BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

SYSTEMIC FAILURE AND LEADERSHIP PARALYSIS: WHY NO ONE COULD SAVE CAMELOT IN SIR THOMAS MALORY'S LE MORTE D'ARTHUR

Jamshid Fazliddinovich Hayitmurodov
Master's Degree Student, Foreign Languages and Literature Department
ISFT Institute, Samarkand Branch
Scientific Supervisor: PhD Professor **Irada Kamollidinovna**
Samarkand — 2026

Abstract: Sir Thomas Malory's Le Morte d'Arthur presents one of the most devastating political and moral collapses in English literature. The fall of Camelot has traditionally been attributed to individual moral failings: Lancelot's adultery, Gawain's revenge, Mordred's treason, or Arthur's weakness. However, this article proposes a fundamentally different diagnostic framework. It argues that the tragedy of Camelot is not primarily a tragedy of individual vice but a tragedy of systemic failure and leadership paralysis. Drawing on political theory, organizational psychology, and medieval constitutional thought, this study demonstrates that the Round Table fellowship lacked four essential components of sustainable governance: (1) clear succession mechanisms, (2) effective conflict resolution institutions, (3) accountability structures for the highest-ranking knights, and (4) a leader capable of making decisive, painful choices. Malory constructs a world where every character can see the approaching disaster, yet no one can prevent it. Arthur knows about Lancelot and Guinevere's affair but delays action. Gawain knows his revenge is destructive but cannot stop himself. Lancelot knows his love is treasonous but cannot leave. The knights know their divisions will destroy them but cannot unite. This paralysis is not accidental. Malory deliberately creates a system where individual wisdom exists but collective action is impossible. The article concludes that Le Morte d'Arthur offers a profound warning about the fragility of idealized political systems. Beautiful ideals — equality, honor, loyalty — are insufficient without robust institutions, clear rules, and leaders willing to enforce them even against friends and lovers. Camelot falls not because its people are evil but because its people are human and its system is fatally incomplete.

Keywords: Systemic failure, leadership paralysis, Malory, Le Morte d'Arthur, political theory, governance, conflict resolution, succession, accountability, medieval literature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction: A New Diagnostic Framework
2. The Illusion of Perfect Governance
3. Problem One: No Succession Mechanism
4. Problem Two: No Conflict Resolution Institution
5. Problem Three: No Accountability for the Powerful
6. Problem Four: Arthur's Fatal Leadership Style
7. The Paralysis of Collective Action (Olson, 1965)
8. Lancelot's Prison of Love
9. Gawain's Prison of Honor
10. Mordred as Symptom, Not Cause
11. The Grail Quest as a Failed Reform
12. Comparative Analysis: Other Medieval Kingships

13. Why No One Could Stop the War
14. Modern Political Theory Applied to Camelot
15. Conclusion: The Warning of Malory

1. INTRODUCTION: A NEW DIAGNOSTIC FRAMEWORK

For centuries, readers and scholars have mourned the fall of Camelot. Sir

Thomas Malory's Le Morte d'Arthur ends with the shattering of the Round Table, the death of King Arthur, the separation of Lancelot and Guinevere, and the dispersal of the greatest fellowship of knights ever assembled. The emotional power of this ending has produced countless interpretations. Some see the tragedy as a warning against adultery. Others view it as a critique of revenge. Still others read it as a Christian allegory about original sin.

These interpretations are not wrong. Adultery, revenge, and sin certainly play central roles in Malory's narrative. But this article argues that they are symptoms, not causes. The true cause of Camelot's destruction is deeper and more structural. Camelot falls because it lacks the institutional infrastructure necessary to manage the inevitable conflicts that arise in any human society (North, 1990; Fukuyama, 2011).

This diagnostic shift is essential. If we blame Lancelot alone, we miss the fact that dozens of knights saw the affair and said nothing. If we blame Gawain alone, we miss the fact that Arthur could have forbidden the war. If we blame Arthur alone, we miss the fact that the Round Table had no clear rules for succession, no court to adjudicate disputes, and no mechanism to restrain Gawain's thirst for revenge.

The central question of this article is not "Who destroyed Camelot?" but "Why could no one save it?"

The answer, I argue, lies in four systemic failures:

1.1. No Succession Mechanism

Arthur leaves no clear heir. He has no legitimate children. His illegitimate son, Mordred, is acknowledged but never formally designated as successor.

When Arthur leaves for France, the throne is empty in legal terms. Mordred's rebellion is treason, but it fills a vacuum that Arthur himself created. A kingdom without a succession mechanism is a kingdom destined for civil war.

1.2. No Conflict Resolution Institution

When conflicts arise between knights — Lancelot versus Gawain, Gawain versus Mordred, Arthur versus Lancelot — there is no institutional process to resolve them. There is no court above the king. There is no arbitration mechanism. There is no constitutional framework. The only resolution methods are personal: forgiveness (which Gawain refuses) or violence (which destroys the kingdom). The Round Table's famous equality, so beautiful in theory, means that no knight has authority over another except Arthur. And when Arthur is conflicted, the system collapses.

1.3. No Accountability for the Powerful

Lancelot is the greatest knight. Gawain is the king's nephew. Guinevere is the queen. These three figures break the kingdom's fundamental norms — adultery, revenge, betrayal — but there is no way to hold them accountable without destroying the kingdom. Arthur cannot punish Lancelot without losing his best warrior. He cannot punish Gawain without alienating his own family. He cannot punish Guinevere without destroying his marriage. The powerful are above the law, and therefore the law means nothing.

1.4. Arthur's Fatal Leadership Style

Arthur is a great man but a flawed leader. He excels at inspiration, unitybuilding, and symbolic actions (the Round Table, the Pentecostal Oath). But he fails at decisive, painful choices. He delays confronting Lancelot and Guinevere. He delays establishing a succession. He delays restraining Gawain. He delays returning from France. Each delay is understandable; each delay is catastrophic. Arthur embodies what modern political scientists call leadership paralysis — the inability to act when action is costly but necessary (Heifetz, 1994; Burns, 1978).

These four failures are interconnected. Together, they create a system where disaster is not merely possible but inevitable. The remainder of this article unpacks each failure in detail, examines how specific characters are trapped by the system, and draws lessons for political theory and leadership studies.

2. THE ILLUSION OF PERFECT GOVERNANCE

Before analyzing the failures, we must understand what Camelot claims to be. Malory presents Arthur's kingdom as the pinnacle of medieval governance. The Round Table is a revolutionary institution. Unlike traditional feudal hierarchies where knights sit according to rank, the Round Table has no head. All knights are equal. All share honor equally. All swear the Pentecostal Oath: to fight for justice, protect the weak, defend ladies, and never commit treason.

This image is extraordinarily powerful. It has inspired political thinkers for centuries. The Round Table appears to solve the fundamental problem of feudal politics — competition among powerful nobles — by creating a fellowship of mutual loyalty.

But Malory simultaneously reveals the fragility of this system. The Round Table's equality is not backed by any institutional structure. There are no written laws. There is no court. There are no elections or succession rules. The entire system depends on one thing: Arthur's personal authority and the knights' voluntary loyalty.

Political theorists from Thomas Hobbes to James Madison have argued that any system based entirely on voluntary loyalty will eventually fail (Madison, Hamilton & Jay, 1961). Humans are not angels. They have competing interests, passions, and loyalties. A stable political system requires not only good intentions but also institutional constraints — rules that bind everyone, including the powerful, and mechanisms to enforce those rules.

Camelot has none of these. Its governance is purely charismatic. Arthur rules because knights choose to follow him. The moment that choice falters — the moment a knight prioritizes family honor over loyalty to Arthur, or love over duty — the system has no backup. There is no constitution to invoke. There is no supreme court to adjudicate. There is no army loyal to the state rather than to individual lords.

Malory understood this fragility (Carpenter, 1997; Hicks, 2010). He lived through the Wars of the Roses, a period when England's governance collapsed precisely because noble loyalties shifted and institutions failed. Le Morte d'Arthur is not merely a romance; it is a political meditation on the conditions necessary for stable governance. The tragedy of Camelot is that it had all the ideals and none of the institutions.

3. PROBLEM ONE: NO SUCCESSION MECHANISM

The most glaring systemic failure in Le Morte d'Arthur is the absence of any clear succession mechanism. Arthur is king. He has no legitimate children. He never designates an heir. When he leaves to fight Lancelot in France, the throne is empty in legal terms.

3.1. Arthur's Refusal to Address Succession

Throughout the narrative, Arthur avoids the succession question. He knows Mordred is his son. He knows Mordred is ambitious. But he never formally acknowledges Mordred as heir, nor does he exclude him. The ambiguity is fatal.

Why does Arthur avoid this question? The answer lies in his personality. Arthur does not like conflict. Naming an heir would require choosing among competing claims, angering some while pleasing others. It would also require acknowledging his incestuous relationship with Morgause, which produced Mordred. Arthur prefers ambiguity because ambiguity allows him to avoid pain.

But political systems cannot survive on ambiguity. When Arthur leaves for France, Modred simply declares himself king. Some knights support him. Others oppose him. The result is civil war. If Arthur had clearly named an heir — whether Mordred, a distant cousin, or even Lancelot — the succession would have been settled. There would have been no ambiguity for Mordred to exploit.

3.2. Mordred as a Symptom, Not a Cause

Mordred is typically read as a villain — the treacherous son who betrays his father. But from a systemic perspective, Mordred is not the cause of the succession crisis; he is a symptom. He fills a vacuum that Arthur created. If Mordred had not rebelled, someone else would have. Empty thrones attract claimants.

Malory's contemporary readers would have understood this immediately. The Wars of the Roses were fought precisely because England lacked clear succession rules after the death of Edward III. Multiple noble families had competing claims to the throne. The result was decades of civil war.

Arthur's England suffers the same fate.

3.3. Comparative Case: Historical Kingships

Medieval Europe had developed various succession mechanisms:

primogeniture (eldest son inherits), elective monarchy (nobles elect the king), and designated succession (king names his heir). Each had flaws, but each was better than nothing. Arthur has none.

Consider the Capetian kings of France. From 987 to 1328, every Capetian king produced a son who survived to adulthood. Succession was automatic. There were no civil wars over the throne. This was not luck alone; it was also careful political management. Capetian kings crowned their sons as co-kings during their own lifetimes, ensuring continuity.

Arthur does nothing similar. He never crowns a co-king. He never formally acknowledges Mordred or any other candidate. He simply leaves, assuming everyone will remain loyal. This is not wisdom; it is negligence.

3.4. What Arthur Should Have Done

A minimally competent political system requires a succession plan. Arthur could have:

· Legitimized Mordred and named him heir
· Named another relative as heir
· Established an elective process among the Round Table
· Divided the kingdom (not ideal, but better than civil war)
· Taken Mordred with him to France

He does none of these. The failure is not Mordred's treason but Arthur's refusal to govern. The succession crisis is the first domino in the collapse. Once the throne is contested, all other conflicts become secondary.

4. PROBLEM TWO: NO CONFLICT RESOLUTION INSTITUTION

The second systemic failure is the absence of any institution to resolve disputes between knights. In a society of armed warriors, conflicts are inevitable. The question is how they are resolved. Camelot has only two methods: Arthur's personal judgment or violence.

4.1. The Failure of Personal Judgment

Arthur is a fair and wise judge in many cases. He resolves disputes between minor knights. He punishes obvious crimes. But when the dispute involves people he loves — Lancelot, Guinevere, Gawain — Arthur cannot judge impartially. His personal affection paralyzes him.

This is not a personal flaw alone. It is a systemic design flaw. A healthy political system does not depend on the leader's personal feelings. It has impersonal rules and institutions. If Arthur cannot judge his friends, the system should provide an alternative: a council, a court, a panel of senior knights.

But Malory's Camelot has no such alternatives. The Round Table has no chief justice, no senate, no constitutional court. Everything depends on Arthur. When Arthur fails, everything fails.

4.2. The Absence of Arbitration

Medieval Europe had developed various arbitration mechanisms. Lords could submit disputes to the Church, to other lords, or to councils of peers. The Knights Templar and other military orders had internal disciplinary systems. Even in the most violent periods, there were alternatives to blood feud.

Camelot has none of these. When Gawain demands revenge against

Lancelot, Arthur suggests arbitration. Gawain refuses. And there is no mechanism to compel him. Gawain can simply leave, gather his brothers, and pursue private war. The Round Table's famous "fellowship" evaporates when tested.

4.3. The Logic of Blood Feud

Gawain's refusal to accept arbitration is not irrational within the logic of chivalry. Blood revenge is a sacred duty. A knight who fails to avenge his brother's death is dishonored. Gawain's position is consistent with one set of chivalric values.

But this is precisely the problem. Chivalry contains multiple, incompatible value systems. One values mercy and forgiveness. Another values family honor and revenge. When these values conflict, there is no meta-rule to determine which takes precedence. The system has no hierarchy of norms.

A functional legal system provides such a hierarchy. Murder is a crime against the state, not merely against the victim's family. The king, not the family, punishes killers. Revenge is forbidden. Feuds are outlawed.

Camelot has none of these. Revenge is still legitimate. The state does not monopolize violence. As a result, private wars destroy the kingdom.

4.4. What Camelot Needed: A Court of Chivalry

What would have saved Camelot? A court of chivalry — a standing body of senior knights empowered to adjudicate disputes, with authority to impose binding judgments, including exile, confiscation of lands, or temporary imprisonment. Gawain would have been compelled to accept the court's judgment, or else be declared a traitor.

Malory does not imagine such an institution. His political imagination, shaped by the chaotic fifteenth century, could not conceive of a solution to the feud problem. And perhaps that is Malory's point: without institutions, the best intentions fail.

5. PROBLEM THREE: NO ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE POWERFUL

The third systemic failure is the absence of accountability for the most powerful knights. Lancelot, Gawain, and Guinevere violate fundamental norms repeatedly, yet they face no consequences until it is too late.

5.1. Lancelot's Impunity

Lancelot is the greatest knight. No one can defeat him in combat. This physical supremacy translates into political impunity. He has an affair with the queen, an act of treason punishable by death. For years, no one exposes him because they fear his sword.

When Agravain finally exposes the affair, Arthur is forced to act. But Lancelot simply rescues Guinevere, killing several knights in the process. He then withdraws to his lands, unpunished. Arthur's attempt to hold him accountable leads to war, not justice.

The problem is structural: there is no force in the kingdom capable of compelling Lancelot. Arthur's army can attack him, but that is war, not law. Lancelot's military power makes him above the law. And if the greatest knight is above the law, the law is meaningless.

5.2. Gawain's Impunity

Gawain is equally unaccountable. He demands war against Lancelot, ignoring Arthur's desire for peace. He refuses arbitration. He threatens anyone who suggests reconciliation. And Arthur cannot stop him because Gawain commands his own army of brothers and retainers.

Gawain's power comes from family. He is the king's nephew. His brothers control significant military forces. A king who opposes Gawain risks civil war even without the Lancelot conflict. So Arthur yields, again and again, to Gawain's demands.

5.3. Guinevere's Impunity

Guinevere's power is different but equally problematic. As queen, she is protected by her position. Arthur cannot easily accuse her without humiliating himself. Lancelot protects her. And she has her own network of supporters at court.

When Guinevere's affair is exposed, she is sentenced to death. But Lancelot rescues her. She ends her days as a nun, not punished by law but choosing her own penance. She never faces a trial. She never accounts for her actions to the kingdom.

5.4. The Problem of Legal Equality

A fundamental principle of justice is that all are equal before the law.

Camelot violates this principle systematically. The powerful are not held accountable. The weak — minor knights, peasants, women — are subject to the law, but the great knights are not.

This is not merely corruption; it is a structural feature of feudal politics. Feudal kings depend on their great nobles for military power. They cannot easily punish them without losing that power. The solution, developed over centuries, was to create institutions that restrained nobles collectively — parliaments, courts, charters of rights.

Camelot has none of these. Arthur rules through personal loyalty, not institutional constraints. When loyalty fails, so does governance.

6. PROBLEM FOUR: ARTHUR'S FATAL LEADERSHIP STYLE

The fourth systemic failure is Arthur's leadership style. Arthur is an inspirational leader but a poor crisis manager. His virtues become vices when the kingdom faces existential threats.

6.1. The Gap Between Symbolic and Decisional Leadership

Arthur excels at symbolic leadership. He creates the Round Table. He establishes the Pentecostal Oath. He unites Britain under a common identity. These are genuine achievements. A kingdom without symbolic unity cannot survive.

But symbolic leadership is not enough. When crises erupt, leaders must make decisional choices — painful, unpopular, consequential decisions. Arthur consistently fails at these.

Consider his handling of the Lancelot-Guinevere affair. He knows about it for years. He does nothing. When Agravain forces the issue, he reluctantly orders Guinevere's execution. When Lancelot rescues her, he does not immediately pursue. When Gawain demands war, he reluctantly agrees. Each decision is reactive, not proactive. Arthur does not shape events; events shape Arthur.

6.2. The Psychology of Delay

Why does Arthur delay? The answer lies in his psychology. Arthur loves Lancelot and Guinevere. Punishing them would cause him personal pain. He also fears losing Lancelot's military power. And he fears Gawain's anger if he does not pursue revenge.

Arthur's delays are rational avoidance of pain. But in politics, delay often makes things worse. If Arthur had confronted Lancelot and Guinevere early, quietly, perhaps the affair could have ended without public scandal. He could have sent Lancelot on a long-term quest, or sent Guinevere to a convent temporarily. The crisis would have been managed.

Instead, Arthur waits until exposure is inevitable. Then he has no good options. Every choice destroys something he values.

6.3. Arthur's Refusal to Delegate

Another aspect of Arthur's leadership failure is his refusal to delegate. He tries to handle everything himself — succession, conflict resolution, military strategy. But one person cannot manage a kingdom alone.

Arthur could have appointed a council of senior knights to govern in his absence. He could have designated a regent for France. He could have empowered a chief justice to resolve disputes. He does none of these. Everything depends on him, and when he is absent or conflicted, nothing works.

6.4. Comparison with Historical Leaders

Compare Arthur to Edward I of England (1239-1307). Edward was a decisive, sometimes brutal leader. He established clear succession (his son Edward II). He created legal institutions (the Model Parliament of 1295). He crushed rebellions ruthlessly. His reign was not peaceful, but the kingdom survived.

Edward I understood what Arthur does not: leadership requires painful choices. Sometimes you must punish people you love. Sometimes you must make enemies. Sometimes you must act before you have perfect information. Arthur cannot do these things. He is too good a man to be a great king in crisis.

7. THE PARALYSIS OF COLLECTIVE ACTION

The four systemic failures combine to create a fifth phenomenon:

collective action paralysis. Everyone in Camelot can see the approaching disaster, but no one can stop it.

7.1. The Tragedy of the Commons Applied to Governance

In political theory, the "tragedy of the commons" describes a situation where individuals acting rationally in their own self-interest deplete a shared resource. Camelot's tragedy is similar. Each knight acts rationally according to chivalric values. Lancelot pursues love. Gawain pursues honor. Arthur pursues peace. But their individual rational actions collectively destroy the kingdom.

No one intends to destroy Camelot. Everyone wants to preserve it. But the system provides no way to align individual incentives with collective survival. Lancelot would lose his love if he

confessed. Gawain would lose his honor if he forgave. Arthur would lose his friends if he acted decisively. Each person's rational choice leads to catastrophe.

7.2. The Bystander Effect

The "bystander effect" in social psychology describes situations where individuals do not intervene in an emergency because they assume someone else will. Camelot is full of bystanders. Sir Bors, Sir Ector, Sir Palamedes — dozens of knights see the affair, see the growing conflict, see Mordred's ambition. They say nothing. They do nothing.

Why? Because intervening would be costly. Accusing the queen risks death.

Opposing Gawain risks his enmity. Warning Arthur risks seeming disloyal. So everyone waits for someone else to act. No one acts. The crisis worsens.

7.3. The Diffusion of Responsibility

Malory's narrative structure emphasizes this paralysis. In the early books, knights act individually, seeking adventure and glory. They are heroic. But when collective action is needed — to restrain Gawain, to confront Lancelot, to stop Mordred — no one steps forward. The fellowship that worked in peacetime fails in crisis.

The Round Table had no mechanism for collective decision-making. Did knights vote? Did Arthur consult? Did councils form? Malory does not show such processes. When decisions must be made, Arthur makes them alone, or Gawain imposes his will, or chaos prevails.

7.4. The Lesson of Paralysis

The paralysis of Camelot teaches a crucial political lesson: good individuals do not automatically create good governance. Institutions matter. Procedures matter. Clear rules matter. Without them, even the best people will fail to coordinate, and tragedy will result.

8. LANCELOT'S PRISON OF LOVE

Lancelot is often blamed for the fall of Camelot. His love for Guinevere is, after all, the original sin that starts the chain of disasters. But from a systemic perspective, Lancelot is not a free agent making selfish choices. He is trapped by the chivalric system he serves.

8.1. The Courtly Love Paradox

Courtly love ideology teaches that a knight's devotion to his lady is sacred (Mrówka, 2014; Armstrong, 2021). He must serve her absolutely, even above his loyalty to his lord. This ideology was imported from French romances and became central to chivalric identity.

Lancelot cannot leave Guinevere without violating the courtly love code. He would be an oath-breaker, a disloyal lover, a man without honor. At the same time, he cannot stay with her without violating feudal loyalty. The system demands both, and he cannot choose.

8.2. Lancelot's Attempts to Escape

Malory shows Lancelot trying to escape this trap. He goes on quests. He tries to achieve the Grail. He attempts to leave Guinevere multiple times. But he always returns. The pull of love, reinforced by chivalric ideology, is stronger than his will.

The Grail Quest episode is crucial. Lancelot knows he cannot achieve the Grail because of his sin. He tries to repent. He tries to change. But the hermit tells him directly: as long as he remains with Guinevere, he cannot be pure. Lancelot knows this and still cannot leave. The system has captured him completely.

8.3. Lancelot as Victim, Not Villain

Traditional readings see Lancelot as a tragic hero whose flaw is excessive love. But from a systemic perspective, Lancelot is a victim of contradictory ideological demands. He is not weak;

he is overdetermined. The chivalric code that made him the greatest knight also made him incapable of choosing between love and duty.

If Lancelot had been a lesser knight, he would not have been trapped. Lesser knights do not face the same intensity of competing demands. They are not the queen's lover. They are not Arthur's best friend. Lancelot's very excellence creates his prison.

8.4. What Lancelot Could Not Do

Lancelot could not:

· Confess the affair to Arthur because that would destroy Arthur's trust and possibly lead to Guinevere's death

· Leave Guinevere because courtly love forbids abandoning a lady

· Kill Gawain to end the feud because killing a fellow knight of the Round Table would be dishonorable

· Surrender to Arthur because he would be executed, leaving Guinevere unprotected

Every possible action violates some chivalric value. Lancelot is trapped. The system has no escape hatch. His tragedy is the tragedy of a good man placed in an impossible situation by the very ideals he serves.

9. GAWAIN'S PRISON OF HONOR

Gawain is typically seen as the villain of the second half of Le Morte Darthur. His thirst for revenge destroys any chance of reconciliation. But Gawain, like Lancelot, is trapped by the chivalric code.

9.1. The Duty of Blood Revenge

In the chivalric world, a knight who fails to avenge his brother's death is dishonored (Kaeuper, 1999; Batt, 2020). He is seen as weak, cowardly, disloyal to his family. Gawain's brothers — Agravain, Gaheris, and Gareth — are killed by Lancelot during the rescue of Guinevere. Gareth is Gawain's favorite, the youngest and most beloved.

Gawain has no choice, within the logic of chivalry, but to demand vengeance. If he forgave Lancelot, his honor would be destroyed. He would be mocked by other knights. His family would despise him. He would lose his identity as a knight.

9.2. The Impossibility of Forgiveness

Modern readers often ask: why can't Gawain simply forgive? The answer is that forgiveness is not a value in the blood-feud system. Forgiveness is seen as weakness. The chivalric code does not say "forgive those who wrong you." It says "avenge your family."

Gawain's position is not irrational. It is consistent with one set of chivalric values. The problem is that another set of chivalric values — loyalty to Arthur, unity of the Round Table — demands forgiveness. Gawain cannot serve both. The system forces a choice, and Gawain chooses family honor.

9.3. Gawain's Late Repentance

On his deathbed, mortally wounded by Mordred, Gawain repents. He writes to Lancelot, confessing that his "over-hasty vengeance" destroyed the kingdom. He asks for forgiveness.

This repentance is moving but too late. Gawain could have repented earlier. He could have accepted arbitration. He could have accepted Lancelot's offers of compensation. But he could not, because the chivalric code would have labeled him a coward. Only when death has removed his honor concerns can he admit his error.

9.4. Gawain as Tragic Figure

Gawain is not a villain. He is a tragic figure — a man destroyed by the very values he tries to uphold. He seeks honor and destroys his kingdom. He defends his family and loses his family. He is loyal to Arthur to the end, but his loyalty takes the form of demanding a war that destroys Arthur.

The systemic lesson: honor systems without institutional constraints produce self-destructive behavior. Gawain cannot stop himself because stopping would be dishonorable. Only death frees him from the trap.

10. MORDRED AS SYMPTOM, NOT CAUSE

Mordred is the easiest character to blame. He is the traitor, the usurper, the son who kills his father. But this section argues that Mordred is not a cause but a symptom of the four systemic failures.

10.1. Mordred's Legitimacy Problem

Mordred is Arthur's son, but illegitimate. In medieval law, illegitimate children could inherit only if legitimized by the king or the Church. Arthur never legitimizes Mordred. But Arthur also never explicitly excludes him. The ambiguity creates Mordred's claim.

If Arthur had clearly excluded Mordred — declared him ineligible for the throne — Mordred's rebellion would have been clearly treasonous. If Arthur had clearly included Mordred — legitimized him and named him heir — Mordred would have had no need to rebel. The ambiguity invites rebellion.

10.2. Mordred's Rational Calculation

From Mordred's perspective, rebellion is rational. Arthur is old. There is no clear heir. Mordred has supporters. If he seizes the throne now, he may succeed. If he waits, someone else may seize it first, or Arthur may name another heir.

Mordred's rebellion is not irrational evil. It is strategic calculation in a system with no clear rules. The tragedy is that the system makes rebellion a rational option.

10.3. The Failure to Integrate Mordred

Arthur could have integrated Mordred into the succession. He could have made Mordred regent while he was in France. He could have taken Mordred with him. He could have given Mordred lands and titles that satisfied his ambition.

He does none of these. Mordred is kept at court, close to power but without power. He is acknowledged as Arthur's son but not as heir. He is given military command (he leads the army against Lancelot) but not the throne.

This halfway treatment is the worst of both worlds.

It gives Mordred the ambition but not the satisfaction.

10.4. Mordred's Symbolic Function

In literary terms, Mordred symbolizes Arthur's original sin — the incest with

Morgause that produced him. He is the returning repressed, the past sin that cannot be escaped. But in political terms, Mordred symbolizes the consequences of failing to manage succession. Every kingdom without clear succession rules produces a Mordred. The specific name changes; the function remains.

11. THE GRAIL QUEST AS A FAILED REFORM

The Grail Quest is often read as a spiritual interlude, a moment of religious elevation separate from the political tragedy. But this section argues that the Grail Quest is actually a failed political reform — an attempt to purify the Round Table that instead weakens it irreparably.

11.1. The Attempt to Create Spiritual Accountability

The Grail Quest can be read as an attempt to introduce a new form of accountability. The knights are tested not by Arthur but by God. Those who fail are revealed as spiritually corrupt. Lancelot, the greatest earthly knight, fails because of his adultery.

This could have been a mechanism for reform. If Lancelot had acknowledged his failure and changed his behavior, the Grail Quest might have saved Camelot. But Lancelot does not change. He continues his affair. The reform fails.

11.2. The Quest as Distraction

The Grail Quest takes the best knights away from Camelot for years. During their absence, the political problems — the affair, the succession, the rivalries — are not addressed. They fester. When the knights return, they are spiritually disappointed and politically disengaged.

The Quest functions as a distraction from governance. Instead of building institutions, Arthur sends his knights on a spiritual adventure. The adventure is noble, but it does not solve the kingdom's structural problems. It postpones them.

11.3. Galahad's Departure as a Loss

Sir Galahad, the perfect knight, achieves the Grail and immediately departs from the world. He does not return to Camelot. He does not help govern. His perfection is incompatible with earthly politics. Galahad cannot save Camelot because Camelot is imperfect, and he cannot exist in an imperfect world.

The message is bleak: the best people leave. Politics is left to the flawed. And the flawed, without institutional support, destroy themselves.

12. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: OTHER MEDIEVAL KINGSHIPS

To understand what Malory is criticizing, we can compare Camelot to other medieval political systems that succeeded — or failed — under similar pressures.

12.1. The Angevin Empire (1154–1214)

Henry II of England (1133–1189) faced problems similar to Arthur's: powerful nobles, family rivalries, succession crises. He responded by creating institutions: the common law courts, the Assize of Clarendon, the jury system. These institutions outlasted him. When his sons rebelled (and they did), the kingdom survived.

Arthur creates no institutions. When his knights rebel, the kingdom dies. Malory seems to suggest that Henry II's approach — legal reform, institutional building — is the correct response to political fragmentation. Arthur's approach — charismatic leadership alone — is insufficient.

12.2. The Capetian Succession

As noted earlier, the Capetian kings of France succeeded for 341 years without a succession crisis. Their secret was advance coronation — crowning the heir as co-king during the father's lifetime. This eliminated ambiguity. Everyone knew who would rule next.

Arthur could have done this. He could have crowned Mordred or another heir. He does not. The failure is not complexity but avoidance.

12.3. The Norman Conquest Model

William the Conqueror (c. 1028–1087) faced a kingdom of powerful, rebellious nobles. He responded by confiscating lands, building castles, and imposing feudal obligations. His rule was harsh but effective. The kingdom survived.

Arthur is not harsh. He is merciful, generous, forgiving. These are virtues in a stable system but vices in a crisis. Arthur cannot be William because Arthur's identity is built on mercy. The same identity that makes him beloved also makes him ineffective.

13. WHY NO ONE COULD STOP THE WAR

The central question of this article is "Why could no one save Camelot?" The answer is now clear: because the system's four failures made salvation impossible.

13.1. The Information Problem

Many knights knew about the affair. Some knew about Mordred's ambition. But no one had complete information. They did not know when the crisis would erupt. They did not know who would side with whom. They did not know if intervention would help or hurt.

In conditions of uncertainty, individuals hesitate. They wait for more information. By the time information is complete, it is too late.

13.2. The Coordination Problem

Even if individual knights wanted to act, they could not coordinate. There was no mechanism for collective decision-making. No one could call a vote. No one could organize a coalition. The Round Table had no procedures for emergency action.

13.3. The Commitment Problem

Knights could not trust each other. If Bors tried to restrain Gawain, would Ector support him? If Arthur punished Lancelot, would other knights rebel? In the absence of reliable commitments, each knight acts defensively, protecting himself and his family. The collective interest is sacrificed.

13.4. The Structural Conclusion

Camelot falls because its political structure is incomplete. It has a king, a fellowship, and noble ideals. It lacks clear succession rules, conflict resolution institutions, accountability mechanisms, and a leader capable of decisive action. These failures make disaster inevitable. No individual could have saved the kingdom because the problem was not individual but structural.

14. MODERN POLITICAL THEORY APPLIED TO CAMELOT

The lessons of Le Morte d'Arthur are not merely historical. They resonate with modern political theory.

14.1. Douglass North and Institutional Economics

Nobel laureate Douglass North argued that economic and political development depends on institutions (North, 1990) — the rules of the game that structure human interaction. Good institutions reduce uncertainty, enforce contracts, and align individual incentives with collective welfare.

Camelot has no institutions. It has customs, traditions, and personal loyalties, but no formal rules. North would predict that such a system will collapse when faced with shocks. The Lancelot-Gawain conflict is such a shock.

14.2. James Madison and Faction

James Madison, in Federalist No. 10, argued that democratic republics must manage faction (Madison, Hamilton & Jay, 1961) — groups of citizens united by a common passion adverse to the rights of others. Madison's solution was a large republic with representative government, which dilutes factional power.

Camelot has no mechanism to manage faction. Gawain and his brothers are a faction. Lancelot and his allies are a faction. Mordred and his supporters are a faction. The kingdom has no way to prevent factional conflict from becoming civil war.

14.3. Mancur Olson and Collective Action (Olson, 1965)

Mancur Olson argued that large groups cannot coordinate collective action without selective incentives (Olson, 1965). Individuals will not sacrifice for the common good unless they receive private benefits or face private penalties.

Camelot's knights sacrifice nothing for the common good until it is too late. They enjoy the benefits of the Round Table without bearing the costs of enforcing its rules. The system is not sustainable.

14.4. The Modern Relevance

Malory's England was collapsing into civil war. Modern democracies face their own challenges: political polarization, institutional decay, leadership failures. Le Morte d'Arthur remains relevant because it dramatizes what happens when institutions weaken and leaders delay. The fall of Camelot is a warning to all political systems.

15. CONCLUSION: THE WARNING OF MALORY

Sir Thomas Malory's Le Morte d'Arthur is not merely a romance. It is a political meditation on the conditions necessary for stable governance. Through the tragedy of Camelot, Malory warns his readers — then and now — that noble ideals are not enough.

15.1. Summary of Findings

This article has argued that Camelot fell not because of individual moral failings but because of four systemic failures:

1. No succession mechanism: Arthur left the throne legally empty, inviting rebellion.
2. No conflict resolution institution: The Round Table had no court to adjudicate disputes between knights.
3. No accountability for the powerful: Lancelot, Gawain, and Guinevere could violate norms with impunity.
4. Arthur's fatal leadership style: The king delayed, avoided, and refused painful choices.

These failures combined to create collective action paralysis. Everyone saw the approaching disaster. No one could stop it.

15.2. Malory's Political Vision

Malory lived through the Wars of the Roses, a period when England's governance collapsed. He saw noble families destroy each other. He saw kings who could not control their nobles. He saw the ideals of chivalry mocked by reality.

Le Morte d'Arthur is Malory's attempt to understand this collapse. His diagnosis is structural: without institutions, good individuals fail. His warning is timeless: every political system that neglects institutions and delays hard choices will eventually fall.

15.3. The Enduring Lesson

Camelot is beautiful. The Round Table is inspiring. The Pentecostal Oath is noble. But beauty, inspiration, and nobility are not governance. Governance requires rules, courts, succession plans, and leaders willing to enforce rules against their friends.

Malory does not tell us to abandon ideals. He tells us to institutionalize them. An ideal without an institution is a dream. A dream cannot survive reality. Arthur dreamed Camelot. Reality destroyed it.

15.4. Final Reflection

The final books of Le Morte d'Arthur are devastating to read. We watch good people — Arthur, Lancelot, Gawain, Guinevere — destroy everything they love. We want to intervene. We want to shake Arthur and tell him to act. We want to stop Gawain and demand forgiveness. We want to force Lancelot to choose.

But we cannot. Malory's genius is to show us a tragedy that is structurally inevitable. No one could have saved Camelot because Camelot's system was designed to fail. The only solution would

have been to design it differently from the beginning — to build institutions before the crisis, to establish rules before they were needed, to create accountability before anyone violated norms.

This is Malory's warning to us. Build your institutions now. Establish your rules now. Create accountability now. Do not wait until the crisis is upon you. Because when the crisis comes, it will be too late. And like Camelot, your beautiful ideals will shatter.

REFERENCES

1. Primary Sources
2. Malory, Thomas. Le Morte d'Arthur. Ed. P. J. C. Field. D.S. Brewer, 2017. https://boydellandbrewer.com/9781843844162/le-morte-darthur
3. Geoffrey of Monmouth. Historia Regum Britanniae. Ed. Michael D. Reeve, trans. Neil Wright. Boydell Press, 2007.
4. Geoffrey of Monmouth. The History of the Kings of Britain. Trans. Lewis Thorpe. Penguin Classics, 1966.
5. https://archive.org/details/historyofkingsof00geof
6. Chrétien de Troyes. Arthurian Romances. Trans. William W. Kibler. Penguin Classics, 1991.
7. https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/261818/arthurianromances-by-chretien-de-troyes
8. Chrétien de Troyes. The Complete Romances of Chrétien de Troyes. Trans. David Staines. Indiana University Press, 1990.
9. Layamon. Brut. Ed. and trans. W. R. J. Barron and S. C. Weinberg. Longman, 1995.
10. Robert de Boron. Merlin and the Grail: Joseph of Arimathea, Merlin, Perceval. Trans. Nigel Bryant. D.S. Brewer, 2001.
11. Caxton, William. The History of King Arthur. Facsimile edition, 1485/1920.
12. Internet Archive. https://archive.org/details/historykingarth00caxtgoog Scholarly Editions and Critical Studies
13. Vinaver, Eugène, ed. The Works of Sir Thomas Malory. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/theworks-of-sir-thomas-malory-9780198123441
14. Benson, Larry D., ed. Malory's Morte d'Arthur. Harvard University Press,
15. 1976. https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674557753
16. Field, P. J. C., ed. Le Morte d'Arthur: The Winchester Manuscript. Oxford University Press, 2013.
17. Field, P. J. C. The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Malory. Boydell and Brewer, 1993. https://boydellandbrewer.com/9780851152948/the-life-andtimes-of-sir-thomas-malory
18. Field, P. J. C. Malory: Texts and Sources. D.S. Brewer, 2017.
19. Archibald, Elizabeth, and A. S. G. Edwards, eds. A Companion to Malory. D.S. Brewer, 1996. https://boydellandbrewer.com/9780859914434/acompanion-to-malory
20. Cooper, Helen. The English Romance in Time. Oxford University Press, 2004. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-english-romance-intime-9780199264846
21. Lacy, Norris J., ed. The Arthurian Encyclopedia. Garland Publishing,
22. 1986. https://www.routledge.com/The-Arthurian-
23. Encyclopedia/Lacy/p/book/9780824034370
24. Lacy, Norris J., ed. The New Arthurian Encyclopedia. Routledge, 1996. https://www.routledge.com/The-New-Arthurian-

25. Encyclopedia/Lacy/p/book/9780815323032
26. Lupack, Alan. The Oxford Guide to Arthurian Literature and Legend. Oxford University Press, 2005.
27. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-oxford-guide-to-arthurianliterature-and-legend-9780199215091
28. Radulescu, Raluca. The Gentry Context for Malory's Morte d'Arthur. Boydell and Brewer, 2003. https://boydellandbrewer.com/9780859917839/the-gentry-context-formalorys-morte-darthur
29. Riddy, Felicity. Sir Thomas Malory. Brill, 1987.
30. https://brill.com/display/title/17812
31. Rovang, Paul R. Malory's Anatomy of Chivalry: Characterization in the Morte d'Arthur. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2023.
32. Moorman, Charles. The Book of Kyng Arthur: The Unity of Malory's Morte d'Arthur. University Press of Kentucky, 1965.
33. https://www.kentuckypress.com/9780813151517/the-book-of-kyng-arthur 23. Bradbrook, Muriel C. Sir Thomas Malory. Longmans Green, 1958.
34. Kennedy, Beverly. Knighthood in the Morte d'Arthur. D.S. Brewer, 1985.
35. https://books.google.com/books?id=6d0OAAAAQAAJ