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Sir Ernest Shackleton’s name is one forever associated with the Antarctic Heroic Era (1895–1922), the latter year being that of his death. Shackleton was an intrepid explorer, voyaging to Antarctica four times and is often compared to contemporary explorers Roald Amundsen, Douglas Mawson and Robert Falcon Scott. Shackleton’s achievements are a result of a combination of natural leadership and finely-tuned management skills, assisted by a strong element of luck. This paper explores Shackleton’s enduring legacy through the contemporary lens of scientific discovery and exploration, modern leadership training methods and management techniques, and observations of his influence upon Antarctic tourism, particularly “adventure” tourism.
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INTRODUCTION

Centennial celebrations of the Heroic Era of Antarctic expeditions (exemplified by explorers Scott, Amundsen, Mawson and Shackleton) have taken place over recent years and the centenary of Shackleton’s Imperial Trans-Antarctic (H.M.S. Endurance) expedition (1914–1917) is currently being celebrated. Ernest Shackleton is widely recognised as a major figure of the Heroic Era. He was of Irish birth and had gained his extensive sea-going experience through a lengthy period of service in the British Merchant Navy as opposed to the Royal Navy, which historically attracted a different class of person in what was then an extremely class-conscious society in Britain. He participated in Robert Falcon Scott’s National Antarctic (H.M.S. Discovery) expedition (1901–1904) and in the three-man party, led by Scott and accompanied by Edward Wilson, which attempted (unsuccessfully) to reach the South Pole. During his own British Antarctic (H.M.S. Nimrod) expedition (1907–1909) he led the Southern Party when, together with Adams, Marshall and Wild, he reached 82°S, “furthest South”.

Later, following the H.M.S. Endurance expedition, reports of Shackleton’s success in ensuring the survival of all of his men and their subsequent rescue from Elephant Island more than eclipsed his failure to achieve his intended crossing of the Antarctic continent from the Weddell Sea to the Ross Sea. Despite Shackleton’s death on South Georgia during the H.M.S. Quest expedition (1921–1922), the scientific achievements of that expedition (published by the American Geographical Society in 1931) were considerable (Campbell Smith 1931).

This paper analyses Shackleton’s enduring legacy with particular reference to his personal attributes, which both during his lifetime and in subsequent decades have become legendary, and will include a summary of his explorations. His legacy is of wide-ranging significance, encompassing early exploration and research extending to present-day training in leadership skills, contemporary management techniques and Antarctic tourism. Roald Amundsen was quoted as saying that “Sir Ernest Shackleton’s name will for evermore be engraved with letters of fire in the history of Antarctic exploration” (Huntford 1985, frontispiece). Raymond Priestley, geologist (later Sir Raymond) elaborated “For scientific leadership, give me Scott; for swift and efficient travel, Amundsen, but when you are in a hopeless situation, when there seems to be no way out, get down on your knees and pray for Shackleton” (Lansing 1961, p. 24). The majority of men who served with Shackleton, together with his family and friends, all acknowledged his particular brand of loyalty, affection, camaraderie and sense of responsibility so often extended on their behalf and for their benefit.

SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY AND EXPLORATION:

H.M.S. DISCOVERY, H.M.S. NIMROD,
H.M.S. ENDURANCE AND H.M.S. QUEST
EXPEDITIONS

As well as being leader of the H.M.S. Discovery expedition (1901–1904) in which Shackleton served as third officer, Commander Robert Falcon Scott R.N. was also director of scientific staff (Fienes 2003). Shackleton did not have direct responsibility, therefore, for the many scientific achievements of that expedition. However, the importance of scientific discovery and exploration to that expedition, and subsequently to that of the H.M.S. Terra Nova (1910–1913), which resulted in members of Scott’s small ill-fated party continuing to man-haul 35 pounds (16 kg) of rock samples on their debilitating return journey from the South Pole, would not have been lost on Shackleton.

While geographical discovery and exploration continued to be Shackleton’s priorities, scientific achievements of the H.M.S. Nimrod expedition included many other important “firsts”. Expedition members were the first to climb Mount Erebus on Ross Island, first to reach the vicinity of the South Magnetic Pole and first to pioneer the original route to the Geographic South Pole (Riffenburgh 2004). Shackleton
reported the scientific results of the expedition in detail to the Royal Geographical Society upon his return to London, but before he could do so they were summarised by the Wellington, New Zealand, correspondent of The Times newspaper, who cabled them to The Times’ London office. The Times’ report included reference to:

- frozen glacier-eroded lakes near Cape Royds abounding in diatoms, rotifers, water bears and infusoria;
- melting of snow at temperatures below zero and at a height of 9,000 feet on the black lava rocks of Mount Erebus;
- marine fauna near Cape Royds bearing a resemblance to the types of animal life of the coal measure series found in Australia and Tasmania;
- masses of marine muds containing vast numbers of foraminiferal shells 40 feet above the sea level, found by the northern expedition;
- the summit crater of Mount Erebus being very active as regards steam and sulphur gases;
- coal measures discovered far south were probably older than the Tertiary Period; and the fact that
- geological discoveries made by the expedition disproved the Antarctic archipelago theory (Shackleton 1909).

Both the H.M.S. Discovery and H.M.S. Nimrod expeditions made small but important contributions to the subsequent establishment of a research station on Macquarie Island, situated to the south of Tasmania which would become an important link in the establishment of radio contact between Antarctica and the rest of the world (Fitzsimons 2011). A party from H.M.S. Discovery spent an afternoon at the island in November 1901, reporting on the penguins, kelp and tussock grass, and John King Davis, when capturing H.M.S. Nimrod, briefly landed a party on the island which collected some specimens (Day 2007). In an address to the Royal Geographical Society on 10 April 1911, Douglas (later Sir Douglas) Mawson discussed the proposed establishment of a base at Macquarie Island, whereby “a party of five men would be left to conduct meteorological, biological and geological studies, while also setting up wireless antennae that, ideally, will allow their Antarctic base to reach them and allow them to communicate with the Australian mainland” (Fitzsimons 2011, p. 290).

When planning for the H.M.S. Endurance expedition in 1914, Shackleton prepared written statements for the Royal Geographical Society’s journal on more than one occasion, outlining his proposed schedule, detailing the scientific research to be undertaken but specifically referring to the crossing of the Antarctic continent as his primary objective (Shackleton 1914). The H.M.S. Endurance spent a month at South Georgia at the end of 1914 before departing for the Antarctic. Responding to a request from the whaling station at Grytviken, Shackleton was instrumental in providing navigational assistance to the whalers (Burton 2010). Shackleton, writing to Reginald Perris on 30 November 1914, noted that the most important work done during his visit had been the erection of the set of true meridian posts, enabling 21 whalers and other steamers to correct their compasses, something urgently required according to the Admiralty’s stated objectives (Shackleton 1914). Shackleton’s subsequent H.M.S. Quest expedition achieved considerable success in its scientific research, with geological and petrological discoveries exceeding the physiographical aspects (Campbell Smith 1931).

Early exploration of Antarctica and scientific research conducted during successive expeditions resulted in sovereignty claims by nations whose citizens had established earlier footholds on the continent. The claims to the British Antarctic Territory originated many years ago and continue to be regarded as extremely important. Whaling nations are known to have paid licence fees to Britain to fish in the British territory before commencement of the Heroic Era (P.G. Quilty pers. comm.). Shackleton’s legacy to scientific discovery and exploration included his mentoring of geologist Douglas Mawson both through his appointment as physicist aboard H.M.S. Nimrod and in the setting up of Mawson’s own Australasian Antarctic Expedition (1911–1914) (Lucas 2012). Shackleton could not, however, have envisaged that it would be Mawson who later would make the case for Great Britain’s claim to sovereignty in the Antarctic or that the benefits of this claim would subsequently be transferred to Australia. “On 13 January 1930 Sir Douglas Mawson read the following proclamation while the Union Jack was raised on what was named Proclamation Island off Enderby Land: ‘In the name of His Majesty King George the Fifth, King of Great Britain, Ireland, the British Dominions beyond the Seas … I have it in command from His Majesty King George the Fifth to assert the sovereign rights of His Majesty over British Land discoveries met with in Antarctica …’” (Rowe 2002, p. 8). Mawson later repeated a recitation of the proclamation while in the cockpit of a Gypsy Moth bi-plane piloted by Stuart Campbell flying over the Antarctic continent, with Campbell throwing a weighted Union Jack onto the ice (Rowe 2002).

While Mawson undoubtedly “stands alone in terms of influence on Australian interests in the Antarctic” (Haward 2007, p. 23), Shackleton’s participation in the four highly publicised British expeditions, H.M.S. Discovery, H.M.S. Nimrod, H.M.S. Endurance and H.M.S. Quest, strengthened the case for Mawson to promote Great Britain’s claim to sovereignty over the “Australian Quadrant” in the Antarctic. The subsequent establishment of the Australian Antarctic Territory in 1936 may be said to represent the most important aspect of Shackleton’s enduring legacy. His persistence and determination in doggedly continuing to represent British (and thereby, indirectly, Australian) interests in the Antarctic underpinned Great Britain’s subsequent claims to sovereignty. The administration of what became the Australian Antarctic Territory was transferred to Australia from the United Kingdom in 1933, following a claim made to the territory for Britain and King George V by Douglas Mawson as part of the British, Australian and New Zealand Antarctic Research Expedition (BANZARE) in 1929–31 (Kriwohen et al. 2007).

This in turn facilitated the establishment and development of Australia’s three scientific bases, Casey, Davis and Mawson stations, and ensured Australian participation in ongoing scientific research on the Antarctic continent for peaceful purposes under the terms of the Antarctic Treaty 1961.
“Australia’s intent has clearly been to create a legal regime that reflects Australian sovereignty over Antarctica and also a national policy of promoting the freedom of scientific research and environmental protection” (Kriwoken et al. 2007, p. 12).

Shackleton was in the audience when Mawson presented a lecture to the Royal Geographical Society on his return to London, and was invited to extend the vote of thanks to the speaker. In doing so, he enthused: “It was of great interest to me that Mawson and Davis, who for the first time went south on our last expedition, should have made one of the best expeditions ever carried out in the Antarctic” (Shackleton 1914, p. 286). Apsley Cherry-Garrard, assistant biologist on the H.M.S. Terra Nova, sums up the relevance of exploration to scientific achievement very succinctly, stating simply that “Exploration is the physical expression of the Intellectual Passion” (Quigg 1983, p. 5).

LEADERSHIP

The regard and respect in which Shackleton was held, particular by the men under his command, is possibly only equalled by the regard and respect which he accorded others. “The mystique that Shackleton acquired as a leader may partly be attributed to the fact that he elicited from his men strength and endurance they had never imagined they possessed; he ennobled them” (Alexander 1998, p. 194). Cherry-Garrard records “There are jobs for which, if I had to do them, I would like to serve under Scott, Amundsen, Shackleton and Wilson – each to his part. For a joint scientific and geographical piece of organisation, give me Scott; for a dash to the Pole and nothing else, Amundsen: and if I am in the devil of a hole and want to get out it, give me Shackleton every time. They will all go down in polar history as leaders, these men” (Cherry-Garrard 1922, Vol. 1, prefacing).

Frank Worsley, merchant officer aboard H.M.S. Nimrod and captain of H.M.S. Endurance, wrote “Shackleton’s popularity among those he led was due to the fact that he was not the sort of man who could only do big and spectacular things … When occasion demanded, he would attend personally to the smallest details …” (Alexander 1998, pp. 193–4).

Shackleton was well aware of the need to keep his men occupied during the long winter months when daylight disappeared from the Antarctic continent. When serving as third officer on H.M.S. Discovery he had been appointed by Scott as editor of The South Polar Times, a publication which encouraged a wide-ranging variety of contributions from officers and men alike and which had proved successful in providing an outlet for otherwise unexpressed emotions (Fiennes 2003). When preparing for his own H.M.S. Nimrod expedition, Shackleton planned and produced the first book ever published in the Antarctic, Aurora Australis (Shackleton 1909) undeterred by the necessity to transport the expedition’s own printing press aboard the ship.

Two weeks after the return of the H.M.S. Nimrod expedition, Shackleton attended a meeting of the Royal Geographical Society in the Albert Hall, London, on Monday 28 June 1909, held in honour of himself and his companions. After Shackleton presented a lecture on the achievements of the expedition the President of the Society, Leonard Darwin, commented “the many noble qualities (that) are necessary to make a successful leader of explorations into unknown lands; and the first of these qualities is courage…. Not the least of Mr. Shackleton’s merits as a leader was, I believe, the care he took to make the utmost use of the experience he had previously gained when serving on the National Antarctic expedition under Captain Scott…” (Darwin 1909, p. 125).

Later Scott, having been asked to acknowledge Shackleton’s achievements, spoke generously, saying that he “regarded it as a great privilege to have been asked to propose this vote of thanks tonight” (Scott 1905, p. 126).

Thomas Orde-Lees, motor expert (later store-keeper) aboard H.M.S. Endurance, wrote in his journal on 23 December 1914 of Shackleton’s efforts “He is indefatigable, up all day and night on the bridge and in the crow’s nest and yet always the most cheerful amongst us and finding time for a game of Bridge or Patience, of both of which he is very fond, and also able to spare the time to attend to the hundred and over little details of each of our respective departments….The more I know him the greater becomes my admiration for his ability as a leader. Although he is expert at nothing in particular, he is easily master of everything” (Orde-Lees 1914). Orde-Lees does, however, record in his journal that, by 11 January 1915, he came close to insubordination, a state of affairs which he put down to anxiety and which he later regretted.

Some years later A.W. Greely, following his review of Shackleton’s publication South, wrote “The narrative is marked by its appreciation of the members of the two expeditions, and from it one is confirmed in the realisation that Shackleton is a leader of men of unusual ability and force. Considerate of his subordinates, he never spared himself, and under a less able leader the Weddell Sea party would have perished” (Greely 1920, p. 546).

Commencing with his earliest expeditions, Shackleton strove to appoint applicants not just for the relevance of their qualifications for a particular post but as individuals who emanated a certain attraction, as in the case of Frank Worsley (Barczewski 2007). Those who were successful in being appointed to a position of responsibility were quite naturally grateful to Shackleton for his vote of confidence and extended their ongoing friendship to him in return. Frank Wild, in particular, became one of Shackleton’s closest friends. Wild died in South Africa on 20 August 1939. In acknowledgement of this friendship, when information recently came to hand concerning the whereabouts of Wild’s ashes, these were subsequently retrieved some ninety years after the latter’s death and placed to the right hand side of Shackleton’s grave at Grytviken with the inscription “Frank Wild, 1873–1939, Shackleton’s right-hand man” (PG. Quilty pers. comm.).

In contrast to Shackleton’s unfailing support for the majority of his men, he could be totally unforgiving in
Christine Hurley, upon hearing lives had having a somewhat association with Shackleton, since they are regarded as to have been put at risk through their earlier placement responsibility for the Expedition 1913–1918 (Northern Party 1914–1918) that instructions of the Official Journal of the Canadian Arctic order to pursue personal glory in further exploration of ship Bartlett confidence – false confidence, but confidence nonetheless. This is regrettable, since McNish was responsible for reinforcing the three lifeboats, including the James Caird, which enabled Shackleton and his men to reach Elephant Island safely (and a small party subsequently to continue to South Georgia) following the loss of H.M.S. Endurance. McNish reportedly never forgave Shackleton for ordering that his beloved tomcat, Mrs. Chippy, be put down prior to the expedition's trek across the ice in order to protect the animal from the dogs (Alexander 1998).

During the Antarctic Heroic Era, once a ship had sailed from port there was no communication with anyone ashore until its return. Thus the world learned of Amundsen's successful attempt to be first to reach the South Pole only when he arrived back in Tasmania and telegraphed a coded confirmatory message home to Norway from the General Post Office, Hobart. News of the tragic death of Scott's party on its return from the Pole was not known for many months until the expedition's ship H.M.S. Terra Nova arrived back in her home port. Officers and crew were therefore dependent upon the skills of their leaders for the duration of a voyage – for good or for bad. For the men of H.M.S. Endurance, their dependence upon Shackleton was for the good – his care and concern for his men are documented throughout relevant literature; for example, “Praising his men and sharing credit for achievements were part of his understanding of leadership” (Haughman 2002, p. 42) and “Shackleton contrived to save his crew through an astonishing mixture of inspirational leadership, courage, and good fortune” (Jones 2003, p. 7).

In contrast, Vilhjalmur Steffanson, leader of the ill-fated 1913 H.M.C.S. Karluk expedition to the Arctic, abandoned his ship and his men when it seemed probable that the ship would be caught fast in the ice. Steffanson left the expedition in the charge of the ship's captain, Bartlett, in order to pursue personal glory in further exploration of the north. His actions were in direct contravention to the instructions of the Official Journal of the Canadian Arctic Expedition 1913–1918 (Northern Party 1914–1918) that placed responsibility for the safe return of the party fairly and squarely on his shoulders (Niven 2000).

Two members of Steffanson's expedition who had previously travelled with Shackleton on H.M.S. Nimrod, Alistair Forbes Mackay (second surgeon) and James Murray (biologist), also abandoned ship, subsequently paying the ultimate price for their foolhardiness. Both are considered to have been put at risk through their earlier supportive association with Shackleton, since they are regarded as having a somewhat exalted idea of their own leadership skills. They “thought much more of their own experience with Shackleton … If anything, that one expedition with Shackleton had given them a sense of too much power and confidence – false confidence, but confidence nonetheless. Bartlett was no leader, as far as they could see. Shackleton was a leader, and having served under him, they considered themselves leaders by association” (Niven 2000, p. 61).

Acknowledged during his lifetime as having exceptional leadership skills, Shackleton became a cult figure to future generations during the twentieth century and beyond. He was lauded as someone who, in extreme circumstances, kept his team together in a survival story described as incredible (Barczewski 2007). Morrell & Capparell agree: “In matters of leadership, the most reliable sources are the ones who are led … Shackleton was an average person; he taught himself how to be an exceptional one. He rose above his peers and earned the unflinching loyalty of his men” (Morrell & Capparell 2001, pp. 10–11).

This raises the question of whether the components of leadership and popularity differ, according to an individual's personality? Successful leadership can and does exist without the leader necessarily being likeable. Mawson was respected as a great leader, but did not attract the hero worship that many ascribe to Shackleton. Liking is seen as essential to popularity.

Not many unpopular leaders receive adulation and it is not unreasonable to assume that men do not follow or espouse those who fail to inspire them. Inspiration is perhaps one of the more endearing virtues of leadership, as is passion. Many of the affectionate references to Shackleton made by his men are indicative of his popularity.

Scott's widow, Lady Kathleen Scott, upon hearing of the safe return of Shackleton and his men from the H.M.S. Endurance expedition, wrote in her diary: “I think it is one of the most wonderful adventures I ever read of, magnificent, Shackleton or no Shackleton” (Kennett 1949, p. 143). However, the general euphoria experienced on Shackleton's safe return with his men must be seen in the context of the British public's ongoing experiences of the First World War. So many lives had been lost, and continued to be lost, that the fate of a comparative few held less significance than might otherwise have been the case. Shackleton had received Prime Minister Winston Churchill's authority for the H.M.S. Endurance expedition to “proceed” in 1914, prior to their departure for Buenos Aires, the Weddell Sea and the Antarctic continent, but he and his men had returned to a world irretrievably changed from the one that they had left.

Following Shackleton's death on South Georgia, the Geographical Review, in 1922, published an obituary in his honour that read in part “With the death of Sir Ernest Shackleton, Britain loses one of the most brilliant explorers of modern days … Shackleton's personality was not less interesting than his exploits. To his commanding personality, his courageous and indomitable spirit, and certain quality of ‘instinctive judgement’ that together made for leadership in a supreme degree, tribute is paid by Hugh Robert Mill in a recent number of Nature (February 12, 1922), and a splendid portrait, ‘Sir Ernest Shackleton: A Study in Personality,’ is sketched by Charles Sarolea in the March number of the Contemporary Review”.

in circumstances where he considered his authority to be contested and where he saw his men's safety and/or survival put at risk as a result. For these reasons he refused to endorse the award of a Polar Medal to four members of the H.M.S. Endurance expedition, including carpenter Harry McNish (incorrectly referred to in some polar literature as McNeish). This is regrettable, since McNish was responsible for reinforcing the three lifeboats, including the James Caird, which enabled Shackleton and his men to reach Elephant Island safely (and a small party subsequently to continue to South Georgia) following the loss of H.M.S. Endurance. McNish reportedly never forgave Shackleton for ordering that his beloved tomcat, Mrs. Chippy, be put down prior to the expedition's trek across the ice in order to protect the animal from the dogs (Alexander 1998).

During the Antarctic Heroic Era, once a ship had sailed from port there was no communication with anyone ashore until its return. Thus the world learned of Amundsen's successful attempt to be first to reach the South Pole only when he arrived back in Tasmania and telegraphed a coded confirmatory message home to Norway from the General Post Office, Hobart. News of the tragic death of Scott's party on its return from the Pole was not known for many months until the expedition's ship H.M.S. Terra Nova arrived back in her home port. Officers and crew were therefore dependent upon the skills of their leaders for the duration of a voyage – for good or for bad. For the men of H.M.S. Endurance, their dependence upon Shackleton was for the good – his care and concern for his men are documented throughout relevant literature; for example, “Praising his men and sharing credit for achievements were part of his understanding of leadership” (Haughman 2002, p. 42) and “Shackleton contrived to save his crew through an astonishing mixture of inspirational leadership, courage, and good fortune” (Jones 2003, p. 7).

In contrast, Vilhjalmur Steffanson, leader of the ill-fated 1913 H.M.C.S. Karluk expedition to the Arctic, abandoned his ship and his men when it seemed probable that the ship would be caught fast in the ice. Steffanson left the expedition in the charge of the ship's captain, Bartlett, in order to pursue personal glory in further exploration of the north. His actions were in direct contravention to the instructions of the Official Journal of the Canadian Arctic Expedition 1913–1918 (Northern Party 1914–1918) that placed responsibility for the safe return of the party fairly and squarely on his shoulders (Niven 2000).

Two members of Steffanson's expedition who had previously travelled with Shackleton on H.M.S. Nimrod, Alistair Forbes Mackay (second surgeon) and James Murray (biologist), also abandoned ship, subsequently paying the ultimate price for their foolhardiness. Both are considered to have been put at risk through their earlier supportive association with Shackleton, since they are regarded as having a somewhat exalted idea of their own leadership skills. They “thought much more of their own experience with Shackleton … If anything, that one expedition with Shackleton had given them a sense of too much power and confidence – false confidence, but confidence nonetheless. Bartlett was no leader, as far as they could see. Shackleton was a leader, and having served under him, they considered themselves leaders by association” (Niven 2000, p. 61).

Acknowledged during his lifetime as having exceptional leadership skills, Shackleton became a cult figure to future generations during the twentieth century and beyond. He was lauded as someone who, in extreme circumstances, kept his team together in a survival story described as incredible (Barczewski 2007). Morrell & Capparell agree: “In matters of leadership, the most reliable sources are the ones who are led … Shackleton was an average person; he taught himself how to be an exceptional one. He rose above his peers and earned the unflinching loyalty of his men” (Morrell & Capparell 2001, pp. 10–11).

This raises the question of whether the components of leadership and popularity differ, according to an individual's personality? Successful leadership can and does exist without the leader necessarily being likeable. Mawson was respected as a great leader, but did not attract the hero worship that many ascribe to Shackleton. Liking is seen as essential to popularity.

Not many unpopular leaders receive adulation and it is not unreasonable to assume that men do not follow or espouse those who fail to inspire them. Inspiration is perhaps one of the more endearing virtues of leadership, as is passion. Many of the affectionate references to Shackleton made by his men are indicative of his popularity.

Scott's widow, Lady Kathleen Scott, upon hearing of the safe return of Shackleton and his men from the H.M.S. Endurance expedition, wrote in her diary: “I think it is one of the most wonderful adventures I ever read of, magnificent, Shackleton or no Shackleton” (Kennett 1949, p. 143). However, the general euphoria experienced on Shackleton's safe return with his men must be seen in the context of the British public's ongoing experiences of the First World War. So many lives had been lost, and continued to be lost, that the fate of a comparative few held less significance than might otherwise have been the case. Shackleton had received Prime Minister Winston Churchill's authority for the H.M.S. Endurance expedition to "proceed" in 1914, prior to their departure for Buenos Aires, the Weddell Sea and the Antarctic continent, but he and his men had returned to a world irretrievably changed from the one that they had left.

Following Shackleton's death on South Georgia, the Geographical Review, in 1922, published an obituary in his honour that read in part "With the death of Sir Ernest Shackleton, Britain loses one of the most brilliant explorers of modern days … Shackleton's personality was not less interesting than his exploits. To his commanding personality, his courageous and indomitable spirit, and certain quality of “instinctive judgement” that together made for leadership in a supreme degree, tribute is paid by Hugh Robert Mill in a recent number of Nature (February 12, 1922), and a splendid portrait, 'Sir Ernest Shackleton: A Study in Personality,' is sketched by Charles Sarolea in the March number of the Contemporary Review".
Shackleton's enduring legacy

Another important aspect of Shackleton's enduring legacy is represented by the increasingly popular tourism industry in Antarctica and the sub-Antarctic. While many tourists visit Antarctica out of interest for the spectacular scenery or amazing wildlife, others are likely to do so as a result of long-standing interest in exploration undertaken during the Antarctic Heroic Era. Shackleton's legacy has resulted in him being one of the best known and most revered explorers of that time and for some fortunate visitors to the Ross Sea historic huts, or to Shackleton's grave in the whalers' cemetery at Grytviken, South Georgia, their experience becomes a once-in-a-lifetime pilgrimage.

Types of Antarctic tourism include adventure tourism, ship-based tourism, land-based exploration, private yacht excursions and Qantas continental over-flights. Some half-dozen Qantas flights per year leave from the Australian mainland capital cities of Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth. Aircraft head south with the objective of flying over the areas of Antarctica made famous by Shackleton and his fellow explorers: the Ross Sea, Ross Island, the Trans Antarctic Mountains and Commonwealth Bay. Expedition ship-based voyages also depart from Australia and New Zealand ports for the historic hut landing sites in the Ross Sea or Commonwealth Bay. Ushuaia, Argentina, and Punta Arenas, Chile, are both departure ports for voyages to the South Atlantic Ocean and Weddell Sea, to the Antarctic Peninsula, to the Falkland Islands, and to South Georgia.

Weather and ice conditions permitting, many voyages encompass visits to Elephant Island, where Shackleton's three lifeboats came ashore, to the whaling station at Stromness Bay and to Shackleton's grave at Grytviken (pl. 1).

The more extreme adventure tourism, as the name suggests, is undertaken by adventurers and explorers skilled in the more challenging sports arenas such as small yacht sailing, mountaineering, base jumping, deep sea diving, kayaking, parachuting and sky diving. These pursuits normally take place in the more remote areas of the world, of which Antarctica is certainly one. For many participants the ultimate challenge may be to follow in Shackleton's footsteps. One ambition can be to follow his early attempts on the H.M.S. Discovery and H.M.S. Nimrod expeditions from the Ross Sea towards the South Pole, or to cross the Antarctic continent from the Weddell Sea to the Ross Sea. Another is to emulate Shackleton's voyage in the lifeboat James Caird from Elephant Island to South Georgia and to attempt the crossing of the island's mountainous interior to reach the old whaling station at Stromness Bay. The 2012–2013 British-Australian expedition, suitably supported and led by world-renowned adventurer Tim Jarvis, successfully re-enacted Shackleton's 1916 voyage from Elephant Island to South Georgia and completed the hazardous crossing of the island. Their success was not without major difficulties, challenges and set-backs, however (Robertson & Darby 2013).

Modern expeditions have the advantage of having access to more accurate forecasting of suitable weather and ice conditions than was the case one hundred years ago. When the whalers of South Georgia warned Shackleton of heavier than usual pack ice to the south for the time of year, prior to his departure in H.M.S. Endurance, they spoke from extensive local knowledge. Notwithstanding his respect for their expertise, he ignored their advice, knowing that if he didn't depart within a certain timeframe he would be unable to complete the proposed journey due to the onset of the Antarctic winter.

Circumstances are now different. Most importantly, polar expeditioners are no longer alone in facing the unknown. Modern technology provides extensive information regarding anticipated terrestrial or marine challenges to be faced in polar travel. There is also the considerable advantage – practical as well as psychological – of virtually instantaneous communication with home base, together with expert advice on appropriate clothing, equipment and high-calorie food, facilities often unavailable or inadequate during the past.

Despite all these advantages, however, many modern expeditions fail, or come close to failure, notwithstanding availability of hi-tech communications and more than adequate provisions. For example, explorer Sir Ranulph Fiennes, one of the most able and experienced expeditioners of modern times, was forced to withdraw from a planned crossing of the Antarctic continent in mid-winter 2013 following severe frostbite to his hands during training (Collins 2013).
LEADERSHIP TRAINING METHODS AND CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

The impact of Shackleton’s legacy has also been felt in arenas other than the Antarctic. Contemporary management literature in the United States focuses on the lessons to be learned from Shackleton’s leadership and his bonding work with his “teams”. Morrell & Capparell 2001, frontispiece in Shackleton’s Way: Leadership Lessons from the Great Antarctic Explorer report “those who have taken Shackleton’s leadership lessons to heart” as including “the Secretary of the Navy, the Commander of Apollo 13, and the Co-founder of TheStreet.com”. The book’s Introduction and subsequent chapters reflect at length upon Shackleton’s many accomplishments and their relevance to modern-day issues: the path to leadership; hiring an outstanding crew; creating a spirit of camaraderie; getting the best from each individual; leading effectively in a crisis; forming teams for tough assignments; overcoming obstacles to reach a goal, and leaving a legacy (Morrell & Capparell 2001).

As a skilled judge of men, Shackleton exhibited exceptional maturity in his understanding of the difficulties of putting together an ideal crew. A good example of this ability is his recollection of a London theatrical manager’s observations that “character and temperament matter quite as much as acting ability”. In this instance Shackleton responded by saying that “he had to balance his types too, and their science and seamanship weighs little against the kind of chaps they were” (Morrell & Capparell 2001, p. 56).

Blair W. Browning (2007) draws a comparison with three leadership approaches/theories: skills approach, style approach and contingency theory. He utilises a non-fiction piece of literature as an example of how leadership theory can be taught or discussed using a(n) historical event re-created through the text as a way of understanding this pertinent aspect of organisational life.

John C. Maxwell, in considering the qualities of well-known American identities over time, cites: “character; charisma; commitment; communication; competence; courage; discernment; focus; generosity; initiative; listening; passion; positive attitude; problem solving; relationships; responsibility; security; self-discipline; servanthood; teachability and vision” as being indispensable leadership qualities (Maxwell 1999, p. vii). He then goes on to claim “Everything rises and falls on leadership. And leadership truly develops from the inside out. If you can become the leader you ought to be on the inside, you will be able to become the leader you want to be on the outside. People will want to follow you. And when that happens, you’ll be able to tackle anything in this world” (Maxwell 1999, p. xi).

James C. Humes (1991), communications consultant and speech writer for every American President from Eisenhower to Bush, is passionate in his belief that “the difference between mere management and leadership is communication, and that art of communication is the language of leadership” (Humes 1991, p. 14). Shackleton had the advantage of being born with the ability to communicate with all classes and levels of people at a personal as well as a professional level, an advantage honed by his enlistment and lengthy period of service in the British Merchant Navy prior to his expeditionary exploits.

CONCLUSION

Research into Shackleton’s enduring legacy has indicated that very little is achieved without passion and with it the determination to proceed at all costs. Shackleton’s particular passion started out as a thirst for the excitement afforded by exploration, as an attraction for the polar regions and for the solitude afforded by ultimate wilderness. However, this indulgence very quickly became a preoccupation with Antarctica. Shackleton never wavered from his desire to travel south, to be in the first party to reach the South Pole, to ensure that a British expedition be the first to cross the Antarctic continent, and to achieve the first circumnavigation of Antarctica.

Shackleton’s allegiance to the men who served under him on his four expeditions south is well noted. He was also steadfast in his determination to extend and expand upon what was then comparatively limited knowledge of the Antarctic continent and Southern Ocean. That the culmination of these ambitious ultimately cost Shackleton his life at a comparatively early age is not surprising. Aged forty-six, he had undergone more physical hardships than many men will ever experience. An engaging, practical, down-to-earth and yet poetical man, many of those who knew him, as well as subsequent biographers, depict him as having possessed to a very high degree that measure of humanity and competence which governed his every endeavour.

Shackleton’s enduring legacy therefore extends to many facets relevant to the twenty-first century. In addition to his leadership attributes and management skills, to his contribution to British/Australian sovereignty in Antarctica through scientific discovery and exploration, and to Antarctic tourism, as recounted earlier, there is another consideration.

Shackleton’s lifelong passion for Antarctica enables all of us to better understand our own often inexplicable attraction to this part of the world, our inalienable regard for this most beautiful and desolate wilderness area, and our resolution to do everything within our respective capabilities to ensure its continued protection well into the future.

Shackleton’s widow, Emily, was well aware of his passion for wilderness and for Antarctica. Upon learning of his death on South Georgia, she requested that his body be returned there for burial from Uruguay, where it had been taken, knowing that this was what he would have wished (Albert 1960, Mortimer 1999). Shackleton’s grave (pl. 1) in the whalers’ cemetery at Grytviken is the only one with the headstone facing due south, towards the Antarctic. The headstone itself is engraved simply “To the dear memory of Ernest Henry Shackleton, Explorer, Born 15 February 1874, Entered life eternal, 5 January 1922” (Haughman 2002, p. 110).
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