

TOPIC: Is a Hard State  
the only solution  
to Problems of  
Pakistan

Outline:

A. Introduction

1. General Statement:

Pakistan lost its  
half-segment in 1971 due  
to adoption of hard  
policies at that time.  
This reflects that hard state  
does not stand to be  
the tangible solution for  
its miseries

2. What does it mean  
by hard state?

3. Thesis Statement:

This essay will  
underscore that hard-state  
cannot address the problems  
of Pakistan.

B. How Hard State Cannot  
Address the Problems  
of Pakistan

1. Undermines the rule of  
law;

a. Judiciary would fail  
to promise justice

b. Case in point: 27th Amendment  
has flipped the wings  
of judiciary to eliminate  
people's grievances  
against oppressors

2. Denies freedom of  
speech;

- a. Minimum freedom in speech cannot reflect the issues of people
- b. Case in point: People opposed the oppression of journalists in Pakistan

3. Snatches fundamental rights

- a. Zero fundamental rights would provoke people for demonstrations
- b. Case in point: People demanded freedom of speech in the regimes of military rulers

4. Ruins fair representation

- a. There would be no process of fair elections
- b. Case in point: Unfair elections led to the disintegration of Pakistan in 1971

5. Strengthens mutiny

- a. Hardness would add to the miseries of ignored and oppressed people
- b. Case in point: Baruchisan Liberation Front seeking liberation on the pretext of state's suppression

b. Fosters religious extremism

- a. Orthodox Ulemas would incite their followers against state
- b. Case in point: State strived to control the demonstrations of Tehreek-i-Labaik in Lahore

## 7. Brings economic crisis;

a. Industrialists would prefer liberation from the hard state

b. Case in point: Strict security regulations of the APS prompted industrialists to shift industries <sup>abroad</sup>

## 8. Ruins state's soft-image;

a. Depicts country's barbarous face to the world

b. Case in point: Tourists denied to visit Pakistan after military operations

## 9. Declines sports;

a. Strict security measures bring fear in the hearts of visiting sportsmen

b. Case in point: India denied to play in Pakistan due to security concerns

## 10. Promotes ethnic crisis;

a. Hardness widens the gap between among multiple ethnicities

b. Case in point: Punjabi and Bengali strife culminated in the separation of Pakistan

## C- Conclusion

To sum up, people think that hard state can bring out Pakistan from the morass of crisis. However, reality is this <sup>averse</sup> assertion.

# ESSAY

In 1971, Pakistani rulers decided to win the allegiance of masses through hard measures. This harshness did not equip Pakistan with the intended policy. There happened disintegration of the country in two parts. Therefore, harshness is not the viable solution to meet the long-standing problems of Pakistan. Hard state means where there exists no endurance for public opinion. The policies of the state appear legitimate in every walk of life. Similarly, hard state cannot liberate Pakistan from its contemporary problems. It would further burdenize Pakistan with enormous problems. In a hard state, rule of law fails to promise people's right. It fails to preserve an appropriate say of people for their rights. Fundamental rights seem a distant dream to people. People fail to witness their genuine representative through fair elections. Mutiny

appears to be the perpetual fate of hard state. Unlike, some people hold averse opinion in this regard. They consider hard state as the only remedy to address Pakistan's problems. They cement their assertion by depicting the success of North Korea, Saudi and China. However, their claim hold little ground. These countries have failed to accomplish the true empathy of their masses. People still strive to get liberation from their hard policies. Hence, Pakistan too cannot promise the solution of its woes with compulsive and coercive approach.

To begin with, hard state undermines the rule of law. Rule of law means the existence of judiciary hold on critical matters of public. Hard state does not allow the judiciary to preserve its hold. It undermines the

prerogatives of judiciary in eliminating or entertaining public's issues. This uncertain condition deprives the public from safeguarding their right of justice. Similarly, the 27th Amendment has raised discontent in people in this regard. It seems to be the obstacle for judiciary. It aims to flip the wings of judiciary. People do not find it as an appreciable measure. They witness it as a regulation on their voice against breachers and oppressors. Hence, rule of law suffers in a hard state. Apart from this, hard state denies freedom of speech. Freedom of speech means one's right to express his or her concerns. Hard state cannot bear this freedom. It wants the regulation in this aspect. Freedom of speech emerges as a threat to survival of hard state. Minimum speech cannot guarantee or the portrayal of people's concerns rights. Similarly, people oppose

restriction in this regard. They do not want to contribute in such a suffocating circumstances. In the same way, Pakistani masses rose against the brutal torture on journalists. They ensured their presence in multiple demonstrations for the perseverance of journalists' rights. Hence, hard state spoils freedom of speech.

Moreover, hard state snatches fundamental rights. Fundamental rights are the rights that enable individual to ensure their survival in any community. It assists in the smooth running of society. Hard state brings the violation of fundamental rights. Fundamental rights come as a obstruction in hard-state's trajectory. It denies fundamental rights. This denial brings anger in masses. They come out on roads to record their concern against this denial. Similarly, this impasse was witnessed during regimes of military rulers. People came

out for the demand of their fundamental rights. There is an escalated gap between folks and rulers. Hence, hard-state cannot protect the fundamental rights of people.

Similarly, hard-state take away the right of fair elections. Elections mean to acknowledge people's verdict. Elections bring clouds of detriment for a hard-state. It would be unable to withstand the pressure of public representatives. Therefore, it condemns the process of elections. Pakistan bore the brunt of this violation in 1971. It disintegrated into two segments in the wake of oppressive elections. Similarly, it cannot afford this happening once again. Thus, hard-state distances the people from the blessing of fair and adequate elections.

In addition, hard-state strengthens muting. Muting means the feelings of separation from state's

24

autonomy. Harsh policies enhance the sentiments of despondency in masses. They seem reluctant to endure policies against their free-will. Oppressed people see these harsh-policies as a death-blow to their already vulnerable rights. They start raising against the institutions of the country. They seek their rights by challenging the sovereignty of the state. The mutiny in Balochistan is case in point. Rebellions justify this appraisal ~~again~~ on the pretext of state's harsh policies. They try to legitimate their demand of liberation on this ground. Thus, hard-state justifies mutiny.

Likewise, hard-state breeds religious extremism. Religious extremism means to incite people on the grounds of their faiths and religion. It does not stand apart from oppression. Oppression culminates in the revival of Orthodox Ulemas. After their revival,

they urge their followers to oppose states harshness in this domain. People start accusing state for breaching the sanctity of sects through harshness. They see state ruthless in denying their religious festivals. Similarly, Pakistan has remained vulnerable to religious extremism for years. It struggled to control the extensive protests of Tehreek-i-Lehall in Lahore. There occurred an ample loss of security personnels in the wake of these demonstrations. Thus, hard-state cannot withstand religious extremism.

Moreover, economic crisis culminates from the hard-approach of any state. Economic crisis means state's failure to meet the livelihood and basic needs of people. No industrialist desire to work under the stringent policies of country. They would prefer to shift their business to a smooth country. Smooth

environment suits their interest. Pakistan witnessed the escape of businesses after the Army Public School incident - People appeared unwilling to comply the strict measures of the state. They faced constant surveillance from the hands of the security personnels. This prompted them to migrate. Hence, hard-state cannot defeat economic - crisis.

Likewise, hard-state portrays the barbaric or barbarous image of any country. Barbarous image means the oppressive mentality of any state. Security operations and measures seem to be the norm in such states. It hinders the arrival of foreigners. Tourism bears an unprecedented decline due to this barbarous image. Tourism fails to contribute in the revenue of such a state. Tourists cannot pose themselves to visit any unstable state at the venture of their lives.

Similarly, Pakistan tolerated this de-escalation in tourism due to its harsh-policies. Tourist guides are still wandering with empty-stomach. Hence, hard-state spoils country's image

Similarly, sports seems to be a distant-dream in hard-states. Sports means the source of entertainment. Hard-state rarely promotes this entertainment. The absence of sports push country's youths in the hands of terrorism. Terrorist manipulate this disappointed and deprived youths in their way. They utilize them for evil gains. Similarly, hard-image of a country hampers the arrival of sportmen. They fear to play in the atmosphere of fear. India's denial to play in Pakistan can be considered as a precedent in this regard. India refused to play in Pakistan owing to security concerns. Thus, there comes no feature

of sports in the destiny  
of hard-states

Last but not least,  
hard-state escalates ethnic  
crisis. Ethnic crisis means  
to keep the sentiments  
of hatred on the  
basis of ethnic belonging.  
Hardness widens the gap  
among various ethnicities.  
They blame one another  
for inflicting atrocities  
on them. There does  
not appear consensus  
and harmony among  
the people. They shift  
the onus of suppression  
and allege one another.  
The Punjabi and Bengali  
strife testified this  
fact in 1971. They accused  
each other for their  
oppression owing to the  
harsh policies of the  
state. Hence, hard-state  
cannot safeguard Pakistan  
from ethnic dissent.

To end up the discussion,  
hard-state does not seem  
to be the tangible  
measure for fixing  
Pakistan's problem. However,  
sceptics endorse this  
as an appropriate one.

Their evidences do not hold any ground in the practical world. Their claims are the outcome of fragile stance. In reality, hard-state takes the country to the brink of catastrophe. Pakistan too is exposed to this fact. It would hardly handle ethnic crisis with the aid of hard-state. The world would observe the barbarous face of Pakistan in return or adoption of this approach. Religious biasness would be prevailing in such a atmosphere. No one can deny the separation of Bengal due to this phenomenon. However, there always exists a light at the end of the tunnel. Pakistan can ameliorate the plights of its people without pursuing the idea of hard-state. If it can hurry the monster like covid-19 in hudd, then reforms to enhance the prosperity of Pakistan is also not un-accomplishable with indefatigable endeavours.