

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

plz break into short
sentences

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: Banachist 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-Labbaik 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 ^{attack}

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 ~~multiple ethnicities~~ among

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 averse 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-**issues** 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 47th 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 military regimes of people came

out for the demand
of their fundamental
rights. There escalated
a 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 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 discussing state for breacking 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 Jehreek-i-Lehail 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. Palattan 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 hand, then reforms to enhance the prosperity of Pakistan is also not unaccomplishable with indefatigable endeavours.