CHARISMATIC AUTHORITY AND NATION-BUILDING: THE ROLE OF ZULFIQAR ALI BHUTTO AND SHEIKH MUJIBUR RAHMAN IN SHAPING POLITICAL IDENTITIES

Shahla Gull[*1], Ghulam Shabbir[2]

[*1]PhD Scholar/Assistant Lecturer, Department of History & Pakistan Studies, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of History & Pakistan Studies, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan

[*1]shahla.gull@uog.edu.pk, [2]ghulam.shabbir@uog.edu.pk

Abstract
This paper elaborates the contribution of charismatic authority to nation-building and the formation of political identity in South Asia, using Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and Sheikh Mujibur Rahman as a comparative case study. Applying Max Weber's idea of charismatic authority, it argues that the two leaders emerged at a time of institutional crisis, when inherited forms of legitimacy appeared exhausted and mass politics required emotionally resonant forms of representation. In 1971, Bhutto transformed postcolonial dissatisfaction in West Pakistan into a populist discourse of democratic participation, social justice, and national recovery, while Mujib turned grievances over language, representation, and economic marginalization into a moral impetus for self-determination and Bengali statehood. The paper demonstrates that charisma was a shaping force as well as a means of political legitimacy, enabling the two leaders to represent the people in a moment of extreme uncertainty. At the same time, the paper contends that charismatic politics produced a mixed institutional legacy. It revitalized political engagement and national imagination, but it also reinforced populism, political polarization, party personalization, and weak routinization of political power. The comparison reveals that charismatic leadership played a key role in the construction of both post-1971 Pakistan and Bangladesh; however, its long-term ramifications exposed the challenge of converting emotional legitimacy into stable democratic institutions.

INTRODUCTION

The political history of South Asia in the 1960s and 1970s provides an especially rich background for exploring the relationship between charismatic authority and nation-building. The postcolonial states of the region were marked by crises of representation, uneven development, elite domination, regional inequalities, and uncertain constitutional futures. In such conditions, political power tended to rely less on the routine functioning of institutions than on the ability of leaders to embody mass aspirations. The cases of Pakistan and Bangladesh are particularly revealing, since the crisis of one state led to the birth of another. At the center of this drama stood Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, not merely as politicians but as symbolic figures whose voices, bodies, and life

stories became crucial to the making of political community (Weber, 1978).

The comparison is significant because Bhutto and Mujib occupied parallel yet distinct positions in Pakistan's late crisis. Both were shaped by regional histories, elite networks, and the memory of Partition in Bengal and Pakistan more broadly (Chatterji, 2007). Mujib led the Awami League as the defender of East Pakistan's demographic majority and the strongest advocate of Bengali autonomy and, eventually, independence. In West Pakistan, Bhutto emerged as the architect of a populist challenge to military-bureaucratic domination and entrenched elite politics. Both leaders accumulated mass followings through spectacular oratory, symbolic accessibility, and the moralization of their claims to represent the people, yet the political consequences of their charisma diverged. Mujib's leadership led to the creation of Bangladesh, whereas Bhutto's leadership sought to rebuild and stabilize a truncated Pakistan after disintegration (Jahan, 1972).

This article argues that Weber's concept of charismatic authority helps explain both the rise of Bhutto and Mujib and the paradoxical nature of their legacies. Charisma mattered because, in moments of state crisis, legality alone cannot command belief. Yet charisma also generated problems of long-term institutionalization, precisely because it concentrated legitimacy in extraordinary individuals. The same force that enabled people to mobilize, resist, and imagine a different political future also encouraged populism, personality-centered politics, and polarization. The result was a central paradox of postcolonial politics: charisma could be indispensable in establishing political existence, yet unstable as a foundation for durable democratic life (Eisenstadt, 1968).

The discussion proceeds in six sections. The first outlines the Weberian framework and its relevance to postcolonial state formation. The second reconstructs the Pakistani crisis of the late twentieth century that provided the social and political context for charismatic leadership. The third examines Bhutto's populist mobilization and the reconstruction of Pakistani identity. The fourth explores how Mujib transformed Bengali nationalism into national sovereignty. The fifth compares rhetoric, ideology, and state formation in the two cases. The concluding section assesses the institutional implications of charisma, especially in relation to democratization, authoritarian drift, and enduring leader-centered political cultures (Conger, 1993).

Charismatic Authority as a Conceptual Framework

For Weber, charismatic authority rests on the belief that a leader is extraordinary, a person with a mission who is recognized by followers in times of distress, uncertainty, or upheaval. In contrast to traditional authority, which is grounded in inherited custom, and legal-rational authority, which is based on impersonal rules and office, charisma is intensely personal and anti-routine. It does not arise from bureaucratic procedure; rather, it challenges established procedure by claiming access to a higher form of legitimacy grounded in exemplary action, emotional identification, and shared faith (Dow, 1978).

This framework is particularly useful for South Asian political history because postcolonial states often inherited administrative structures without acquiring equally viable political legitimacy. Questions of Muslim political thought and postcolonial identity in both Pakistan and Bengal were closely tied to the search for legitimate authority (Donohue and Esposito, 1982). In communities divided by region, language, class, ethnicity, and unequal development, formal constitutions, civil services, and electoral mechanisms could not by themselves secure consent. Under such circumstances, leaders who dramatized suffering, transformed abstract grievances into compelling narratives, and presented themselves as the moral representatives of the people acquired exceptional significance (Hayat, 2020).

Charisma is not simply a psychological aspect of leadership, but rather is a social relationship that is built upon recognition. This is the reason why rhetoric, symbolism, public performance, and crisis are fundamental in its operation. The believers should have the belief that the leader

possesses an extraordinary mission. When this belief is socialized and thus becomes socially generalized, then charisma may enable radical political change, amalgamate different constituencies, and approve of leaving the conventional institutional practice. Charisma, according to Weber, is revolutionary energy since he reinvests the power of an office in an individual and the methodology in a cause (Tucker, 1968).

But one other issue that Weber stressed was the issue of routinization. A charismatic movement cannot stand in a suspended state of exceptionalism forever in hope of governing it. It has to ultimately deploy the extraordinary legitimacy of the leader into long-lasting institutions, the party organization, law, administration, and mechanisms of succession. This alteration is fundamentally uncertain. When charisma is routinized successfully, it can create institutionalized forms that persist beyond the moment of foundation. Otherwise, political order will hinge on the persistence of centrality of the leader, and it is likely to be factional, coercive, or disintegrate when the charisma of leaders begins to fade (Shils, 1965).

Weber has been rediscovered repeatedly in the academic literature on modern leadership, owing to the continuing success of charismatic politics in both democracies and postcolonial states. The experts have brought out that charisma often borders on populism, particularly where leaders purport to have an unmediated connection with the multitude against the elites, the establishment, or internal adversaries. This intersection is quite pertinent to the case of Bhutto and, in another different register, to the case of Mujib, as both did authenticity and communal fate by doing so in such a way as to displace the process of normal mediation via the established institutions (Eatwell, 2006).

There is an additional dimension of populism literature. Populism has been construed as a thin-centered notion or politics logic, which separates the society based on the pure people and the corrupt elite and demands politics should reveal the general will of the people. As much as the concept was created across different comparative contexts, it assists in describing how charismatic leaders transform disunified grievances into a single moral field. The politics of Bhutto in a special way adhere to this pattern, considering that he was always against ordinary Pakistanis and against privileged oligarchies, military dominance, and inherited ostracism (Canovan, 1981).

Simultaneously, the literature of postcolonial state formation keeps reminding us that nation-building means not just the government but the creative generation of political community. The country is not established by administrative decree. It has to be told as well as personified and well-felt. Leaders are important since most of the times they are the intermediaries between the frustration of the people and collective fate. Charisma is therefore constitutive in situations when the state is weak, contested, or new. This renders Bhutto and Mujib particularly disclosing case studies of studying the theme of political identity in South Asia (Gellner, 1983).

The theory of populism also brings out the line that differentiates institutional representation and affective representation. Populist-charismatic leaders frequently assert that elections, parties, and constitutions serve to lure those who are true to the true people, as the leader alone is aware of what the people will desire. This offers gigantic mobilizing strength and, at the same time, undermines pluralism since the enemies are no longer just competitors but can be branded traitors to the fate of the people. The populist charisma had been embedded in the moral absolutism that would in turn determine the political cultures of both Bhutto and Mujib (Laclau, 2005).

Comparative studies of populism likewise suggest that charismatic leaders are especially successful when they articulate broad chains of equivalence among otherwise separate grievances. Economic deprivation, regional discrimination, cultural insult, and political exclusion can be linked together as symptoms of one unjust order. That is precisely what happened in Pakistan and East Bengal during the late 1960s. Bhutto and Mujib did not merely speak to existing discontent; they reorganized it into collective narratives with

national consequences (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017).

The Late Pakistani Crisis and the Social Space for Charisma

The commonality between Bhutto's and Mujib's emergence was the long-term crisis of being a postcolonial state of Pakistan. Since independence, Pakistan had been facing strains to unite the territorially isolated two wings, the various people speaking different languages, and a political system dominated by elites, derived through civil-military authority. Anglo-Pakistani East Pakistan was still at a disadvantage in terms of representation, allocation of resources, and politics in spite of the ideological focus on Muslim unity. The West Pakistani state elites viewed centralization as a national survival and saw that tactic intensify instead of eliminating the regional contradictions in the country (Alavi, 1972).

These tensions were aggravated during the Ayub Khan rule. Authoritarianism in development generated conspicuous growth in certain instances as well as highlighting social and regional opinions of exclusion (Noman, 1988). On the one hand, it is hailed by some as a time of modernization and developmental zeal; on the other hand, the state tightened its grip over power, narrowed the freedom of democracy, and increased perceptions of inequality. The resistance against Ayub permeated among the students, workers, professionals, and provincial constituencies. The credibility of the technocratic government and the military-bureaucratic state started to fall, and their legitimacy started to suffer. Politics demanded increasingly leaders who could understand how to translate the anti-regime feeling to emotionally appealing popular lingo (Jalal, 1990).

In East Pakistan, the decades of bitterness about language, representation, and economic relations were involved in the experience of the language movement and the repetitive powerlessness. The Awami League led by Mujib changed these complaints into the Six-Point demand of autonomy, which slowly developed into the strongest constitutional threat to centralized Pakistani nationalism. The power of the movement was not just in their constitutional propositions, but it was also in their moral framing: East Pakistanis have been portrayed as the majority, who had been deprived of the rights that the principle of democracy should have provided them (Oldenburg, 1985).

In West Pakistan, the rise of Bhutto in politics took another path but connected with it. He had severed ties with the Ayub regime and had established the Pakistan People's Party on the language of democratic participation, anti-elitism, and social justice. The charm of Bhutto transcended among the students, the working classes, and even parts of the lower middle classes of urban society since he explained economic and political marginalization in dramatic and unforgettable ways. He did not just criticize privilege, but he was able to show himself as the leader capable of reawakening mouth and pride back to those who were not included in the heights of state power (Bhutto, 1967).

The duality of the political crisis in Pakistan was revealed in the 1970 election. The Awami League of Mujib took East Pakistan; the PPP of Bhutto conquered the western wing. The outcomes revealed two ideological idioms of social geography that were based on democratic mandates. The consequent denial or failure of the central regime to hand over power peacefully resulted in electoral polarization sufficient to become a sovereignty crisis. It was no longer about the question of which side was going to rule, but about what political society the state still could plausibly call its own (Sisson and Rose, 1990).

In March 1971, the East Pakistan military crackdown turned that crisis into disaster. The later studies of the issue of genocide and violence in the war given by the scholars have fortified the role of state coercion that exterminated the final remains of central legitimacy in the eastern wing (Debnath, 2011). The state violence, mass displacement, and war turned the self-determination one-sided into a radicalized demand and annihilated the already weak legitimacy of the Pakistani center in the eastern wing. The fact that Mujib was in prison could

only increase his symbolic power, and the role of Bhutto during the crisis is one of the most controversial aspects of the entire political history in Pakistan. What is evident is that 1971 demolished the ideological base of Pakistani cohesion and left a gap of legitimacy in both of the successor political domains (Zaheer, 1994). Theorists of secession and the break of states have demonstrated that such a moment results in strange points of departure of charismatic politics. In the failure of constitutional routine, where violence separates the practices of normal political mediation, authority is once again frequently planned out in symbolic condensation. This is what has happened following 1971. In Bangladesh, the country was envisaged by liberation and sacrifice at the symbol of Mujib. Bhutto was also a person and party that articulated the national recovery and democratic reconstruction in Pakistan. The two projects relied on charisma since both started as the result of institutional collapse (Ahmed & Shabbir, 2014).

Bhutto's Charisma and the Reconstruction of Pakistan

The political charisma of Bhutto was based on language. His retrospective works reveal that he perceived politics as a struggle to defend national honor, betrayal, and the moral meaning of the crisis in Pakistan (Bhutto, 1971). Very few South Asian leaders of his generation could dramatize politics as a moral conflict as much as he had the ability to do so. His orations were a combination of outrage, drama, irony, rebellion, and closeness. He talked like a well-educated internationalist, as well as a man who could sound like he was the real voice of the common Pakistani. This power to combine elite polish with mass emotionality was the key to his attractiveness. It enabled him to sell himself as a modern, radical, and nationally grounded person (Wolpert, 1993).

Bhutto had a talent for synthesizing ideas, and the slogan that was most identifying of the PPP, i.e., the connection of Islam, democracy, socialism, and popular power, was the expression of that talent. He did not contrast religious legitimacy and social transformation but put

them in the same rhetorical context. It was not the strict coherence of doctrine but the wide symbolic inclusiveness. The discourse of Bhutto appeased the conservative sentiment and radicalized the anticipations of redistribution and participation. He made ideology a language of political affiliation applicable to several constituencies simultaneously (Bhutto, 1969).

The populism of Bhutto relied on building up the people as a collection of morally injured. His enemies were landed privilege, industrial oligarchy, bureaucratic dominance, and military authoritarianism. In this regard he was a type of populist as outlined by the comparative theorists: the leader channels institutional frustrations into people-versus-elite opposition and purports to have privileged access to the authentic general will. Bhutto had many followers not because of his policies but because they felt that he represented the desires of people who were long denied the right to be heard (Weyland, 2001).

The 1971 crisis made the charisma of Bhutto even greater. He inherited a state after the disintegration of Pakistan that was traumatized by defeat, the dismemberment of territories, and the overthrow of the military rule under Yahya Khan. In this kind of environment, being a mere office-holder would not be enough. Pakistan needed not only an administration but also a reconstruction that symbolizes it. That was provided by the charisma of Bhutto. He emerged as the non-military leader who was able to turn humiliation into meaning and disorientation into a story of national rebirth (Talbot, 1998).

It was institutional reconstruction in part. It also had geopolitical pressure, and external alignments and security concerns kept on influencing the outlook of the civilian power in Pakistan (Hussain, 1985). The 1973 Constitution is one of the most valuable contributions of Bhutto since it enabled him to transform part of personal legitimacy into common law. The promise of popular sovereignty being restored after decades of authoritarian distortion was the form of parliamentary government, federal compromise, and constitutional settlement. However, the authorship of Bhutto of constitutional politics failed to eradicate the

conflict between personal power and institutional restraint; instead, it shifted the conflict in the new order (Burki, 1980).

Bhutto reshaped the Pakistani nation with the help of economic and social reform rhetoric. Nationalization, inclusion of labor, and redistributive language were to be an indication that post-1971 Pakistan was not going to be a miniature of the old order. It would be a more socially responsible polity where the ordinary citizen was significant. This was an effort to broaden the definition of national identity beyond security and Islamic symbolism to social justice, participatory citizenship, and developmental legitimacy (Waseem, 1994).

The charismatic politics of Bhutto, however, had one major contradiction. The more he made himself a popular sovereign, the less he could bear to think of independent centers of opposition. The opposition parties, provincial critics, and the voices of dissent were not considered legitimate competitors to the people's project, but they were regarded as hindrances to the people's project. Individualization enhanced the mass mobilization and undermined the pluralism habits. Populism comparative scholarship applies in this case: leaders who purport to represent the people often find it difficult to take opposition as an ethical standpoint (Panizza, 2005).

This paradox was tightened at the office. Bhutto was able to be both institution-building and centralizing. He gave back civilian confidence and revitalized the life of parliament, yet he had reduced political space by executive domination, deploying coercion, and mistrust of independent institutions. His charismatic foundation of legitimacy promoted the notion that the country was in need of development and a powerful leader capable of taking decisive action against deep-seated opposition. This kind of reasoning puts institutional checks at the periphery or even as a hindrance (Rizvi, 2000).

Another way in which Bhutto and the military demonstrate the ambiguity of charismatic civilian leadership in Pakistan is the relationship that Bhutto had with the military. He was trying to restrain military independence after 1971 and to renew civilian centrality, though he also needed to make use of centralization and state authority in a manner that did not inherently depersonalize power. It was not the smooth passage between praetorian politics and legal-rational democracy. Rather, Bhutto was a leader of a mixed political order whereby charismatic-populist and coercive state power were still caught in a bad relationship (Shah, 2014).

The wider impact of the charisma of Bhutto was that it rendered the mass politics in Pakistan emotionally irreversible. The register he assisted in creating had to be answered even by his opponents. Anti-elitism, direct appeal to common people, dramatic rhetoric, and personalization of political struggle became the permanent elements of Pakistani political life. That way the charisma of Bhutto lived beyond his regime and even his death. It was incorporated into the grammar in which subsequent politics would still be waged (Talbot, 2009).

The legacy of Bhutto is becoming increasingly observed by scholars as not merely democratic or authoritarian but also constitutively dual. He democratized aspiration by making voices that had been pushed to the periphery of mainstream politics central, but he also promoted a form of politics where party loyalty was the alternative to organizational richness and inner party democracy. This duality is one of the factors that can be used to understand the lasting nature of Bhutto's symbolic power and the frequent instability of an order that he contributed to (Zahoor, 2017).

Mujib's Charisma and the Founding of Bangladesh

Mujib had a constitutive charisma compared to the reconstructive charisma of Bhutto. His politics had a particularly vocal social foundation because of the cultural richness of the Bengali identity and the history of its formation since 1947 (Eaton, 1993). He was a product of a long tradition of Bengali mobilization that encompassed the language movement, provincial grievances, and the struggle over autonomy, but it was his specific accomplishment to make these strands emotionally resonant to an assertion of

nation. He was not only Bangabandhu because he was a party leader but also because people felt that he was the true representative of Bengali oppression, pride, and national fate (Baxter, 1997).

The transformation in this was based on speeches by Mujib. His oratory comprised closeness, ethical urgency, and chronology. He had not only put the grievances of East Pakistan into the context of administrative imbalance; he had raised them to the level of honor, recognition, and democratic justice. By so doing, he brought constitutional conflict into the experience of life. The most well-known one, the speech of 7 March 1971, served not only as a kind of tactical intervention but also as a political world-making. It identified a nation, trained its wounds, and set it psychologically to struggle as sovereigns (Rahman, 1971/2020).

Charismatic authority can also border on legality and rebellion, as evidenced in the 7 March speech. Mujib never declared independence in that speech, but he, in essence, approved disobedience, moral readiness, and parallel legitimacy. He was addressing a political order, which was not yet formally dissolved, but he turned power out of the political order onto the people whose will it had violated. This is charisma in the meaning of Weber: the voice of the leader turns into a source of normative orientation, which is more convincing than the institutional commands' routine (Khan, 1976).

The imprisonment of Mujib during the war only enhanced his symbolic power. Being not on the battlefield but everywhere in the national consciousness, he became unable to be separated from the moral discourse of sacrifice. Leaders who found the organization tend to gain charisma through action, and they can gain it as effectively through pain on behalf of the community. The incarceration of Mujib had made him the party chief in all but that he had become a kind of sacred leader of liberation. The country was not waiting just to have a politician back, but the embodiment of its legitimacy come back (Maniruzzaman, 1975).

His power after independence was unrivaled. This was a turning point in the national crisis to

charismatic consolidation around a founding leader as early commentary described (Feldman, 1975). Bangladesh was born out of war with massive expectations and ruinous material weaknesses. Charisma in that moment carried out critical integrative work. It assisted in bringing a traumatized society together, dignifying sacrifice, and forging symbolic continuity during the liberation struggle and statehood. Mujib provided the new state with a founding story about democracy, linguistic-cultural identity, and anti-subordination. This is because the citizens of Bangladesh could visualize themselves as an independent people since his leadership had already constructed them into political existence (Rashiduzzaman, 1979).

There is one crucial difference between the ideological content of the charisma of Mujib as compared to Bhutto: Mujib, in his own memoirs, is also shown as having been shaped by imprisonment, organization, and regional struggle in the way that he understood the future of the Bengali political destiny (Rahman, 2012). It was not just a culture; language and majority rule became principles of political justice. The project by Mujib overturned the previous reasoning of Pakistani nationalism. What was considered a local peculiarity was transformed into a universal foundation of a new national demand. Bengali identity ceased to be an internal difference that could be dealt with; it was the content of sovereign peoplehood (Islam, 1985).

Simultaneously, the founding moment revealed the weaknesses of charisma. Bangladesh experienced war devastation, food insecurity, institutional shortages, and colossal administrative problems. Charismatic legitimacy might establish solidarity, yet it might not necessarily establish bureaucratic effectiveness, distributive fairness, or stable party competition. The shift between liberation and rule consequently subjected the power of Mujib to a massive strain. The father of the nation was symbolic and had to preside over a ruined state whose abilities were spaced much below the expectations of people (van Schendel, 2009).

This strain can be used to explain why post-independent Bangladesh was on a path to greater

centralization. Reading Mujib in hindsight, his writings in prison also highlight the discrepancy between liberationist desire and the weight of ruling a weak state (Rahman, 2017). The more criticism was directed at the company and the greater the governance issues became, the more tempting it was to have the founder concentrate his power. The supposition that unity had to be the unquestioned leadership of Mujib was the traditional challenge of routinizing charisma. A leader who seems to be too vital to life in the nation can easily be interpreted to mean that he/she is too valuable to be limited to normal competition. However, this solution worsens the predicament by undermining the pluralist institutions that are required to achieve long-term stability (Riaz, 2016).

The politics of memory have made the charisma of Mujib persist even after his death. In Bangladesh, the national history debates regularly turn out to be debates over the role of Mujib in the national history. This is characteristic of charismatic foundational personalities: they do not fade into constitutional memory on their own but instead still serve to delimit symbolically the legitimate politics. Competitors act to either inherit, redefine, or undermine the charisma of the founder, since national legitimacy is still in some way associated with the ownership of historical narrative (Mahmud, 2022).

The recent research on the dynastic and memory politics in South Asia supports this fact. The heritages of charismatic founders are resources in subsequent battles concerning partisan identity, moral authority, and political succession. The appeal to Mujib in Bangladesh is never simply commemorative; it is part of the assertions of who is the most authentic representative of the nation. In this meaning, charisma remains as a symbolic capital that is inherited even after the leader has passed away (Das, 2023).

Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Making of Political Identities

In a head-to-head comparison between Bhutto and Mujib, it is possible to note that the two leaders transformed the field of politics rhetoric into an identity-forming technology. They were not merely communicating programs; they were performing political belonging. They used oratory, symbolic gestures, and emotionally charged narrative to make their followers feel that history had gotten a voice. This is the reason why speeches and slogans are very important in both instances. They reduced huge structural changes into easy-to-remember moral plays about humanity, deceit, and fate (Brecher, 2016).

The rhetoric of Bhutto was synthetic. He attempted to reconcile Islam, democracy, and socialism to increase the emotional and ideological scope of his movement. The rhetoric of Mujib was cumulative and foundational. He combined language, majority rule, cultural pride, and economic justice into one demand on national self-determination. In case Bhutto attempted to expand the social meaning of Pakistan in the wake of rupture, Mujib attempted to rationalize rupture as the only morally acceptable consequence of years of denial (Qureshi, 1972).

The political identities that they created were thus the same in form and different in content. The people in both situations turned into a morally privileged category. The people of Bhutto were, however, a wide populist collectivity that had been hurt by the domination of elites in Pakistan, and the people of Mujib were a national collectivity that had not been given sovereign recognition in Pakistan. The animosity of Bhutto was vertical towards ruling elites; Mujib was both vertical and territorial towards a state structure that was felt to overpower even though formally shared (Devji, 2013).

This difference had an influence on the role of ideology. The Islamic socialism of Bhutto was a language of inclusion and redemption, particularly following the downfall of the older Pakistani myths. The nationalism of Mujib was a political birth language: Bengali. One set out to recreate citizenship in a state that already existed; the other to build a state that was sufficient to a people already mobilized. However, both of them relied on the capability of the leader to transform diffuse frustrations into the consistent identity discourse (Syed, 1963).

The effectiveness of such stories cannot be underrated. Institutions do not hold nations together, but they need stories within which people can place themselves. Bhutto and Mujib both provided them at the time when inherited ones failed. Bhutto informed Pakistanis that the state must not be defeated and disintegrated at the expense of national purpose. Mujib informed Bengalis that years of disgrace could be changed into independent pride. The emotional power of those stories was provided by charisma since it enabled followers to perceive the leader as living evidence of collective possibility (Arendt, 1962).

Charisma and State Formation in Postcolonial Contexts

A lack of institutionalization in relation to political legitimacy tends to be a common phenomenon within the postcolonial state. Colonial bureaucracies have a higher likelihood of surviving a shift of power than a common national agreement. The issue in divided societies is even more intense: territory and the administration may be controlled by the state, which does not necessarily imply similar degrees of emotional loyalty from regions and groups. The emergence of charismatic leaders in such spaces is often a result of promising that there is a bridge to be made between the structure of the state and the collective meaning (Jalal, 1995).

This was a deep gap in Pakistan prior to 1971. The state purported to be a symbol of Muslim unity, but most East Pakistanis found it remote, inequitable, and oppressive. The issue continued in, however, modified versions after 1971: Pakistan needed new discourses to define itself, and Bangladesh needed institutions corresponding to the national community that the war had created. These supplementary transitions were held by Bhutto and Mujib. One needed to establish legitimacy in a weakened state; the other, create state capacity in a newly independent people (Noman, 1988).

The postcolonial studies of power reveal that a weak state and social disunity tend to overpower the requirement of individual leadership. Where the institutions are not trusted, citizens seek embodying assurances of national end. However,

this remedy is not stable, as it postpones the process of formation of impersonal political routines. The greater the concentration of legitimacy in any leader, the more difficult it is to convince citizens that offices, procedures, and organizations should be obeyed other than the individual (Malik, 1997).

Bhutto and Mujib thus represent a more significant postcolonial predicament. Their charisma did not just happen to nation-building, but it was part of the process by which political communities were brought together. But even the success of their own power made the rise of independent institutions more difficult. Comparable ministries, parties, and legislatures tended to be reliant on their closeness to the head and not internalized procedural principles. That is why charismatic state building may also mobilize citizenship and, at the same time, worsen institutional maturity (Kohli, 2004).

There is also a time aspect of the problem. Leadership that is decisive may seem to be vital in a revolutionary or post-breakdown situation. However, subsequently, there is an obstruction to adaptation, criticism, and succession by the same concentration of symbolic power. The centrality of the founder cannot be easily normalized and makes political life hard. Both Pakistan and Bangladesh demonstrate that the process of transforming the charismatic exception into the institutional routine can be postponed, disputed, or achieved only partially (Brown, 2014).

Institutional Consequences: Democracy, Authoritarian Drift, and Polarization

Among the most compelling points in support of charismatic leadership is the fact that it is democratizing participation as it is able to bring hitherto sidelined groups into the political scene. This was certainly the case with both Bhutto and Mujib. Every aggrieved constituency whose grievance had long been down-stepped or down-centered administratively. These constituencies opened up the social space of politics and transformed the question of who was a legitimate speaker in the country by providing them with a powerful political language. The manipulative

element of charisma was only in that regard; it had an incorporative aspect to it (Burki, 1974). Meanwhile, charisma may destroy the procedural ethics of democratic consolidation. As soon as the leader becomes the anointed decoder of the will of the people, an electoral and institutional contestation is soon seen as a minor consideration. Parliamentary disagreement, federal bargaining, and judicial restraint can then be discussed as obstacles to national purpose as opposed to being a constituent part of democratic life. This tendency is observed in both Bhutto's Pakistan and Mujib's Bangladesh but under different pressures of history (Schmitter, 1974).

The authoritarian temptation is even partially in-built in charismatic legitimacy. Since the leader is perceived as an historical necessity, power concentration may be explained by emergency, patriotic training, or anti-sabotage. This does not imply that charismatic leaders will automatically be dictators. It implies that the ethical intensity of charisma is easily shifted to executive aggrandizement unless opposed by powerful institutions and a culture of opposition legitimacy (O'Donnell, 1973).

This dynamic also leads to political polarization. Comparative analysis of the military intervention in Pakistan and Bangladesh indicates that polarized politics of the civilian world had time and again created new space for extra-democratic arbiters (Mishra, 1981). Charismatic politics promotes moral division since the individuals are characterized with reference to an obstructive, corrupt, or foreign opponent. The case of Bhutto, anti-elitism with a class aspect, enhanced hostility with those in authority and, subsequently, with political opponents. The situation with liberation legitimacy was that in the case of Mujib, the opposition was subject to the accusations of betrayal of the national cause. These trends eventually led to political cultures where conflict often took an existential and not a procedural form (Shamshad, 2025).

There were organizational implications of such polarization. Party identity was brought to a deep level of personalization, and the succession was more and more dependent on memory, lineage, or symbolic inheritance instead of internal ideological renewal. Subsequent South Asian research on dynastic politics can be useful in this regard since it demonstrates how charisma is internalized in families, martyrdom discourses, and practices of commemoration. The symbolic afterlife of the leader may be used to maintain the loyalty of the party but may also prevent the democratic process in institutions inside the party (Das, 2023).

The conflict between democratic opening and personalization of the organization is evident in the two cases. The PPP mass base provided by Bhutto politics changed the Pakistani politics of rivalry, but the party was still heavily reliant on Bhutto's name and legacy. The memory of Mujib also became inseparable from the founding narrative in Bangladesh, and politics became somewhat a contest of who could truly inherit the legacy of liberation. Charisma, therefore, in both states, resolved one of the issues of legitimacy and created another (Waseem, 2006).

Comparative Discussion: Similarities and Divergences

There are many similarities that can be seen between Bhutto and Mujib. Both came into power on systemic crisis as opposed to institutional normalcy. Both represented translated structural grievances in a powerful language of moral community. They both employed oratory to romanticize politics as a fight over honor and group destiny. Both gained power not only by virtue of election control in an office but also because they had followers who thought they were, in a historical sense, chosen to carry out a mission. The common aspects and traits warrant the treatment of these aspects in a general Weberian paradigm (Taggart, 2000).

But the differences, too, are not less important. Mujib was the majority of the people of a territorial enclave deprived of sovereign status in the then-nascent state of Pakistan, but Bhutto was an umbrella coalition of masses in the persisting west of the country. The charisma of Mujib was constitutive to national birth; Bhutto, after national trauma, was reconstructive. And the ideological focus of Mujib was Bengali

nationalism, and the populism of Bhutto was Islamic-socialist. These variations did not just influence their rhetoric but the institutions they ruled in (Baxter, 1997).

There is one more divergence in relationships between charisma and state capacity. Mujib ruled an independent nation that was crippled with war that had left the transfer of symbolic power to administrative control extremely hard. Bhutto became an heir to a weakened yet working state apparatus. This implied that Mujib was more directly challenged with the task of creating a state, whereas Bhutto was tasked with a mission of re-legitimizing and reorienting a state. The routinization issues they encountered were hence comparable and not equal (Rashiduzzaman, 1979).

Their differences in the international context of their legitimacy were also important. The debates on early development in Bangladesh, in turn, soon related issues of distributive justice, reconstruction, and developmental priorities with the issues of nationhood (Bhattacharya, 2014). The formation of Bangladesh was through war, migration of refugees, intervention of the Indian military, ceremonies, and attention of the world's humanitarian bodies. Post-1971 Pakistan continued to live in the maze of Cold War reasoning, Islamic politics, and the politics of national survival following defeat. Their various external environments dictated the applications and demands of charismatic authority, although the domestic mass politics were the key concern in both scenarios (Sisson and Rose, 1990).

However, the general inference it brings about is that both projects of political identity used charisma as the necessary element. Bhutto made Pakistan have a language of post-separation recovery that connected dignity to partaking and social justice (Ludden, 2011). Mujib provided liberation language to Bangladesh, which attributed nationhood to cultural acknowledgement, democracy, and sacrifice (Jalal, 2014). And without charisma, such stories would have probably been feebler, more labored, and less emotionally attaching. They became transformative politically and volatile institutionally with charisma (van Schendel, 2009).

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and Sheikh Mujibur Rahman reveals that charismatic power played the main role of nation-building as well as the formation of the political identity in the South Asian region in the times when Pakistan fell and Bangladesh appeared. The concept of Weber is very useful since it makes it clear that it focuses on the issues of crisis, social recognition, individual mission, and an uneasy relationship between extraordinary leadership and routines. Bhutto and Mujib emerged as leaders who took authority when inherited systems of legitimacy became doubtful and both were able to make their followers believe that each one of them was unique in representing the future of the people

The charisma of Bhutto assisted in rebuilding Pakistan after the year 1971 by transforming the state of humiliation into a democratic renewal agenda, constitutional compromise, and populism on the agenda. Mujib was charismatic, and this gave birth to Bangladesh as he turned the grievance of the Bengali people into the memory of sovereign nations and liberation. All leaders thus portray the constitutive force of charisma within postcolonial politics: it can empower a multitude, give legitimacy to radical transformation, and place people in their narration.

Meanwhile, the article has also stated that charisma has left behind a problematic institutional legacy. Since legitimacy was overly vested in the leader, parties and state institutions could not find it easy to separate themselves with personal power. The charismatic mode of political construction not only did not produce such by-products as populism, polarization, dynastic transmission, or organizational weakness, but rather was a recurrent source of such by-products. Charisma performers succeeded emotionally in both Pakistan and Bangladesh more than the administrators did with routinization.

The greater lesson is not that charisma must be rejected as irrational in all its forms, in all its non-democratic forms. The problem of memory, violence, and reconstruction becoming an inseparable ingredient of leadership symbolism remains to be proved many times by the historical narrative of liberation and the assembling of states in Bangladesh and Pakistan (Partha, 2011). It may play invaluable democratic roles in the exaltation of speech and recognition and awarding moral status to people marginalized through bureaucratic or elite domination, especially in conditions of exclusion and obliteration. However, unless charisma is later internalized in the constitutional restraint, partisan institutionalization, and a pluralist civic culture, there is danger of party institutionalization of the political society becoming the externalization of personal power. They cannot be discussed without Bhutto and Mujib, who both envisioned, rallied, and changed modern Pakistan and Bangladesh, and it explains why two states still struggled with the political afterlife of visionary leaders.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, I., & Shabbir, J. (2014). The changing face of Pakistan's economic relations with India and Bangladesh: Prospects and challenges. *The Round Table, 103*(3), 311–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/00358533.2014.918728

Alavi, H. (1972). The state in post-colonial societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh. *New Left Review, 74*, 59–81.

Arendt, H. (1962). *On Revolution*. New York: Viking Press.

Baxter, C. (1997). *Bangladesh: from a Nation to a State*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bhattacharya, D. (2014). Bangladesh's development surprises: Achievements and policy priorities. In *The Bangladesh Paradox*. Dhaka: University Press Limited.

Bhutto, Z. A. (1967). *The Pakistan People's Party: Its ideology and programme*. Lahore: Pakistan People's Party.

Bhutto, Z. A. (1969). *The Myth of Independence*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Bhutto, Z. A. (1971). *The Great Tragedy*. Karachi: Vision Books.

Bhutto, Z. A. (1978). *If I Am Assassinated*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

Brecher, M. (2016). *Political Leadership and Charisma*. Cham: Springer.

Brown, A. (2014). *The Myth of the Strong Leader: Political Leadership in the Modern Age*. New York: Basic Books.

Burki, S. J. (1974). Politics of economic decision-making during the Bhutto years. *Asian Survey, 14*(9), 779–791.

Burki, S. J. (1980). *Pakistan under Bhutto, 1971–1977*. London: Macmillan.

Canovan, M. (1981). *Populism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Chatterji, J. (2007). *The Spoils of Partition: Bengal and India, 1947–19671947–1967*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conger, J. A. (1993). Max Weber's Conceptualization of Charismatic Authority: Its Influence on Organizational Research. *The Leadership Quarterly, 4*(3–4), 277–288. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(93)90035-R

Das, R. (2023). Dynastic dilemma in South Asia: Influence, networks and democratic decline. *Contemporary South Asia, 31*(3), 361–377. https://doi.org/10.1080/09584935.2023.2227591

Debnath, A. (2011). The 1971 genocide: An examination of Pakistani atrocities in East Pakistan. *Journal of Genocide Research, 13*(4), 421–447.

Devji, F. (2013). *Muslim Zion: Pakistan as a Political Idea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Donohue, J. J., & Esposito, J. L. (Eds.). (1982). *Islam in Transition: Muslim Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dow, T. E. (1978). An analysis of Weber's work on charisma. *The British Journal of Sociology, 29*(1), 83–93.

Eaton, R. M. (1993). *The Rise of Islam and the Bengal Frontier, 1204–17601204–1760*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1968). *Max Weber: on Charisma and Institution Building*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Eatwell, R. (2006). The concept and theory of charismatic leadership. *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions, 7*(2), 141–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/1469076060064 2156

Feldman, S. (1975). From crisis to charisma: Bangladesh after independence. *Pacific Affairs, 48*(1), 5–22.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Haq, M. (1989). The tragedy of Bangladesh and the role of leadership. *South Asian Studies, 4*(1), 45-63.

Hayat, S. (2020). Max Weber's concept of charisma and charismatic leadership reconsidered. *Pakistan Journal of Historical and Cultural Studies, 41*(1), 1–18.

Hossain, A. A. (1988). *History and Culture of Bangladesh*. Dhaka: University Press Limited.

Hussain, A. (1985). *Delusions of Grandeur: the United States and Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Islam, S. S. (1985). *The Bangladesh Liberation Movement: Growth of Nationalism and Crisis of State*. Dhaka: University Press Limited.

Jahan, R. (1972). *Pakistan: Failure in National Integration*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jalal, A. (1990). *The State of Martial Rule: the Origins of Pakistan's Political Economy of Defence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jalal, A. (1995). *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia: a Comparative and Historical Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jalal, A. (2014). *The Struggle for Pakistan: a Muslim Homeland and Global Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Khan, Z. R. (1976). Leadership, parties and politics in Bangladesh. *The Western Political Quarterly, 29*(1), 102–125. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912976029 00108

Kohli, A. (2004). *State-Directed Development: Political Power and Industrialization in the Global Periphery*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laclau, E. (2005). *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso.

Ludden, D. (2011). The politics of independence in Bangladesh. *Economic and Political Weekly, 46*(35), 79–85.

Mahmud, J. (2022). Political memory and the making of Bangabandhu in contemporary Bangladesh. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies, 45*(6), 1184–1201.

Malik, H. (1997). *State and Civil Society in Pakistan: Politics of Authority, Ideology, and Ethnicity*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Maniruzzaman, T. (1975). Bangladesh: An unfinished revolution? *The Journal of Asian Studies, 34*(4), 891–908.

Mascarenhas, A. (1986). *Bangladesh: a Legacy of Blood*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Mishra, J. (1981). Military regimes in Bangladesh and Pakistan. *Journal of Asian and African Studies, 16*(3–4), 220–238.

Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). *Populism: a Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Noman, O. (1988). *Pakistan: Political and Economic History Since 1947*. London: Kegan Paul International.

O'Donnell, G. (1973). *Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, University of California.

Oldenburg, P. (1985). A place insufficiently imagined: Language, belief, and the Pakistan crisis of 1971. *Journal of Asian Studies, 44*(4), 711–733. https://doi.org/10.2307/2056443

Panizza, F. (Ed.). (2005). *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy*. London: Verso.

Partha, C. (2011). *The Bangladesh Liberation War: Memory, Meaning, and Nationhood*. London: Routledge.

Qureshi, S. M. M. (1972). Pakistani nationalism reconsidered. *Pacific Affairs, 45*(4), 565–580.

Rahman, S. M. (2020). *The Historic 77 March Speech of Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman*. Dhaka: Government of Bangladesh. (Original speech delivered 1971)

Rahman, S. M. (2012). *The Unfinished Memoirs*. Dhaka: University Press Limited.

Rahman, S. M. (2017). *The Prison Diaries*. Dhaka: Bangla Academy.

Rashiduzzaman, M. (1979). The political evolution of Bangladesh. *Asian Survey, 19*(11), 1025–1041.

Riaz, A. (2016). *Bangladesh: a Political History Since Independence*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Rizvi, H. A. (2000). *The Military and Politics in Pakistan: 1947–1997*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications.

Schimmel, A. (1980). *Islam in the Indian Subcontinent*. Leiden: Brill.

Schmitter, P. C. (1974). Still the century of corporatism? *The Review of Politics, 36*(1), 85–131.

Shah, A. (2014). *The Army and Democracy: Military Politics in Pakistan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shamshad, H. (2025). From populism to political polarization: Bhutto's role in shaping modern Pakistani politics. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL, 8*(3), 1–14.

Shils, E. (1965). Charisma, order, and status. *American Sociological Review, 30*(2), 199–213.

Siddiqi, D. M. (2010). Political culture in Bangladesh. In R. Sisson & L. E. Rose (Eds.), *War and secession: Pakistan, India, and the creation of Bangladesh*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sisson, R., & Rose, L. E. (1990). *War and Secession: Pakistan, India, and the Creation of Bangladesh*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Syed, A. H. (1963). *Pakistan: Islam, Politics, and National Solidarity*. New York: Praeger.

Taggart, P. (2000). *Populism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Talbot, I. (1998). *Pakistan: a Modern History*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Talbot, I. (2009). *Pakistan: a New History*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Tucker, R. C. (1968). The theory of charismatic leadership. *Daedalus, 97*(3), 731–756.

van Schendel, W. (2009). *A History of Bangladesh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waseem, M. (1994). *Politics and the State in Pakistan*. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.

Waseem, M. (2006). *Democratization in Pakistan: a Study of the 2002 Elections*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a contested concept: Populism in the study of Latin American politics. *Comparative Politics, 34*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.2307/422412

Wolpert, S. (1993). *Zulfi Bhutto of Pakistan: His Life and Times*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Zaheer, H. (1994). *The Separation of East Pakistan: the Rise and Realization of Bengali Muslim Nationalism*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Zahoor, M. A. (2017). Zulfikar Ali Bhutto: Political behaviour and ouster from power. *Journal of the Punjab University Historical Society, 30*(2), 117–130.