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Abstract
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Chair: Martha Cottam

The unforeseen mass protests in Tunisia that overthrew Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali and quickly spread to Egypt where Muhammad Hosni Sayyid Mubarak was forced from office highlight that a psychological aspect needs to be added to how revolutions are studied. Although the various countries directly affected by what is now known as the Arab Spring share similar socio-political, cultural, and economic backgrounds, the different fates of Ben Ali and Mubarak being forced from power while authoritarians such as Bashar Hafez al-Assad have remained show that these similarities do not necessarily dictate how an authoritarian will behave when facing similar popularly-backed threats. The literature on revolutionary social movements provides insight into what conditions such revolutionary movements need to succeed, in terms of organization and resources, as well on how international relations of closed political systems can aid or hinder the survival of such systems when faced with existential crisis. However, a psychological perspective on why an authoritarian may relinquish power when challenged has been largely missed in this literature.
This dissertation then, seeks to address this gap of how a leader’s personality may affect decisions to flee, or fight on, when faced with tremendous pressure to step down. By analyzing the case study of Egypt’s Mubarak, this dissertation finds that a leader’s personality, as shaped by the environment, affects decision-making and may impede an authoritarian with a paranoid personality disorder from returning to a psychologically harmonious balance, once disrupted, that would allow him to regain control of his environment and thereby fight to keep his political power. In the case of Mubarak, such a paranoid mental state influenced his decision to ultimately step down after approximately 30 years in power.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

On 17 December of 2010, a Tunisian was denied redress for grievances experienced from local authorities and set himself on fire. Tarek el-Tayeb Mohamed Bouazizi, a local street vendor, poured a flammable liquid on himself and proceeded to set himself ablaze in front of the local governor’s office from embarrassment he reportedly felt after having his wares and produce confiscated while purportedly also being ridiculed by a local official (Rohr, 2011). The unforeseen mass protests stimulated by this event led to the ouster of Muhammad Hosni Sayyid Mubarak as leader of Egypt; of Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali as leader of Tunisia; the death of Muammar Gaddafi in Libya; and the beginning of a bloody civil war in Syria which rages on as of the time of this writing. Indeed, the relative speed with which the revolutionary spirit spread in the region highlights that a psychological aspect to how revolutions are studied is needed as the many countries affected by these popular movements were similar in many ways, yet experienced different outcomes. The existing literature on revolutionary social movements provides insight into how such popularly backed movements, aimed at removing an authoritarian from power, succeed or fail due to the structures of political systems and the organization of the movement itself.

However, a question that has been largely unexplored in this literature is of how an authoritarian leader’s personality affects decision-making in response to such existential threats. Simply put, why would a long-ensconced dictator flee and not fight on with the resources of the state at his disposal when challenged by such a threat? Although this study largely agrees with authors such as Muriel Mirak-Weissbach who have assessed that Mubarak was a narcissist, this does not explain why he would vacate his office when he did. Therefore, this study assesses that
traits, similar to those of Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD), in Mubarak’s observed behavior before the Arab Spring indicated he would possibly develop Paranoid Personality Disorder (PPD), if the right environmental stressors were present, and that this condition better explains why he vacated his office when he did.

This study therefore applies the paranoid personality to the case of Egypt’s Hosni Mubarak as an authoritarian leader who reacted to the Arab Spring; by using Jerrold Post’s *Conceptual Framework and Organization Design for an Integrated Political Personality Profile* (2005). Additionally, Raymond Birt’s ‘Dynamic Cycle of Paranoid Reaction’ is used to chart Mubarak’s behavior as it traverses the range of emotional stages the paranoid can be expected to likely feel as the paranoia is triggered by stressors in the environment and the individual attempts to regain an emotionally harmonious state after having been knocked off balance (1993, pp. 613-614).

Understanding why he ultimately stepped down from office, while someone like Syria’s Bashar al Assad remains in power (as of the time of this writing) will further understandings of modern authoritarian political systems and their sustainability in the modern and ever-more-connected international community.

**Anthropomorphizing the State**

When someone refers to Egypt as having taken an action, what is being referred to is the result of a political process that likely involves various individuals in just as many political offices who inform and advise a Head of State on making a final decision on an issue. Referring to Egypt as a unitary actor capable of taking an action is just much easier to say. It is important to have an understanding of what constitutes the state and why imbuing such an abstract concept with human qualities, as to say that a state acts as if alive, has become a common practice in general conversation. Indeed, various theories of international relations have relied on this
anthropomorphization of the state to explain everything from wars between states to international
treaties (Birt, 1993, p. 607). The literature on this phenomenon tells us this process can be said
to begin when a, “supra-local authority emerges,” that, “holds the loyalty and legitimacy of
power over dispersed groups…mediating with supernatural authorities, and…representing the
group…with some variable degree of internal authority within the loosely defined and organized
chieftaincy” (Cohen, 2008, p. 2). The state is, in a sense, a constructed social-deity assumed to
possess a supernatural ability to create and maintain social order and thereby allow the individual
to perceive the world as balanced, just, and therefore worth living in (Feuerbach, 1957, p. 152).
Under such an understanding, “state personhood is a useful fiction, analogy, metaphor, or
shorthand for…persons, and in others they are not” (Wendt, 2004, p. 289).

Much like the old saying about the making of a sausage, enjoying a bratwurst does not
necessarily indicate a desire to know recipe. It is useful to assume then that, “ordinary citizens,
the media, and policymakers all systematically personify the state,” based on a desire for the
state to replace the individual, “for good or for bad, in affairs that the individual does not feel, or
does not want to be, a part of” (Wendt, 1999, p. 10, 2004, p. 289; Wight, 2004, p. 272). The
concept of a state as if a person then assists to understand a society’s socio-political environment
and, assumedly, its perceptions of the world by implying a state is able to make decisions and
manipulate an environment as an individual would in given circumstances (Neumann, 2004, p.
261). This embodiment of human qualities in an abstract concept is furthered when
governments, “position themselves in relation to other states by adopting certain discourses,”
under a national policy that makes the state appear to have, “capabilities and characteristics of
individuals socializing with other states in international society” (Epstein, 2011, p. 341; Luom-
A problem arises when the acceptance of the state as an individual promotes the idea that a state’s bureaucratic organs are independent from the society, as the process that creates a state’s bureaucracy, “detaches a certain group of individuals from the collective mass,” to man the political machine and bring the state to theoretical life (Emirbayer & Cohen, 2008, p. 183). However, a danger exists in that this anthropomorphization can promote alienation between a people and their government as it, “muddles agent/agency relations in human political affairs by engaging the state…in actions that in any other context would be attributed to human beings” (Kurtz, 1993, p. 18).

Interestingly, states are not the only international political bodies referred to as if a person for the sake of convenience. Having been attributed human-like capabilities, when states are perceived to act recklessly or be hostile to other states, pressure from affected societies for international actors to react to, “immensely magnified dangers of interstate competition and conflict,” can prompt creating, “some form of emergent international organization and authority,” that can regulate assumed unitary capabilities of states (Cohen, 2008, p. 4). As a result, from Westphalian peace to modern-day international bodies and agreements, governments have continued to commit to international contracts that significantly reduce their state-autonomy as domestic and international pressure demand the creation of international political entities, such as the United Nations (UN) or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), to keep states in line with internationally agreed upon norms. Both examples are notable because they not only regulate the behavior of member states as a governing body, but also as military threats to non-member states should the interests of members be threatened. Subsequently, this highlights that states and other international bodies are tools constructed by people to better
determine who gets what, when, and how and cannot be sentient beings in themselves that are able to make decisions and take actions unilaterally (Harold D Lasswell, 1936, pp. 3-4).

That states are constructs having been established, distinguishing between the concept of a state and the political offices in a government allows for understanding state actions by emphasizing the role that individuals play in political decision-making and vice versa through bureaucratic structures and international relations between governments (Kurtz, 1993, p. 27; Peters & Pierre, 2008, pp. 244-245). This is particularly true in phenomenon such as the Arab Spring where the countries affected by this regional phenomenon have similarities that include language, political system types, and religion; yet differed in their closeness to the West and the respective leaders' reactions to the popularly backed protests against them.

It may be assumed then that, “state activity is always the activity of particular individuals acting within particular social contexts…that enable and constrain common action” and that, "to assign personhood to the state is to neglect, not only the role of human agency, but also to occlude the power inscribed in the state as a structure” (P. T. Jackson, 2004, pp. 286-287; Wight, 2004, pp. 279-280). Needless to say, this view further assumes a function of a state is to maintain sociopolitical stability within identified boundaries (Wendt, 2004, p. 315). This is beneficial in the study of international comparative politics as it allows for, “basic questions about the way in which societies choose to govern themselves… to understand the policy choices made on behalf of the public, and the relationships among major groups of actors” (Peters & Pierre, 2008, pp. 243-244). However, at times decisions are not made on behalf of the public for the public’s sake but instead on behalf of a leader such as Mubarak who may have viewed himself as a corporal manifestation of the state of Egypt, and yet separate and above the public the state represents.
PERSONALITY IN POLITICS

Whatever the ultimate outcome of a person’s rise, or fall, as a head of a political system in charge of a nation’s resources, one has to wonder how that person achieved the feat of becoming a political leader in the first place. For autocrats, the question also arises of how that autocrat managed to hold onto power; or alternatively, lose it after having had it. In other words, what was it about that person and/or the socio-political environment that facilitated him or her becoming a leader? On the other hand, relatedly, to cease to be a leader if that is the case.

Greenstein stated that personalities matter in politics when the political environment allows for restructuring (1969, pp. 41-46; Winter, 2010). Far from taking away from the importance that personality plays in the political world, Greenstein’s observation highlights how an individual’s personality influences how that actor understands barriers in the environment to be and thereby identifies opportunities to achieve success despite these barriers. Success is therefore not just dependent on permissive environments, but also on the motivations and abilities of actors to maneuver in less-permissive environments in order to attempt to influence events. In this regard, the study of leadership decision-making is a natural segue into understanding political events as this field helps understand how an individual gathers and organizes resources based on how the environment, and barriers within that environment, are perceived.

Needless to say, this assumes the individual is proactive in convincing others to support these endeavors and as a result of these efforts, assumes the role of a leader (Bateman & Crant, 1993, p. 104; Deluga, 1998, p. 266). Therefore, why a person seeks power; how relevant information is consumed; and how challenges are reacted to reveal a good deal of how that person has interpreted the environment and set about using resources derived from a leadership position to
navigate barriers to achieve success (Kaarbo & Hermann, 1998, p. 248). Taking this further, related work has shown that such factors are important not only in individual leadership decision-making, but in larger group- and regime-level decision-making as well wherein various individuals must agree on how to react to their environment to establish relevant policies (Hosoya, 1974, pp. 356-357; Stewart, Hermann, & Hermann, 1989).

At the level of the individual, how the leader with predominant policy-making authority has arranged their advisory and policy execution apparatus to react to events over time and situations matters as differing views can be sidelined and ignored so that the leader’s will is the influencing factor in policy-making (Glad, 1989; Hermann, Preston, Korany, & Shaw, 2001, p. 84). Therefore, when a leader is the dominant decision-maker, understanding why that leader behaves as he or she may requires understanding of how the respective personality was formed by identifying traits that have influenced that individual. This in turn assists in understanding how that leader interpreted the environment and reacted to challenges and barriers in that environment.

That said, it is worth noting the effect that the political environment has on leaders, and vice versa, essentially represents an ongoing relationship. So much so that the, “person, environment, and behavior continuously influence each other such that situations are as much a function of persons as vice [sic] versa” (Bandura, 1986; Deluga, 1998, p. 266; Schneider, 1983). Indeed, this continuing cycle leaves enough of a mark on the individual that a, “question in studying the implications of personality in politics then is that of which affects what more, the person or the environment, and when is it likely to do so” (Hawkings, 2009; Kowert, 1996; McNeill, 2001; Preston & Hart, 1999).
Methods of answering this question begin with understanding the targeted environment, the history of the individual, available channels of public and political mobilization, and the identification of publically observable qualities of the individual as a member of a political leadership (Greenstein, 2011; Simon & Uscinski, 2012; Winter, 2011, p. 1060). Greenstein for example, lists, “effectiveness as a public communicator, organizational capacity, political skill, policy vision, cognitive style, and emotional intelligence” as qualities that aid in achieving political power (Greenstein, 2001, 2011). While none is more important than others, he asserts that possessing an operational level of competence in as many of those qualities as possible, raises an actor’s potential for success (Greenstein, 2001).

By potential for success, what is implied is the accumulation of political power. This concept of political power is succinctly described by Sharp as being the, “totality of means, influences and pressures available to determine and implement policies and governance of a society…especially…to the institutions of government, the State, and those who oppose them” (G. Sharp & Roberts, 2011, pp. 2-3). Specifically, Sharp states these sources of power include, “authority (legitimacy), human resources, skills and knowledge, intangible factors, material resources, and sanctions (punishments)” which are derived from a positive approval of leadership or a downright intimidation of a populace that is unwilling to resist an authority (G. Sharp & Roberts, 2011, pp. 4-5). A removal of any of these sources can lead to a loss of authority that lessens obedience of, not only the people to the leader and/or the regime, but also of such institutions as the military or police forces that are used for applying sanctions against dissenters (G. Sharp & Roberts, 2011, pp. 6-7).

Studying the traits of a person’s personality is useful for studying leaders therefore because, although situations and environments can change over time, influential personality traits tend to
remain, “consistent for certain situations and either irrelevant or inconsistent for other”
(Hermann, 1980, pp. 67-68). Research in this field has sought to study the impact of personality
traits on political decision-making by, “delineating which characteristics and which people are
more or less influenced by situational factors and which aspects of a situation have an impact”

In this way, such work has carried on Allport’s work wherein he defined personality as being
an individually unique and dynamic psychological structure shaped by a person’s experiences
and influential in that person’s reactions to the environment (1937, 1961). Having opined that
previous research was representative of the, “complexes of habits…rather than truly fundamental
aspects of personality”, he concluded that personalities are influenced by critically important but
rare cardinal traits; situationally relevant and more regular central traits; and the least important
and situationally irregular secondary traits (Allport, 1921, p. 444, 1961; Carlson, 2012, p. 4).

Indeed, developments in personality research, since Allport, that have sought to identify
consistent and influential traits across situations and time have informed more recent studies of
what are known as the Big Five or Five Factor Model of personality (Gallagher & Allen, 2014, p.
4; John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). This diverges from psychoanalytic approaches that suggest
personality is subconsciously derived in that it, “(a) assumes that personality traits exist and are
measurable, (b) these traits vary across individuals, (c) the causes of human behavior are rooted
within the individual, and (d) people can understand themselves and others” (Gerber, Huber,

This model suggests that a person’s level of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness,
neuroticism, and openness can be measured by assessing how a person describes him or herself
and others and can be used to understand how a person’s personality effects their interaction with
their environment as these traits are largely stable across time and situations (Cooper, Golden, & Socha, 2013, p. 69; McCrae & Costa, 1987). In regards to the role of personality in politics, studies have reached many interesting results to include that the Big Five traits can influence political attitudes as well as the likelihood of a person participating in political protests (Brandstätter & Opp, 2014; Jonason, 2014). In short then, events influence political actors when the actors interact with their environment. While not absolute, the existing research helps in understanding how a person interacts with the political environment.

**Plan of the Dissertation**

Chapter Two visits literature exploring the foundations of this work that emphasize the formation of sociopolitical revolutions and how the international relations of types of governments effect the creation and success of such movements. As this study is concerned with how an authoritarian leader responded to a popularly-backed threat to his rule, the Iron Cage of Liberalism theory is used to help explain how international relations with democratic systems may affect an autocracies’ domestic politics in order to help build context regarding political structures affecting the decisions of Mubarak in Chapter four. The literature review also explores Post’s personality types and other literature on the paranoid personality to build an understanding of what existing literature says about this disorder.

Chapter Three presents collection methods and the conceptual framework used in this study that includes identifying indicators of paranoia observable in Mubarak’s behavior by using publicly available information. As mentioned previously, this study uses Post’s framework as it informs the assessment of the socialization process of Mubarak, and political decisions made once in power, to support the claim that Mubarak was a paranoid when making the decision to step down from office. In accordance, this study also uses Birt’s Dynamic Cycle to support this
claim by identifying his possible decision-making process as he ultimately decided to leave office.

Chapter Four presents the case study of Hosni Mubarak. Because of the many similarities between the societies directly affected by the Arab Spring, they represent a historically opportune period to study how the dependent variable of a leader’s personality, responded to a shared significant political phenomenon. For the case of Mubarak, this chapter presents a biographical background useful for understanding his reaction to the Arab Spring.

Chapter Five presents the argument that personality is what prompted Mubarak’s decision to leave office and uses Post’s framework and Birt’s diagram to argue that, although Mubarak likely would normally fit into the profile of the narcissist, as argued by Mirak-Weissbach, this study observes that his decision to flee was more attributable to a triggered paranoia than narcissism.

Chapter Six concludes this work by summarizing how the paranoid personality type, in the context discussed, reacted to an existential crisis and how that furthers understanding of authoritarian responses to crisis. In the end, an understanding of how personalities guide a nation’s political decisions is made by differentiating between a society and its political representation as manifested in the concept of the State. In the case of authoritarian systems, the psychological makeup of leadership personalities and the backgrounds of the formations of those personalities are important for understanding how authoritarian leaders hold onto power, or forfeit it, when faced with a popularly backed opposition movement.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Various factors inevitably led to the development of Mubarak’s PPD, which ultimately influenced his decision to step down in the face of the Arab Spring-inspired uprisings against him in Egypt. To say that his eventual removal from power was strictly psychological is to disregard the efforts the activists who for, whether right or wrong, decades worked to bring Mubarak’s reign over Egypt to an end. Conversely, to say the removal of Mubarak was strictly a result of activists working for decades to remove him from power is to disregard Mubarak’s efforts to remain in power for decades despite all of the work, by oppositional forces, for his removal. This chapter therefore touches on what the literature has to say about both sides of this story and, although various factors are undoubtedly not mentioned as the complexity of these phenomena makes it so that no one work could ever completely cover all aspects and perspectives on this subject, attempts to provide a general understanding of how Mubarak’s political end came about.

Revolution

Barrington Moore stated that a people in a defined area with a common identity expect certain basic services from a government in exchange for power transferred onto that authority (Moore, 1978, pp. 12-13, 37-48). Among these services can be expected the creation of a socio-economic tranquility conducive for a thriving economy and a distribution of public services and public goods that allows a majority of a population to survive under that authority's governance. Additionally, Moore believed that government is in the business of providing for the social coordination of popularly accepted behavior as it allows for societal stability and security. As this occurs, rules and mores become institutionalized as social custom and thereby become
societal moral code. The authority therefore, becomes trapped by such expectations and, if it fails to provide these things, the deviation reveals a reason for that authority to be reformed, or replaced altogether (Habermas, 1991, p. 27; Kelly, 2004, pp. 39-40; Moore, 1967, pp. 486-487, 1978, pp. 15-30).

As such, when these movements occur they are revolutionary in nature as what is sought is politically transformative change that reverberates throughout a society. For such transformations to occur, it is those movements that most resemble popular socio-political rapid grassroots phenomena that seek institutional reform and transformational changes in power and class structures of a society that are more able to enact lasting changes. This is because, as Tilly explains, people acting together in pursuit of shared interests (through a process of organization, mobilization, and opportunity identification) are able to, through collective action, manipulate the environment by overcoming the might of the state (1978). This implies that such a movement overcomes the might of the state; it is by default overcoming any personality or regime in control of the resources of that state as well.

A revolutionary movement therefore occurs to change the political and societal landscape of a public. Furthermore, the goal of such a movement is not to manipulate the political landscape in a favorable direction while retaining the existing socio-political power structures. Instead, the goal of a revolution is to tear down existing political structures that benefit the existing ruling authority to make room for new relationships between revolutionaries and a replacement authority that is ushered in. Because of this, a revolution presents a clear existential threat to a regime.

Such a movement must have at its core a strong sense of solidarity that links the leaders of a movement with the mobilized participants. As Useem notes, the shared communication
networks, unifying symbols/values, and authority structures present in established bloc communities with strong subjective and objective attachment to each other combine to naturally create a sense of solidarity (1980, pp. 361-367). Therefore, when using established cultural channels to promote recruitment, the language used to convey messages to domestic and international publics becomes critical in determining how societal organizers, “locate, perceive, identify, and label” information used for messages internalized by receptive individuals (Goffman, 1974, p. 21).

Specifically, the terminology and ideology employed to frame an issue in order to garner attention and support, is critical. When successful, framing creates opportunities that can mobilize masses collectively to challenge oppressive regimes. For example, nonviolent civil disobedience as a form of protest can generate great amounts of sympathy and support for a cause if activists, “assess the likely responses and repression, especially the threshold of violence, of the dictatorship to the actions of the democratic resistance” in order to frame the actions of a regime as tyrannical (Gene Sharp, 2010, p. 49).

It is no surprise that activists who employ focused, organized, and sustainable strategies in the pursuit of well-formed agendas are better able to generate active participation in pursuit of political goals than activists who do not employ such strategies (Andrews, 2001, pp. 75-76; Cress & Snow, 2000, pp. 1082-1085; Giugni, 1998, pp. 374-376; Ulsaner, 2007). Such better-disciplined activists are more likely to succeed in achieving their goals and, consequently, are more likely to catch the attention of the regimes that they challenge. Not coincidentally, the perceived threat then, that a regime attributes to a movement and that consequently influences how a threatened regime reacts, is dependent on the success of the activists in organizing and mobilizing resources (McAdam, 1999).
When a regime reacts with disproportionate violence it risks alienating domestic and international support for its actions and creating empathy for oppositional forces from observant publics that thereby assist in the creation of domestic and international conditions helpful to a movement against it (Gene Sharp, 2010, p. 28). Alternatively, a regime may attempt to avoid conflict by acquiescing to some calls for change by reforming select institutional structures and policies identified by oppositional forces as problem areas in order to present a harder target for oppositional forces. However, doing so risks eroding the ability of the regime to control state resources and can also inadvertently assist in the creation of conditions that aid in its overthrow (Gene Sharp, 2010, p. 23). In this regard, the opportunities for a successful popular uprising to challenge a regime are not constant, but rather most likely to occur when an opposition is most able to overcome existing barriers to effective collective action by forcing a regime to react and acknowledge the legitimacy of anti-regime forces (Tarrow, 1993; Tocqueville, 1955).

A modern twist to this is that communication technologies can be used to aid activists in garnering international support by being able to reach foreign audiences through social media. When successful, this contributes to creating increased pressure on a regime with strong Western ties and hastens reactions that might weaken the regime and thereby strengthen the opposition. The ongoing fallout of the Arab Spring serves to show that authoritarian regimes with strong Western ties have more reason to fear international reprisal for heavy-handed actions against citizens than do autocracies with weak or no Western ties. This fear in turn leads to a more likely desire to appease dissenters by accommodating some popular demands, appear more democratic, and possibly even do so at the expense of political power (Staniland, 2011, pp. 1630-1631). In this regard, information and communication technologies (ICT) assist in the creation of conditions conducive for revolutionary social-movements to be successful by allowing for
continuous transmission of information to, “tremendous cross-sections of the population with a single voice” that strengthens social bonds and solidarity across cultures (Klapper, 1957, p. 471; D. P. Ritter & Trechsel, 2011).

**The Iron Cage of Liberalism**

A related phenomenon pertinent to the study of revolutions is the bureaucratic iron cage that refers to state bureaucratic functions in search of rational and efficient means of managing resources and thereby holding onto political power. As applied onto international relations, this iron cage may refer to state institutions used by national-level governments to manage relations with other national-level governments. In short, a state, as a steward of power derived from its people, theoretically seeks efficient methods to retain, manage, and improve on that power and thereby creates bureaucratic structures that can influence policy at home and abroad by limiting how that power can be used to interact with other governments (Weber, Baehr, & Wells, 2002, pp. 286-291).

This is to mean the international institutions and pacts created, or entered into, by a state to participate in the international community limit available policy choices on relevant international and domestic issues (Weber, Roth, & Wittich, 1978, pp. 12-14). An effect on international relations then, is that as authoritarian regimes enter into arrangements with liberal democracies and publicly commit, if even just for show, to Western democratic values, both the democracy and the authoritarian regime may become bound by those values as respective constituencies hold the governments’ behavior accountable to those values (D. Ritter, 2015). Because of this, authoritarian regimes with visible relationships with liberal democracies become vulnerable to revolutions as the relationship may gradually force democratic reform on the authoritarian regime if constituencies of the democracies demand their governments hold authoritarian
regimes accountable for undemocratic policies and actions (D. Ritter, 2012, p. 97; D. P. Ritter & Trechsel, 2011, p. 4). Furthermore, if an authoritarian state adopts democratic policies, even if just minimal efforts to appease democratic allies domestic anti-regime critics, it unintentionally creates state-sanctioned institutions beneficial for anti-regime forces as policies enacted limit actions the regime can take in response to turmoil in the future (Almeida, 2003, pp. 351-352).

It is beneficial therefore, for oppositional groups to make use of international liberal and democratic values by using social media to attract international public support by highlighting undemocratic actions of authoritarian regimes and thereby create pressure on the democratic allies to force those regimes to reform (Habermas & McCarthy, 1985, pp. 5, 203-205; D. P. Ritter & Trechsel, 2011, p. 4). This Iron Cage of Liberalism thereby serves as an incubator for the creation of conditions by which an oppressive regime may eventually fall. A possible downside for the democratic state, however, is that, if a popular revolt against an authoritarian ally force the democratic government to call for the removal of the authoritarian leader, other authoritarian allies may become reluctant to maintain a relationship with the democratic government. In example, Jordan’s King Abdullah II’s comments, on how quickly Mubarak was discarded during the revolt against him, show that such considerations are taken into account when maintaining, Jordan’s at least, relationships with countries such as the US (Sale 2012, p. 54).

**Paranoid Personality**

Unlike Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder (OCPD) where the afflicted individual mistrusts the capabilities of others to efficiently accomplish goals, the individual afflicted with Paranoid Personality Disorder (PPD) harbors a, “longstanding suspiciousness and mistrust of people” in regards to the intentions of others (Livesley & Schroeder, 1990, pp. 633-634; Post,
2005, pp. 93-94). Being a less severe form of paranoia than schizophrenia, PPD may manifest in an individual when triggered by stress derived from a life-change and is not indicative of a clear break from reality, unlike more extreme cases of paranoia (Bernstein & Useda, 2007, pp. 43-51). Not unlike Edgar Allen Poe’s *The Telltale Heart*, an underlying theme of the paranoid’s mistrust derives from a self-acknowledgement that behavior of the individual afflicted with the condition is deviant from that of accepted societal values (Hesselbach, 1962, pp. 345, 347). This is a contrast to OCPD in that OCPD is influenced by a fear of failure to reach desired goals, whereas PPD is influenced by a fear that the behavior used to reach goals is deviant (Robins & Post, 1997).

Furthermore, like the narcissist, the paranoid’s own preferences dominate the thinking process as other viewpoints are seen as threats that conspire to control and thereby usurp the self-autonomy of the paranoid (Morris, Milner, Trower, & Peters, 2011, pp. 212-214; Robins & Post, 1997, pp. 11-12, 36-67). Because of this, criticisms of that dominating viewpoint of the paranoid are seen as proof of the paranoid being unjustly persecuted (Morris et al., 2011, p. 211).

Unsurprisingly, this rigid worldview assumes that the paranoid knows what is going to occur, that incompatible information serves to confirm and validate the suspicions of the paranoid (Beck, Freeman, & Davis, 2006, p. 134) and furthermore, this predictably leads to extreme stress when challenged by divergent information. To cope, the paranoid seeks scapegoats to blame for persecution felt to be unjustly experienced. Consequently, an indicator of the paranoid personality is the need, and therefore active search, of an external enemy (Beck et al., 2006, pp. 118-119) as the self-image that the paranoid has is unstable and in need of validation (Thewissen, Bentall, Lecomte, van Os, & Myin-Germeys, 2008, p. 150).
Assumedly then, the suspicious nature of the individual afflicted with PPD indicates, not only an inability to fully understand oneself, but an ineptness at reading others as well. This instability of the paranoid’s self-image is derived from the damage done to personal relationships resultant from the mistrust of worldviews not aligned with a psychological need for grandeur. This thereby, feeds the paranoid’s fear of losing self-autonomy by either being too trusting with those few that are held dear, by being excluded from those that are held dear, or by being overpowered by those that seek prevent the desired political grandeur (Dagnan, Trower, & Gilbert, 2002; Wing, Cooper, & Sartorius, 2012, p. 170).

It is no surprise then that the political paranoid is characteristically largely anti-social and resistant to participating in a group setting unless in charge. The PPD individual tends to be personably rigid and unwilling to compromise in expressed worldviews. Furthermore, the need to have an external enemy to validate fears of being unjustly persecuted promotes the tendency to exaggerate perceived affronts and for reactive behavior attacking imagined threats (Waldinger, 1997, pp. 149-150). Overall, these behaviors cause others to behave in a cautious manner in order to not ignite the suspicions and anger of the paranoid.

**Narcissistic Personality**

Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD), a condition characterized by needs for attention and admiration due to a sense of grandeur, generally begins in early adulthood. The narcissist possesses feelings of being elite, entitled to preferable treatment and envy by others, and of being able to take advantage of people in order to achieve desires. Not surprisingly, most relationships are often tenuous as the narcissist has a hard time empathizing with others and, though may appear socially charming, “more often they are boring, arrogant and easy to dislike” (MacDonald, 2011).
According to Post’s framework, the primary goal of the, “self-oriented narcissist is…to gain recognition, fame, and glory” (Kernberg, 1995, pp. 228-230; Post, 2005, pp. 84-85). In this way, Post makes the distinction that an individual afflicted with NPD is not necessarily in love with him/herself as much as with the image that the narcissist desires others to perceive (Malkin, Zeigler-Hill, Barry, & Southard, 2013, p. 2; Shapiro & Bernadett-Shapiro, 2006, p. 26). Much like the Wizard of Oz then, the power of the political narcissist lies in the image that others believe is an accurate representation of the individual and not necessarily in what the narcissist is actually capable of accomplishing. The ability to manipulate the political environment therefore rests on the influencing what others believe is within the narcissist’s power. Maybe more so than the other personality types then, the machinations of the narcissist rely heavily on a game of bluff and decisions in moments of crisis that tend to reveal a clearer depiction of the thought process as the narcissist maneuvers to maintain the charade.

A useful indicator of political NPD then are the political stances that the narcissist assumes as the belief that, “what is good for him is good for his country” guides policies and reactions to challenges to power (Post, 1993, p. 112, 2005, p. 87, 2011; Post & Baram, 2003, p. 170). Such stances assume that the narcissist possesses a divine/natural privilege to power and a natural and righteous insight guiding a path following “the dream” (Post, 1993, p. 118). Furthermore, such a worldview allows the narcissist to become more disregarding of alternative viewpoints from others while becoming highly sensitive to criticism as disagreements with the narcissist’s views are seen to be a direct challenge to the predestined path being followed (Post, 2005, pp. 84-86).

Such an outlook helps explain why others are treated, by the narcissist, as tools towards an end that are disposable after no longer serving a purpose. Another indicator of the narcissist therefore is observable in the tenuous relationships with others, as people are seen not as unique
individuals, but as tools of the narcissist (Post, 2007, pp. 75-76). This lack of empathy reveals an uncertain self-identity, on the part of the narcissist, as the preoccupation with publicly projecting a desired image indicates a fragile self-esteem that needs to be surrounded with disposable followers whose subservience serves as an ego-boost (Post, 2005, pp. 84-85; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006, p. 618; Volkan, 1980). Not surprisingly, this need promotes an inability to acknowledge ignorance of the self and of followers, and an inclination to rely on dogma to validate a worldview dependent on the safety that a predetermined destiny provides (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006, p. 619).

Tellingly, the narcissist in power has a low tolerance for conflict amongst an inner circle as the preferred management style seeks to coerce others to work to further the narcissist’s agenda (Post, 2005, pp. 87-88; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006, p. 620). As can be expected, the narcissist tends to be overly involved in managing personnel in order to take more credit than is deserved for successes while deflecting failures onto others. Failures, it can be said, represent blows to the self-esteem derived from projecting an image of grandiosity and, in extreme instances, can lead to a narcissistic rage directed at those viewed as responsible for the perceived injury (Kohut & Ornstein, 2011, pp. 634-640; Post, 2007, pp. 74-75; Ronningstam, 2005, pp. 86-87; Shapiro & Bernadett-Shapiro, 2006, pp. 29, 46-47).

However, this does not mean that a narcissist is necessarily an ineffective leader. Notably during times of crisis, a political narcissist may be the political actor needed to provide a grand vision to mobilize the masses into action and overcome an obstacle facing a society (Higgs, 2009, pp. 174-176; Maccoby, 2004, p. 95; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006, p. 622). If successful, the belief that the narcissist is destined for greatness and power is validated and thereby legitimizes the behavior of the narcissist as a driving force of history. As more successes accrue,
the narcissist then tends to overly exaggerate the influence over others and events. This overconfidence however, in turn can lead to increased instances of failure and of aggression as the narcissist begins to, “devalue the strength and competence” of adversaries and become increasingly divorced from reality (Post, 1993, p. 111).

For the sake of being an effective leader then, whether the narcissist’s inner circle is comprised of sycophants or advisors that keep the leader grounded in reality is critical. An advisor that can keep the leader grounded in reality can aid the narcissist in presenting a unifying message to mobilize a constituency and overcome crisis. Sycophants however, further weaken the narcissist as a leader, “because of his difficulties in empathizing with others, he will have a difficult time putting himself into the mind of his adversary” (Post, 1993, p. 112). When this is the case, adversaries seem alien and provide an outlet for the leader’s frustrations (Robins & Post, 1997, p. 92). As the frustrations and the need for an adversary grow, the target of the leader’s wrath can be identified by way of the absolutist language used to convey that one is either with, or against, the leader (Post, 1986, pp. 679-682).

**Obsessive-Compulsive Personality**

At healthy levels, Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder (OCPD) can aid an individual’s professional success in business- and/or technological-oriented environments (Villemarette-Pittman, Stanford, Greve, Houston, & Mathias, 2004, p. 8). However, in extremis, OCPD can be a professional hindrance. The same traits that assist in maintaining a focus on an objective can hinder decision-making if too pronounced in an individual’s personality. As a disorder, OCPD is a condition, generally begun to be noticeable in early adulthood, characterized by, “a chronic…pattern of excessive perfectionism” as indicated by a need for orderliness,
control over the environment, and resultant personal stress and suffering relationships (Pinto, Eisen, Mancebo, & Rasmussen, 2007, pp. 246, 249).

For example, moderate levels of preoccupation with organization allow an individual to remain focused on identifying and completing the steps needed to successfully reach goals. However, extreme preoccupation with organization can lead to an obsession with details that is detrimental to personal relationships, both professional and personal, as the OCPD forces a disregard for information and viewpoints that do not aid in the completion of the desired goal (Post, 2005, p. 88). Not coincidentally, an extreme preference for organization resembles narcissism in that the insistence that efficiency and perfection be idealized, though never realistically achievable, also prefers that other viewpoints be disregarded as divergent viewpoints cannot be conducive to the optimal levels of efficiency that the individual with OCPD envisions (Beck et al., 2006, p. 328; Villemarette-Pittman et al., 2004, p. 6).

It is not surprising then that the individual with OCPD is frequently, “excessively conscientious, moralistic, scrupulous, and judgmental of self and others” (Pinto et al., 2007, p. 251; Post, 2005, p. 89). An explanation is that as the individual compares desired outcomes with the perceived abilities of others to achieve those goals, the thought process becomes increasingly dichotomous as views of others are influenced by where they stand in supporting the vision of the individual with OCPD (Beck et al., 2006, pp. 327-328; Villemarette-Pittman et al., 2004, pp. 7-8). Indicative of the OCPD mindset then is the use of language rife with statements of tangible facts and ideas that eschew abstract feelings that do not lend themselves to identifiable limits of behavior.

Similarly indicative of OCPD is an extreme fixation on operational details that results in a poor allocation of time with the most important aspects of achieving an objective left to the last
minute (Post, 2005, p. 88). This emphasis on an idealized rational process for achieving a goal thereby results in a loss of ability to perceive a larger picture (Post, 2005, p. 88; Villemarette-Pittman et al., 2004, p. 7). To the detriment of relationships, like Leonard Nimoy’s Spock, the OCPD personality displays a limited ability to express emotion and empathy towards others as doing so is equated to displaying weakness. Not surprisingly, a common symptom of OCPD is depression as the individual becomes increasingly emotionally distanced from others (Beck et al., 2006, p. 321).

Accordingly, negative emotions caused by a limited social life are noticeably observable by severe instances of anxiety. As fears of making mistakes build, the decision-making process is hampered as the individual panics over external factors beyond control. Explosive acts of aggression towards others become more likely and serve as indicators of the personality disorder being present (Beck et al., 2006, pp. 320-321; Eisen, Mancebo, Chiappone, Pinto, & Rasmussen, 2008, p. 320; Villemarette-Pittman et al., 2004, pp. 14-15). Unsurprisingly then, psychosomatic disorders tend to develop as the individual’s chronically heightened anxiety causes physical maladies that further fuel feelings of frustration and fuel the indicative acts of aggression (Beck et al., 2006, p. 321).

**Conclusion**

Distinguishing the political leadership from the anthropomorphization of the state is important for understanding how leadership decisions are influenced by environments and vice versa. By accounting for the socialization of a political personality and the political structures that influence decision-making, this dissertation seeks to use observed behavior of Hosni Mubarak as a leader to identify him as a paranoid personality type and thereby explain the
decision to fight or flee when confronted by the popular uprising of the Arab Spring.

Furthermore, by visiting literature on social movements and international relations to understand how relationships of states influence reactions to revolutions, a theoretically grounded move from international relations into political psychology is possible to delve into a more psychologically-oriented understanding of international relations as a field.

The following chapters therefore detail how this dissertation carries out the goal of furthering the integration of political psychology and international relations via the subsequent case study of Egypt’s Mubarak. Afterwards, the concluding chapter will tie in how the personality type discussed explains Mubarak’s reaction to the Arab Spring and present broader implications that this work envisions for future research in international relations and leadership analysis at a distance.
CHAPTER THREE

Methods

This study examines an authoritarian response to a popularly backed revolt in Egypt. As discussed previously, a successful revolution most resembles a popular socio-political rapid grassroots phenomenon that seeks institutional reform and transformational changes in power and class structures of a society. Ultimately, this cannot be said to have been the outcome of the Arab Spring in Egypt as much of the political infrastructure and actors remained in place despite the removal of Mubarak. What has occurred instead can be better described as a popularly backed revolt and not a successful revolution. However, the outcome does not detract from the argument that Mubarak likely viewed what was occurring at the time he made his decision to leave office as a revolution directed at him. As such, this study examines how Mubarak's environment influenced his decision to flee when faced with the Arab Spring. By linking international relationships between State types to the success or failure of domestic popularly backed oppositional movements in non-democratic societies, this study seeks to further understanding of the paranoid personality as personified by an authoritarian leader faced with a popularly backed opposition to his hold on power.

Conceptual Framework

Jerrold Post’s *Conceptual Framework and Organization Design for an Integrated Political Personality Profile* (Post, 2005, pp. 102-104) and Birt’s ‘Dynamic Cycle of Paranoid Reaction’ are used to test the hypotheses that Hosni Mubarak fit the personality type of the paranoid when he made the decision to leave his office (1993). Because Post’s method requires an understanding of the socialization of the leader, using this framework allows for an analysis of
Mubarak’s motivations (Post, 1980, 1983). Furthermore, Birt’s diagram assists in charting Mubarak’s transition from when he was more likely identifiable with a narcissist, as Mirak-Weissbach posited, to a paranoid who chose to flee when confronted with a popularly-back threat to his rule, as this study finds.

Therefore, this study’s focus is on identifying those dimensions of Mubarak’s life that explain the a) societal context surrounding influential key events and key people; b) the political worldview of the individual, in regards to the individual’s perceived place in the political system; c) the resultant leadership style of the leader while in power; and d) the personality of the leader, as it pertains to the framework. This is to say that questions asked look at whether he relied on a father figure to base a leadership style on and how that influence affected the transition from being the mentored to being a Head of State. This in turn assists in assessing how Mubarak subsequently viewed his role as a Head of State to a nation that is used to assess how he identified threats and reacted to them by way of policy implementation. By doing so, the above-mentioned hypothesis is tested and an analysis of the leader’s personality is conducted.

In order to understand the motivations of leaders at key moments while in power, Post developed a psycho-dynamic and longitudinal framework that considers internal and external influences on the creation of the leader’s self-identity (Post & Baram, 2003, pp. 164-165). This is key in that the framework assumes that an individual in a political position experiences transitions in life, as other people do, that affect how political decisions are made (1980, pp. 35, 39). This is taken to imply that the actions by the individual in pursuit of a political dream are not characterized by just the behavior after the ascent to power.

Before a powerful political position has been acquired, the individual can be expected to have followed a Jungian mentor/archetype whose example guided him, by deed or by ideology,
in search of eventual success (Black, 2003, pp. 249-250; Hemmer, 2003, pp. 231, 239; Post, 1980, p. 39; Jerrold M. Post & Baram, 2003, pp. 165-166). Having achieved power in later life, the leader may then transition into a mentor role as embodied in the role of an authority-figure such as a Head of State (Black, 2003, pp. 249-250; Post, 2003, pp. 19-30).

As the composition of the inner circle of advisors, officials, and the political system overall, is analyzed, the sort of personality that has developed is revealed by how the leader positions and heeds trusted and untrusted people around him and how he pursues viewed threats (Black, 2003, pp. 251-252). Likewise, policies to address political concerns also are a reflection of a leader’s personality as he assumes the role of chief representative of the nation (Black, 2003, pp. 254-257; Post & Baram, 2003, p. 168). Understanding the external and internal influences on a leader’s socialization therefore, allows for a better understanding of why a leader might the make a decision to fight or flee, when faced with a popular uprising.

There is a key difference in how Post used his framework to create a psychobiography than from what is used here however. Instead of using this information to generate a prediction on possible future behavior of the leader, this work uses the information to identify which type of personality the leader is best identifiable with. Having arrived at this juncture, an analysis of the reasons the leader made the decision he made when confronted with the Arab Spring, based on that personality-type, is made.

Methods

If a comparison of Mubarak alongside other Arab authoritarians such as Zine El Abidine Ben Ali or Bashar al Assad were to be made, various similarities across cultures, languages, demographics, religions, and even oppositional factions and their complaints against their
respective regimes could be identified. Even the generations from which these authoritarians hail from are similar. As authoritarians, it is fair to assume the other leaders had a top-heavy political system with a strong executive branch and weak legislature resembling the system Mubarak inherited from Sadat and Nasser who sought to establish a strong central presidency when they assumed control of Egypt (Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, p. 43; Sale 2012, p. 57; Sika, 2013, p. 58).

Furthermore, like Mubarak, it is safe to assume they all exhibited some characteristics of a narcissist and had appointed an inner circle of public officials who were at heart sycophants who would, “fall over each other to extol the president, laud his wisdom, and sing the praises of his amazing and historic decisions” (Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, p. 58).

However, the case study of Hosni Mubarak of Egypt is analyzed using Post’s framework. Because the countries affected by the Arab Spring are very similar in regards to respective demographics, religious influence on society and politics, and government types, it is possible to control for these variables and focus on leader personality and key events in explaining how the Arab Spring affected the leaders’ reactions to facing a popular revolution. This being the case, characteristics of the societies such as the ethnicities of the population, levels of economic development, religions, and political system type, are seen as influential independent variables that influence the leader’s personalities.

Meanwhile, key events in the societies that influenced the socialization of the leader and forced an adaptation of personality, to include both pre- and post-political life, are seen as intervening variables/force multipliers that affect a psychological predisposition that, while otherwise present, would not have occurred had environmental stimuli not caused the personality disorder to manifest. These events can be assumed psychologically salient if the leader exhibits
a behavior resulting from the event. Concurrently, the events can be assumed politically salient if a policy was created in response, and/or, if there was a reshuffling or political appointment made to deal with the issue. Finally, the decision to fight or flee when faced with a credible threat, such as the Arab Spring revolutions, to the hold on power is treated as the dependent variable.

The method by which this study is accomplished is by creating a psychobiography of Hosni Mubarak to detect patterns in behavior as influenced by selected key events and people in the leader’s environment and life (Post, 2005, pp. 70-74; Post & George, 2004, pp. 13-15). This method is appropriate because as a Head of State, Mubarak served as, “...a symbolic leader, the one figure who draws together the people's hopes and fears for the political future. On top of all his routine duties, he has to carry that off-or fail...” (Barber, 1972, p. 5). Therefore, by observing patterns in a figure’s life, estimations of that figure’s decision patterns when confronted with stress in a leadership role may be made (Barber, 1972, p. 4; Post, 2005, p. 5; Schultz, 2005, pp. 3-7).

In these case studies however, the key behavior/political decision, that is to be explained by analysis, has already occurred and so therefore, this research will seek to understand the observed behavior instead of attempting to predict it. As per Post then, two parallel timelines are researched and used to juxtapose and integrate the context of the leader’s upbringing with key events and people that influenced the political personality after the leader had assumed a position of power (Post, 1986, p. 679). As key events are identified, a cross-sectional analysis is conducted to identify the leaders’ reactions and adaption, and thereby influenced behavior, shaped by the experiences (Post, 2005, p. 70).
Problems present in creating political psychobiographies require an acknowledgement that the public figure being studied is aware of the image presented to observers and of what information is available to the public (Elms & Song, 2005, p. 3). Prudence would have one assume then that the publicly viewable image is a controlled projection that may not completely reveal the political figure. This presents a problem for gathering verifiable data that can be used to analyze the individual’s actions. However, it is still possible to do psychobiographical research from a distance by examining patterns of individual behavior that, “cannot easily be explained…by ordinary explanations” (Elms & Song, 2005, pp. 302-304; Post, 2005, p. 13; Song, 2005, pp. 345-354) by acquiring biographical data on the subject. A method to achieving this is to use verified observations of notable societal events to detect patterns of behavior, as juxtaposed to declared intentions of the individual pursuant to personal biographical correspondence, such as speeches and/or letters, under abnormal conditions such as during crisis, that help to explain influences that affect a political personality (Dennis, 2005, pp. 314-317; H. D. Lasswell, 1986, pp. 65-77; Renshon, 2005, pp. 324-325).

Data Gathering

Because there are two parallel timelines created from which key events are identified and analyzed to make assessment of Mubarak’s personality in order to address the research question, two research agendas have been pursued. The first concentrates on gathering data pertaining to the socio-cultural and familial context of Mubarak’s upbringing and key societal events pre- and post-ascension to power. The second agenda focuses on how the leader perceived the world around him as reflected in such constructs as the composition of inner circles of advisors and friends and perspectives revealed through speeches and other writings. In this manner, not only is the influence of the leader’s early socialization on his personality understood, but also how that
resultant personality subsequently influenced Mubarak’s decision-making under extreme circumstances.

Initially, historical events in the societies of the chosen leaders are identified and used as a basis for a timeline by using LexisNexis. The logic in this is that politically salient events are likely reported in the various major newspapers that the database has available for access. Furthermore, political actions such as reactive policies and political appointments in response to an event that reveal a worldview can be found from such sources as the BBC. Additionally, mining for data in this manner allows, not only for a basic historical timeline of political events used to identify salient moments affecting a leader’s behavior, but also for identifying relevant and influential political actors in the leader’s life.

Another source for gathering hard data of a country, such as population demographics, international relations, and some key internal and external political events, that has been used is the US Central Intelligence Agency’s World Factbook. A major benefit to using this source is not only the hard data on countries that is available, but that it is available on a year-by-year basis. Therefore, if societal dimensions such as international relations, ethnicities of the societies, and religion are constant and can be treated as independent; major changes in these variables will be noticed by studying the hard data available therein.

Finally, more qualitative works relevant to creating a historical timeline of the countries in question, and subsequent identified societal events/issues, behave been identified by using Amazon.com’s rating scale. The logic behind this is that commercially in-demand authors on such topics can be assumed academically salient on the topic that they are writing on. However, this commercial success does not necessarily equal academic acceptance as it might just indicate commercial popularity due to a controversial stance on a topic. Therefore, such identified works
are also compared to the number of citations the work has via Google.com’s book and academic article search engines.

This process allows for a primary timeline that provides the bulk of the information needed to understand the leader within the context that informed his personal development. The second timeline conversely, requires the gathering of data more informative of the Mubarak’s personality as revealed through his behavior while in power. Fortunately, the Egyptian leader has created over the course of his unique career plenty of written material from which to gain a sense of who he was psychologically while in power. Therefore, given the research’s focus on the paranoid’s response to the a crisis such as the Arab Spring by using Post’s framework on personality; speeches, interviews, memoirs, and other material are used to verify more publicly available information.

Criticisms, inevitably, exist of using prepared speeches and memoirs to analyze a political figure’s personality. However, by comparing the image that the leader wants to present, with the actions revealed by studying his behavior and thereby making inferences from publicly observed political actions, indicators useful for determining the leader’s personality type are revealed. This in turn aids in understanding the decision to fight or flee once confronted by the mass protests characterized by the Arab Spring, and thus, answer the research question and test the presented hypothesis.
CHAPTER FOUR

HOSNI MUBARAK

“Mubarak…has become a fussy and paranoid prisoner…given to claims about the great
conspiracy he saw in his downfall.”

- Bradley Hope (2012)

Bradley Hope, in his short eBook Last Days of the Pharaoh, provides a telling description of
Mubarak’s last days as leader of modern-day Egypt based on accounts from individuals who
witnessed Mubarak’s struggle to deal with the uprisings against him first hand (2012). Yet,
descriptions of Mubarak do not portray an individual whose narcissism caused his downfall.
Instead, Hope implies Mubarak’s fall was due to his ignoring advice from such advisors as
Secretary General of the National Democratic Party Hossam Badrawi whose recommendation
that Mubarak step down, in response to the uprisings, was heeded too late (2012). Instead of
listening to Badrawi, Mubarak was too trusting of his son Gamal whose influence on government
policy led to the predicament in which Mubarak found himself in 2011 (Hope, 2012). According
to this account, Mubarak will likely end his days imagining that a conspiracy against him caused
his thirty-year reign over Egypt to end.

The story of Mubarak is interesting in that his rise to power was as much attributable to his
ambition as it was to accident. Indeed, born on May 4, 1928, to poverty and a low-level
bureaucrat of an abusive father, Mubarak as a child likely did not imagine he would one day
become the leader of Egypt. However, joining Egypt’s Air Force set in motion events that would
catapult him into Egyptian and international politics (Hope, 2012; Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, pp.
55-56).
This is not to say that Mubarak bumbled through life before becoming President. That he had ambition is observable in descriptions of him having been a social climber, when in the Air Force, who looked for opportunities to exploit for his advantage (Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, pp. Mirak-Weissbach). One such opportunity came in the aftermath of Egypt’s war with Israel in 1967. Following the Egyptian military’s poor performance against the Israeli military, Gamal Abdel Nasser Hussein, who was still in charge at the time, removed military officers that he blamed for the failure and thereby cleared the way for junior officers like Mubarak to climb the ranks (Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, p. 48). This is again not to say Mubarak’s rise was completely out of his control. In part due to his performance in Egypt’s participation during the Yemen War, by 1967, he had already been a highly regarded instructor and officer. To add to his already established record as a military leader, when the Israeli military attacked Egypt on June 5, 1967, he was able to order his squadron out of harm’s way from the Cairo West Airfield where he was commander and ultimately spared it the demise that other squadrons experienced (Cox, 2003, pp. 55-58).

Following Nasser’s death and Muhammad Anwar El Sadat’s ascension to the Presidency, Mubarak’s fortunes again advanced following Sadat’s decision to move Egypt closer to the West. One-step that Sadat undertook to achieve this was to expel Soviet military personnel from the country. While this decision had its critics, one in particular was a military advisor who Sadat replaced with Mubarak. This promotion raised Mubarak’s standing to head of the Egyptian Air Force and to being the Deputy Minister of War (Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, p. 49).

His rise in Sadat’s regime did not end there however. Whereas, Mubarak never appointed a Vice President during his time as President, by 1975, Sadat had appointed Mubarak to replace Hussein Shafei as his Vice President (Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, pp. 52, 65). Although
Mubarak’s noticeably quiet personality gave the impression to some that he had been chosen for the position because he was at heart a lackey of Sadat, in truth, he was actually quite active in Egypt’s foreign policy (Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, p. 52). Aside from his role in negotiations to end a guerrilla war in Morocco and his role as part of a delegation to China, both in 1976, Mubarak was also supportive of Sadat’s participation in the Camp David peace accords to find peace between the Arab world and the State of Israel (Solecki, 1991, pp. 50-51).

After becoming President following the assassination of Sadat, Mubarak remained markedly different from Sadat’s more extravagant persona in that he actively sought to project a low-key image of him and his family to the public (Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, pp. 59-61). In addition, Mubarak initially also sought to separate himself from Nasser’s leadership style and be more politically inclusive of oppositional factions. In the first decade of his rule, this strategy worked well for Mubarak as the public had tired of Sadat’s extravagance and flamboyancy and welcomed Mubarak’s measured approach towards governance (Hope, 2012). However, this measured and cautious style, “gradually came to be seen by many observers as static to the point of neglectful” (Hope, 2012). Yet, even though Mubarak took pains to distinguish himself from both Nasser and Sadat in some ways, in other ways he closely resembled them both as he too believed, “in a strong ruler…one who was very strong and can do anything” (Hope, 2012).

Perhaps it was this shared belief amongst Mubarak, Sadat, and Nasser of how a ruler should behave that helped bring about a commented on alienation between the general public and the government that influenced the formation of the uprisings in the Egyptian society that eventually forced Mubarak from power (Amin, 2011, p. 145). Amin points to this alienation as being a result of Sadat’s infitah policies and resultant exploitation and flouting of the laws by business
elites who pursued the privatization of public goods for private gain (Amin, 2011). He does not level all of the responsibility for this alienation at the elites however.

Since the mid-1970’s he claims, Egypt experienced a reinterpretation of moderate Islam into a more extremist version. This growing extremist Islam affected many poorer segments of the population and contributed to pushing college graduates with few economic prospects towards Islamic fundamentalist groups opposing the regime (Amin, 2011, pp. 122-123; H. F. Jackson, 1982, p. 71; Reed, 1993, p. 97). However, it is noticeable that even after the Islamist Mohamed Morsi replaced him, similar demands and criticism made of Mubarak were made of Morsi before he too was forced from power and replaced by Mubarak-era officials (Banerji, 1991; Sale 2012, p. 53; Sika, 2013, pp. 62-63, 65). Mubarak’s fall then, while certainly assisted by his personality and decision-making, could also have been influenced by an environment that had itself been marked by an Egyptian image of how a leader should be.

Moreover, some of the challenges that Mubarak faced while in office began with the divergence from Nasser’s nationalistic economic policies to Sadat’s consumerist-oriented infitah policies in the early 1970’s. To spur economic prosperity, the infitah policies were to harness Arab capital, western technology, and Egyptian resources by removing statist shackles thought by Sadat to have restricted economic growth, initiative, and to have made the public sector suffer, “from the excesses of bureaucracy and heavy expansion into areas better left to the private sector” (Ates, 2005, p. 135; Bromley & Bush, 1994, p. 202). In short, the infitah policies, “aimed not only to transform the economy according to the free-market model, but also to correct the deficiencies of state control and achieve integration with the world economy” (Ates, 2005).
This integration however resulted in a privatization of public services and institutionalized government corruption that contributed to Egypt becoming a soft state (Amin, 2011, pp. 122-123; Gray, 1998, p. 91; Sika, 2013, p. 43). Under the infitah policies, Egypt’s business friendly taxes and lack of protectionist policies, as well as abundance of cheap labor, attracted global markets to the Egyptian economy but also resulted in a flood of foreign capital and goods as investors sought to offset saturated markets, higher wages, and resultant reduced profits elsewhere. However these new revenue sources were not enough and investors began purchasing existing public services, opened to privatization under infitah policies, and thereby effectively sequestered, “public property for private use” (Amin, 2011, p. 13; Sika, 2013, p. 44). According to Amin, this sequestration of public services led to the public losing services previously available under the Nasser government and the alienation of the general population from the government.

The resultant Egyptian soft state, as Amin calls it, was characterized by a weakness of the government to enforce laws as business elites used their ties to government officials, and the use of bribes, to have their flaunting of the law overlooked (Amin, 2011, pp. 34-35; Banerji, 1991). Notably a, “widespread disobedience by public officials and, often, their collusion with powerful persons and groups...whose conduct they should regulate” existed that caused corruption to become a way of life that spread from the, “executive power to the legislative, and from there to the judiciary” (Amin, 2011, pp. 8-9; Banerji, 1991; Myrdal, 1970, p. 208). This culture of corruption, as the years progressed, became institutionalized in the government during an era of a ‘consumer society’ that Amin has likened to a weakening of a body’s resistance to germs brought on by Sadat’s policies promoting consumerism (Amin, 2011, pp. 58-59). Internationally, as Egypt, “adopted economic reforms with the logic of maintaining the regime’s
power by controlling both politics and the economy,” Western benefactors, “agreed to overlook this [corruption] in return for an increase in foreign direct investments, the continued flow of oil to the world, and political stability” (Sika, 2013, p. 44).

Indeed, following Sadat’s signing of the Camp David treaty with Israel in 1978, Egypt became the second largest beneficiary of US military and economic aid after Israel; although business elites were the main beneficiaries of this aid (H. F. Jackson, 1982, p. 73). The US in turn received not only a crucial ally needed to broker a peace between Israel and Palestine, but also an ally that actively helped in countering the Soviet Communist ideology. Having foregone its relationship with the Soviet Union, Sadat’s regime turned on its former ally and assisted the American cause in the Cold War by training and arming Afghan rebels to fight the Soviets. In kind, the US provided Egypt with military aid and assistance in modernizing its military (Cody, 1980; Wilson, 1979). To be sure, siding with the US made political sense for Sadat as he expelled, “20,000 Soviet military advisors and began courting the” US (Brownlee, 2011-12, p. 648). As relations with the US thawed, Egypt began to receive increased aid and food subsidies that reached US $1billion annually from 1974 to 1977 and, following Egypt’s October 1973 war with Israel, US-brokered deals that led to Egypt regaining territory in the Sinai lost during the 1967 Six-day War (Brownlee, 2011-12, p. 649).

However, the reliance on foreign aid and investment and unreliable revenue sources, such as fees from the Suez Canal and remittances, made the Egyptian economy vulnerable to economic shocks which further pushed government officials to develop relationships with business elites who were reportedly, or were widely believed to be, embezzling public resources (Banerji, 1991; Bromley & Bush, 1994, p. 202; Gray, 1998, p. 96; Sika, 2013, pp. 44-47). Needless to say, whether by accident or design, Sadat’s infitah policies furthered the concentration of wealth in
the hands of a few and, when this did not change under Mubarak, the alienation continued to
grow as poverty increased and disproportionately affected rural areas not of interest to the
business elite (Amin, 2011, pp. 142-143; Banerji, 1991; H. F. Jackson, 1982, p. 71; Sika, 2013,
p. 53; Tucker & Stork, 1982, p. 3).

And so the influx of aid and accumulation of national debt continued under Mubarak who,
shortly after coming into power, was warned by the World Bank that Egypt’s foreign debt had
grown to an alarming $4.2 billion; with around 7.5 percent of Egypt’s gross national product
being used to defray interest costs on existing debts (H. F. Jackson, 1982, p. 70). Yet, the
relationship with the West paid off when, in response to Egypt’s participation in operation Desert
Storm against Saddam Hussein, “US and Arab debt relief wrote-off an estimated US $13bn…the
US canceled US$6.7bn of military debt,” and, “…sponsored a very favorable treatment of
Egypt’s debt by its Paris Club creditors, leading to a halving of its US $20.2bn owed to them”

In spite of this favorable reduction in debts, critics of Mubarak saw this deal as further proof
that he was, as critics of Sadat had alleged of him, taking cues from the US and therefore a
puppet of the West, business elites in the private sector and his regime who profited off the
infitah policies, and international financial institutions. Furthermore, and that because of this,
perhaps the real power holders in Mubarak’s regime were pro-US advisors who had an interest in
maintaining Egypt’s political status quo (Amin, 2011, pp. 57-59, 148-150; Mirak-Weissbach,
2012, pp. 60-61). To be fair to critics, when Mubarak acquiesced to various pro-liberalization
groups and signed a standby agreement and structural adjustment loan with the International
Monetary Fund and World Bank on 17 May 1991, his government was forced to further reduce
its role in the economy by continuing to privatize public services (Amin, 2011, p. 73; Gray,
Despite this submission to foreign influences, in exchange Egypt received monetary compensation and military aid that increased the country’s international standing and strengthened Mubarak’s control of the military as its access to, “modern weapons, training and other benefits that come mainly from the United States” was preserved (Reed, 1993, p. 105). However, no matter the amount of aid Egypt received from the West, critics were not silenced as, “neither the structure of socio-economic power within Egypt, or the character of political power at the level of the state” were directly addressed (Bromley & Bush, 1994, p. 210; Reed, 1993, p. 104).

In fact, groups wary of the influence foreign powers had on Egypt’s politics continued to make note of the unaddressed inequality s the continued public discontent with Mubarak’s regime aided in their efforts to build public support for their agendas. These efforts by such groups, according to Amin, were bolstered by a damaged national psyche caused by the combined loss of Arab nations to Israel in the 1967 Six-Day War that was not rectified by the Egyptian victory over Israeli forces on 06 October 1973 (Amin, 2011, pp. 139-140). Although Mubarak and his followers would come to celebrate his role in this operation to the point where the exaggerations of his personal heroics would grow until the, “soldiers, artillery, tank units, logistics…were merely secondary props” to his grandeur (Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, pp. 59-60). In short, by the time of Sadat, there was enough damage to the Egyptian national psyche that neither the Sadat nor the Mubarak regimes’ were able to recover the nationalist pride of the Nasser era and so anti-regime and extremist factions flourished.

Although, “Islamic fundamentalist groups was only one threat to his power base,” since its inception, the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood had the goal of transforming Egyptian society through a civic-, versus a theocratic-interpretation of Islam, and was one of the more successful
groups opposing the government of Mubarak (Bradley, 2009, pp. 73-74; Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, pp. 16, 33; Munson, 2001, p. 488; "Profile: Hosni Mubarak," 2015). This success was in large part due to the organization’s business model of engaging in local community projects that addressed public needs. Doing so enabled the organization to expand tremendously and establish a large membership and network of social and welfare institutions across the country and region (Wickham, 2015, pp. 21-22). However, although the Brotherhood’s success made it a boon to the government in that public needs were addressed, at the same time this success legitimized the political Islam the Brotherhood became adept at leveraging against the secular government of Mubarak (Amin, 2011, pp. 34-35).

That said, the success of the Brotherhood was not entirely of its own efforts. Although the Mubarak regime repressed Islamist militants, it assumed that the Islamist message did not carry mass appeal and so let moderate Islamists be politically active from approximately 1981 to 1989. More specifically, an alliance with the al-Wafd Party resulted in a political success of eight seats in parliament during the 1984 parliamentary elections (Campagna, 1996, pp. 281-283; Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, pp. 61, 75; Reed, 1993; Sale 2012, p. 55). This success however, highlighted that the Brotherhood could be a viable political force that now had a legal presence in parliament. Furthermore, although Brotherhood members were unable to successfully carry out the organization’s goal of having sharia law nationally implemented, the political success continued as by the 1987 elections, alliances with the Liberal and Socialist Labor parties resulted in the Brotherhood’s presence growing to 36 seats in parliament (Campagna, 1996, pp. 283-284).

When viewed in the context of Mubarak’s actions against Islamist militant groups like the al Jihad al Islami group that assassinated Sadat, the government’s tolerance of politically active moderate Islamists during the 1980s is telling (H. F. Jackson, 1982, pp. 72, 74; Kandil, 2014, pp.
By allowing the Brotherhood to participate and succeed politically, while at the same time acting against the more extreme Islamist militants, the Mubarak regime gave the Brotherhood the legal legitimacy needed to challenge Mubarak later. Furthermore, when taken into account, later actions by the Mubarak regime against the Brotherhood reveal that tolerance of groups expressing criticism against the regime ended if those groups became political threats.
By the time the Arab Spring reached Egypt, Mubarak’s paranoid personality disorder had begun to manifest. Undoubtedly, stress caused by a popular uprising would trigger a psychological reaction, which, in an autocratic leader such as Mubarak, ultimately influenced his decision to step down from power. Although described by Mirak-Weissbach as not being a smart person and a narcissist, Mubarak was likely very aware of the political constraints he faced in reacting to a very public movement against him and, having seen the Tunisian uprising sweep Zine El Abidine Ben Ali from office, experienced enough stress that his otherwise latent PPD matured (2012, p. 58). This is to say that although it is likely Mubarak was more of a narcissist before the uprisings, as Post’s framework details can occur, he experienced a fateful life changing moment when his condition was triggered and he decided he had to step down (Post, 1980, pp. 35, 39).

However, signs that Mubarak possibly had a latent paranoia were visible in the decision to let the Brotherhood be politically active under the false belief the Islamist message would not gain popular support; the identification of the organization as a credible political threat following its successes; and actions by the regime to reduce the organization’s influence and begin to label it a terrorist organization by the 1990s. This is to say the false assumption the Brotherhood could not fare well politically may have been a miscalculation or a revelation of the paranoid’s rigid worldview where he believes he knows what will occur in a given situation. It is also revealing then that when the Brotherhood achieved political success, this new and incompatible reality saw the Mubarak regime begin to aggressively target Brotherhood members in the 1990s.
As with such cases, evidence of Mubarak’s narcissism and aggression indicating a slide into paranoia are observable in hindsight. A place to begin may be where Mirak-Weissbach began by noting that poverty, an abusive father, and behavior in school that led to him being labeled a troublemaker, characterized Mubarak’s childhood. Additionally, Mirak-Weissbach implies that his wife’s higher upbringing and disdain for his poorer country relatives, who she would not even invite to her son’s wedding, may have prompted Mubarak to feel ill at ease when amongst a higher social caste and to seek compensation for his implied social inadequacies (Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, pp. 55-56). In the same description, Mirak-Weisbach notes Mubarak was a social climber while in the Air Force who spied on his colleagues and reported their illegal activities to his superiors. This embarrassment of one’s upbringings and behavior aimed at raising his fortunes by working against his peers, as Mirak-Weissbach implies, would undoubtedly be looked down upon by peers and thereby force Mubarak to acknowledge that his behavior was contrary to accepted societal values and therefore deviant (Hesselbach, 1962, pp. 345, 347; Robins & Post, 1997).

That Mubarak understood this behavior was frowned upon may explain the humble persona he strove to project as a career officer in the Air Force. This same persona proved beneficial to him later as Vice President to Sadat as it led others to describe him as someone who had never, “been implicated in corrupt business schemes, influence peddling or malfeasance of any sort…” or sought, “…neither distinction nor notoriety” (Tucker & Stork, 1982, p. 4). Indeed, early on Mubarak was commonly described as a hardworking and simple leader who sought to hold infitah profiteers accountable and who took pains to separate himself from the flamboyant lifestyle of Sadat (Tucker & Stork, 1982, pp. 4-5). This behavior is hardly, “typical of the young narcissist” who developed early in life as Mirak-Weissbach assessed Mubarak to be (2012, p.
In truth, this is a difficult argument to make even if one assesses Mubarak’s persona was an expression of a, “self-oriented narcissist…to gain recognition, fame, and glory” as he was consumed with the need to project a favorable image to others (Kernberg, 1995, pp. 228-230; Malkin et al., 2013, p. 2; Post, 2005, pp. 84-85; Shapiro & Bernadett-Shapiro, 2006, p. 26). However, the error here is not in diagnosing Mubarak a narcissist; rather in diagnosing him only a narcissist when his behavior was more likely tied to additional behavior that would indicate a proclivity for eventual paranoia.

Mirak-Weissbach also observed that, “one could say that Mubarak 'inherited' narcissism, not from his parents, but from his two predecessors – Gamal Nasser and Anwar Sadat” (2012, p. 49). Sadat’s own steps to separate his legacy from Nasser show that he felt a perhaps narcissistic need to distinguish himself from his predecessor which Mubarak, whether intentionally or unintentionally, may have internalized as a requirement for him to achieve his own grandeur separate from Sadat. However, such a theory may be all but impossible to test without access to Mubarak himself. What can be observed is that Mubarak, a poor kid who through service in the Egyptian military was able to achieve riches and power over others, like Nasser and Sadat before him, also eventually suppressed groups like the Brotherhood that posed a political threat (Witte, 2004, pp. 15-18).

This eventual policy of targeting political threats shows that Mubarak was aware of the fragile political system he had inherited from Sadat as evident in the efforts to rig the 1984 presidential election in his favor by manipulating rules governing which parties could participate and which parties were barred from doing so (Hendriks, 1985). Notably, Hendriks claims to have personally witnessed voter intimidation and large-scale tampering of election rules in the poorer outskirts of Cairo and the countryside where Mubarak and his regime were less popular.
(1985, p. 12). As this was the same year of the Brotherhood’s parliamentary success in 1984, that the Mubarak regime let the Islamist message be heard, yet rigged the presidential elections against competition, indicates he may have harbored a, “longstanding suspiciousness and mistrust of people” (Campagna, 1996, p. 282; Livesley & Schroeder, 1990, pp. 633-634; Post, 2005, pp. 93-94). Such an assumption is furthered by claims that this sort of rigging of the political process in favor of Mubarak’s regime continued well into the 2010 elections (Hope, 2012).

Also observable is that by the early to mid-1990s, persecution of Brotherhood members escalated as Egypt experienced a resurgence of Islamic-oriented violence aimed at undermining the regime (Cox, 2003, pp. 110-111; Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, pp. 71-72; Moustafa, 2000, pp. 3, 7, 12). To sidestep a bit, one way to view the escalated hostility towards the Brotherhood is to assume that, as a politically active and modern Islamist institution, the Brotherhood was an ideal scapegoat to display a government response to the violence. It is surely tempting to view the increased focus on the Brotherhood, during this period of Mubarak’s rule, as an example of a regime acting against a political opponent. Indeed, by portraying the organization as extremist by likening it to such groups as al Jihad al Islami which not only assassinated Sadat, but also influenced nefarious characters like Ayman al-Zawahiri who would later join with Usama bin Laden to create al Qa’ida, the regime could justify violence against the Brotherhood as actions against terrorists (Kandil, 2014, pp. 150-153). Moreover, the escalation of hostilities towards the Brotherhood coincided with the new mission of al Qa’ida’s seasoned fighters to return to their countries from fighting in Afghanistan and topple their respective secular governments in the 1990s, to include Egypt, following the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan (Kandil, 2014, p. 152).
Whatever the case, this escalated hostility, as Campagna notes, resulted in increased arrests of Brotherhood members beginning as early 1991, legislative initiatives to diminish influence in professional associations in 1993, and a coordinated media campaign involving state officials and the semi-official press to label the Brotherhood a terrorist organization (1996, p. 280). However, although the Brotherhood was not the only Islamic fundamentalist group targeted by the Mubarak regime whose reaction to a, “major insurgency movement…against the government,” caused it to, “clamp down in dissent,” it was the major Islamist political group targeted (Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, pp. 71-72). Yet, perceived political threats aside, another way to view the Mubarak regime’s actions against the Brotherhood, and a possible explanation for Mubarak’s eventual paranoiac personality, would be to take into account the various assassination attempts against Mubarak during this same period.

Indeed, around this time, Mubarak’s behavior markedly changed according to Mirak-Weissbach. After 1990 she states, “Mubarak became totally self-centered and adamant about establishing his one-man, one-party rule” and, “began to place his personal security above all other considerations, defining that as the central responsibility of the army and the Republican Guard” (Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, p. 56). Having the state’s security apparatus at his control, security procedures said to be implemented for the safety of Mubarak and his family against terrorist action were known to paralyze traffic on roads for 20 kilometers (Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, pp. 56-57).

This reaction to terrorism was not unwarranted however, as the 1990’s were marked by an increase in terrorist attacks on tourists in Egypt, and on Mubarak himself, and which were aimed at undermining the regime’s credibility of being able to control Egypt. In example, on December 27, 1993, Austrians and Egyptians alike suffered injuries when gunmen attacked a tour bus they
were on. This event was followed up on June 26, 1995 when Islamic militants attempted to
assassinate Mubarak as his convoy drove through Addis Ababa in Ethiopia in route to a meeting
at the Organisation of African Unity (Darraj & Schlesinger, 2007, p. 76). This attempt on
Mubarak’s life by Islamic militants was followed by a terrorist attack, on April 18, 1996, outside
the Europa Hotel in Cairo and a massacre of tourists at the Queen Hatsheput temple on
with another attempt at Mubarak’s life in September of 1999 when he was slightly injured as a
man tried to stab him while he was in his car waving to crowds in Port Said, Egypt (Darraj &

Mubarak’s resultant tough reactions to these events even took him into contention with his
US allies at this time. Although his regime was warned that his violations of human rights could
cost Egypt billions in aid from the US, he disregarded this warning by stating, "I refuse to allow
human rights to become a slogan to protect terrorists," (Reed, 1993, p. 103).

Notably, this tough talk not only threatened his international relationships, but likely also his
domestic support as the Egyptian military benefited from the military aid acquired from the US
and Mubarak’s bravado threatened resources the military received through this relationship.
Were Mubarak not able to, “preserve access to modern weapons, training and other benefits that
come mainly from the United States,” he may have faced problems from military officers who
were unconvinced Mubarak could maintain Egypt’s relationship with the Clinton administration
that they assumed would, “likely place more emphasis than its predecessor on democracy,
human rights and political reform” (Reed, 1993, p. 105). This added threat of losing support
from a powerful faction of his regime undoubtedly added another layer to the pressures Mubarak
dealt with as the leader of Egypt.
Mubarak Decides to Go

As the Arab Spring uprising became ever more intense, international pressure for Mubarak to step down increased. During this period, from 25 January to 11 February 2011 and when approximately 846 people died as the environment became more tumultuous, Mubarak’s paranoiac condition most likely fully manifested ("Egypt: Cairo's Tahrir Square fills with protesters," 2011). As he watched events unfold on a coded satellite signal in his palace, Mubarak felt pressure to step down from a domestic uprising of various segments of the population that included Muslim Brotherhood supporters and US officials who reportedly told Egypt’s military that Mubarak had to leave (Kirkpatrick & Slackman, 2011; Press, 2013; Sale 2012, p. 53). Ironically, this use of the Egyptian military by a foreign power to convey a lack of support for an authoritarian juxtaposed Nasser’s and Sadat’s overthrow of King Farouk I and, by proxy, the British and American influence in Egypt by the Free Officers movement (Witte, 2004, pp. 18-24).

In these early stages of the uprisings, Mubarak’s absence was noticeable in what Mirak-Weissbach stated was a sign he was experiencing a ‘play dead reflex’, attributable to a narcissistic personality disorder that caused him to withdraw from the public eye and flee to his residence in Sharm al Sheikh (Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, pp. 45-49). However, by using Birt’s ‘Dynamic Cycle of Paranoid Reaction’ to analyze Mubarak’s actions, his withdrawal from the public eye during this period may reveal when he entered a paranoiac state in which he tried to present a softer public image useful for regaining control of the country and prevent his ouster; he failed however.

Using William L. Benoit’s five commonly used strategies to repair public images from image repair discourse theory, Anagondahalli found that Mubarak consistently used denial, evasion of
responsibility, reduction of offensiveness, and corrective action themes in his addresses to the uprisings to attempt to remake his image to his audience (2013, pp. 242-243; Benoit, 1997). Tellingly, these themes are similar to indications of a progressive paranoiac reaction to the uprisings in Mubarak’s speeches on 29 January, 01 February, and 10 February 2011 that support the assessment his final decision to step down was influenced by paranoia. Inferred from these indicators is that this condition may not have manifested had psychological stress from the sociopolitical environment not triggered the paranoia.

That said, also apparent is Mubarak’s ineptness at reading people as he did not seem able, or willing, to understand that removing his cabinet alone would not placate the protestors ("Mubarak dismisses government," 2011; Mubarak, 2011; "Mubarak names his deputy as new PM," 2011). His decision to appoint former intelligence Chief Omar Suleiman as his Vice President, after never having had one during his time in office, in his speech on 29 January, further displays this ineptness and hints that Mubarak may have thought he could sidestep the public outcry for his removal ("Timeline: Egypt's revolution," 2011). Having publicly stated on 01 February that he would remain until his current term ended in September, this last ditch effort to control his departure displays that, even then, he still did not fully grasp that he did not have enough public support to stay in power (Kirkpatrick, 2011; "Timeline: Egypt's revolution," 2011). Furthermore, that Mubarak was unable to see that he had also lost the military’s support, which had by then begun to pressure Mubarak to cease allowing Gamal to influence his decision-making, is telling (Hope, 2012). This ineptness, although not necessarily a sign of a lack of intelligence, may have been related to a shallowness derived from a reliance on the projected power of his political office to bark out orders and judgements as, “if transmitted from a High Authority, and thus embodying the Truth” (Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, p. 58).
This is to say that despite an overblown belief in his self-efficacy, the paranoid acknowledges his behavior is not acceptable. In his first speech on 29 January, Mubarak attempted to control the dialogue over his behavior when addressing the audience as equals by saying, “I talk to you in a very critical situation which forces us…” and thereby insinuating he was one of the protesters fed up with the current system (BBC, 2011; Mubarak, 2011). In this way, by framing himself as a regular member of the public, he accepted that his past behavior set him apart from the populace and thereby attempted to redirect the anger at him by presenting himself as someone who shared in the concerns of the protesters. These attempts to reinvent himself as just another Egyptian continued in the second speech where his acceptance of responsibility was only slightly less vague as he began with almost the same language describing, “critical times that are testing Egypt and its people” (Mubarak, 2011). However, while the second speech contained little language acknowledging his behavior as being not acceptable, by the third speech Mubarak admitted that, “mistakes can be made in any political system and in any state” and that those responsible should be held accountable (BBC, 2011).

By vaguely addressing the uprisings that began on the 25th, he was addressing the deaths and violence and thereby indirectly admitting he may have been at least partly responsible for the public anger directed at him ("Timeline: Egypt's revolution," 2011). However, the acknowledgement was only partial as he attempted to find a scapegoat by putting the blame for the violence on the protestors and the ubiquitous ‘other’ as, per Mubarak, “these demonstrations… shouldn’t have happened due to the big gaps of freedom that were given” though, “there's a very little line between freedom and chaos” (CNN, 2011). His denial of responsibility for the violence is further telling in that his solution for the public discontent at this point is to replace his government; but remain in place himself. Perhaps this was an
acknowledgement that the influence of advisors such as his son Gamal had caused him to lose control of his government, or simply an effort to redirect public anger. Whatever the case, by this time this did not matter as there was likely little Mubarak could do to stay in power.

And indeed, a more obvious indicator he feared his methods for achieving his goals were not acceptable was the continued employment of the Emergency Law that had been in place since 1958. Although suspended during the rule of Sadat, Mubarak quickly reinstated this law after Sadat’s assassination and used it to maintain absolute control of the Egyptian security apparatus during his thirty-year rule (Hendriks, 1985, p. 18; Hope, 2012; Sheeran, 2013, pp. 517-518; Sika, 2013, p. 58; Staff, 2012). In short, by leaving the law in place, Mubarak revealed he felt he would need a resource like the law to help overcome obstacles to his pursuit of the grand vision he had for the future of Egypt. In other words, he was mindful and perhaps afraid of challenges to his rule.

This assuredness in a vision is significant in that it allows the individual with PPD to reject culpability for negative effects of his actions on others, as Anagondahalli’s analysis of Mubarak’s use of an evasion of responsibility shows that he attempted to do when justifying his actions by stating they were with good intentions (Anagondahalli, 2013, p. 242). As this grand vision dissolves the paranoid of responsibility for his deviant behavior, it may explain Mubarak’s unwillingness to acknowledge guilt for the grievances of the protestors. In this the paranoid is similar to the narcissist Mirak-Weissbach assessed Mubarak to be and who she claims was “famous for his stubbornness and contrariness”; perhaps due to his confidence in his vision (2012, p. 58).

That Mubarak believed in a vision and felt an assuredness of its success was evident in his speeches and became more pronounced as he continued to respond to demands that he remove
himself from office. In his first speech, this vision was implied and almost used as a defense mechanism from the criticism of the protesters. Indeed, his confidence in his self-efficacy was evident when Mubarak claimed to know the complaints of the protesters as he had watched the demonstrations and ordered government forces to let the people speak; which he says he did, as he stated that he was a champion of the poor and in control of the nation. This confidence in his role in a grand design was further evident when he claimed responsibility, “for the security of this country and the citizens” and to be able to not allow, “things…robbed and stolen and fires set” (CNN, 2011).

By his second speech, Mubarak again acknowledged the country was going through tough times but caveats this by pointing out this was due to the ill intentions of, “those who sought to spread chaos and violence”. He therefore challenged his constituents, “to choose between chaos and stability” and believe in his, “initiative of forming a new government with new priorities and duties that respond to the demand of our youth and their mission” as he was, “determined to finish my work for the nation”. Perhaps in realization that he was no longer in control of Egypt, Mubarak began to offer details on how he would go about this by offering that he had called on parliament to, “discuss amending article 76 and 77 of the constitution concerning…the presidential term” ("Hosni Mubarak's speech: full text," 2011).

However, signs that Mubarak’s paranoia had taken hold and begun to influence his eventual decision to step down were clearer by speech three. Although still working to frame himself as just another member of the public, by 10 February, Mubarak’s words portrayed him as a father figure in a, “dialogue with his sons and daughters.” Having reverted to an authority figure, he swore to, “not relent in harshly punishing those responsible” for the chaos afflicting the nation and to, “set a defined vision to come out of this crisis” with the help of those who were truly,
“concerned about Egypt and its people” (BBC, 2011). He then mentioned specific ways in which he would order relevant government offices to enact these reforms by amending articles of the Egyptian Constitution. This transition from fellow citizen to authority figure through the three speeches highlights Mubarak’s gradual acceptance that he had lost control as he attempted to present the illusion that he was still in charge and should be obeyed after failing to ingratiate himself with the protestors. His final decision to leave therefore publicly displays his final acknowledgement of defeat.

Interestingly, throughout each speech he repeatedly referred to an ubiquitous ‘They’ and, by speech three, also revealed a feeling of being unjustly persecuted for his efforts to carry out his grand vision. That Mubarak had entered a tumultuous psychological state of mind was further evident when he claimed that the, “current moment is not to do…with Hosni Mubarak, but…with Egypt” therefore implying he was the state and affronts to him were therefore affronts to Egypt (BBC, 2011). While this blaming of his woes on an unseen enemy may have been the result of facing a mass movement against him, this seeking out of an external enemy due to a perceived slight was not new however as he had displayed a need to identify enemies who slighted his, and by extension the nation’s, honor before.

One example was of a soccer match in Sudan between Egypt and Algeria where, by one account, as he watched the violent aftermath of the game unfold on television, Mubarak was reported as being ready to send Egyptian Special Forces into Sudan to protect Egyptians reported by news services as being attacked by knife-wielding Algerians (Montague, 2009). Mubarak’s willingness to exact retribution against perceived enemies was revealed when violence in Egypt directed at Algerians, Algerian businesses, and the Algerian Embassy was fanned by media outlets condemning Algeria for the reported hostilities against Egyptians at the soccer game
("Egypt's President Mubarak enters Algeria football row," 2009). This anti-Algerian message was telling because many of the media outlets in Mubarak’s Egypt had connections to the regime and anger at Algerians projected by the media indicated the regime sanctioned the negative coverage as retribution for the reported bad treatment of Egyptian fans at the game. Further indicative of Mubarak using his position as leader of Egypt to strike at perceived enemies and assert his power, following the violence in a televised speech to parliament, Mubarak declared that, “the dignity of Egyptians is part of the dignity of Egypt,” and, “Egypt does not tolerate those who hurt the dignity of its sons” (Al-Awsat, 2009; Topol, 2009). By saying this, Mubarak revealed his self-view as being a personification of the State and belief that affronts to Egypt were affronts to him.

In another example of Mubarak’s violent aggression towards perceived slights, he allegedly ordered the July 2005 terror attacks in Sharm el-Sheikh due to a business dispute between his son Gamal and hotelier Hassain Salim (Dickovick, 2014, pp. 41-42; Musharbash & Windfuhr, 2011; "Toll climbs in Egyptian attacks," 2005). The attacks were reportedly carried out by the militant Abdullah Azzam Brigades of al Qaeda in Egypt and the Levant however, if the allegations were true, they would reveal another indication that Mubarak had a as yet a largely dormant affliction of paranoia waiting to be triggered. Such an order, again if true, would be an example of a narcissistic rage manifesting itself and directed at an identified enemy when Mubarak felt slighted.

Whatever the case, this need of Mubarak to have an enemy to blame for perceived injustices was evident in his three speeches as he continually referred to an ubiquitous enemy which he at times identified as a foreign entity and at other times labeled as terrorists (CNN, 2011). This enemy, whatever it may have been, represented a challenge to Mubarak’s rigid paranoid
worldview as he felt this enemy influenced the uprisings against him and he, being a socially
inept paranoid, could not understand why he had been unjustly persecuted. Indeed, by his third
speech, Mubarak stated that it pained him to see how some of his fellow countrymen treated him
despite his selfless heroic war- and peace-time deeds in the service of the nation (BBC, 2011).

This feeling of victimization was repeated after his ouster in a prerecorded broadcast on al
Arabiya news, on 10 April 2011, where he denied responsibility for any violence during the
uprising and claimed to feel pained from an unjust campaign full of lies against him. Perhaps
coincidentally, this message was broadcast on the same day he and his two sons, Alaa and
Gamal, were to address accusations of having illegal financial activities and of being responsible
for the killing of civilians during the uprisings ("Egypt's Prosecutor Summons Mubarak, Sons for
Investigation," 2011; Mirak-Weissbach, 2012, p. 53). Despite already having fallen from power,
such displays of feelings of victimization revealed that Mubarak, as Hope claimed, maintained a
paranoid state of mind after his fall.

Far from being spontaneous, the paranoia likely began because of challenges to Mubarak’s
worldview. A rigid worldview is a defining characteristic of PPD as incompatible information
challenges the paranoid’s outlook and causes stress that feeds the general mistrust of others; the
need for an external enemy or scapegoat; the feeling of unjust persecution; and ultimately, the
anti-social propensities that may cause the paranoid to be unwilling to participate socially unless
in charge. It should be noted these traits are similar to traits of the narcissist and perhaps help
explain why Mirak-Weissbach assessed Mubarak’s behavior was explainable by diagnosing him
as a narcissist.

This is understandable in that a narcissist and paranoid both have a grand vision that can
make the difference between an effective leader who can unite a people during a time of crisis,
and a bad one who cannot manipulate the environment to his will. In the case of Mubarak however, by conceding to the pressure for him to step down, he revealed that, at that moment during the Arab Spring at least, he had become an ineffective leader. Using Birt’s ‘Dynamic Cycle of Paranoid Reaction’ that was derived from the works of Meissner, to, “simplify the nature of the shifting characteristics by which the paranoid defines his personality” the general moment when Mubarak failed to regain control of the environment and likely realized he had to step down is identifiable (Birt, 1993, pp. 613-614; Meissner, 1986). By analyzing Mubarak’s three speeches and documented actions in response to the protests, the cycle of Mubarak’s reaction from Aggressor/Superior on through is detailed below.

**Aggressor/Superior**

At this stage, the paranoid is in psychological harmony with the environment until the paranoia is triggered by a perceived slight. Birt acknowledges that identifying the trigger is not always easy since the inflated ego of the paranoid can make a perceived threat of any number of negative events. In the case of Mubarak, the emotional trigger was likely the popularly backed uprisings that spread across the region and called for his overthrow. The problem in analyzing Mubarak’s reaction then is that, as Mirak-Weissbach has noted, following the 25 January commencement of the public demonstrations against Mubarak, he was noticeably absent from the public eye. Because of this, it is assumed that the paranoiac process for Mubarak had already been triggered before his first speech was given and that what is observable in those three speeches are his attempts to return to harmony by returning to the Aggressor/Superior state of mind.

For example, in his first speech, approximately four days after the Arab Spring uprisings had begun on the 25th; Mubarak evaded taking responsibility for the turmoil in the streets and
instead put blame on the protesters who he said had crossed the fine line from freedom into chaos. This first speech includes clear messages, from Mubarak to his audience, meant to convey that he was in control of the country and its security apparatus and would hold accountable the enemies who caused the turmoil. This language followed the continua of aggression and narcissism associated with a paranoid’s behavior and revealed that Mubarak, in this speech, was preoccupied with keeping control of his situation and getting even with those he felt had slighted him (Birt, 1993, p. 613).

Victim/Superior

At this stage, the paranoid feels unjustly persecuted as the sacrifices made for the greater good dictate that methods for achieving accomplishments not be questioned. For Mubarak, his methods served to increase Egypt’s prestige on the international stage as it had grown under his watch to be the, “biggest region in its…area” and therefore deserved prestige and to be protected from, “anything that would allow chaos” as no, “democracy would be there if we allow chaos” (CNN, 2011). In short, his argument in this first speech was that his means were justified by the results of expanding Egypt’s glory and his repeated reiteration of this in the second speech was apparent as he declared that history would judge him for his defense of the nation’s sovereignty and interests. However, by the third speech, his descriptions of his war-time sacrifices in the nation’s service served to remind the public that he, Hosni Mubarak, was a patriot and leader who did what needed to be done for the greater good of the nation (BBC, 2011; "Hosni Mubarak's speech: full text," 2011).

References to, “big gaps of freedom that were given” and his assertions that he was working for, “the people and giving freedoms of opinion, as long as you're respecting the law” showed that he felt hurt for the unjustified disrespect he felt from protesters given all that he had done for
the nation (CNN, 2011). It is likely that Mubarak was already experiencing feelings of being unjustly persecuted associated with the Victim/Superior stage when he delivered the first speech.

This feeling was evident by the second speech where Mubarak began to specify why he deserved more respect than was shown from calls for him to step down. After all, he pointed out during this speech, he had, “spent enough years of my life in the service of Egypt and its people” and, even despite the protests against him, intended, “to finish my work for the nation” for its betterment ("Hosni Mubarak's speech: full text," 2011). This defense of his actions was in contrast to his first speech’s general statements that he had, “spent war and peace in this country, very hard times” whereas by the second speech his heroic acts describe him having, “lived and fought for its [Egypt’s] sake and…defended its land, its sovereignty and interests” ("Hosni Mubarak’s speech: full text," 2011).

**Victim/Inferior**

At this stage, the paranoid not only begins to psychologically withdraw inward, but also to introject the negativity of the perceived hostile force and project that hostility back out towards the perceived enemy. Indeed, before Mubarak addressed the nation and the international community in his first speech, he had likely not only experienced the previous two stages mentioned but also progressed through the Victim/Inferior stage and begun to accept his fate. This in turn may have caused him depression and a desire to withdraw from the public eye as observed in his noted public absence before his first speech.

The introjection and subsequent projection of hostility against him was evident in Mubarak’s return to the public arena with his first speech where he accused the protestors of seeking to cause chaos. This was also evident in the evolving language of the subsequent two speeches where he began to become more specific with not only details on how he would address the
protestors’ demands, but also on who was to blame for the turmoil. By the second speech, Mubarak appeared to imply the Brotherhood was the political force responsible for turning the, “noble and civilised [sic]” protests into the chaos of the uprisings for their own ends (BBC, 2011). However, by the third speech, after having accepted his fate and heeded the calls to step down, he also lashed out at those he felt betrayed him by stating that he would not listen to “foreign dictations” (BBC, 2011). What this showed was that, even at this point when Mubarak had accepted his fate, he was still not willing to admit that his behavior had led to his downfall as he still sought a scapegoat to blame for the conspiracy he felt has transpired against him.

**Aggressor/Inferior**

The internalization of hostility from a perceived threat and subsequent projection of that hostility onto an identified enemy shows that Mubarak had progressed through the first three stages of Paranoid Reaction and was unable to progress from the fourth stage of Aggressor/Inferior back to the harmonious first stage by the time he gave his first speech. In truth, it is unlikely he was ever able to progress from the third stage of Victim/Inferior at all given his loss of support from the military and calls from international allies for him to step down. This inability to counterattack perceived enemies and thereby reestablish his superiority by punishing opponents left Mubarak few choices.

As Birt points out, when a paranoid reaches the fourth stage, he is focused on plotting revenge against his enemies in order to reestablish superiority (1993, p. 614). However, Mubarak lost the ability to use Egypt’s modern military to suppress what quickly became violent protests against him. Additionally, he lost Western support to remain in power as evidenced by the US-led calls for him to step down. Contrary to depictions of Mubarak as not being very bright, it is evident that he was very much aware of the situation confronting him and his
inability to manipulate the current environment to his will. It being the case that he could therefore not reassert his control over the country and subsequently return to his harmonious psychological state, he stepped down.

**Conclusion**

For approximately thirty years Mubarak used the might of his regime to stand at the helm of the Egyptian state. Yet in 2011, a series of uprisings inadvertently caused by the self-immolation of a fruit-vendor in neighboring Tunisia forced him out of power. As Post’s and Birt’s previous work has helped explain, having had a paranoiac personality disorder triggered by a mixture of domestic and international pressures culminating in popularly-backed calls for his ouster, Mubarak was unable to return to a psychologically harmonious, “narcissistic and grandiose pseudolife” where he felt in control of his environment (Birt, 1993, p. 614). Thus, facing the mounting revolt focused on him as the visible face of the regime and international calls from allies for him to step down, he did so.

However, neither the story of Egypt nor the regime has ended with Mubarak’s departure. Although the futures of both are the stuffs of other stories, it will undoubtedly be interesting to see how the Egyptian environment will develop and influence the decisions of future Egyptian leaders. In an ironic twist, in the short time since Mubarak’s departure, Egypt has experimented with a system led by the Brotherhood’s Mohammed Morsi; only for it to be replaced by Mubarak-era military official Abdul Fattah al-Sisi (BBC, 2015). Perhaps a lesson for those who observe international relations then is that the fate of an authoritarian figurehead, if not the system, is sealed once entered into Ritter’s Iron Cage.
CHAPTER SIX

“The lesson…is that it's not enough to oust a dictator. What we need when we get rid of a dictator is democracy…unfortunately, we replaced one dictator by another one...” - Shirin Ebadi (2011)

Conclusion

This study has put forth that the closing of Mubarak’s approximate 30-year rule was the result of an onset of PPD that caused him to become stuck in a paranoiac state of mind and ultimately influenced his decision to step down as Head of State of Egypt. Birt’s ‘Dynamic Cycle of Paranoid Reaction’ helps to show that Mubarak was unable to return to a psychologically harmonious mindset by reasserting his feelings of dominance over his environment once stress caused from the uprisings against him heightened his paranoia to where his decision-making became affected. That said, this study has been limited by the lack of access to Mubarak and to those who knew him over the years that can provide anecdotes supporting or disproving the argument that Mubarak displayed paranoiac indicators before his removal from office.

Unsurprisingly however, Mubarak has not left much explanation for his stepping down from power in the face of popular uprisings against him. True to what one can expect from a paranoid, an explanation from Mubarak has been elusive to the public, as he has continued to deny having done anything against the Egyptian society’s interests over the years. Accordingly, this study has had to rely on second hand observations and journalistic accounts to reach the conclusions that have been determined here. However, these conclusions further understandings
of international relations and authoritarian decision-making by tying in pressures on authoritarian systems created from domestic politics influenced by ties to the West.

This in turn has surfaced questions for further research into how these Iron Cages of Liberalism affect authoritarian leadership decision-making in the modern world. Such questions may take any number of directions for future researchers. However, in international relations, some relevant questions may be whether, having seen what happened to Mubarak, will authoritarian leaders be less willing to develop and maintain strong ties to the West, regardless of the incentives involved, if such ties will result in their political demise? As has been seen in the years since the self-immolation of Bouazizi, not only was Mubarak forced from power, but so were other long-time authoritarians Ben Ali in Tunisia and Muammar Muhammad Abu Minyar al-Gaddafi in Libya.

While Ben Ali had had ties with the West for approximately the same length of time as Mubarak, Gaddafi’s ties were only relatively recent, as his previous policies had helped make Libya into an international pariah. This begs the question of whether the lengths of time authoritarian governments engage in relationships with democracies matters or whether just being in such a situation creates the conditions by which authoritarians will lose their power. This question is buttressed by the fact that, despite Ben Ali, Mubarak, and Gaddafi having fallen to the Arab Spring uprisings, other authoritarians such as Syria’s al-Assad who did not have strong ties to the West and instead strengthened relations with competing powers remains in place despite facing similar uprisings and a protracted and violent civil war.

To begin to answer these questions, comparative studies of the various leaders caught in the Arab Spring uprisings could identify similarities in their political systems and societies to determine if international ties influenced which authoritarians stepped down from power and
which did not. To take it one-step further, assessing personality types may help identify whether certain types are more susceptible to environmental pressures. In the end though, Mubarak’s downfall is attributable to a variety of external factors and combinations thereof.

However, it is evident that his personality played a part in influencing his eventual decision to step down from the office he had occupied for over three decades. This is visible in his final three speeches in which he progressively became resigned to his fate as the protests continued. What is also observable is that the possible narcissistic disposition that he displayed over the years, as Mirak-Weissbach has argued, became something more frantic after the uprisings. Traits that had been possibly indicative of narcissism became more pronounced and hinted at a paranoia that overtook Mubarak’s mental ability to overcome the pressures from his environment and outlast the Arab Spring uprisings as he had outlasted other events in his life. It is this paranoia, this study has concluded, that was the deciding factor in Mubarak’s downfall.
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