

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317658970>

Historical Analysis of Successive Governments in Pakistan: A History of First Six Decades, 1947–2007

Article · January 2017

CITATIONS

0

READS

14,524

2 authors, including:



Umbreen Javaid

University of the Punjab

89 PUBLICATIONS 241 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Project

Aoa, i need this article for my research Study, Thanks [View project](#)

Historical Analysis of Successive Governments in Pakistan: A History of First Six Decades, 1947-2007

Umbreen Javaid*

Amir Latif**

Abstract

Pakistan is widely being portrayed a weak democratic state as elected governments were unnecessarily broken frequently. Violence in the recent years has given more strength to the negative perception of Pakistan as a polity not conducive for democratic institutions, this was doubled with the risk of military coup, which overshadowed the encouraging trends, like the maturing of Pakistani democracy, as demonstrated in parliament's adoption of far-reaching constitutional reforms. It is also evident that international community, at least indirectly if not directly, is the responsible for the lack of democracy and peace in Pakistan. Western powers, particularly, supported military government to promote their ideal of stability under misperceptions or for safeguarding of their own interests.

Introduction

As matter of fact history of Pakistan is full of ups and downs in the political and developmental scenario. Since its birth Pakistan has faced a self-centered and self-beneficial group of leaders who were all over the history of Pakistan and predominantly achieved their desired goals. In pursuit of these political games, leaders gained power and state became weaker gradually. One can say that history of democracy in Pakistan is also history of breaking democratic institutions and history of new hope after every failure. During the government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (1971-1977) and the second government of Nawaz Sharif (1997-1999), Pakistan experienced relatively strong – though temporary – civilian control of the military. Both cases support the hypothesis that periods of greater civilian control have been associated with a single locus of civilian political authority, a strong popular support with limited threat to military interests. While, governments of Benazir Bhutto (1993-1996) and of Nawaz Sharif (1990-1993) exercised moderate civilian control over Pakistan and both these regimes can also be characterized as moderate levels of political division, popular support, and threat to military core interests.

Historically soon after independence there was an absence of leadership, as nation's father, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah (first Governor General of the Pakistan), passed away only one year after the creation of country and his comrade

Khan Liaquat Ali Khan (1st Prime Minister), was murdered in 1951. About the rest, the Quaid had said that “I had false coins in my pocket. Consequently, several ministers in the cabinet were not elected politicians. Similarly, in the history members of the cabinet remained those people who did not have seat in the constitute assembly. “The cabinet and other high political appointments [held by bureaucrats] reflected lack of talent among the political leaders”(Yusuf, 1999). Some observers explain that democratic failure of Pakistan is the result of powerful traditional forces that are highly resistant to change and divide the blame game equally among the generals, civilian politicians, religious leaders, and feudal lords. Undoubtedly, Pakistan’s politics are complex. Mistakes by several institutions and individuals have resulted in the breakdown of each of Pakistan’s experiments with democracy. But if there is a common thread running through all the history, is the army’s perception of itself as the country’s only viable institution and its deep-rooted suspicion of civilian political processes.

Historical Analysis of Political Governments

Pakistan came into being as a delicate nation state, as many other third world countries. There was a vast gap of ideological and ethnical differences and made administration very difficult to handle. Pakistan movement which was headed by Quaid-e-Azam also single handedly tackled by him supported by his determination, hard work, sense of purpose and faith in democratic norms, and this was the main attributes of his leadership. First year of independence can be said as heavy dependence of his charismatic leadership, prestige and command and supreme acceptance, which lasted till his death on September 11, 1948, leaving behind a leadership vacuum. Second to him was Khan Liaquat Ali Khan, Quaid’s comrade and first prime minister of the country which had same qualities and vision but less acceptance in all across the country. He tried to strengthen the parliamentary system which resulted in military invasion in Pakistan and his tenure was cut short by an assassin’s bullet in October 16, 1951. With his death, the vision of parliamentary democracy deteriorated badly. The civil bureaucracy did not take long to convert the office of Governor-General into an instrument of bureaucratic intervention. Liaquat Ali Khan’s failure to make an acceptable constitution proved to be a setback to political stability. Insufficient time to establish institutions was one of the reasons for these leaders. Comparing tenures of the founding leaders of India and Pakistan, it is quite clear that Nehru lived till 1964, whereas Quaid-i-Azam died just after one year – that creating a void in the leadership of the country (Hassan, 2011).

According to Khalid Bin Sayyed (Sayyed, 1959), it is not true that there is shortage of strong leaders in Pakistan, rather there are too many but they remained strong for each one of them. The thing which is lacked is the loyalty and sincerity towards the country as well as their parties. Pakistan remained a state of nature as described by T. Hobbes, in which every group fight to the other group. There is an endless and

ruthless struggle for power gain. These leaders were self centered and selfish in nature and only can see the provincial or group benefits and not of the nation.

Syed Muhammad Zulqarnain Zaidi (2010) in his article *The Assassination of the Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan: The Fateful Journey*, endorsed the facts of the relations among Liaquat Ali Khan, Mushtaq Ahmed Gurmani, Khawaja Nazimuddin and Ghulam Muhammad and narrated the episode of assassination of Prime Minister and designing of new governor general and new prime minister under the heading of *The Birth of New Regime on the Night of 16 October, 1951 at Rawalpindi*. He further goes on by saying that the murder of Prime Minister detracts democracy structure and damaged the state of Pakistan. This shooting at Liaquat Ali facilitated the army to take serious part in the country's politics. This proved to be the turning point of the civil-military nexus and plunged country into darkness and wilderness of oligarchic misrule. These were the same reasons behind when many years later another Prime Minister Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto too was judicially murdered by the same monster, which was born on October 16, 1951 on the night of Liaquat Ali Khan's assassination conspiracy (Zaidi, 2010).

He further elaborated that Gurmani had already sketch in his mind. Ruling elites were present in a big room. Gurmani requested Nazimuddin for privacy and took him to another room and said, "The country is passing through grave political crisis because the Prime Minister has been assassinated. We must have a government immediately. You must leave Governor Generalship and take on premiership. Since you are Governor General, holding the highest post, nobody will object you if you become Prime Minister. Thirdly, you belong to the biggest province. The people over there will have no objection too". Khawaja Nazimuddin expressed his inability to carry the heavy burden and refused three times to become the Prime Minister. Gurmani pleaded him whether he liked it or not in any case he will have to accept the responsibility. Finally Nazimuddin accepted. Then Gurmani asked, "When you have vacated the seat of Governor General and you became the Prime Minister, somebody should be there to fill in your place", he said, "Yes, of course". "Then I propose the name of Ghulam Muhammad". Khawaja Sahib said, "It is alright." After closing this discussion both came out and went into the room where the others were sitting. Gurmani announced the settlement and they all agreed to it, though it was a bizarre decision. Before Liaquat Ali Khan had been buried, a new regime had taken birth.

First Phase: Manipulation with Democracy (1947-1958)

Dividing in segments, first segment of the history of Pakistan's politics is from 1947-1958. During this period according to Namanua Kiran (Kiran, 2012) Eastern wing was very suspicious regarding their due share and representation in government. Three cabinets of single party were made during the years of 1947-1954. First cabinet was made by Quaid-e-Azam under the leadership of Khan Liaquat Ali Khan, with three members from Bengal, four from Punjab, one each

from Sindh and N.W.F.P. This was the balanced cabinet according to status of the members and their portfolios. Later, two more members each from Bengal and Punjab and one from N.W.F.P. were also included. She further elaborates that this same cabinet continued under the second Prime Minister Khawaja Nazimuddin during 1951-53. During this era language controversy was on its peak and also there is law and order situation worsened in Punjab due to the Ahmadi controversy. But his period was cut short by then Governor General Ghulam Muhammad and removed him from his office in April 1953. Situation is very critical as the six out of thirteen members of Nazimuddin's Cabinet, majority belong to western wing, showed their eagerness to work in the new Cabinet, which shows their concern about their self than democracy (Kiran, 2012).

Then came the premiership of Muhammad Ali Bogra who was an ambassador in USA and the cabinet was selected by Ghulam Muhammad, including six members of the former cabinet. It is worthy to mention here that out of ten ministers only one member was from the eastern wing. This Cabinet (which includes, M.A. Isphahani, Maj. Gen Iskandar Mirza, Ayub Khan, Dr. Khan Sahib, Hussein Shaheed Suhrawardy and Choudhury Muhammad Ali etc.) was dismissed on 24 October, 1954 with the dissolution of first Legislative Assembly.

One of the major incidents in this tenure is on October 7, 1953, Muhammad Ali Bogra announced his famous formula in the Constituent Assembly, by which seats in the National Assembly will to be allocated on the basis of population while Senate will be the symbol of equal representation from all the five units. While to combine, each wings would have equal representation. This formula was appreciated by a wide section of people from both wings, but the Punjabi members, rejected it. Their understanding was that unless West Pakistan was made into a unitary structure, Bengalis, in alliance with Sind and the North-West Frontier Province, would dominate the Central Government (Soomro, 2006).

Second constituent assembly of Pakistan was elected after holding indirect elections in 1955. After this election earlier party position in the house was totally changed as Muslim League lost its majority and Awami League, united Front and other minor groups got seats in the assembly. Now, it was impossible for any single party to form government, hence, coalition government was made. During this, Governor General Ghulam Muhammad was sent on two months leave, permanently retired and Sikandar Mirza, already working as honorary Governor General, was confirmed as Governor General. Name of Suhrawardy was also suggested for new Governor General in the Cabinet meeting with Sikandar Mirza. While in the voting, there was tie and the deciding vote was of Ayub Khan in favour of Sikandar Mirza (Kiran, 2012).

She further elaborates that during this phase four coalition governments were made.

1. First was of Muslim League including United Front under the premiership of Ch. Muhammad Ali with five and four members in cabinet respectively. This was the first instance that both the wings were given equal participation in the government.
2. Ch. Muhammad Ali resigned in 1956 and new government was formed under the Huseyn Shaheed Suhrawardy who was an eastern wing national leader, this government showed political maturity and proved better performance. This government was ended in October 1957.
3. Next government was formed with the coalition of four different political parties under the premiership of Ibrahim Ismail Chundrigar. This government was also broken due to huge differences among coalitional partners and the tenure of government was cut short as small as two months only.
4. Tragedy continues as the fourth government was formed by Republican Party in coalition with minor other parties under the Sir Feroz Khan Noon. This government tried to continue the save the system. Awami League act as supporter to this government and did not took part in seat for cabinet as compromise could not done. According to Ziring all the cabinet personals were opportunist and remained to gain their personal benefits. This government was also ended in the time span of under ten months only.

Taimurul Hassan is of the view that both Pakistan and India was the beneficiary of authoritarianism in sub-continent that can be witnessed into our political systems. But after independence India started a system of rule of law and made efforts for democracy which is the dominant part of their history and they remained successful, while in the case of Pakistan, colonial state was replaced and changed with authoritarian legacy (both of civilian and military). It is also evident that Muslim elite joined Pakistan movement as they can see more opportunities for them in a new Muslim country (Hassan T. , 2009).

Further, it is evident that in Pakistan since independence not more than 200 families remained in the political power. These politicians joined hand in hand with military in pursuit of lust for power grabbing, which remained disastrous for our country. During first decade of independence seven prime ministers tells the story of a viable political structure of our country. History of 1950s is full of power abuse as head of state to make or break governments by Ghulam Muhammad and Sikander Mirza (Khan, 2005).

There is no question of the intensions of military and civil bureaucrats it is the country that suffer the most, regarding authoritarianism. Military is to defend the borders of the country but in Pakistan military remained power sharer and holder from civilians in the political affairs of the country, "It was only with the assurance and support of the army in Pakistan that Ghulam Muhammad (Governor-General)

removed Khawaja Nazimuddin (Prime Minister), in 1953, when he was enjoying the support of Constituent Assembly, and once again same incident happened with the support of army in 1954. Keeping these circumstances in mind, it was not surprising that General Ayub Khan, in addition to his duties of commander-in-chief of the army, assumed the responsibilities of the minister of defense in the new government”(Khan, 2005).

Role of Judiciary

Democratic constitutions of the world provide a list of fundamental rights of the people which are recognized and guaranteed by the superior judiciary. In a democratic system, judiciary not only custodian of constitution but also performs as guarantor of the fundamental rights of the people and also keep a check on arbitrary rules and excesses of the executive. But in the case of Pakistan unfortunately, judiciary did not play her due role and became instrumental to the executive. On October 24, 1954, Governor General Ghulam Muhammad dissolved the National Assembly and restructured Ministers Council. Moulvi Tameezuddin Khan, President of Assembly, challenged action of Governor General and filed a writ petition, under Section 223-A of the Government of India Act 1935, in the Sindh Chief Court against the Federation of Pakistan and the members of the restructured Council. Munir Ahmad Chief Justice in his historical judgment regarding Moulvi Tameezuddin Case upheld the action of Governor General Ghulam Muhammad of breaking first constituent assembly under Doctrine of Necessity. This action of Justice Munir opened the door for military and civil political adventurists in Pakistan and consequently, country has been suffering since then (Hassan, 2011).

“The political history of Pakistan and the way the game of politics has been played so far have ensured a weakening of the democratic spirit and a corresponding strengthening of the dictatorial ghost (Aziz, 2001).”

Second Phase: Military Regimes (1958-1971)

Ayub Khan's Regime 1958-69

Major General Sikandar Mirza (Governor General) appointed Ayub Khan as Prime Minister of Pakistan on October 24, 1958 and on October 27, 1958 he made Mirza to resign by force. This is the turning point of the history of Pakistan when military-bureaucracy oligarchy started power game. At this stage regional movements and ethnic issues were on rise and Ayub Khan was considered as neutral or with no political entanglement with various political forces. Ayub Khan did not trust parliamentary democracy and he did not like this form for the peoples of Pakistan and wanted to have authority with a new style, which he did by the introduction of Basic Democrats, a program that was initiated for the rural and social development. In 1959 he took vote of confidence by these Democrats and legitimized the action by Mirza of Ayub's premiership. At this point Mohtarma

Fatima Jinnah supported Ayub Khan and prayed that may Allah give him wisdom and strength to bring Pakistan back on normality. But in 1965 presidential elections Miss Jinnah could only take 36% votes against the Ayub Khan administrative control polls. On this 64% vote win Ayub Khan ultimate symbol of power and legitimate ruler. This phase was welcomed by the nation as the country was badly affected by political instability and military-bureaucracy enjoyed dominance throughout this era. This oligarchy influenced in all the institutions of the country (Ahmed, 2007).

Yahya Khan's Regime: 1969-71

Yahya Khan's era can be said as the most troubled era and he did not have much to perform. There is no other opinion that these military personals wanted more and more centralized political autonomy and very bleak provincial authority, which was one of the causes of the separation of eastern wing (now Bangladesh). It is also worth mention here that after the orders for holding elections in 1970 by Yahya, he also passed Legal Framework Order to prolong his command and control. This LFO was only promulgated as preemptive measure to check and stop any new will be formed civilian government to take any action against army, and also that new government must not dare to challenge his command. This shows the historical perception of the armed forces about the politicians that the army did not wanted to marginalize in the name of provincial autonomy at any cost. This regime was cut short due to separation and creation of Bangladesh (Pattanaik, 2004).

Popular Democracy

Bhutto era: 1971-77

Equally fortuitous, Zulfikar Ali Butto came to the helm of affairs in post-Bangladesh Pakistan at this moment of truth, on December 20, 1971. And this traumatic hour, he proved to be man of the moment. Bold, energetic, pragmatic and visionary, he was a born leader, endowed with great qualities of head and heart. Patiently, indeed very patiently and methodically, he sought to pick up the pieces and tried to build up a "New Pakistan", piece by piece, brick by brick. While he lost no time in initiating some direly-needed and long overdue internal reforms (Abid & Qalb-i-Abid, 2013).

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto emerged as a source of opposition for decades for those classes and social groups who were not direct beneficiaries but always cut the fruits behind Bhutto. Bhutto himself showed and reflected desires of all including industrialists, bureaucracy and military as well. During the first two years of Bhutto, he focused on the issues related to laborer, farmers and middle farmers, and due to his policies he was very much admired among middle class of both urban and rural and also educated urban middle class. During his phase bureaucracy, feudal landlords and mega industrialists were the main "enemies" to his social program and military was also sidelined and they were targeted also. But soon the whole episode change

and these targeted areas got prominence. Policies of social and land reforms did not deliver as it was conceived by Bhutto in the next phase of his government, and all above said “enemies” got power by manipulating the circumstances according to then environments. Class that emerged under the Bhutto era eventually got united with the urban middle class, bureaucracy and also with military for removing him in 1977. So, the beneficiaries became the cause of his downfall as they were in the Ayub Khan case (Zaidi S. A., 2005).

Bhutto era can be seen as a break in the patterns of military regimes in the politics of Pakistan since early days and it also can be witnessed as the turning point in the political history. It is said to be the beginning point for the base of constitutional and democratic political system according to the aspirations of the public, with a mixed economy. Areas like, making of a new constitution, nationalization, efforts to eliminate corruption are the signs for a committed effort for restructuring political and economic affairs of Pakistan. Breakup of Bangladesh and defeat from Indian army proved to be deep psychological impacts on the masses and leadership of Pakistan. This proved to be a new start as the two nation theory badly hit a new idea flourished that it is ethnicity not religion is the core element in the Pakistani politics. Further, as it was portrayed by the military that she is the sole guardian of the Pakistan’s security issues, this idea gone in the wind. Mr. Bhutto knows all these realities and major step which he took was Shimla Agreement in 1972, by which he accepted that the war is not a reliable method, principles of peaceful and bilateral are the basis of Pak-India relations (Kapur, 1991).

As far as the Bhutto era is concerned, according to our civil-military historical relationship it can be said as a temporary break and worked as a buffer era between one army ruler to the other. As army cannot enjoy center position in the affairs of the country after their debacle of the eastern wing (Bangladesh), so Bhutto factor was both pleasant for the public and military as well. And after this use of Bhutto till 1977, army regains its position that was lost, and a civil leader was no more required, to challenge the authority (Kapur, 1991).

Third Phase: Military Regime

Zia’s Experimentation Regime, 1977-88

As it is quite clear by the above said fact, Mr. Bhutto was marginalized, and another military coup, General Zia ul Haq, assume headship of the country, as he was fully aware of the political system of the country as well as politicians. So, military exploited the conditions and “Doctrine of necessity” once again worked for this action by the judiciary, and he was allowed to make indispensable amendments. Once given this permission, lead to famous president-prime minister tug of war, that always won by president due to his legislation of 8th amendment. Some opportunists also shared their political support for this drama. His hand written constitution gave him so much power that he himself wrote his own fate by referendum of 1984 and made President of Pakistan. His legislation was for grabbing

power in different spheres as, judicial review, discretionary power to hold referendum, appointment of Governor, appointment of federal and high court judges, including a clause of 270 order 14, which gave protection to all the amendments that he made since he came to power (Pattanaik, 2004).

In the referendum of 1984, the people of Pakistan were asked to show support for the Islamization process, and did people of Pakistan wanted Zia to continue? Notion of Islam was frequently used by Zia to keep space in the masses. "Islam in danger" slogan was used to legitimize his desires. In February 1985, a non-party election was conducted and Muhammad Khan Junejo was selected as Pakistani Prime Minister. Mr. Junejo was working well for political support about Afghan peace plan and called in March 1988 a Round Table Conference. Then occurred the Ojhri Camp tragedy the same year and army ammunition exploded just like fireworks. After the enquiry National Assembly was dismissed by Zia on May 29, 1988, and Mr. Junejo was sent home from the Premiership which was very surprising by saying that "The National Assembly has failed to make a move towards the Islamization objectives and could not provide protection to the life and property of the people of Pakistan". New elections were scheduled to be held in October 1988 (Ahmed, 2007). On August 17, 1988 an air crash ended his political order, and hopes emerged that political democratic government will pull the country from this downfall.

Immaturity of the Political Leadership

Benazir Bhutto

1988-1990

After December 1988, civil government took control of the country and that showed events of political immaturity of our leadership in a span of just more than a decade. As democracy and political institutions are deliberately destructed by the military rulers, so, intolerance, erosion of rule of law, short term political goals, misuse of authority and refusal to consensus in parliament became our culture and legacy. These short falls leads to a faulty democratic system. As the environment for the military was very bleak in context to the international system, General Aslam Baig decided to transfer controlled authority to civil hands, with dominance in his hands. But a hidden agenda to balance the public support for PPP, ISI constructed Islami Jamhoori Ittehad (IJI) a political alliance under Mian Nawaz Sharif and also to prevent a clean sweep in the national assembly by PPP and also to keep a check on largest populated province of Punjab. After making of government military refused to share power with Ms. Bhutto and finally Ms. Bhutto had to agree upon the power-sharing formula. Under this environment civil government could no reconstruct civil military relations and areas of foreign policies and internal security were dominated by Gen. Beg. The result was evident that the government could not satisfy the masses to consume resources on development rather on defense. Due to which Ms. Bhutto was unable to deliver properly and allegations of mismanagement

and corruption were tagged with her government including political opposition outside the assembly. So, in 1990, President Ghulam Ishaq Khan dismissed her government by using 8th amendment on the pressure by military.

Nawaz Sharif

1990-1993

In the general elections of 1990, an alliance was made against PPP, naming IJI under Nawaz Sharif. Events showed that this setup was favored by the establishment, and on the Election Day same was happened. IJI won 106 NA seats while PPP only 45. In the matter of counting total voting, then it is matter or only two percent lose for the PPP and more than six percent increase for IJI (in mostly urban constituencies), as compared to the 1988 elections. Although Ms. Bhutto was of the view that it was a fraud election and that international observers were not called, but there was no public support behind this blame, finally PPP peacefully started the role of opposition, and Nawaz Sharif became Prime Minister on November 06, 1990. During his era business community was quickly flourish and steps to privatize public departments were also taken. He minimized or finished bureaucratic hindrances in the investment, which was a positive trend in the country's economy. With this success and controlled position, why his government fall? Answer is, that president was in a fear to his success and commanding flow, he saw Sharif as a danger to his presidency, and in 1993 the clash was on, on the issue of appointing army chiefs, president Ishaq Khan also assume very similar to as it was 30 months back when he dismissed Ms. Bhutto. So in April 1993 he dismissed Nawaz government and dissolved the national assembly. Supreme Court in May 1993 overturned the action of president and IJI government was reinstated, but in the same time Mr. President manage to disintegrate IJI in the national assembly as well as in the provincial assemblies and made Sharif government very hard to stand and deliver. Further, this president's tailored crises made losses in the economic sector of the country. To stop further destruction and chaos Gen. Abdul Waheed Kakar acted as broker in the agreement between president and prime minister and the new general election was scheduled on October 06, 1993(Rais, 1994).

Benazir Bhutto

1993-1996

After elections 1993 the result of national assembly was expected one. It was expected that no party will get any tangible lead to form a government in dominance. Results showed that PPP got slight edge over PML-N by taking 86 seats over 73. Due to this hung situation Ms. Bhutto succeed to form a coalition government with the smaller parties and became Prime Minister on October 19, 1993 for the second time. Islami Jamhoori Itehad disintegrated in 1992 as MQM, NPP and JI broke the alliance. Mr. Sharif was of the view that he will run

government without their support but it did not come true. In the overall situation PML-N got slight edge over PPP by 39.9 to 37.9% respectively (Rais, 1994).

Nawaz Sharif 1997-1999

In the collapse of 1990 government of Ms. Bhutto, Nawaz Sharif helped military and happily accepted its role. But this military ousted him when he was interfering in military appointments with the help of PPP in 1993, same was the pattern of 1996 and this time ousted term was of PPP with the help of PML. In the elections of 1997 Sharif gained 2/3 majority and this time he moved openly against 8th Amendment, and engineered 13th amendment in which president's power to dismiss the government has been taken away and the parliament was made sovereign. This is the phase when civil government grabbed the power and Sharif had over done some special acts which angered the army and a situation of targeting the opposition had made, like forcing Gen. Karamat to resign and also including personal liking and disliking in judiciary as well, which resulted in fourth military takeover in October 1999.

Democratic analysis of governments during 1988-1999 in the words of Noor ul Haq then it is quite evident that the bureaucratic civil president Ishaq, dismissed first government of PPP on August 05, 1990 and later on April 18, 1993 of PML. Next civil president Laghari also dismissed government of PPP on November 05, 1996. So, in a span of eleven years four democratic governments were stepped out on the allegations of corruption and inefficiency issues. And this era can also be said to be identical as our history is with the features of weak political parties, selfish leadership and finally non democratic actions (Noor-ul-Haq, 2012).

Fourth Phase: Military Regime

Who it can be? Military again: Pervez Musharraf: 1999-2008

As discussed earlier that the civil governments were also adventurists including the military mindset, and same was the case in October 1999 coup, when Nawaz Sharif planned to remove army general from authority when he was in a foreign visit to Sri Lanka and made his desired General Ziauddin as army chief. On this attempt top officer staged a coup and dismiss Nawaz government on October 12, 1999 as well as all provincial governments. General Musharraf suspended the constitution and made himself as Chief Executive. President Tarar continued to be as President and Supreme Court as endorsed the action of army in May 2000 and gave three years to hold new elections. As learnt from the history, Musharraf typically turned himself as civil president and removed Tarar in June 2001 but continued as Army Chief. He engineered local government system in 2001 and had conducted a referendum on April 2002 and established himself for the next term of five years. In August 2002 he issued a Legal Framework Order (LFO) for changes in suspended constitution for

stronger President, like, dissolving National Assembly and removal of the Government, power to appoint services chiefs, Provincial Governors and the Election Commission and condition to hold the office of Prime Minister for a maximum of two terms (Rizvi, 2013).

Musharraf government had to face many challenges including Middle East situation and later of Afghanistan, Taliban and war against terrorism, that is still going on. Pakistan played as front line state in the war against terrorism and was successful in the international scenario. In doing so, he had to finish all the extremists and terrorists, so he did Lal Masjid operation on July 11, 2007 to please international community. In power of his authority Musharraf stopped Chief Justice on March 09, 2007 and sent Iftikhar M. Chaudhry on leave. He sent this case to Supreme Judicial Council to legitimize this action and in the constitutional history of Pakistan, first verdict against military ruler was made by the judiciary, and according to writer, in the struggle of seeking legitimacy some political parties including PPP signaled support to Musharraf and showed their willingness to re-elect him (Ahmed, 2007).

For legitimizing military government and form a civil one, Musharraf tailored general election of 2002. He made a situation where political leaders willing to work with him will acquire lead, for this PML-Q (headed by Ch. Shujaat Hussain) was hired that broke out from PML-N and was willing to work as underdog. PML-N and PPP took part in the elections without their leadership. PPP establish new party as PPPP (Pakistan People's Party Parliamentary headed by Ameen Faheem) to avoid complications. A coalition of small parties called National Alliance, a Six religious party alliance MMA (Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal), MQM (Motahida Qaumi Movement) and five sections of PML were the leading players in the election of 2002. PML-Q had a quite support of administration and result also proved it and they had overall 122 seats (including reserved), PPPP got 80, MMA which was a surprise package got 61, PML-N got 19, MQM got 17, National alliance got 16 and also smaller groups got less than five seats each. Military support was also evident when PML-Q formed a coalition government. National alliance and smaller parties also supported this government. Inaugural session of this new House was held on November 16, 2002 and on November 21 Prime Minister Mir Zafarullah Khan Jamali (originally nominated by President General Pervez Musharraf) was elected as the Leader of the House with 172 votes out of 342, who took the oath of office on November 23, 2002 (Rizvi, 2013).

During this period political control over government and relationship with Supreme Court was very tense so he imposed Emergency on November 3, 2007, and issued a Provisional Constitutional Order (PCO), that required judges to take a new oath. Under this PCO majority of judges either refused or they were not invited to take the new oath, which resulted in lost of their jobs. This was the way of Musharraf to remove Chief Justice and a large number of judges. Musharraf got rid of judges but the public and political reaction was very negative and on this action

public protested. For easing the public and protests against his government he took steps and left the office of Army Chief on November 28, 2007 resulted lost direct control over Army, took oath as civilian president on November 30, 2007 and also pulled away state of emergency on December 15, 2007 and returned to constitutional rule (Rizvi, 2013).

Musharraf's nonstop exploitation of the political system caused isolation from all sides including those who stood by his side. He decided to change Prime Minister Jamali in June 2004 without any solid reason caused dissatisfaction among his loyalists. And on June 20, 2004 a temporary setup Prime Minister Ch. Shujaat Hussain was given this assignment. Blue eyed boy Shukat Aziz (Finance Minister) got elected in a bye election to replace temporary PM Ch. Shujaat on August 20, 2004. The PML-Q and its allies were only the spectators in this whole episode of prime ministerial change. They had no role except to endorse the decisions and unilateral changes of Musharraf (Rizvi, 2013).

Way Forward

In Pakistan, the recent constitutional reforms go far beyond the issue of restoring key features of the original constitution of 1973 (widely amended during the periods of military rule by Zia ul Haq and Pervez Musharraf). Famous of these reforms is the 18th amendment, which moves powers from the president to the prime minister and parliament and also granted more powers to the provinces. Now, president can no longer dissolve parliament at will, but only in specific defined circumstances. Dissent on various issues was recorded, but all members of the parliamentary committees reached agreement in the overall interest of reforms. Before final signature by the president, the amendments were approved unanimously by parties in both the lower and upper houses of the parliament.

In recent years, democracy has also flourished in other ways: the media has become much more free and courageous; the courts have asserted their independence and the 2008 elections saw a peaceful transfer of power. All three factors were instrumental in the overthrow of the Musharraf regime. Yet, it is also vibrant and pluralistic, and a sense of public accountability is starting to grow. Big challenges lie ahead for Pakistan's politicians. Most importantly, the constitutional amendments need to be implemented in full letter and spirit. The provinces need to develop significant capacity to take on additional powers. Pakistan needs all possible support to make the democratic system work. And rightly, "Democracy is not the alternative to stability; it is Pakistan's only hope".

Conclusion

Pakistan inherited a colonial system of governance. The foundations of which are rooted in the imperial feudal system that is influenced by the British Raj. Economy of the country is agricultural based and the system of governance was originally designed for meet only two ends, first is to have an agro based economy and

fulfillment of needs and the other is to have an army to strengthen the designs of the then rulers. Peoples will and rule of law was not the focus of attention from our past and this is the same culture that political leaders of Pakistan inherited. Pakistani ruling class handled power without ethical restraints that led political and constitutional corruption of Pakistan. History of past sixty years or so is swarming with these types of hypocrites. Efforts to maintain a balance between the rule of law and rule of individuals was also made and some work on these areas was also done. On the other hand some jugglers also juggled their tricks in the name of religion, language, parliamentary, presidential, provincial, one-unit, Pakistan first and so much so other tricky terms.

Notes and Reference

- * Prof. Dr. Umbreen Javaidis Director, Centre for South Asian Studies, and Chairperson, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
- ** Amir Latif is PhD Scholar at Centre for South Asian Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
- Abid, M., & Qalb-i-Abid, S. (2013). *Finding Balance between Unity and Diversity: A Major Challenge to Democracy, Governance and National Unity*. Lahore: Punjab University Press.
- Ahmed, M. (2007). Legitimacy Crisis in Pakistan (A Comparative Study of Political Behavior). *Journal of Political Studies*, 12, 8.
- Aziz, K. K. (2001). *Pakistan's Political Culutre: Essays in Historical and Social Origins*. Lahore: Vanguard Books.
- Hassan, M. (2011). Causes of Military Intervention in Pakistan: A rEVISIONIST dISCOURSE. *PAKISTAN vISION*, 12(2), 84.
- Hassan, M. (2011). Causes of Military Intervention in Pakistan: A Revisionist Discourse. *Pakistan Vision*, 12(2), 389.
- Hassan, T. (2009). Authoritarianism in Pakistan. *Journal of Political Studies*, 15, 2-3.
- Kapur, A. (1991). *Pakistan in Crisis*. London: Routledge.
- Khan, M. A. (2005). *We've Learnt Nothing from History, Pakistan: Politics and Military Power*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Kiran, N. (2012). Political Stability in Pakistan: Regionalism and Role of Cabinet (1947-1958). *Pakistan Vision*, 13(1), 208-209.

- Mujahid, S. (2013). *Chapter: Finding Balance between Unity and Diversity: A Major Challenge to Democracy Governance and National Unity*. Lahore: Punjab University Press.
- Noor-ul-Haq. (2012). Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan. *IPRI Journal*, 12(2), 114.
- Pattanaik, S. S. (2004). Pakistan's Sustainable Democracy': Army as teh Political Architect. *Strategic Analysis*, 28(2), 274.
- Rais, R. B. (1994). Pakistan: Hope Amids Turmoil. *Journal of Democracy*, 5(2), 136-138.
- Rizvi, H. A. (2013). *A narrative of Pakistan's nine elections (1970-2008). The first 10 general electsion of Pakistan. A story of Pakistan's transition from democracy above rule of Law to democracy under rule of Law 1970-2013*. London: PILDAT.
- Sayyed, K. B. (1959). Collapse of Pariamentary Democracy in Pakistan. *Middle East Journal*, 13(4), 389.
- Soomro, P. B. (2006). Nawab Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani's Role in the Politics of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of History & Culture*, 27(2), 69.
- Yusuf, H. (1999). *Pakistan: A Study of Political Development 1947-97*. Lahore : Sang-e-Meel Publication.
- Zaidi, S. A. (2005). State, Military and Social Transition: Improbable Future of Democracy in Pakistan. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(49), 5175.
- Zaidi, S. Z. (2010). The Assassination of the Prime Minister Liaquat li Khan: The Fateful Journey. *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, 31(1), 99-101.