

PART - II:SECTION - A:"QNO-2:"* INTRODUCTION:

There are various powers being exercised by US President and by prime minister of UK. The major difference is that US has a presidential form of government, whereas UK flows parliamentary form of government. Due to this very reason, US president is relatively more independent in his decision making. On the other side, UK had to consult all because all of them are elected representatives and he is just the first among the equals. The powers of both are being restricted due to various checks and balances. However, the US president is relatively more powerful than the UK's Prime Minister.

Gha:i Paper

* Powers of US President:

His powers in various aspects are being enlisted below:

* Executive Powers:

- ⇒ He is the executive head of both the state and the government.
- ⇒ He has the power of appointment. All the big appointments in the country are being made by him.
- ⇒ He has the power to shape the foreign policy of the country. He has authority over treaties, appointing ambassadors, declaring wars, and several others.

use subheadings; not points

* Legislative Powers:

- ⇒ He has the power to veto any bill being passed from congress.
- ⇒ He can make executive orders for 90 days.
- ⇒ He can appeal to public, in order to pressurize the members of senate.

=> He has the power to bargain with senators for law making.

Judicial Powers:

=> He has the authority to appoint judges.

=> He has the authority to pardon anyone.

Powers of Prime Minister of UK:

The various powers of prime minister of UK are being mentioned below:

Executive Powers:

=> He is the executive head of the government.

=> He orders the president for summoning parliament's session.

=> He appoints different people after consulting the cabinet ministers.

=> He has the power to appoint cabinet as well.

Ghazi Paper

⇒) He has the power to make foreign policy including treaties, peace deal, appointing ambassadors, and several others after consulting the cabinet.

* Legislative Powers:

⇒) He has the power to pardon someone.

⇒) He has the power to appoint judges in consultation with cabinet.

⇒) He can summon parliament's session by ordering the president.

⇒) As, he enjoys majority in parliament, so laws are also made according to his wishes.

* Judicial Powers:

⇒) He has the power to pardon someone.

⇒) He has the power of appointing judges in consultation with the parliament.

* Powers that make US President more powerful:

The various superior powers of US president are being enlisted below:

⇒ Absolute authority over cabinet:

In US, the cabinet members are being appointed by the President, and he has the power to remove them as well. On the other hand, the cabinet members of UK are being selected by the prime minister (PM), but he is just first among the equals. In UK, the cabinet members are being elected directly by the people, and that is the reason, why UK's PM has to consult them in everything. In contrast to it, US president selects the cabinet ministers, so he has relatively more authority.

⇒ Influence over the world:

US President is considered, "the president of the world". This is because US is the super power and has greater influence over the world. On the other

add and highlight references/examples against these arguments

hard UK's PM has relatively lesser influence over the world.

⇒ US president is head of state and government:

US president is head of both state and government. This gives him relatively extra powers than UK's PM, who is just head of government.

⇒ Power of appointment:

US president has relatively more powers in appointment as compared to UK's PM, who has to consult the cabinet and parliament.

⇒ Power in Foreign Policy:

US president is more powerful in shaping foreign policy as well. UK's PM had to consult the cabinet and the parliament while formulating foreign policy.

⇒ Security of Seat:

US president is only removed through impeachment; else, he is secure. On the other hand, UK's PM can be ousted anytime, if the parliament moves

vote of no confidence against Lim.

* Conclusion:

In a nutshell, both US president and UK's PM had different powers. Both work under different system of government. US president is the ~~sole~~ ^{supreme} authority in US; whereas, the UK's PM is head of government in UK. However, there are certain powers which makes US president more powerful. Hence, it is the US president whose seat can be considered as the most powerful seat and authority, present on earth.

SECTION-B:

Q-No-5

* INTRODUCTION:

There had been various instances where marginalization of certain groups had led to riots, protests, and ultimately independence of countries. In case of united India also, the marginalization of Muslims by Hindus, led to creation of Pakistan.

Not only marginalization, but also the ideology and leadership played key role in the division. The main deciding factor was the ideology and leadership. This can be further substantiated with the fact that, if they both had the same ideologies, then they would have never related to each other.

* BACKGROUND:

The Hindu-Muslim conflict had remained in the area from quite long. In the start, it was the ideology and leadership that made Muhammad Bin Qasim to attack this area. He had clash with the varying ideology of Hindus. Similarly, it was this ideology that made Mehmood Ghaznavi to attack this region for seventeen times and play havoc with their temples. Additionally, due to this ideology different scholars came to this region and created rifts between the two. Even today, the hindus considers as outsiders and call them as bastards and perpetrators. They also consider it as unjust, that the mughals had been ruling them for years. Thus, it is not a new phenomenon, rather this clash was from quite along time.

* Different personalities
 that strengthened the

rift between the two further:

There has been various personalities whose favor for promoting their ideologies, further created rifts between the two:

use specific and detailed headings.

* Sheikh Ahmad Sirhindi:

Sheikh Ahmad Sirhindi was a staunch advocate of Islam and strictly opposed any thing that was against shariah. At his time, Akbar had tried to reconcile both the muslims and the hindus, by creating a modified religion named "Deen-i-Ilahi". It was an attempt to reconcile the two. Similarly, Akbar also tried to appoint rajputs and married ^{different wives} from them as well. However, due to Sirhindi's strict interpretation of Islam, he clearly and ~~off~~ openly opposed all these steps of Akbar. This created a rift between the two classes which was difficult to cover later.

* Sir Syed Ahmad Khan:

Sir Syed tried to cover that gap by ^{making} creating liberal interpretation;

Ghazi Paper

but then it was too late and was difficult to reconcile the two classes.

Shah Wali Ullah:

Shah waliullah also tried to make the muslims a bit moderate in their policies, but it was all in vein.

Different ideologies that ~~made~~ eventually led the muslims towards the muslim nationalism:

The various hindus ideologies that forced the muslims to follow muslim nationalism, are being enlisted below:

do not use one word headings. they should be elaborate and self explanatory

Shudhi:

Shudhi ideology was being promoted by the hindus which was aimed at purifying the newly converts to Hinduism. This ideology further strengthened the rifts between the two classes.

Ghazi Paper

* Shangha:

This movement was being led by hindus to convert muslims to hinduism. This further divided the two and harmed their unity.

* Atthard Bharat:

The ideology to regain the lost victories that hindus enjoyed earlier, was another key ideology that created rifts between the two, and ultimately ended in muslim nationalism.

* Different Muslim leadership that made the Hindu-Muslim separation inevitable:

The different key leaders that made the hindu-muslim separation inevitable are being listed below:

* Allama Iqbal:

Seeing the conditions of the subcontinent, Allama Iqbal

Ghazi Paper

(4)

clearly advocated for a separate muslim country in the north-west India.

* Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad:

Abdul Kalam also finally advocated & advocated for a separate state for muslims, where they could practice their religion, without any intervention.

* Quaid-e-Azam:

Finally, it was the charismatic leadership of Quaid-e-Azam that made the Hindu-Muslim separation inevitable. Earlier, Quaid advocated for separated electorates only, but seeing the difficulties which the two classes had been facing due to varying ideology, Quaid then advocated for a separate state for muslims.

* Conclusion:

The long struggle and the clash between the two classes: hindus and the muslims, finally resulted into separation of two separate states. Different leaders played a key role

Gha:i Paper

in uniting them; but, if all went in vain. When it realized that the two different ideologies won't allow peaceful living conditions, various leaders started advocating for separate states based on different ideologies. Ultimately, the varying ideology and leadership of Muslims made the Hindu-Muslim separation inevitable.

Q-NO-6:

* INTRODUCTION:

Different countries make different constitutions according to their circumstances and according to the wish of their people. Then, with time, the demands of the people vary and leads to amendments in the constitution in order to suit them. In the constitution, the various branches of government are being restricted through the process of

Ghazi Paper

checks and balances, which ensures balance of power between them. In Pakistan also this balance of power varied after amendments, but here, ~~the~~ the 26th amendment will highlighted mainly that ~~how~~ it disturbed the balance of power between the different groups.

BACKGROUND:

Pakistan has been struggling to balance the power between the various branches of government since independence. Earlier, the government of India Act made the Governor more powerful. Then, the 1956 constitution tried to shift the power to PM and balanced all the three branches. ^{The} 1962nd constitution, again~~ed~~ vested more powers in the executive authority. However, the 1973 constitution was framed to balance the power of the three branches again. In 2010, the 18th amendment made judiciary independent and allowed the *sou moto* power to it. However, the recent 26th amendment cubed the *sou moto* power from Judiciary again. Musharraf also made the ^{Ghazi Paper} judiciary subservient to executive.

MOTOWOTOFOSO

* Balance of power between Executive, legislature, and Judiciary prior to 26th amendment

The balance of power mechanism is being enlisted below:

* Check of Executive over legislature:

- ⇒ PM can order the president to dissolve the national assembly.
- ⇒ PM can refer the new ~~laws~~ amendments to the shariat appellate. The laws violating shariat were being checked.

* Check of legislature over Executive:

- ⇒ legislature can move vote of no confidence against the PM at any time.
- ⇒ legislature can also initiate impeachment process against the executive.

★ Check of ~~Legislature~~ Judiciary over executive and legislature:

- ⇒ Judiciary could reject any amendment or law that was in violation to the constitution.
- ⇒ Judiciary had the power of ~~sole~~ veto.
- ⇒ Judiciary could reject any law that is in violation to shariah.

★ Balance of power after the amendment:

The balance of power mechanism after the amendment is being enlisted below:

★ Check of Executive over legislation:

- ⇒ These checks remained the same and were not altered due to several reasons.

★ Check of Legislature over Executive:

These checks were also not altered and remains the same, as were present

earlier.

* Check of executive and legislature over judiciary:

These checks had been altered, and now the legislature and executive have the authority to select the chief justice among the top three judges of supreme court.

* Checks of Judiciary over executive and legislature:

The power to take somative ~~acts~~ against any amendments etc has been taken away from judiciary. Now, it will operate like Turkey's judicial system, which also cannot take action unless being referred to it by the executive. Similarly, the power of reviewing constitution related cases has also been curbed from judiciary.

* Conclusion:

In a nutshell, the 26th amendment is being considered as a step to clip the powers of judiciary. It has made judiciary dependent on executive power and is a blow to judicial independence. However, the constitution is always amended according to the ~~its~~ wishes of the people and according to the demands of the time. The new balance of power is more tilted towards the executive branch now.

Q-NO-7:

* INTRODUCTION:

Populism is rise of one leader and is being greatly loved by majority of the population very severely. The factors which leads to populism are several including: political parties and their leaders; interest groups and lobbies; and, media and propaganda.

Ghazi Paper

However, the major role is always being played by political parties and their leaders. It is the leadership that attracts the attention of the people and ultimately results in populism.

* BACKGROUND:

The world is full of examples where the role of political parties and leadership led to the populism. Hitler had been one of the example ~~which~~ ^{who} came forward due to his leadership characteristics and due to failure of other parties to show tangible results. Recently, Erdogan in Turkey had also been an example of populism. Similarly, ~~Trump~~ Trump in US had been a glaring example of modern day populism due to his leadership and role of other political parties. In ~~the~~ India, the rise of Modi and hindutva has been another prominent example of populism. Finally, the leader of Pakistan Tehreek Insaf (PTI) - Imran Khan - is another example of populism.

* ROLE OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND THEIR LEADERS IN MODERN- DAY POPULISM:

The marginalizing behaviour of some of the political parties leads to populism. In Pakistan, when the leading parties like PMLN and PPP tried to sideline the voices of the people. It led to rise of another party and to rise of the populist leader i.e. Imran Khan. Similarly, in USA, when Trump announced his policy of "America First", people started to move towards him and ~~becomes~~ ultimately led to his recent victory as well. Similarly, the BJP party in India and leader like Modi, further ~~pay~~ paved the way for modern-day populism.

attempt these parts by giving subheadings

* Role of interest groups and lobbies in modern day populism:

Interests groups and lobbies

Gha:i Paper

try to support that leader, who can make policies according to their wishes. In US also, the Jewish lobby has always played a key role, and similar is the case for weapons lobby over there. Interest groups like big business tycoons had also favored only those leaders who can take steps in accordance with their wishes.

* Role of media and propaganda in shaping modern-day populism:

Media and propaganda play its role by spreading and propagating different narratives. The two groups try to show the negative aspects of some leaders and political parties; while, highlighting the positive aspect of the populist leader in order to help him gain more support among the public. In Pakistan too, the populist leaders used media

Ghazi Paper

and propaganda in his favor, and that is the reason why the new government has put severe restrictions on internet, and has tried to censor the media as well through different tactics.

a 20 marks answer should have around 15 subheadings and be on 7-9 pages

CONCLUSION:

In a nutshell, different groups have played different roles in shaping modern-day populism. Each of them had tried to bring that leader, who could support them in future. Everyone has been important in shaping modern-day populism; however, political parties and leaders have played a decisive role in shaping modern-day populism.