

Q

Discuss the commonalities and differences in the strategies employed by Ayub Khan, Zia ul Haq, Musharraf the three military regimes in the history of Pakistan in legitimizing their rule, undermining democracy, and utilizing state institutions to suppress their opponents.

Analyze the impact of these actions on Pakistan's political landscape during their respective tenures.

Answers:

Pakistan has spent several decades under military rule since its creation. It began with in 1958 when Muhammad Ayub Khan overthrew president Iskandar Ali Mirza and appointed himself president. His time period was from 1958 to 1969. In 1977 General Zia-ul-Haq, chief of army staff, assumed power through a coup against prime minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. His rule ended in 1988. The third military regime started in 1999 when General Pervez Musharraf's ^{officers} arrested Prime minister Nawaz Sharif and his ministers. General Pervez Musharraf stayed in power till 2008. Each military regime had its distinct characteristics, faced unique challenges, and implemented different strategies to legitimize their rule.

There are many commonalities and differences in the strategies employed

These three military regimes in the history of Pakistan.

Commonalities and Differences - in the strategies employed by Ayub Khan, Zia-ul-Haq, Musharraf in:

- (i) Legitimizing their rule
- (ii) Undermining democracy
- (iii) Utilizing state institutions

(i) Legitimizing their rule:

To justify their rule, these three military Generals, Ayub Khan, Zia-ul-Haq, and Musharraf used judiciary. During military regimes of these three General, there were instances of judges being appointed with the influence or approval of the respective military leaders. The process of judicial appointments was often subject to the political environment and the preferences of the ruling authorities.

Ayub Khan (1958-1969)

Ayub Khan played significant role in judicial appointments during his regime. He implemented constitutional amendments that expanded the Executive powers, allowing him to have considerable

influence over the appointment of Judges.

The Legal Framework (LFO) was issued in his time.

The LFO empowered the president to transfer cases involving offenses against public order, security and defense of Pakistan to military tribunals.

This move was criticised for undermining the independence of the judiciary and concentrating power in the executive branch.

Zia ul Haq (1977 - 1988)

Zia ul Haq's regime significantly influenced judicial appointments. The judiciary underwent changes to align it with Zia's Islamization policies, and judges sympathetic to the regime were appointed.

(1977)
The imposition of martial law by Zia ul Haq was agitated before the Supreme Court by Begum Nusrat Bhutto. The petitioners wanted to declare this imposition of martial law unconstitutional before the court but the court did not accept the petition and validated martial law under doctrine of necessity.

Pervaiz Musharraf (1999 - 2008)

Musharraf's regime also had a notable impact on judiciary. Following the coup 1999, Musharraf took measures that affected the composition of the judiciary.

Including the composition of judges who were perceived to be more favorable to the military regime. Musharraf introduced constitutional amendments that concentrated power in the presidency, allowing him to dissolve the parliament and dismiss the prime minister.

In each case, the military leaders sought to shape the judiciary in a way that aligned with their policies and goals.

(ii) Undermining Democracy:

Ayub Khan - Basic Democracy:

Basic democracy was a political system introduced during his rule. Basic democracy aimed to establish a grassroot level of representation. Local government units called Basic democracies were created at the district and sub-district levels. It replaced the previous system of elected local bodies. Members of National and provincial assemblies were not directly elected by public but by the members of basic democracy. The President held significant powers under this system. Ayub Khan's regime justified basic democracy as a means to prioritize economic development and stability.

This system centralized power with the president and central government having considerable influence over decision making.

Zia-ul-Haq - Local Government System:

Zia-ul-Haq introduced local government system during his regime. The system was aimed at decentralizing administrative and political authority, providing local autonomy and facilitating rural development. This system aimed to devolve administrative and financial powers to local government institutions. Union council was the basic administrative unit. Election on local level were held on non-party basis. System aimed to decentralize the decision making process. His regime sought to incorporate Islamic principle into governance.

Pervaiz Musharraf - Real Democracy:

Pervaiz Musharraf, during his tenure as president, often referred to his vision as "Real Democracy". He introduced party less local government system. Similar to Zia-ul-Haq's approach he advocated for devolution of power to local levels. The Local Government Ordinance 2001 aimed to empower local governments and enhance their decision making authority. Moreover, in 2002, Musharraf held a controversial referendum seeking public approval for his continued presidency.

These three regimes faced opposition, leading to protests. Their form of democracy was criticised by the public at some level.

(iii) Utilizing state institutions:

These three regimes utilized different state institutions against their opponents.

Ayub Khan : (Legislature - to pass acts)

Ayub Khan's regime was known for using different means, including legal mechanisms, to maintain control.

The Elective Bodies Disqualification Order (EBDO)

and the Public Office Disqualification Order (PODO)

were used to disqualify political opponents.

Under these orders, Ayub Khan's government could disqualify individuals from participating in elections or holding public office, suppressing opposition voices.

Ayub Khan's disqualified the president of Muslim League, Abdul Gayyom by utilizing the acts and even put some leaders in prison.

Zia-ul-Haq : (Coersion - create fear)

General Zia-ul-Haq, was known for using repressive measures, including imprisonment, to suppress opposition and consolidate power. During his military regime, Zia implemented martial law and suspended the constitution, leading to widespread human rights abuses.

Political opponents, activists and journalists critical

of Zia's policies often faced arbitrary arrests and

imprisonments. His approach to governance was characterized as authoritarianism, and his regime's use of imprisonment as a tool of control contributed to a climate of fear and political repression.

Musharraf: (empowered police)

Gen. Pervez Musharraf strengthened the police force to address issues of governance and law and order.

There were also times when these strengthened institutions were criticized for being used against political opponents. Police Order 2002 was a legal reform to improve the efficiency of police force and strengthen their ability to maintain law and order.

But it was also criticized for being used against political opponents. NAB was criticized for being used for political motives.

Impact of these actions on Pakistan's political landscape

(i) These patterns used by the three military regimes have become part of our political culture. Till this day, either bills or acts are passed against political opponents, or fear is created among people and political members,

and use of police to arrest the members of the other party. It has become a political culture in Pakistan.

(ii) Voting behavior is disturbed because of their democratic system.

Collectively, these regimes contributed to a pattern of authoritarianism, limited political freedoms and challenges to democratic governance

in Pakistan. The consequences of these periods continue to shape the political dynamics.

Conclusion:

These three military regimes, of Ayub Khan (1958 to 1969), Zia-ul-Haq (1977 - 1988) and Pervez Musharraf (1999 - 2008) shaped Pakistan's political landscape. Their strategies for legitimizing their rule, undermining democracy and utilizing the institutions to suppress the opponents, shared some commonalities and differences and they faced criticism and opposition, leading to eventual transitions back to civilian rule in Pakistan.