

Psychoanalysis of Leaders: Case Study of President Zia and President Musharraf Leadership in Conceptual Framework

You gain strength, courage and confidence by every experience in which you really stop to look Fear in the face. You must do the thing you think you cannot do. —Eleanor Roosevelt

Iram Khalid and Sulman Ali*

Abstract

A leader is a core element of making and implementing foreign policy in a state. The study of "Individual Level" in international relations proves that ideas, emotions, psychology of a leader leave a deep impact on foreign policy and internal policies of a state. This aspect and school of thought is quite applicable in Pakistan where individuals have made more policies than governments. These leaders took those decisions as per their cognitive map and left deep, long lasting and relatively negative impacts at social level in Pakistan. These affects needs to be met and resolved on emergency footings or else they will further destabilize Pakistan in future.

Key words: Cognitive paradigm, psychoanalysis, war, Islamization, Musharraf's secularism

Conversations about International relations and foreign policy, they often focus on leaders and nature of their leadership. The common perception is that Foreign policy is leader's initiatives which must be assertive, clear and decisive. This variable has long been recognized as the decisive variable for success or failure of numerous activities ranging from military operations, operating a business to arranging foreign and domestic policy in nation-state system (Herman, Hagan, 1994; Bass, Stogdill, 1990) Thucydides is perhaps first scholar to discuss the fundamental elements of leadership while discussing the Peloponnesian war between Athens and Sparta. Furthermore, in his book *The Prince* Machiavelli provides a guideline to the Young rulers, giving them a template to ensure their success.

Margaret Herman (1980) discusses the four basic personal characteristics of a leader which eventually affect and shapes the foreign policy. These are Beliefs, Motives, Decision style and Interpersonal style. Most social scientist and political journalists mostly takes these variables to study the personality of a leader. These factors not only develop the personality of a leader but also provide a deep insight of his/her decision making capability. These characteristics can also be studied though public statements (Public Speeches, interviews etc) of a leader and use them to evaluate the key

*Authors are Professor and M.Phil Scholar in Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore – Pakistan

personality traits of the leader (Yang, 2012). Other actors in policy making like bureaucracy, state system also plays a vital role but the personality of a leader will leave its impact.

Beliefs refer to leader's basic assumptions about the surrounding world. Questions like Are Events predictable? Can events be controlled? Answers to these questions depict the beliefs of a leader. Beliefs, as proposed by many intellectuals affect the political leader's interpretation of his environments and subsequently on strategies, he imply. Nationalism is may be the most basic aspect of belief system of a leader, especially leaders of third world. Nationalism is being often used by leaders to control the events and to upsurge the masses mostly for their own benefits.(Jervis, 1976; Holsti, 1977)

To Study the motives of a leader is may be the toughest for political-analysis. Hunger for Power is may be the most discussed motive for leadership, but there are others, such as need of affiliations, need of approval from others, can be the major motives. Motives apparently affect the leader's interpretations of his environment and strategies he use for his foreign policy. Decision style refers to the preferred method for taking decision. How a leader does take decision? Is there any certain approach he adopts? Major components are openness for new information, preference to certain level of risk, complexity in processing the information ability to tolerate the Doubtful information. The last characteristic of leader's personality is interpersonal style. How a leader communicates with other policy makers? Two major aspects, Paranoia (Excessive Suspicion), and Machiavellianism (Manipulative Behavior) are considered to be dominant in political leaders (Barber, 1972; Johnson, 1977; Hofstadter, 1965)

These four characteristics affected the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. Specifically Beliefs and Motives urge leaders to dominate the policy making process. As George (1969) wrote:

"The political actor's information about situations with which he must deal is usually incomplete; his knowledge of ends means relationships is generally inadequate to predict reliably the consequences of choosing one or another course of action; and it is often difficult for him to formulate a single criterion by means of which to choose which alternative course of action is 'best'"

Psycho-Analysis of Leadership in Foreign Policy: A Historical Perspective

The Study of International Relations have mostly revolves around the ideas of cooperation and conflict. The significance of state, its status and absence of

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

authority above it is most of the time remains the centre of global politics. The study of international politics and foreign policy has been defined in the context of Number of Pragmatic School of thoughts, theories and approaches like Marxism, Realism, and Constructivism. The Realist school of thought dominates the subject for the study of states, wholly based on concept of power, balance of power and national interest. This whole scenario and approaches left a little or no space for personal beliefs, values, perceptions, emotions, personalities in international relations.

Furthermore the international relation describes mostly in intuitional theories, model of wars, democratic peace theories which further reduced the role of an individual, leader in global politics. It is long believed that the role of leader is minimal in foreign policy making process. The cognitive map, psychology of a leader is most of time being neglected. The system level analysis is being more opted for the analysis of the global politics. The individual level study is being most often neglected or less used for the study (Holsti, 1976; Tetlock, Macguire, 1986)

Individual-Level Analysis in Foreign Policy Analysis

The individual level has been used for explanation of certain incidents at global level like the atrocities of World War II cannot be discussed without the polices of Hitler, the 1930s and 40s Soviet polices cannot be explained without Stalin, Chinese foreign policy without Mao and current Russian policies without discussing Putin cannot be understood. These issues and aspects do enhance the importance of individual level study but the system level analysis kept the core analytical method to study international relations (Hook, 1945; Singer, 1961; Droff, 2004)

The above mentioned issues show that the psychology of leader does make vital implications on foreign policy. To understand the influence and role of an individual in foreign policy making and implying, "Political Psychology" is the most significant tool. Political Psychology covers the cognitive map, emotions, personality, biases, image of adversary of a leader. The whole study determines the inflow of information to the leader and the decision he takes in the context of its personality attributes. This individual level study of foreign policy gives an in-depth picture of the decisions being taken by the leaders according to their psychology (Renshon, Renshon, 2008; Stone, *et al*, 2014; Peterson, 2014)

Derivational Base of Political Psychology

The roots of political Psychology can be traced back to 1930s and 40s when the scholars started to look into the reasons for WWI and WWII. The studies were being taken regarding nationalism, attitudes towards wars and the aggression of the leaders. Freud's "idea of aggressive instincts are the basic cause of wars" was the core of these researches. Later the focus was turned into the study of the occurrence of the systematic political and international incidents, which make the human instincts to take decisions as per their demands. This leads to little impact of psychoanalytical study in international relations for next decade or so (Einstein, Freud, 1932; Lavine, 2010; Tileaga, 2013; Erisen, 2012)

The psychoanalytic studies kept on working as psycho-historical and psychobiography creating some influence. The major studies being taken in this regard was Walter Langer's (1943) Study on Hitler and George and George's (1956) Psychoanalysis of the policies, attributes of Woodrow Wilson during the creation of League of Nations and his debate with US Congress on the issue. The Childhood circumstances and his relations with his dominant father which lead Woodrow Wilson to state of uncompromised with the US legislation authorities are main focus of this study (Friedman, 1994; Erikson, 1967; Goelhart, Childress, 2006)

Evolutionary Process of Political Psychology in Contemporary World

By 1950s and 1960s, the focus of the social psychologists was diverted from reductionist perspective which was the study of individual needs and motivations, the contextual study of foreign policy in political scenario with regard to international and political scenarios. Almond's (1950) study is the critical study of changing "moods" of US foreign policy in that time period with regard to the public demand. The studies were broader instead of focusing on some specific individual hence covered number of incidents and issues that made the impact on foreign policy (Levy, 2013; Fancher 1998; Walker, 1990)

During that time first systematic foreign policy analysis in international relations was introduced in shape of "Decision Making Approach" by Snyder, Bruck and Spain in 1954. This approach was completely opposite to the rational, apolitical and out-come oriented existing models. These scholars are of the view that state behavior can be understand by focusing on the political elite of the state specifically focusing on their ideas of national interest, the domestic political context in which they operate the situation and nature of information and communication. Although this "First Wave" of the decision making approach did make some influence. On the contrary most of the

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

scholars took the personal attributes of a leader in general and neglects their impact on foreign policy analysis. The “Second Wave” came after the Allison’s (1971) work which was study of the collaboration of heads of different governmental agencies with different policy preferences and power holding among them (Blatt, Levy, 2003; Plambo *etal*, 2009)

Growing Dissatisfaction among scholars regarding negligence of the psychoanalytical study leads to number of political psychology studies. The work of Whollstetar (1962) and George (1969) were among the major work of that time. Whollstetar took the case of failure of US agencies regarding Pearl Harbor Attack in 1941. She was of the view that the reason of failure was not lack of information rather it was the excessive information which could not be handled at individual level. Meanwhile George focused on the individual belief system. He believes that all the beliefs, emotions and biases are controlled by the “Master Beliefs” which restrain to change (Leites, 1954; Etheridge, 1978; Walker, 2003)

Conceptual Birth of Cognitive Paradigm

In 1976 Jervis’ study ‘Perceptions and Misperception in International Politics’ proved to be the initiator of systematic study of “Cognitive Paradigm” in foreign policy analyses. Jervis gave detailed theoretical and experimental evidences from the diverse areas of international politics covering the queries of perceptions and misperceptions in international politics. The core of this Cognitive Paradigm was *“The world is extraordinarily complex, incoherent, and changing, but that people are limited in their capacities to process information and fully satisfy standards of ideal rationality in their attempts to maximize their interests. People adopt a number of cognitive shortcuts or heuristics”* (Kahneman, Slovic, & Kahneman, 1982; Jones, 1999)

Evolutionary Process in 1990s and 21st Century

In 1976, Jervis wrote about the Motivational aspects behind decision making process. According to him these motivations or emotions become reality because of effort to influence people and fear of decision making. These factors lead to “Motivated Biases” or motivated reasoning. The Cognitive factors and motivation aspect were being used to study different incidents and issues like George W. Bush’s attack on Iraq in 2004. The cognitive paradigm was given preference by the scholars because of its reliance and easy gestation. This trend started to change in 1990s, when the human emotions started to become focus to study the behaviors of leaders. The international relations’ scholars were of the view that emotions take away an individual from rational thinking and decision making. In 1990s and first decade of 21st

century a lot of work has been done on the impact of emotions on foreign policy of a state. The impact of physical illness, the drive of self-esteem, issue of recognition has been conducted in recent past years (Rosen 2005; McDermott, 2004; March, 1978; Kunda, 1990; Stein, 1985)

The above discussion proves the significance of psycho-analytic of a leader in international relations. These all factors, aspects and personal cognitive maps, emotions, motivations, biases do leave a deep impact on foreign policy of a state. These all elements and angles of study are specifically vital for study of Pakistan's foreign policy as it has most often ruled by "Individuals" rather than governments. These individuals opted foreign policies, took decisions on mostly personal attributes and in context of their cognitive maps. The foreign policies by these individuals not only affected the time period of their own regime but also left long lasting political, economical and especially social implications for Pakistan.

Personalities and Policy Making Process: A Theoretical Debate

The above discussion about the evolution of individual-level study in foreign policy analysis depicts the significance of this angle in policy making process. Although Policy making is the process which involves number of actors, bodies, ideas and systems but the role of individual has its vital place in this whole process. Although Waltz (1959) summarized the role of individual in the light of universal human nature concept (Thayer, 2004) and most of the studies affirmed this idea but number of studies shows that numerous issues, personal beliefs, ideologies affect the decision making ability of an individual. The Study of international relations has been taken under the System-level studies but Foreign Policy Analysis proves that all the foreign policy decision being taken is based on the actor-specific model. The decisions are taken by a single individual or individuals working in group.

Every theory has a "ground" to work on like Physics' ground is study of matter and antimatter or Economics has its ground in firms and household. Likewise International relations has its own ground which can be summarized as *"human decision makers acting singly or in groups. It is Foreign policy analysis (FPA) of International relations which emphasis and proves that all the decisions taken in international arena are end result of individuals working singly or in groups. It perceives through ho humans reacts to their surroundings, crisis times, under pressure or in context of their cognitive map. (Lane, 1990). The studies shows that every individual or leader per say reacts and works differently under the stress or pressurized situations (Burton, Hughes, Victor, 2012).*

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

Actor-Model in Decision Making Process

Along with the evolution of international relations, the political psychologists have conducted many studies to test the actor-model in decision making process. These researches are being conducted as per many aspects like decision maker's personality, studying of many case studies, comparative systematic studies with single variable and most recent by taking multiple-variables for personality test. These studies brought the outcomes of personal traits, power hunger, temperament, cognitive style and personality's orientation of a leader (Singer, Eric, Winter, 1992). Graham Hall (1921) may be was the first major contributor in political psychology field of study. He conducted the study wholly on the base of Darwinian strong emphasize of Human instinct, irrational natural selections, mob rule and emotional decisions of political elites (Stone, Smith, 1983)

*The psychoanalytical study initiated by Freud who studied Leonardo Da Vinci. Freud's major works *Future of an Illusion* and *Civilization and its Distractions* became the Fundamental data bases for future psychoanalytical studies. It mainly focused on the study of individuals or more specifically assist in creating psychobiography of certain leaders and personalities in global politics. Many take this study as mere look into effect of personality in politics but this is not the case as Greenstein (1975), Elms (1976) and Herman (1977) consider this approach as a tool for deep analytical research of personalities and as Simonton (1985) called it study of "man versus time" when applied to politics (Sears, 1987). Although this approach emerged as a major tool for studying the psychological attitudes of individuals but also it faced criticism from both laymen and scholars of psychology and international relations.*

Critique on Psychoanalysis

*Andrew Salter's book *The Case against Psychoanalysis* (1952) was the first major critique work on psychoanalysis approach. This work was a bold step as it was not easy to criticize this theory. Andrew believed on "Behavioral Approach" for the study of psychology instead of cognitive map, emotions of and individual. He believed that experimental data in clinical attributes is sufficient to study the psychological behavior of individual. Andrew not only criticized this theory but also presented a strong alternative idea and practice in field of psychology in place of widely accepted theoretical approach.*

Ethan Plaut (1998) presents a detailed outlook of this theory and criticized the loopholes in psychoanalysis theory of Freud. Plaut is of the view that Freud's explanation about human mind is too simple to be accepted. It ignores the complexities of a human mind. Beystehner (1998) characterized this theory as

too generalized and it failed to leave an adequate room for exceptions to the general rule. Another major criticism is on the "Sexism" of Freud. Critics believe that Freud is clearly tilted towards Male Gender and ignored the feminist aspect in his study. Bruce Bueno de Mesquita (1981) in his book "The War Trap" challenged this theory by focusing on rationalist approach. He was of the view that concept of decision making is an just an attempt to understand phenomena of war.

Leaders' Psychoanalysis

Leaders and political personalities are the top most individuals in any system either democratic or authoritarian. Their decisions taken by these individuals not only affect their own time but sometimes shape the pattern of world politics for very long time period. These individuals took decisions; establish policies mostly in context of their cognitive map. The personal beliefs, ideologies, childhood circumstances, emotions, personality traits of these leaders make them to take some specific decisions in specific time. These times are mostly of dare crisis and stress. Following is the brief psychoanalysis of some major leaders and personalities whom decisions and policies have not only affect them but impact regional and global politics for quite long time.

Adolf Hitler and Atrocities of World War II

World War II was the war of Hitler. He emerged as Nazi Leader who provoked German Nation to plunge the world in Second World War of Twentieth Century. Hitler was the person who changed the political and war history of world single handedly. Under his command the Nazi Army not only started the biggest war front in Europe but also targeted a specific race Jews. The psychoanalysis and study of cognitive map of Hitler clearly depicts the real picture (Coolidge, Davis, Segal, 2007). Carl Jung in 1939 wrote first personality analysis report of Hitler after meeting him. Jung wrote Hitler as "inhuman" and "Sexless" individual who was solely driven with ambition to create third Reich and take vengeance for insult, German nation endured in history (McGuire, Hull, 1977). Murray (1943) describes Hitler as an individual who is *"incapable of normal human relationships"* and have a troubled childhood. He has a fragile, small and sickly frame which caused an inferiority complex in him. *"He never did any manual work, never engaged in athletics, and was turned down as forever unfit for conscription in the Austrian Army.* Murray Wrote.

Hitler has suffered from Oedipus complex (Love for Mother, Hate for Father). He developed hunger for power to give back "Lost Glory" to his mother by dominating his father. Fromm (1973) characterized Hitler under his Oedipus

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

complex, in which he has considered German Land as his mother whom “Glory” he has to re-establish and Characterized Jews as his father whom he hated deeply. This brief psychoanalysis of Hitler reveals the core reason for his numerous brutal decisions which resulted in grave atrocities during World War II.

George W Bush’s War Aggression

George W. Bush Jr. came into power after neo-liberalist Bill Clinton. Clinton was a strong believer of taking decisions after in-depth analysis of the events while on the other hand Bush was a total opposite to his predecessor. Bush was an aggressive president of US. He waged wars on Afghanistan and Iraq. The psychoanalysts have studied the behavior of Bush and penned it down as a influential impact of his cognitive map. George Bush a son of Ex-US president who has a dominant personality, fought war, famous personality during his student years remained a strong shadow personality over junior Bush. George Bush himself did not possess a powering personality like his father. Belonged to a family where excelling and success is the core to get affection and vital place (Minutaglio, 1999). Bush was not so bright, athletic student which was non-acceptable in family. He tried to overcome and match the achievements of his father which lead him to desperation. Dr. Frank (2004) author of “Bush on the Couch” described this as the reason his alcoholism (Steinberg, 2004)

The War policies of Bush are also end result of his psychological mind set and cognitive map. Bush Sr. also started the war against Iraq but remained unable to achieve the desire goals against Saddam Hussein. Bush Jr. wanted to achieve that goal to match his personality with his father. Laura Miller (2004) explained this attitude in term of psychology *“I don't want to kill my father, he does, and to prove that I'm devoid of such bad impulses, I'll take him out”*. Through this war Bush not only wanted to overcome his father’s achievements but also show his contempt to him by “Toppling” down Saddam Hussein. Bush Sr. introduced the world with his “New World Order” and Bush Jr. Bullied Congress and UN to create “Coalition of Willing” which his father forged during first Iraq war. Psychoanalytically a son drove US policies just to prevail over his father but failed ultimately (Sunskind, 2004)

Putinism and Russian Politics

After the Soviet disintegration in 1991, the newly emerged Russia remained a non-actor in international politics. Its destructed economy, shaken socio-political structure pulled it down from the status of a Super power. The Russian influence came to non-existent in global politics. Russia opted the

policy of isolation for almost two decades. In recent developments, Russia has started to play a significant role in regional and international politics i.e. Issue of Syria and Ukraine Crisis where not only Russia played a proactive role but also make other states to feel its presence. Changing state behavior of Russia revolves around the personality of Putin. The individual who has been ruling Russia since 1999-2000 and under new constitutional amendments will remain in power till 2024 (Blank, 2008)

Putin being born in Soviet Union 1952 was the only surviving child of his parents. His brought up clearly depicts the reasons behind his “Tough and Controlled” Stature. He pursuit the practice in Sambo (a mixture of Martial Arts and Wrestling, initiated by Soviet Union) and then in Judo. After his graduation in law in 1975, he joined Soviet intelligence Agency KGB. During his service in KGB, his current personality traits were developed. He was trained under Andropov, who became a hero for Putin. Andropov controlled KGB for Longest (1967-82). Putin was not only impressed from his personality but also from his ideology. Andropov considered Democracy as rogue and “against the Russian Culture”. This leads Putin to develop controlled policies like controlling opposition by propaganda and close economy and electoral system (Hill, Gaddy, 2013)

Putinism a term developed by Western scholars shows the Putin’s influence on Russian politics and state foreign policy. These policies are clear projectors of his brought up, service in KGB and impact of his Hero on his own personality (Applebaum, 2012). Putin cannot take Russia back to the Soviet glory but his personality trait has brought Russia back into the limelight of global politics. The critics target his policies and style of government but his image, personal habitats and foreign policy foes make him a strong case of individual-level study in foreign policy analysis (Sakwa, 2008)

Psychoanalysis of Pakistan’s Dictators

Pakistan is being ruled by individuals instead of governments. The policies made by these individuals were more often revolved around self interest and a mean to prolong their tenures. These individuals used the religious, cultural, regional sentiments of masses of Pakistan as per their personal psychology. The cognitive map of some was liberal and some have the psychological mindset of religion. Both state of minds drive the national policies both internal and foreign in the context of their cognitive map. Interestingly not only military dictators rule Pakistan according to individual-level method but also the democratic governments were being handled by personalities.

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

Military Dictators not only de-railed the democratic system in Pakistan but also shaped the policies which left their aftershocks for a very long span of time. The dynamic regional and global scenarios also helped them to establish and implement their policies on Pakistan. Be it the Indus Water Treat in General Ayub Khan Regime, Disintegration of Pakistan under General Yahiya's rule, Afghan War in General Zia's Regime or "War on Terror" during General Musharraf's military rule. These all incidents, issues and scenarios changed the future of Pakistan altogether. They were the individuals but affected the fate of millions.

Zia's Islamization and Pakistan

"There is no Better, Liberal, Progressive, Progressive Ideology than Islam and there is no difference between Islam and Democracy" (Zia-ul-Haq, March 23, 1988)

Psycho-Analysis of Zia-ul-Haq

The introduction to General Zia-ul-Haq's family background helps to understand its "Islamic" polices, style of rule. Belonged to middle class and religious family, Zia was born in 1924, in Jalandhar, India. He was brought up in orthodox religious surroundings. His father a Clerk in Indian Railway, himself was religious person but believed on Knowledge is Power. Hence forth Zia-ul-Haq was sent to prestigious St. Stephen's College in Delhi. The religious ambiance wholly comprehended the religious beliefs and childhood faith of Zia. He joined Indian Army during World War II after the demand of soldiers was increased and British rule relaxed the hiring system. Having an ordinary physique and conservative personality, Zia was not considered to be part of the elites of Army (Omissi, 2004)

His only effort to be a man out of his orthodox upbringing and religious habits was smoking. Else than this habit he used to offer his prayers regularly and complete his religious duties punctually. After the independence of Pakistan in 1947, he migrated to Pakistan with his family and joined Pakistan army as a Major.

Mediocre Military Career

The Military career of Zia was steady but not outstanding by any means but the Prime Minister of Pakistan Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto bypassed six senior generals and appointed General Zia-ul-Haq as the Chief of Army Staff in 1976. Bhutto ignored the proposed list of eligible candidate by General Tike Khan. Bhutto was impressed by the humility of Zia which he performed during the visits of

Bhutto to Military Base in Multan (Mazari, 1999). Zia headed the tribunal which tested the military officers involved in the 1973 military effort to topple the government of Bhutto. Hence he developed a direct link with Prime Minister. Zia also openly supported the stance of government against PNA during 1976-77. Despite all this on July 5, 1977, Zia overthrew the government of Bhutto and plunged the country in longest and gruesome Martial Law Period (Weaver, 2002)

After taking over the government Zia portrayed himself as “Reluctant Coup Commander” and declared to conduct elections in 90 days. Just like former military rulers Zia clung to the Power. By having a religious background, the right-wing political parties like Jamat-e-Islami (JI), Muslim League and Jamiat-e-Ulama Islam (JUI) joined hands with Zia. These parties not only stood with General Zia but also propagated the legitimacy of his regime. Maulana Madoodi, the head of Jamat-e-Islami published a white paper in favor of his military coup and defended his actions (Haqqani, 2005)

Personality Traits: Using Islam for Rule

Unlike his predecessors, Zia was a religious personality. He was not in favor of liberalization of Army and Pakistan. It was clear from the interior secretary Roedad Khan’s statements. He stated *“There had been military coups before”, so observed “but now for the first time, a maulvi, a deeply religious person was the Head of the State, the Head of Government and the Army Chief – a frightening combination”*. He further stated Zia was *“determined to recreate the Islamic legal and social order which had originated in the tribal area more than a thousand years ago”* (Khan, 1998). Most of the West was of the view that Zia has *“Wrapped himself in cloak of religion”* (Hayes, 1986)

Zia considered, Islam was the sole reason of creation of Pakistan and country cannot survive without Islam. Zia use Islam for not only enhancing his personal image among masses of Pakistan but also to prolong his regime. The religious parties and entities especially “Sunni School of thought” provided complete support to develop “Islamization” of Zia. This whole scenario started Sectarianism, religious extremism and created a confused society in Pakistan.

The regional geo-strategic and global politics also played as blessings in disguise for Zia. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and Iranian Islamic Revolution in same year of 1979 helped Zia to promote its policies. Zia used the Soviet blunder in his favor and joined the capitalist bloc and got the support of Saudi Arabia. On the other hand Iranian clergy started to “Export” its revolution. Being belong to opposite religious school of thought, Zia was not in

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

favor of this Iranian policy, hence Zia seek Saudi economical support. Zia established the “Afghan Jihad”, Create Taliban, changed the educational system and altered the Judicial System of Pakistan with US and Saudi Money.

Islamization of Society

Zia changed the Pakistani society according to his own beliefs and hunger for power. The culture of Kalashnikov, Flow of Narcotics in Pakistan and seeds of religious sectarianism were sowed under his regime. The social, education system of Pakistan was most affected from his policies and to date facing the aftermaths. Zia adopted the policy agenda of Jamat-e-Islami which wants *Sharia* laws in Pakistan. The policies of Zia were more often revolves around the agenda of Ji. During Zia regime the Islami Jamiat Tulaba (IJT) the student-wing of Ji was the only student union which was allowed to be functional in educational institutes around Pakistan (Haqqani, 2005)

Like all dictators, Zia wanted to prolong his rule. In context of his past, personality and for using masses’ sentiments regarding Islam, he used Islam. He “Islamized” the whole infrastructure of Pakistan especially at social level. The profound policies of Zia were:

- The reconstruction of Islamic ideological council, consist of thirteen members, eight of whom were religious leaders, clerics/muftis.
- Introduction of Islamic Penal Code
- Establishment of *Zakat* and *Ushr* System in economical structure
- New Educational reforms on “Islamic” bases
- Hudood Ordinance
- To make women to stay inside house walls (Skov, 2005)

“Islam” in Educational Sector

Zia targeted the education sector specifically to deeply influence the minds and beliefs of laymen. At the start of his regime the literacy rate in Pakistan was 80 percent for which he used to blame the colonial powers and liberal leaders of Pakistan. He was critical opponent of liberal school of thought; hence he established 12,000 “Mosque Schools” or Madrassahs more specifically. New revised, more nationalism based, subjective history curriculum was introduced in schools of Pakistan. He threatened that any “a carbuncle” teacher will be sacked who will try to “*poison our younger generation with an ideology that was secular or alien to the Pakistani ethos*”

Zia was brought up in orthodox religious family. This childhood effect remained with him all his life. During his service, he was a religious person and his regime is the clear picture of his cognitive map. Religion was not only core of his personal life but also implemented his “Islamization” on Pakistan which not only effected our society during that time period but also left its long lasted, gruesome implications on our social structure.

Musharraf’s Secularism and Pakistani society

“My Decision was based on the well-being of my People and the best interests of country-Pakistan always comes first” (Musharraf, 2006)

Musharraf the fourth dictator of Pakistan was totally opposite to his last military fellow Zia-ul-Haq. He held a complete different ideology about ruling and policies for regime. Unlike Zia he did not prioritized Islam over all other ideas. Musharraf presented the idea of “State First” or in this case “Pakistan First”. He promoted the idea of national interest and categorized religion and politics separately in all aspects. Deeply inspired from Kamal Ataturk, Musharraf designed his regime as per his policies. Musharraf wanted a liberal and moderate state like modern Turkey where religion is only the personal matter of individuals and state has little role to play in it.

Cognitive Map of Musharraf

Musharraf was born in a middle class moderate family on August 11, 1943 in Delhi. With father as a Civil Servant in Foreign Ministry and Mother as a educated working Muslim which was a rarity in that time. After his father’s transfer to Turkey he attended school in Ankara from 1949 to 1955. The culture, values and specifically personality of Kamal Ataturk inspired him immensely. Kamal Ataturk was the personality who changed the whole demography and outlook of Turkey after collapse of Ottoman Empire in after WWI. He introduced reforms in New Turkey, abandoned the old traditions and made the state from a deeply religious to a moderate secular state. Now keeping the personality of Ataturk in mind and Musharraf’s inspiration from him in early age explains a lot about Musharraf’s psychology, ideology and aptitude of Musharraf. Governmental policies both internal external of Musharraf are comprehensible proof of his cognitive map. Musharraf joined army in 1961 and took major wars with India in 1965 and 1971. Before taking over government, Musharraf was famous for his unsuccessful adventure in Kargil in 1998. Retrieved from: http://www.travel-culture.com/pakistan/general_pervez_musharraf.shtml

Revising Fate of Democracy in Pakistan

Musharraf threw Mian Nawaz Sharif over on October 12, 1999. Although he was selected as Chief of Army Staff by Nawaz Sharif few months back by bypassing him over senior candidates but it proved to be a revised Bhutto-Zia Story. The Plane hijacking case was the drop scene of the clash between Musharraf and Zia. The democratic government holding two-third majority was once again toppled over mainly due to its incompetency and lack of political understanding. After taking over Musharraf presented himself as “a Benevolent Dictator” who has reformist and liberal ideology.

During his first speech to the nation as Chief Executive of Pakistan, he announced his policies which were clearly reflections of his ideal Ataturk's policies. He presented his seven point liberal agenda including erasing extremism and sectarianism, reversing the “Islamization” policies of Zia and inclusion of liberal-western educated members in his cabinet. Musharraf wanted to get rid of image of religious state and to promote a soft image of Pakistan (Newsline, June 2002)

Regional Changes and U-Turn in Policies

In 1999, Pakistan was facing international sanctions and isolation at large scale mainly due to nuclear tests in 1998. After the military takeover by Musharraf, the state faced more hardships at global level. On September 10, 2001, Pakistan was a sanctioned and quite less significant state in international relations. The state was left alone by US after Soviet war or more famously “Afghan Jihad” in early 1990s. September 11, 2001 was a non-incident day for Pakistan but the regional and global geo-strategic position was about to be changed and ironically Pakistan has to play may be most vital role in this whole scenario.

In words of Musharraf he was contacted by Collin Powell, the secretary of state of US of the time and was asked “Either you with us or not”. Musharraf has no other choice to opt. He chose to take a U-turn in foreign policy, became front ally of US and abandoned Taliban, once blue eyed child of Pakistan. Musharraf was liberal and from very start he wanted to reverse the policies of Zia-ul-Haq of 1980s. As per Musharraf those policies have deeply affects Pakistani society in negative aspect. He wanted to promote a liberal, progressive and a moderate Pakistan at global level. The “War on terror” provided him a golden chance to get rid of the extremist elements (Musharraf, 2006)

Concept of “Enlightened Moderation”

After taking a wholly new stance in foreign policy, Musharraf started to implement his ideals internally. He introduced his vision of “Enlightened Moderation”. This vision includes the promotion of liberal values, new education system, promotion of soft image of Pakistan at global level, Women rights and right share in government and advancement of technology and Electronic Media in the state (Hussain, 2007)

In 2000, Musharraf took his first major step according his liberal ideology. He tried to alter the Blasphemy Law, established under Zia’s “Islamization” in 1981. His second step was taking steps against militant, sectarianism and extremist organizations with in Pakistan. On January 12, 2002, Musharraf gave a speech against militant entities and condemned all unlawful extremist activities in Pakistan. He banned the foreign funding to the Madrassahs and asked them to teach modern and science related subjects. These first efforts although failed more or less but it proved to be start of new “Liberal Wave” in Pakistan (Hussain, 2000)

Another major step taken by Musharraf was about the role and status of women in society. He was a profound advocate of Women rights and equality mostly based on Western ideology of Feminism. In 2002, during the election reforms, he fixed sixty reserve seats for women in General Assembly. Along with that women were also allowed to contest on general seats during elections. After 2002 elections seventy-two women became members of national assembly among whom twelve won on open elected seats (Musharraf, 2006)

Vital steps were taken by Musharraf to liberalize the society were the revolution of Electronic Media in Pakistan and modernizing education sector. Before 2000, Electronic media was relatively weak and almost non-existent in the country and revolved around one TV channel which was a government’s Media representation. Being a liberal person, Musharraf started to develop electronic media channels in Pakistan. For this purpose Pakistan Electronic Media Regulatory Authority (PEMRA) was established in 2002. This body started to issue license for establishing new Media Channels which became the base of electronic media revolution in Pakistan. Meanwhile educational reforms were introduced according to modern needs and fulfilling around modern technology especially in Information technology sector (Javed, 2014)

These Musharraf’s liberal and progressive policies started a new trend and produced new “Wave of Modernization” in Pakistan. A new Liberal class

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

emerged with the country. The “Islamization” of Zia diminished a bit especially after electronic media revolution.

Policies of Two Dictators: Social Implications for Pakistan

Both Zia and Musharraf took mostly took steps and opt policies on their personal emotions, motivations and ideologies. The Cognitive maps of both dictators played vital role in establishing their policies, type of governance, internal infrastructures and means to prolong their regimes. Although both authoritative rulers of Pakistan opted totally opposite school of thoughts for running their rules but both left very deep and long lasting implications for Pakistan specifically at social level. Their ideologies had opposite stances and both left their own marks on Pakistani society. These marks are not only being left but still prevailing and to large extend are at Dagger’s drawn to each other.

Same Society, Two Worlds

The policies of these dictators have majorly affected the ideologies of masses of Pakistan. One is holding the “Islamization” of Zia and still believes on his type of Sharia, Education system and judicial system while on other hand the newly emerged “Liberals” of Musharraf’s era have totally opposite way of thinking and understanding of social infrastructure. They believe on the Musharraf’s Liberal Islam, Technological and Moderate education system. Pakistani society consists of almost 20 corer individuals is widely apart. The gulf on between both schools of thoughts is alarmingly increasing. There is hardly any similarity between them. Both have differences from system of education to ideology of Islam to treatment with women. Any effort to reduce this relational gap is non-existent or very minimal which is gravely alarming situation for stability of Pakistan

Our War or Not?

The section of society who believes on ideology of Zia is still not convinced that “War on Terror” is our war. Frighteningly the people with this thinking are in majority which not only shows the failure of government but also our society’s lack of understanding with geo-strategic circumstances. Mostly the religious political parties, number of religious scholars and masses from underdeveloped urban areas and rural areas are the believers of this ideology. Jamat-i-Islami and JUI which enjoyed very close ties with Zia is the major supporter of this school of thought. Interestingly not only the religious minded individuals are not the only supporter of this idea but also number of intellectuals and academics are in favor of it. Major example of people of this mindset is Maulana Abdul Aziz of Lal Masjid who refused to condemn Taliban

and their massacre attack on Army Public School of Peshawar which caused a strong stir in society but somehow the influential Maulana has not been under arrest and kept on delivering his hate speeches from Lal Masjid in capital of the country

Educational Gulf

As mentioned earlier one of the relational gaps in our society is in the education system of Pakistan. On one hand there are students of approximately 14,000 Madrassahs. This lot of students has their own social circle, specific educational mindset and being brought up in a specific and confined environment. These students have the “Zia Mindset” on numerous issues specifically regarding war on terror. Taliban are still *Mujahedeen*, War on Terror is War of US and our government and Army is fighting a wrong war on behalf of Western powers. The statement of Munawar Hassan, former head of Jamat-e-Islami in which he said that TTP militants are *Shaheed* while Pakistani Army Personnel are not *Shaheed* in this war on terror. Now this sentiment is accepted by a large section of our society.

The other section of our society which belongs to the Elite Class, Students of Private English institutions and liberal academics hold the “Musharraf Ideology”. This section of our society strongly believes in policies of Musharraf, supporters of killing and executing of TTP militants and largely supports drone attacks within Pakistani territory. The stance of this society was seen during the Maulana Abdul Aziz issue, when a large number of Civil Society members protested outside Lal Masjid and demanded the arrest of Maulana. This section is largely active on social media and on numerous occasions blames Islam and religious scholars for almost every social issue. The hostility and gulf between both these sections is clear and yet again alarming not for themselves but for Pakistan.

Threat Perception from Religious outlook and symbols

The most disquieting situation developing in our society especially in the young generation is the fear from Islamic outlook and symbols. The responsible for developing this fear is by and large our local and international media. Every terrorist attack carried by militants is shown exclusively on media. In this media reports the terrorists or a militant is usually a Muslim and carries the outlook with beard, head-scalp and traditional clothes of Muslims. Now this image has been run and re-run on media channels for millions of times. The effect of this media coverage and propaganda has affected the youngsters for whom a man with beard and head-scalp is a terrorist. The propaganda on electronic media is responsible for this mindset and Pakistani government

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

need to take necessary measures for this very critical issue. Measures on emergency footings are needed to be taken because Pakistan is a Muslim country and large sections of masses carries this outlook. This issue will cause a further destabilization in our society and our already confused masses will further worsen this situation.

Recommendations

- Government need to take Religious scholars on board for enhancing awareness regarding war on terror
- The students of Madrassahs need to be taken in central circle of society so the feeling of alienation can be reduced among them.
- The gap between education institutions need to be finished and a curriculum suitable for both sides have to be introduced
- Tool of Media specifically Electronic media have to be used for Enhancing Public awareness regarding War on Terror so masses will know "This is our War"
- Compact legislation need to be made and implemented against the factors which are promoting hate speech against own country and Army. So can nation and army will not demoralized from this issue.

Conclusion

A leader is a core element of making and implementing foreign policy in a state. The study of "Individual Level" in international relations proves that ideas, emotions, psychology of a leader leave a deep impact on foreign policy and internal policies of a state. This aspect and school of thought is quite applicable in Pakistan where individuals have made more policies than governments. These leaders took those decisions as per their cognitive map and left deep, long lasting and relatively negative impacts at social level in Pakistan. These affects needs to be met and resolved on emergency footings or else they will further destabilize Pakistan in future.

End Notes

Adil, A. (June, 2002). 'Murder in God's name, *Newsline*.

Adler, N. J. (1996). Global women political leaders: An invisible history, an increasingly important future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(1), 133-161

Allison, G. T. (1971). *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis*. Boston: Little Brown.

Almond, G. A. (1950). *The American people and foreign policy*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Applebaum, A. (2013). *Putinism: The Ideology*. London: London School of Economics

Barber, J. D. (1972). *The Presidential Character*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Blank, S. (2008). *The Putin Succession and its Implications for Russian Politics*. Stockholm: ISDP.

Deluga, R. J. (1998). American presidential proactively, charismatic leadership, and rated performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(3), 265-291

Droff, R. R. H. (Ed.). (2004). *Some Basic Concepts and Approaches to the Study of International Relations*. Washington D.C: U.S Army War College.

Dyson, S. B., & Preston, T. (2006). Individual Characteristics of Political Leaders and the Use of Analogy in Foreign Policy Decision Making. *Political Psychology*, 27(2), 265-

Einstein, A., & Freud, S. (1932). *Why war?* Paris: International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation.

EIR. (2004). George Bush: A Puppet Who Chose His Puppeteers". *Executive Intelligence Review* Retrieved 27/3, 2015, from http://www.larouche.com/other/2004/book_reviews/3133bush_on_couch.html

Elms, A. C. (1976). *Personality and Politics*. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

Erisen, E. (2012). An Introduction to Political Psychology for International Relations. *Journal of International Affairs*, 27, 9-28

Etheridge, L. (1978). *A world of men: The private sources of American foreign policy*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

F.I, G. (1975). Personality and Politics. *Handbook of Political Science*, 2, 1-92.

Fionna Hill, C. G. G. (2012). *Mr. Putin: Operative in Kremlin*. New York: Brookings Institution Press.

Fancher, R. (1990). Introduction to "The Origin and Development of Psychoanalysis"

Frederick L. Coolidge, F. L. D., & Daniel L. Segal. (2007). *Understanding Madmen: A DSM-IV*

Assessment of Adolf Hitler. *Individual Differences Research*, 5(1), 30-43.

Freud, B. (1967). *Thomas Woodrow Wilson: Twenty-eighth President of the United States*. Houghton: Mifflin.

Friedman, W. (1994). Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House and Political Psychobiography. *Political Psychology*, 15(1), 36-59.

Fromm, E. (1973). *The anatomy of human destructiveness*. New York: Henry Holt & Company Inc.

G, H. M. (Ed.). (1977). *A Psychological Examination of Political Leaders*. New York: Free Press.

Garrison, J. A., Kaarbo, J., Foyle, D., Schafer, M., & Stern, E. K. (2003). Foreign Policy Analysis in 20/20: A Symposium. *International Studies Review*, 5(2)

George, A. L., & George, J. L. (1956). *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A personality study*. New York: John Day.

Hafner-Burton, E. M. a. H., Alex and Victor, David G. (2012). , The Cognitive Revolution and the Political Psychology of Elite Decision Making.

Herman, M. G. (1980). Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders. *International Studies Quarterly*, 24(1).

- Haqqani, H. (2005). *Pakistan: Between Military and Mosque*. Lahore: Vanguard.
- Hayes, L. D. (1986). *The Struggle for Legitimacy in Pakistan*, . Lahore: Vanguard,.
- Holsti, O. R. (Ed.). (1976). *Foreign policy formation viewed cognitively*. In R. Axelrod. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hook, S. (1945). *The hero in history*. New Brunswick: NJ: Transaction.
- Hofstadter, R. (1965). *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays*. New York: Knopf.
- Holsti, O. R. (1977). *The Operational Code as an Approach to the Analysis of Belief System*. Washington DC.: National Science Foundation.
- Hudson, V. M. (2005). Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 1(1), 1–30.
- Hussain, Z. (2007). *Frontline Pakistan: The Struggle with Militant Islam*. New York: I.B Tauris & C. Ltd.
- Hussain, Z. (February, 2000). In the Shadow of Terror, *Newsline*.
- Javed, A. (2014). *Any Regrets General? : The role of media in the fall of General Pervez Musharraf from power*. Masters, University of Oslo, Oslo.
- Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jonathan Renshon, S. A. R. (2008). *The Theory and Practice of Foreign Policy Decision Making*. *Political Psychology*,, 29(4).
- Jones, B. D. (1999). Bounded rationality. *Annual Review of Political Science*,, 2(297-321).
- Johnson, L. (Ed.). (1977). *The Operational Code of Senator Frank Church*. New York: Free Press.

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

- K, S. D. (1985). The Vice-Presidential Successions effect: Individual or Situational Basis? *Political Behavior*, 7, 79-99.
- Kaarbo, J., & Hermann, M. G. (1998). Leadership styles of prime ministers: How individual differences affect the foreign policymaking process. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(3), 243-263.
- Khan, R. (1998). *Pakistan: A Dream Gone Sou*. Karachi: OUP.
- Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated political reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 480-498.
- Koch, J. P. H. K. B. B. J. (2009). *Guide to Psychoanalytic Developmental Theories*. New York: Springer.
- Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (Ed.). ((1982)). *Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lane, R. (1990). Concrete Theory: An Emerging Political Method. *American Political Science Review*, 84, 927-940.
- Langer, W. C. (1943). *The Mind of Adolf Hitler: The Secret Wartime Report*. New York: NY: Basic Books.
- Lavine, H. (2010). *Political Psychology*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Leites, N. (1951). *The operational code of the Politburo*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lee H. Hamilton, M. H. D. (1978). Foreign Policy and Democratic Process: Making the Separations of Paperwork. *Foreign Affairs*.
- Levy, J. S. (Ed.). (2013). *Psychology and Foreign Policy Decision-Making*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Mazari, S. B. K. (1999). *A Journey to Disillusionment*. Karachi: OUP.
- March, J. G. (1978). Bounded rationality, ambiguity, and the engineering of choice. *Bell Journal of Economic Management Science*, 9(587-608).
- McGuire, W. H., R.C.F. (1977). *C.G. Speaking Interviews and encounter*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Mesquita, B. B. d. (1981). *The War Trap*. New Heaven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Miller, L. (June 16, 2004). The Inner W, *Salon*.
- Minutaglio, B. (1999). *First Son*. New York: Three Rivers
- Murray, H. (1943). *The Personality of Adolf Hitler*. Washington DC: Office of Strategic Services.
- Musharraf, P. (2006). *In the Line of Fire: A Memoir*. London: Simon & Schuster Company.
- Omissi, D. (1994). *The Sepay and the Raj: The Politics of the Indian Army, 1860-1940*. London: Macmillan.
- Peterson, M. B. (2014). Evolutionary Political Psychology: On the Origin and Structure of Heuristics and Biases in Politics. *Advances in Political Psychology*.
- Philip E. TetLock. Charles McGuire, J. (1986). Cognitive Perspective on Foreign Policy. *Political Behavioral Annual*, 1.
- Plaut, E. R. (1998). *Psychoanalysis: From Theory to Practise, Past to Present* Retrieved 27/3, 2015, from http://www.personality_research.org/papers/plaut.html
- Robert Goelhart, D. C. (2006). *Woodrow Wilson: A Bibliography of Books in English*. Bloomington: Indianan University.
- Rosen, S. P. (2005). *War and human nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sakwa, R. (2008). Putin's Leadership: Character and Consequences. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 60(6), 879-897.
- Salter, A. (1952). *The Case Against Psychoanalysis*. Michigan: University of Michigan
- Sears, D. O. (1987). Political Psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 229-255.

Psychoanalysis of Leaders

- SIDNEY J . BLATT, P. D. K. N. L., PH.D. (2003). Attachment Theory, Psychoanalysis, Personality Development, and Psychopathology. *Psychoanalytical Inquiry*, 23(1), 102-150.
- Singer, J. D. (1961). The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations. *World Politics*, 14(1), 77-92.
- Skov, B. (2005). *Zia ul-Haq – a lasting impact on the direction of Pakistani politics towards a fundamentalist Islamic state?* Oslo University. Oslo.
- Snyder, R. C., Bruck, H. W., & Sapin, B (Ed.). (1962). *Foreign Policy Decision-making*. New York: Free Press.
- Stone, J. e. a. (2014). Political Psychology. *WIREs*, 10.
- Stone, W. F., Smith D.C. (1983). Human Nature in Politics. *Political Psychology*, 4, 693-712.
- Stein, J. G. (Ed.). (1985). *Calculation, miscalculation, and conventional deterrence, II: The view from Jerusalem*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sunskind, R. (October 17, 2004). Faith, Certainty and the Presidency of George W. Bush, *Times Magazine*.
- Thayer, B. A. (2004). *Darwin and international relations: On the evolutionary origins of war and ethnic conflict*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Tileaga, C. (2013). *Political Psychology: Critical Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.
- Weaver, M. A. (2002). *Pakistan: In the Shadow of Jihad and Afghanistan*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Winter, D. G., Singer, Eric (Ed.). (1992). *Personality and foreign policy: Historical overview of research*. West view Press.
- Winter, D. G., Hermann, M. G., Weintraub, W., & Walker, S. G. (1991). The Personalities of Bush and Gorbachev Measured at a Distance: Procedures, Portraits, and Policy. *Political Psychology*, 12(2), 215-245.
- Wohlstetter, R. (1962). *Pearl Harbor. Warning and decision*. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.
- Walker, S. G. (1990). The Evolution of Operational Code Analysis. *Political Psychology*, 11(2), 403-418