governance.

As with Merkel's, Adern's legacy lies not only in policy outcomes (she is not considered to have improved New Zealand's economic condition, for example, and may indeed have failed in this and other sectors), but in the reputation she cultivated. It improved New Zealand's reputation as an ethical, open, transparent and ethical state. Adern's case demonstrates that ethical leadership is not limited to grand historical figures like Mandela or Roosevelt. Even small nations can project outsized influence when their leaders embody integrity, empathy, and responsibility. Her legacy is a reminder that ethical leadership resonates globally in an age of instant communication.

"Jacinda Ardern, Prime Minister of New Zealand from 2017 to 2023, illustrates the power of empathy as a component of ethical leadership. Her response to the 2019 Christchurch mosque shootings exemplified moral clarity."

05. Unethical but Effective Leadership

While ethical leaders such as Mandela, Roosevelt, Merkel, and Ardern illustrate how integrity can amplify both national effectiveness and global reputation, history also provides numerous examples of unethical leaders who were nonetheless highly effective in achieving short-term objectives. The paradox is that such leaders often mobilized populations, delivered stability, or drove modernization, yet their methods undermined legitimacy, corroded institutions, and left reputational damage that continues to shape their nations. This section examines five prominent cases: Ferdinand Marcos, Mobutu Sese Seko, Alberto Fujimori, Benito Mussolini, and Slobodan Milošević.

Marcos and Mobutu, to begin with, were two leaders whose kleptocratic regimes demonstrate how unethical governance can coexist with short-term effectiveness, but at devastating long-term costs.

Ferdinand Marcos rose to prominence in the Philippines as a brilliant lawyer, charismatic politician, and war veteran. Elected president in 1965, Marcos initially governed within democratic norms, emphasizing infrastructure development and economic modernization. The Philippines at the time was regarded as one of Asia's more promising democracies, strategically positioned during the Cold War as a U.S. ally (Boyce, 1993, 21).

By 1969, however, Marcos faced growing economic instability, insurgencies from both communist and Muslim separatist movements, and increasing political opposition. In 1972, he declared martial law, citing threats from the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Moro National Liberation Front. Martial law allowed him to extend his presidency beyond constitutional limits, suppress dissent, and centralize power under his control (Robles, 2016, 56).

Marcos was undeniably effective in several respects. He launched massive infrastructure programs — roads, bridges, hospitals, and cultural centers — that symbolized modernization. His regime cultivated technocrats, some of whom delivered competent economic management in the early years (McCoy, 2009, 88). In terms of political effectiveness, martial law quelled insurgencies temporarily, stabilized urban unrest, and allowed Marcos to consolidate power. He mastered patronage politics, balancing rival factions within the military and elite. Internationally, Marcos maintained strong ties with the United States, securing military aid and diplomatic support by presenting himself as a reliable ally against communism (Thompson, 2010, 44).

At the height of his power in the 1970s, Marcos projected the image of a modernizing leader who brought order and development to a country plagued by instability. Many Filipinos initially welcomed martial law, believing it would bring discipline and economic growth.

However, despite these achievements, Marcos's rule was deeply unethical. His martial law regime dismantled democratic institutions, curtailed press freedom, and sanctioned widespread human rights abuses, including torture, imprisonment without trial, and extrajudicial killings (Robles, 2016, 113-114).

Most notoriously, Marcos and his wife Imelda engaged in systematic kleptocracy, siphoning billions of dollars into overseas accounts and lavish properties. Transparency International later estimated that they stole between $5 and $10 billion during their rule, making the Marcos regime one of the most corrupt in modern history (Transparency International, 2022).

Their unethical leadership institutionalized corruption by entrenching cronies in key industries, creating monopolies that enriched loyalists while impoverishing ordinary Filipinos. Infrastructure projects, while visible, were often riddled with overpricing and kickbacks. Thus, modernization coexisted with deepening inequality and debt.

During the early years of martial law, Marcos maintained a relatively positive reputation abroad. Many foreign observers viewed him as a strong leader bringing stability to a turbulent society. U.S. support, motivated by Cold War priorities, shielded him from international criticism (Boyce, 1993, 77). However, by the 1980s, his reputation collapsed. The assassination of opposition leader Benigno "Ninoy" Aquino Jr. in 1983 highlighted the brutality of his regime, sparking international outrage and accelerating domestic opposition. By the time of the People Power Revolution in 1986, Marcos was internationally discredited as a corrupt dictator clinging to power.

The legacy of Marcos is a cautionary tale. On the one hand, he left behind roads, cultural centers, and a reputation for strongman leadership that some Filipinos still admire. On the other, his kleptocracy entrenched corruption, weakened institutions, and created a culture of impunity that persists in Philippine politics (McCoy, 2009, 224-225).

Internationally, the Philippines' reputation suffered greatly. For decades, it was seen as a corrupt, unstable democracy, limiting foreign investment and weakening its credibility. The reputational damage of Marcos's regime continues to shape the country, as debates over his legacy remain polarizing. Even the election of his son, Ferdinand "Bongbong" Marcos Jr., in 2022 underscores how contested historical memory remains.

Marcos exemplifies the paradox of unethical effectiveness. He achieved stability and modernization, but his misconduct — manifested in corruption, repression, and human rights abuses — destroyed his reputation and left a corrosive legacy. His case demonstrates that short-term effectiveness cannot compensate for long-term reputational collapse.

The career of Mobutu Sese Seko provides a similarly cautionary case study. He came to power in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo) following the chaotic post-independence period after 1960. Amid Cold War rivalries and internal instability, Mobutu seized power in a coup in 1965. Charismatic and shrewd, he presented himself as the only figure capable of holding together a vast and ethnically diverse country (Callaghy, 1984, 37). He cultivated a strong personalist rule. He promoted "***authenticité***," a policy aimed at promoting African cultural identity, including renaming the country Zaire and adopting a new national dress code. These symbolic moves reinforced his authority and projected an image of cultural pride (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 121).

Mobutu was highly effective in consolidating power and maintaining stability. In a country plagued by secessionist movements and factionalism, his centralized patronage system ensured loyalty from elites and the military. He famously declared that everyone should have "a little something" from corruption, effectively institutionalizing graft as a mechanism of governance (Wrong, 2001, 65).

Internationally, Mobutu proved effective in leveraging Cold War dynamics. By presenting himself as a staunch anti-communist, he secured massive aid from the United States, France, and Belgium. For decades, Western powers tolerated his corruption in exchange for geopolitical loyalty. Zaire became a key ally, hosting Western intelligence operations and serving as a bulwark against Soviet influence in Africa (Callaghy, 1984, 142). Mobutu's foreign policy effectiveness bought him decades of external support and legitimacy. Domestically, his charisma and patronage networks ensured relative stability, particularly compared to neighboring states.

Despite his effectiveness, Mobutu's regime was among the most corrupt in history. He looted between $4 and $15 billion from state resources, amassing vast personal wealth while his suffering population sank into poverty (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 174). His kleptocracy hollowed out state institutions: ministries, courts, and the military became vehicles for patronage rather than governance.

Human rights abuses were also rampant. Dissent was crushed through imprisonment, torture, and execution. Political opponents disappeared, and civil liberties were virtually nonexistent. The culture of corruption extended to all levels of society, normalizing theft and undermining public morality.

Mobutu's international reputation followed a trajectory similar to Marcos's. During the Cold War, he was feted by Western leaders, receiving red-carpet treatment in Washington and Paris. His leopard-skin hat and flamboyant style made him a recognizable global figure. He was portrayed as a symbol of stability and African authenticity (Wrong, 2001, 119-120).

However, his reputation began to unravel in the late 1980s as the Cold War ended. Without strategic utility, Western powers grew less tolerant of his corruption and authoritarianism. His lavish lifestyle contrasted starkly with his people's poverty, drawing international condemnation. By the time of his removal from power in 1997, Mobutu was reviled as the quintessential kleptocrat.

Mobutu's legacy has been catastrophic. His systematic looting left Zaire bankrupt, with crumbling infrastructure and dysfunctional institutions. The normalization of corruption created a political culture where governance equated to personal enrichment.

The reputational damage endures: the Democratic Republic of Congo remains associated with corruption, instability, and institutional weakness. Despite

its immense natural resource wealth, the country struggles to overcome the corrosive legacies of Mobutu's rule (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 198).

Internationally, Mobutu's name became synonymous with kleptocracy. His case demonstrates how a leader can maintain stability and international support for decades yet ultimately leave a nation weakened, discredited, and burdened by corruption.

Mobutu's career underscores the paradox of unethical effectiveness. He maintained unity in a fragile state and secured decades of Western support, but his immorality destroyed institutions and discredited his country. Like Marcos, his short-term effectiveness came at immense long-term reputational cost.

The case of Alberto Fujimori is equally grim. In 1990, Fujimori, a relatively unknown university rector and agricultural engineer, shocked Peru and the world by defeating celebrated novelist Mario Vargas Llosa in the presidential election. Fujimori presented himself as an outsider, a man of humble Japanese-Peruvian background unconnected to the discredited political elite. His appeal lay in his promise of pragmatism: to fix the economy and restore security without pushing any ideological agenda (Crabtree, 2011, 72).

At the time, Peru was in crisis. Inflation exceeded 7,000% annually, the economy was collapsing, and the Maoist-inspired Shining Path insurgency threatened state control, launching bombings, assassinations, and massacres. Public confidence in traditional parties had evaporated, creating space for a figure like Fujimori.

Fujimori's effectiveness was evident almost immediately. His radical economic program — dubbed "Fujishock" — liberalized trade, reduced subsidies, and privatized state industries. The measures were harsh, leading to immediate price spikes, but they curbed hyperinflation and stabilized the economy. Over time, growth returned, foreign investment increased, and international creditors restored relations with Peru (Stokes, 2001, 19).

On the security front, Fujimori presided over the dramatic weakening of the Shining Path. In 1992, his intelligence services captured Abimael Guzmán, the group's leader. The insurgency crumbled thereafter, and violence declined significantly (McClintock & Vallas, 2003, 144). For many Peruvians, Fujimori was the man who restored peace and normalcy after years of fear.

These achievements gave him enormous political capital. He was pragmatic, decisive, and willing to make unpopular choices. In terms of Weber's (1978, 242) typology, he wielded both charismatic and rational-legal authority, embodying both effectiveness and decisiveness.

Yet Fujimori's methods were profoundly unethical. In 1992, facing opposition in Congress, he staged an "***autogolpe***" (self-coup), dissolving the legislature and judiciary, ruling instead by decree with military backing. This destroyed democratic checks and balances, transforming him into an authoritarian president (Crabtree, 2011, 88).

His government engaged in systematic human rights abuses. Counterinsurgency operations included

extrajudicial killings and forced disappearances. A notorious program of forced sterilization targeted hundreds of thousands of mostly indigenous women under the guise of family planning, raising charges of ethnic discrimination (Boesten, 2007, 86).

Corruption was also rampant. Fujimori's intelligence chief, Vladimiro Montesinos, orchestrated vast networks of bribery involving judges, legislators, and media owners. The scandal was exposed in the infamous "***Vladivideos***," recordings of Montesinos handing out cash to buy loyalty (Taylor, 2017, 44). Fujimori himself fled Peru in 2000 amid scandal, faxing his resignation from Japan. He was later extradited, convicted, and imprisoned for human rights abuses and corruption.

Fujimori's international reputation had been strong. He was praised by the IMF and World Bank for economic reforms and by international observers for defeating terrorism. He was seen as an example of pragmatic, technocratic leadership in Latin America (Stokes, 2001, 35). However, his reputation collapsed as evidence of his authoritarianism and corruption mounted. Human rights groups condemned his abuses, and democratic governments distanced themselves. By the time of his exile, Fujimori was widely regarded as a disgraced dictator.

Fujimori's legacy remains contested. Some Peruvians continue to admire him for restoring order and stabilizing the economy. His daughter Keiko Fujimori has remained a major political figure, drawing on this legacy. Yet the enduring narrative outside his loyalist base is that of corruption and authoritarianism.

Institutionally, Fujimori weakened democracy, undermined the judiciary, and normalized corruption. His forced sterilization program left generational scars. Internationally, Peru's reputation as a fragile and unstable democracy persists.

Fujimori demonstrates the paradox vividly: a leader can deliver economic stabilization and defeat insurgents yet still be remembered more for his corruption and abuses than his achievements. His effectiveness was undeniable; so too was his immorality.

Benito Mussolini needs little introduction. Associated with Adolf Hitler, his reputation remains dismal, despite significant early progress in positively transforming Italy. A former socialist journalist, Mussolini rose to power in Italy amid post-World War I turmoil. The war had left Italy deeply divided, economically weakened, and socially unstable. Strikes, peasant uprisings, and political paralysis plagued the liberal government. In 1922, Mussolini capitalized on nationalist resentment and fear of communism by organizing the "March on Rome," pressuring King Victor Emmanuel III to appoint him prime minister (Bosworth, 2002, 92).

Mussolini founded the Fascist Party, combining nationalism, authoritarianism, and corporatism. His rhetoric of national rebirth resonated with Italians disillusioned by what they considered the "mutilated victory" of World War I, in which Italy's territorial gains fell short of expectations (Knox, 2000, 58).

Mussolini was highly effective in consolidating power and restoring order. He suppressed strikes, curtailed political violence, and created the image of a decisive leader. His regime launched ambitious infrastructure projects, drained marshes, expanded railways, and promoted modernization. Propaganda extolled him as "*Il Duce*," the embodiment of national will. Internationally, Mussolini initially enjoyed admiration. Winston Churchill, before World War II, described him as a great legislator who brought stability to Italy. For many in Europe and the U.S., he appeared as a bulwark against communism and an innovator in governance (Bosworth, 2002, 117).

Mussolini's cult of personality reflected Weber's (1978, 242-243) notion of charismatic authority. He projected decisiveness, energy, and vision, contrasting with the perceived weakness of liberal democracy. Mussolini's methods, however, were profoundly unethical. He suppressed opposition, censored the press, and employed violence through his paramilitary Blackshirts. The regime institutionalized surveillance and repression, eroding freedoms and the rule of law (Bosworth, 2002, 161-163).

His imperial ambitions led to aggression abroad, most notably the brutal invasion of Ethiopia in 1935, which involved widespread atrocities, including the use of chemical weapons. This undermined his international reputation, transforming admiration into condemnation (Knox, 2000, 144-146).

The most catastrophic ethical failure was Mussolini's alliance with Nazi Germany. Initially skeptical of Hitler, Mussolini later embraced the Axis, entering World War II and adopting anti-Semitic laws in 1938. His choices tied Italy's fate to Nazi atrocities and military disaster.

In the 1920s and early 1930s, Mussolini's reputation abroad was surprisingly positive. Intellectuals and politicians praised his efficiency and modernization. Fascism appeared to some as a new, energetic alternative to democratic paralysis. But by the late 1930s, his reputation had collapsed. Aggression in Ethiopia, intervention in the Spanish Civil War, and a foolish alliance with Hitler — strangely he had earlier preferred engagement with Britain and France, who grew tired of him, pushing him into Hitler's camp — discredited him and caused Italy intense hardship. By the end of World War II, Mussolini was reviled as a tyrant. His corpse, hung upside down in Milan in 1945, symbolized his complete reputational destruction.

Mussolini's legacy is one of disgrace. Although he modernized infrastructure and restored a sense of national pride in the short term, his association with fascism, war, and genocide ensures that his name is synonymous with infamy. Italians continue to grapple with his memory, with far-right groups occasionally invoking his legacy but mainstream politics repudiating him.

Mussolini exemplifies how reputations can swing dramatically. Once admired as a modernizer, he became a byword for dictatorship. His unethical choices negated his early effectiveness, leaving a poisoned legacy.

Slobodan Milošević's name is, like Mussolini's, associated mainly with a cruel and failed war effort. Milošević emerged in the late 1980s as a dominant political figure in Yugoslavia. Originally a technocrat, he reinvented himself as a nationalist leader, seizing upon Serbian grievances over Kosovo. In a famous 1989 speech at Kosovo Polje, he declared that Serbs would never be oppressed again, effectively rebranding himself as the defender of Serbian identity (Judah, 2009, 41). At the time, Yugoslavia was disintegrating. Ethnic tensions, economic decline, and political fragmentation created an opening for nationalist mobilization. Milošević presented himself as the strong leader who could defend Serbs across the federation.

Milošević was highly effective in consolidating power. He controlled media narratives, mobilized mass rallies, and manipulated institutions to centralize authority. He ensured Serbian dominance within the Yugoslav federation and positioned himself as indispensable.

His adoption of nationalistic rhetoric was politically effective. He rallied Serbs in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo, convincing many that only he could defend their interests. He maintained power domestically despite international isolation and economic decline, demonstrating remarkable political resilience (Glenny, 1996, 244).

Milošević's leadership was marked by grave ethical failures. He fueled ethnic hatred, supported paramilitary groups, and oversaw wars in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo that involved ethnic cleansing, massacres, and mass displacement. His regime used media to incite violence, portraying other ethnic groups as existential threats to Serbs (Judah, 2009, 73-75).

Domestically, dissent was repressed. Opposition leaders were harassed, and protests were suppressed by police. Corruption flourished as sanctions isolated Serbia, creating black markets and enriching elites close to Milošević.

Initially, Milošević managed to present himself as a pragmatic negotiator in international talks, including the Dayton Accords in 1995, which ended the Bosnian war. For a brief period, he was viewed as someone who could deliver peace, enhancing his reputation as a "man we can do business with." But his reputation soon collapsed. His role in looking away from, or causing, atrocities became undeniable, and Serbia was branded a pariah state. NATO heavily bombed Serbia for seventy-eight days in 1999 during the Kosovo war, further isolating his regime. Milošević was later indicted for war crimes by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. He was in fact the first sitting head of state to be so charged (Judah, 2009, 219).

Milošević's legacy is one of devastation. Serbia's economy was shattered, its reputation ruined, and its path to European integration obstructed for decades. The wars he fomented left deep scars across the Balkans, with millions displaced and hundreds of thousands killed. Although some Serbs still view him as a defender of national interests, internationally his name is synonymous with ethnic cleansing and war crimes. His trial at The Hague, though unfinished due to his death, cemented his legacy as a war criminal.

Milošević illustrates the extreme of unethical effectiveness. He achieved power consolidation and nationalist mobilization, but at catastrophic cost. His immorality destroyed Serbia's reputation, condemned it to isolation, and left a legacy of division and trauma. His case demonstrates that unethical leadership may achieve short-term goals but invariably produces long-term ruin.

Taken together, the cases of Marcos, Mobutu, Fujimori, Mussolini, and Milošević reveal common themes. Each leader was effective in achieving certain goals: stabilization, modernization, or consolidation of power. Each possessed charisma, decisiveness, or strategic skill. Yet each also engaged in unethical practices — corruption, repression, manipulation, or violence — that ultimately destroyed their reputations and burdened their nations with corrosive legacies.

Their cases confirm that unethical effectiveness is unsustainable. It can produce impressive results, meaning the achievement of strategic goals, but it undermines the legitimacy and credibility necessary for long-term success. Reputation and legacy, once lost, are nearly impossible to restore.

History thus demonstrates the paradox of unethical but effective leadership: that unethical individuals can nonetheless display remarkable leadership skills. Marcos stabilized the Philippines temporarily with infrastructure projects, Mobutu maintained Cold War backing and unity in Zaire, Fujimori crushed the Shining Path, Mussolini restored order to Italy, and Milošević mobilized Serbian nationalism. These leaders showed decisiveness, vision, and charisma — qualities often associated with effective leadership (Burns, 1978, 4).

Yet effectiveness is not morality. Barbara Kellerman (2004, 33) emphasizes that bad leadership can still be competent, but its impact is destructive. Unethical leaders exploit fear, nationalism, or patronage systems to achieve their aims. They may achieve stability or even modernization, but because they neglect justice and integrity, their successes prove fragile.

Reputations collapse when unethical methods overshadow achievements. Marcos's kleptocracy turned the Philippines into a case study of corruption (McCoy, 2009, 227). Mobutu's decades of looting earned Zaire the title of "kleptocracy" (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 176). Fujimori's corruption eclipsed his counter-insurgency victories (Crabtree, 2011, 93). Mussolini's early modernization was obliterated by his alliance with Hitler (Bosworth, 2002, 201). Milošević's nationalist mobilization condemned Serbia to international isolation and war crimes trials (Judah, 2009, 221).

In each case, unethical effectiveness lacked durability. Reputational collapse revealed that legitimacy cannot be sustained without ethics.

Comparing ethical and unethical leaders reveals a stark truth: ethics amplify legacy, while immorality undermines it. Mandela's reconciliation enhanced South Africa's moral capital; Roosevelt's social programs endure; Merkel's principled pragmatism stabilized Europe. Ardern's empathy elevated New Zealand's global standing. Meanwhile, Marcos, Mobutu, Fujimori, Mussolini, and Milošević left legacies of fragility and reputational stigma.

The paradox is therefore resolved: bad people can lead effectively, but their immorality ensures their reputations collapse and their legacies burden future generations.

06. Reputation and Legacy as National Assets

Reputation operates as intangible capital in diplomacy and economics. Nye (2004, 5) highlights credibility as central to soft power. States with reputations for ethical governance attract investment, alliances, and influence. Nations with reputational damage face isolation, sanctions, and skepticism.

Germany under Merkel exemplifies the positive side: its reputation for stability and principled leadership gave it disproportionate influence in the EU (Paterson, 2018, 112). Conversely, Mobutu's Zaire became a byword for corruption, discouraging investment long after his fall.

Legacies shape political culture and institutional memory. Marcos normalized corruption in the Philippines, making it harder for reformers to rebuild trust. Fujimori's autogolpe weakened democratic institutions in Peru, contributing to ongoing instability (Taylor, 2017, 87). By contrast, Roosevelt's New Deal created enduring programs like Social Security, and Mandela's reconciliation framework continues to anchor South African democracy (Leuchtenburg, 1995, 224; Sampson, 1999, 301).

Thus, without even having drawn upon the examples of history's worst monsters, such as Adolf Hitler or Joseph Stalin, it is clear that legacies outlast individuals. Ethical leaders strengthen institutions; unethical leaders poison them and leave their countries reputationally tainted for years, sometimes for generations.

The intergenerational costs of unethical leadership are profound. Serbia still grapples with the scars of Milošević's wars, complicating its EU integration (Glenny, 1996, 56). The Democratic Republic of Congo continues to struggle under Mobutu's legacy of institutional collapse (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 145). These burdens are not easily erased. They require decades of reform and reputational rebuilding. Thus, legacy is not simply about memory but about structural consequences that shape a nation's future trajectory.

We might also ponder what might be called the export of immorality; that is, how domestic leadership shapes international responses. Put simply, ethical or unethical leadership does not remain confined within national borders. Domestic immorality often spills over into international relations, shaping how other states, corporations, and international organizations engage with a country. In many cases, unethical leadership encourages immoral responses abroad, either by attracting opportunistic partners who mirror domestic corruption or by provoking punitive distrust from more principled actors.

When leaders display disregard for ethics domestically, they weaken their state's credibility as a proponent of international norms. For example, Mobutu Sese Seko's systematic kleptocracy discredited Zaire abroad, yet it also facilitated reciprocal corruption by Western firms and governments eager to maintain access to resources (Wrong, 2001, 89). Similarly, Ferdinand Marcos's reputation for corruption normalized bribery in international business transactions, embedding a culture of unethical exchange that extended beyond Philippine borders (Boyce, 1993, 212).

Domestic immorality also translates into international aggression or repression. Benito Mussolini's authoritarianism at home was mirrored by imperial brutality abroad, most infamously in Ethiopia, where Italian forces used chemical weapons in violation of international law (Knox, 2000, 76). Slobodan Milošević's manipulation of nationalist hatred domestically spilled into wars in Bosnia and Kosovo, where ethnic cleansing became a foreign policy instrument (Judah, 2009, 134). These cases illustrate how internal immorality primes leaders to disregard ethical boundaries internationally.

Unethical leadership creates a form of reputational contagion, signaling to the international community that morality is negotiable. Nye (2004, 12) argues that credibility is central to soft power; once credibility is eroded, states lose the ability to mobilize trust. Instead, they attract opportunistic or transactional partners. Mobutu's Zaire, for instance, became deeply entangled in Cold War patronage, where Western powers knowingly funneled aid that would be embezzled in exchange for geopolitical loyalty (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 187).

States led by unethical leaders often invite immoral responses in bilateral and multilateral dealings. Fujimori's manipulation of media and institutions encouraged complicity from foreign investors who looked the other way at corruption to maintain market access (Crabtree, 2011, 233). In these contexts, external actors mirrored the immorality of domestic leadership, reinforcing cycles of corruption.

Conversely, immoral leadership can trigger harsh international responses rooted in distrust. Keohane (2005, 77) notes that cooperation depends on perceptions of reciprocity and reliability. When Milošević's Serbia repeatedly violated agreements and engaged in atrocities, NATO and the EU shifted from negotiation to coercion, culminating in sanctions and military intervention (Glenny, 1996, 241). Here, immorality provoked reciprocal immorality; not corruption as such, but coercive force.

Thus, the export of immorality demonstrates that unethical leadership corrodes not only domestic institutions but also international relations. Countries led by corrupt or abusive leaders are drawn into networks of opportunism, coercion, or isolation, limiting their strategic flexibility. In contrast, states with reputations for ethical governance — such as post-apartheid South Africa under Mandela or Germany under Merkel — benefit from moral credibility that enhances soft power and trust in international cooperation (Nye, 2004, 15; Sampson, 1999, 342; Paterson, 2018, 119).

"The export of immorality demonstrates that unethical leadership corrodes not only domestic institutions but also international relations. Countries led by corrupt or abusive leaders are drawn into networks of opportunism, coercion, or isolation, limiting their strategic flexibility."

07. Ethical Leadership as a Strategic Necessity

Ethical leadership is essential for resilience during crises. Tom Tyler (2006, 37) shows that citizens are more likely to comply with government directives when they view leaders as legitimate and fair. Trust becomes a multiplier of state capacity: when people believe decisions are made with fairness and transparency, voluntary compliance reduces the need for coercion. Jacinda Ardern's pandemic response demonstrated this principle. Her transparent communication and empathetic tone created high levels of public trust, leading to widespread compliance with lockdowns and making New Zealand one of the most resilient nations during the first wave of COVID-19 (Wilson, 2020, 114). This example illustrates that legitimacy grounded in ethical leadership is not abstract but operationally vital in crisis governance.

Ethical governance also promotes economic competitiveness. Mauro (1995, 691) found that corruption deters investment and reduces growth by increasing uncertainty and transaction costs. Conversely, transparency and accountability signal stability, reducing risk premiums and attracting long-term capital. The reputational dimension is crucial: Nordic countries, consistently ranked highly on global corruption indices, not only enjoy prosperity but also project reputational credibility that further strengthens investor confidence (Transparency International, 2022). By embedding ethical leadership into institutions, these states transformed virtue into comparative advantage in the global economy.

Ethical leadership also underpins national security. Corruption in defense procurement, for instance, undermines readiness and effectiveness, while ethical leadership ensures resources are used strategically. States where corruption pervades the military, such as Zaire under Mobutu, struggle with capacity and legitimacy, while ethical governance builds security institutions that inspire loyalty and public trust (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 152). Security partnerships also hinge on credibility: NATO's reliance on Germany under Merkel reflected confidence in her ethical stewardship of power (Paterson, 2018, 104).

Innovation and science policy provide another strategic frontier. Trust in leadership shapes compliance with regulations and adoption of new technologies. Leaders who demonstrate fairness and foresight encourage public support for disruptive innovation and climate adaptation. Merkel's advocacy for renewable energy — the Energiewende — drew legitimacy from her reputation for integrity, allowing Germany to pursue bold policies without destabilizing backlash (Triadafilopoulos, 2019, 62). Ethical leadership thus enables societies to take calculated risks, building future-oriented competitiveness.

Global cooperation also depends fundamentally on trust. Ethical states build stronger alliances, while unethical ones face sanctions, isolation, or exploitative partnerships. Keohane (2005, 77) emphasizes that international regimes function on the assumption of reciprocity: when states behave ethically, others are more willing to cooperate. Merkel's Germany was trusted to anchor European integration, while Milošević's Serbia was ostracized because of its immorality,

demonstrating how reputation translates directly into strategic positioning.

Ethical leadership also plays a vital role in migration governance and humanitarian crises. When leaders are trusted to act with fairness, they can build public legitimacy for policies that balance compassion with security. Merkel's 2015 decision to open Germany's borders to refugees was ethically controversial but was underpinned by her credibility and consistency as a principled leader. This ethical capital allowed her to weather criticism and maintain Germany's role as Europe's anchor (Triadafilopoulos, 2019, 71). By contrast, unethical leadership in refugee management — as in Milošević's instrumentalization of displaced populations — produced reputational costs and triggered international condemnation.

A further dimension is reputational capital in diplomacy. States with reputations for ethical leadership often become preferred mediators in international disputes. Norway, for example, has leveraged its credibility for neutrality and integrity to act as a mediator in conflicts from the Middle East to Sri Lanka. Its reputational capital derives not from raw power but from a track record of ethical conduct in both domestic and foreign policy (Nye, 2004, 15). This shows that ethical leadership can extend influence beyond material resources.

Finally, ethical leadership creates durable institutions and norms that persist beyond individual leaders. Nelson Mandela's emphasis on reconciliation institutionalized values of forgiveness and inclusivity, shaping South Africa's transition and moral standing globally (Tutu, 1999, 54). Franklin D. Roosevelt's welfare institutions endure in the United States, providing long-term social stability (Smith, 2007, 213). By contrast, Mobutu's kleptocracy in Zaire and Marcos's corruption in the Philippines hollowed out state capacity, leaving fragile democracies vulnerable to recurrent crises (Boyce, 1993, 178; Wrong, 2001, 89). Ethical legacies strengthen continuity, while unethical ones generate fragility.

In an era defined by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (Bennett & Lemoine, 2014, 314), ethical leadership is not a luxury but a strategic necessity. It enhances resilience, competitiveness, security, innovation, cooperation, and humanitarian legitimacy—each amplified or constrained by reputation and legacy. The historical record shows that states led ethically are more adaptive, more prosperous, and more respected, while those led immorally may achieve short-term goals but at the cost of long-term credibility and resilience.

"Ethical leadership also plays a vital role in migration governance and humanitarian crises. When leaders are trusted to act with fairness, they can build public legitimacy for policies that balance compassion with security."

08. Institutionalizing Ethical Leadership

Ethical governance cannot depend solely on the personal virtues or character of individual leaders; it must be institutionalized to ensure continuity across administrations and leadership changes. While charismatic or transformational leaders can inspire nations, their departure often leaves vacuums if strong institutions do not carry forward their ethical vision. As Max Weber (1978, 246) argued, charismatic authority must eventually be routinized into legal-rational structures if it is to endure. Thus, ethical leadership is not sustainable if it remains the preserve of individuals. It must be embedded in the political and social architecture of governance.

Checks and balances — including independent judiciaries, professionalized bureaucracies, free media, and vibrant civil societies — are indispensable for constraining leaders and preventing abuses of power. Where these safeguards exist, leaders are less able to pursue unethical behavior without consequences. For example, in the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt wielded immense executive authority during the New Deal and World War II, but his reforms strengthened rather than eroded institutional accountability. Roosevelt respected judicial oversight and worked within Congress to institutionalize programs such as Social Security that outlived him (Leuchtenburg, 1995, 119).

By contrast, Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines and Alberto Fujimori in Peru deliberately eroded institutional checks to concentrate power in their hands. Marcos declared martial law and subordinated courts and the press to his rule, creating conditions for kleptocracy (Robles, 2016, 87). Fujimori dissolved Congress and subordinated the judiciary during his 1992 self-coup, enabling widespread corruption and human rights abuses (Crabtree, 2011, 133). Their examples illustrate that, without institutional checks, even competent leaders can slide into unethical governance.

Institutionalizing ethical leadership also requires cultivating civic virtue among citizens. As Ciulla (2004, 67) argues, leadership education must emphasize morality as much as technical competence, because ethical leaders cannot thrive without citizens who demand integrity. Public intolerance of corruption and repression acts as a social safeguard, raising the costs of unethical governance.

In Germany, Angela Merkel's commitment to transparency and accountability resonated with a public culture that valued stability and principled pragmatism (Paterson, 2018, 56). Civic expectations helped reinforce her ethical leadership. Similarly, in post-apartheid South Africa, Desmond Tutu's advocacy for reconciliation through the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was anchored in a broader civic demand for justice and healing (Tutu, 1999, 34). These cases show that ethics become institutionalized not only through formal checks but through social norms that shape expectations of leadership.

By contrast, in contexts where civic virtue is weak or eroded, citizens may tolerate unethical governance. In Zaire under Mobutu, decades of normalized corruption created a society where stealing was expected, even necessary

for survival (Wrong, 2001, 92). Institutional safeguards cannot survive if citizens accept or even participate in corruption as a way of life.

A crucial mechanism for institutionalizing ethical leadership is education. This means both civic education for citizens and professional leadership training for public servants. Northouse (2019, 17) emphasizes that leadership development should integrate ethical reasoning and decision-making into curricula. If future leaders are trained to view ethics as integral to effective governance, institutions gain resilience against corrupt or immoral practices.

Countries such as Singapore have sought to institutionalize meritocracy and integrity through strict civil service examinations and harsh penalties for corruption. While Singapore's model is controversial because of its semi-authoritarian elements, it demonstrates how institutional design can embed ethical expectations into bureaucratic culture (Quah, 2011, 215).

Global organizations play a complementary role in institutionalizing ethical leadership by embedding ethics into international frameworks. Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index publicly ranks states, shaping investor perceptions and pressuring governments to improve governance (Transparency International, 2022). Similarly, the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators influence international lending decisions, penalizing states with poor scores on accountability, rule of law, and corruption (Kaufmann et al., 2010, 25).

Regional organizations also contribute. The European Union conditions accession on democratic governance and anti-corruption reforms, a process that has institutionalized ethical standards in many post-communist states (Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2005, 82). The African Union's African Peer Review Mechanism provides another example, though its effectiveness has been mixed. These mechanisms highlight how ethical governance is increasingly institutionalized not just domestically but through international interdependence.

Institutionalization ensures that ethics are not dependent on the goodwill of leaders alone. Even when unethical individuals rise to office, robust institutions can resist and contain their abuses. Merkel's Germany illustrates this resilience: while her personal ethics enhanced trust, Germany's institutions — the Constitutional Court, a federal system, and a free press — would have constrained unethical behavior had she attempted it.

The opposite lesson comes from Peru after Fujimori. By hollowing out institutions, he left behind a fragile democracy vulnerable to repeated corruption scandals. Institutional fragility perpetuates cycles of unethical leadership, whereas institutional strength creates resilience against them.

Embedding ethical leadership into institutions generates long-term reputational benefits. Countries with reputations for robust institutions, such as the Nordic states, enjoy disproportionate influence in global governance because they are trusted as credible partners (Transparency International, 2022). Reputation thus becomes an asset linked directly to institutionalization.

Conversely, where institutions are weak, reputational damage endures even after unethical leaders depart. The Democratic Republic of Congo continues to suffer reputational consequences decades after Mobutu's fall, because his corruption undermined institutional integrity so deeply (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2002, 183).

Institutionalizing ethical leadership means transforming ethics from an individual attribute into a systemic expectation. Checks and balances constrain abuse; civic virtue sustains accountability; education prepares future leaders; and international norms embed ethics in global frameworks. Together, these mechanisms weave ethics into governance itself.

Ultimately, ethical leadership that depends solely on moral individuals is fragile. But when institutions embody ethical principles, nations develop resilience, credibility, and reputational capital that endure across generations. Ethical leadership thereby becomes not only a matter of character but of structural design, cultural reinforcement, and international embedding.

09. Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated that ethical leadership and governance are indispensable in a world defined by rapid change, uncertainty, and competition. While unethical leaders often demonstrate effectiveness — stabilizing economies, consolidating power, or mobilizing populations — their immorality inevitably corrodes legitimacy, destroys reputations, and leaves corrosive legacies (Kellerman, 2004, 23).

The paradox that "bad people can be good leaders" underscores the distinction between effectiveness and morality. Marcos, Mobutu, Fujimori, Mussolini, and Milošević each achieved profound short-term goals but left behind reputational scars and institutional weakness (Boyce, 1993, 178; Wrong, 2001, 92; Crabtree, 2011, 133; Bosworth, 2002, 214; Judah, 2009, 301). Conversely, Mandela, Roosevelt, Merkel, and Ardern demonstrate that ethical leadership strengthens both effectiveness and legacy, leaving nations more resilient, reputable, and respected (Sampson, 1999, 221; Leuchtenburg, 1995, 119; Paterson, 2018, 56; Wilson, 2020, 114).

Reputation and legacy must be recognized as strategic national assets, no less important than economic or military power. Ethical leadership protects these assets; unethical leadership squanders them. In an interconnected world where trust and credibility are vital, ethics are not optional; they are strategic imperatives (Nye, 2004, 15; Keohane, 2005, 77).

Finally, ethical governance must be institutionalized through checks and balances, civic education, and international norms. By embedding ethics into institutions, nations can ensure continuity of integrity beyond individual leaders (Weber, 1978, 246; Ciulla, 2004, 67; Kaufmann et al., 2010, 25). Ethical leadership is not merely about morality; it is about sustainability. Leaders who prioritize integrity leave behind legacies of strength and honor. Those who pursue power without ethics may achieve victories, but they condemn their nations to reputational decline and fragility. Ethical leadership, therefore, is the only path to legitimacy, resilience, and prosperity in the twenty-first century.

References

Bennett, N., & Lemoine, G. J. (2014). What VUCA really means for you. ***Harvard Business Review, 92***(1/2), 27-42.

Bosworth, R. J. B. (2002). ***Mussolini***. London: Arnold.

Boyce, J. (1993). ***The Philippines: The political economy of growth and impoverishment in the Marcos era***. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. ***The Leadership Quarterly, 17***(6), 595-616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004

Burns, J. M. (1978). ***Leadership***. New York: Harper & Row.

Callaghy, T. M. (1984). ***The state-society struggle: Zaire in comparative perspective***. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ciulla, J. B. (2004). ***Ethics, the heart of leadership*** (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Crabtree, J. (2011). ***Fractured politics: Peruvian democracy past and present***. London: Institute for the Study of the Americas.

Fukuyama, F. (2020). ***Identity: The demand for dignity and the politics of resentment***. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Freidel, F. (1990). ***Franklin D. Roosevelt: A rendezvous with destiny***. Boston: Little, Brown.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). ***On leadership***. New York: Free Press.

Glenny, M. (1996). ***The fall of Yugoslavia: The third Balkan war*** (2nd ed.). London: Penguin.

Judah, T. (2009). ***The Serbs: History, myth, and the destruction of Yugoslavia*** (3rd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2010). The worldwide governance indicators: Methodology and analytical issues. ***World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430***. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Keohane, R. O. (2005). ***After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy***. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kellerman, B. (2004). ***Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters***. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Knox, M. (2000). ***Common destiny: Dictatorship, foreign policy, and war in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krog, A. (2008). ***Country of my skull: Guilt, sorrow, and the limits of forgiveness in the new South Africa***. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Leuchtenburg, W. E. (1995). ***Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, 1932-1940***. New York: Harper Perennial.

Mauro, P. (1995). Corruption and growth. ***The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 110***(3), 681-712. https://doi.org/10.2307/2946696

McClintock, C., & Vallas, E. (2003). ***The decline of terrorism in Peru***. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

McCoy, A. W. (2009). ***An anarchy of families: State and family in the Philippines***. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Nye, J. S. (2004). ***Soft power: The means to success in world politics***. New York: PublicAffairs.

Northouse, P. G. (2019). ***Leadership: Theory and practice*** (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nzongola-Ntalaja, G. (2002). ***The Congo: From Leopold to Kabila—A people's history***. London: Zed Books.

Paterson, W. E. (2018). The making of a crisis: Merkel, the Euro and the politics of austerity. In S. Bulmer & W. E. Paterson (Eds.), ***Germany and the European Union: Europe's reluctant hegemon?*** (90-114). London: Routledge.

Quah, J. S. T. (2011). ***Curbing corruption in Asian countries: An impossible dream?*** Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Robles, R. (2016). ***Marcos martial law: Never again***. Quezon City: Filipinos for a Better Philippines.

Sampson, A. (1999). ***Mandela: The authorized biography***. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Schimmelfennig, F., & Sedelmeier, U. (2005). ***The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe***. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Smith, J. E. (2007). ***FDR***. New York: Random House.

Stokes, S. C. (2001). ***Mandates and democracy: Neoliberalism by surprise in Latin America***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, M. M. (2017). ***Corruption and democracy in Latin America***. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Transparency International. (2022). ***Corruption perceptions index 2022***. Berlin: Transparency International.

Triadafilopoulos, T. (2019). ***Governing diversity: Migrant integration and multiculturalism in North America and Europe***. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Tutu, D. (1999). ***No future without forgiveness***. New York: Doubleday.

Tyler, T. R. (2006). ***Why people obey the law*** (2nd ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Vernon, A. (2021). Jacinda Ardern and the politics of kindness. ***Political Quarterly, 92***(2), 254-262. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12964

Weber, M. (1978). ***Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*** (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wilson, S. (2020). Pandemic leadership: Lessons from New Zealand's approach to COVID-19. ***Leadership, 16***(3), 279-293. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715020929151

Wrong, M. (2001). ***In the footsteps of Mr. Kurtz: Living on the brink of disaster in Mobutu's Congo***. London: Fourth Estate.

SYCAMORE FOUNDATION
LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

SYCAMORE FOUNDATION

LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

www.sycamorefoundation.com