

Pakistan: "Is Military Only Option

Abstract

Pakistan's history and its democratic experiment is marked by political and structural discontinuity, as being in a Zigzag form. The military establishment ruled the country for much of its history and by establishing its firm Base, democracy -was never allowed to flourish. The musharafs fall had put the country once again at the rail's of democracy yet the transitional -phase and restoration of democracy had not generated stability, due to the continuous political in stability and chaos in decision making , Pakistan is for from having a sound democratic political system. The political parties / elites and civic society itself are not exempted from responsibility of its problems. The democratic restoration phase from musharafs fall proved highly complex what faults within the system are is the focus of this paper. The null hypothesis may be that Pakistan Better deserves for military establishment than elected representatives, an attempt to show through analyzing recent political developments in Pakistan.Pakistan's military is a central actor in many of today's most pressing security challenges, and few institutions face such extreme pressures from such diverse forces. In recent years the military has been asked to simultaneously combat a vicious internal insurgency, suppress international terrorist groups, and respond to Pakistan's worst floods in eighty years, all while squaring off against a much larger rival in one of the most strategically complex regions in the world.

Keywords: Terrorism, South Asia, Military, Democracy, Authoritarianism, Constitutionalism, Polarizations, Corruption, Proxy War, Nationalism, Democratic Structure, Increasing Social Strains, Inter-Ethnic Strife, Ethno-Regional Polarization, Religious Fundamentalism, Sectarian Violence Etc

Introduction

Since the 9/11 attacks, strategically, Pakistan assumed importance and priority, through its paradoxical mission of both generating as well as suppressing Terrorism, and emerged as locus of South-Asian politics but politically continues to be unstable. The relationship with U.S is marked by 'use and throw 'leaving the country in chaos. Politics is shaped by military-bureaucratic entity rather than governing body. Since, its birth, Pakistan has undergone a running battle between democracy and authoritarianism, in the process of nation building and in search of viable political system.¹ The country's political setup has failed to live up expectations of unfortunate wretches. Pakistan is faced with several challenges, undermining its democratic Structure with a future in stake, are shaking its survival and appearance on the world map. The unsolved power structure remained root cause of persistent imbalances in its traumatic political history and so witnessed periodic phases of instability due to the absence, of consensual politics, enduring constitutionalism and appropriate mechanism for electoral transfer of power² the asymmetrical distribution of seats and lack of consensus over national symbols after partition eroded constitutional making and constitutional order faded. Today, increasing social strains, inter-ethnic strife, ethno-regional polarization, religious fundamentalism, sectarian violence corruption, coordination and cooperation deficit and growing Anti-Americanism have multiplied the problem.³ Pakistan's history is marked by four period of civil rule and four of martial law, during which many constitutions come and gone like of 1958, 1962 1969 and 1973 but constitutionalism remained at par and each ruler (both civilian and military) after assuming power established his own constitution. During its early phase, Pakistan failed to establish a well functioning constitution and hold regular elections. The inexperienced politicians, even Jinnah failed in institutional building and subordinated party organization within political system.⁴ Jinnah's Death resulted in political chaos, along with decline of legitimacy of Muslim league. The political parties that could not organize political support

Anjum Ara

Assistant Professor,
Deptt. of Political Science,
University of Kashmir,
J & K

facilitated the hegemonic military establishment. The growing centralism, Muslim nationalism, landlordism and tribalism led Pakistan equipped with peculiar traits of elitist politics and through their interplay, bureaucracy and military registered their dominance over parties with in the evolving structure of power.⁵ The result was 1958 coup, led by Ayub Khan, from which Pakistan's experiment with Military rule begins and coup culture developed. Then onwards, political control remained directly or indirectly in the hands of military. One after one come in power both through internal or external coup, often deposed Each other and imposed martial law while dismissing governments. These coups belonged to Ayub Khan 1958, Yahiya Khan March 1969, Zai ul-Haq July 1977 and general Musharaf 1999. Zia's reign proves historic as Pakistan accelerated Islamization both in army as well as in society at large.⁶ In between, Zulif Kar Ali Bhutto also ruled over Pakistan with his autocratic style of governance and his civil phase was no better than Generals.

However, Pakistan did witness 10 year experiment with democracy, during third civil phase from 1988 on words to 1999, whereby two prominently figures, Benazir Bhutto of PPP and Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan Muslim league ruled over Pakistan. Both served dual terms but due to armed interference, neither served full term.⁷ The final civil phase begins with fall of Musharafs armed hegemony. There were several reasons for each coup and even Judiciary justified them in accordance with the "doctrine of Necessity". Their fruits seems better than elected ones, under military regimes, Pakistan experienced rapid economic growth, nuclear acceleration and political unity. During Nawaz Sharif's and Benazir's reign, economy damaged, sectarian conflicts increased and minorities got suppressed.⁸ However, spell after spell of military rule, the coups brought by generals and unstable civilian phases failed to fix the system, thereby, Pakistan had mal-developed political system. Though, the democracy and freedom had been buried by Pakistani military yet military governments were relatively moderate and have maintained many political freedoms than elected ones for instance, During Musharafs reign, press enjoyed freedom, minorities got reservation and women got representation, which even a women Prime Minister had not done.⁹

Today, Pakistan is at crucial Juncture violence is everywhere and political elite's are at war with each other and so, with the fragmented Political order, it is near at collapse. The Political violence never transformed Pakistan into a full-flagged democracy and strong entity, instead strengthened the roots of authoritarianism.¹⁰ Within military regimes, Pakistan to some extent remained politically and geographically united. There are thousands of causes of democratic downslide in Pakistan, which made military dominant and still seems viable option to handle its affairs.

Pakistan was carved out of bloodshed, dislocation caused by partition which resulted migration of nearly 8 million Muslim to Pakistan and the new migrated elite dominated the centre, thereby, asymmetrical distribution of power between migrant

dominant centre and locals at provinces. Ethnic and linguistic minorities were denied legitimacy¹¹ and step-mother treatment towards sub-national identities caused Political chaos. The fear of losing position, led migrant elite to shape polities along non representative lines¹² paved way for armed interference in the political domain to guarantee stability. The disappearance of military in political process from 2008 again results in demand for independence by regional identities like Baluch for Baluchistan and other regional nationalisms. The absence of central-state apparatus for Nation building is still present. It seems that only army now can save Pakistan from disintegration.

National Security remained priority for decades and Pakistan's hostility towards India worsened Institutional imbalance in Pakistan. The feeling of insecurity led to transfer of further resources to armed forces during last 50 years, enhanced military dominance' but the democratic¹³ government from last two years failed to compete with India and bring superpowers in tune with their security interests, for which military was successful. The increased role of India in Afghanistan and its emergence as economic giant, capturing attention from big powers (U.S.A, France, U.K) evident through recent visits, again has caused feelings of insecurity in Pakistan and Particularly headache for military, which might result in another military coup.

The country which from its creation had undergone political, economic and strategic disasters has been left in further disillusionment by its worth noting leaders. The root cause is corruption; often result in military coup's which from time to time shattered constitutionalism. Both Nawaz Sharif and Benazir Bhutto were involved in corruption and interestingly each coup was justified on the grounds of national security and each General described the incompetence or corruption of politicians¹⁴ the corrupted Politicians had left no effort in destroying democratic structure. Economically, they had eaten up the state and with the devastating flood, the level of corruption has increased e.g. nearly 16 million, U.S Dollars of Tax corruption.¹⁵ Pakistan is becoming its own worst enemy, leaving vacuum for military to come.

Political parties have worst record, no one among lot function effectively and often personal loyalties eroded party interests. Many a times, they are viewed as personal creations and vehicles of few individuals and many died with the death of their masters. Regionalism is their characteristic and they are deriving support from limited regional constituencies like PPP from Sindh. They are engaged in factionalism and kingship politics dominated political structures, through which, politics has been reduced to struggle between competing kinship groups for scarce resources, thereby, destructed party functioning.¹⁶ The democratic restoration from Musharafs fall failed to fill loopholes in political parties and in present crisis, parties are unable to govern and maintain political unity, while itself are cause of disunity, thus, leaving chance to military again under justification of stability.

The role of intelligence services cannot be underestimated and only because of their support military Generals ruled over Pakistan.¹⁷ These intelligence agencies like ISI are still active in politics and source of military to influence Political process. Commanders behind the curtains, with intelligence gathering are pursuing political intervention. The transformational shift to democracy failed to subordinate intelligence agencies and to restrict their role in domestic interference, causing unrest and reason for military dominance. All Politicians are puppets in their hands and instead of restricting their sphere, are dancing under their supervision.

Pakistan is still agrarian rural and feudal. The feudal groups constitute a huge hindrance in socio-economic development. They dominate over socio-economic order and have created socio-economic situation for their advantage, along influenced Psyche and politics of Pakistan. These feudal groups never accepted rule of law and the feudal leadership is incapable of leading democratic country.¹⁸ Feudalism is anti-democratic and Pro-military, so, until disappearance of feudalism Pakistan deserves military rule. The ethnic regional polarization emerged with partition but presently it has touched the Sky. The regional identities like Sindhis, Bluchis and Pathanis after independence feel alienation from "Punjabnization of Punjab". However, it was military that saved Pakistan from disunity. Then, the ruling elite, used militarization and Islamization as strategies to paralyze the voices of regional identities¹⁹ but from 2008, the dialectical contradiction between centralization or centre and regional identities widened, caused political instability. Non- Panjabi; ethnic classes are highly discounted with Punjabi ruling elites, who are reluctant to accept multi-ethnic composition of country, reduced it to law and order problem rather than national integration.²⁰ The growing centralization problem has not ended in present democratic era, which is alarming its unity. Military rule though brutal from one side, yet have established unity, now the only option.

Throughout, its history, Pakistan had undergone identity crises, as to what type of state it is or should be, thereby, it had identity deficit. Some fight for multinational state, some demand secular state while Islamists demand for Islamic state based on shriah. Again complex as to what type of Islamic version (Shia, Sunni or other) and to what degree.²¹ The country and its constitution had failed to define its identity since beginning. The objective resolution of 1949 was passed after taking 18 months to develop consensus over it but become foundational fault as it define dual paradoxical identity of Pakistan. On the one hand, it defined Pakistan as theocratic and on the other, as federal, democratic and secular state. Again Urdu was shown national language, to which East Bengal resented and subsequently 425 Amendments were made to the resolution though itself consisting of 125 clauses. Even the subsequent constitutions laid similar paradoxical problem.²² Both traditionalists and modernists are still fighting to bring state structure on their side, thus cause of political violence. Another face of it is religious intolerance. The seeds of Islamization were innate to Pakistan but particularly

flourished during the reign of Jinnah and Zia- ul- Haq but it was only under the reign of Nawaz Sharif and Benazir Bhutto that Sectarian violence increased particularly between Shia and Sunni. Ahmadiyas had already been described as non Muslims-²³. Everyday people die on roads, public places and mosques due to suicide bombings. The identity issue had reached such level that state has failed to define it. The Islamic radicalisms have taken a revolutionary stand to defend constitutional Islamic laws. For instance in January 2011²⁴ governor of Punjab Salman Taseer was killed by his body guard Mumtaz Qadri, who said he was angered by Mr. Taseer's support for amendment of the blasphemy law. Though his funeral saw large scale protests yet the impotency of govt was evident in January 2011 when Pakistan peoples party member parliament sherry Rohman drops her attempt to amend the blasphemy laws, accusing her party of appealing extremists by ruling out any changes to law.²⁵ The present democratic government is unable to control it and cannot remain neutral between them. Often state is viewed as pro-suni and anti-shia, which it seems now, especially evident recently through denial to Shia community to participate in Muharram ceremonies. Though government justified it under condition of instability, yet the question remains, why only to Shia community and why internal religious interference?

On the other hand, Radical religious indoctrination and Islamic Zeal is getting fast momentum, especially after government allowed operation against Militants in North-Waziristan, Fata and Khabir Pakhtukha. Military during their rule never interfered in tribal life and Tribal Militants but now Politicians are viewed as aliens, shatans and American agents. These radical forces are undermining legitimacy of government by religious propaganda and Fidayee attacks.

Anti-Americanism and Anti-agnosticism or anti-secularism is growing fastly and democracy is identified as Westernization. Pakistan's complex culture had grievances towards western culture and perhaps was reason for Ayub Khan Famous saying, "Western Parliamentary democracy could not be imposed on people of Pakistan". Democracy has not full support in Pakistan²⁶ and is equated with morality and qualified with religion. After Musharaf's 1999 coup, lashkar-e-Toiba spokesman Abdullah Munlazar said, "Democracy is a good thing, but the parliament was unislamic and Musharaf got rid of it". Thereby psyche of Pakistan is suitable for what? Authoritarianism. Since army is identified with Islamic Political agenda and its linkages with radical forces are providing strong religious motivation for aggressive action. Armed Generals often consider themselves serving divine purpose. The military had remained self-appointed guardian to save country from disunity not only as duty but considering as matter of right.

What misfortune Pakistan had after 9/11 attacks upon U.S.A, no one could deny that, both externally and internally, its strength had declined. Pakistan's alliance with U.S.A over, "the War on terror" proved counterproductive as it itself has become the home of terror. American policy towards

Pakistan is that of "use and throw" not cooperative alliance. This proxy war has severely damaged Pakistani economy and peace, as it consumed 61 million U.S dollars till September 2010.²⁷ Democratic Pakistan is anti to U.S interests in south Asia. The government is destroying and damaging their own state and have made military handicapped, serving US interests. The Military seems now thirsty for political power and want to participate politically to regulate the country, which became evident through Musharafs²⁸ formation of new political party "All Pakistan Muslim League" on Oct. 2010. However, he failed to put a strong basis for it.²⁹

Looking towards Pakistan it seems clear that there is a struggle for power after power. Particularly Judiciary has become over active, though the Pakistan has witnessed a remarkable constitutional development through 18th amendment, yet the contradictions between the executive and Judiciary remained on the forefront. The issue of appointing judges, emergency powers and issue of presidential immunities etc. remained unsettled. Through 18th amendment key powers of president were transferred to parliament, there by parliamentary democracy.³⁰

Thus, democratic restoration had failed, disappointed and is ill named, because the landlords, bureaucrats, intelligence agencies Judiciary and religious fundamentalists and others has shown reluctance to accept rule of law and except judiciary, all supports military rule. From the period of Transition, each organ of government is in struggle to assume more and more power and their spheres have not been described, recently highlighted by NRO case (under Article 48 of 1973 constitution) against Asif Ali Zardari.³¹ The 18 amendment for destroying absolute central authority and ensuring effectiveness of 1973 constitution had shown no effective fruits. No change has occurred, authoritarian institutions still predominate and the way of governance is autocratic.³² VIP culture has developed in government, leaving agony and is increasing alienation of people from governance and regions from centre. Human Rights violations had not ended in Baluchistan. The mal-developed Political culture has ruined economy and Pakistan in short is faced with multiple problems. Peace and security are essential pre-requisites for promoting democracy and economic developments while all which Pakistan represents is destructive of both. Many argue,³³ survival of Pakistan is necessary both for South-Asia as well as for neighbours, for whom I am concluding with pessimistic mark, "For survival, military is the only option in Pakistan"³⁴

Conclusion

At the most abstract level of analysis, the interplay between the contested ideas of Pakistan and the integrity of the Pakistani state will be determinative. When a state is unable to protect its citizens and to collect the taxes required for the delivery of basic services, its citizens will cease to regard themselves as citizens but as subjects. They will try to leave the state, seek to transform the very "idea" that holds them together, or fight the state – or all three at the same time. Pakistan has never had a

workable arrangement between the state and those who are ruled. In the words of Professor Hamid Kizilbash, talking about the upsurge in sectarian and political violence, "the people we ignored are taking their revenge." There are five or six necessary things to happen before Pakistan can be safely put in the "normal" category. These include relations with India, a revived economy, a repaired state, a rebalanced civil-military relationship, a redefined role of the military in the state, fighting domestic insurgencies more effectively, allowing a reshaped police force to emerge, and finding a new role for Pakistan vis-à-vis its neighbours, notably India. The politicians would have to moderate their disputes, concentrating on issues and reform, and not patronage and corruption. However, none of these would seem to be a sufficient factor that trumps all others. In the end, "muddling through" will have at least four or five variations. Pakistan's future is not immutable. It has lasted sixty years, but in the process lost more than half of its population in a breakaway movement, and barely resembles the tolerant state envisaged by Jinnah. The territory and the people of what is now Pakistan will remain, even if they are mutilated by population movement, environmental change, the redrawing of boundaries, or a war. Pakistan's nuclear weapons will also remain, even if they are not controlled by a central government. If one assumes that Pakistan is not merely a state in trouble but that it will become a rogue state that cannot be reformed, whether based upon past Pakistani actions or not, then a balancing policy could be easily transformed into one of containment. This was rejected by the Council on Foreign Relations task force, but at least one of the members wrote a dissent that pointed out that Pakistan cannot be counted upon to pursue policies that match up with American interests in a number of sectors, notably relations with India, nuclear policy and support for terrorists.⁸⁰ If one believes that present policies are not working, that aid packages will not have much of an impact, and that Pakistani nationalism trumps Pakistani national interest, then Pakistan should be seen as a threat, not an asset. This would be confirmed should there be a successful terrorist attack originating in Pakistan against India or a Western country – for example, a successful Times Square bombing that kills many Americans. In this case it is likely that public opinion would demand a reassessment of the relationship with Pakistan. Any adventurism, without taking into account the long term political and security fallouts, will only make the region more unstable, as happened in the 1980s, with the jihad strategy led by the US and in the 1990s, with the Taliban strategy led by Pakistan. India, though, was not part of the conflict in this region in the 1980s and 1990s, the pangs of conflict was felt in J&K and elsewhere. Pakistan's military, its intelligence agencies and extremist forces would not have become so powerful within the country, had it not been for the jihad and instability across the Durand Line during the 1980s and 1990s. Nor, would there have emerged a strong anti-Indian sentiment amongst the Pakistani youth. Any American military intervention in Pakistan is not likely to help the US achieve its primary objectives – political and military.

Nor is it likely to make Pakistan a stable democracy. Nor is it likely to secure the region and address India's concerns. Unless, the US is planning for the long haul and to build a democratic Pakistan from the scratch, which is unlikely. In the same way, the US believes it has the answer to every issue and carries the burden of finding a solution for every problem. Without understanding, that in many parts of the world, its policies and strategies is a part of the problem, rather than the solution. Wish one could be Sahadeva and tell the US: If only we could tie you up and make you dysfunctional!

References

1. Veena Kukreja and M.P Singh "Pakistan, democracy development and security issues" - edited book sage publications 2006 pp 59
2. Malik Iftikhar H: "Pakistan in 2001 The Afghanistan crisis and the rediscovery of frontier" 2002- pp 205 Asian survey.
3. Ibid pp-205
4. Ayesha Jalal (1985) "Jinnah and the Governor-General ship issues" Modern Asian Studies Vol xix No's.1 pp-29-63
5. Ayesha Jalal- (1990) "The state of Material law" The Origins of Pakistan Political Economy of Defense pp-205
6. Stephen Cohen (2006) "The Idea of Pakistan" oxford Press pp 10-12
7. Ibid p 15-16
8. Ibid pp-22-25
9. S.Akbar Zaidi (2007) "Is Pakistan a Democracy" PP-15
10. Ibid p-16
11. Mohammad Waseem (2002) "Causes of Democratic Downside in Pakistan" Economy and Political Weekly Nov -2002, pp 44-45
12. Ibid 2002
13. Ayesha Siddiqi (2007) "Military Inc-inside Pakistani Military Economy" Pluto press pp-61-64
14. Stephen Cohen (2006) " The Idea Of Pakistan" oxford Press p-6
15. The News International – News Paper Pakistan September 2010.
16. Craig Baxter (1998) ed book "Government And Politics in South Asia" West View Press pp-185-187
17. Owen Jones (2005) "Pakistan The eye of Strom" pp-244-245
18. Ibid pp-247-249
19. Veena Kukreja and .M.P Singh "Pakistan, democracy development and security issues"- edited book sage publications 2006 pp 16-18
20. Ibid-19
21. Ibid pp 13
22. M.V. lakhi (1970) "Constitutional Developments in Pakistan" The first Phase 1947-56 South Asian Studies vol 15 jan 1970 pp-1-14
23. Stephen Cohen (2006) " The Idea Of Pakistan" oxford Press p-10-11
24. Jonathan Paris, Prospects for Pakistan (London, U.K.: Legatum Institute, 2010).
25. Owen Jones (2005) "Pakistan The eye of Strom" p-228
26. Ibid pp-228-229
27. Awsaf News Paper Pakistan September 2010
28. For a recent report based on conversations with a senior retired Pakistani officer active at the time of these initiatives, see Aziz Haniffa, "Musharraf was never close to solving Kashmir, says Pakistani general," India Abroad, Dec. 16, 2010, p. A-16.
29. Source New York Times October 2,2010
30. Cohen, the Idea of Pakistan (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2004), p. 328.
31. Robert Blackwill, "Plan B in Afghanistan, Why a De Facto Partition Is the Least Bad Option" Foreign Affairs, Jan.-Feb. 2011.
32. Pamela Constable, "Pakistan's army chief seeks stable Afghanistan", Washington Post, Feb. 2, 2010. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp->
33. BBC, "Global Views of United States Improve While Other Countries Decline", April 18, 2010, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/160410bbcwspoll.pdf>.
34. Salman Masood, "China Praises Pakistan's Fight against Terrorism and Vows to Bolster Partnership," New York Times, Dec. 20, 2010, p. A8.