

Question no. 1

1. Introduction

Since 1971, the democratic system of Pakistan has seen multiple ups and downs. Immediately after the fall of Dhaka, the populist regime of Bhutto maintained power till 1977. Thereafter ~~we see~~ overt military rule was seen till 1988. Then a ~~transition~~ occurred when Benazir came to power, but the next decade was marked with political instability. In 1999, Musharraf took over and democracy took a backseat. Since then a democratic transition marked with poor civil military relations came to the fore. The civil military relationship has ~~shaped~~ democratic continuity when ~~external~~ and internal factors demanded so. However, military coups eroded democratic institutions and lately a hybrid system is in place. The following discussion would revolve around this ~~the~~ evolution of democratic system along with the role the military played in shaping democracy in the country.

2. Critical Examination of Evolution of Pakistan's Democratic System since 1971

Rise of Bhutto → 1971 - 1977



Zia's military dictatorship 1977 - 1988



Restoration of Democracy 1988 - 1999



Musharraf's takeover 1999 - 2007



Smooth transitions 2008 - 2022



Hybrid regime 2022 - present

1. Inception of Democracy 1971 - 1977

Bhutto's tenure ~~more~~ from 1971 to 1977 was a democratic one. It was marked ~~with~~ authoritarian tendencies ~~but~~ an overt military involvement in domestic affairs was negligible.

(Stanley Wolpert in Zulfikar Bhutto
of Pakistan)

2. Zia's efforts at eroding democratic Institutions

Zia suspended the constitution and
hence, democracy went to the backseat
(Ayesha Jalal in Struggle for Pakistan).
His era ~~was~~ marked with democratic
backsliding and poor democratic traditions

3. Benazir's Efforts at Restoring Democracy

Benazir Bhutto became PM in the
elections of 1988. She highlights her
struggle in Daughter of the East.
Yet after a mere 20 months, her
democratically ~~elected~~ government was sent
packing after her own President Ghulam
Ishaq Khan sacked her government.

4. Period of Musical Chairs 1988 - 1999

This decade witnessed 4 tenures
of Prime Ministers; none completed their term

Article 58(2)(b) was used by presidents to sack the governments repeatedly. ~~Albeit~~ being a democratic decade, the covert rule of ~~non-elected~~ institutions was visible.

5. Democratic Instability 1999 - 2007

On 12th October 1999, General Musharraf entered the political ~~arena~~ ^{democratic} arena with his coup. Despite his constant ^{democratic} subterfuge, the decade was marked with overt military rule. In the ~~Line of Fire~~, Musharraf's autobiography ~~denies~~ his attempts at convincing the public of the semblance of his so called democracy.

6. Smooth transitions among democratic governments 2008 - 2022

These 15 years were marked with smooth transitions between successive governments. However, ~~democratic~~ institutions continued to falter during this time.

7. Contemporary hybrid regime Post 2022, Pakistan is witnessing

an overt hybrid regime. The Prime Minister and non-elected institutions are working in tandem.

3. How Civil Military Relations have shaped democratic continuity and instability

Stability

- Restraint and very little interference (post Zia)
- Troika 1990s
- Creating King's Parties

Instability

- Coups ~~1977~~ 1977
1999
- Removing PM via no confidence
- Prioritizing economy to remain in power

1. Shaped democratic continuity by practising restraint

After Zia's plane crash on 17th Aug, 1988, the military practised restraint and allowed a smooth transition where in the Chairman Senate became President.

2. Troika during 1990s

In Crossed Swords, Shuja Nawaz records the practise of Army Chief to mediate between President and PM. By doing so, army & non-elected institutions covertly managed the issues.

relate your headings and arguments to the qs statement.....

3. Creation of King's Parties

Numerous such political parties were set up to weaken the incumbent government. Rise of IJI in 1990, Patriots in 2002 are examples of this. Despite them, democracy remained as these parties contested elections and used democratic tools for transition.

4. Created Instability by orchestrating coups.

The ~~1977~~ 1977 coup and 1999

coup were brazen violations of democracy.
The military ~~ushered~~ in using such undemocratic means.

add and highlight references/examples against these arguments.....

5. Removing PM via no confidence

Successive governments have been removed by orchestrating votes of no confidence against the incumbent Prime Ministers. This erodes democratic principles.

6. Prioritizing economy to remain in power.

This ploy was used by Musharraf to prolong his rule. This was a sheer violation of democracy ~~when~~ ~~no~~ ~~elect~~ no free and fair elections were held.

Conclusion

The evolution of democracy since 1971 has been turbulent marked with periods of relative stability. The civil military relations ~~greatly~~ guide the transition and ~~path~~ the elected governments

take. Consequently, a stable civil military relation is necessary for preventing future misadventures and treading smoothly on the path of democracy.



Question no. 2

Introduction

Pakistan has witnessed both parliamentary and presidential forms of government. ~~Both~~ The 1956 and 1973 constitution declared a parliamentary form of government, whereas the 1962 constitution declared the presidential form of government. Moreover, with certain amendments, 1973 constitution assumed a semi-presidential touch for a brief time. The comparison between these two forms can be made on grounds of their effectiveness in maintaining rule of law, transparency, and successive transitions. They can be contrasted on the fundamental differences in their respective spirit of functioning. Pakistan can draw certain lessons from the oscillation between these two systems that parliamentary form is more suited to the multicultural, parochial and multiethnic society of Pakistan.

Comparing the Parliamentary and Presidential forms of government in Pakistan

The comparisons in both of these arrangements are illustrated in the following diagram.

President was
Head of State

Government was
imposed by will of
people

Judiciary independent
in both arrangements

Presidential form more
suited for its time

1. President was Head of State in
both arrangements.

The President was head of state even in
a parliamentary form. However, when he was
head of Govt as well during Parliamentary
form.

2. The governments had the backing of
the people (legally)

The 1962 constitution was legally
representative of the entire nation as a

referendum
form legally mandated the presidential

3. Judiciary independent in both arrangements

The judiciary was independent of the executive and legislature in both presidential and parliamentary forms.

4. Presidential form more suited for its time.

The 1962 constitution was more equipped for that particular tenure. A strong centralized government was required in the dynamics of cold war.

Contrasting the two forms of Government.

1. The Prime Minister was part of legislature; The President is not part of legislature.

The Prime Minister was always an elected Member of National Assembly. The President was not required to be a member of the legislature.

2. Empowered local government during Presidential forms

Unlike parliamentary tenures, the local governments were empowered in presidential times. This produced a centralised govt, however as the local gov. comprised the electoral college to elect Ayub Khan in 1962.

3. Government was unstable under Semipresidential Tenures of Zia and 1990s.

The undemocratic imposition of Article 58(2)(b) led to the dissolution of 4 governments between 1985 - 1999.

Juno	1988	by Zia
BB	1990	by GIKhan
NS	1993	by GIKhan
BB	1996	by F Leghari

4. Presidential System not truly representative of the masses.

The referendums held by Zia, Musharraf were alleged to be massively rigged. The Presidential election of Ayub vs Fatima Jinnah was massively rigged as well. Hence, the system was not truly democratic.

Lessons to be drawn from oscillation between the two systems

1. Parliamentary system more suited to Pakistan

Presidential system has always ended in failure for Pakistan's multi ethnic, multicultural and parochial society. Article 58 (2)(b) has been misused to dismiss democratically elected governments.

2. Presidential form incites a centralised govt.

A centralised government goes against the basic spirit of federalism of Pakistan. Consequently, presidential form is not suited in the long run.

3. Presidential forms run on the whims and caprices of the President.

The 1962 constitution was for Ayub Khan, by Ayub Khan and of Ayub Khan. Hamid Khan notes that Ayub was even in favour of establishing a monarchy in

Pakistan.

4. Parliamentary System has its drawbacks
vis a vis horse trading

The Parliamentary form is not without flaws either. The concept of horse trading has brought down multiple governments in past and also pave way for manipulation in senate elections.

5. A true federation can function within a parliamentary setup of Pakistan

Decentralisation of power and provincial autonomy are necessary for the progress of Pakistan. Presidential system in Pakistan has gone against these principles. In a parliamentary setup with full provincial autonomy can strive well under a parliamentary government.

Conclusion

Pakistan has experimented with both presidential and parliamentary forms of government. Presidential form function with concentration of power and centralised authority. However, parliamentary works on principle of decentralization. Pakistan needs to continue its

parliamentary form and reduce its
minor fallacies by introducing structural
reforms that minimise horse trading, strengthen
local governments, and ensure completion
of government tenure.

08

