



The napoleon of crime and the archduke of evil professor james moriarty and ernst stavro blofeld: A comparative study in villainy

Dr. Mohan Gopinath

Professor, Department of Organizational Behavior, School of Business, Alliance University, Bangalore, India

Abstract

Villains and villainy have had a grip on readers who like this genre of writing. This grip is often willingly sought by the reader who takes delight in reading about the machinations of the multitudes of plots the villains weave. Very often they come up against someone who puts an end to their activities; Sherlock Holmes and Bond are the two foils faced by the protagonists in this paper. This paper analyzes as to who is the greater villain; Professor Moriarty created by Arthur Conan Doyle or Ernst Stavro Blofeld created by Ian Fleming. It begins with a general and brief treatise on villainy and then moves on to the specifics in terms of the title of the paper. The two protagonists are analyzed in terms of three parameters *viz.* level of intelligence, degree of cruelty, and refinement of the plots they conceive. The object is to identify who is the greater villain, which is revealed in the concluding section of the paper.

Keywords: villains, villainy, intelligence, cruelty

Introduction

The origin of the word 'villain' lies in the Medieval Latin word: *villanus*. The fact that it's Medieval Latin matters because although the word 'villa' in classical Latin referred to a large country dwelling, by the time of Late Latin-the 3rd to 6th centuries-the word could also refer more generally to any aggregation of rural dwellings, making it nearly equivalent in meaning to village. Medieval Latin came after Late Latin (Medieval Latin was in use from the 7th through the 15th centuries), making *villanus*, with its "inhabitant of a villa" meaning, basically a synonym of villager.

The landed aristocracy (those at home in villas in the classical Latin sense of the word) dominating medieval society in the days of Middle English had all the power, politically and linguistically, and under their use of the word, the Middle English descendant of *villanus* meaning "villager" (a word styled as 'vilain' or 'vilein') developed the meaning "a person of uncouth mind and manners." As the common equating of manners with morals gained in strength and currency, the connotations worsened, so that the modern word villain is no unpolished villager, but is instead (among other things) a deliberate scoundrel or criminal. There are innumerable villains to be found in the annals of literature. For the sake of clarity and succinctness, I will examine two of Shakespeare's villains, i.e. Iago and Richard III. While there are many more villains in the plays of Shakespeare, this paper is focusing on these two as being representative of the others; these two in other words, exhibit many of the characteristics found in other villains; greed, cruelty, treachery, jealousy, lust, and anger. The others mainly are Claudius in *Hamlet*, Cornwall and Edmund in *King Lear*, and Aaron the Moor in *Titus Andronicus*. I do not consider Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice* a villain. He is more to be sympathized with than anything. He is a person whom the world has treated badly; his reactions are understandable. I will look at the character of Iago first. When asked by Rodrigo whether he hates Othello, Iago's

response, "Despise me if I do not" (*Othello* 1.1.14) more than makes a case for it. Iago hates Othello. To Rodrigo, Iago portrays the situation as one of injustice, complaining that "Michael Cassio, a Florentine ... that never set a squadron in the field" has been promoted by Othello to the position Iago desired. If Iago's characterization of Cassio as a "Florentine" is the first of many hints to Iago's xenophobia, then the pornographic implications of Othello and Desdemona's sexual improprieties he describes before her father says it blatantly: "Zounds, sir, you're robbed; for shame, put on your gown; / Your heart is burst; you have lost half your soul; Even now, now, very now, an old black ram / Is tugging your white ewe" (*Othello* 1.1.87-90). According to Michael Neill, "this fantasy" possesses "the characteristic anonymity of pornography-it trades only in perverted erotic stereotypes ('fair daughter' and 'lascivious Moor')", and serves "to plant the suggestion, which perseveres like an itch throughout the action, that the attractive public face of this marriage is only the mask for something unspeakably adulterate" (Neill 397). Iago's further threats to Brabantio that Othello, characterized as "the devil" "will make a grandsire of you" (*Othello* 1.1.92) and his vivid image of Othello and Desdemona "making the beast with two backs" (*Othello* 1.1.117) further reinforces the case that Iago's rhetoric is based in sexual politics and racial identity.

Turning to Richard III, we see another kind of villain who is, and this adds to his evil nature, also physically challenged. With Richard III, Shakespeare faced the challenge of creating a villain who would carry the play completely. Richard is a new type of villain, one not the dim reflection of a hero, but instead, the play's protagonist and prime mover. Richard is complex, "a creature of his deformity and jealousy," writes E. Pearlman, "a character hated by his own mother and who hates all women in return" (Pearlman 424). But despite all of his negative qualities, Richard is an infinitely satisfying speaker, one who is plainspoken, yet "uses rhetoric with no trace of irony" (Hill 464). As R.F. Hill

Observes, “In *Titus Andronicus* and *Richard III*, the characters of Aaron and Richard Crookback constantly disturb the rhetorical mode. Their vigor and humor are presented with a naturalism that makes the language of the other characters look, indeed, frigid, thin, and artificial.” (Hill 464).

This unique rhetorical strategy is evident from Richard’s opening soliloquy. What reads at first like a courtly public address, “Now is the winter of our discontent / Made glorious summer by this sun of York, / and all the clouds that lour’d upon our house / in the deep bosom of the ocean buried” (*Richard III* 1.1.1-4) soon turns confessional. Richard paints himself as the monster he sees himself to be, “not shaped for sportive tricks / nor made to court an amorous looking-glass, [...] so lamely and unfashionable. / that dogs bark at me as I halt by them” (*Richard III* 1.1.14-15, 22-23). But Richard is not a monster in looks alone, he backs up his monstrous countenance with the ambition to do any number of horrible things in order to gain power. “I am determined to prove a villain,” (*Richard III* 1.1.30) he confesses, “plots I have laid inductive, dangerous, / By drunken prophecies, libels, and dreams, / To send my brother Clarence and the King / In deadly hate the one against the other” (*Richard III* 1.1.32-35).

The extent of Richard’s villainy is in full flower as he courts the Lady Anne, despite having murdered her husband and father in law. Richard flatters her, telling her that it was her beauty that “did haunt me in my sleep / to undertake the death of all the world / So that I might rest one hour in your sweet bosom” (*Richard III* 3 1.2.120-122). (The foregoing paragraphs are based on ‘Villain, Speak: William Shakespeare and the Rhetoric of Evil’, Ross E. Lockhart (2004), to be found in ‘Hares Rock Lots’, The official website of the author and editor Ross E. Lockhart).

To sum up, villains and villainy come in all shapes and sizes and types of behavior. We cannot say that a villain will exhibit a standard type of behavior which will classify him or her as being a villain. As is clear from the lead-in to this paper, villainy is complex and sometimes cleverly masked so that it seemingly can also be seen as a virtue. In fact, in an attempt to add realism to their stories, many writers will try to create “sympathetic” villains, the antithesis to an antihero called an anti-villain. These villains come in just as many shapes and sizes as anti-heroes do. Some may wish to make the world a better place but go to antagonistic lengths to do so. The basic fact remains however, that some villains are cruel, some are bestial, some are grossly uncaring about the chaos they cause, *et al.* The fact also remains that they are a part and parcel of humanity. As long as the latter exists, so will villains and villainy. There is no escaping from this.

2. Moving On

First and foremost a villain needs to have a realistic motivation to be evil. Villains who are evil purely for the sake of evil are unrealistic and this leads to bland and boring characters. Childhood trauma is a common element in the backstories of villains, but it can quickly come across as cliché, especially today. A childhood trauma alone is not a basis for an evil person, but it can definitely be a start. There still has to be a reason why this trauma lead to this person becoming evil though, as traumas could just as well lead to a subdued character or simply a heavily suppressed memory.

Psychopaths and sociopaths often make for great villains as they are inherently different from us and usually in a darker way. Perhaps less so in the case of sociopaths and not all sociopaths

and psychopaths are criminals, evil or dangerous in any way, but their archetype can make a solid foundation for an evil character nonetheless.

But first, what’s the difference? If we focus on the more stereotypical versions, both psychopaths and sociopaths are unable to empathize with others like regular people and both are usually the result of faulty brain regions, but psychopaths are the more violent types and the ones without a sense of right and wrong, while sociopaths often do have some sense of right and wrong however skewed their version may be. As far as committing crimes go a sociopath will generally do so erratically and based on impulses, while a psychopath will carefully plan their crimes in advance and take calculate risks.

This paper analyzes two the most ruthless and intelligent villains in fiction. If we go by what is written in the earlier paragraphs, it is clear that both Professor Moriarty and Blofeld are virulent psychopaths. They have never acted on impulse, but have crafted their acts through a careful and intelligent nurturing of what is to be expected from them. This careful and meticulous plotting of a crime is the ultimate sign that the plotter is a person who is dangerous and will be extremely difficult to stop. Run of the mill villains operate at the base of the pyramid of evil; intelligent and psychopathic villains operate from the pinnacle. The latter do not do anything on impulse. They plan their moves in such a way that the need for impulsive and improvised moves never happen; these are not a part of their lexicon. If the plotting is done well in advance and infinite pains have been taken over what is being planned, it is obvious that every move and countermove has been taken into account and no surprises will come in the way of what is going to happen. For the record and if I may digress slightly (as I have used the word ‘plan’ in this paragraph), planning is one of the executive functions of the brain, encompassing the neurological processes involved in the formulation, evaluation and selection of a sequence of thoughts and actions to achieve a desired goal. Various studies utilizing a combination of neuropsychological, neuro pharmacological and functional neuroimaging approaches have suggested there is a positive relationship between impaired planning ability and damage to the frontal lobe. Obviously, there is no damage to the frontal lobes of either Professor Moriarty or Blofeld; the question of impaired planning therefore does not come into play in anything that they do.

A crucial point or question relates to the concept of evil. Hillestad (2014) ^[7]. Indicated that:

‘Evil can be done both intentional, instrumental and by consequence. Other theorists however have stated that the concept of evil exclusively rests on a myth originated in the Judean-Christian conception of Satan and ultimate evil. This last argument presupposes evil itself as non-existent in the real rational world. It seems however a fact that most people attach certain basic meaning to the concept, mainly that it represents ultimately bad and terrible actions and behavior directed toward common people for the purpose of bringing upon them ultimate pain and suffering’.

Why do people do unspeakably evil things? I am not a psychologist and so I will not be able to use jargon to answer this question. To answer this question I will elaborate on a few general thoughts on evil. ‘First of all, an evil person’s intention is

to harm others, and often to promote themselves. Second of all, their actions inflict harm on others. So in that respect they can be defined as evil. But, an important aspect here is that they have a disorder. Here nature and nurture enter the picture. They are likely to have a disposition for developing into anti-social creatures, but their childhood is decisive in whether they develop it or not. For example, one common trait of serial killers is the fact that they have been abused during childhood. Another trait is that they often come from families with a psychotic history. The conception that some people are evil, and some good, is part of our culture. Whether we are aware of it or not, we have internalized the idea that there is a clear line dividing these two kinds of people. It is always "us" that are on the right side of the line, and the "others" who can be found on the wrong side. It is a person's disposition that causes a person to commit evil deeds'. (Anna Rømcke Høiseth in 'The Line Between Good and Evil' – no further details available).

As far as we know, neither Professor Moriarty or Blofeld came from families with a psychotic history.

3. The Choice

Why did I consider comparing Professor Moriarty with Blofeld? In the Sherlock Holmes novels and stories, it is Professor Moriarty who looms large on the horizon. There are a number of other villains in the stories, but it is the Professor who looms large and is referred to by Holmes as 'the Napoleon of crime'. He is ever present in Holme's life like an evil presence; not seen but definitely there till he finally reveals himself. Consequently, amongst all the villains in the Holmes dossiers, the Professor stood out and was an obvious choice.

The matter was not that simple when it came to the Bond villains. For the record, the following list gives the names of the novels and the names of the villains appearing in them. Here I have not taken into account the villains appearing in the short stories. While they are important, they do not hold a candle to the major ones.

Casino Royale: Le Chiffre

Live and Let Die: Mr. Big (Buonaparte Ignace Gallia)

Moon Raker: Sir Hugo Drax (Graf Hugo von der Drache)

Diamonds Are Forever: Jack Spang and Seraffimo Spang

From Russia, with Love: Rosa Klebb and General Grubozaboyschikov

Dr. No: Dr. Julius No

Gold finger: Auric Gold finger

Thunder ball: Ernst Stavro Blofeld

On Her Majesty's Secret Service: Ernst Stavro Blofeld

You Only Live Twice: Ernst Stavro Blofeld (a.k.a. Dr. Guntram Shatterhand)

The Man with the Golden Gun: Francisco (Paco) "Pistols" Scaramanga

The choice was a difficult one, till one realizes that it is Blofeld who appears in three of the Fleming's novels about James Bond i.e. 'Thunderball', 'On Her Majesty's Secret Service', and 'You Only Live Twice' (also known as the SPECTRE trilogy). That simplified matters in terms of choice of the Bond villain for comparison purposes. I then took into account as to which of the Bond villains had the greatest impact on Bond in terms of the harm they did to him. Here again, it was Blofeld who stood out.

In fact, he also caused he who caused the biggest tragedy in Bond's life when he murdered Tracy, Bond's wife who had only a few hours ago got married to Bond. This completely shattered Bond and he had to be rehabilitated by M who took a personal interest in this matter. Blofeld therefore, has the unique distinction of having played a very major part in Bond's life. Consequently, he became the villain against whom I decided to compare Professor Moriarty.

(Note - In Ian Fleming's novels, SPECTRE is a commercial enterprise led by Blofeld. It is by no means a run of the mill organization. The top level of the organization is made up of twenty-one individuals, eighteen of whom handle day-to-day affairs and are drawn in groups of three from six of the world's most notorious organizations-the Gestapo, the Soviet SMERSH, Marshal Josip Broz Tito's secret police, the Italian Mafia, the Unione Corse, and a massive heroin-smuggling operation based in Turkey. Their début is in the 9th Bond book, Thunderball (1961) [3]. At the time of writing the novel-1959-Fleming believed that the Cold War might end during the two years it would take to produce the film, and came to the conclusion that the inclusion of a contemporary political villain would leave the film looking dated; he therefore thought it better to create a politically neutral enemy for Bond. Fleming's SPECTRE has elements inspired by mafia syndicates and organized crime rings that were actively hunted by law enforcement in the 1950s. The strict codes of loyalty and silence, and the hard retributions that followed violations, were hallmarks of American gangster rings, Mafia, the Unione Corse, the Chinese Tongs and Triads and the Japanese Yakuza and Black Dragon Society. During the events of 'Thunderball', SPECTRE successfully hijacks two nuclear warheads and plan to hold the world to ransom).

4. Characteristics of the Protagonists

I had some difficulty in writing this section, as the physical traits of Professor Moriarty are not dwelt on by Conan Doyle to the extent that Fleming does for Blofeld. This is I feel, is due to the different writing styles of the two, as Fleming is much more prone to getting into specific details, whether these details have to do with an object, a scene, or a person. For example, in the novel 'From Russia with Love', we come across the following description of Bond having breakfast:

'When he was stationed in London it was always the same. It consisted of very strong coffee, from De Bry in New Oxford Street, brewed in an American Chemex, of which he drank two large cups, black and without sugar. The single egg, in the dark blue eggcup with a gold ring round the top, was boiled for three and a third minutes. "It was a very fresh, speckled brown egg from French Marans hens owned by some friend of May's in the country. (Bond disliked white eggs and, faddish as he was in many small things, it amused him to maintain that there was such a thing as a perfect boiled egg). Then there were two slices of whole wheat toast, a large pat of deep yellow Jersey butter and three squat glass jars containing Tiptree "Little Scarlet" strawberry jam; Cooper's Vintage Oxford marmalade and Norwegian Heather Honey from Fortnum's. The coffee pot and the silver on the tray were Queen Anne and the china was Minton, of the same dark blue and gold and white as the egg cup.'

We cannot imagine Conan Doyle getting into such specifics in his writing. He prefers to 'hook' the reader by the beauty of the plots and their unusual settings against the wonderfully evocative rooms in Baker Street (especially when it is foggy or raining). Here we have a linear style, which is a way of saying the events of a story are told in chronological order. Doyle's stories do not jump around all over the place. The narrator Watson might start us off with a brief mention of the present and how he is remembering a certain case. He also tells his stories in the past tense. But, Watson still tells us the sequence of past events in chronological order; the man does not do spoilers in other words. By not giving things away too early, Watson allows readers to experience the mystery as he experienced it back in the day.

Fleming's use of images and imagery is therefore more pronounced than in the writing style of Conan Doyle. In fact, I will quote a small extract from one of Shakespeare's plays to show the power which imagery can add to the prose. The perfect example of imagery that is both innate and peripheral, can be seen in the second part of *Henry IV*, in which play the gigantic and alcohol loving Sir John Falstaff delivers a paean to 'sherry-sack', (sack from Jerez, in Andalusia) with a detailed analysis on its power to inflame both wit and courage.

"A good sherry- sack hath a two -fold operation in it. It ascends me into the brain, dries me there all the foolish and dull and crudy vapors which environ it, makes it apprehensive, quick, forgetive, full of nimble, fiery and delectable shapes, which, delivered o'er to the voice, the tongue, which is the birth, becomes excellent wit.... But the sherry warms it, and makes it course from the inwards to the parts' extreme; it illumineth the face, which, as a beacon, gives warning to all the rest of this little kingdom, man, to arm; and then the vital commoners and inland petty spirits muster me all to their captain.... And this valor comes of sherry." (Act IV, Scene II).

The interplay of innate and peripheral imagery is so seamless that we do not notice it when the lines are read or heard. The passage starts with the former and then gradually moves to detailing of peripheral imagery with the detailed description of what sherry – sack can do to the face of the drinker. It is this combination that gives life to the imagery. Through the dual use, Shakespeare makes the imagery two dimensional and increases the visual component of the words. From the foregoing paragraphs it is clear that it is Fleming who is the master of detail and relishes writing about the minutiae without losing the thread of the story.

I will now look at physical and mental characteristics of the two protagonists of this paper. This is important as the reader will then get a better perspective on the driving forces behind these two men. Speaking to Dr. Watson about Professor Moriarty, Holmes tells him that 'he is the Napoleon of crime, Watson. He is the organizer of half that is evil and of nearly all that is undetected in this great city. He is a genius, a philosopher, an abstract thinker. He has a brain of the first order. He sits motionless, like a spider in the center of its web, but that web has a thousand radiations, and he knows well every quiver of each of them.'

He appears a for the first time in the story 'The Adventure of the Final Problem', in which Sherlock Holmes is supposed to have been killed. In this story, Moriarty is depicted as something of a

Mafia Godfather: he protects nearly all of the criminals of England in exchange for their obedience and a share in their profits. Holmes, by his own account, was originally led to Moriarty by the suggestion that many of the crimes he perceived were not the spontaneous work of random criminals, but the machinations of a vast and subtle criminal ring. In such a way, he can be described as a Consulting Criminal, the opposite of Holmes, a Consulting Detective.

Professor Moriarty was also exceptionally knowledgeable and accomplished in academic fields, having received excellent academic education and excelled, with even Sherlock Holmes praising his academic expertise. He was known to have unprecedented talent in mathematics, with particular knowledge and ability in the Binomial Theorem to the point that he published a treatise on the mathematic field that was deemed to be so profound that it was globally acclaimed when he was still at the age of 21 and later became the most brilliant mathematical professor in the history of an unknown university, all which impressed Holmes himself to the point that he even said Professors Moriarty's exceptional mathematical expertise came from him already having been endowed from birth with what he described as phenomenal mathematical faculty. Professor Moriarty was also exceptionally competent and knowledgeable in scientific fields, particularly Astronomy, especially in using mathematics to solve the field's problems, having published the book *Dynamics of an Asteroid* that was said to contain such rarefied heights of pure mathematics that it is said that there was no man in the scientific press capable of criticizing it and even Holmes was once again impressed by Professor Moriarty's work. He was also very excellent in technology, as he was famous for his technological achievements, although his abilities in technology and achievements in said field are unknown. His ability to publish such renowned books also proved him to be a prolific author. (The foregoing paragraph is based on the contents available in Baker Street Wiki).

As far as the physical appearance of Professor Moriarty re concerned, the following extract is again from the story 'The Adventure of the Final Problem' in which Holmes says, 'his appearance was quite familiar to me. He is extremely tall and thin, his forehead domes out in a white curve, and his two eyes are deeply sunken in his head. He is clean-shaven, pale, and ascetic-looking, retaining something of the professor in his features. His shoulders are rounded from much study, and his face protrudes forward, and is forever slowly oscillating from side to side in a curiously reptilian fashion. He peered at me with great curiosity in his puckered eyes'.

With Blofeld, we are provided with a much more detailed description of the physical characteristics of the person. Blofeld appears for the first time in 'Thunderball' written in 1961 and is the ninth full length Bond novel. He later appears in 'On Her Majesty's Secret Service' and 'You Only Live Twice'. In 'Thunderball', Blofeld is described as:

'having eyes which were deep black pools surrounded – totally surrounded as Mussolini's were – by very clear whites. The doll-like effect of his unusual symmetry was enhanced by long silken black eyelashes that should have belonged to a woman. The gaze of these soft dolls eyes was relaxed and rarely held any expression stronger than a mild curiosity in the object of their focus. They conveyed a restful certitude in their owner and in the analysis off what they observed. To the innocent, they exuded confidence, a

wonderful cocoon of confidence in which the observed could relax knowing that he was in comfortable, reliable hands. But they stripped the guilty or the false and made him feel transparent – as transparent as a fishbowl through whose sides Blofeld examined, with only the most casual curiosity, the few solid fish, the grains of truth, suspended in the void of deceit or attempted obscurity. Blofeld's gaze was a microscope, the window on the world of a superbly clear brain, with a focus that had been sharpened by thirty years of danger and of keeping just one step ahead of it, and of an inner self-assurance built up on a lifetime of success in whatever he had attempted.

'The skin beneath the eyes ... was unpouched. There was no sign of debauchery, illness or old age on the large, white, bland face under the square wiry black crew-cut. The jawline, going to the appropriate middle-aged fat of authority, showed decision and independence. Only the mouth, under a heavy, squat nose, marred what might have been the face of a philosopher or a scientist. Proud and thin, like a badly healed wound, the compressed, dark lips, capable only of false, ugly smiles, suggested contempt, tyranny and cruelty. But to an almost Shakespearean degree, nothing about Blofeld was small'.

His schemes are as gigantic and complex as the man himself. In 'Thunderball' he steals two atomic bombs and holds the world to ransom. In 'On Her Majesty's Secret Service', Bond learns that Blofeld has altered his appearance radically - he is now tall and thin; has reduced his weight to 12 stone (170 lb; 76 kg); sports long silver hair, a syphilitic infection on his nose, and no earlobes; he wears dark green tinted contact lenses to hide his distinctive eyes. Perhaps less calculating than previously, he is notably saddled with the exploitable weakness of snobbery about his assumed nobility, indicating that he is losing his sanity. He is hiding in Switzerland in the guise of the Comte Balthazar de Bleuchamp and Bond defeats his vindictive plans to destroy Britain's agricultural economy. In 'You Only Live Twice', published in 1964, Blofeld returns and Bond finds him hiding in Japan under the alias Dr. Guntram Shatterhand. He has once again changed his appearance. He has put on some muscle, and has a gold-capped tooth, a fully healed nose, and a drooping grey mustache. Bond describes Blofeld on their confrontation as being "a big man, perhaps six foot three (190 cm), and powerfully built." It is indicated that Blofeld has by now gone completely insane, as he all but admits himself when Bond levels the accusation. Bond strangles him to death at the end of the novel. In both 'On Her Majesty's Secret Service' and 'You Only Live Twice', Blofeld is aided in his schemes by Irma Bunt, who is clearly his lover in the latter, and posing as Shatterhand's wife. Bond incapacitates her in their Japanese castle base before it blows up, killing Bunt. The preceding paragraphs highlight the fact that we are comparing two people who are amongst the top in exercising the art of villainy. The reader will of course know that villainy to be practised at the highest level is no mean achievement. We are not looking at petty villains here; we are looking at two of the top practitioners of this evil art. We are looking at two people who are as much masters in their chosen profession as Shakespeare was in his. The next section analyzes certain parameters of villainy and then links it to Professor Moriarty and Blofeld in order to see who can be called the greater villain.

5. Who is the Greater Villain?

Robson (2016) ^[15]. argued that:

'ironically, the psychology of altruism may also shed light into those darker souls at the other end of the spectrum – the super-villains such as Lord Voldemort, Darth Vader or Hannibal Lecter who are, quite simply, 'pure evil'. 'The idea formed the basis of a recent paper by Jens Kjeldgaard-Christiansen at Aarhus University in Denmark, who points out that the brain may instantly calculate a 'welfare trade-off ratio' for each person we meet. Someone who gives little (or nothing) but takes a lot, has a low welfare trade-off ratio, and we have an instant gut reaction not to trust them. The lower they score, the more we dislike them, and depending on just how poisonous they are, you may even decide to kick them out of our group – or kill them. It is the characters that provoke the strongest of these reactions that should be considered evil, he says – and hearing those chilling tales should underline the values of altruism, encouraging us to pull together and be more cooperative as a result (Kjeldgaard-Christiansen, 2015) ^[8]'.

If we base our analysis of our two protagonists on the above argument, it is clear that both of them score very low on the welfare trade-off ratio. We also have an instant gut reaction not to trust them. In addition to this parameter, I will now analyze them on three others, i.e. level of intelligence, degree of cruelty, and refinement of the plots they conceive. I believe that these three parameters are very closely linked to understanding their persona – this is the reason why they have been isolated for analysis.

6. Intelligence

Intelligence is defined in many different ways. Science Aid (2017) ^[11] indicated that 'it is one's capacity for knowledge, logic, problem-solving, understanding and creativity. It's also the ability to choose between two things and the ability to resolve different conflicts. The word "intelligence" is derived from the Latin word "intelligere," which means to comprehend or perceive. Intelligence isn't only observed in humans, but also in plants and animals'.

Knowledge, logic, problem-solving and intensity – these are the key words which are relevant to this paper. Both Professor Moriarty and Blofeld uses all four of these components in plotting their complex schemes. The professor is a bit more subtle in his method of operating, while Blofeld paints on a very large canvas. The ingenuity of the schemes are obvious; Professor Moriarty however, does not come to the forefront like Blofeld does. This is not to say he is a lesser villain. I am only saying that in the novels by the two writers, it is Blofeld who makes a greater impact on the reader. This in no way diminishes his intelligence. A report published by the Board of Scientific Affairs of the American Psychological Association titled 'Knowns and Unknowns' (1995), said that:

'Individuals differ from one another in their ability to understand complex ideas, to adapt effectively to the environment, to learn from experience, to engage in various

forms of reasoning, to overcome obstacles by taking thought. Although these individual differences can be substantial, they are never entirely consistent: a given person's intellectual performance will vary on different occasions, in different domains, as judged by different criteria. Concepts of "intelligence" are attempts to clarify and organize this complex set of phenomena. Although considerable clarity has been achieved in some areas, no such conceptualization has yet answered all the important questions, and none commands universal assent. Indeed, when two dozen prominent theorists were recently asked to define intelligence, they gave two dozen, somewhat different, definitions.'

Both the protagonists have displayed the ability to 'to adapt effectively to the environment, to learn from experience, to engage in various forms of reasoning, to overcome obstacles by taking thought'. The overall conclusion to this section would be that we are dealing with a pair of villains who have misused the highly intelligent brains with which they were endowed.

7. Cruelty

The suggestion that cruelty is a pedestrian human characteristic offends liberal sensibilities. We can conceive of human beings as naturally egoistic, but not as naturally sadistic. Thomas Hobbes, the philosopher of liberalism with perhaps the lowest regard for human nature did not allow that normal humans might pursue the suffering of others for its own sake. Even if we view cruelty as something of which humans are uniquely capable, we tend to insist with Hobbes that delight in the suffering of others is a monstrous aberration of human nature, not an essential aspect of it.

Did Professor Moriarty or Blofeld delight in the sufferings of others? I am not so sure if the Professor actually 'delighted' in inflicting cruelty on others. From what Doyle tells us, Professor Moriarty was perhaps more interested in committing crimes to profit by it rather than to inflict calculated cruelty on people. Cruelty would be a by-product of his crimes and not the actual reason for his committing the crimes. We always see him as a behind the scenes operator. As Holmes himself says, "'he [Moriarty] sits motionless, like a spider in the center of its web, but that web has a thousand radiations, and he knows well every quiver of each of them. He does little himself. He only plans. But his agents are numerous and splendidly organized. Is there a crime to be done, a paper to be abstracted, we will say, a house to be rifled, a man to be removed – the word is passed to the Professor, the matter is organized and carried out. The agent may be caught. In that case money is found for his bail or his defence' (from the 'The Final Problem').

We are on a different tack when we deal with Blofeld. Here is a man who thinks nothing of destroying millions of people through the use of nuclear bombs or in waging biological warfare on a country or in helping the Japanese to commit suicide by the hundred. He in fact actually takes a perverse delight in doing all these things. As I said earlier, his canvas is a huge one and his brush strokes are bold and the paints he uses are vividly colored. Cruelty is ingrained in him and human life is of no value to a person of his ilk. He takes the kind of pleasure an artist would take in his or her paintings; for paintings we only have to substitute his complex and well executed activities. He goes

through with them though he knows that he is also causing untold grief to many people who are only peripherally affected by his wanton acts. Cruelty for Blofeld is therefore a game to be played without thought of the consequences.

8. Plots

This is comparatively a straight choice. We are not given much information about the specific crimes committed by Professor Moriarty. He is referred to in many of the stories but as we saw, does not make his presence felt until 'The Final Problem'. In fact, one of the Scotland Yard detectives goes so far as to say that they feel that Professor Moriarty is a bee in Holmes's bonnet. This is because they obviously have not come across first hand with any of Professor Moriarty's activities. Conan Doyle must have done this deliberately in order to create the mystic figure lurking in the background more menacing.

When we turn to Blofeld, Fleming has no such inhibitions. The plots in which Blofeld figure are complex, gripping, realistic, and capable of evoking in the reader that 'willing suspension of disbelief' about which Coleridge wrote. Incidentally, this does not apply only to the stories in which Blofeld appears. It is evident in almost all of Fleming's stories, barring the few exceptions such as 'Quantum of Solace' which are on a different but equally mesmerizing level. Fleming obviously took a tremendous amount of trouble over getting the plots right as well as the language. I am reminded of PG Wodehouse who also used to write an enormous amount of notes with regard to the plot of a novel before commencing to write it. Fleming was helped by his war time experiences which gave the authentic flavor to the novels. Without this background, it is doubtful if the novels would have lacked the realism they now contain to an enormous degree. In short, the three novels in which Blofeld appears are much more informative with regard to what kind of a person Blofeld is; the reader knows more about him than he knows about Professor Moriarty after he has finished reading both the sets of stories. It is also important to note that Blofeld has many more human weaknesses than Professor Moriarty. These weaknesses appear to get more and more bizarre by the time the last novel is written.

9. Conclusions

Lewis (1953) ^[10]. Wrote that 'If anyone thinks that Christians regard unchastity as the supreme vice, he is quite wrong. The sins of the flesh are bad, but they are the least bad of all sins. All the worst pleasures are purely spiritual: the pleasure of putting other people in the wrong, of bossing and patronizing and spoiling sport, and backbiting; the pleasures of power, of hatred.... That is why a cold self-righteous prig who goes regularly to church may be far nearer to hell than a prostitute. But, of course, it is better to be neither.' The Western concept of evil is a complex one is different from the way the Indian religions look at evil. Reichenbach (1998) ^[12]. said that many Indian religions place greater emphasis on developing the karma principle for first cause and innate justice with Man as focus, rather than developing religious principles with the nature and powers of God and divine judgment as focus. According to Krishan (1997) ^[9], the Karma theory of Buddhism, Hinduism and Jainism is not static, but dynamic wherein livings beings with intent or without intent, but with words and actions continuously create new karma, and it is this that they believe to be in part the source of good or evil in the world.

According to me, both Professor Moriarty and Blofeld are at the pinnacle of their professions which is to wreak havoc on humankind. The views of Lewis, whom I have quoted above, is more applicable to both of them rather than the more nuanced way Indian religions look at evil which is dependent on the karma one does in one's present life. The question now obviously rises, as to who is more evil and villainous in terms of displaying cruelty. Here I feel the answer is obvious and the needle points to Blofeld for the reasons elaborated in this paper. Moreover, in the ultimate analysis, in Blofeld there is a grandeur about his schemes which transcends the petty world in which humans live and the schemes, by their very nature, are covered with a poetic aura which lifts them well beyond the ordinary.

I trust the reader agrees with me on this point.

"Ut haec ipsa qui non sentiat deorum vim habere is nihil omnino sensurus esse videatur."

"If any man cannot feel the power of God when he looks upon the stars, then I doubt whether he is capable of any feeling at all."
Horace.

10. References

1. Baker Street Wiki. Retrieved from https://bakerstreet.fandom.com/wiki/James_Moriarty (date not specified).
2. Fleming I. *From Russia with Love - Chapter 11 - The Soft Life*, Jonathan Cape Ltd, 1956.
3. Fleming I. *Thunderball*. Penguin Books. London, 1961.
4. Fleming I. *On Her Majesty's Secret Service*. Penguin Books. London, 1963.
5. Fleming I. *You Only Live Twice*. Penguin Books. London, 1964.
6. Hill RF. Shakespeare's Early Tragic Mode. *Shakespeare Quarterly JSTOR*. Web. 1958; 9(4):455-469.
7. Hillestad TM. *The Metapsychology of Evil- Main Theoretical Perspectives Causes, Consequences and Critiques*. University of Stavanger. Report, 2014.
8. Kjeldgaard-Christiansen J. *Evil Origins: A Darwinian Genealogy of the Popcultural Villain*. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 2015.
9. Krishan Y. *The Doctrine of Karma: Its Origin and Development in Brāhmanical, Buddhist, and Jain Traditions*. *Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan*, 1997, 17-20.
10. Lewis CS. *Mere Christianity*. Geoffrey Bles. England, 1952, 94-95.
11. *Nature and Psychology of Intelligence*. (2017). In *Science Aid*. Retrieved, 2017. from <https://scienceaid.net/Intelligence>.
12. Reichenbach B. *Karma and the Problem of Evil. Philosophy of Religion Toward a Global Perspective* (Editor: G.E. Kessler), Wadsworth, 1998, 248-255
13. Neill M. *Unproper Beds: Race Adultery, and the Hideous in Othello*. *Shakespeare Quarterly JSTOR*. Web. 1989; 40(4):383-412.
14. Neisser U, Boodoo G, Bouchard T, Boykin AW, Brody N, Ceci SJ, *et al.* "Intelligence: Knowns and unknowns". *American Psychologist*. 1996; 51(2):77-101. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.51.2.77. ISSN 0003-066X. Archived (PDF) from the original on 28 March 2016. Retrieved, 2014.
15. Robson D *Heroes, Villains. the psychologist*. *Journal of the British Psychological Society*, 2016, 29.
16. Pearlman E. *The Invention of Richard of Gloucester*. *Shakespeare Quarterly JSTOR*. Web. 1992; 43(4):410-429.