

Topic

I have gone through whole essay

How do constitutional changes affect the balance of power in Democratic Government?

Ur writing but not claiming or proving any point

1 Introduction

Thesis Statement: Undoubtedly, the constitutional changes directly affect the balance of power in the democratic government through the political, social and economic interests; however, by applying the pragmatic steps all the state components can be stable through constitutional balanced approach.

2. Balance of Power in State: Overview.

3. Constitutional changes affect the balance of power in democratic government

(3.1) Violating the fundamental rights of human.

(3.2) Imposing the biased opinion on the verdict of courts.

- (3.3) Compromising the power-authority of state component: pillars
- (3.4) Emergence of political influence over the judges.
- (3.5) Rising of political clashes among parties.
- (3.5) Weakening the strong writ of courts
- (3.6) Promoting the tendency of the dynastic politics
- (3.7) Discouraging the mechanism of the rule of law
- (3.8) Uprising the conflicts among Judiciary, Executive and legislature.
- (3.9) Compromising the credibility of sub-ordinate courts
- (3.10) Damaging moral authority of institutions.

4. By applying the balanced constitutional changes, the balance of power would be suitable for the state components in the democratic government.

(4.1) prioritizing the balanced duties of constitution for all the state components.

(4.2) depoliticizing the judicial process, justice and appointments.

(4.3) promoting the grand political consensus among political leaders.

(4.4) Encouraging the institutional harmony or the constitutional obligations.

(4.5) protecting the human basic rights.

5. conclusion,

"Constitution is a direction for all the state components and institutions, as the balance of power must be sustainable for prevailing institutional affairs smoothly and directly. Therefore, any amendment which curtail the power of the component of the state, it would definitely disarray the balance of power among judiciary, executive and legislature. Subsequently, constitutional changes affect the balance of power in the democratic government!"

Constitutional and political history of Pakistan, Hamid Khan. Having observed the said words, the constitutional changes affect the balance of power in the democratic government through pursuing political and economic interests. Moreover, constitutional changes violate the fundamental rights, imposing the biased opinion on court verdict and compromising the power authority in the state components. Along with it, these

Changes uphold the political influence over the judges and rise the political clashes among parties and masses.

Such changes in constitutional weaken the strong writs of courts and institutions; it promotes the tendency of the dynastic politics and it discourages the mechanism of the rule of law. Not only this but it also

damages the moral authority of institutions that serve the public interests. However, by applying the strong measures and balanced constitutional changes, the balance of power can be ensured

among the institutions in democratic government. Prioritizing the balanced duties of constitution for all

Write short sentences plz

the state components, depoliticizing the judicial process and appointments and promoting the grand political consensus among political parties and institutions play pivotal and crucial roles in the balance of power.

To start with, state is the supra entity of the world international relations. It goes around the balance of power among each component. It contains the three pillars that exist in the obligations of duties to the citizens are legislature, Executive and Judiciary. All the pillars are regularized under the separation of power by the under framework of constitution. Each pillar demands the equal power and interdependence, as it performs the duty, given by constitution without interferences and burdens. Thus, it is called the balance of power in the state system.

Constitutional changes affect the balance of power through the violation of fundamental human rights. Mostly, constitution ensures the fundamental rights. According to Universal Declaration of Human Rights, convention signed 10. Dec, 1948, it gives the full fledged

freedom of human rights to which Pakistan is also signatory. Unfortunately, Amendments in constitutional directly violate the human rights through

Plz write down which amendment u r writing about which curtail the power of human rights protection.

Hence, constitutional changes violate the human rights in democratic government.

Constitutional changes affect the judicial procedure to impose the biased opinion on the court verdicts. Historically, every government, first of all, derails the judicial process for their interest, manipulating the judicial affairs through the constitutional amendments.

For proving the point, Pakistan, United Kingdom, Belarus and Iran are constantly pursuing the procedure of courts for interference of opinions. This case is hitting the balance of power in the democratic government. Therefore, the

constitutional changes bring the ineffective policy in the balance of power of the state pillar.

These changes compromise the power authority of state pillars. State is a strong entity of the world; it is monitored through the legal framework in the shape of constitution. It regulates the pillars of state, but when one pillar suffers from the imbalance of power, the situation becomes unstable between two pillars. "Therefore, it is the change in the constitution that destabilizes the state's balance of power; constitution is the responsible factor for upholding the balanced stability." Hamid Khan. So, changes distract the flow of power in authority.

Plz bro check, it is very generic

No substantive discussion

Furthermore, emergence of political influence over the judges and verdicts is happened components. Along with it, these

due to the constitutional changes. Historically, in the case of Pakistan, the majority amendments are supportive to the Judicial reforms. When new government comes to power, it works on the judicial reforms, for the stability of government, whereas, India is the first democratic country that strongly pursues the democratic and believes in the balance of power among the institutions, especially in judiciary. It would not be wrong to state, in Pakistan, the political influence is the constant focus that has been remaining on the judgments and court verdict.

constitutional changes give rise the political clashes among parties. It is a very common phenomenon that political party always prioritizes its interest in the politics. For instance, the political situation in Pakistan is very suitable to spell out

the political clashes, raised by constitutional changes. In India and Pakistan and their political consensus on the constitutional changes are the trigger point of clashes due to the consensus. Every party gets passed the amendment on its interest and breaches the consensus with other parties. Ergo, constitutional changes demoralizes the politics.

Constitutional changes weaken the strong writ of judiciary and other institutions. According to the prominent philosopher of political science said, "Every institution has its moral writ to function its affair, but if it fails to impose, the credibility of any institutions become futile, plutto". However, the writ of the institutions and judiciary are supposed to be compromised due to which the balance of power endures the most.

Tendency of the dynastic politics is at the peak because of the constitutional changes.

Many a political party leaves no stone unturned to make an influence of dynastic politics in a country. As Dr Ishtiaq said in his book *Pakistan: A Garrison State* in which he explained, the historical perspective of Pakistan is replete with dynastic politics like Indian Gandhian party. For sustaining their legitimacy, they go with the constitutional amendment, building the blocks to extend the tenure of government.

In short, due to the constitutional changes, they compromise the balance of power for their dynastic politics.

~~The proper mechanism of the rule of law is being discouraged under the constitutional changes in the democratic government.~~

The balance of power promotes the rule of law through the parliament, and judiciary.

Rule of law is the most significant obligation of judiciary and executive, ensuring for all the citizens. However, 26 amendment curtailed the separation of power mechanism of the judiciary.

It results into failure of implementing the rule of law in a country.

Hence, constitutional changes discourage the rule of law.

Every amendment directly or indirectly upriser the conflict among the pillars of state: Executive, Judiciary and parliament. The history is replete with such clashes and conflicts among pillars. Pakistani government mostly curtail the power of judiciary to make the legislature powerful instead. However, constitution of Pakistan articles 91 and 91, they define the separation of power among the pillars. No one has right to interfere in any other pillar of state. So, constitutional changes violate the balance of power duty of the constitution.

The judiciary is the very important pillar of a state, but when it is manipulated by constitutional changes, the credibility of the sub-ordinate courts would be compromised. It mostly happens in the democratic government either in Pakistan, India, the USA or the UK. According to Ishrat Hussain, "Whenever any institution is reformed or restructured, the whole structure of that institution would somehow be replicated." Similarly, courts, the lower ones, would face the discreditable effect of any amendment regarding judiciary and their power would also be compromised.

Moral authority of institutions would also be damaged through the illogical constitutional changes. Constitutional changes can be either positive or negative, but their repercussions are far-reaching. Subsequently, any amendment would go with reforms but

it damages another moral authority. For instance, 86 amendment had the core purpose to build the supremacy of parliament, whereas the moral authority of judiciary is at stake because parliament has the complete authority to appoint ~~of~~ judges of the superior courts in accordance with article 175(A). Such ~~the~~ reforms curtailed moral authority of other institutions

However, prioritizing the balanced duties of constitution for all the state pillars would bring the balance of power in the democratic government. Constitution strictly emphasizes the separation of power and boundary of the each constitutional institution, working under the given powers of constitution through article 51 and 91. This assigned boundary leads the proper and certified mechanism, maintaining the balance of power. It not only brings stability and co-relations

among the institutions but also strengthens the state pillars.

Judicial process and appointments should be depoliticized, as the balance of power can be ensured independently. Most probably, parliament interferes in the appointments of the judges which is very drastic for the supremacy of judiciary. According to article 175(A), every senior judge must be appointed as per the procedure. As it used to be happened in the past, the senior most judge would be elected. This process would ensure the transparency of the balance of power thoroughly in the democratic government.

The grand political dialogue and consensus is the hope of the balance of power, ensuring among institutions through constitutional changes. Moreover, political consensus supports

the positivity in the constitutional changes in order to avoid the violation of the balance of power. "Grand political dialogue for reforms would definitely carry out the huge opportunities of growth and improvements of institution" Sir Shashi Tharoor. Every United political consensus changes the approach of the constitutional changes for balance of power.

Encouraging the institutional harmony on the constitutional obligations is an evident to protect the balance of power among the pillars of state. "Judiciary has moral authority, parliament, whereas executive force and resources, so all have the respective authority. Their internal harmony would push them to bring about the balance of power" Justice Saeed Zaman Siddique. Harmony in the internal and external institutions grip the hold of

balance of power through constitutional changes.

Protection of the basic human rights is the strict and obvious sign of the balance of power in the democratic government. Every institution is responsible to build up the strong wall, protecting the human rights whether through constitutional or state policy. To keep prioritizing the fundamental rights should be the top mind of government. All the said obligation is possible to keep balancing in power of the state components. The constitutional changes reflect the core custodian of the protection of human rights.

In a conclusion, there is no denying the fact that constitutional changes would affect the balance of power in a democratic government through compromising the power authority of the state pillars, emergence of

political influence over ~~state~~^{the} judges, rising political clash among, promoting the tendency of the dynastic politics.

Furthermore, constitutional changes discourage the mechanism of the rule of law, uprising the conflict among the judiciary executive and legislature, compromising the credibility of the sub-ordinate courts as well. However, for upholding the balance of power through the constitutional changes, the most important segments play the very significant role in shape of prioritizing the balanced of power of and constitutional duties for all the state components, depoliticizing the judicial process and promoting the grand political consensus. Every state is inclined to the balance of power internally; without the balance in power, stability is an utopia and sore dream.

Aristotle