
POLARIZED POLITICS: THE CHALLENGE OF DEMOCRACY IN PAKISTAN

Author(s): Nasreen Akhtar

Source: *International Journal on World Peace*, JUNE 2009, Vol. 26, No. 2 (JUNE 2009), pp. 31-63

Published by: Paragon House

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20752885>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/20752885?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal on World Peace*

JSTOR

POLARIZED POLITICS: THE CHALLENGE OF DEMOCRACY IN PAKISTAN

Nasreen Akhtar

Lecturer of Political Science
International Islamic University
Women Campus. Office No: C-016
Sector H-10, Islamabad
Pakistan

Nasreen Akhtar is a Lecturer of Political Science and International Relations in the Department of Politics and International Relations, International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan. She earned an M.A. in Political Science, and an M.Phil. in U.S. history and international relations.

In Pakistan, state elites have been affiliating with the different ethnic groups for their own political interests. This diminishes the sense of equal justice and state legitimacy.

The creation of a nation-state is a historical process that may take a long time to complete. This is not to suggest that Pakistan or other Third World countries have to pass through the same sequences of state-making as the Europeans did. We need to highlight the complex issues and the constraints that Pakistan has faced since its inception in 1947. While the internal obstacles to national integration are well-known, one must also consider the geopolitical pressures that emanate from the regional and international environments. The central theme of this paper is that nations and identities are evolutionary processes that cannot be artificially and externally imposed, but only aided by policies that are sensitive to needs of the constituent groups.

INTRODUCTION

Polarized politics is having an immense impact on the Pakistani nation and it has been posing security threats to a state founded on the principles of peace, prosperity, and democracy. But internal factors are leading the Pakistani nation toward war, conflicts, and clashes against the Army.¹ Over 60 years have been passed since Pakistan was founded. Is polarization a serious problem in Pakistan? I elaborate on how it has materialized during the civil-military regimes.

The dominant elites in Pakistan, and elsewhere in the Third World, have uncritically accepted the Western notions of nation-state and centralization in structuring the state and promoting national integration. This idealization is predicated on two

interrelated postulates: (a) the nation-state is the form of a modern state, and that (b) centralization is the sign of modernization.² However, the European pattern of the nation-state or even fashioning a uniform model of nation-building for all developing countries is dangerous, and might lead to self-destruction. There is much evidence and many reasons for this cautionary note, but one will suffice to explain the pitfalls of pursuing the policies of nation-building through a strong central government.

It is an historical accident that most of the post-colonial states like Pakistan have inherited a mosaic of ethnic, religious and linguistic groups that have a proud past, a strong sense of ethnic or communal identity and

The European pattern of the nation-state or even fashioning a uniform model of nation-building for all developing countries is dangerous, and might lead to self-destruction.

rich cultural traditions. Needless to say, these groups had a semi-autonomous existence, if not a self-rule, for centuries before western colonization. The construction of a cohesive national identity by the central state, primarily through “primitive accumulation of power,”³ and without political legitimacy would rather provoke resistance, alienate important sectors of the society, and might undermine the legitimacy of the state itself.

In Pakistan, state elites have been affiliating with the different ethnic groups for their own political interests. This diminishes the sense of equal justice and state legitimacy.

In my view, the creation of a nation-state is a historical process that may take a long time to complete. This is not to suggest that Pakistan or other Third World countries have to pass through the same sequences of state-making as the Europeans did. We need to highlight the complex issues and the constraints that Pakistan has faced since its inception in 1947. While the internal obstacles to national integration are well-known, one must also consider the geopolitical pressures that emanate from the regional and international environments.⁴

The central theme of this paper is that nations and identities are evolutionary processes that cannot be artificially and externally imposed, but only aided by policies that are sensitive to needs of the constituent groups. What are the policies that various Pakistani civil-military regimes have

attempted to strengthen the idea of Pakistan's security, and nationhood? How have political culture and religion affected the state policies? How have ethnic, linguistic and religious groups responded and have adverse impacts on democratic process? What have been issues and challenges on the path to nation-building in Pakistan and why has democracy not taken root? In answering these questions, we will focus on the following two propositions:

- a) Promotion of economic or cultural interests of ethnic groups alone does not guarantee their integration until they are allowed to participate in the political process, share power, and develop stakes in the state.
- b) Devolution of power, regional autonomy and recognition of multiple linguistic and cultural identities within a pluralistic, democratic framework would contribute to national solidarity and lay the foundations for the development of a nation-state.⁵

ISLAM AND PAKISTAN

Islam could be a complete code of life, if it would be practiced with a true spirit. Although Islam stresses the *Muslim Umbha* (Muslim unity), in our fragmented world this has been a mirage. Moreover, Muslims in different regions have different cultures, and have divided in different subgroups; Sunni, Shite, Wahabi, Deobandi, etc. In the united India, Muslims ignored differences and were united for the same cause of "an independent state." Islam had taken deep roots in the sub-continent. Its strong pillars tremendously influenced its followers in United India. The formation of Islamic identity in British India was also influenced by a variety of cultural and political factors. Islam gave people coherence, direction, and meaning.

However, the role of Islam in promoting a sense of Muslim political community in pre-independence era and its mobilizing appeal during the Pakistan independence period has produced conflicting interpretations of its relevance to the construction of a Pakistani nation. This controversy stems from the fact that the leaders of the movement, including Quaid-i-Azam Mohammed Ali Jinnah rested the claim for Pakistan on the idea of a "Muslim nation." He argued that Islam was not just a religion, but

represented a separate social order, culture, and a civilization that gave the Muslims a distinctive character as a political community.⁶ Different strata of Muslims in the subcontinent supported the concept of Muslim nationalism for a variety of reasons, not all of them religious.⁷ Most of the supporters of Pakistan rejected the notion of territorial nationalism, claiming that Islam transcended narrow ethnic and lingual differences. Dr. Allama Mohammad Iqbal, the poet and philosopher who proposed the idea of Pakistan in 1930s, said “It is not the unity of language or country or the identity of economic interests that constitutes the basic principle of our nationality. We are members of the society founded by the Prophet.”⁸ However, Jinnah did not conceive Pakistan in purely pan-Islamic terms. His conceptualization of Muslim nationalism was special, based on protection

The question Pakistanis have confronted is whether Islam could serve as effectively a unifying force the same way as it did during the struggle for the creation of Pakistan.

of minority rights, and defined in relation to the Hindu majority.⁹

After Pakistan’s independence, Islam became the source of confrontation between secular and religious leaders; even religion could not unite the people in East Pakistan (Bangladesh) and West Pakistan. The question Pakistanis have confronted is whether Islam could serve as effectively a unifying force the same way as it did during the struggle for the creation of Pakistan. There are three different per-

spectives on this question that contend for shaping the national identity and nationhood. Let us characterize these roughly as Islamist, modernist, and sub-nationalist. The Islamist position on nation needs a little explanation. The Islamists believe that Islam is a complete code of life, has answers to all modern problems, and it must be relied upon as a source of personal conduct and public affairs. They define Islam essentially as a political ideology, and set the mission of the faithful, at least in areas where they have formed an independent state, to create an Islamic state, establishing supremacy of the *Shariah* (Islamic law or way of life).¹⁰ The Islamists doctrinally refuse to consider territorial definition of a nation as relevant to the Muslims. Their conception of an Islamic *Millat* (nation) would embrace all believers irrespective of their race, language or domicile. Faith in Allah, Quran and

the Prophet gives them a far greater sense of togetherness than any other factor.¹¹ Using this phraseology, or, if you wish, symbolism, the Islamists stress the role of religion in achieving national unity.

The second and more vital aspect of the Islamist perspective is conception of an Islamic state. By deconstructing the history of the Pakistan movement, they claim that the country's independence was won in the name of Islam, and that the driving force behind the idea of Pakistan was the creation of an Islamic state.¹² This seems to be a total reversal of the position that they took during the political struggle for Pakistan. The *Ulema* (Islamic scholars) from *Abrar*, *Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Hind*, and even *Jamat-i-Islami* had refused to support the creation of Pakistan because they believed that a nationalist movement could not be Islamic. Even *Jamat-e-Islami* (Islamic Party) opposed the idea of Pakistan. They believed *Muslim Ummaka*, and did not trust the leadership of Westernized Muslims like Jinnah.¹³ The *Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Hind* and the famous Deoband Islamic seminary rather associated themselves with the Indian nationalism.¹⁴ The position of Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi, the most articulate and celebrated exponent of the Islamic state, on the creation of Pakistan had the same reservation and was not different from the orthodox *ulema*.¹⁵ The only difference is that he was equally opposed to the Indian nationalism.¹⁶ But their opposition to Pakistan in no way could exclude them from participating in the political process, or prevent them from migrating to the new country, as many of them did. After the creation of Pakistan, the Islamists have contended that Pakistan is an ideological state, meaning that the sole purpose of making Pakistan was to create conditions for the Islamic values and way of life. Maulana Maudoodi goes one step further in characterizing any failure to implement Islam in state affairs as "a form of national apostasy."¹⁷ The scholars from various religious groups had failed to convince the people of East Pakistan, those who had fought against their own people and army.

A more complex construction is the "ideology of Pakistan" that was thrown into public debate for the first time in the 1970,¹⁸ and got official support during the dictatorship of Zia-ul-Haq (1977-88). None of its advocates has yet clearly defined what it exactly means, but by implication "ideology of Pakistan" refers to two things: Islam is the basis of nationhood in Pakistan; Islam must be accepted as the supreme guiding principle of the state.¹⁹ Even the most professed secular leaders have frequently brought

the “ideology of Pakistan” into political debate, not realizing that it would strengthen the politics of Islamization. It is partly this ambivalence and political use of Islam by the secular elites that has allowed the Islamists to set the agenda of Islamic politics.²⁰ Presently, a few people have hijacked Islam to pursue and implement it according to their own understanding and purposes. The Militants in Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) do not understand or support the meaning of “ideology of Pakistan.” Their unconventional interpretation of *Sharia*²¹ has tremendously affected the security of the state and nation. In my view, nation-building needs construction, development, democracy and rule of law. Deconstruction, denial of development, and lawlessness by the militants in FATA has destabilized the process of nation-building in the twenty-first century.²²

There is a vast difference between claiming a state for Muslims, which was the case when Pakistan was founded, and Islamizing a state.

It is common perception in Pakistan that Pakistan was achieved in the name of Islam. Let us examine some of the contradictions of the Islamist position on nation-building. First, it is historically incorrect that the demand for Pakistan rested on the promise of creating an Islamic state in the vision of the fundamentalists. There is a vast difference between claiming a state for Muslims, which was the case when Pakistan was founded, and Islamizing a state.

It was the consistent failure to reach an acceptable agreement on the constitutional guarantees to the rights of the Muslims in British India that strengthened the demand for Pakistan. The Muslims in the United India were being denied their fundamental rights. A sense of deprivation instigated the Muslims to be separated. The objective was to preserve cultural identity and protect economic and political interests of Muslims by creating a state in the Muslim majority areas. As mentioned earlier, Islamic symbolism was regarded necessary for the political mobilization of the Muslim masses and it served that purpose very well. Even today in Pakistan, Islam is being regarded as an effective tool to serve political purposes by both state and non-state actors.²³

Second, the founders of Pakistan, particularly Iqbal and Jinnah, have been grossly misinterpreted by the Islamists in support of their views on

the relation between Islam and the state. None of them was even remotely associated with the idea of an authoritarian, hegemonic, or a theocratic state, which the Islamists today pursue with so much dedication. There is no doubt that, on occasions, Jinnah made brief references to Islam in seeking support for Pakistan, but dragging him closer to the Islamist position is a very recent phenomena. An objective reading of history would reveal that the creator of Pakistan was a constitutional democrat to the core, and a secular Muslim.²⁴ Jinnah's presidential address to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, on August 11, 1947 bears testimony to this: "You are free, you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go to your mosques or to any other places of worship in this state of Pakistan. You may belong to any religion or caste or creed—that has nothing to do with the business of the state."²⁵ Unfortunately, Jinnah's real personality and ideological outlook fell victim to the political exigencies of the authoritarian state and obscurantist *ulema*.²⁶

Third, once Pakistan was achieved, Islam alone could not foster solidarity. Islam emphasizes *Shura* (consultation) which is the core element of democracy and without consultancy democracy cannot take root. As we know, the concept of consultancy was lacking in Pakistan's political institutions since 1947. As the political environment changed due to the state elites, the central dynamics of politics and the true spirit also changed, requiring an authoritarian approach to strengthen the bonds of political community. The Muslim leaders faced challenges in the newly Muslim state. The post-separation from the Hindu majority, ethnic groups in East Pakistan (present Bangladesh) and West Pakistan emerged as a political force and new polarization along center province lines emerged. The main issue was rights and a fair share of power in the new state. The separation of former East Pakistan amply demonstrated the fact that faith (religion) and political interests are two different matters. This episode must have put an end to the wishful thinking that the material interests of diverse regional groups and state elites are insignificant or can be superseded by the holy politics of Islam.

The empirical fact is that the economic disparity, denial of political power, injustice and superimposition of new forms of cultural or ideological identity foment the ethnic nationalism seen in Pakistan. Power politics and ethnic rivalry have taken root in society. This should have ended reliance

on Islam as the sole basis of nation formation. But it cannot be. The religious leaders have continued their rhetoric, paying little or no attention to pragmatic issues that might involve the genuine and concrete interests of the peoples of different regions. Rather, they serve to promote their own communities instead of the nation or state. In my view, religious leaders have been promoting the sense of community, not of a larger humanity. People do not have much trust in religious leaders' ability as political leaders, thus for more than sixty years a single religious political party has not had heavy control in central government. Rather, religious political parties have had political influence in the parliament as an "alliance."²⁷ Basing nation-building on religious matters obscures very real issues pertaining to the distribution of political power and participation in government and

Basing nation-building on religious matters obscures very real issues pertaining to the distribution of political power and participation in government and erodes trust and confidence in the political union.

erodes trust and confidence in the political union.

A nation, as opposed to a state, is a cultural identity. It is a politically conscious and mobilized collectivity of people which possesses, or may aspire to, self-government or independent statehood. A nation is not necessarily the same as the citizenry of a state, nor is it restricted to those who possess a common language, ancestry, or cultural heritage, although these components are usually involved. It is "essentially subjective, a sense of social

belonging and ultimate loyalty."²⁸ This is an era of nation-building. Since the end of the Cold War many newly independent states have emerged on the world map and nearly a billion are deprived citizens of old states striving to become modern nations.²⁹ The challenge of nation-building, operating in a highly complex nexus of society, economy, and polity, hinges on the issues of access to and the stakes in structures of power.³⁰

The creation of a nation-state is a historical process that may take a long time to complete. This is not to suggest that Pakistan or other Third World countries have to pass through the same sequences of state-making as the Europeans did, but to highlight the complexity of the issue as well as the constraints that Pakistan faces. While the internal obstacles to national

integration are well-known, one must also consider the geopolitical pressures that emanate from the regional and international environments.³¹ Nation-building is an evolutionary process; it cannot simply be imposed by external powers or by the ruling elite but depends on the development of society.

Another dilemma which the Pakistani nation faces after Quaid-e-Azam is the lack of charismatic and sincere leadership. The central concern of this paper is to examine why Pakistani regimes have failed to strengthen the ideology of Pakistan. How have Pakistani multi-ethnic groups responded to the question of ideology? This paper will explore how ethnic and religious groups have been politicized and promoted by the state and military elites.

CONFLICT BETWEEN IDENTITY AND IDEOLOGY

It is a grave problem that the new generation hardly understands the meaning of “ideology of Pakistan.” They are striving to understand what Pakistan is. It is hard to blame them; our political socialization process is not strong enough. Even political leaders³² have denied the “two nation theory.”³³ The two nation theory became mirage when the people from East Pakistan demanded their separate state “Bangladesh” because they spoke a different language “Bangla.” The post-independence era could not unite the two units (East Pakistan and West Pakistan). Geographical gaps divided the state elite politically, economically and ethnically; the Muslims of India struggled to preserve their Islamic ideology. Yet the question of ideology was less relevant in East Pakistan. The sense of political deprivation increased the sense of a separate identity and Bengali nationalism. As a result of such questions of ethnic identity, Pakistan has created enormous difficulties in developing a coherent sense of nationhood. The fact of a common religion was rendered irrelevant during the secessionist movement in East Pakistan.

Religion has polarized more societies than it has unified. Even within a single religious denomination one may find numerous strands. Doctrinal differences, political contestation for power, material gains and territorial space can make the particular religion and the question of its authenticity one of great dispute.³⁴

Complex historical and social factors have shaped the interaction between religion and ethnicity in Pakistan, a state which came into being with the support of ethnic groups.

Pre-Independence, the perception that Muslim identity was threatened by Hindu dominance was a more important factor than ethnicity for Muslim groups and political parties. Of course, Islam has remained at the center of post-Independence political discourse; nevertheless, it is today less important when the central issue has become the demand of constitutional rights (provincial autonomy) by various ethnic groups. The troubling question of what type of state Pakistan should be—liberal democratic or Islamic—

Ethnic identity and language became more important once Pakistan was created. The fact of a common religion was rendered irrelevant during the secessionist movement in East Pakistan.

evokes distinct responses from each social sector and political interest.

Military leaders, mainstream political parties, and Islamicists have all attempted to define this relationship according to their own vision of a just society and the role of religion in society and state affairs. Thus civil-military rule as well as their policy preferences provided a space for community groups to emerge as an effective force in the state.

Among the three main forces in the country, the quest for shaping the Pakistani state has added yet another dimension to the ethnic and political polarization of Pakistan. As a consequence of these conflicts of interest and the strange alliances they produce, the autonomy of the civil political sphere and civil liberties and minority rights has been severely compromised.

During the military regime of General Zia-ul-Haq, the promotion of ethnic politics and Islamization³⁵ was inevitable because military rulers needed the support of the minority ethnic political parties to balance and offset the mainstream parliamentary parties. In 2006, General Musharraf dealt with the Baluch nationalists with an iron hand.³⁶ The military operations in Baluchistan have posed a great security threat to the process of nation-building.

NATION BETWEEN RELIGION AND STATE

Since Pakistan began fighting the war against terrorism within Pakistan in Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and supporting the U.S policy in Afghanistan, the nation has been divided into different sections. The fundamentalist interpretations of Islam and *Sharia* by the local Taliban has increased strong resentment against Talibanization. Another group feels that Taliban are fighting against an imperial force (U.S.) or for justice so the state must support their demands for speedy justice and peace.³⁷ Thus society has been divided into moderate-religious and extreme-religious sections. Intra- and inter-state religion clash has been a major obstacle in promoting nation-building in Pakistan.

In the twenty-first century religion has emerged as a powerful force which has both divided and united the world.³⁸ Non-state actors (religious groups) used India's soil to destabilize Pakistan.³⁹ But the significance of religion was never denied in the past. In British India the formation of Islamic identity gave direction and meaning to its followers, promoting

As a consequence of these conflicts of interest and the strange alliances they produce, the autonomy of the civil political sphere and civil liberties and minority rights has been severely compromised.

a sense of political community to economically-deprived Muslims during the Pakistan movement. In fact, Islamic ideology has produced conflicting interpretations of its relevance to the construction of a Pakistani nation. This controversy stems from the fact that the leaders of the movement, including Quaid-i-Azam Mohammed Ali Jinnah rested the claim for Pakistan on the idea of a "Muslim nation." He argued that Islam was not just a religion, but represented a separate social order, culture, and a civilization that gave the Muslims a distinctive character as a political community.⁴⁰ Different strata of Muslims in the subcontinent supported the concept of Muslim nationalism, although for different reasons.⁴¹ Jinnah did not conceive Pakistan in purely pan-Islamic terms. His conceptualization of Muslim nationalism accommodated the protection of minority rights, yet was defined in relation to the Hindu majority of the subcontinent.⁴²

NATION AND CONTROLLED DEMOCRACY

Democracy is not simply defined as the rule of majority or elections to form a government. Modern democracy includes the rule of law, accountability, and justice in all the state institutions. This has never been fully realized in Pakistan. What prevailed is power politics, personalities, injustice, and inequity. Pakistan suffered due to an excess of centralism and the lack of democratic values. The nation has always sacrificed for the promotion of democracy and the supremacy of law⁴³ but has never tasted its fruit. As I mentioned earlier, the nation-building process requires the true development of democracy. What happened in Pakistan was that rulers assumed power through dubious means, and then employed more dubious means to

Modern democracy includes the rule of law, accountability, and justice in all the state institutions. This has never been fully realized in Pakistan. What prevailed is power politics, personalities, injustice, and inequity.

sustain their power. And there are others who come to power through legal and constitutional means but perpetuate their rule by subverting all routes for orderly and legitimate political change.⁴⁴

Democracy has been under the control of both civil and military rulers. State elites created the impression that the people are not capable of democracy, and they need to implement their own political vision to run the institutions.⁴⁵

Since Pakistan's independence in 1947 until the fall of East Pakistan in 1971, ethno-centrism prevailed, and this acted as encouragement to Bengali nationalism. Tariq Ali has discussed this:

“Inequity and inequitable distribution of resources by the central government had isolated the Bengali from the state, especially after 1954, when the overall economic situation deteriorated. Out of the total development fund, East Pakistan's share was only 22.1% and non-Bengali businessmen, financed by capital from West Pakistan had set up most manufacturing enterprises.”⁴⁶

In fact, the limited Bengali representation in the central government had increased the sense of deprivation, suppression and exploitation. The fragile economic situation in East Pakistan made the Bengali people anti-West Pakistan and also enhanced their ethnic distinctness in the unequal federal structure of Pakistan. The Bengali move for provincial autonomy encouraged other ethnic communities in West Pakistan.

Unfortunately the same ideology and the same religion could not defuse the sentiment of separate nationalism between Bengalis and Punjabis.⁴⁷ Ethnic identities were strengthened in East Pakistan and, to a lesser extent, in the smaller provinces of West Pakistan, especially in Sindh. Ethnic hostility between East Pakistan and West Pakistan increased after the elections of 1954 when all the opposition parties united and emerged as a force, the United Front, and they defeated the Muslim League. Their victory gave greater impetus to Bengali ethno-nationalism. Increasing violence between Bengali and non-Bengali workers gave the central government a pretext for dismissing the United Front government, establishing the governor's rule in East Pakistan and banning the Communist Party. This dismissal caused further resentment amongst the Bengali population and Communist Party.⁴⁸

The close association of the governor General Ghulam Muhammad with the Punjabi elite and the neglect of the Bengalis increased popular resentment. The Governor's reliance on the Punjabi community widened the gulf of mistrust between East and West Pakistan. Parity was an issue of great concern. Weak and limited Bengali representation in the central government increased the sense of exploitation. The Bengali demand for an autonomous province encouraged other ethnic communities in West Pakistan.

The separation of East Pakistan amply demonstrated that faith and political interests were two different matters. National solidarity on religion obscures real issues pertaining to the distribution of political power and participation, eroding trust and confidence in the political union, effecting fragmentation rather than cohesion.⁴⁹

OBSTACLES AND RESTRAINTS IN THE WAY OF NATION-BUILDING

Is building of a nation inevitable? This process cannot be achieved without a state's "legal" functions. If a state has become dysfunctional or is not functioning under the Constitution, then the nation cannot be promoted. This is not just a theoretical statement but a practical requirement. Societies and states are interlocked. The institutional and political capacities of the state of Pakistan have declined very sharply over the past quarter century.⁵⁰ The role of the state in nation-building is inevitable, yet takes on a different character when hijacked by undemocratic forces. Since the 1950s, the military has dominated in Pakistani politics. It has conducted foreign policy directly or indirectly.⁵¹

Political forces in Pakistan have a consensus on the parliamentary form of democracy, which the two constitutions of the country, 1956 and 1973, drafted by the two respective constituent assemblies, amply reflect. Pakistan's colonial political heritage and its post-independence development of institutions are responsible for this consensus. The British introduced political institutions and practices in the subcontinent that they knew best, rooted in their own history. Our founding fathers fighting the case for Pakistan could not think of any other political system, since their own political experience had included training in British constitutional law, and they were grounded in the history of its institutions.⁵²

Military leaders have thrice tried to reorient the Pakistani political system toward some sort of presidential form of government. Ayub Khan who was the first to try so many things was the first leader to change the parliamentary system, replacing the 1956 Constitution with his own in 1962. He was elected indirectly by an electoral college of councilors comprising eighty thousand, later increased to one hundred and twenty thousand. The second military ruler, Yahya Khan, wanted to give the country his own version of a presidential system after stabilizing the situation in East Pakistan, which had deteriorated to a complete collapse of authority. But, with mass rebellion and Indian intervention, the country broke apart. Yahya Khan's dream of creating a stable presidential system died with his exit from power.

Since 1985 we have seen attempts by two other military rulers, General Zia-ul-Haq and General Pervez Musharraf, to alter the parliamentary struc-

ture of the constitution, purportedly to balance the executive power of the prime minister. With the provision of “58-2(b) powers”⁵³ in the hands of the President, the political system of Pakistan is closer to an executive presidency in its functioning than a parliamentary democracy. Article 58-2(b) has been used as a political weapon to destabilize democratically elected governments. The political parties, both mainstream as well as religious and regional, have made their preference known by promulgating the two parliamentary constitutions and by removing 58-2(b)—when they had an opportunity to do so in 1997, through the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of Pakistan.

In 2002, the military establishment under Musharraf’s leadership abandoned its agreement with democratic forces on establishing the National Security Council, and by re-inserting the 58-2(b) provision through the Seventeenth Amendment. Surprisingly, the same parliamentarians who supported the deletion of 58-2b in 1997 voted for the Seventeenth Amendment that has brought that power back to the hands of the President. This is a great weakness in the Pakistani political system. When legislators are permanently on sale for political benefits and corrupt patronage, parliamentary democracy cannot take root.⁵⁴

With the provision of “58-2(b) powers” in the hands of the President, the political system of Pakistan is closer to an executive presidency in its functioning than a parliamentary democracy.

We might speculate elsewhere why India, where politics is perhaps equally corrupt, has had some working democracy for much of the same post-Independence period. Is it the multiplicity of ethnic and caste and religious identities that has made it too difficult for any class, military or political, to impose hegemony?

Vested interests and the establishment that wanted to create artificial groupings and parties have countered efforts against floor-crossing by rescinding laws and even constitutional amendments. The case of the Fourteenth Amendment is an example. But floor-crossing for corrupt inducement is just one of the factors destabilizing parliamentary democracy. There are other, perhaps more significant, reasons for the derailment of the

parliamentary system in Pakistan. Chief among them is military rule and its so-called “guided democracy.” The takeover by the military four times in Pakistani history, and the determination of leaders to stay in power as long as possible by manipulating political institutions, has caused an institutional decay that has included the political parties.⁵⁵

Military rule could not have been effective nor lasted long had it not politically co-opted the same elites who held public office in the civilian governments. This was enabled by the political fragmentation engineered by the military regime and intelligence agencies under its control. It was a conscious and well-designed effort of military rulers to divide political forces by rewarding those who joined their rule and oppressing those who refused to render the political services they desired.⁵⁶

Although the Pakistani leaders both military and civilian accepted federalism, they worked against its spirit. In fact, they turned Pakistan into an authoritarian state.

In Pakistan’s political history, the centralization of state power did not take into consideration the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and regional realities. From day one, the state elites regarded the voicing of regional interests (for provincial autonomy) as anti-state; their demands were suppressed through coercion. Although the Pakistani leaders both military and civilian accepted federalism, they worked

against its spirit. In fact, they turned Pakistan into an authoritarian state.

The frequent dissolution of the elected government by the powerful Governor/President and provincial assemblies and enforcement of governor’s rule has adversely affected the nation-building approach in Pakistan. Over-centralization and the frequent intervention by the central government has been the norm. The Pakistan People Party’s (PPP) leader Zulfqar Ali Bhutto was the first elected Prime Minister who removed the Bluchistan government of National Awami Party (NAP) in February 1973. The practice of removing unwanted governments continued. Nawaz Sharif, who formed his government in the Center in 1996, dismissed the Sindh Assembly in August 1999. This was because the Pakistan Muslim League (PML) government in Sindh lost its majority in the House after Mohajir Qomi Movement (MQM) and PML broke up their alliance.

If we look into Pakistan’s political history during the transitional

democratic process from 1985 to October 1999, all elected parliaments failed to play a proper legislative role; they rubber-stamped all ordinances and passed bills presented by the executive without much debate or scrutiny, perhaps under some pressure from the military.

In the 1950s, politicians (in West Pakistan) and military elites remained dominant. They used their institutional power to topple governments, and established new political parties and groups, playing one against the other. There were frequent allegations of inefficiency, nepotism and corruption against politicians.

General Zia-ul-Haq was the first president who exercised institutional and constitutional power (Eighth Amendment 58-2 b) and dissolved the Prime Minister Jonejo's elected government in 1988. President Ghulam Ishaq Khan continued the same practice. He also used the same amendment to dismiss Benazir Bhutto's government in 1990. The same president dismissed the elected government of Nawaz Sharif in 1993.⁵⁷ Benazir Bhutto in power nominated Farooq Khan Laghari for President. President Laghari dismissed Benazir's government in 1996. After Bhutto's dismissal, Nawaz Sharif was elected the prime minister. His party had a two-thirds majority in the Parliament. He eliminated the Eighth Amendment 58-2 (b) from the Constitution. Nawaz Sharif became the most powerful prime minister Pakistan had seen. The elimination of 58-2 (b) diminished the powers of the president and Farooq Khan Laghari resigned. Nawaz Sharif nominated his trustworthy man as the next President of Pakistan—ensuring he had no power to dismiss the government.

This imbalance of power made the prime minister near-absolute. His conflict with General Pervez Musharraf over the Kargil War of 1999⁵⁸ resulted in his removing him as Chief of the Army Staff and increasing resentment among Army officers. They refused to accept the newly appointed Chief (General Zia-u-Din). Musharraf seized power and dismissed the elected Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, the federal and provincial governments and suspended the national assembly, senate and the provincial assemblies, declaring that the Constitution would stay in abeyance in October 12, 1999.

Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif had dismissed the Chief of Army Staff a few hours before the military action when the General was still flying back to Pakistan from Sri Lanka.⁵⁹ Musharraf dismissed Nawaz's government,

put him jail and filed case against Nawaz to disqualify him and, as mentioned earlier, the Supreme Court's verdict was not acceptable to the Sharif brothers and their party.

Interestingly, Mr. Nawaz was not disqualified during Musharraf's regime. It was the PPP-led government that was not comfortable in Punjab where PML-N was ruling as the majority party. General Musharraf, who toppled the Nawaz's government, became the "Chief Executive" in October 12, 1999. He announced his seven point agenda for his government that centered on economic revival, law and order, good governance, accountability and the eradication of corruption, with no time frame for the restoration of democracy.⁶⁰

General Musharraf became the "Chief Executive" in October 12, 1999. He announced his seven point agenda for his government that centered on economic revival, law and order, good governance, accountability and the eradication of corruption, with no time frame for the restoration of democracy.

As with earlier dismissals of governments in office, the removal of the government of Nawaz Sharif and the military takeover were challenged in the Supreme Court of Pakistan. The Supreme Court in 2000 declared that General Musharraf's extra-constitutional coup d'état of 12 October 1999 was validated on the basis of doctrine of State necessity.⁶¹ When elected officials fail to control the situation politically, the army is justified in taking control to restore order.⁶²

The October coup demonstrated once again that the state elites consider the free play of political forces a danger to national security. It had been their consistent policy to control the political process, restrict participation and guide the political process from the top. In their elitist view of politics, the popular will of the poor and illiterate masses cannot be trusted; the people are vulnerable to the manipulations of the socially-influential landed aristocracy.⁶³ The Army comes forward to protect the solidarity of Pakistan.⁶⁴

By abrogating or suspending the constitutions, the military acquired vast powers to remove, and if necessary, eradicate all sources of societal opposition. Political parties that have been dominated by the landlord class or single dominant individuals and institutions of the civil society, have

proved too weak to offer any resistance to unconstitutional rule. So fragmented is political life in Pakistan that those in the opposition have hailed the removal of elected governments. Such celebrations over the downfall of the governments of other parties have anticipated the removal of these very parties on the same grounds. The feudal political culture has strengthened the view that democracy has only legitimized the power of the most influential classes. The political crisis is deepened and the development of institutions necessary to support democratic governance is delayed.⁶⁵

The generals took away whatever autonomy the provincial elites had acquired under the Constitution of 1973. The Musharraf regime used coercion against Akbar Bugti who demanded provincial autonomy.⁶⁶ Consequently, authoritarian rule has strengthened ethnic identities more than building the intended unified nation.⁶⁷

FRAGMENTATION AND NATION-BUILDING

Pakistan is a fragmented nation-state. It is a society composed of a mix of ethnic groups in all provinces; all ethnic groups share their culture with different provinces. Baluchis migrate to Sindh, there are Pashtuns living in Sindh, and Punjabis have been assimilated in Karachi.

Due to their movements, ethnic groups have emerged in all provinces of Pakistan. Today ethnic groups can sometimes even pose a security threat when they have access to high quality weaponry. External forces also play a major role in promoting ethnic identity in multi-ethnic states. Specifically, India played a role in fomenting Baluch nationalism, as Pakistan has played a role in promoting the Kashmiri.

The collective nationhood experience of many post-colonial states provides mixed evidence of the success of creating national solidarity and a sense of common national identity. Not all states have really succeeded in nation-building based on the equitable distribution of power or representation of all groups; nor have they all fallen apart.

Ethnic movements have at times shifted from seeking advantage within the state to moving beyond to the realm of ethno-nationalism, and then reverting to earlier positions. These shifts have correlated primarily with international influences, such as the case of the “greater Baluchistan” and Pashtun movements. We have seen in the elections of 2002 and 2008 the

re-emergence of ethnic-coalition partnerships in the centre.

The political factors in ethnic politics have been highlighted by Hamza Alvi, who has stressed the over-developed state structure, weak political institutions, and the perception of “Punjabi hostility” as major causes of regional-ethnic conflicts.⁶⁸

Pakistan is comprised of heterogeneous ethnic orders; in fact, the people of Pakistan form a complex “polygot” as Tahir Amin puts it, with migration from Central Asia, and Iran, plus the indigenous residents.⁶⁹ If we look at history before the secessionist movement of 1971, there were six major ethnic groups: Baluch, Bengalis, Mohajirs, (Urdu speakers in Sindh who migrated from Northern India), Punjabis, Pashtuns, and Sindhis.

Although ethnic groups claim a home province, the same territory is claimed as the historic homeland by at least one other, and in some instances, more than one other ethnic identity.

But, with the exception of the Bengalis in what was East Pakistan until 1971, there have always been a mix of ethnic groups in all the provinces. Unlike India, Pakistan has not altered the territorial status of the provinces it inherited from British India in 1947. So although ethnic groups claim a “home province,” according to Rasul Bakhsh Rais, “the same territory is claimed as the historic homeland by at least one other, and in some instances,

more than one other ethnic identity.”⁷⁰

In Sindh and Baluchistan, waves of migration have altered the demographic balance; first with the inflow of refugees from other parts of India in 1947, and next from Afghanistan in 1979, when the Soviet Union invaded the country. Since then, only the ANP (Awami National Party) has demanded Pakhtunkhwa, complaining about Punjabi domination.⁷¹ But their demand is fulfilled by the present government of the PPP. Unequal distribution of economic resources has led to migratory movements and finally separatist movements in the case of Bangladesh and now Baluchistan. Punjabi and Pashtun migration in Sindh have led to Sindhi and Mohajir movements. They use language and history to authenticate separateness, as Hindu and Muslim parties did in pre-Partition India.⁷² In Punjab the Sirai community also claims to be a separate group in South Punjab, an agrarian region and a major source of revenue.

The relationship between democracy and the multi-ethnic polarized society is interactive. The ethnic character of society influences the political ordering of the community, determines the rules of politics and shapes the general patterns of political behavior; democratic maturity mitigates ethnic tensions.⁷³

The British Raj supported Punjabis and Pashtuns more than other ethnic groups. As a part of their divide-and-rule strategy they termed ethnic groups who supported the British during the uprising of 1857 “martial races” while groups that had been instrumental in the uprising were dubbed “non-martial races.”⁷⁴ The biggest colonial legacy of the British has been the highly centralized and authoritarian state apparatus that came under the domination of Punjabis and Pashtuns over time. Consequently, the state elites of Pakistan have tried to create a single nation-state by using Islam and Urdu as a smokescreen for their nation-building policies.

In West Pakistan, ethnic groups raised their voices against prejudice and discrimination by the Punjabi dominating class, and the Baluch clashed with the center in the late 1950s on the issue of land allotments to Punjabi settlers along the border with Sindh. Since 1999, land has become a political issue at Gwadar, where non-Baluchs have been allotted lands, increasing local resentment.⁷⁵ Baluchistan’s Governor has said that Gwadar port belongs to the Baluch people.⁷⁶ This port can play a vital role in the development of Baluchistan. But the confrontation between the Center and Province will hurt development, peace, and stability in Baluchistan.

The central government needs to rethink its present nation-building strategy in terms of political reconciliation and provincial autonomy. Strong and authoritative central governments have always weakened the Pakistani state. The state elite has accommodated ethnic groups, promoted ethnicity for its own personal political interest. It has also instigated a sense of strong nationalism among them which eventually has turned anti-Pakistan.

CHALLENGES AND THREATS FROM WITHIN

Unfortunately the state structure has been weak and the political system has remained unstable in Pakistan. Unified social structures are weakening. As we know, no nation and society can progress without a strong state and strength relates to a state’s institutional and political capacity to perform

its primary functions, i.e. deliver services to society and provide justice. Military and civilian regimes have been equally unaccountable.⁷⁷

The judiciary has with rare exceptions been facilitating the military regime. The acceptance of the doctrine of necessity on critical occasions has undermined the judiciary from working as the guardian of the constitution and protector of the sovereignty of the parliament. The judiciary is identified as power broker, a facilitator under the cover of the Law of Necessity.⁷⁸ Whenever the judiciary refused to obey the ruler, whether civilian or military, it has been suppressed. Judges have been forced on leave; they were retired before tenure or detained and dismissed as General Musharraf did in 2007.⁷⁹ The deposed Chief Justice (CJP) of Pakistan, Iftkhar Muhammad, took oath as CJP under Musharraf's Provisional Constitutional Order

Since Pakistan has been supporting the U.S. war on against terrorism in Afghanistan, religious extremism and terrorism both have been posing a grave threat to nation-building process.

(PCO), and legitimized the military coup. Chief Justice himself fought with the State for himself and his colleague's reinstatement and has come back to his previous position on November 2, 2007.⁸⁰ But the question comes whether he would be able to work as an independent Chief Justice under the present government or whether the judiciary will get its independence and the people will benefit without discrimination? In the long run, in my view, it

cannot work. The appointment of the judges is a big question mark; they are appointed by the president under the Constitution of 1973. In the past both the prime minister and the president have been confronting over the appointments of judges.⁸¹

Since Pakistan has been supporting the U.S. war against terrorism in Afghanistan, religious extremism and terrorism both have been posing a grave threat to the nation-building process. Religious extremists have challenged the writ of government and the local Taliban have imposed Sharia⁸² in some areas of NWFP (North West Frontier Province).⁸³ Both provincial and federal governments have lost their control over the Swat District of the NWFP.⁸⁴ The Post-Bugti scenario poses a great threat in Baluchistan. The current government has not ended the military operation against Baluch militants. If it is continued and Baluch demands are not met under

the constitution of 1973, then civil war may well break out.

The grandson of the late Akbar Bugti, Brahamdagh has founded “Baluchistan Republican Army” in 2007. He threatened the present government of PPP: “if the government would not stop military operation in Baluchistan it should wait how we repay” he demands “independent Bluchistan.”⁸⁵ As we know, subversive activities, kidnappings and targeted murders⁸⁶ have increased manifold, especially in Baluchistan where a section of Baluch nationalists have taken up arms. On the other hand, the Taliban are challenging the State’s security and have stretched the security apparatus.

POLITICS BETWEEN REALISTS AND IDEALISTS

The major factors that prevented democracy from flourishing:

- a) the role of the higher judiciary in condoning the sacking of civilian government and solution of parliament, providing a cover to the perpetuation of self-interest by dictators. November 3, 2009 makes Pakistan’s history, over sixty years passed, the first time the Supreme Court resisted the executive and the military both.⁸⁷ If the judiciary would not protect the dictator’s and elites’ interests, Pakistan would be a different country;
- b) the other factor which has been the major obstacle in the way of democracy and nation-building is the lack of democratic values in the state institutions and democratic approach in our leadership;
- c) the last factor that is also significant which has divided our society in ethnic groups has been an undemocratic, and authoritative nature of our top leadership of mainstream political parties as we have seen after elections 2008.

The present government of the PPP was not comfortable with the Pakistan Muslim League Nawaz (PML-N) government in the largest province Punjab after the PML-N decision to quite its alliance with PPP.⁸⁸ Political rivalry increased between the two major parties (PPP-PML-N) when the PML-N decided to support lawyers movement and “long march.” When the two parties could not reach a compromise, the Supreme Court’s decision to disqualify the former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and the Chief Minister of Punjab on 25 February 2009 strengthened Nawaz’s image

nationally and internationally. The Court decision was seen as political, not legal or constitutional, because the judges were appointed by Musharraf. The decision destabilized the entire political structure in the country. Under the Court's verdict, the Sharif brothers were declared ineligible in contesting elections.⁸⁹ President Asif Ali Zardari, who has been denounced by the Sharif brothers, dismissed the PML-N government in Punjab that imposed Governor Rule after the court verdict. The decision to impose governor rule, I think, was the wrong one at the wrong time. The PPP lost its popularity and PML-N gained public sympathy which united the nation against the PPP-led government. From February 25 to March 16 (the twenty days "politics for power"), the political history of Pakistan polarized the society and party leadership between realists and idealists. The demand for a national agenda by the idealists dominated with the Army's and international community's intervention. We saw a military intervention on the eve of a political deadlock and a serious confrontation between political parties has always been crucial⁹⁰ and will be continued in the future if the politicians fail to act wisely and pragmatically. The Chief of the Army Staff (CAOS), General Ashfaq Kayani, has frequently been meeting with the president and prime minister to resolve the political crisis. This time the Army has restored its image which was lost by General Musharraf during his regime.

The restoration of the deposed Chief Justice would not be possible without CAOS's intervention. The government's decision at the last moment to restore the Chief Justice is an admission that over-centralism is not a political solution. It is a denial of the people's power and a grave risk to state sovereignty. This political dimension will not be reversed by the realists. This is not the first PPP government that was uncomfortable with the Punjab government. Prime minister Benazir Bhutto, during her first tenure, also confronted the then-Chief Minister of Punjab, Nawaz Sharif. Thus political intervention from the center during the entire history of Pakistan has been rampant. In my view the denial of provincial autonomy and political mandate has weakened the process of nation and state building. Concentration of power in the center has weakened the philosophy of Federation. Today Balouchistan has become a security challenge for the central government due to its denial of autonomy to Baluchistan.

THE POLITICS OF NATIONAL RECONCILIATION OR POLITICAL INTERESTS

The politics of national reconciliation has been applied in Pakistan's history, but it never been applied for the national interest or nation-building. State elites always used the term "reconciliation" either to stay in power or to facilitate a specific ethnic, political group. General Mushrraf also took initiative about national reconciliation (NR).⁹¹ In fact, it made a secretive political deal as NR because Mushrraf and Benazir Bhutto had bitter political relations. Mushrraf wanted to be elected the president for the next five years and Benazir Bhutto wanted to be a prime minister for the third time, but Mushrraf's 17th⁹² amendment was the major hurdle in her way. Both promised to facilitate each other and the National Reconciliation Order (NRO)⁹³ issued by Mushrraf in 2007. In May 2006, Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif both had signed the "Charter of Democracy"⁹⁴ (CoD). Both condemned dictatorship and pledged that they would continue democratic struggle against Mushrraf's regime. Benazir Bhutto ignored CoD and compromised on a deal for sharing power with Mushrraf.

The present government is also using the tactic of "political reconciliation" to retain and maintain its power and has filed a petition in the Supreme Court to review the Sharif brother's case against their disqualification. President Zardari also has announced the intention to lift the Governor rule from Punjab and accepts PML-N's majority to form the provincial government. It happened after the PPP failed to get its majority in the Punjab provincial assembly.⁹⁵ At the time when this piece is being discussed the Supreme Court has commenced a hearing to seek reversal of the Supreme Court's decision on 25th February 2009. Will the Court nullify the previous verdict and on what ground? Will the Sharif brothers be declared eligible to contest elections? Will the Court will play its role independently and fairly? These questions determine the political relations between PPP and PML-N and the independence of judiciary in Pakistan after the reinstatement of the deposed Chief Justice. It is, however, too early to judge given the fact that deposed Judges were restored shortly before this article was written.

CONCLUSION

The consequences of polarized politics in Pakistan are that the nation has not developed democratically, economically, and politically. State elites, both civilian and military, have failed to promote a democratic state structure and political system. The spirit of the Constitution has never been implemented. Most of the problems of nation-building arise from idealizing the nation-state model. What is needed is constitutional politics and power arrangements in which the state guarantees economic, cultural and political rights and, in return, a new social contract exercised and constituent groups accept the institutional and territorial legitimacy of the state.

Democratic norms and values are not a measure of political ideology. What matters to the political parties and political leaders is “political convenience to justify one’s misrule or the party boss orders.” Currently, Pakistan is passing through the gravest period of its history. Religious extremists, terrorists, nationalists, and ethnic groups are the greatest security threat to Pakistan. If we look at the current political system, the Army has the upper hand in political affairs as we saw, for example, during the first two weeks of March 2009.

Another factor which has promoted undemocratic political culture and undermined the nation as a “united nation” is that political parties have been dominated by the landlord class or single dominant individuals. Institutions of the civil society have proved too weak to offer any resistance to unconstitutional rule. Since Pakistan has suffered from political confrontation among the politicians, those in the opposition have not only hailed removal of elected governments but have also demanded such an unconstitutional act on the ground that the government was not functioning according to the Constitution. There cannot be greater political absurdity than such demands and celebrations over the downfall of government of other parties. This also shows absolute political immaturity, lust of power, selfishness and lack of self-esteem among the political class of Pakistan. A strong feudal political culture has strengthened a view that democracy should not be the most preferred way of political and economic development of Pakistan and that democracy has only legitimized the power of the most influential classes.

If we look at Pakistan’s political structure and history we can see that

over-centralism cannot overcome the forces of nationalism, ideology, and identity, and the state elites must accept and respect the Constitutional rights to disengage the undemocratic political forces and regain legitimacy. We have to recognize that the politics and ideology of identity is primarily about self-preservation as a cultural entity, and about economic, and political rights.

Since the world has been changed by the presence of global media, information about nations, states, and the movements for self-preservation cannot be suppressed. The state can no longer hide truth from citizens. Thus, the state needs to respect the Constitution and Constitutionalism must be seen in all state institutions in order to be seen as promoting a fair and legitimate government.

Notes

1. In 1971, people in East Pakistan, now Bangladesh, fought with Pakistani Army.
2. Author's discussion with Prof. Dr. Rasul Bakhs Rais, 26 January 2009.
3. Youssef Cohen, Brian R. Brown, and A.F. K. Organski, "The Paradoxical Nature of State-Making: The Violent Creation of Order," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 75, No. 4 (1981), pp. 901-10.
4. Ken Booth, ed., *New Thinking About Strategy and International Security* (London: Harper Collins Academic, 1991), p. 270.
5. Rasul Bakhsh Rais, op. cit.
6. Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, *Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, Vol. 1 (Lahore: Sh. Mohammad Ashraf & Sons, 1960) p. 160.
7. K.K. Aziz, *A History of the Idea of Pakistan* (Lahore: Vanguard, 1987), 4 volumes.
8. S. A. Vahid, *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal* (Lahore: Sh. Ashraf & Sons, 1964), p. 396.
9. Stanley Wolpert, *Jinnah of Pakistan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).
10. Abu-Al Maudoodi, *Islami Riyasat* (Islamic State) in Urdu (Lahore: Islamic Publications Ltd., 1969).
11. Abu- Al Maudoodi, *Nationalism and India*, (Pathankot: Maktaba-i-Jammat-i-Islami, 1967). Maudoodi was a religious scholar in Pakistan. He is considered a most respected person and an authority on religious issues.

12. Abdul Hameed Nayyar, "Rewriting the History of Pakistan," in Asghar Khan, ed., *The Pakistan Experience: State & Religion*, (Lahore: Vanguard, 1985), pp. 164-177.

13. Afzal Iqbal, *Select Writings and Speeches of Maulana Mohammed Ali*, (Lahore, 1944), p. 452.

14. Hafeez Malik, *Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan*, (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1963), p. 240.

15. Freeland Abbott, "The Jam'at-i-Islami of Pakistan." *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. 11 (Winter, 1957), p. 40.

16. Maudoodi, *Tehrikh-i-Azadi-i-Hind aur Musalmans* (The Indian independence movement and Muslims) in Urdu (Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1974).

17. Maudoodi, *Islamic Law and Constitution*, trans. and ed., Khurshid Ahmad (Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1960), pp. 5-6.

18. The reason: the separatist movement in Bangladesh was at its climax.

19. Sayeduddin Ahmad, *Ideology of Pakistan* (Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research, 1998).

20. Charles H. Kennedy, *Islamization in Pakistan* (Islamabad: Institute of Policy Research).

21. Islamic laws according to Qurannic principles.

22. In FATA, militants challenged the writ of the government and even the Army failed to restore the Government's writ in Swat and some Agencies in FATA.

23. Pakistan got independence on August 15, 1947 but the first constitution was delayed due to the religious factor (1956). General Zial-ul-Haq used Islam to gain political support from the various sections in the country. The bloody incident occurred during Mushrraf's era when some clergy were going to impose Sharia within the Capital and challenged Mushrraf's powers. Currently, Molvi Fazlullha has challenged the writ of the government in FATA and is striving to impose misinterpreted Sharia. Girl's schools are being burnt or closed. Women cannot move. Thus, Talibanization is being imposed in the name of Islam.

24. Sharif-u-al Mujahid, *Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah: Studies in Interpretation* (Karachi: Quaid-i-Azam Academy, 1981).

25. *Quaid-e-Azam Mahomed Ali Jinnah: Speeches as Governor-General of Pakistan 1947-1948* (Karachi: Pakistan Publications, n.d.), p. 65.

26. Rasul Bakhsh Rais. Op. cit.

27. In 2002, six religious parties, in the form of the MMA (Muthida-Mujles-Amal) United Front, emerged because people in Pakistan were opposing General Mushrraf's policy "war against terrorism." Unfortunatly, the MMA also supported Mushrraf for political gain and established their government in NWF, FATA

(currently the government) has signed an agreement with the local Taliban in Swat district, where they have established their own courts and have imposed Sharia.

28. Robert J. Jackson and Doreen Jackson. *A Comparative Introduction of Political Science*. (New Jersey: Simon & Schuster, 1997), p. 35.

29. Lucian W. Pye. *Politics, Personality and Nation Building: Burma's Search for Security*. (U.S.A: MIT, 1962.) p. 3.

30. Urmila Phadnis, Rajat Ganguly. *Ethnicity and Nation Building in South Asia*, (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1989), p. 59.

31. Mohammed Ayub, "The Security Problematic of the Third World," *World Politics*, Vol. 43 (January 1991), pp.265-266.

32. Altaf Hessian, leader of MQM (Muthida Qomi Movement) visited India in November 2004, where his anti-Pakistan statement increased resentment in civil society. See details in *Dawn* and *Daily Times*, 8-10 November 2009.

33. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, the great educationist was convinced that Muslims and Hindus could not live together.

34. Rasul Bakhsh Rais, *Recovering the Frontier State: War, Ethnicity and State in Afghanistan*, (USA: Lexington Books, 2008).

35. See detail in Khalid Hassan, *Rearview Mirror*, (Islamabad: Alhamr, 2002).

36. "Akbar Bugti killed in an Army operation," *Daily Times*, 27 August 2006.

37. In the Swat deal of March 16, 2009, the government accepted the Taliban's demands to exercise Sharia. Under this deal the judges were barred from the courts. Seven Qazi (religious scholars) were appointed to Swat High Court. See detail in "NWFP gov't asks Swat judges not to attend courts over Security Concerns," *Daily Times, The News*, March 19, 2009.

38. This post-9/11 incident makes religion a source of conflict between and within the states. This incident adversely affected Pakistan because religious forces have united against the state. Suicide bombers are being used as a weapon which has killed civilians, security personnel, and political personalities, including the former prime minister Benazir Bhutto (27 December 2007) and foreigners.

39. On November 26, 2008, terrorists attacked Mumbai. India accused Pakistani-banned religious groups, e.g. Laskar-e-Taiba which is a Kashmir based organization, banned by Mushrraf regime after 9/11.

40. Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, *Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, Vol. 1 (Lahore: Sh. Mohammad Ashraf & Sons, 1960) p. 160.

41. K.K. Aziz, *A History of the Idea of Pakistan* (Lahore: Vanguard, 1987), 4 volumes.

42. Stanley Wolpert, *Jinnah of Pakistan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

43. The long March, March 2009 (Lawyers movement) supported by the political parties, and civil society against the government succeeded after lawyers, and common people were scared. Some lawyers were burned alive in Karachi during Mushrraf era in 2007, some of them were targeted by suicide bombers. Most importantly, judges were put under house arrest when they refused to obey Mushrraf's order in November 2007. See details in *Daily Times*, May 13, 2007.

44. Nasreen Akhtar, "Ethnic Politics and Political Process in Pakistan" paper was presented in the conference on 15-16 October, Organized by Malaya University, Kula Lumpur, Malaysia.

45. Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan in the Twentieth Century: A Political History*, Karachi Oxford University Press, 1997.

46. Tariq Ali, *Pakistan: Military Rule on People's Power*, (New York: William Morrow, 1970).

47. Nasreen Akhtar, "Ethnicity and Political Process in Pakistan," op. cit.

48. Khalid bin Sayeed, *The Political System of Pakistan* (Pakistan: by arrangements with Houghton Mifflin 1966), p.62

49. Rasul Bakhsh Rais. Professor of Political Science at LUMS, (personal interview), December 28, 2008.

50. Rasul Bakhsh Rais. "A Dysfunctional State." *Daily Times*, 18 November 2008.

51. Author's interview with Islamabad-based (Ret) Col. (who requested anonymity), on 11 February 2009.

52. Nasreen Akhtar. "Pakistan's Undemocratic Political Culture" <http://arts.monash.edu.au/mai/asaa/proceedings.php>. Accessed on 28 December 2008.

53. General Zia amended the constitution 1973 and inserted 58-2 (b). The president shall dissolve the National Assembly if a situation has arisen in which the Government of the Federation cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and an appeal to the electorate is necessary, see, *The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan*, (Islamabad: Ministry of Law, Justice and Human Rights, 2004), p. 32.

54. Nasreen Akhtar, "Pakistan's Undemocratic Political Culture," op. cit.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid.

57. Nawaz Sharif challenged the Presidential Order in the Supreme Court. Presidential Order was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court and the Nawaz Sharif government was restored. Ghulam Ishaq Khan and Nawaz Sharif

could not work together. The then-Chief of the Army Staff, General Abdul Hamid Kakar forced them to resign. See text in *Dawn*, May 26, 1993.

58. Limited war was fought between India-Pakistan. Both Prime Minister and Chief of the Army Staff blamed each other.

59. *Dawn*, October 13, 1999.

60. Mushrraf was forced to resign on August 18, 2008.

61. Shuja Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan its Army, and the Wars Within* (Karachi: Oxford University Press 2008), p. xxxi.

62. "Army asked to be ready if security worsens," *Daily Times*, March 15, 2009. In early 1977, the same proposal was given by Prime Minister Zulfar Ali Bhutto's aide to ask the then-Chief of the Army Staff, General Zia-ul-Haq to control the situation and he would leave his office until the situation was controlled but General Zia rejected that proposal. See detail in Kahlid Hassan, *Rearview Mirror*, (Islamabad: Alhamr, 2002).

63. Rasul Bakhsh Rais. op. cit.

64. Mushrraf's interview with the Indian press on March 9, 2009. He legitimized the Army's intervention in politics.

65. Ibid.

66. Akbar Bugti was killed in a military operation on August 26, 2006.

67. Tahir Amin, *Ethno-Nationalist Movements of Pakistan: Domestic and International Factors*, Institute of Policy Studies, (Islamabad: 1988). p. 77.

68. Hamza Alvi, "Authoritarianism and Legitimizing of State Power in Pakistan," in Subtrata Mitra (ed), *The Post-Colonial State in South Asia*, (London: 1990).

69. Tahir Amin, op. cit.

70. Rasul Bakhsh Rais, "Politics of Ethnicity and Democratic Process in Pakistan" *Ethno-Nationalism and the Emerging World Disorder*, Gurnam Singh, ed., (New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers, 2002).

71. Author's interview with Islamabad-based retired bureaucrat (who requested anonymity).

72. Tariq Rehman, *Language and Politics in Pakistan*, (Krachi: Oxford University Press, 1996).

73. Rasul Bakhsh Rais, *Recovering the Frontier State: War, Ethnicity, and State in Afghanistan*, op. cit.

74. Craig Baxter, Yogendra Malik, Charles Kennedy, & Robert Oberst. *Governments and Politics in South Asia*. (Colorado: West view Press, 1998.) pp 8-9.

75. Rasul Bakhsh Rais, talk in seminar on "Dialogue on Provincial Autonomy,"

organized by aid action organization in Ambassador Hotel Lahore, 6 August 2008.

76. See detail in, Malik Siraj Akbar. "Raisani says Gawadar Belongs to Baluch," *Daily Times*, December 22, 2008.

77. Rasul Bakhsh Rais. "A dysfunctional State," *Daily Times*, November 28, 2008.

78. Shuja Nawaz. op. cit.

79. General Musharraf removed the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pakistan in March 2007.

80. General Musharraf imposed a state of emergency in the country on November 3, 2007.

81. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto and President Farooq Khan Laghari had conflict over the judiciary in 1996.

82. Islamic laws are being implemented according to their own understanding, and they have set up their own courts.

83. Abdul Saboor Khan. "Taliban Impose Sharia in Hangu," *Daily Times*, December 3, 2009.

84. Daud Khattak. "ANP's leader says Swat is out of Govt's control," *Daily Times*, December 7, 2008.

85. Malik Siraj Akbar. "Barahamdagh threats to 'repay' PPP," *Daily Times*, February 10, 2009.

86. See details in *Dawn*, January 27, 2009 and *Daily Times and Dawn*, 3 February, 2009. John Solecki, UNHCR official kidnapped by Baluchistan Liberation United Front.

87. Haris Khalique, "No democracy no tolerance," *The News*, May 9, 2008.

88. The Party leader Asif Ali Zardari, (President of Pakistan) broke all promises he made with PML-N on the issues of judiciary and repeal of 17th amendment; includes 58-2b. See detail in *Daily Times*, August 26, 2008.

89. See detail, "The Supreme Court released judgment on the Sharif brothers disqualification case," *Dawn*, March 21, 2009.

90. Talat Masood. "The Crisis and the Army," *The News*, March 16, 2009.

91. South Africa's model 2002 earned global respect. See "Ghana's National Reconciliation Commission: A Comparative Assessment" on www.ictj.org/static/Africa/Subsahara/GhanaCommission.pdf.

92. Under the 17th amendment the person who has served as Prime Minister twice cannot avail a third term, so both Benazir and Nawaz Sharif were declared

ineligible. These days, the removal of the 17th amendment has become PML-N's agenda.

93. See detail in *Dawn, The News*, October 6, 2007. Under this Ordinance, all corruption cases against Benazir Bhutto and her husband Asif Ali Zardari (President of Pakistan) were given amnesty.

94. Text of Charter of Democracy, see in *Dawn* May 16, 2006.

95. "Zardari signs summary to lift Governor's rule," *The News*, March 30, 2009, *Daily Times*, March 29, 2009