

5-2010

Civil-military relations: A case study of Pakistan

Najiyah Khan
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [International and Area Studies Commons](#), and the [Political Science Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Khan, Najiyah, "Civil-military relations: A case study of Pakistan" (2010). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 880.

<https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/880>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS: A CASE STUDY OF PAKISTAN

by

Najiyah Khan

Bachelor of Arts
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
1997

Bachelor of Science
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2000

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

**Master of Arts in Political Science
Department of Political Science
College of Liberal Arts**

**Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
May 2010**



THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

We recommend the thesis prepared under our supervision by

Najiyah Khan

entitled

Civil-Military Relations: A Case Study of Pakistan

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Political Science

Mehran Tamadonfar, Committee Chair

Kenneth Fernandez, Committee Member

Ted Jelen, Committee Member

Satish Sharma, Graduate Faculty Representative

Ronald Smith, Ph. D., Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
and Dean of the Graduate College

May 2010

ABSTRACT

Civil-Military Relations: A Case Study of Pakistan

by

Najiyah Khan

Dr. Mehran Tamadonfar, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Political Science
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Pakistan is a young and violent nation. It has been under military rule for more than half of its existence and the presence of Islamists in the country has been increasing in recent years. These two actors have played a crucial role in creating the Pakistan of today: a violent, unstable system with revolving governments. What role have civilian governments played while interacting with the Islamists and the ever present military? What has led to the Pakistan we see today? Is there any hope that Pakistan can remove the violent actors within its borders and create real change to become a stable nation?

This thesis will attempt to analyze the three main actors in Pakistan: the civilian government, the military, and the Islamists. It will discuss how the relationship between these three has been alternatively cooperative and antagonistic.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to give my thanks to my thesis committee. Their assistance in the entire writing process was most valuable. My deepest gratitude goes to the chair of my committee, Dr. Mehran Tamadonfar. His unwavering support is emblematic of an excellent professor. I am also very grateful to the administrative staff. They were of great assistance in every step of the process.

The support of my family was instrumental in the successful completion of this thesis. My mother's unselfish support will never be forgotten. I hope to be as supportive of my children's endeavors as she has been of mine. Lastly, I want to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation to my strongest advocate, my remarkable husband, Ali. His unconditional love and support has always been a motivating factor in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	vi
CHAPTER 1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	1
Civil Institutions	2
The Military Establishment	6
Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan	13
CHAPTER 2 THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF PAKISTAN	15
Colonialism.....	15
Partition of the Indian Subcontinent	16
Creation of Pakistan.....	20
Kashmir	27
1971 War.....	28
The Role of Modernization in Pakistan Civil Society	31
CHAPTER 3 THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT	33
History	33
Ideology.....	34
Organization.....	35
Ethnic Make-up	37
Military in Politics.....	40
The Military in the Government	43
Islamization and the Military	49
CHAPTER 4 ISLAM AND THE ISLAMISTS	57
Islam as a Political Ideology	57
Islamism in Pakistan.....	57
Sectarianism and Islamism.....	62
Contemporary Islamist Conflict.....	64
CHAPTER 5 DEMOCRATIZATION AND CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS	68
Islam and the State.....	68
Civilian Leaders	68
CONCLUSIONS	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	88
VITA	91

INTRODUCTION

Pakistan has been through a tumultuous sixty years since independence. The military played a pivotal role in the independence of Pakistan and has continued its political role ever since. While the military's role permeates throughout the political system, there have been periods of challenges to this role over the years. In recent years, particularly since the war on terror was undertaken by President Musharraf, the military is being challenged by the Islamists who employ Islam as an instrument for achieving their political objectives.

Why is the military so dominant in Pakistan? How has the war on terror shaped the new dimensions of the civil-military relations in Pakistan? How do the democratic forces, secular and Islamist, deal with the changing policies of the military political leaders? How will the current efforts at democratization change the civil-military relations in the future? What will be the future of Islamism in Pakistan? These are the critical questions that will be dealt with in this thesis.

Despite tremendous efforts on the part of the secular and religious forces, and the creation of many civil institutions, there is no effective institutional counterbalance to the military. In fact, some military leaders are effectively linked to the civil society and have co-opted these forces to their own interests. General Zia-al-Haq's Islamization process (1977-1988) and support for the Islamists empowered such groups, which the military regime manipulated in its own domestic and foreign policies. The events of September 11 changed the dynamics of the military-Islamists relationship, creating a war at home. It is in this

context of internal war that the future of Pakistani democracy must be understood and analyzed.

Many factors have played a role in creating the Pakistan of today. One must begin by going back to the time before independence to understand the kind of foundation Pakistan was built upon. The violent split of the Indian Subcontinent put Pakistan on a unique path towards self-governance and greatly influenced the direction that it has taken.

Pakistan and India were divided in 1947 after less than one-hundred years as a British colony (also known as the British Raj). Pakistan was created for the Muslims of the Indian Subcontinent and the Hindus were to remain in India. The “partition”, as it is known to Indians and Pakistanis, was vicious and brutal. The migration of approximately ten to twelve million people is considered to be the largest of its kind in modern times.¹ The number of deaths during the actual migration between August and September of 1947 vary between 200,000 to one million people.

The partition left a legacy that has been felt more so in Pakistan than in India. Pakistan had to create a country from scratch. Infrastructure, institutions, and governmental systems did not exist in Pakistan. India, on the other hand, had many of these in place during the time of the British Raj. The British had established institutions in India, which were utilized after partition to set up the Indian government. Pakistan had no one but the military to turn to for assistance

¹ Khan, 2007, p.6

in creating some sort of government system. No outside organization or nation was concerned about its feeble existence. With the weak and fragile Pakistan still recovering from the devastation of partition, the military was able to come in and take hold of the country from the beginning.

Pakistan's beginnings and current standing in the world offer an interesting study on relations between a dominant military and an almost non-existent civil society. Chapter one of this thesis will introduce a theoretical framework analyzing civil-military relations. It will discuss how the strength of civil institutions can dictate and decide what kind of influence, if any, the military will have in state affairs. Samuel Huntington's theories on civil-military relations will be discussed; specifically, his ideas regarding objective civilian control.

Chapter two will discuss the establishment of the state after partition. The history behind the political development and the stages of both nation and state building will be analyzed. Pakistan's nation building mainly revolved around religious identity, it was the reason for partition was to have a separate nation for Muslims. The discussion about state building process will underscore the attempts at creating a government system. This will include the first constitution, written in 1956, and the role of Islam.

Chapter three will focus on the history and the continuing military influence in Pakistani politics. Pakistan has seen direct military rule for more than half of its sixty years of independence. The military leaders who have chosen to step in to the leadership role have done so with the intention or claim of saving Pakistan from self-destruction. No mention is made of the threat the military feels to its

own existence and power. Numerous military leaders will be discussed in this chapter, as well as the methods used to protect their power. The military has and will use almost any means necessary to protect its own interests; this includes using the Islamists.

Chapter four examines the significant role of the Islamists in Pakistani politics from inception to the present. Islamists are defined as individuals or groups that use Islam as a platform and inspiration for their political ideology and goals. In Pakistan, many but not all Islamists use political parties to further their agenda. They have, at times, aligned themselves with the military for this purpose and this partnership has been volatile. Both players use each other to protect their own interests. The influence of the Islamists has grown tremendously in the past thirty years and more so since the events of September 11, 2001.

Chapter five will analyze attempts at the democratization of Pakistan and the vital role the civil-military relationship has played in this struggle. I will include a detailed analysis of the civilian leaders and their power play with the military. With the numerous obstacles Pakistan has had to face, how can it move forward and become a stable and healthy nation? It demands a relationship between the civil society and military that gives power to the civilian institutions. Pakistan has a long road ahead to meet this challenge. Will the military and the Islamists be willing to step back and allow the civil institutions to have the main role in Pakistani politics? The hope is that Pakistan has the ability to survive the internal wars it is currently facing and move forward in becoming a stable democracy.

CHAPTER 1

CIVIL MILITARY RELATIONS: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Throughout history, numerous countries have experienced their military's involvement in the governmental system. Some have evolved into civilian governments whereas others have experienced a vicious cycle of regular military intrusion. Pakistan is one country that has witnessed a military presence in its governmental system since its birth. In its nearly sixty-two years since independence, the Pakistani military has had either direct or indirect control of the government. It has had a tremendous influence on the direction that Pakistan has taken. The current instability witnessed today in Pakistan is due to an unbalanced relationship between the civil system and the military establishment. What is greatly lacking is a civil-military relationship that allows for the civil institutions to flourish and the military to stand in the background of this civil environment.

Samuel Huntington is well known for his research in civil-military relations. He breaks down the various levels of relationships that can exist between a country's military and civil system. He and other political scientists argue that to eliminate the possibility of the military's encroachment into governmental affairs, civil supremacy must be present. The question that must be asked is what types of civilian systems create an easy entry for the military and allows them to flourish? In addition to Samuel Huntington, both Max Weber, and Christopher Clapham contribute to this part of the discussion.

The backbone of a strong, well-established political system is a high level of political institutionalization. Samuel Huntington contends that there are four features that measure the institutionalization of a political system. They are: adaptability, complexity, autonomy, and coherence. When these four are in sync, the political system, civil society, military, and other institutions work together to create civil supremacy.

Gabriel Almond and C. Bingham Powell also contribute to the study of civil institutions (civil supremacy) by describing two ways to gauge the amount of civil supremacy that exists in a given civil society. They use sub-system autonomy and structural differentiation to measure the level of institutionalism.

Weak civil institutions allow easy entry for domineering governing systems, such as: patriarchy, patrimonialism, and neo-patrimonialism. These systems are exhibited effectively by the military establishment. These systems and how they allow for a strong military presence in the civil government will be explained in greater detail in this chapter.

Civil Institutions

Samuel Huntington defines institutionalization as a “process by which organizations and procedures acquire value and stability.”² He argues that a major distinction between a politically developed system and an underdeveloped one is the numbers, size, and effectiveness of its organizations.³ He describes four features of institutionalism that exist in societies and how these will dictate

² Huntington, 2006, p.12

³ Ibid., p. 12

the type of society that exists in certain countries. The first feature is the adaptability-rigidity of an organization in a society. The more adaptable it is the more likely it is to survive over time. The “generational age” of an organization is one approach to measure its adaptability. If an organization is still being led by its founders its ability to adapt in the future becomes less likely. A successful transfer of power over the lifetime of an organization is very important in creating longevity. The second feature of institutionalism is the amount of complexity or simplicity in an organization. If it is a highly complex organization it is considered highly institutionalized. Huntington gives an example of the United States as a hierarchy that exemplifies a high level of institutionalism. It has numerous political institutions which serve many functions, they include: the presidency, congress, the Supreme Court, and state governments which all serve different purposes.⁴ The third feature of institutionalism is the amount of autonomy or subordination that exists within an institution. This feature measures how much independence an organization has from non-political actors, such as the military. Are organizations easily influenced by the behavior of these non-political actors or are they immune to their influence? In highly institutionalized and well developed societies, the political organization is highly autonomous. While in societies which lack autonomy, political organizations are extremely susceptible to outside actors. The fourth feature of institutionalism is the level of coherence or disunity in a society. According to Huntington, the ability to coordinate and

⁴ Ibid., p. 18-19

discipline (signs of coherence) is crucial to politics, and political systems that have successfully exhibited these behaviors have been highly institutionalized.

When these four features of institutionalism exist in a civil society the ability of outside entities to influence it is less likely. This is largely due to the ability of the civil institutions to provide for the society. The civilian society is satisfied that the civil institutions can and will provide all that they need to succeed. The loyalty of the populace to these institutions prevents the entrance of outside actors.

Related to the above discussion on levels of institutionalism are Huntington's two approaches to minimizing military power. These will offer a glimpse at the different levels of involvement by the military in societies. In subjective civilian control, one organization in civil society is able to maximize its power over all other civil institutions. But there can be a fight for civilian control amongst the civil groups. The military is manipulated by the domineering civil group which wants to protect its own interests (i.e. maintaining power over all other civil institutions). Because the military plays this function, it is unable to be seen as an independent entity, which is crucial to a healthy, well-established civil society. Conversely, in objective civilian control, military professionalism is of the utmost importance. By maximizing the professionalism of the military, the civil society makes them a tool of the state. They become a separate, autonomous entity; the military operates independent of the civil society. Huntington argues that by "making the military professional the state makes them politically sterile and neutral."⁵ Therefore, they know their place and the role they serve in society.

⁵ Huntington, 1957, p. 84

Huntington contends that objective civilian control is difficult to create; hardly any non-western nations have been successful in creating complete objective civilian control.

Gabriel Almond and G. Bingham Powell discuss sub-system autonomy and structural differentiation in civil societies and how they can dictate the amount of institutionalism that exists. They add to Huntington's argument regarding what contributes to civil supremacy (i.e. strong civil institutions). Sub-systems, such as political parties, pressure groups, and the mass media ought to be independent of the government. Almond and Powell define sub-system autonomy as the amount of independence these actors have from the governmental structure. In weak civil societies these actors will be subordinate to the government (ignoring the will of the populace), whereas in a strong civil system, these actors are allowed autonomy to process political demands and proposals.⁶ When these actors are subordinate to the government, other outside actors are able to easily infiltrate the government and use their own power to further their own interests.

Almond and Powell define structural differentiation as the development of new roles and subsystems; it also deals with the changes that can occur in the relationship between roles, structures, or between subsystems. Structural differentiation is a principal aspect of development or transformation of a political system.⁷ Almond and Powell use the United States as an example of a highly

⁶ Almond and Powell. 1966, p. 46

⁷ Ibid., p. 307 and 22

differentiated political system, “political functions are to be performed by multiple highly specialized structures: communication is controlled by the mass media; political recruitment is done by the electoral and party structures; interest articulation, by a large variety of groups.”⁸

Subsystem autonomy and structural differentiation are somewhat inter-dependent. Almond and Powell claim that subsystem autonomy exists alongside structural differentiation.”⁹ They argue that these two aspects of political development are critical to the health of a government system. Subsystem autonomy and structural differentiation can dictate the level of institutionalization that is able to exist free and independent of the government system.

The theories of Huntington, Almond and Powell are connected by the argument that describes the requirements of strong civil institutions and how they lead to a healthier government system which is immune to non-governmental actors.

The Military Establishment

Huntington’s research on civil-military relationships opens the door to a collection of theories that discuss praetorianism, patriarchy, patrimonialism and neo-patrimonialism. These theories explain the mindset of a military that feels entitled to entering the political realm.

Huntington contends that praetorianism is a key component in a weak civil society-strong military relationship. He defines praetorianism as the military’s

⁸ Ibid., p.31

⁹ Ibid., p. 307-8

interference in their country's political system¹⁰ "A praetorian society is one in which there are no effective institutions, and in which social groups take direct political action to achieve their goals - a free-for-all in which the army is likely to be most successful because it largely controls the instruments of force."¹¹ Huntington continues by adding, "the military's presence is due to the absence of effective political institutions that are capable of mediating, refining, and moderating group political action...this absence means that power is fragmented: it comes in many forms and in small quantities. Authority over the system is transitory, and the weakness of political institutions means that authority and office are easily acquired and easily lost."¹² He discusses how in countries which are not fully developed, the military has the opportunity to help build the society. The key is that they realize their presence in civil society can prevent or stunt the growth of political institutions and the economy. The military must acknowledge that they can leave the praetorian environment only if they use the political system to do so.¹³ This is an idealist view of military behavior. If the power that comes with leadership does not consume them perhaps they will do what is right and help their country create strong institutions and therefore build a healthier civil-military relationship.

¹⁰ Huntington, 2006, p. 195

¹¹ Clapham, 1985, p. 139

¹² Huntington, 2006, p. 96-97

¹³ Ibid., p. 261-62

Talukder Maniruzzaman also discusses the weakness of a military government. He describes how military politicians are unable to establish political organizations or effective political institutions. "Military skills do not transfer well to the sphere of politics. Society is more complex than an army..."¹⁴ He argues that when creating political institutions, it is necessary that the leaders of a nation have the political skills that go beyond the functional specialization which is how the military trains its personnel. These political skills are earned through years of service in the public sector.¹⁵

He goes on to discuss how the ongoing military interventions create a cycle of underdeveloped political systems. How can the civil society break this vicious cycle and make an attempt at establishing strong civil institutions?

Maniruzzaman cites Samuel Huntington when he discusses that the key factor in political development is the growth of durable political institutions.¹⁶ Samuel Finer adds to this discussion on the political weaknesses of the military. He addresses two weaknesses: the first is their inability to properly run any society that is not at its most primitive stage and the second weakness is their lack of legitimacy.¹⁷

In developing societies, the military has an easier time administrating the government. The military system usually includes systems of provisioning,

¹⁴ Maniruzzaman, 1987, p. 5

¹⁵ Ibid., p.5

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 6

¹⁷ Finer, 1988, p.12

supply, engineering, communications and education. This could be enough to run a developing nation state. Whereas, in more advanced nations, the basic technical skills of the military no longer match up to the demands of a growing nation. In these nations, the economy and institutions are much more advanced; this leads to the military mismanaging the nation due to its inexperience in this area. These institutions need to be administered by experienced political leaders.

Finer contends that the second political weakness of the military is the absence of legitimacy.

“Rule by force alone, or the threat of such force, is inadequate; in addition, government must possess authority. It must be widely recognized not only as the government but as the lawful, rightful government. A government that based its rule on the fact that it was materially stronger than any other force or forces in society would prove both short lived and ineffective.”¹⁸

A military may attempt to legitimize itself by claiming to prepare the nation for an incoming civilian government (i.e. elections). Finer quotes J. Rousseau to summarize the importance of gaining authority, “the strongest is never strong enough to be always the master unless he transforms might into right and obedience into duty.”¹⁹ Unless the military makes attempts at legitimizing its presence in government its time in power may will become short lived.

Finer also discusses different types of military regimes. He defines them as, “a set of techniques used by the military to carry out their policies rather than as

¹⁸ Ibid., 15

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 17

political or constitutional structures.”²⁰ He outlines three different kinds of regimes. The first is “indirect rule.” A civilian government is still in control; however, the military blackmails the civilian government or removes one civilian government for another. The second kind of military regime is dual rule. This regime has both military and civilian rule; Finer states that it can take on the qualities of an indirect rule or direct rule. The last type of military regime is direct rule. In this system the army has removed the civilian government and taken complete control of the country. These different regimes describe the degrees of intervention by the military and therefore how involved they become in the government.

Max Weber defines patriarchy as the paternal rule of a household. He considers it the pure type of traditional domination.²¹ This term deals with the household whereas patrimonialism expands its focus to include the rule of a leader. Weber defines patrimonial government as “an extension of the ruler’s household in which the relation between the ruler and his officials remain on the basis of paternal authority.”²² It is usually found in feudal systems of government. For Weber, both patrimonialism and feudalism are the two main types of traditional domination. Almond and Powell contend that patrimonial systems have a traditional political system with low subsystem autonomy. The low level

²⁰ Ibid., p. 149

²¹ Bendix, 1977, p. 330

²² Ibid., p. 360

of subsystem autonomy allows for easy entry by outside actors, in this case the military.

Christopher Clapham suggests that neo-patrimonialism best describes the characteristics of third world nations.²³ He defines it as a form of organization in which relationships of a broadly patrimonial type pervade a political and administrative system...²⁴ It also goes beyond the confines of a household and infiltrates the government. Bureaucrats hold offices in government organizations and they practice government as a form of private property not public service. They see the system as a way to advance their personal goals, even if they go against the needs of the state. Neo-patrimonialism serves a valuable function of maintaining a single legitimate source of authority. One individual makes all the decisions and only his authority matters. Military leaders in a praetorian society practice this single authority system. The general becomes the leader of the military and of the civilian government. The leader in this system demonstrates the relationship between himself and his underlings as one of personal subordination. Delegating responsibilities can become problematic; these leaders believe they have the right to intervene in any matter that comes under their jurisdiction regardless of the chaos it could cause. This serves the valuable function of maintaining a single legitimate source of authority. The sole leader has control over every aspect of the governmental system. His understanding of

²³ Clapham, 1985, p. 48

²⁴ Ibid., p. 48

the true purpose of serving in government is severely limited. They are unwilling or unable to create a new (modern?) approach to governing.

Clapham describes the reasons why neo-patrimonialism is the most prevalent type of authority in third world nations. "First, the natural human disinclination to distinguish between one's private and official self equally corresponds to the normal forms of social organization in pre-colonial societies. Neo-patrimonialism...also characterizes tribal societies in which one's kin group is the primary social value."²⁵ In a more global society, where common values are lost, the need to connect at a personal level is even more desired. This, therefore, reinforces neo-patrimonial tendencies in third world nations.

Clapham discusses how "neo-patrimonialism can consider straightforward considerations of personal benefit and the exchange of favors that come to replace the reciprocal obligations which characterize patrimonialism in its original form."²⁶ He argues that this is apparent in the corruption prevalent in these types of systems.

Huntington describes the absence of a civil-military relationship in authoritarian regimes when compared to more industrialized democracies,

They lack the kind of civil-military relations characteristic of the world's industrial democracies which I once termed 'objective civilian control'. This involves: first, a high level of military professionalism and recognition by the military officers of the limits of their professional competence; second, the effective subordination of the military to the civilian political leaders who make the basic decisions on foreign and military policy; third,

²⁵ Ibid., p. 49

²⁶ Ibid., p. 50

the recognition and acceptance by that leadership of an area of professional competence and autonomy for the military; and fourth, as a result the minimization of military intervention in politics and of political intervention in the military.²⁷

When civil supremacy exists, a healthier government system usually follows. In this environment, the military knows its place in the hierarchy. He argues that these characteristics lead to civil supremacy. Neo-patrimonialism is common in societies that have weak civil-military relations and weak institutions. This weakness refers to a system where most likely the civil government is weaker than the military and is therefore dominated by the military establishment. This also allows ease of entry for the military into the political environment. Hence, a praetorian society now exists.

Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan

These theories can be applied to third world nations with strong military establishments. Many of these nations exhibit numerous aspects of the theories discussed in this chapter. Since its independence, Pakistan has been a victim of an all too powerful military. The military has played a role in the political system since its inception in 1947. One of the main issues at play in Pakistan is the lack of civil supremacy. As has been explained in this chapter, the lack of established institutions allows for the military's entry into the civil society. The case study of Pakistan illustrates how military rule introduces a cycle of underdevelopment of institutions and government systems. The military prevents the country from maturing into a strong political system. Some of the authors discussed in this

²⁷ Huntington, 1996, p.3-4

chapter describe the weaknesses of military governments and those weaknesses have been witnessed in Pakistan during its sixty years of existence.

Can Pakistan find a healthy balance between its civil and military institutions? First, civil supremacy must be established, this will be the cornerstone of a strong political system. Will the military allow Pakistan to take this first step towards the creation of a country that will no longer need to rely so heavily on its military establishment? As this thesis will discuss in further detail in the following chapters, there are many actors responsible for the current state of affairs in Pakistan.

CHAPTER 2

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF PAKISTAN

Colonialism

The “British Raj” occupied the Indian Subcontinent for nearly one-hundred years (1858-1947). However, Britain had been in this region for quite some time before establishing a colony. The East India Company, a British trading company, exchanged valuable goods on the subcontinent for a hundred years before making it a colony in 1858.

Many researchers have discussed the divide and rule practice of the British as a strategy to keep the Indian population (both Hindus and Muslims) under control. During the occupation by the East India Company, revolts broke out amongst the civilian population. The British responded by aligning the people by religion and castes. They understood that dividing the population by religion and caste would create a weak populace; therefore, preventing or limiting the chances of future uprisings. “To preserve British power, officials encouraged minority constituencies to define themselves in opposition to one another, as Muslims against Hindus...”²⁸

This practice of divide and conquer by the British greatly contributed and influenced to the communal tensions on the Indian Subcontinent seen then and now. It played a role in creating the violent atmosphere of the partition. It was also a factor in the 1971 war with India, which resulted in the secession of East Pakistan.

²⁸ Walsh, 2007. p. 153

Partition of the Indian Subcontinent

The decolonization of the British Empire occurred after World War II. The war had ravaged England and the financial strain of their vast empire was difficult to maintain. As the British turned to rebuilding their own country, there was a new opportunity for Indian sub-continent decolonization. During this time, numerous violent outbreaks were occurring in their largest colony. The British Empire wanted to make a quick exit from the escalating riots on the Indian Subcontinent.

Two organizations within the Subcontinent emerged in the early 1900s and they eventually became national players in the fight for independence. They were the All-India Muslim League and the Congress Party (a majority of its members were Hindus). The Muslim League was created in 1906 by an elite group of Muslims who witnessed the marginalization of the Muslim populace at the hands of the Hindu majority. Aga Khan, the leader of the Ismaili (a sect of Muslims) community in Bombay led this delegation; he was also one of the richest Indians on the Subcontinent. Upcoming elections regarding new British constitutional changes brought upon a strong desire to have a separate Muslim entity that would be able to fairly represent the political rights of Muslims on the Indian Subcontinent. This elite group of Muslims brought their concerns to the Viceroy of the British Colony, Lord Minto. They declared that a separate Muslim electorate must be created before the elections on the constitutional reforms. They argued that non-Muslim candidates and/or elected officials would not represent the needs of Muslims but rather the needs of the Hindu majority. This opportunity to further split the two religions was ideal for the strategy of the

British rulers. They believed that splitting the two largest groups on the Subcontinent would solidify the power of British rule. According to historian Judith Walsh, numerous scholars believe that this 1906 decision to allow a separate Muslim party to go against the Congress party was the beginning of the British practice of “divide and rule.”²⁹ Months after the meeting with Lord Minto, this group of Muslims created the All-India Muslim League. The organization was to be exclusively Muslim, and the purpose of the League, officially, was to advance the political rights of Muslims.³⁰

At the time of independence, the Muslim League was led by Muhammad Ali Jinnah. He is considered the “Father of Pakistan” and was known as a man of great integrity and charisma. His natural leadership skills were tested time and time again during the arduous process of independence. He earned his law degree in England and returned soon afterwards to Bombay where he began a successful law practice.³¹ He began working with the Muslim League in 1913. Shortly after joining, Jinnah realized that Muslims and Hindus would not be able to survive together as a united nation. He believed the Hindu majority would always drown out the Muslim voices and he, therefore, channeled his energy towards an independent state for Muslims. Jinnah was not a religious man and his vision for Pakistan was a secular nation. Even though the Muslim League members did use Islam to ignite a desire among the Muslim populace, Jinnah

²⁹ Walsh, 2007. p. 168-169

³⁰ Ibid. p. 169

³¹ Ahmed, 1997, p. 4

had no intention of creating an Islamic state. His charismatic nature and ability to inspire the masses earned him the title of Quaid I Azam (great leader) by the people of Pakistan. Jinnah died one year after Pakistan's independence, too soon for the young nation.

Before partition, Jawaharlal Nehru as the leader of the Congress party pushed for the independence of India from British Rule. He became the first prime minister of India after partition. The Congress Party wanted an undivided, independent India. The British involved in the debate sided with the Congress Party over the Muslim League's position for two separate independent countries: one for Muslims and one for Hindus.

Lord Mountbatten, Britain's last Viceroy to India, played a crucial role in the independence of the Indian Subcontinent. He represented the British during negotiations, acting as a mediator. Lord Mountbatten suggested that a date for independence be chosen quickly, before any issues regarding the splitting of a nation were decided (dividing up the army, allocating revenue sources, and other related issues). This purposeful neglect would greatly affect Pakistan's attempts at establishing a state. In February, 1947, the negotiators chose June, 1948 as the deadline for independence. "Lord Mountbatten...was to act as a midwife for a new independent India, or more than one India if that proved inevitable. He was to arrange things as well as he could for the birth. But if he could not arrange things well, the baby was to be born regardless".³² Pakistan would be created for the Muslim majority areas. It would consist of West Pakistan, which

³² Porter, 2004, 302-3

was in the northwest region of the Indian subcontinent, and East Pakistan (which would become Bangladesh in 1971), in the northeast. India, in between these two areas, would be home to the large Hindu population.

The newly divided nations were completely unprepared for the massive migration that would soon take place. Independence was declared on August 14, 1947 for Pakistan and India's independence was the following day, August 15, 1947. Muslims in India began their journey to their new homeland of Pakistan and Hindus in Pakistan began their trek to India. This exodus included approximately twelve million people.³³ Unfortunately this was a very violent and bloody period of time that involved numerous atrocities. The animosity towards different religions was augmented by a strong sense of nationalism and religious identity. Being forced to give up everything they owned led many to express their frustration in extremely violent ways.

Entire villages were destroyed and the inhabitants killed, women were kidnapped, mutilated and raped, and entire trainloads of people traveling to their new homeland were burned. These are only a few of the ways the horrendous hostility was expressed.

“The violence was designed to eliminate and drive out the opposing ethnic group while forging a new moral community. For all the superhuman effort which had been invested in untangling the two nations - their land, possessions and military stores – few had turned their minds to the new nations' most precious asset: their people”.³⁴

³³ Khan, 2007,

³⁴ Khan, 127

After the bloody migrations had ended, the countries were left to pick up the pieces of their tattered nations. They had to build their new homelands from the bloodbath of independence and move forward. The number of deaths during the months of August and September of 1947 range from 200,000 to one million. An exact count will never be known, "...the machinery did not exist to keep an exact tally of deaths, and in many cases the murder gangs buried their victims...at least one million lost their lives.³⁵ This was the tragic birth of these nations. Along with other serious issues of development (economy, treasury, and a non-existent government system) Pakistan had to deal with millions of refugees. The numerous demands on the young nation would add to the stress of attempting to create a stable, unified state.

The Creation of Pakistan

The leaders of Pakistan had to focus on nation and state building. The nation building revolved around religious identity. The creation of Pakistan was ultimately due to a desire to have a nation where Muslims would be fairly represented.

While State building involved setting up a governmental system to run the nation, the new system would most likely be parliamentary because that system was in place before partition. During the British Raj a parliamentary system of government was established on the Indian subcontinent. The British implemented a government system much like their own parliamentary approach

³⁵ James, 1997, p. 636

in many of their colonies. The influence of the British Empire is quite present in the governments of both India and Pakistan today. This government style was the only system the subcontinent had witnessed in recent times and it was implemented in the two new nations.

Nation Building - Islam was used as a source of national identity in creating Pakistan; a division between Muslims and Hindus. Before partition Jinnah came to the conclusion that Muslims would never be fairly represented on the Indian subcontinent. He fought for a separate nation with the hopes that it would provide Muslims with a voice in the government. Jinnah, however, in a famous speech given on August 11, 1947, to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan in the city of Karachi, specifically stated the intention to make Pakistan a secular nation.

“You are free; you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go to your mosques or to any other place 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. . . .We are starting this fundamental principle that we are all citizens and equal citizens of one state.”³⁶

The use of Muslim identity to create Pakistan was quite strong and influential in gaining support for its creation. The leaders of the Muslim League used religion to instill a passion among the populace for a separate state for Muslims. The timing was ideal; communal tensions amongst the Muslims and Hindus were at its peak. The idea of a separate nation for Muslims became very appealing.

³⁶ Abbas, p.18

These contradictions by Jinnah led to a shaky start for the nation. After Jinnah's death in October of 1948, the direction of the country was further derailed by leaders who stepped in with their own agendas. What and how much of a role would Islam play in the government was unknown.

State Building - Numerous issues arose after the Muslim migration to the new country. The leaders of the Pakistan movement were more concerned with creating a nation than with deciding the details of a Pakistan government. Jinnah and others were so involved with fighting for the creation of a Muslim country that anything beyond that never came to mind.

“There is nothing in the archives to even hint that someone was responsible for defining the nature and structure of the state, its purposes and functions, its powers and limitations ...Pakistan, in effect, was created without the guidance of an astute...savant who might have given thought to the Muslim political experience and how it combined with the conditions of the subcontinent to fabricate a contemporary nation-state”³⁷

Because creating a foundation was ignored by the first leaders of Pakistan, the nation found itself haphazardly putting a government in place. The assumption was that the Muslim League would step in after partition and begin building a state system. However, this organization fell into disarray after partition. They were founded on the ideal of overcoming Hindu domination. When independence occurred, the Muslim League's ideology was irrelevant. Without a national party to unite the nation, regional parties entered the young political

³⁷ Ziring, p. 98.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 85

system. These parties reflect Pakistan's cumulative social cleavage patterns.³⁸ This issue has been a major factor in Pakistani politics since its independence. The country is vastly diverse; many ethnic, linguistic, and regional differences exist. These have and continue to cause great challenges to the government structure. The government does not fairly represent all regions of the country and this has led to long-lasting tensions which detract from creating a stable governmental system.

Immediately after partition, the new nation was faced with many complicated issues. Pakistan faced, "In its first year...an empty treasury, non-existent economy, jerry-built governing structure, inundation of millions of desperate people (refugees) and a war in Kashmir."³⁹

Jinnah chose to become the first Governor-General of Pakistan and also assumed the position of the President of the Constituent Assembly. This was not due to a desire for complete power, rather, "it was motivated by a desire to underscore Pakistan's sovereignty..."⁴⁰ His intention was to protect Pakistan and nurture it from its birth. However, some scholars argue that this move has set a bad example for future leaders of Pakistan. Many of Pakistan's leaders have used these positions to increase their own power. Ian Talbot argues that Jinnah's reasons for assuming such power was to protect the young nation from going under. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of future leaders.

³⁸ Ziring., p. 96

³⁹ Talbot, 1998, p. 12

An established state would find it difficult to properly handle the many problems Pakistan faced from birth. These issues along with trying to establish a parliamentary system overwhelmed the first leaders of Pakistan. Their failure to properly deal with these issues has much to do with their personal agendas. After partition, The Government of India Act of 1935 was used as a temporary constitution. This document was created during the British Rule and the leaders of Pakistan used it until they could create their own constitution. However, drafting a constitution for Pakistan was to be a long and arduous process.

Constitution Making - The establishment of a constitution is considered the cornerstone of a new country's foundation. However, Pakistan's first constitution was not completed until 1956, nine years after independence. This delay was caused by the parliament's reluctance to lose their power once the constitution was ratified. The parliamentarians serving between independence and the mid 1950s had no experience, nor a sense of responsibility to serve the people of Pakistan.⁴¹ CAP (Constitutional Assembly of Pakistan) members were expected to implement a constitution for Pakistan. The lack of resources at the time of partition prevented elections of any kind, so CAP was made up of men who served in the provincial assemblies elected in 1946 during the British rule.⁴² These individuals served in numerous posts (at the city, state, and national level)

⁴¹ Ziring, 1998, p. 98

⁴² Abbas, 2005 p.18

⁴³ Ibid., p. 20

at the same time and were seen as power hungry and void of integrity. They had great difficulty in defining an Islamic state.

Overt Islamization of the government could be seen as a hindrance to a stable government. After Jinnah's death, the CAP members were unwilling to find a healthy balance of Islam in the government system. The ulama (religious leaders) that served in CAP were successful in their attempts to add in the opening sentence to the Objectives Resolution (a precursor to a constitution) a line that God alone has sovereignty over the universe.⁴³ Thus, the first presence of religion in the government documents took place. Jinnah's dream of a secular Pakistan had taken its first step away from his vision.

Islam and its role in the government are mentioned in four sections of the 1956 Constitution. The Preamble begins in the name of Allah (God). This religious practice to begin with the "name of God, the most beneficent and most merciful", is common amongst Muslims. The Preamble goes on to state that Jinnah wanted Pakistan to be a "democratic state based on Islamic principles."⁴⁴ The writers of the Constitution used Jinnah to explain the presence of Islam within the document. The document states that Muslims would be free and able to live their lives according to Islamic teachings. This section concludes by stating the date of ratification of the constitution in first the Islamic calendar and then the Gregorian calendar. From the first section of the 1956 Constitution, Islam's presence is prevalent.

⁴⁴ Choudhury, 1967

⁴⁵ Ibid.

In Part I of the Constitution, titled The Republic and its Territories, the nation is given the formal title of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.⁴⁵ In later revisions to the constitution, made by future leaders, this title was revised. Islam was removed from the title and then added again, dependent upon the agenda of the individual in power.

Part III, titled Directive Principles of State, discusses Islam's role in relation to government affairs in more detail. It begins by stating that Pakistan will create ties with other Muslim nations. Also, measures will be taken to enable Pakistani Muslims to live their lives by the teachings given in the Holy Quran and the Sunnah (the way Prophet Muhammad lived his life). This section also intends to offer institutions where Muslims will be able to learn about these teachings. The nation will make it mandatory for Muslims to learn the Holy Quran. It will also ensure that the collection of Zakat (charity collected from Muslims to be distributed to the poor) is properly handled. In addition, the state will be responsible for administering the affairs and the organization of mosques.⁴⁶ In Part III of the constitution it is quite apparent that the State intends to have control over Islamic religious activities. The influence of religious leaders in the creation of the 1956 Constitution is obvious.

The last section of the Constitution that mentions Islam is part 12, titled General Provisions. Under "Islamic Provisions" the President of the country will create an institution for Islamic research and teaching. This institution will assist

⁴⁵ Ibid.

in cementing a Muslim community based on Islamic principles.⁴⁷ A special tax, to be decided by the Parliament, may be applied to Muslims to aid in the financial costs of this institution. In addition, any laws that are enacted by the state will not contradict the teachings of Islam, nor will these laws violate the rights of non-Muslims.

The 1956 Constitution had numerous mentions of Islam and its role in administering state affairs. This constitution would be revised many times in the future. Whoever was leading the country at the time, civilian or military would use the role of Islam in government affairs to their benefit. Some removed Islam and some increased its role in state affairs. The role of Islam depended upon that particular leader's personal agenda. This usually involved around protecting or increasing their power.

The role of Islam in Pakistan's Constitution is much stronger than Jinnah intended. The role of the maulas (religious leaders), the violent partition and the tension with India, all created the desire and need for a Muslim identity. The presence of Islam in the 1956 Constitution represents this desire.

Kashmir

Kashmir was a detrimental setback to the new country of Pakistan. From the time of partition to the present, this area, located along the northern border between Pakistan and India, has been a major point of contention; it led to the first war between the two nations within a year of independence. "Thus from day one, this conflict landed Pakistan in a security dilemma, and the military budget

⁴⁷ Ibid.

became a priority, indirectly increasing the strength and power of the military and furthering the poverty of the country.”⁴⁸ Before partition, the princely states (which included Kashmir) were advised to align themselves with either Pakistan or India. The decision was expected to be based on the majority religion in that region. In Kashmir the majority of the population was Muslim. However, after immense pressure from Indian forces, the Hindu leader of Kashmir chose to align with India. To the people of Pakistan, Kashmir is both a religious and political issue that has not been resolved. They believe that because the majority of the population is Muslim, Kashmir belongs to Pakistan. This contentious issue has created deep lying animosity with India since Partition. It has also led to the military’s enduring presence along the border of Kashmir.

The 1971 War

The 1971 War illustrates the inability of the West Pakistan leadership to practice democracy. Since partition, East Pakistan (known as Bangladesh since 1971) had been ignored as West Pakistan made attempts to create a new nation. East Pakistan had a larger population; however, the make-up of the citizenry was of Bengali ethnicity. The West Pakistan leaders marginalized the Bengali majority of East Pakistan by ignoring their right to fair representation in parliament. It is ironic that this marginalization they directed towards fellow Muslims is what had initially created a desire for a separate nation for Muslims. These Bengalis were seen as lower class citizens because they were ethnically different than West Pakistanis. The fact that both populations (West and East

⁴⁸ Abbas, 2005, p. 17

Pakistan) were Muslims was not enough for the West Pakistan government to treat the Bengalis fairly.

In the 1970 parliamentary elections the East Pakistani political party received the majority of seats, "Out of the 162 seats allotted for East Pakistan in the National Assembly it won 160..."⁴⁹ The leader of the party was Mujibur Rahman. From West Pakistan, the PPP (the Pakistan's People Party) led by Zulfikar Bhutto won the second most seats in parliament. The Awami League had fairly won the elections and expected to be the majority in the parliament. However, the PPP and Bhutto were not ready to do so. Bhutto was willing to share the power, as long as the PPP had the upper hand. Rahman was fed up with the power politics of the Western part of the nation. West Pakistan had been unwilling to hand over power because they felt the need to protect their own interests before the interests of democracy and fairness.

East Pakistan believed that secession was the only option, but West Pakistan was vehemently against the secession. For West Pakistan, losing land mass and population would weaken Pakistan against India. The reason against the secession of East Pakistan was based solely on the issue of national security. During the year 1971, unsuccessful negotiations took place to share power between the two political parties (the Awami League of East Pakistan and the PPP of West Pakistan). The military took violent action during this time to intimidate the Bengali population of East Pakistan. In March of 1971, they conducted "Operation Searchlight". The military attacked two residence halls at

⁴⁹ Talbot, 1998, p. 199

Dhaka University (in the largest city of East Pakistan), which resulted in deaths of hundreds of their own citizens. Numerous attacks on other targets within the city were an attempt to implement martial law in East Pakistan. The rebels in East Pakistan were seen as traitors because they wanted to secede. This violent attack remained unknown to most of the population of West Pakistan, due to a media blackout ordered by the government.⁵⁰ During this year of terror, approximately seven million refugees fled across the border to India.

India used the refugee issue to get involved in the civil war. By supporting the East Pakistanis India saw an opportunity to weaken and divide West Pakistan. The leadership of used the involvement of India as an opportunity to use Islam to galvanize their population for the war. By painting India as an instigator who was attempting to split the Muslim nation, West Pakistan government legitimized the cause of the war. They justified the large military presence in East Pakistan as a fight for Islam against non-Muslims. By late November 1971, India had lined up troops along their shared border with East Pakistan. The war between India and Pakistan lasted only two weeks. The Indian army was significantly more powerful in numbers and artillery than the Pakistani army and the end came quickly. The cease fire occurred on December 16, 1971, the same day Bangladesh declared independence. 93,000 Pakistani POWs were captured by the Indian army, further demoralizing a nation that just experienced a humiliating civil war.

⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 208

This time in Pakistan was quite detrimental to its nation building. Being ripped in half during a war with their more powerful neighbor further demoralized a nation still trying to create a foundation for itself. This time period also illustrates the power issues that the military and civilian governments in West Pakistan were handled with immaturity and selfishness. The inability to share power provoked a violent episode in the country's history. The protection of Islam and preserving the nation were the arguments used by the Pakistani government time and time again to justify its actions regardless of how violent and unethical they may have been.

The Role of Modernization in Pakistan Civil Society

The absence of modernization in this environment is related to the ideas discussed earlier in this chapter and also in chapter one. To define modernization political scientist Richard Chilcote quotes from the well-known work *The Politics of Modernization* by David Apter, "Modernization implies three conditions – a social system that can constantly innovate without falling apart...; differentiated, flexible social structures; and a social framework to provide the skills and knowledge necessary for living in a technologically advanced world."⁵¹ It can be argued that the lack of modernization in Pakistan allowed the military and the Islamists to easily enter the civil system and establish control. The increased lack of stability attributed to their presence greatly hinders Pakistan's future chances of advancing into a modern society

⁵¹ Chilcote, 1994, p.225

The colonial legacy is visible in Pakistani politics today. The quick departure of the British from the Indian Subcontinent prevented the healthy birth of Pakistan. Trying to create a nation-state after the horrific partition was too much for the young nation to handle. It has never fully recovered from that experience. The role of Islam during this time was contradictory. The founders used Islam to instill a passion in the populace but at the same time Jinnah desired a secular nation. His dream died with him. If he had lived perhaps Pakistan would have taken a different path. The government system that was put into effect after independence was full of power hungry individuals who put off implementing a proper constitution to protect their positions of power. Numerous constitutions and revisions have come and gone in Pakistan politics, almost as quickly as the civilian governments. The creation of a constitution soon after partition might have led Pakistan on a different path, but it was prevented by the lack of resources and the unstable environment caused by the violent split of the Subcontinent.

From the beginning in 1947, the military used this weak civilian system to enter the political foray with great success. Their personal vested interests in the power of political office and the economic sector will be discussed in the following chapter. The military's use of Islam to further their own agenda is also prevalent in the numerous military takeovers.

CHAPTER 3

THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

History

The partition of the Indian Subcontinent in 1947 required the British Indian army and its resources to be divided between India and Pakistan. Because neither India nor the British were enthusiastic about splitting the Indian Subcontinent, the lack of support that Pakistan received upon independence is not surprising. "Pakistan's share of the Indian army came to roughly 36 percent or approximately 140,000 out of a total strength of some 410,000 in 1947...The stickiest issue was how to divide the surplus stores (firearms). Pakistan's representatives wanted joint administration of these stores. But New Delhi's representatives were not in the business of distributing firearms to enemies."⁵² Due to the lack of support Pakistan received from England and India, it started off as a country financially and militarily weak. India from the beginning had the infrastructure and government system in place when the countries split in 1947. Pakistan had to start from scratch, and to expect their new enemy to be fair in splitting financial and military resources was highly unlikely. "If it was to survive as an independent entity it had to create a new administrative structure for its central government, resettle millions of refugees, build new provincial governments in both western Punjab and eastern Bengal, ...establish an industrial infrastructure, modernize its defense forces and to do so without

⁵² Jalal, 1990, p. 42

anything remotely resembling a financial machinery.”⁵³ Pakistan’s top priority was the defense of their new borders. They had serious threats to their security from both Afghanistan and India. If Pakistan was to be perceived as weak and unable to defend itself, it would fall apart as a nation very quickly.

Ideology

Upon independence the military’s main purpose was focused on national security. It was considered the protector of Muslim Pakistan against neighboring Hindu India. The military was the only entity that survived the split from India and therefore was relied upon to create the foundation of Pakistan. National security involved both the survival of the nation and of Islam. The military was the protector of the country, but more importantly it was protecting *Muslim* Pakistan. The religious overtones of its role prevented the military from being placed in its proper position in the government system. Since this was the foundation built by the military over sixty years ago, it has been difficult to separate one from the other. The military has become the protector of all that is important for Pakistan. It has become entrenched in this ideology, and the military will therefore find it quite challenging to break away and function solely as a subordinate organization to the civilian government. “Since the military has acquired the role of the guardian of the country’s sovereignty and overall security the organization tends to view domestic political crises from the perspective of the external threat.”⁵⁴ Since everything happening within the country can effect

⁵³ Ibid., p. 48.

⁵⁴ Siddiqa, 2007, p. 64.

outside security threats, the military feels justified in getting involved in every aspect of the internal functions of the state. By interfering in the internal structure of the country the military is protecting the external threats that could jeopardize the existence of Pakistan. This is the mentality of the military and can help explain why it has and continues to play such a pivotal role in Pakistan politics.

Organization

The military of Pakistan consists of three branches: army, air force and navy. “The military in Pakistan is a voluntary service, with 650,000 personnel. The army has 550,000 personnel. This is followed by the Pakistan Air Force (PAF) with 45,000 personnel and the Pakistan Navy (PN) with 25,000 workforce.”⁵⁵ Due to its size, the army branch chief holds the most power. The large numbers of the army also gives it more “institutional power” than the Air Force and Navy. These three departments are organized in a hierarchy. The chiefs of the services are the highest authority in this structure.

The organization of the military has allowed for the powerful army sector to create an influential position for itself. It is without a doubt the most powerful of the three departments. The numerous takeovers of the civilian government has allowed for it to expand its influence and power over the other two branches.

The massive financial power of the Pakistan military is a crucial aspect of its strong hold on Pakistan. It is able to operate freely without any consequences because it holds such a grip on the nation. Ayesha Siddiqa defines Milbus, “as

⁵⁵ Siddiqa, 2007, p. 59

the military capital used for the personal benefit of the military fraternity, especially the officer cadre, which is not recorded as the part of the defense budget or does not follow the normal accountability procedures of the state...It is either controlled by the military or under its implicit or explicit patronage.”⁵⁶

The Inter-Services Intelligence Agency has become an intricate part of the military’s operations; more so since the Afghanistan war in the 1980s. It has also been linked with the Islamists and this relationship has been instrumental in creating the Pakistan of today. The head of the ISI is appointed by the military chief and reports only to him.

The ISI has been involved in numerous attempts to dislodge power from the civilian government. One example is when they became involved in creating a coalition of Islamists political parties to compete Benazir Bhutto’s PPP party in the 1998 elections to prevent her from winning re-election. This example of behind the scenes tactics by the ISI illustrates their strategy to protect their interests. Including the volatile Islamists in this agenda created an unstable alliance that has been a love/hate relationship since its inception.

The power of the ISI grew immensely during the Russian invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. “...a legacy of the conflict was the immense growth in the ISI’s power which both shaped Afghan policy and funneled Western largesse to the *mujahideen*.”⁵⁷ The numerous refugees that came into Pakistan during this time period included the mujahideen (freedom fighters) which had been trained

⁵⁶ Siddiq, 2007, p. 5

⁵⁷ Talbot, 1998, p. 269

by the ISI to fight the Russians. With their presence in Pakistan, the ISI had inherited a large, violent problem. These mujahideen focused on three issues: increased sectarian violence, targeting western interests (mostly the United States) and fighting against India for Kashmir.⁵⁸

Ethnic Make-up

Pakistan is made-up of four provinces. Geographically, the Northwest Frontier Province (NWFP) represents the northwest region that borders Afghanistan, sixteen percent of the population lives in this province.⁵⁹ Below the NWFP is Baluchistan, which is in the Southwestern part of the country. It also borders Afghanistan to the west and meets the Arabian Sea to the South. This province represents three percent of the Pakistani population.⁶⁰ These two provinces represent primarily tribal communities that date back generations. They do not necessarily identify themselves as Pakistani first. Tribal identity is more important. Pashtuns reside in the NWFP and they identify themselves as such. During partition these tribes did not want to be a part of the newly formed Pakistan. They preferred to be their own nation, however, the British ignored this request and the lines of division were drawn without their input. They have been forced to be a part of Pakistan.

⁵⁸ Abbas, 2005, p.13

⁵⁹ Haleem, 2003, p.468

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 467

To the east of the NWFP is Sindh, which borders the Arabian Sea to the South and India to its east. It represents seventeen percent of the population.⁶¹ This region also holds the majority of migrants that are called Mohajirs. These people are defined as the immigrants who left India during the 1947 partition of India and Pakistan. They mostly reside in the urban areas of the Sindh province. Above the Sindh province is the Punjab. Over fifty percent of the population of Pakistan resides here. It shares borders with the three aforementioned provinces and also with India to the east and the disputed region of Kashmir to its north. The Punjab was witness to the bloodiest violence during the partition. It was split into two in 1947. The west portion lies in Pakistan and the eastern portion lies in Western India.

The provinces represent people who are very much identified by their place of origin. There are also language barriers to consider. Some of the provinces do not claim Urdu (the most common language spoken in the country) as their first language. This is another reason that creates a divide amongst Pakistanis. The Punjabi language is considered the second most common language spoken in Pakistan. If a Pakistani meets fellow Pakistani one of the first questions asked is which province are they from. Immediately assumptions are made about them after they are identified. Many of these people identify themselves more so with their region than they do as a Pakistani.

The Pakistan military is made up primarily of individuals living in the Punjab province. These Punjabis, an agrarian class, are well schooled in the military

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 468

culture. “The deep and enduring roots which the military have sunk into thousands of Punjabi villages may be the key to military dominance in Pakistan.”⁶² They educate the children of the villages. Punjabis believe that being a part of the military is an honor. It takes them out of the fields and offers steady pay and pensions; families express great pride in knowing their children are members of the military. The Punjabi majority in the military creates a bond amongst the members, one that is difficult for an outsider to penetrate. It has become an elitist organization. The preference for Punjabi recruits has led to a disgruntled populace outside of the Punjab province.

“Approximately 75 percent of the army is drawn from the Punjab province. Another 20 percent are from districts in the NWFP. The other two provinces, Baluchistan and Sindh, together have about a 5 percent share of the personnel...this ethnic composition plays a major role in the country’s politics, since it dovetails into the tense relationship between the ethnic communities and centre-province relations.”⁶³

The reasons for the military being a majority Punjabi goes back to the British Raj. The 1857 Mutiny of the Bengal Army brought about changes in the make-up of the army. “The British military...created the myth of the ‘martial races’ with reference to the Punjabis, as part of their drive to restructure the armed forces...The Punjabis were more willing to fight for the British in return for material rewards and greater employment opportunities...As a result, the

⁶² Dewey, 1991, p. 261

⁶³ Siddiq, 2007, p. 59

percentage of Punjabis in the military rose from 32.7 percent in 1858 to 53.7 percent in 1910.”⁶⁴ The Pakistan military has successfully kept up this tradition.

Military in Politics

Two conflicts that took place in 1965 and the mid 1980s reflect the consistent nature of the Pakistan military to become too involved in the political side of Pakistan’s war strategies. The military ought to take orders from the civilian leader. However, in the case of Pakistan, the political leaders during these wars were both military generals. This immediately creates a conflict of interest and the outcomes of these wars confirm this problem. Islamists thought became more influential during the wars and these have contributed to the current problems facing Pakistan.

The 1965 war – The war with India “linked Pakistan’s military closer to an Islamist ideology. Religious symbolism and calls to Jihad were used to build the morale of soldiers and the people.”⁶⁵ The military men believed that the Bengalis were brainwashed by Hindu India. With this mindset they justified the violent atrocities against the Bengalis. “The traditional ulema and Islamists used the environment of jihad to advance their own agenda, and one agenda item was that they should be accepted as custodians of Pakistan’s ideology and identity.”⁶⁶ However, General Ayub Khan had his own vision of Islam’s role in Pakistan. “He

⁶³ Siddiqi, 2007, p. 59-60

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 41

⁶⁶ Haqqani, 2002, p. 50

envisioned Islam as a nation-building tool, controlled by an enlightened military leader rather than by clerics.”⁶⁷ General Ayub felt he was the “enlightened leader.” This is how Islam was used to further his own agenda. He used it to further fuel the flames of hatred the Pakistanis felt for Hindu India; he felt this was nation building. By painting the war as a fight for Islam’s existence on the Indian Subcontinent, jihad was justified. The state controlled media also painted a picture of successful Pakistani military conquests against India. This slanted media coverage convinced the Pakistani population that their war against India was a success. The opposite was true. Pakistan had occupied more enemy land than India; however, India’s land was more strategically located. Ayub Khan met with the Indian Prime Minister Lal Shastri in Tashkent (capital of Uzbekistan) to discuss the details of swapping the land taken during the brief war. The public was in an uproar. Due to the slanted media portrayals, they could not understand why Khan was giving up so much to India if Pakistan had won the war. After intense protests, he resigned as president in March 1969. “Instead of transferring power to the speaker of the National Assembly, a Bengali, as required by his own constitution of 1962, Ayub Khan returned the country to martial law. The army chief, General Agha Muhammad Yahya Khan, became Pakistan’s president and chief martial law administrator and ruled by decree, without a constitution.”⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Haqqani, 2002 p. 50

Ayub Khan used religion to justify the war against India. He used the Muslim/Hindu animosity to his advantage and he used any means necessary to show the Pakistani people that this war was just. The military had to defend Islam's and Pakistan's existence. The Kashmir issue and the security of Pakistan against India created a need for the military. This war reminded Pakistanis how much the military was needed to protect their nation. He knew very well that he could use Jihad and the survival of Islam on the Subcontinent to justify the war.

The Russian invasion of Afghanistan – This conflict began in December of 1979 and played a crucial role in General Zia-al Haq's Islamic agenda. Pakistan was in the perfect position to play the concerned neighbor. Zia saw an opportunity to convince Islamists that this invasion was a threat against Islam. Recruits came from all over the world. He used the ISI to assist in training the mujahideen (freedom fighters) and supply them with arms given by the United States. "The ranks of the ISI were expanding as the agency handled the recruitment, training, and operations of Afghan mujahideen."⁶⁹ An Islamist based education system, brought in by the Pakistani government, was put in place for the Afghan refugees. The purpose of this education was to convert these refugees into freedom fighters with a deep and passionate Islamist mentality.

Zia also made sure that the Islamist political parties of Pakistan played a role in this war. "As the scope of the Afghan jihad expanded, so did the influence of

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 141

Islamist ideology in Pakistan. Ever mindful of the need to retain control, Zia made sure that Jamaat-e-Islami was not the only Pakistan party involved with the Afghan refugees and militants.”⁷⁰

In August of 1998 Zia was killed in a mysterious plane crash over region of Bahawalpur in India. The cause of the crash remains unknown.

Zia’s legacy is not well regarded by any means. His desire to legitimize his leadership by implementing Islamic policies was quite transparent. He used any means necessary to gain that legitimacy. He used money from the United States to fund the Afghan war, to train the mujahideen, and to increase the strength of the Islamic parties. “Zia exploited the deeply-held religious sentiments of various factions and set them against the minorities for the perpetuation of his hold on them.”⁷¹

The Military in the Government

The 1958 Military Takeover – Mohammad Ayub Khan was born in the village of Rehana in 1907. His birthplace was about fifty miles from the major military cantonment in Rawalpindi, which at the time was in the western part of the Indian subcontinent. His father served in the British Indian army, and was a pious Muslim.⁷² Ayub attended Sandhurst Military College in England and joined the British Indian Army in 1928. He commanded an infantry battalion in World War II and chose to join the Pakistan Army after partition. He had a rapid succession of

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 191

⁷⁰(Maluka, Z.) Ziring, 1998 p. 504

⁷¹ Ziring, 1998, p. 251

promotions during the first few turbulent years of the young country of Pakistan. He went from colonel in August of 1947 to commanding the Pakistan Army by September 1950. He became the first Pakistani to hold this prestigious title. The British had appointed a British General to oversee the military after partition. When the British General retired from his post as army commander, Ayub was chosen to be his successor.⁷³

Pakistan's first ten years were turbulent. The first Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan was assassinated in 1951. Seven years later, as the commander of the Pakistan Army, Field Marshall Ayub Khan had his men seize control of the country. Martial law overtook Pakistan for the first time and Ayub had a plan in place. "He was convinced that Pakistan needed more, not less, centralized government, that the decision-making process had to be narrowly focused and made the responsibility of experts and specialists. Precious time had been lost in petty political maneuvering, the country's development had suffered from a decade of neglect, and a diverse and impatient population had become restive and more difficult to control."⁷⁴

The 1977 Military Coup d'état - Zia-al-Haq was born in 1924 into a lower-middle-class family of East Punjab, India. His father worked in a government department as a clerical worker. Zia joined the British Indian Army and graduated soon after World War II. During the 1947 partition of the Indian

⁷² Ibid., p. 252

⁷³ Ibid., p. 221

⁷⁴ Haqqani, 2002, p. 47

subcontinent, he “was an escort officer on the last Pakistani train with refugees... to leave the Indian city of Babina for Pakistan.”⁷⁵

By 1972, Zia had been promoted to Major-General following the reorganization of the Pakistan Army after General Yahya’s fall and Bhutto’s rise to power. Bhutto had been told about Zia from an Army officer by the name of General Gul Hassan. In 1976, Bhutto appointed Zia to be the Chief of the Army Staff (the highest post in the army). There were many qualified army generals above Zia. However, Bhutto had reasons for choosing a Mohajir (a class of people who migrated to Pakistan from India during Partition) as the leader of the army. The army was made up of mostly Punjabis and Pathans (both groups of people were indigenous to Pakistan before partition). To give this post to someone outside this circle was something the high officers could not accept and many resigned.⁷⁶ Bhutto had hoped this would cause Zia to look to him for assistance. “Bhutto’s tactics were aimed at bringing the army high command to heel. In the end, however, he only energized the movement that would unseat and destroy him.”⁷⁷

In 1976 a conspiracy between the military and the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) took place with the intention of removing Benazir Bhutto from power. The ISI, in October of 1976, sent a memo to Bhutto titled, “General Elections.” It advised Bhutto that if he held elections now he would win without any serious opposition. It also exuberantly praised Bhutto’s leadership. Bhutto was then

⁷⁵ Abbas, 2005, p. 89

⁷⁶ Ziring, 1998

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 456

convinced to hold elections for the National Assembly in March of 1977.⁷⁸ The religious parties, joined by two secular parties and the Muslim League, created the Pakistan National Alliance (PNA). The support for this party was overwhelming. The results of the elections were suspected of being rigged, but by who remains unknown. The PNA claims it was Bhutto's PPP that rigged the elections and Bhutto seems to have at least tried to appease the PNA by offering to let the PNA run unopposed for certain National Assembly seats.⁷⁹ The PNA decided to express their grievances on the streets of Pakistan. Mass protests broke out and Bhutto asked the military for help. In April, the PNA and Bhutto agreed to meet for talks. "On July 5, 1977, although participants in the parleys stated the two sides were close to agreement over holding fresh elections, the military took over. They claimed that it was forced to intervene because Bhutto's talks with the PNA were going nowhere and the country was on the brink of complete breakdown."⁸⁰

When the army intervenes in Pakistan it does so with a desire to return the country to order, or so it states. In this case, by creating the chaos brought on by likely rigged elections, the military created a legitimate reason to come back into power. This time they linked with the Islamist parties to achieve their goal. "...Zia's close ties with the Islamists who led the agitation that provided him with the excuse for his coup indicate greater forethought on his part than is often

⁷⁸ Haqqani, 2002, p.116-117.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 121

conceded.”⁸¹ Zia’s plan for his Pakistan was to be Islamic in every respect. He created the connections necessary to fully implement this theme long before he came into power.

The 1999 Military Coup - Pervez Musharraf was born in New Delhi in British India in 1943. He belonged to a middle-class, well-educated family. They migrated to Pakistan during the partition four years later. They were able to catch the last train leaving Delhi, India to Karachi, Pakistan. The haunting memories of that journey shaped who Musharraf is today.⁸² He joined the Pakistan army at the age of eighteen and he was involved in the 1965 and 1971 wars. After the 1965 War, he was awarded his first medal for gallantry after he refused to leave his post when it ignited by shellfire”⁸³ Musharraf was an impressive officer moving up in ranks as the years passed. He joined the Special Services Group (SSG-commandos), where he served for a total of seven years. This group takes on a hectic lifestyle and dangerous missions.⁸⁴

On October 12, 1999 General Musharraf was returning to Pakistan from Sri Lanka aboard a Pakistan International Airlines (PIA) flight destined for Karachi. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif had planned to remove Musharraf from office during this trip and replace him and his loyal military colleagues. Musharraf had a contingency plan in place should an event like this occur. The PIA plane carrying Musharraf was told to divert to the Middle East, it was not allowed to land at

⁸⁰ Ibid., p.123

⁸¹ Haqqani, p. 124. 2002.

⁸² Ibid., p.123.

⁸³ Haqqani, 2002, p. 124.

Karachi airport nor its back-up airport of Nawabshah, Pakistan (fifty miles from Karachi). Sharif's people had ordered the Karachi airport to shut down its airstrip. Eventually the military was able to commandeer the air traffic control room and open up the airstrip for the PIA flight. The military had also taken over the Prime Minister's residence in Islamabad. The plane landed safely and military rule began yet again in Pakistan.⁸⁵

To cement the power of the military in politics, General Musharraf took two instrumental steps. First, he reinstated Article 58(2) (b) and second, he created the National Security Council (NSC). These two acts "institutionalized the military's control of politics."⁸⁶ Article 58(2) (b) allows the president to disband the government.⁸⁷ This article has been removed and added to the constitution numerous times. The military leaders prefer that it remain in the constitution. The NSC transformed the military's role from one of policy maker to an organization that had equal footing with the civilian and political sectors of the country. Ayesha Siddiqa argues that, "...the economic stakes of the military elite, and their financial autonomy, played a vital role in persuading them to push for an independent status for the organization (NSC)."⁸⁸

Musharraf stepped down as Army Chief in late 2007. He was sworn in as a civilian president immediately after resigning from the military. Elections were

⁸⁴ Jones, 2002, p. 42-55

⁸⁵ Siddiqa, 2007, p.106

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 89

⁸⁷ Ibid.

held in March of 2008 and the PPP came in first with the most number of the Parliamentary seats.

He resigned from office in August 2008, while an impeachment process was being conducted against him.⁸⁹ For now, the military is in the background and a civilian government rules the country. The military has practiced this form of indirect control before. With violent conditions currently in the Swat Valley region of Pakistan, it is only a matter of time before the military steps out of the shadows and into the governmental system yet again.

These three military leaders were able to easily enter the political system due to the absence of civil supremacy in the Pakistan governmental system. The lack of strong civil institutions allowed these generals to quickly takeover the civilian governments. These actions create a vicious cycle in which a proper, established governmental system is unable to create foundation to build upon. These military men used Islam for their own selfish purpose to extend and justify their intervention in the governmental system. This cycle will most likely continue its destructive course.

Islamization and the Military

The military leaders introduced Islamic agendas during their time in office. Different tactics used by these men were intended to solidify and justify their leadership position. Also, the military would often appease the Islamists who

⁸⁸ Country Profile: Pakistan. 7 May 2009. 18 May 2009. http://bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/country_profiles/1157960.stm.

were watching the actions of the military closely to judge how well the military leader kept the Islamists satisfied.

The Islamization of Pakistan under Zia ul-Haq - In Zia's first speech he mentioned the PNA's protests as a sign that it was time to bring Islam into the forefront of the government. "It proves that Pakistan, which was created in the name of Islam, will continue to survive only if it sticks to Islam. That is why I consider the introduction of an Islamic system as an essential prerequisite for the country."⁹⁰ Thanks to the PNA's riots, Z. Bhutto was out and the military was in power. Zia's religious ways and the Islamists role in bringing the military into power were a sign of things to come. "Zia-al-Haq not only attained power as a result of the mosque-military alliance, he also worked assiduously to strengthen it over the next eleven years."⁹¹

One of the more important signs of Zia's Islamic Pakistan was the implementation of Zakat collection in 1980. This is the yearly tax of 2.5% of one's assets that Muslims are expected pay. "The government announced that it would deduct Zakat from bank accounts and distribute it through a central Zakat administration."⁹² He also brought Sharia (religious) Courts into the Pakistan government. "Zia called the Shariat Courts a high-priority item on his reform agenda, and he justified the action by insisting that Pakistan had been created for the purpose of providing Islamic justice." He did explain that these courts

⁸⁹ Haqqani, 2005, p.127

⁹⁰ Haqqani, 2005, p. 129

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 140

would be an addition to the regular courts already in place.⁹³ Zia also changed the primary and higher education systems to reflect the strong presence of Islam infiltrating the entire state. "Textbooks were rewritten with an Islamist ideological agenda...students were being taught that Pakistan was a fortress of Islam."⁹⁴ He also turned his attention to the university system in Pakistan, and wanted to fire all secular professors. Also, the role of *madrassas* became more important. Zia declared that a diploma from a madrassa would be equivalent to a university degree, therefore enabling these graduates to be eligible for government jobs.⁹⁵ Zia had intended to go about Islamicizing the country at a fast rate. However, the nation was far from ready to receive this kind of overhaul. "The nation's underdevelopment in a wide array of categories, not the least of which was a paucity of Islamic jurists, prevented the instant manifestation of the Islamic state...he attempted too much too soon."⁹⁶

Islamization under Pervez Musharraf - Musharraf's opinion on the Taliban in Afghanistan was one of hesitant acceptance. He believed that their version of Islam was, "ignorant and primitive...It is condemned by the entire Islamic world."⁹⁷ The only reason he gave for supporting the Taliban regime was, "the national interest and security issues dictated Pakistan's policies and the country

⁹² Ziring., p. 466-67

⁹³ Ibid., p. 149

⁹⁴ Haqqani, 2005, p.152

⁹⁵ Ziring, 1998, p. 470

⁹⁶ Abbas, 1995, p.195

could not afford a threat from Afghanistan's side in addition to the one in the East (India)."⁹⁸ National security was the reason behind this decision. Pakistan was already defending itself from India to the east; if the western border became a security issue as well Pakistan would not survive.

In the nearly two years between the coup and 9/11, Musharraf made weak attempts to reign in the Islamists in Pakistan. A few days after the successful coup, Musharraf gave his first major policy speech, "[...he categorically asked] the clergy to curb elements which are exploiting religion for vested interests and bring bad name to our faith."⁹⁹ He tried to take action on his words by attempting to reform the Blasphemy Law in April 2000. This law allowed anyone to accuse someone else of blasphemy which would lead to their arrest. Abuses of this law were rampant. Musharraf's change to the law would, "require the case to be registered only if the district administration had first investigated the veracity of the accusation."¹⁰⁰ The Islamic parties were in an uproar over this procedural change. Due to their reaction, Musharraf backed down.

Musharraf expressed his opinion about religious extremism during a speech he gave to religious scholars and clerics in June, 2001. "Is there any doubt that we have been left behind although we claim Islam will carry us forward in every age, every circumstance and every land...How does the world judge our claim? It looks upon us as terrorists. We have been killing each other. And now we

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 195

⁹⁸ Abbas, 2005, p. 192

⁹⁹ Jones, 2002. p. 19-20

want to spread violence and terror abroad. Naturally the world regards us as terrorists. Our claim of tolerance is phony.”¹⁰¹

Musharraf saw a difference between the Kashmiri Islamists and the Islamists in Pakistan before and after 9/11. “Musharraf’s government has continued to make a distinction between “terrorists” (a term applied to Al Qaeda members, mainly of foreign origin) and “freedom fighters” (the officially preferred label in Pakistan for Kashmiri militants).”¹⁰² It shows favoritism for one group over the other. The desire of the military government to designate a different title to the Kashmiri fighter shows their agenda in that region. The fighting is justified in Kashmir. It is for the purpose of freeing the Kashmiris from Indian rule.

Musharraf was giving mixed messages about Islamic extremists before 9/11. The fear of retaliation from the extremists was holding him back. Within a few days after 9/11, Musharraf’s stance on the Taliban completely changed. The pressure came from the United States to align with the West or become the enemy. Musharraf “had taken a historical U-turn in its policy toward the Taliban by fully supporting the U.S. military campaign. On the domestic scene, Musharraf started to announce measures against the hard-line religious groups and limit the license of the mullahs.”¹⁰³ The Islamists voiced their opinion in many ways. Musharraf had been the target of numerous assassination attempts since 9/11. The Indian Parliament was a victim of their violent retaliation on

¹⁰⁰ Abbas, 2005 p. 195

¹⁰¹ Haqqani, 2007, p.

¹⁰² Abbas, 2005 p. 222

December 13, 2001. The Islamists attacked the Parliament building in the capital city of Delhi. Five individuals drove up to the building and began firing shots. Twelve people (including the five terrorists) were killed in the attack. No member of the government was hurt during the attack.

India responded by lining up military troops along their 1,800 mile border with Pakistan. Musharraf then announced the arrest of fifty members of Lashkar-e-Taiba, a terrorist group which declared responsibility for the attack. Then the arrest of their leader, Hafiz Muhammad Saeed and another leader of Jaish-e-Muhammad did nothing to appease the Indian government. In January, Musharraf gave a speech in which he declared, he would not allow terrorism in the name of Kashmir...Pakistani officials arrested several hundred militants only to release them a few days later, including the two leaders mentioned above. "It was clear that the ISI was not keen to offend its jihadi partners by keeping them in prison for too long."¹⁰⁴ The partnership between the Islamist groups and the government is one-sided. The Islamist groups know that the government needs them and the government realizes that the militants have the upper hand in their relationship.

After two assassination attempts on Musharraf eleven days apart, the Pakistani government realized they needed to take drastic measures. They arrested or killed many militants, yet many have eluded capture. "The ISI paid substantial amounts of 'severance pay' to jihadi leaders such as Hafiz Muhammad Saeed (leader of Lashkar-e-Taiba) and Maulana Masoon Azhar

¹⁰³ Haqqani, 2002, p. 303

(leader of Jaish-e-Muhammad) and Maulana Fazlur Rehman Khalil (of Harkatul Mujahideen) in return for their agreement to remain dormant for an unspecified duration.”¹⁰⁵ Not surprisingly, the ISI seems to be operating independently of Musharraf’s government. Even though the ISI is a branch of the military, it runs its own agenda, separate from the military. By aligning itself with the Islamists, the ISI has become larger and more powerful than the military could have imagined. The ISI has a close relationship with the militants, closer than Musharraf would have ever wanted during his time in office.

In summary, the Pakistan government and the militants have had a relationship that meets both of their needs. The military government uses them to cause chaos and it gives the military the excuse it needs to step in and take over. The militants receive protection and special treatment from the military establishment. The government keeps them close enough to use their presence to their power advantage. However, the militants make sure that their power is never forgotten. “Pakistan’s rulers have attempted to manage militant Islamism, trying to calibrate it so that it serves its nation-building function without destabilizing internal politics or relations with Western countries...the state has supported Islamists groups to influence domestic politics and support the military’s political dominance.”¹⁰⁶

The role of the ISI and the Islamists is the crucial link between the military and the Islamists. They have been responsible for numerous events that have

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 306

¹⁰⁵ Haqqani, 2007, p. 150

jeopardized any chance at democracy in Pakistan and they will continue this path of terror and instability in the region.

CHAPTER 4

ISLAMISM AND ISLAMISTS

Islam as a Political Ideology

Since partition, the Pakistani military has been a key player in giving Pakistan an Islamic identity. Islam was used to create a separate nation for the Muslims of the Indian Subcontinent. In wars between India and Pakistan, it again became the rallying cry for the military to gain support and legitimacy from the masses. When the Russians invaded Afghanistan, the Islamic agenda became international. Recruits came from all over the world to fight the Russians. It became a war between Communists and Islam.

The religion has been used repeatedly to gain power and legitimacy by the military and the Islamists. "...part of the state apparatus used religion and religious groups for a political purpose. The extent of the religious groups influence and the sentiment unleashed by them could not be controlled. And the military stepped in to deal with the symptoms of the chaos generated by religious-political agitation, without any effort to deal with its causes."¹⁰⁷

Islamism in Pakistan

A large number of Islamists in Pakistan use political parties to achieve their goals. One of the most well known is Jamiat-e-Islami. This political party and others have gained some power in the Pakistani parliament. The Islamists have also aligned themselves with the military establishment numerous times to further their own agenda in Pakistani politics.

¹⁰⁷ Haqqani, 2002, p. 21

Islamist Groups - The Jamaat-e-Islami (translated as Islamic society or Islamic party) was active in politics during the formation of Pakistan and is still active today. It was created six years before independence in 1941 and its founder was Maulana Maududi. His beliefs stem from the idea that Islam is as much an ideology as a religion. He believes this Islamic ideology continues the mission of the prophets. This mission was as follows:

1-To revolutionize the intellectual and mental outlook of humanity and to instill the Islamic attitude toward life and morality to such an extent that their way of thinking, ideal in life, and standards of values and behaviors become Islamic.

2-To regiment all such people who have accepted Islamic ideals and mold their lives after the Islamic pattern with a view to struggling for power and seizing it by the use of all available means and equipment.

3-To establish Islamic rule and organize the various aspects of social life on Islamic bases, to adopt such means as will widen the sphere of Islamic influence in the world, and to arrange for the moral and intellectual training, by contact and example, of all those people who enter the fold of Islam from time to time.¹⁰⁸

Author Husain Haqqani quotes Sayyed Nasr, "The Jamaat legitimated communalism in Islamic terms and helped the League find a base of support by appealing to religious symbols. The Muslim League, in turn, increasingly Islamized the political discourse on Pakistan to the Jamaat's advantage, creating a suitable gateway for the party's entry into the political foray."¹⁰⁹ The Muslim League and the Jamaat used each other to achieve their own goals and this

¹⁰⁸ Haqqani, 2002, p. 22

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 21

resulted in legitimizing the political function of the other in furthering their communalist cause.¹¹⁰ Maulana Maududi believed in regimenting the Muslim population and placing a belief system in their thinking that was not that different from Pakistan's nation builders. They considered regimentation necessary to iron out the creases in the design of the nation-state united primarily by the religion of its citizens. Maududi wanted to inspire a large group of Muslims who would not want power but would lead by example.¹¹¹ His idealistic views are not practical in an environment of chaos and power struggles. Pakistan was not the place for a man like Maulana Maududi.

The leaders wanted to use his ideas but not him as the representative of the ideas. "The Muslim League leaders saw Maududi as a rival claimant for popular support...some saw elements of totalitarianism in his concept of pious leadership while other considered Jamaat-e-Islami's revolutionary rhetoric dangerous."¹¹² Maudadi felt they were not the right leaders for the nation. "The slogan of the party is, 'the country is God's; rule must be by God's law; the government should be that of God's pious men.'"¹¹³ Of course, Maududi felt his party would be the one to have the most pious individual to represent the country. His party was instrumental in influencing theologians to support an Islamic constitution. The first constitution was adopted in 1956 by Prime Minister Muhammad Ali. It gave

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 21

¹¹¹ Ibid., p.21-23

¹¹² Ibid., p. 23

¹¹³ Ibid., p. 23

Pakistan the official name of, “The Islamic Republic of Pakistan.” The followers of Maududi give credit to him for this Islamic influence in the first of many constitutions of Pakistan. Jamaat-e-Islami has become one of the country’s most organized and internationally visible religious parties, even though its numbers remain small in relation to the population of the country.¹¹⁴ Its presence and influence is still relevant over sixty-five years after its founding.

The university level organization of the Jamaat-e-Islami was founded in 1947 by a group of students that had been inspired by Maulana Maududi. The Islami Jami’at-e-Talaba (Islamic Students Society, also known as IJT) was considered the student wing of the JI; however, it took a more radical viewpoint. The members clashed with more left-minded students on campuses. As these members graduated and became members of the parent organization, the JI became more political than it ever had been under the guidance of Maulana Maududi. “It no longer stuck to a single modus operandi and was now willing to explore all possible avenues toward expanding its influence and ideology.”¹¹⁵

During the 2002 elections, the Muslim League decided to join the Islamists parties under the name of Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal (MMA). They won 18 percent of parliament seats, which was a first in the history of Pakistan elections. The MMA also gained control of the NWFP region. This control “made it a breeding

¹¹⁴ Haqqani, 2002, p.25

¹¹⁵ Ibid., p.24

ground for religious extremism, shaping the fundamentalists' leanings of their Afghan neighbors, the Taliban.”¹¹⁶

Islamic Militants Role in the Russian Invasion of Afghanistan – “The American assistance to the Afghan *Mujahideen*, which kept increasing, was a critical factor in tilting the operational balance against the Soviet Union.”¹¹⁷

The Islamists grew in numbers and power during the war. This was due to the assistance of the ISI branch of the Pakistan military. The war was against a non-Muslim nation and therefore became a Jihad in the eyes of the Islamists. The ISI had their own agenda and the Islamists were the perfect recruits. The ISI were instrumental in educating and training the Islamists. After the war was over, these trained Islamists came into Pakistan along with large numbers of Afghani refugees. The Islamists became involved in the ongoing Kashmir conflict and the sectarian violence between Sunnis and Shias.

Madrassas played a crucial role during the Afghanistan war with Russia from 1979 to 1989. They were churning out religious individuals ready to fight the communists. “The *Madrassa* assembly lines had started to turn out gun fodder in increasing quantities. According to a retired Pakistani general, Kamal Matinuddin, Zia established a chain of *deeni madaris* (religious schools) along the Afghan-Pakistani border...in order to create a belt of religiously oriented students who

¹¹⁶ Shuja, 2008 p. 532

¹¹⁷ Arif, 1995 p. 318

would assist the Afghan Mujahideen to evict the Soviets from Afghanistan.¹¹⁸
Again, the military was deeply involved in the training of Mujahideen.

After the war these trained Islamists migrated to the Kashmir region to fight another enemy of Islam (India). As previously mentioned, after 9/11 Musharraf had described the individuals fighting in the Kashmir region as freedom fighters. He called the extremists in Afghanistan terrorists. Only under pressure, from the United States, did he eventually call both groups terrorists.

Sectarianism and Islamism

The military manipulates the sectarian and ethnic divisions to legitimize the need for military intervention. "...the ethnic and sectarian divide in Pakistan has played a significant role in contributing to praetorianism through its promotion of civil-military alliances and counter-alliances which have at times legitimized military intervention."¹¹⁹

The two largest sects in Islam are Sunni and Shia. The main distinction between the two sects is their differing belief as to who was to take over the leadership of the Islamic Empire after the death of Prophet Muhammad. The Sunnis believe Prophet Muhammad named his successor, Abu Bakr, and therefore no doubt exists as to who would lead the Muslims. However, the Shia believed that the next leader ought to be from the bloodline of the Prophet. There have been numerous conflicts between these two groups over the years.

¹¹⁸ Abbas, 2005. p. 114

¹¹⁹ Haleem, 2003

These groups are easy to manipulate, which has led to them becoming pawns of the military.

The sectarian violence has the potential to create bitter divides between the Shias and Sunnis. "The sectarian divide has a greater potential for causing instability and the possible 'Lebanonization' of Pakistan than any provincial/ethnic divide because of the higher levels of emotion and consequent religious fanaticism."¹²⁰

Ethnic divisions have also contributed their fair share of violence in Pakistan. The population of Pakistan is mostly Muslim, but their ethnic origin can be more important and meaningful than their religion. "Ethnic violence in Pakistan has been abundant; particularly since the 1980s...between 1985 and 1992 over 3,000 people have lost their lives in the province of Sindh as a result of ethnic violence between the indigenous Sindhis and the minority Mohajirs."¹²¹

An example of how the military manipulates ethnic tensions follows, "the widespread ethnic clashes in Karachi between Mohajirs on the one side and the Pathans and Punjabis on the other in the mid and late 1980s (during Zia's rule) were widely believed to have been engineered by the intelligence agencies in order to maintain the need for military rule."¹²² They used any means necessary to maintain rule, even if it involved bloodshed of fellow Pakistanis.

¹²⁰ Mumbai Evidence Given to Pakistan. 5 January 2009. 27 May 2009. <http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/7810981.stm.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 469

¹²¹ Haleem, 2003, p. 470

Because these division cause such impassioned responses from the participants it is highly unlikely they realize they are being used. It is discouraging to see the military and the Islamists use such violent measures against the population to sustain their power over the country.

Contemporary Islamist Conflicts

There have been many conflicts in recent times that have involved Islamists with connections to Pakistan. This section will discuss the attacks on various locations in Mumbai, India and also the current conflict in the Northwest region of Pakistan. These exemplify the fact that Pakistan is and will continue to be, at least in the near future, a hotbed for religious extremism.

Mumbai Terrorist Attacks - On November 26, 2008, Mumbai, India was victim to a terrorist attack that involved five different locations in the large city. The targets included two hotels, a train station, a restaurant and a Jewish center. 173 people were killed by ten gunmen. India has stated that a Pakistan based terrorist group, Lashkar-e-Taiba is responsible for the attacks.¹²³ The purpose of these attacks by Islamic militant groups is to jeopardize any hope of friendly relations between Pakistan and India. Insecure relations with their larger and more powerful neighbor feed the instability in the region. Islamists thrive and grow in this type of environment.

The Present Conflict in Swat Valley - The Swat Valley is located in Northern Pakistan, bordering Afghanistan, in the North West Frontier Province (better known as the NWFP). The conflict began in early May of 2009 between

¹²³ Mumbai Evidence Given to Pakistan.

Taliban forces based in this area and the Pakistan military. It was in response to the peace deal between that fell apart; and also attempts by the Taleban to expand their area of control.¹²⁴The Taleban are infiltrating Pakistan with plans to make it an Islamic nation to their liking.¹²⁵ According to the BBC's Shoaib Hasan, the ISI created the Taleban to create a larger military to combat India's massive military size. The ISI strategy saw that having Afghanistan would allow for the Pakistani military to have, "geographic strategic depth in case of war with India."¹²⁶ According the army officials, around 15,000 military forces are in the region combating 4,000 to 5,000 Taleban men.¹²⁷ Unfortunately, due to the fighting, numerous civilians have had to evacuate their villages. This massive influx of refugees, nearly 2 million since august of 2008¹²⁸, has created additional problems for the Pakistani government.

Can the Islamists be involved in a more democratic system of government in Pakistan? Can they accept secular opposition in the political party system? Their history does not give either of these questions a positive answer. They are adamant that their way of life is the best way for Pakistan. When they disagree they express it through violence. It does not seem feasible that they will be willing to sit down and discuss disagreements with others involved in the political

¹²³ Pakistan army in Taleban City. 23 May 2009. 27 May 2009. <news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8065062.stm>

¹²⁴ Pakistan Conflict map. http://.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/8044604.stm

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Pakistan Army in "Taleban City"

¹²⁷ Pakistan army in "Taleban City"

system. They weaken the somewhat democratic system that exists in Pakistan now. They have been responsible for assassinating leaders who are trying to practice democracy. The assassination of Benazir Bhutto and the Swat Valley conflict are recent examples of how they marginalize the democratic process. They are more comfortable with aggression rather than discussion. Pakistan's future is a bleak one. The military and the Islamists are fighting for control. The weak civilian system is unable to become involved in this fight for the leadership of Pakistan. Is there hope for this civilian system? Even if someone did come up from society to try to change the future of Pakistan, that person would most likely be the victim of an assassination. Islamists do not debate someone with different views than their own; they remove them from the process violently. This has become a fact of life in Pakistan.

“Unless Islamabad's objectives are redefined to focus on economic prosperity and popular participation in governance – which the military as an institution remains reluctant to do – the state will continue to turn to Islam as a national unifier.”¹²⁹ The country's leaders have relied on this strategy of Islam as the “national unifier” for so long. Any hope of change will be very difficult. Old habits die hard and with such violent opposition in Pakistan, the necessary changes will be difficult to achieve.

¹²⁸ Haqqani, 2002, p.326

CHAPTER 5

DEMOCRATIZATION AND CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

Islam and the State

Pakistan has been led by a handful of civilian leaders. They each had significant dealings with the military and the Islamists. The civilian leaders have used Islam and the Islamists as a way of justifying their rule and strengthening their power. In regards to their relationship with the military, these civilian leaders have had to appease this establishment to protect their own position of leadership. All but one, Asif Ali Zardari (the current leader), has been removed from power by the military. He has been the President since September 2008 and the question that must be asked is how long it will be until the military removes him from power.

Civilian Leaders

This chapter will discuss and analyze four civilian leaders and their brief time in power. It will look at how each of these leaders has attempted to satisfy both the military powers lurking in the background and also the Islamists that constantly claim that these civilian leaders never protect the interests of Islam. The presence of patrimonialism is strong in the civilian leaders; the fact that three of the four leaders come from the same family confirms the practice of patrimonialism in the civilian politics of Pakistan.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto – He was born in 1928 in the Larkana area of the Sindh province and his father was a feudal landlord. Z. Bhutto attended the University of California, Berkeley and obtained a degree in Political Science and continued

his education at Oxford University. He also studied at Christ Church College, and received his graduate degree in jurisprudence in 1952.¹³⁰ He was a part of the leadership in Pakistan since the late 1950s and was included in General Ayub's "inner circle", as a confidant and advisor.¹³¹ Under Ayub, Z. Bhutto served as the foreign minister and the natural resources minister.¹³² Zulfikar Bhutto left Ayub's cabinet in June, 1966.¹³³ His decision to leave was mostly due to the debacle of the 1965 war, it was embarrassing and upsetting for Bhutto; he felt that Ayub had caved to the demands of the West and lost Kashmir. He resigned from the cabinet and within a year and a half created his own political party.

The Pakistan People's Party (PPP) was created in late 1967 with welcoming arms by the populace. Z. Bhutto was quite popular with the youth who had become disgusted with the way Ayub had handled the 1965 war. They were looking for a young, charismatic leader to change the direction of Pakistan's future and Z. Bhutto fit that role perfectly. He rallied the masses to oppose the unpopular military leadership. The basic principles of his political party are as follows: "Islam is our faith, democracy is our politics, socialism is our economy, and all power to the people."¹³⁴

¹²⁹ Ziring, 1998, p. 276

¹³⁰ Ibid., p. 276

¹³¹ Abbas, 2005, p. 36 and 40

¹³² Talbot, 1998, p. 179

¹³³ Pakistan Peoples Party. 2007. April, 4, 2008 www.ppp.org.pk/history.html.

Zulfikar Bhutto, through his Pakistan's Peoples Party (PPP), became Prime Minister in 1971. Every leader of the PPP since its inception has been a Bhutto by blood or marriage. After Z. Bhutto's death in 1979, his wife Nusrat took over. Their daughter Benazir was next to become the Chairwoman of the party. She held that position until her assassination in December of 2007. In her will she gave the chairmanship to her son, Bilawal Bhutto Zardari. Her husband, Asif Ali Zardari, is presently the chairman of the PPP and also the current president of Pakistan. It is expected that Bilawal will take control of his grandfather's party once he completes his education at Oxford University.

During his rule, Z. Bhutto did make attempts to appease the religious side of the populace. "The 1973 Constitution declared Pakistan an Islamic Republic, with Islam as the religion of the state."¹³⁵ These steps created the foundation for enforcing the shariah and the potential for giving legitimacy to religious groups.¹³⁶ He also hosted the Islamic Summit in 1974; this gathering of Islamic nations "created an environment of expectancy for Islamic unity and possible Islamic social order."¹³⁷

Additional attempts to appease Islamists Z. Bhutto included declaring the Ahmadi religious group a minority in 1974. Bhutto was not religious man, but he shrewdly understood what must be done to protect his position of leadership; rather than confront the powerful religious groups, he marginalized the

¹³⁴ Shafqat, 2002, p.135

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 135

¹³⁶ Ibid., p. 136

controversial Ahmadi group. "Through an amendment in 1974, persons who do not believe in the finality of the prophet are non-Muslims in the legal sense."¹³⁸ The Ahmadis do not consider Islam's Prophet Muhammad as the last prophet. For Muslims, Prophet Muhammad is considered the last of God's prophets sent to earth. By going against this basic belief Islam, many Muslims declare Ahmadis as non-Muslims. This became a huge issue after an incident at a railway station in the small town of Rabwah in the Punjab province. The Ahmadi's account of the incident is as follows. While the train was at a scheduled stop in the city of Rabwah, some members of the IJT (the student branch of the JI) became verbally abusive towards an Ahmadi woman. They hurled anti-Ahmadi insults at her. Fellow Ahmadis on the train came to her defense and beat the young men. The IJI, on the other hand, claim that Ahmadi leaders were passing out religious handouts on the train and this upset the IJT members enough to lead to a violent altercation.¹³⁹

The Rabwah incident became the catalyst necessary for the IJT to argue for the denunciation of the Ahmadi group as a true sect of Islam. Soon after, many other religious political parties joined in this tirade. By declaring the Ahmadis a minority, Bhutto was giving in to the demands of the religious-political groups. "Instead of taking the risk of confronting the religious agitators, Bhutto decided to concede their demand."¹⁴⁰ These parties did not feel Z. Bhutto was religious

¹³⁷ Kleiner, 2007, p. 2

¹³⁸ Abbas, 2005 p. 81-82

¹³⁹ Haqqani, 2002, p. 107

enough to lead an Islamic country. He was known to drink and considered a womanizer, which they felt, was inappropriate behavior for a devout Muslim. Also, his party had a socialist manifesto, which clashed with the Islamists view of how Pakistan should be run. Z. Bhutto was under pressure to secure the support of these Islamic political parties, because without their backing his position in power would be in jeopardy.

General Zia-al-Haq of the Pakistan Army took over Z. Bhutto's government in a 1977 coup. Bhutto was subsequently brought to trial on charges of attempted murder of a political opponent. His execution took place in April of 1977. The questionable methods of the court to try and convict Bhutto were orchestrated by General Zia and the Islamist political party, the Jamaat-e-Islami. This was the tragic end to one of the most charismatic leaders that Pakistan has witnessed. However, his family legacy and political party would continue through his daughter and son-in-law.

The next two civilian rulers were Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif. Between 1988 and 1999, these two each ruled Pakistan twice. This back and forth was due to the military's and Islamists presence in politics. Even though they were not directly in control, their presence was strong enough to influence the direction these leaders took the nation.

Benazir Bhutto (Prime Minister from November 1988 through August 1990) - Benazir Bhutto was the daughter of Zulfikar and Nusrat Bhutto. She was born in 1953 in Karachi, Pakistan. She earned her Bachelor's in comparative government at Harvard University and continued her studies at Oxford. B. Bhutto

was in her teens during her father's time as the Prime Minister. During his subsequent trial and execution her personality was forming into a person forever burned by the military government. She led the PPP with great fervor and demanded democracy, but she constantly found herself fighting the military establishment that killed her father. Benazir Bhutto was assassinated on December 27, 2007. She had returned to Pakistan after many years in exile and was planning to run in the upcoming January elections. Even though her times in office were overshadowed by questionable ethics by both her and her husband, Asif Ali Zardari, she died a martyr in her followers' eyes. Her father's Pakistan People's Party became the patrimonial symbol of her return to power. The only leaders of this party have been the founder, his wife, his daughter, and presently the daughter's husband. This practice is indicative of a patrimonial and neo-patrimonial approach to government. The PPP will not allow anyone outside the family a chance to run the party.

The Pakistan populace had become so cynical of politics during the reign of General Musharraf. To have Benazir, the daughter of the first family of Pakistani politics, return from exile and run again for the high office gave the people of Pakistan the hope they had lost so long ago. This hope overshadowed the fact that B. Bhutto might not be the best choice to move Pakistan forward. She rode the coattails of her father's legacy. The Pakistani people placed all their hopes on the Bhutto legacy to pull them out of the mess of eleven years of military rule. The practice of patrimonialism and neo-patrimonialism is present in the PPP and the people of the country deeply desired a return to this patrimonial political

party. The people have witnessed this type of civilian government system more than any other. It is important to keep in mind that the founder of the PPP was and is still considered one of the most charismatic and impressionable civilian leaders that Pakistan has witnessed. Any link to him is enough for many Pakistanis. The fact that Z. Bhutto's son-in-law is the current president of Pakistan proves this point. It says a great amount about this civilian population. In some respects they are not developed enough to advance to more democratic system of government because they are unwilling to let go of the PPP and what it stood for in their eyes.

After the death of General Zia in a mysterious plane crash in 1988, new elections were in the works. The army realized that they must step back and let their obvious control become invisible. This led to more behind the scenes attempts at controlling the elections of 1988. A coalition party created to compete against Benazir Bhutto in the 1988 elections was organized by the Inter Services Intelligence (ISI) branch of the military. This coalition, the Islami Jamhoori Ittehad (IJI-Islamic Democratic Alliance), was a mix of Islamist and promilitary parties. It was created by the Vice Chief of the Army Staff, General Mirza Aslam Beg. His intention was to continue the military's presence in politics after the death of Zia-al-Haq. The ISI funded the political party and also had the Jamaa-e-Islami join it to increase its chances of winning. Lieutenant General Gul, head of the ISI, threatened the IJI's role in the Afghanistan jihad operations if they did not join the coalition. The IJI, under pressure from the ISI, then agreed to join the IJI and also campaigned against Benazir Bhutto. However, the country

was ready for change. The army did not foresee a strong response to the PPP. Despite the ISI's involvement in the opposition to the PPP, Benazir's party won ninety-two seats out of 215, while the IJI won fifty-four.¹⁴¹ The win did not mean the end of the military's involvement in politics. They made sure that one of the leaders of the IJI, Nawaz Sharif, was made the chief minister of the Punjab province (the largest and most powerful province of Pakistan). Having a member of the opposition as the chief minister of the largest province would keep Benazir wary. The president of the country was Ishaq Khan, a friend of the military. The leadership of Pakistan was shared by three people: the prime minister, the president, and the army chief of staff. Prime Minister Bhutto had to appease the other two to remain in office.

The Islamists attacked her almost immediately. "Soon after her election...several ulama issued a fatwa (religious edict) declaring that a woman could not be head of government in an Islamic country...The leader of the Jamaat-e-Islami (JI) argued that her real vulnerability lay in her 'lack of credibility' on national security issues...she could not be trusted with the country's nuclear program and the jihad in Afghanistan."¹⁴²

Another attack she endured was from the ISI. They used the controversial Salman Rushdie book, *Satanic Verses* to create problems for Benazir's government. In February of 1989, violent protests against the book occurred in

¹⁴¹ Haqqani, 2002, p. 202

¹⁴² Ibid., p.207-8

Islamabad. Muslims felt that the book demeaned Prophet Muhammad and also contained inappropriate passages.

...the book had been published a year earlier, in 1988, and no one in the Muslim world had taken notice of it until Pakistani cleric-politician Maulana Kausar Niazi wrote a series of articles about it in the Pakistani press....he said that a copy of the book with offensive passages duly highlighted had been sent to him by a senior official in the ISI...As for the ISI's motives, the agency was repeating what Pakistani intelligence services had successfully done in the past: it was hoping to embarrass a civilian government over an emotive religious issue.¹⁴³

This embarrassment drew international attention and increased the animosity between the Islamists and Benazir, all at the hands of the ISI. The ISI made sure to keep their role in this incident secret. Benazir Bhutto was removed from office in August 1990 by President Ishaq Haq. He claimed to be following military orders. "The Bhutto government operated against the backdrop of a hostile military establishment that was prepared to use any opportunity to remove her from power...the young prime minister was seen as 'the symbol of a democratic Pakistan.'"¹⁴⁴ Any chance of democracy, no matter how small, would threaten the strong grip the military had on the governmental system of Pakistan. Her ties to the United States also concerned the military establishment. A relationship with the most powerful nation in the world could weaken the military's strength in Pakistan. Therefore, Bhutto was considered a serious threat and she was removed from office.

¹⁴³ Haqqani, 2002, p. 208

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 210

Nawaz Sharif (Prime Minister from November 1990 through July 1993) - Nawaz Sharif was born in Lahore, Pakistan in 1949. His family had migrated from East Punjab, India in 1947 during the partition. His father opened a steel factory that became a chain by the 1970s. This was when Z. Bhutto was in office and nationalized the steel industry. "The Sharifs joined the ranks of many families who had a personal grudge against the PPP and Z. Bhutto. When Zia took over in 1977 and the family business was restored to them, they became strong champions of the general's cause."¹⁴⁵ Sharif was a graduate of the Lahore Government College. He served as the finance minister and then the chief minister of the Punjab province before becoming prime minister.¹⁴⁶

In the 1990 elections held after Bhutto's dismissal, the ISI created an anti-Bhutto coalition to make sure she did not return to office. The ISI also contributed large amounts of cash to these anti-Bhutto parties. "An election slush fund amounting to 150 million rupees (approximately \$3 million) was created at the ISI by General Beg (the current army chief)...ISI chief Lieutenant General Asad Durrani admitted in an affidavit that he distributed 'a total of (Pakistani rupees) 60 million to 20 anti-Bhutto politicians."¹⁴⁷ The IJI won the elections and the next decision was choosing the new prime minister. Sharif used his Punjabi ethnic ties to convince many of the Generals that he was the one to rule and he took office in November of 1990.

¹⁴⁴ Abbas, 2005, p. 135

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 135.

¹⁴⁶ Haqqani, 2002 p. 219.

He went along with the ISI to continue the “push for an Islamist government in Afghanistan and launched its guerilla operations in Indian-controlled parts of Jammu and Kashmir.”¹⁴⁸ During the Gulf War in 1991, Sharif sided with the US and Saudi Arabia, which was against the wishes of General Beg. Islamists took to the streets to express their anger at the US war against Iraq. He did try to please the Islamists on some issues. “He ordered women to cover their heads on television...during the 1992 Olympic Games, ‘the government refused to allow women’s swimming events to be shown on television because the swimsuits were considered too immodest for Islamic sensitivities.”¹⁴⁹”

There was an incident in which the Islamists and Sharif disagreed. The 1992 destruction of the historical Babri Mosque in the Indian city of Ayodha caused vengeful Islamists to destroy Hindu temples. “Sharif’s government cracked down on the Islamists for attacking the temples.”¹⁵⁰

In June of 1993, President Ishaq Khan once again dismissed a civilian ruler. He “‘accused Sharif of corruption and mismanagement’ and appointed a caretaker prime minister and dissolved the parliament.”¹⁵¹ The Supreme Court soon decided that the President’s dismissal of Sharif was unconstitutional.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 222

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 225

¹⁴⁹ Haqqani, 2002, p. 226

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 228

“Confrontation between Ishaq Khan and Sharif persisted...and eventually the army stepped in to convince both Sharif and Ishaq Khan to resign.”¹⁵²

Benazir Bhutto (Prime Minister from October 1993 through November 1996)

-In the elections of 1993, the country seemed to have had enough of the religious parties; they received only nine seats in the 207-member National Assembly. Bhutto’s PPP was able to attain eighty-six seats in the National Assembly, while Sharif’s PML collected seventy-two seats. However, in the popular vote the PML had a higher percentage than the PPP. It was a close margin, slightly over one and a half percent more voted for the PML (39.7 percent for the PML and 38.1 percent for the PPP).¹⁵³ In the new parliament, Bhutto was able to create a frail coalition with smaller parties and was voted the prime minister. The new president was Farooq Leghari, “a Baluch tribal chief from Punjab...who allied himself with the establishment.”¹⁵⁴ The “troika” of Pakistan government again made the prime minister powerless against the president and the army chief. Violent riots in Karachi in 1994 considerably weakened Bhutto’s leadership, which is exactly what the military establishment wanted. Husain Haqqani quotes Tahir Amin who discusses all the players in this violent episode.

“In Sindh (Karachi is located in this province), the absence of an agreement on power-sharing between the Muhajir Quami Movement (MQM) and the PPP, internecine civil war between the

¹⁵² Ibid., p. 228

¹⁵³ Amin, 1994, p. 195

¹⁵⁴ Haqqani, 2002 p. 229

¹⁵⁴ Haqqani, 2002 p. 233

two factions of the MQM fueled by the covert role of civil and military intelligence agencies, and sectarian conflict between extremist Shia and Sunni organizations and possibly Indian Intelligence Agency (RAW) agents all worked together to create a proverbial Hobbesian condition of 'war of all against all' in Karachi. This resulted in approximately 800 dead during 1994."¹⁵⁵

Bhutto used great force to gain control of Karachi. Her party representatives used violent means to establish peace in the port city. The people of Karachi harbored resentment towards Bhutto for her harsh response.

Another important event that occurred during Bhutto's time in office was the Taliban's increasing power in Afghanistan. The ISI convinced Bhutto to support this new regime.¹⁵⁶ "In March 1996, Bhutto's government was reported as having second thoughts about supporting the Taliban..."civilian officials expressed concerns, 'about the consequences for Pakistan of a Taliban government in Kabul, which might foment Muslim fundamentalism, and possibly even secessionism in Pakistani-ruled tribal areas bordering Afghanistan.'"¹⁵⁷

Around the same time, the JI rallied to remove Bhutto from office, most likely due to her hesitation to support the Taliban regime. Eventually, fourteen parties joined this opposition alliance.¹⁵⁸ In November of 1996, President Leghari dismissed Bhutto and dissolved parliament. The military had supplied Leghari with evidence of corruption by Bhutto's husband, Zardari.¹⁵⁹ It was later revealed that the alleged corruption charges were dropped due to a lack of evidence.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 240

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 240

¹⁵⁷ Haqqani, 2002 p. 241

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 241

Nawaz Sharif (Prime Minister from February 1997 through October 1999) -In the next round of elections held in February of 1997, the same two parties were the only real contenders. The PML and the PPP were still represented by Sharif and Bhutto, respectively. Nationwide turnout was around 30 percent...the electorate was clearly tired of electing governments that faced dismissal within a couple of years. The low turnout favored the PML, which secured two-thirds of the seats in the new National Assembly.¹⁶⁰ Sharif returned to the position of Prime Minister, nearly four years after his dismissal.

This time around, Sharif tried to expand the powers of the prime minister. “Sharif attempted to increase the powers of the prime minister ‘at the expense of the parliament, the judiciary and the provinces under the pretext of introducing sharia. This mobilized the ‘orthodox Islamic groups to counterbalance his political adversaries’ but also increased the leverage of the Islamists.”¹⁶¹ Here is another example of the government using Islam and the Islamists to strengthen their own power. By using Islam Sharif gave more power to the Islamists. In the end, Sharif did not protect his office. He created the means in which to weaken it. Islamists used it as another reason to disapprove of a non-religious civilian government.

Another action that angered the Islamists was Sharif’s attempts to broker a trade deal with India. Both the ISI and the Islamists were in the midst of “large-

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 243

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 245

¹⁶¹ Haqqani, 2002 p. 245

scale jihad operations in Afghanistan and Kashmir that could be jeopardized by Sharif's ideas of trade with India."¹⁶² Before the trade talks could take place, India detonated its first nuclear weapons. These detonations took place on May 11 and 13, 1998, and announced to the world that India was a nuclear power. Of course, Pakistan had to respond in kind. What better way to show the military might of Pakistan than to hold nuclear tests of its own. Sharif was under pressure domestically and internationally. The US threatened sanctions if Pakistan detonated nuclear weapons. In Pakistan, "the Islamist parties brought tens of thousands of demonstrators in the streets demanding nuclear tests and the military weighed in favor of testing...on May 28, 1998, Pakistan tested five nuclear bombs."¹⁶³ The repercussions of Sharif's decision were felt immediately by the middle and affluent members of Pakistan's population. Husain Haqqani quotes Sartaj Aziz when describing the financial aftermath of the nuclear tests.

"The night after the nuclear tests, Sharif's government froze over \$11.8 billion in private foreign currency deposits in Pakistani banks. Ordinary Pakistanis had maintained these deposits to protect themselves from fluctuations in the value of Pakistani currency and for years the government had guaranteed that balances in these deposits could be withdrawn in foreign currency. Successive governments had, however, used these deposits to finance Pakistan's trade imbalance and the banking system would not have been able to cope with demands for hard currency withdrawals expected after the nuclear tests."¹⁶⁴

This weak economic state concerned the military because their vested interests were being affected. In October of 1998, army chief General Karamat

¹⁶² Haqqani, 2005, p.246

¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 247

recommended the “creation of a National Security Council, which would ‘institutionalize decision-making...from the military’s point of view, civilian politicians could hold office only as long as they ensured continuity in policies preferred by the military and ceded some of their constitutional authority to technocrats and army generals.”¹⁶⁵ Sharif became fed up with General Karamat and asked him to either resign or to take over the government. Karamat did not have the personality to take over the government and therefore opted for early retirement.¹⁶⁶ Sharif already had someone in mind to replace Karamat.

Sharif appointed Pervez Musharraf as army chief in October of 1998. He assumed that as a Mohajir, Musharraf would be unlikely to ever try to take over. As history has shown, this theory has been proved wrong. Little did Sharif know that within a year he would be the victim of a coup.

The Kargil Affair exemplifies the military’s audacity to make decisions without consulting the civilian leader. This incident brought great embarrassment upon Sharif. The Pakistan military wanted to make a stand in the Kashmir region. During the spring of 1999, Musharraf ordered his troops to cross the line of control that divides the Indian and Pakistani armies in Kashmir. The Pakistani troops made it to one of the most strategic points in Kashmir, the town of Kargil. They had made “significant territorial gains...Tactically, the operation was a success, politically, it was a disaster. Sharif found himself in the midst of a major international crisis. And while General Musharraf had sent the troops in, Prime

¹⁶⁵ Haqqani, 2002 p. 248

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 248

Minister Sharif was left with the unenviable task of getting them out.”¹⁶⁷ The issue of Kashmir has been a thorn on the side of Pakistan since partition. Because the majority of the Kashmir population is Muslim, the Pakistan government feels that the region should be aligned with them. When Sharif had troops pull back from their positions, the Pakistanis were horrified. How dare Sharif blink first when staring at the Indian Army? Of course, Sharif was trying to save face in the international arena and he wanted Musharraf to pay for orchestrating this debacle. Musharraf was also quite upset with Sharif. “By deciding to pull out of Kargil without negotiating any Indian concessions in return...Sharif had squandered a militarily advantageous position and caused a crisis of confidence within the Pakistan army.”¹⁶⁸ Thus began the animosity between these two men. Pervez Musharraf took over Sharif’s government in a bloodless coup in October 1999.

Asif Ali Zardari - Asif Ali Zardari was born in Karachi, Pakistan on July 26, 1955. His family is of Sindhi background and they lived a comfortable life. His 1987 marriage to Benazir Bhutto was arranged and they have three children. During her two terms in office as Prime Minister, Zardari served as both the Federal Environment Minister and the Federal Investment Minister. He earned the nickname “Mr. 10%” while serving in his wife’s government. This nickname referred to the amount he would take off the top in business dealings with companies while he served in government positions; an obvious conflict of

¹⁶⁷ Jones, 2002. p.34

¹⁶⁸ Jones, 2002, p. 35

interest. He was charged and subsequently jailed on charges of corruption stemming from these actions. Near the end of Benazir's second term in office Zardari was charged with the murder of his wife's brother. He was later cleared of the murder charges but spent over eleven years in prison.¹⁶⁹

He returned to the political stage after his wife's assassination on December 27, 2007. In her will she had bequeathed the leadership role of the PPP to their son, Bilawal Bhutto Zardari. The plan is to allow Asif Ali Zardari to serve as the temporary chairman of the party until their son completes his education at Oxford University. In September of 2008 Zardari won the presidential election by the legislature of Pakistan in a landslide.¹⁷⁰ This was despite Zardari's history of corruption and unethical behavior. What could explain the legislature's decision? Was ten years of military rule wearing them down? Was it the possibility of the Bhutto name coming back into politics? Zulfikar Bhutto left a legacy that carried on with his daughter and now his son-in-law. The country was so desperate for a return to the most inspirational and charismatic civilian leader the country has ever witnessed; and they are willing to overlook all the ethical problems and manipulative behavior that Z. Bhutto exhibited.

The strong grip the army has on the civilian governments even when they are not in direct control is evident in the governments of both Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif. These civilian leaders were constantly trying to appease the

¹⁶⁹ Country Profile: Pakistan. 7 May 2009. 18 May 2009. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia_profiles/1157960.stm>

¹⁷⁰ Ibid

military and the Islamists while trying to run a country with some semblance of control. They were naïve to think that their respective governments could get anything done with the military, ISI and the Islamists watching their every move. The military was able to easily dismiss these civilian governments with similar techniques that also disenfranchised the Pakistani population. They became apathetic to the repeated dismissals and general downward spiral of the country at the hands of the military and Islamists.

Conclusions

Pakistan has been on the front lines of terrorist activity in recent years. It is an ever-changing landscape which involves the military, the Islamists, and the civilian system. This thesis has attempted to analyze the different roles these players have played and will play in the future of Pakistani politics. This is instrumental in understanding the challenges it faces as it tries to move forward toward a stable government system. The roadblocks ahead are monumental and the question remains whether this battered nation will be able to pick up the pieces and become a stable nation free of terrorist activity. Pakistan's inception and brief existence has been marred by upheaval punctuated by short periods of relative calm. It has experienced violent terrorist attacks, more so in recent years, especially after September 11, 2001. The conflict in the Swat Valley and other areas of Pakistan exemplify the fact that this nation is the focal point of terrorist activity and will continue to be so in the foreseeable future.

The absence of civil institutions in Pakistan has allowed the military to easily infiltrate all aspects of the governmental system. The Islamists have also used the military's large role in governmental system to their advantage. They have their own agenda and use the military establishment to further their goals. Their interests lie in preserving their distorted version of Islam. The Islamists continue to create an unstable nation that can be their haven for unrest.

What lies ahead for Pakistan? The success of the military's current offensive in Swat Valley could lead Pakistan in a new direction. However, more needs to be done to successfully change the present conditions in Pakistan. Effective

civilian institutions must be established for any chance of a better future. The military and the Islamists must step back from their present roles and allow for the growth of civil institutions. However, neither one of these groups is willing to relinquish control nor the financial gains that come with power.

Pakistan needs a leader that can come up from the populace and inspire the people to demand change. However, the environment is treacherous and dangerous for anyone willing to fight for transforming Pakistan. Three of the last four civilian leaders have come from the same family. This practice of nepotism must end; and so must the presence of patrimonialism. These approaches to government have been injurious to Pakistan's progress. It is necessary for Pakistan to begin to rely upon a system of meritocracy. Will Pakistan be able to move beyond these entrenched practices and create an environment that would allow someone to come up from the populace? Pakistan has a long road ahead if it tries to change the course of its future. If it stays on the current path it will continue to be an unstable haven for extremists and the military. The status quo only serves to perpetuate and sustain those that currently hold power and allows the subjugation of the citizens. If the people of Pakistan demand a just government that serves its populace, it may require a violent revolution to overthrow the vested powers that have ruled Pakistan since its inception.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbas, H. (2005). *Pakistan's Drift Into Extremism*. London: M.E. Sharpe.

Almond, G. a. (1966). *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Amin, T. (1994). Pakistan in 1993: Some Dramatic Changes. *Asian Survey* , 191-199.

Arif, G. K. (1995). *Working with Zia: Pakistan's Power Politics 1977-1988*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Bendix, R. (1977). *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chilcote, R. (1994). *Theories of Comparative Politics: The Search for a Paradigm Reconsidered*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Choudhury, G. (1967). *Documents and Speeches on the Constitution of Pakistan*. Decca: Green Book House.

Clapham, C. (1985). *Third World Politics: An Introduction*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Country Profile: Pakistan. (7 May 2009). Retrieved 18 May 2009 from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia_profiles/1157960.stm>

Dewey, C. (1991). The Rural Roots of Pakistani Militarism. In D. Low, *The Political Inheritance of Pakistan* (pp. 255-283). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Finer, S. (1988). *Man on Horseback*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Haleem, I. (2003). Ethnic and Sectarian Violence and the Propensity Towards Praetorianism in Pakistan. *Third World Quarterly* , 24 (3), 463-477.

- Haqqani, H. (2007). Paistan and the Islamists. *Current History* , 147-152.
- Haqqani, H. (2002). *Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military*. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Huntington, S. (2006). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Huntington, S. (1996). Reforming Civil-Military Relations. In L. D. Plattner, *Civil-Military Relations and Democracy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Huntington, S. (1957). *The Soldier and the State*. Cmabridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Jalal, A. (1990). *The State of Martial Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- James, L. (1997). *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Jones, O. B. (2002). *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Khan, Y. (2007). *The Great Partition: The Making of India and Pakistan*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kleiner, J. (2007). Pakistan: An Unsettled Nation. *Diplomacy and Statecraft* , 18 (1), 1-25.
- Maniruzzaman, T. (1987). *Military Withdrawal from Politics*. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Mumbai Evidence Given to Pakistan. (2009, January 5). Retrieved May 27, 2009, from bbc.com: <http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south/7810981.stm>.

Pakistan Army in Taleban City. (2009, May 23). Retrieved May 27, 2009, from BBC: news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8065062.stm

Pakistan Conflict Map. (2009, May 24). Retrieved May 27, 2009, from bbc.com: http://.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/8044604.stm

Pakistan People's Party History. (2007). Retrieved April 4, 2008, from Paksitan People's Party: www.ppp.org.pk/histpry.html

Porter, B. (2004). *The Lion's Share: A Short History of British Imperialism, 1850-2004.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Shafqat, S. (2002). From Official Islam to Islamism: The Rise of Dawat-ul-Irshad and Lashkar-e-Taiba. In C. Jaffrelot, *Pakistan: Nationalism Without a Nation?* (pp. 131-147). New York: Zed Books, Ltd.

Shuja, A. (2008). *Crossed Swords.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Siddiq, A. (2007). *Military, Inc.* London: Pluto Press.

Talbot, I. (1998). *Pakistan: A Modern History.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Weaver, M. A. (2002). *Pakistan: In the Shadow of Jihad and Afghanistan.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Ziring, L. (1998). *Pakistan in the Twentieth Century: A Political History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VITA

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Najiyah Khan

Degrees:

Bachelor of Arts, Political Science, 1997
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Bachelor of Science, Management, 2000
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Thesis Title: Civil-Military Relations: A Case Study of Pakistan

Thesis Examination Committee:

Chairperson, Mehran Tamadonfar, Ph. D.

Committee Member, Kenneth Fernandez, Ph. D.

Committee Member, Ted Jelen, Ph. D.

Graduate Faculty Representative, Satish Sharma, Ph. D.