

Paradox between democracy and security- a case study on Pakistan

Lisamaria Markula

December 2011



HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Tiedekunta/Osasto – Fakultet/Sektion – Faculty Faculty of Social Sciences		Laitos – Institution – Department Politics	
Tekijä – Författare – Author Lisamaria Markula			
Työn nimi – Arbetets titel – Title Paradox between democracy and security- a case study on Pakistan			
Oppiaine – Läroämne – Subject World Politics			
Työn laji – Arbetets art – Level Master's thesis	Aika – Datum – Month and year 05.12.2011	Sivumäärä – Sidoantal – Number of pages 120	

Tiivistelmä – Referat – Abstract

This thesis examines the paradox between democracy and security in Pakistan outlining six factors contributing to the paradox, i.e. historical developments; different definitions of democracy among the different political actors in Pakistan; economic developments; lack of education; power play among the government, the army, Inter Services Intelligence, judicial system, political parties, warring tribes and different religious and ethnic sects in Pakistan; and elite governance. The thesis also examines how these factors affect the development of democracy in Pakistan with the main argument that the Western style of democracy neither fully exists nor it works in Pakistan in the current circumstances, especially due to historical patterns and an obsession with the external security.

The thesis uses secondary sources including books, journal articles, country reports, commentaries in addition to first-hand information based on the author's personal experiences in 2010-2011 in Pakistan. The main theories used in the thesis are delegative democracy by Guillermo O'Donnell and elite governance theory by Duncan McCargo, which combined explain the historical developments leading to the paradox as well as the election dynamics and elite dominance prevailing in Pakistan.

Throughout its history, Pakistan has been mostly ruled by military regimes, with only four stints of civilian rule which have all ended either in corruption charges or in military take over. The military regimes have been characterised by a strong support from the USA and an increased economic growth and stability, whereas civilian rules have been laden with instability, corruption and mostly poor relations with other countries. This constitutes the background for the paradox, which is majorly upheld by the security-political predicament to find an equalizer against India, which has been a paramount concern for any policy maker since the independence. In addition, this paradox is being upheld by the constant power play among the political actors and the long-standing elite dominance whereby the elites are more interested in retaining their own power instead of focusing on the interests of the masses. With masses being uneducated and mostly concerned about their own survival, the general public as well as the elites, have preferred the military rule as it brings about more stability and economic growth. Therefore, with the current circumstances the future of democracy in Pakistan seems bleak, as the factors constituting a liberal democracy are not fulfilled in Pakistan with partly free judicial, partly free press, rampant corruption, immense human rights violations, especially in terms of the fight against terrorism, with a history of election rigging and interference from the army and Inter Services Intelligence during civilian rules.

Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords

Pakistan, democracy, security.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	5
Introduction.....	6
I METHODOLOGY AND THEORY.....	
1.1 Methodology.....	10
1.2 Definition of democracy	11
1.3 Theoretical framework.....	15
II SECURITY.....	
2.1. The roots of the current security situation.....	25
2.2. Dispute with India.....	36
2.3. Terrorism and its roots in Afghan war.....	40
III DEMOCRACY.....	
3.1. Defining factors of democracy.....	44
3.1.1 Judicial.....	44
3.1.2. Corruption.....	48
3.1.3. Press freedom.....	50
3.1.4. Human rights.....	53
3.2. 2008 elections.....	61
3.2.1 Beyond 2008 elections.....	73
IV OPENING THE PARADOX BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND SECURITY	
4.1 Dominant patters detrimental to democracy.....	79
4.1.1. ISI influence.....	79
4.1.2. Madrasas and lack of education in Pakistan	84
4.1.3. Economic development and the military.....	87
V CONCLUSION.....	
5.1 Summary.....	90
5.2 Way forward?.....	93
Bibliography.....	100
Appendices.....	114

Acknowledgements

This thesis is for everyone interested in democracy research in South Asia, and it is dedicated to all the wonderful people whom I met during my stay in 2010-11 Pakistan, which is an interesting, varied country, often wrongly depicted in the foreign media.

I would like to thank Juri Mykkänen, thesis advisor, for his long-standing support and advice as well as Laura Starr and Sandra Vinh for correcting the language.

Introduction

Democracy is widely a respected and aspired concept, and has long-standing roots in Western countries, but when the essentially Western notion of democracy has been applied to so-called developing countries in other parts of the world it has faced many complications. In post-war Asia the newly founded republics encountered many classic problems of nation-building, as many Asian countries have many minorities and long-standing competing tribes, which pervade boundaries of nation-states. Thus, many Asian countries have been defined as development or corporatist states, and have suffered from many military regimes and brutal oppression of minorities like in the case of Burma, Cambodia and Laos among others. In the Asian context, it is not therefore surprising that the newly-founded Islamic republic of Pakistan faced many problems, and was led by military regimes until the 1970s and has only had brief stints with democratic governance since its independence. Pakistan has been characterised by elite governance with stability and economic growth occurring at times of military rule, whilst democratic rule is ripe with corruption and political instability.

Due to the current security situation and an adverse media image, many people would not ever think that Pakistan would have been a role model for other Muslim countries in the 1960s, and that Pakistan has played a vital role in facilitating conflicts, for example in bringing the US and China together in the 1970s, and in bringing peace to Afghanistan in late 1980s. Throughout its history, it has tried to navigate between the Western and Muslim worlds, constantly seeking allies for itself, and gotten meshed with wars due to its loyalties to allies like the USA. Pakistan has had all the resources to become a powerful player within South Asia and Middle East, but its obsession to find a balance against India and competition with the much-bigger neighbour has hampered the development of Pakistan. Whilst India has become a big player within South Asia and now in world politics due to its size, democracy and educated population, Pakistan has lagged behind. One of the key reasons is that whilst India has spent money on education and cultivating its huge middle class, Pakistan has spent vast amounts of money on defence ignoring the education and welfare sectors leading to huge gaps between the rich and the poor, which has contributed to the polarisation of the society. Pakistani politics are thus characterised by a power struggle between civilian authorities and its army, Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), police, judicial system coupled with a constant fight between the main political parties. In addition, there are rivalries between different clans

and families for regional power, and one region, Balochistan, is demanding its independence, as it has been neglected by the government. Therefore, it is not surprising that riots erupt frequently about food prices, the energy crisis, transport or floods which are fuelled by the rivalling political parties. Despite the general distrust against the government, many people suffer from political apathy and are not willing to fight for their rights, as they cannot see any visible improvements. At the same time the army is highly trusted, and many retired army officials have set up their own business or are CEOs of companies, which sees the army's influence entrenched in the corporate world.

According to Freedom House, Pakistan (excluding Kashmir) is 'partly free' scoring 4 out of 7 in political rights and 5 in civil liberties with overall score of 4.5, 1 being the most democratic and 7 representing the least democratic countries.¹ According to a Freedom House report, Pakistan has been ruled by the military directly or indirectly for much of its independent history since its partition from British India in 1947. In 1985 General Zia ul-Haq even changed the constitution to enable the President to dismiss elected governments, and following his death in 1988 the successive civilian presidents dismissed the governments of Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto in 1990 and 1996, and Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in 1993 on the pretext of corruption and abuse of power. Sharif's second Prime Minister's term after 1997 elections came to an end with a military coup, when Sharif tried to sack the army chief General Pervez Musharraf who then appointed himself chief executive in 1999 whilst declaring a state of emergency, and suspending democratic institutions. The Legal Framework Order (LFO) of 2002 enabled Musharraf to gain effective control over parliament and to change the electoral rules to the disadvantage of opposition parties. In addition, Musharraf's military regime openly supported pro-government parties like Pakistan Muslim League Quaid-i-Azam (PML-Q), and as a result captured majority of seats at the 2002 parliamentary elections and took over the new government.² However, the pattern of interrupted government terms continued, when Musharraf gave in to opposition parties' pressure after sacking his Chief Justice in 2007, and Alif Zardari's presidential term from 2008 onwards started the fourth era of civilian rule in Pakistan's history.

¹ Freedomhouse.org, Country report: Pakistan 2011, 2011, available from: <http://freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=22&year=2011&country=8108>

² loc. cit.

As seen before, there is a history of interrupted democratic rules in Pakistan, as every democratic government has ended without completing its term, and the military has every time stepped in and restored the stability within the country. Therefore, the paradox between democracy and security has its roots in the historical developments of Pakistan, and in the constant search for security and an equalizer against India. This has been the paramount concern of all governments from the start whether it has been military or civilian. Thus, external security has many times overshadowed all other concerns, and it has been too easy for governments to ignore calls for democracy, if country's sole existence is at stake due to Indian threat or later on due to Afghan conflict and terrorism, and this first factor of the paradox will be discussed in second section. The second factor contributing to the paradox is the different definitions and understandings of democracy by the rivalling political parties and the constant struggle between them that results in inherent domestic instability under civilian rule when compared to military rule, when the governing military and its supporting party keep the domestic situation relatively stable, and this will be further examined in the third section. The third factor contributing to the paradox is the economic stability under the military rules contributing to overall security, where statistically military governments have been able to surmount larger economic gains when compared to civilian governments, which will be further examined in the fourth section. The fourth factor is the lack of education among the masses of which 46% are still illiterate,³ and this makes them prone to manipulation, and calls for education by political parties or the government often amount to nothing due to a lack of long-term commitment and power struggles among them. This dilemma of education is addressed in the fourth section. The fifth factor is the constant power struggle between civilian government, army, ISI, judicial system, political parties, warring tribes and ethnic and religious sects, and this is strongly linked with the sixth and final factor, the elite governance. Ultimately, the paradox between democracy and security is upheld by the elites of Pakistan, powerful families and tribes, which only consists a tiny fraction of the population but since the independence they have held power in the country. Whether it has been civilian or military rule governed by the elite, their ultimate goal has been to serve their own interests, and this dominance has been facilitated by overlapping membership of army, bureaucrats and businessmen, which will be addressed in the theory section. Ultimately, the

³ Unicef, Pakistan statistics, 2011, available from:
http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/pakistan_pakistan_statistics.html

thesis will examine the factors affecting the paradox, and how these factors affect the development of democracy in Pakistan with the main argument that the Western style of democracy neither fully exists nor it works in Pakistan in the current circumstances, especially due to historical patterns and an obsession with the external security.

In order to examine this paradox between democracy and security, the thesis will firstly define the theory and methodology used in the thesis, i.e., the elite governance and delegative democracy theories. Secondly, it will look at the historical development of democratic and military rule in Pakistan since its independence, and the continuing preoccupation with its neighbours India and Afghanistan, and how this obsession has adversely affected the birth of democracy in Pakistan. In the third section the thesis will examine the current situation of democracy in Pakistan and describe what it means to different political actors in Pakistan, and finally it will look at the recent 2008 elections as an example of the ill-functioning democracy Pakistan. In the fourth section the thesis will sum up the main obstacles to democracy, that is, lack of education, ISI and economic factors. In the fifth and final section the thesis will provide a conclusion with a short snapshot to future.

I METHODOLOGY AND THEORY

1.1 Methodology

The thesis uses secondary material like journal articles, books, commentaries and country reports as well as first-hand information based on the author's personal experiences in 2010-2011 in Pakistan. Coincidentally, during the first months in Pakistan I was asked in a restaurant what I think about democracy for a student documentary. I had to actually compare Finnish and Pakistani democracy on video, which made me think about this topic for the first time in Pakistan. However, one of the first questions for foreigners coming in Pakistan is why she/he came to Pakistan, because the Pakistani people, especially the elite cannot always understand why foreigners would want to come to their home country due to the current security situation. Many people are sad to see the plight of their country, and the horrid images especially in the foreign media, but the question remains, how many people are actually willing to do anything to change the situation?

In the recent wave of demonstrations and the rebirth of democracies in northern Africa, it has also been questioned whether such waves would reach Pakistan but this has been seen as unlikely, as many Pakistani people have lost their faith in democratic institutions due to the rampant corruption and political instability, and the lack of real alternatives to Zardari's rule. Therefore, the thesis will seek to answer the following question:

What are the main factors contributing to the paradox, and how do they affect the development of democracy in Pakistan?

1.2 Definition of democracy

Democracy is one of the most debated topics in the contemporary world and has become an every-day buzzword among politicians and the general public, and especially in the so-called West democracy is highly valued and violations of democracy are taken very seriously.

However, this is not the case in the newly democratic states where the democratic practices have not taken root and democracy is defined differently, and often only exists in paper and is not adhered to in day-to-day affairs.

Democracy has its roots in the ancient Greece, and the Greek term ‘democracy’ simply means ‘rule by the people’. The Athenian democracy, which has set the premise for Western notion of democracy, was characterised by “a general commitment to the principle of civic virtue: dedication to the republican city-state and the subordination of private life to public affairs and the common good”,⁴ where people were only able to fulfil themselves and live respectably as citizens within the ‘polis’ and prided with free and open political life where people could build up and realise their capacities and skills. In this system direct participation was the key, and Greek democratic ‘polis’ can be seen as an effort to allow men from various backgrounds to articulate and change their notion of the good through political interaction.⁵ However, this classical ‘polis’ was characterised not only by unity, solidarity, participation but also by a highly restricted citizenship, whereby women, immigrants and slaves were excluded and only men of 20 years and beyond were able to participate.⁶ Even though the ‘grandfather’ of all democracies comes from Antiquity, created as a counter-reaction to misuse of power by the rulers, the modern democracies stem from the Enlightenment era in the 18th century, when the basic elements were defined as separation of powers, basic civil rights, religious liberty and separation of church and state. The French philosopher Montesquieu had a big role to play in setting the framework for the separation of powers that later on was enshrined in the constitution of the so-called first modern democracy in the world that is the USA. Montesquieu wrote that there is no liberty if “were the same man or same body, whether of the nobles or of the people, to exercise those three powers, that of enacting laws, that of executing public resolutions and of trying the causes of individuals” (that is executive, legislature and judiciary).⁷ In the current form of liberal democracy the guarantee of basic human rights, separation of powers, freedom of opinion, speech, press and

⁴ D. Held, *Models of Democracy*, 1996, p. 17-18

⁵ loc. cit.

⁶ Held, *op. cit.*, p. 23

⁷ C. L. Montesquieu in Held, *op. cit.*, p. 85

mass media, religious liberty, general and equal right to vote and good governance meaning public interest and absence of corruption are enshrined in the country's constitution. One of the most famous quotes on democracy comes from the first US President Abraham Lincoln who coined democracy as "government of the people, by the people, for the people".⁸

Looking at social scientists' definitions, Diamond, Linz and Lipset define democracy, similarly to Robert Dahl's polyarchy, as a system of government with "meaningful and extensive competition among individuals and organised groups (political parties) for all effective positions of government power through regular, free and fair elections that exclude the use of force"; "a highly inclusive level of political participation in the selection of leaders and policies, such that no major social group is prevented from exercising the rights of citizenship"; "a level of civil and political liberties- freedom of thought and expression, freedom of the press, freedom of the assembly and demonstration, freedom to form and join organisations, freedom from terror and unjustified imprisonment- secured through political equality under a rule of law, sufficient to ensure that citizens can develop and advocate their views and interests and contest policies and offices vigorously and autonomously".⁹ Gordon White defines democracy as "a set of institutional procedures to guarantee basic civil and political rights and allow political competition between political forces, usually organised through parties".¹⁰ Karen Dawisha defines democracy as "a political system in which the formal and actual leaders of the government are chosen through regular elections based on multiple candidacies and secret balloting, with the right of all adult citizens to vote. It is assumed that leaders chosen via free and fair elections, using universal adult suffrage, will be induced to modify their behaviour to be more responsive to the popular wishes and demands than leaders in authoritarian states."¹¹ Civil liberties and political rights are seen as two distinct conceptual dimensions of democracy, whereby political rights can be measured with degree of universal adult suffrage and fair elections, and civil liberties through freedom to create and join organisations, freedom of expression, and access to varied and contending

⁸ A. Lincoln in Democracy-building.info, A short definition of democracy, 2011, available from: <http://www.democracy-building.info/definition-democracy.html>

⁹ L. Diamond, J.L. Linz and S.M. Lipset, Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy, 1995, p. 6-7

¹⁰ G. White, 'Constructing a Democratic Developmental State' in M. Robinson and G. White, The Democratic Developmental State, 1998, p. 19-20

¹¹ K. Dawisha, 'Democratization and political participation: research concepts and methodologies' in K. Dawisha and B. Parrott, Democratic changes and authoritarian reactions in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova, 1997, p. 40-41

sources of information. The greater the level of civil liberties the greater the level of democratisation will be, and thus these two concepts serve as indicators of democracy.¹² Karen Dawisha continues that “a consolidated democracy is one in which most major social groups expect that government leaders will be chosen through competitive elections and regard representative institutions and procedures as their main channel for processing claims on the state. One way of measuring consolidation is to apply a ‘two-turnover test’, in which democracy may be viewed as consolidated if the party or group that takes power in the initial election at the time of the transition loses a subsequent election and turns over power to those election winners, and if those election winners then peacefully turn over power to winners of later election.”¹³ Therefore, from this definition, it becomes clear that Pakistan does not belong to consolidated democracies in that it has never passed the ‘two-turnover test’. In addition to this test, many theorists like Robert Dahl, highlight the civilian control of the military as the key condition for successful democratisation, and thus one of the biggest obstacles in a road to democratisation is the continuation of violent conflict within the state or with other states. Thus, it seems that the greater the level of violent conflict, the more democratic institutions will be undercut,¹⁴ and in Pakistan both of these conflicts exists namely among different sects and against terrorists and against India. Generally, a strong middle class connected with commercial and industrial elites is viewed as a necessary ingredient for democratisation, and it is seen that economic winners support democracy to the point that they think it validates and sustains their prevailing economic position, whereby economic losers are thought to support democracy to the point they think the continuation of a democratic state independent of prevailing economic classes decreases economic inequality.¹⁵ However, in Pakistan’s case the middle classes are few and weak, and economic winners only support democracy in paper, and have reaped better benefits at times of authoritarian regimes which will be discussed in latter sections.¹⁶ Due to similar difficulties many regimes around the world can be classed as low-quality democracies, whereby other similar terms are low-intensity democracy, poor democracy and delegative democracy mainly used in Latin America, which denote “a system that may have fair, competitive and open elections; authentic power for elected officials; freedom of expression and of the press; and at least some independent organisations and the media, but that nevertheless lacks

¹² loc. cit.

¹³ op.cit., p. 43

¹⁴ op.cit., p. 49-50

¹⁵ op. cit., p. 53

¹⁶ op.cit, p. 56

accountability, responsiveness and institutional balance and effectiveness between elections”,¹⁷ and this will be discussed in detail in next section.

¹⁷ Diamond, op.cit., p. 8

1.3 Theoretical framework

Within the Asia-Pacific region and also in Pakistan, the governance is characterised by elite control, and Scruton defines elites as ‘the class of persons within a society who are in a position to view themselves...as chosen, either by others or by nature, to govern’.¹⁸ As opposition to Western democracies where pluralism of different groups is the norm of the day, in Asian countries governance is the privilege of a constricted set of intertwining elite interests, whereby in many cases especially large business work closely with the bureaucracy, and military is involved in decision making through military officers-turned bureaucrats. Though political parties and other democratic institutions generally enjoy formal powers, they have to frequently take into account the economic and military interests of the business leaders and the army, and therefore the line between public and private is not clear. Another interesting factor of the elite governance in Asia is the overlapping memberships of business, bureaucratic, military and political elites. As a result, close circles of the top politicians have gained lucrative monopolies or state contracts as a reward and this development is very visible in Pakistan, whereby many retired army officials are now politicians or business leaders and where e.g. the current President Zardari acquired beneficial contracts during his wife’s Prime Minister tenure in the 1990s.¹⁹ According to Duncan McCargo elite governance can be seen as a mission of which the main aim is to retain the elite power, whereby all of the economic and regulatory resources at disposal are used for the sole purpose of decreasing the impact of popular input into the political process, and therefore the main aim of elites across the Asia-Pacific is to control public demands, especially in favour of political liberalisation, where economic growth has acted as a perfect incentive in facilitating the perpetuation of the politics of exclusion.²⁰ Elite governance does not even require parliamentary, and many times vital decisions only concern business leaders, politicians and bureaucrats, and here ‘elite accommodation politics’ are at play, where big business are important players as opposed to ‘client oriented politics’ where small business and other interest groups have their share of benefits. In the elite accommodation politics iron triangle of leading government officials, key business leaders and senior people from economic ministries and agencies are the central players. A key feature is the extent to which the elites seek to exclude or restrict mass participation in decision-making processes, and therefore the majority of the policy and

¹⁸ Scruton in D. McCargo, ‘Elite Governance: business, bureaucrats and the military’ in R. Maidment, D. Goldblatt, and J. Mitchell (eds), *Governance in the Asia Pacific*, 1998, p. 126

¹⁹ H. Abbas, *Pakistan’s Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America’s War on Terror*, 2005, p. 142

²⁰ McCargo, *op. cit.*, p. 126-127

legislative decisions are concluded by closed circles of politicians, administrators and interest groups with hardly any reference to the public interest.²¹ Many countries within the Asia-Pacific region have been or still are run by elite-dominated political systems, where the concern of the state first and foremost is to deal with economic development and with retaining bureaucratic privileges and military influence, and such political regimes generally depend on close-knit co-operation between the public and the private sectors, with the outcome that mass political participation is frequently limited, and the interests of general public are therefore subjugated to those of well-connected political figures and large businesses. Even though such patterns of elite governance have been linked with high levels of economic growth in many states across the region, internal contradictions characterise the corporatist arrangements.²² Apart from elite governance, another concept, which was developed by Riggs to describe Thailand's elite-dominated political order, is insightful for Pakistan. This concept, that is bureaucratic polity, has been generally applied to South-East Asian states to explain their developmental state model which not only has the key elements of such states (strong government, public/private sector relationships, foreign direct investment (FDI), deferred gratification, and the American security umbrella) but also other features like being less centralised and monolithic in nature, and often characterised by a bigger extent of corruption and inefficiency. Bureaucratic polities are first and foremost focused on serving the interests of public officials instead of national development, even though the rhetoric of development continues to be a significant legitimising discourse for such entities but they are essentially elite-dominated and exclusionary in character.²³ This description can be applied to Pakistan since many political actors like government, main political parties and businesses always talk about development and improving standards of living, but generally pay lip service to their voters and hardly take real actions to counter illiteracy and poverty rampant across Pakistan. Majority of the population is illiterate, whereby the elite has received top education from the private universities. There is a religious education system, that is, madrasas, which provide religious and science education to the uneducated masses, but unfortunately this network of schools have become a breeding ground for the terrorists. In 2002 President Musharraf launched a madrasa reform, which was not very effective in that in 7 years only circa 500 of the 20,000 madrasas were reformed.²⁴

²¹ op.cit, p. 133-134

²² op. cit., p. 146

²³ Riggs in McCargo, op. cit., p. 138

²⁴ A. Mir, Talibanization of Pakistan: From 9/11 to 26/11, 2009, p. 183

The attempt was half-hearted, as the religious right-wing has big role to play in Pakistani politics.

Elite governance is furthermore closely linked with military and frequently such elite controlled states have been ruled by the military. This is due to the fact that in many Asia-Pacific countries the border between civilian and military areas of power and influence is blurred and in Pakistan this is clearly the case, when military officials are becoming politicians. The grounds for military involvement in the political order range from country to country but are characteristically linked with the following historical developments: the key role of the military in a national independence struggle; external support for the military rule during the Cold War, especially from the USA; domestic political meaning of the military as an outcome of long-standing insurgency conflicts, and such factors are at play also in Pakistan where the military was very important first of all in waging the independence struggle from British empire and away from Hindu-dominated India, and secondly in getting huge amounts of defence funding from the USA since its independence to the present day, and finally in fighting the ethnic, political conflicts and the increased terrorism within Pakistan. In countries where the military had a leading role in a national independence struggle, it is often successful in claiming a special legitimacy as a one of the founders of the new nation in the post-independence political system. In the immediate post-colonial period the military officers, who were involved in the national struggle, often held power in the early years and as a result they were able to set up constitutional and other mechanisms to ensure their continuing significance in the political system. Furthermore, the military was often successful in arguing that it would be dangerous for them to pull out from politics before the nation-building has been completed with success.²⁵ In effect, military rule was often legitimated by the reference to internal and external security threats like ethnic unrest. In Pakistan the preoccupation with India and later on ethnic and political strife and an increase in home-grown terrorism have been used to legitimise military rule especially during the General Zia era in the 1980s. Within the Asia-Pacific region many military takeovers like Indonesian takeover in 1966 were often validated by the military on the basis of preventing a political crisis, and thus acting 'for the good of the nation' and this also happened in Pakistan with the takeover by General Zia ul-Haq in 1979 and General Pervez Musharraf 20 years later. Frequently military officers argued that the army was closer to the general public than the civilian politicians, as they were frequently lofty of the civilian political process and saw

²⁵ McCargo, *op. cit.*, p. 140

political parties and parliamentary procedures as laden with corruption and incompetence. As this argument was in many cases true, it gave some legitimacy for the military,²⁶ and e.g. in Thailand in 1991 corruption was used as a pretext for overthrowing the constitutional government.²⁷ This has been a common practice in Pakistan where both Benazir Bhutto regimes fell in the hands of military in 1990 and 1996 due to accusations of corruption evoking comparisons to her father Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and his ousting in 1977. Interestingly, Benazir Bhutto's husband Alif Zardari was seen by some circles to have affected Bhutto's fall due to the frequent corruption allegations and he was imprisoned for this more than once. But after the iconic Benazir's death he became the President of Pakistan in 2008, when many people grieved the death of the democratic hope for Pakistan, who suffered the same fate as his father who was hanged in 1979.

Apart from elite governance and bureaucratic polities, a contending concept that may be applied to Pakistani context is delegative democracy by Guillermo O'Donnell. According to him delegative democracies are not consolidated or institutionalised, but they endure over time, if threats of authoritarian regression or development toward institutionalised representation are not visible.²⁸ Delegative democracies are founded on one basic principle that the winner of a presidential election can govern the country as he deems fit, and to the extent that the current power relations permit for the duration of the elected term. This characterises Pakistan very well especially under President Musharraf and Zardari in recent times, whereby especially Musharraf was governing the country as he deemed fit. According to O'Donnell, "the President is the embodiment of the nation and the main custodian of the national interest, which it is incumbent upon him to define. What he does in government does not need to bear any resemblance to what he said or promised during the electoral campaign - he has been authorised to govern as he sees fit. Since this paternal figure has to take care of the whole nation, it is almost obvious that his support cannot come from a party; his political basis has to be a movement, the supposedly vibrant overcoming of the factionalism and conflicts that parties bring about."²⁹ Similarly Karen Dawisha states that parliamentarianism gives more flexibility to the political process, facilitates consensus building and resolves the

²⁶ op.cit., p. 141

²⁷ op.cit., p. 161

²⁸ G. O' Donnell, 'Delegative Democracy?', Working Paper, 1992, available from: <http://kellogg.nd.edu/publications/workingpapers/WPS/172.pdf>, p. 3

²⁹ op.cit., p.8

interests of multiple political parties, whereas presidentialism, with its focus on the election of one individual to an omnipotent post decreases the power of the party system and thus presidential system cultivates the formation of a two party or two bloc system.³⁰ In the case of Musharraf his support came from Pakistan Muslim League Quaid-i-Azam (PML-Q) and many religious parties and the military, and thus enjoyed wide varied support from different players in the society. It can be said that many of the reforms like fight against corruption, madrasa reform which were promised during the electoral campaign were started but never completed, and the focus soon shifted to fight against terrorism and consolidation of his own power. Generally, such presidential candidates view themselves as being above all parties meaning above political parties and organised interests. In this context other institutions like congress and judiciary become annoyances that come with the democratically elected position, and thus accountability to them or other private or semi-private organisations is deemed as a redundant obstacle to the full presidential authority. Musharraf indeed viewed himself as knowing the best for Pakistani nation, and made himself a President after being Chief Executive. Finally, he also influenced the judiciary by sacking his Chief Justice and other judges which caused him loss of support and marked the beginning of an end to his era. However, O'Donnell argues that delegative democracy is not unfamiliar to the democratic tradition, because it can be seen as being more democratic but less liberal than representative democracy in that it is stoutly majoritarian: democracy is founded in elections by a majority than gives someone the right for a selected period to be the embodiment and interpreter of the interests of the nation. In elections ballotage is often used in delegative democracies: if they do not directly create a clear-cut majority, then majority will be created to support the myth of a legitimate delegation.³¹ Such behaviour can be seen both with Pervez Musharraf with getting the support from PML-Q and the religious right, and with Asif Zardari with carving out the support from Pakistan Muslim League Nawaz (PML-N), Muttahida Qaumi Movement (MQM), Jamaat-i-Islami (JI)- any party that would stick with Pakistan's Peoples' Party (PPP)-led coalition to retain the majority. In addition, such democratic forms are stoutly individualistic, but more of a Hobbesian than a Lockean form, as voters are ought to select, notwithstanding their identities and affiliations, the person who is more fit for taking care of the interests of the nation. Consequently, elections are very emotional with high stakes, as many candidates compete to be the zero-sum winner of the delegation to govern the country

³⁰ Dawisha, *op.cit.*, p. 56

³¹ G. O'Donnell, 'Delegative Democracy', *Journal of Democracy*, vol.5, no. 1, 1994, p. 60

with no other impediments than those enforced by non-institutionalised power relations.³² This is very evident in Pakistan, where elections are indeed very emotional game, and are based on individuals, and this can be seen in latter sections, as in 2008 elections emotionally-laden Benazir factor had a big role to play in getting Alif Zardari into power. After the election voters are supposed to go back to the condition of passive, but expectantly cheering, spectators of whatever the President does. This has generally been the trend in Pakistan, but in recent times there has been more mass demonstrations on electricity cuts, floods, health care and the mass has played a more active role in the post-elections period.

Excessive individualism at the time of composing presidential power goes well with the organicism of the Leviathan. In this context, the nation and its true political expression, that is the movement, are characterised as living organisms, whereby the nation can be cured and saved through uniting detached fragments (sectorialism, political parties, egoism) into a harmonious unit. As the nation is in disorder, and because its current voices merely repeat its fragmentation, delegation includes the right to apply the tough medicines that will heal the nation though many citizens might not see it in this light, and for this organicistic view it appears obvious that solely the head of the nation really knows what is best for it. Thus, O' Donnell states that "the President and his personal staff are the alpha and omega of politics. The President isolates himself from most of the existing political institutions and organised interests, and bears sole responsibility for the successes and failures of 'his' policies".³³ At the same time parties and congress criticise his policies, and at times courts due to legalistic reasons obstruct obviously unconstitutional actions, whereby workers' and capitalists' associations protest stridently. Simultaneously, the party which elected the President in power complains about the loss of their popular support, and start to decline parliamentary support to President's policies, which only results to further political isolation of the President. Thus, it becomes gradually more difficult to form a stable government coalition, which increases President's tendency to bypass and/or corrupt that and other institutions.³⁴ This is currently evident with President Zardari whose party PPP has suffered a loss of support and even some of the ministers like former Sindh Home Minister Zulfiqar Mirza have turned to complain about the government coalition. In this situation Zardari has become more isolated and government coalitions especially during the past year have been very unstable

³² loc. cit.

³³ op.cit., p. 60-61

³⁴ op.cit., p. 61

with PML-N and MQM departing from the coalition, which will be discussed in latter sections. Furthermore, delegative democracies entail weak institutionalisation and are thus unsympathetic toward strengthening the institutions giving the President the advantage of no horizontal accountability. Thus, such democracies have the obvious advantage to enable rapid policy making, but at the expense of a bigger probability of grave mistakes with risky implementation, and of focusing responsibility of the outcome only on the President. Therefore, Presidents in delegative democracies are likely to suffer from huge swings in popularity: one day they are seen as heroes, and the next day they are cursed as fallen gods.³⁵ Zardari has vividly experienced this during his tenure, as in 2010 he was blamed for slow action on floods, and then for the Karachi violence in 2010-11. However, in summer 2011 his government was hailed for taking action on a teenager killed by the Rangers and putting the perpetrators into justice as well as for historical Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) reforms, only to be criticised for slow action on heavy rains and dengue in autumn 2011.

In similar manner, another concept, i.e., semidemocracy, can be used to explain the Pakistani reality. O'Donnell and Schmitter state that semidemocracy can be distinguished from semiauthoritarianism, as that form can be seen as liberal participation without electoral contestation, whereby in semidemocracy electoral contest is displayed.³⁶ In Pakistan electoral content is very vibrant especially in the 2000s with many competing parties promising similar reforms. Nevertheless, the limits to liberal participation are retained so as not to give opposition parties the chance to win the elections and they may be severed from interest groups and their communication and funding may be constrained. This was evident in 2008 elections in Pakistan where opposition candidate applications were denied under the state of emergency, which would have impeded for example former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in competing in elections. The importance of elections in semidemocracies can also be reduced by power sharing between an elected and unelected elite and power can thus be transferred to military, business groups or bureaucracy.³⁷ Burton, Higley and Gunther state that though semidemocracies can be sustainable among isolated, uninvolved mass populations, they are gradually weakened when elites start being confronted by more complex societies. Similarly, O'Donnell and Schmitter argue that even though semidemocracies last longer than semi-authoritarian regimes, they are degraded by social mobility, market vulnerability and

³⁵ op.cit, p. 63

³⁶ O'Donnell and Schmitter in W. Case, 'Can the 'Halfway House' stand? Semidemocracy and Elite Theory in Three Southeast Asian Countries', *Comparative Politics*, vol. 28, no. 4, 1996, p. 438-439

³⁷ Case, op.cit., p. 439

normative standards of the contemporary times.³⁸ In Pakistan where mass population is still majorly uninvolved from politics, the semidemocratic system has flourished and still can continue to prevail especially when education is not extended to masses. The dominating factor in such democracies is the elites, who are at the peak of the state apparatus and/or lead resource rich economic and socio-cultural groups in society, and the nature of their relations determines the types of regimes. Where elites are not unified and where they wage personal and factional fights at all costs, the regimes suffer from instability and violent seizures of power, whereby unified elites bring about stable regimes which give rise to democracies at least in countries where modernisation necessary for mass participation has occurred.³⁹ In the Pakistani context one can see clearly the elite dominance, which is at the heart of semidemocracies characterised by disunited elites waging inter-elite fights, with instability especially during democratic regimes.

After looking at elite governance, bureaucratic polity, delegative democracy and semidemocracy, yet another concept's viability, that is, democratic developmental state can be tested. This concept became popular in the 1990s in analysing poorer democracies, in opposition to the so-called Western view of liberal democracies providing a strong stimulus for societal development due to its institutional setting with a government conducive for market-led growth.⁴⁰ According to White "the maintenance of minimal democratic institutional form is compatible with a pattern of elite-dominated growth which is socially unequal and exclusionary and politically disempowering".⁴¹ Due to the huge disparities in political access, widespread clientelism and corruption, which marked the 'low-intensity democracies' of elite-dominated East Asia, democracy might be a crucial long-term goal "but potential impediment to the earlier stages of socio-economic development" meaning that "democracy is a luxury which poor societies can ill afford".⁴² Lee Kuan Yew, former premier of Singapore, stated that "I believe that what a country needs to develop is discipline more than democracy. The exuberance of democracy leads to indiscipline and disorderly conduct which are inimical to development",⁴³ and according to social scientists like Landell-Mills what is needed is a strong civil society.⁴⁴ Thus, if objective is development, then nascent

³⁸ O'Donnell and Schmitter in Case, *op.cit.*, p. 439-440

³⁹ Burton, Higley and Gunther in Case, *op.cit.*, p. 440

⁴⁰ White, *op.cit.*, p. 21

⁴¹ *op.cit.*, p. 22

⁴² *loc. cit.*

⁴³ Lee Kuan Yew in White, *op.cit.*, p. 22-23

⁴⁴ White, *op.cit.*, p. 23

democracies should follow the path of democratic developmental states which key characteristics comprise of socio-economic system, civil society, political society, state institutions and international environment. They are prone to surface “in societies at a higher level of socio-economic development, with a relatively homogenous population, a relatively strong sense of national identity, a relatively cohesive social structure, and a lack of gross inequalities of condition”, and where civil societies are vibrant, and “can forge broad developmental coalitions to strengthen the strategic capacity of the state to tackle problems of poverty and insecurity” and “where party systems are relatively well-developed, concentrated rather than fragmented, and organised along programmatic rather than personalistic or narrowly sectional lines”, and “where political power is organised to allow a concentration of executive authority and where state apparatus is staffed by professional civil servants”, and “where the autonomy of national elites is not so undermined by external political or economic dependence as to reduce significantly their capacity to rule and the principle of democratic accountability”.⁴⁵ Although this concept is appealing to Pakistan in that it puts more weight to development than democracy, and indeed development is what Pakistan needs in the current situation. However, the conditions laid out above are not present in Pakistan, because it has weak socio-economic development with gross inequalities, weak civil society and its population is organised in sectional identities instead of strong sense of national unity, and its party systems are organised along sectional and personalistic lines, and state system is staffed by former army staff and businessmen rather than professional civil servants. Therefore, hardly any of the conditions of a democratic developmental state are fulfilled in Pakistan, and thus this concept cannot be used to describe the democracy in Pakistan.

Summing up all other four adjacent theories, all of them pertain to elite governance/dominance within the country, whereby elites are the dominating actor within domestic and international politics and whereby their policies are made in support of their limited elite interest. All of them acknowledge the onset of elections as a proof of a democratic setting, and semidemocracy and delegative democracy concepts also acknowledge the instability of the regimes with huge upswings related to the support of the President or the governing elites. Elite governance theory is most apt to explain the history of Pakistani elite control and military dominance that is coming from highly volatile security situation post-independence, military’s role in the independence struggle and external US

⁴⁵op.cit., p. 45-46

support. It also explains the dynamics of the elites with intertwining membership of the military, business and bureaucracy, whereas delegative democracy concept explains well the current political dynamics with a dominating President and huge upswings in support resulting in political instability.

When looking at the usage of the theories, delegative democracy is mostly used to describe politics in Latin America and the post-Communist countries but also some articles on Asia for example Philippines and South Korea exist, and O'Donnell has refined his concept since his first article in 1991. Semidemocracy is mostly used for Asian countries for example Thailand and Malaysia but also for Africa like Senegal and Ghana and for post-Communist countries like Ukraine since its theoretical inception in 1996. It is interesting to note that on one hand semidemocracy theory has taken inspiration from O'Donnell's delegative democracy and the article has referred to two of O'Donnell's pieces, one of them being the 1994 article on delegative democracy, and thus it is easy to see where the resemblance between the theories comes from. O'Donnell has on the other hand used literature mostly on Latin American democracies from the 1980s and the early 1990s. Elite governance theory has not been widely used, however, since its inception in 1998, and there are hardly any articles on this subject. Interestingly, the author has not used any of the mainstream books or articles on democracy, but he has fully relied on case studies of different East and Southeast Asian countries like Japan, China, Thailand, Indonesia and Malaysia ranging from the mid-1960s to the late 1990s. Elite governance theory, however, best explains the different aspects of the paradox of democracy in Pakistan. Elite governance theory and the pertaining military dominance explain the historical developments and the search for security constituting first factor of the paradox. It also pertains well to fifth and sixth factors of the paradox i.e. power struggle and elite dominance, whereby semidemocracy theory explains the fourth i.e. lack of education and partly third i.e. economic stability under authoritarian rules, and as stated before delegative democracy explains well the current political dynamics in Pakistan. Therefore, none of the theories can explain the Pakistani political situation on its own, but together they can account for the historical and current patterns in the Pakistani context.

II SECURITY

2.1 The roots of the current security situation

Like it has become evident in the first part of the thesis, one of the greatest paradoxes in Pakistan is democracy. There is more stability and more economic growth during military governments, whereby civilian governments are more unstable and more corrupt, and this has indeed facilitated the persistence and support of military regimes in Pakistan, which is one of the six factors of the paradox. During Field Marshal Ayub Khan's era in the 1950s-1960s Pakistan was a role model for the developing world, and during General Zia's era in the 1980s the economy was also experiencing a boost. Due to his ruthless rule the country remained internally stable and extended power beyond its borders during the Soviet-Afghan war. During General Musharraf, the country experienced a big economic upswing, however security-political stability suffered after 9/11 due to Musharraf's turn from supporting Taliban toward the USA. Interestingly enough, Pakistan and the USA have had the best relations during these military rulers, and the USA has benefited from a more stable, economically sound Pakistan as its ally during the military eras. Because of the powerful army and the weak civil society, civilian governments have struggled in maintaining the power, and all civilian governments have ended in military take over. In Pakistan military is the only institution which people trust in, as politicians and police appear to be corrupt, and military has always come to people's aid in difficult times e.g. earthquake, flood crisis.

Due to the pattern of military regimes boosting the internal and external security, and democracies bringing instability, it is important to understand what led to this situation, and how Pakistani democracy was founded, which all come back to the first years of independence. From the start Pakistan has been obsessed with being on par with India. Pakistani decision makers were gripped by a sense of insecurity and bitterness caused by India's efforts to undo Pakistan and Kashmir immediately after the independence. In the following years, Pakistani decision-makers were certain that India, a country many times bigger than Pakistan in terms of size and its resources, was conspiring against Pakistan threatening its independence and territorial integrity. This is where the army gained special legitimacy since the beginning thanks to its important role in the independence struggle and the persistence of security threats especially from India making its continuous role paramount to Pakistan's security, which is one the characteristics of elite governance. It is important to reiterate here that the reasons for military involvement backing up elite governance are all at

play in the first years of Pakistan, that is, the key role of the military in the national independence struggle; external support from the USA during the Cold War especially during military regimes in Pakistan; and domestic political importance of the military as an outcome of long-standing insurgency conflicts.

In order to conquer the serious security political challenges, the main concern of Pakistani diplomacy was to seek an equalizer against India. Ever since independence, this policy has been the most vital preoccupation of Pakistan's foreign and defence policies.⁴⁶ In the first years of independence, Pakistan had relied on the United Nations (UN) to secure it against any Indian aggression and, in any case, to assist in resolving the dispute with India on Kashmir. In addition to the UN, Pakistan banked its hopes on the British Commonwealth and Britain for any help in resolving the Kashmir issue. Nonetheless, Pakistan did not find the British very helpful, because they were leaning towards India instead of Pakistan. Soon after independence, Pakistan also explored Pan-Islamism. However, its call for an Islamic bloc even aroused uneasiness in countries like Egypt which were seemingly worried that Pakistan would become a rival for leadership in the Islamic world.⁴⁷ The failing support from the Islamic world, left Pakistan only to turn to the global superpowers for help, although straight after its independence Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan declared that Pakistan would not take any sides in the ideological conflict between the USA and Soviet Union. However, this changed in 1949 with the US invitation for Indian Prime Minister Nehru to visit the USA, and therefore Soviet Union got interested in Pakistan.⁴⁸ In 1949-1953 Soviet Union did not veto any UN Security Council resolutions on Kashmir, and the countries exchanged ambassadors, but the relations deteriorated with Pakistan's membership of the US-sponsored military pacts in 1954. With ever deteriorating Indo-Pakistan relations, and no support from the Commonwealth, UN, Soviet Union, Islamic World, Pakistan decided to join the Baghdad Pact (later CENTO) and Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) to find an equalizer against India. Furthermore, Ayub Khan, who seized power in 1958, was interested in securing the latest US military equipment and assistance for Pakistan, whilst securing

⁴⁶ S. Amin, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: A Reappraisal*, 2010, p. 39-40

⁴⁷ *op. Cit.*, 39-40

⁴⁸ *op. Cit.*, p. 41

economic assistance, which strengthened Pakistan's military stance against India, which was later seen in Indo-Pakistan war in 1965.⁴⁹

Ultimately, "it was the quest for arms and aid to be used against India, rather than any real fear of communist aggression which was Pakistan's main motive for joining the Western sponsored military pacts".⁵⁰ Therefore, from the start there was disagreement with the USA about the meaning of the pacts, as Pakistan insisted on pacts being applied to any aggression from Indian side toward Pakistan. As a result of the US-sponsored alliances, Pakistan's relations with Soviet Union and its standing in the Third World suffered, whilst India became the leading player of the non-aligned movement. Subsequently, Pakistan expected the US support in case of Indian aggression, especially after the US-Pakistan Agreement from March 1959 which stated that the US "regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of Pakistan".⁵¹ However, the US was not willing to take sides in Indo-Pak aggression, and with President Kennedy's accession and India-China border war in 1962, Western military aid was sent to India without consulting Pakistan, which ended the US special relationship with its 'most committed' ally in Asia. Disenchanted by the USA, Pakistan sought support from China for its security, and Sino-Pak relations had not suffered from SEATO membership (alliance to contain China), as China understood that this membership acted as a security against India rather than to contain the expansion of communism. Because of the strained Sino-Indian relations especially after 1962, and because of Pakistan's frustration with USA, Pakistan turned to China, whilst strengthening its relations with Soviet Union to find an equalizer against India. Consequently, the 1960s were a decade of bilateralism in Pakistan's foreign policy.⁵² However, a border conflict in Rann of Kutch area in-between India and Pakistan changed the course of bilateralism, and as Pakistani forces fared better in the initial fighting, Pakistani decision makers were disillusioned by their military power. In these sentiments, Pakistan launched Operation Gibraltar in August 1965 and sent infiltrators to the Kashmir cease fire line (CFL), but they failed in garnering support from local population. Due to internal issues within the military establishment, Pakistan lost time and India was able to bolster their defence and launch a military attack to Lahore which was saved at last minute.⁵³ After unsuccessful call for help for USA, China promised to help Pakistan and escalate the conflict, but due to

⁴⁹ op. Cit., p. 43-44

⁵⁰ Amin, op. cit., p. 46

⁵¹ loc. cit.

⁵² op. cit., p. 44-47, 49

⁵³ Abbas, op.cit., p. 40, 45-46

international pressures of not battling China against India again, Pakistan accepted a cease fire, where ‘India won simply by not losing’,⁵⁴ and in the aftermath of Tashkent agreement from January 1966 there was huge disillusionment among Pakistani people, as they had been led to believe Pakistan was on verge of historic victory, but the war only furthered the resentment among East Pakistan after realising their insecurities and defencelessness during the war, and it also signalled the beginning to an end of Ayub Khan era.⁵⁵

In 1969 Yahya Khan took over in martial law, and his era was characterised by the growing Bengali nationalism. After Awami League won most seats in Eastern Pakistan in late 1970, whilst Zulfikar Ali Bhutto’s PPP won most seats in the West, the leader of Awami League Mujib ur-Rahman should have been sworn as Prime Minister, but his terms were not acceptable to Yahya Khan and Bhutto. With hardening stances in both sides and assumptions of Indian support to Bengali side, the relations between the two Pakistan’s became unbearable.⁵⁶ By March 1971 Mujib ur-Rahman declared Bangladesh as an independent state which led to Pakistani army attack and inflicted mindless arson, rape, murder of the Bengalis which to date remains a shameful event in Pakistani history, and which was condemned by the US among others. It is important to note that in the midst of this carnage a religious party, Jamaat-i-Islami (JI), forged an alliance with the Pakistani army and had played a significant role in the Eastern conflict against the so-called enemies of Islam (due to Bengali roots and Indian support),⁵⁷ and this trend of religious fervour became to dominate Pakistan from the 1970s onwards. The conflict ended with an Indian offensive in East Pakistan in December 1971, which left 93,000 Pakistani soldiers and civilians as prisoners of war in India which were a contention between the two countries for years to come. In the aftermath of the conflict Yahya Khan was replaced by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who became President and the first civilian martial law administrator in Pakistan.⁵⁸ His rule was characterised by many democratic developments like the adoption of 1973 constitution in Pakistan, being the first time in history where a directly elected legislature created a constitution.⁵⁹ Despite successful land and other reforms and successful foreign relations with Arab countries and a reviving US link, Bhutto was faced with a disenchanted army and a growing power of religious parties, and in the midst of street violence in all major cities, some army officers refused to

⁵⁴ op. cit., p. 48

⁵⁵ op.cit., p. 51

⁵⁶ op. cit., p. 60-61

⁵⁷ op.cit., p. 63

⁵⁸ op.cit., p. 67-68

⁵⁹ op. cit., p. 78

obey Bhutto's order, which rapidly resulted to imposition of martial law and military takeover by Bhutto's Army Chief Zia ul-Haq in 1977.⁶⁰ In addition to army support, General Zia relied on religious parties like JI and this religious fervour characterised his rule from the start, whereby army became the 'defender of Pakistan's ideological borders'. Zia defined Pakistan as an Islamic state according to his own religious belief, that is, Deodanbi school of thought which only had minority support in Pakistan, and the process of converting the majority, that is, believers of Bareilvi Islam, to Deobandi divided the country along sect lines, which had long-standing repercussions. Zia rule was highly authoritarian in nature, and the state was redefined through puritan Islamic laws e.g. Islamic punishments for some offences (like stoning of death for adultery), Islamic taxes (e.g. charity tax zakat), Islamic courts (i.e. shariat) as well as blasphemy law, which was used to persecute the minorities like Ahmedi community and the poor, peaceful Christian community in Pakistan.⁶¹ He also recognised the madrasa, religious school network, for the first time in Pakistan, and later on madrasas became famous for being breeding grounds for radicalised young men, some of whom were fighting in Afghan resistance, some of whom became Taliban, some of whom later fought Indian army in Kashmir and the rest conducted acts of terrorism within Pakistan. Not only radicalising the school system, Zia imposed censorship to press and TV, persecuted anti-Zia political parties and intellectuals and altered the history by depicting Jinnah as a theocrat, though Jinnah's vision was to build an independent, secular Pakistan.⁶² In the foreign policy front, Zia's rule was characterised by the Afghan conflict, whereby Zia led a diplomatic offense against the Soviets even before the US intervention, provided shelter to Afghan refugees, and gave secret military support to Mujahideen in Afghanistan. One of the long-standing factors in his policy was not to allow direct contact between the US intelligence and Afghan resistance but to channel everything through ISI starting from the military training, which only rooted ISI's powerful position in Pakistan and in the Pak-US relations.⁶³ As seen in forthcoming sections, Afghan war conveniently authorised the usage of force and the Islamic crusade against godless Soviets, and at domestic front this only accelerated the Islamisation and division of Pakistan into different sects with ever-growing influence of the military and the ISI.

⁶⁰ op. cit., p. 86-87

⁶¹ op. cit., p. 104-105

⁶² op. cit., p. 108

⁶³ Abbas, op.cit., p. 110

After Zia's death in a mysterious plane crash, Benazir Bhutto and PPP won the elections in late 1988, and thus she became the first female Prime Minister of a Muslim state in the world, but she was tied down in some aspects, as she had to promise that she would not intervene in Pakistan's nuclear programme, change Afghan policy or the budget of the military and even made a further concession of keeping the Sahabzada Yaqub Ali Khan as the Foreign Minister, as favoured by the USA.⁶⁴ Despite being loved in the Western media, Arab world and among PPP supporters and hailed for being Bhutto's daughter, she faced opposition from Nawaz Sharif, who was seen as a heir to Zia's legacy, and their relationship was characterised by a lack of co-operation and mutual distrust. In addition, MQM under Altaf Hussain was monolithic and violence-averse organisation and was resorting to terror tactics in Karachi in such a manner that Bhutto had to call the army for help to bring Karachi into order, which not only increased the animosities between PPP and MQM but also between the government and the army. On top of opposition from other political parties and army, the ISI was disrupting the political credibility of Bhutto government by accusing her husband Alif Zardari of corruption and thus at the same time shaming Benazir, and finally in August 1990 she was dismissed with charges of corruption and malfeasance in the governance.⁶⁵ Following Benazir's ouster, the first Nawaz Sharif government was also beleaguered by other political parties, army and ISI and also with worsening US-Pakistan relations in the aftermath of Gulf war though Sharif had lent support to the US. In addition, he was discredited due to his shady deals (personal wealth increased from \$10 to \$400million, and his co-operative banks in Punjab collapsed leaving thousands of widows, orphans without their savings whilst their owners of these banks from his party went scot-free) and also wrongly appointed Abdul Waheed Kakar as Army Chief thinking that he still enjoyed army and ISI support. In this disillusion Sharif started to talk about president being too powerful under the constitution and thus restraining President Ishaq Khan's powers, and this led to an all-out conflict between Sharif and Khan. After Sharif blasting Khan on TV in April 1993, Khan dismissed his government, but the Supreme Court reinstated Sharif government within a month, which humiliated Ishaq Khan. In this political mess Army Chief Kakar came in and got Khan and Sharif to resign and installed a neutral caretaker government before general elections.⁶⁶ In the 1993 elections, third in 5 years, coalition of PPP and Muslim League brought Benazir Bhutto back in power, but again her government's image was tarnished due to alleged corruption of

⁶⁴ op. cit., p. 136

⁶⁵ op. cit., p. 137-9, 142

⁶⁶ op. cit., p. 146-7, 150-151

her ministers, bureaucracy and her husband, who was believed to have been taking kickbacks from government contracts and any corrupt bureaucrat was using his name to cover up their own corrupt practices.⁶⁷ During her tenure the ethnic and sectarian violence upsurged and well-known Saudi Sufi Iqbal and Lieutenant General GM tried to take over the country and declare it as a Sunni state. In the aftermath of the attempted coup Army Chief Kakar cleansed ISI out of Islamists, reigned in jihadi fighters from Kashmir and forced retirement to many ISI officials, who then became consultants for extremist religious groups.⁶⁸ Though in foreign policy front Benazir enjoyed the US support, the accession of Taliban in Afghanistan in 1994 affected her governance. Her political ally, Maulana Fazl ul-Rahman, leader of Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Islam-Fazlur (JUI-F) was a keen supporter of Taliban, and opened the communications channels between Kabul and Islamabad, and accession of Taliban was welcomed in Pakistan, because at last there was a friendly government in Afghanistan, and many Pakistani youth went to join Taliban after being trained in madrasas administered by JUI-F. The governance became increasingly more difficult, when in late 1994 Taliban-oriented Tehreek-e-Nafaz-e-Shariat-e-Mohammadi (TNSM) movement spread in Northwest Frontier Provinces (NWFP) and was bringing traffic and government offices to halt calling for Islamic law in Malakand region. The following year the first suicide bomb in Pakistan's history blasted a portion of Egyptian embassy in Islamabad in support of Arab volunteers in Afghan war, and at the same time sectarian conflict in-between Sunni and Shia upsurged with the worst incident in 1996 in Kurram agency leaving over 200 people dead. In addition, intra-MQM violence in Karachi claimed over 1000 lives only in 1994, as MQM had turned into a mafia sustaining with extortion, providing protection for its supporters and conducting revenge killings.⁶⁹ With difficult security situation, also appointment of army chief came to haunt Benazir, and ISI and Intelligence Bureau (IB) were giving her trouble, and her appointment of PPP-favoured judges in Punjab caused issued with judiciary. This judicial issue was solved by President Leghari, but this worsened the relations between Bhutto and Leghari, and in the end Leghari dismissed her government in November 1996, meaning fourth consecutive civilian government not completing its 5 years in office, and set up a Council for Defence and National Security (CDNS) until the elections in the following year bringing Sharif into power again.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ op. cit., p. 152

⁶⁸ op.cit., p. 153

⁶⁹ op.cit.,p. 155-56

⁷⁰ Abbas, op. cit., p. 157-158

Sharif did not like President Leghari's wishes to play a significant role in running the government, and thus changed the Zia's Eight Amendment which had defined President and Prime Minister's powers in a way to encourage power conflicts, and the new Thirteenth Amendment now made Prime Minister more powerful and gave him the power to dismiss and appoint chiefs of armed forces, and thus Sharif became the most powerful man in Pakistan. Furthermore, he formed Accountability Bureau to haunt the opposition parties, dismissed chief of navy, took away parliamentary dissent, and tried to get Leghari to appoint a new Army Chief, which eventually led to Leghari's resignation.⁷¹ Situation changed when Hindu fundamentalist party won elections and Atal Behari Vajpayee became Indian Prime Minister in spring 1998, and only 2 months later India detonated its first atomic bomb, whereby the US and Western powers urged a restraint to Pakistan which had a nuclear programme since the 1970s. Sharif was under pressure not only from the US but also at the domestic front from the religious parties urging the detonation. After consultation with army officials, the cabinet decided in favour of nuclear tests and Pakistan officially entered the nuclear club within a month after India, which was celebrated among the Pakistani public, which only demonstrated how important it is to see Pakistan in the context of its Indian relations and how so many policies have been decided by the policies of the other.⁷² Of course this led to an international condemnation and sanctions to Pakistani government which only worsened the perilous economic situation. At the same time Taliban took control of whole Afghanistan in August 1998, and the US was afraid that they might also take over Pakistan, and in the aftermath of a suicide bombing in the US embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam concocted by Osama bin Laden, the US launched a missile attack in Afghanistan leading to cries of violations of Pakistan's airspace and left 11 Pakistani men killed- and this event was the first time Osama bin Laden's name became known all over Pakistan.⁷³ At domestic front Sharif continued to consolidate his power, and in a surprising move in August 1998 he devised the 15th Amendment to the constitution calling for the enforcement of Islamic law in Pakistan for which Sharif and his government would be interpreters, which was a move designed to get unfettered power in Pakistan rather than a religious one. This bill, which would have made Pakistan an Islamic caliphate under Sharif with implementation of Sharia pertaining to a loss of all rights for minorities, was passed in lower house, but stayed with the Senate which would only pass the bill with a change of composition in next elections in 2000, which never

⁷¹ op. cit., 159-161

⁷² op. cit., p. 161-163

⁷³ op.cit., p. 164

happened.⁷⁴ Sharif's appointment of Pervez Musharraf as Army Chief signified the beginning of an end to his rule, and in the midst of Pakistan-initiated Kargil war in spring 1999, which came after a freeze in Indo-Pak dialogue and which left Pakistan totally isolated diplomatically, Sharif pleaded to President Clinton in July 1999 that all blame for the disastrous Kargil war lied in his generals, whereby Musharraf blamed Sharif for the failed operation. Both devised plans to get rid of each other, and when Musharraf flew to Sri Lanka to attend army's celebrations in Colombo, Sharif sacked Musharraf and new Army Chief was appointed, which made Sharif unacceptable to the army officials. Though Sharif tried to deter Musharraf's plane in landing to Karachi, he failed, and when Musharraf landed the military had taken over and Musharraf became the man in charge, which was hailed by the general public. Interestingly, every change of government since the independence has been applauded by the majority of the public, which signified disenchantment with the outgoing government or a hope for a better future. However, it is important to note that this hope did not have positive connotations, but it often had a negative security-related meaning that the situation at least could not worsen from the current one.⁷⁵

The October 1999 military coup was not favoured by the USA, and previously the US State Department had even issued a statement saying that the US strongly opposes "any attempt by political and military actors in Pakistan to take power unconstitutionally", and thus Musharraf coup was the first military takeover in Pakistan not approved by the USA,⁷⁶ however the relations soon improved. In the domestic front, Musharraf proclaimed to be committed to building national confidence, ensuring law and order, reviving economy, implementing devolution plans to move power to grass root level and conduct all-round accountability, which is nothing new from past Pakistani leaders, but the Pakistani public was willing to give Musharraf a chance.⁷⁷ The new regime wanted to be different from the past and avoid the curse associated with all previous military interventions, whereby at first they gain a sense of vitality and vigour, when hopes are high, and reforms are called upon and politicians are despised due to their alleged incompetence and corruption, which was earlier pointed out as one of the characteristics of the elite governance theory. With the passing of time, the army rule becomes a hybrid democracy with some turncoats and new faces co-operating for the

⁷⁴ Abbas, op.cit., p. 164-165

⁷⁵ op.cit., p. 177

⁷⁶ op.cit., p. 180-181

⁷⁷ op.cit., p. 183

new rule, which characterised Ayub Khan and Zia regimes, whereby Yahya Khan's rule was an exception to the rule due to the ongoing disintegration of Pakistan at that time. As Musharraf had witnessed this vicious cycle, the general public hoped that he would not commit the same mistakes.⁷⁸ His first move was directed against corruption and he set up National Accountability Bureau (NAB), as with every change in government since the so-called revival of democracy in 1985 the public had been calling for accountability, but no previous government had taken serious steps to counter it, but NAB under Lieutenant General Amjad was successful in catching and imprisoning many corrupt politicians, business men, but with his departure in September 2000, NAB's priorities changed, as Musharraf now was ready to make compromises for the politicians willing to support him. According to Hassan Abbas, Musharraf was in a difficult position, as the general public expected him to be a great reformative leader, whereas political and military elite wanted to maintain the status quo.⁷⁹

Another early priority for Musharraf was to tackle the religious fanatics and extremists in the country, but was unable to do much due to their significant power and due to alleged repercussions to foreign policy toward Kashmir and Afghanistan. However, with international isolation due to its foreign policy, the US State Department released a report in spring 2000 stating Pakistan has tolerated terrorists living and moving freely within its territory besides supporting groups that engage in violence in Kashmir. This did not however change Musharraf's pro-Taliban stance explained by national and security interests, as Pakistan could not afford another threat in addition to India. But with negative international opinion, and the frenzies conducted by the Taliban government, his stance was beginning to change.⁸⁰ At the same time Indo-Pak relations seemed to be improving thanks to Agra summit in June 2001, but during the summit 80 people were killed in a week in Jammu and Kashmir by Lashkar-e-Toiba (L.e.T), which was a major setback for Musharraf and the summit ended without a joint statement.⁸¹ However, the most important event during Musharraf era was the 9/11 terrorist attacks, which changed Pakistan's pro-Taliban policy due to pressures mainly from the USA, and whereby Pakistan was upgraded from a country harbouring terrorists to a US ally in the war against terror. Although this 360 degree policy change was hailed in the US and other Western countries, it had negative effects in the

⁷⁸ Abbas, op.cit., p. 183

⁷⁹ op.cit., p. 184, 189

⁸⁰ op.cit., p. 195

⁸¹ op.cit., p. 197-98

domestic front, and it is questionable how sincere Musharraf was in his attempts to root out home-grown terrorists. According to Amir Mir, Musharraf played a dual act in co-operating with the West whilst going soft on al-Qaeda and Taliban-linked terrorists within Pakistan. Though Musharraf initially banned six major jehadi organisations in Pakistan in 2002-2003, all of them reappeared with a different name and identities and were allowed to conduct their operations. Although Pakistan did arrest over 700 al-Qaeda and Taliban extremists under Musharraf, the political instability bolstered religious parties, and the extremist elements in the military and intelligence institutions were allowed to conduct their covert operations in Afghanistan as well as in Kashmir.⁸² Musharraf has subsequently even admitted that he was not an all-willing ally of the USA, but military aid, economic concessions and a better international standing favoured siding with the US along with Richard Armitage's threat of Pakistan 'being bombed to stone age'.⁸³ At the same time he had to side with the powerful religious, military and intelligence organisations in Pakistan, thus many of his reforms for accountability, madrasas and arrests were half-hearted. This support is also linked to security-political concerns, of Afghanistan being considered as strategic depth, whereby such organisations were needed to conduct the covert operations in both sides of Pakistan's borders in a fear of India.⁸⁴ During Musharraf era the international standing improved, but at the cost of domestic political instability and a growing sectarian violence and terrorism which was being controlled during his era thanks to the strong military rule, but the situation became more volatile with the wake of the civilian governance and democracy of Asif Zardari.

⁸² Mir, op.cit., p. 278, 380

⁸³R. Armitage in BBC News, US threatened to bomb Pakistan, 2006, available from:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/5369198.stm

⁸⁴ Mir, op.cit., p. 386

2.2. Dispute with India

One cannot comprehend Pakistan's history or current security-political situation nor its troubled democratic past without understanding its complicated relationship with India. The ongoing political conflict between India and Pakistan is often on the headlines. Many people wrongly perceive that this conflict is about religion, but people often forget that there are millions of Muslims living in India alone, in fact India has more Muslims than Pakistan. The conflict dates back to the division of India into India, East and West Pakistan in 1947, when the British decided to leave India. Before the partition the Muslims were in power, and were favoured by the British, and after the partition Muslim population was placed in an uncomfortable situation, and taken off power. It was extremely important for them to retain the strategically situated state of Jammu and Kashmir, and Pakistani army was sent to whole state by force, as they thought that the local Muslim population would support them. However, the Maharajah and the Prime Minister called for Indian military assistance, and against all odds the Indian army won, which was to the surprise of the Pakistanis who thought that the Hindu/Sikh army would never be a match for the self-proclaimed Islamic soldiers. As there was a danger that the Indians would cross the British imposed international border, which was not a scenario for the liking of the US and British officials (as they disliked Gandhi and Hindus), the British moved the issue to the Security Council, which imposed a cease fire, a return to August 1947 boundaries and a plebiscite in Kashmir. As the resolution enabled Pakistan to retain a part of Pakistan, they occupied whole Kashmir, and thus the council resolution has never been put in place. Pakistan has tried a military solution in Kashmir in 1965 and in 1999, but the Indian army beat them.⁸⁵ Therefore, three full-scale wars-in 1947-1948, 1965, and 1971-and a constant state of military preparedness on both sides of their mutual border have marked six decades of bitter rivalry between Pakistan and India. This above mentioned acrimonious partition of British India and the unresolved issue of Kashmiri sovereignty have been major sources of tension and therefore both countries have built large defence establishments at a significant cost to their economic and social development. The above mentioned Kashmir problem is ultimately rooted in claims by both countries to the former princely state, divided since 1948 by a military Line of Control (LOC) into the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir and Pakistan-held Azad (Free) Kashmir. India blames Pakistan for supporting a violent separatist rebellion in the Muslim-dominated Kashmir Valley that has taken up to 66,000 lives since 1989. Pakistan admits only to lending

⁸⁵ A. Sethi, The trouble with Pakistan, speech at Finnish-Indian Trade Association, 22nd March 2010

moral and political support to the rebels, and it criticises India for human rights abuses in Indian-occupied Kashmir. India continues to blame Pakistan for maintaining an infrastructure of terror and for actively supporting terrorist groups that are held responsible for attacks inside India.⁸⁶ In fact, since 1989 there have been many covert operations against India mainly through Jihadist terrorists like L.e.T, whose “true goal is not Kashmir, it is India. And L.e.T is not shy about announcing that its intention is to establish an Islamic state of South Asia”, argued the US Congressman Gary Ackerman in March 2010.⁸⁷

However, despite the stalemate in bilateral talks since Mumbai attacks of 2008 which left 166 people dead, when the bilateral talks resumed first time after that incident in late July 2011, there were promises for a new era. India and Pakistan agreed to counter terrorism measures and to ease trade and visa regulations between their countries, and even called for discussions on nuclear weapons but leaving Kashmir aside. Pakistani Foreign Minister Hina Rabbani Khar said that “this is indeed a new era of bilateral cooperation between the two countries, and it is our desire ... to make it an uninterrupted and an unintermittible process. There has been a mindset change in the people of the two countries that we must acknowledge.” This was a big milestone after latest round of peace talks began in February 2011, whilst the previous talks were suspended in 2008 due to the Mumbai attacks with India accusing ISI’s involvement and Pakistan of not doing enough to counter the perpetrators of the attacks. Surprisingly the July round was not suspended despite 13th July 2011 Mumbai triple bombing killing 20 people, which was linked to Indian terrorist group with links to Pakistani militants.⁸⁸ In September 2011 Pakistan and India issued a statement that “the ministers mandated their commerce secretaries to pursue with vigour the task of fully normalising bilateral trade relations and agreed that their countries would cooperate for a high ambition of preferential trade relations under the framework of the South Asia Free Trade Agreement

⁸⁶ A. Kronstadt Pakistan-US relations, CRS Report for Congress, 2009, available from: www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33498.pdf, p. 55

⁸⁷ C. Rajghatta, Pak army may be paying compensation to slain 26/11 terrorists’ skin: US lawmaker, 2010, available from: http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2010-03-13/us/28148791_1_terrorist-state-pakistan-army-mumbai-attacks

⁸⁸ K. Daigle, India, Pakistan say bilateral relations are on right track, 2011, available from: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/27/india-pakistan-bilateral-relations-right-track-_n_910651.html

(SAFTA)” whilst agreeing to double bilateral trade from current \$2.7billion to \$6 billion by 2014, which is in effort to build mutual trust and progress bilateral relations through trade.⁸⁹

However, in the recent developments, India-Afghanistan pact from 4th October 2011 has destabilised the situation, as India promised long-term military and financial help to Afghanistan after the US and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) troop withdrawal scheduled for December 2014, whereby Afghanistan pledged access to Afghan natural resources and a closer economic integration with India. This agreement poses a threat to Pakistan’s influence in Afghanistan as well as adds more pressure to Pakistani government to take action on inter-border terrorists. The Obama administration is calling for Pakistan to launch a new campaign against Afghan insurgents and related terror groups or it would face economic sanctions or US military intervention especially after September 2011 attack on the US embassy in Kabul by Haqqani network operating from Pakistan. The Haqqani family leads an ethnic Pashtun militant group which was at first place armed and by financed by Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and ISI in the Afghan conflict in the 1980s, and they also supported the Taliban government, and have been fighting against the US since 9/11 and are estimated to have 10,000 to 15,000 fighters supported by Tehrik Taliban Pakistan (TTP).

Despite the US pressure, Pakistani government has been hesitant in deploying army in North Waziristan to destroy the Haqqani and TTP network, as such operations are very expensive and also may lead to increasing acts of terror in other parts of Pakistan not forgetting the redeployment of Pakistani troops stationed in the Indian border. Thus, Pakistan has accepted the US drone attacks in the region, which will be discussed in third section. However, Obama administration deems even the drones insufficient, as it is frustrated by its inability to bring Afghan conflict into end, and is speaking about occupation of North Waziristan. White House Spokesman Jay Carney said on 23rd September 2011: “We know that the Haqqani network was responsible for the attacks on our embassy in Kabul. We know that the Haqqani network operates from safe havens in Pakistan, and that the government of Pakistan has not taken action against those safe havens.”, and continued that Pakistani government should “break any links they have and take strong and immediate action against this network”, and

⁸⁹ Investors.com, India, Pakistan lay down timeline to normalise trade relations, 2011, available from: <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Newsfeed/Article/136412257/201109282219/India-Pakistan-agree-to-lay-down-timeline-to-normalize-trade-relations.aspx>

reportedly the US drones killed 3 Haqqani militants in 14th October 2011 including a key player who handled network's finances.⁹⁰ Despite this minor success, the US is urging stepping missile strikes in the region. At the same Pakistani army Spokesman Major General Athar Abbas, ruled out occupation and warned that the unilateral US action would have "grave consequences" and would "put the government and the military's backs to the wall."⁹¹ This issue is the main cause of Pak-US tension, and Pakistan has tried to counter balance US pressure with threats to pursue closer strategic and military relations with China instead of the US, and Pakistani Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani told Chinese Minister of Public Security Meng Jianzhu on 27th September 2011 meeting: "Your friends are our friends, your enemies are our enemies and your security is our security."⁹² Therefore, this recent India-Afghan agreement adds to a destabilisation of an already unstable situation, and Afghan government's decision that was taken in US consultation, in order to bring India to play a greater role in Afghanistan, immensely increases the geo-political instability and the threat of great power conflict in Central and South Asia.⁹³ This negative development among the three strategically important countries for Pakistan, it is only further adding to the obsession with India and foreign policy bias in Pakistan's politics, which continues to overshadow other concerns like education and democracy in the interest of national security.

⁹⁰J. Carney in Telegraph.co.uk, US drone strike in Pakistan kills three Egyptians, 2011, available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/8830186/US-drone-strike-in-Pakistan-kills-three-Egyptians.html>

⁹¹ A. Abbas in J. Cogan, India-Afghan pact poisons Aghan-Pakistan relations, 2011, available from: <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2011/oct2011/afgh-o06.shtml>

⁹² Y.R. Gilani in Cogan, op.cit.

⁹³ loc. cit.

2.3. Terrorism and its roots in Afghan War

Relationship with its western neighbour Afghanistan is another factor which has especially since General Zia's rule in the 1980s overshadowed other than security-political concerns in the minds of Pakistani decision makers. After a coup in Afghanistan in 1978, when People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA), backed by the Soviet Union, seized power, it meant an external threat of Soviet Union to the Zia government and also a possibility of internal subversion from leftist PPP members, ethnic Balochs, Pashtuns residing along the contentious Durand line. As a result, the Pakistani government started to organise and train different Afghan ethnic groups under the umbrella of Islam and Zia's strategy was eased by the 'godless' nature of the new Soviet-supported Afghan regime. However, one must note that even before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan there were a few Mujahideen training camps in Pakistan, and they were mostly situated in the NWFP and FATA, which still remain the strongholds of Taliban. With the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, Pakistan's ISI intensified their efforts to organise Afghan partisans in Pakistani training camps. As a result, 1979-1989 was characterised by the establishment of an elaborate indoctrination and training system for Mujahideen fighters in Pakistan, facilitated by immense amounts of the US aid, and consisted of a network of madrassas and training camps located in the neighbouring of the Durand line. Ultimately, General Zia was successful in securing the continuation of his unstable regime through his strategy of championing Islam, but this strategy blurred the line between civilian and military rule and led to a creation of a network of radical Islam supporters.⁹⁴ In fact, Pakistani leaders had long sought access to Central Asia and the so-called 'strategic depth' with regard to India through friendly relations with neighbouring country Afghanistan. This policy thus contributed to President-General Zia ul-Haq's support for Afghan Mujahideen 'freedom fighters' who were battling Soviet invaders during the 1980s and to Islamabad's later support for the Afghan Taliban regime from 1996 to 2001. Like Hussain states, Pakistan's support for the Taliban regime did not have any ideological basis but rather had geo-strategic reasons, which were directed at an assertion of Pakistan's weight over Afghanistan through a Pashtun movement. Consequently, the key motive was to obtain strategic depth toward India and isolate Iran. Military strategists believed that the lack of the geographical depth might compromise Pakistan's security if a war with India occurred.

⁹⁴ Z. Fillingham, 'The Pakistan Taliban', Geopolitical Monitor, 2009, available from: <http://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/the-pakistan-taliban>, p. 2

Therefore, Pakistan's Afghan policy has been characterised by the attainment of this strategic depth since the 1980s.⁹⁵

However, one should bear in mind that Pakistan's relations with Afghanistan were already strained after British colonial rule ended in the subcontinent, and subsequent Afghan governments had all rejected the contentious Durand Line, which is the international border in-between the countries established by the British. Afghanistan was therefore the only country who rejected Pakistan's membership of the UN and in the course of the 1950s and the 1960s, the Afghan government supported a Pashtun separatist movement in Pakistan's North West Frontier Province. Consequently, the key goal of Pakistan's Afghan policy was to set up a friendly or pliable government in Afghanistan through the usage of ethnic and religious connections. Thus, during the Afghan war in the 1980s, Pakistan supported radical Pashtun Mujahideen commanders such as Hekmatya, and due to the same reason Pakistani government also lent support to Pashtun-dominated Taliban. However, when Taliban became related to harbouring terrorism in international circles, this also affected Pakistan negatively, as the Taliban influence reached to Pashtun areas and beyond in Pakistan.⁹⁶ The Afghan conflict not only contributed to the growth of home-grown terrorism in Pakistan, but it also had effect on increase of sectarianism within the country. Hussain argues that external factors had an immense role to play in stoking sectarian conflict in Pakistan, and apart from Afghan conflict the simultaneous Iranian revolution led to a huge reaction throughout the Muslim world. The spill-over effect of the Shia revolution caused anxieties within the Arab rulers as well as in Pakistan and the Iran-Iraq war played only to increase the rivalry between Sunni Arab states and Shia Iran, and many Arab states gave money to counter the Iranian Shia revolutionaries, which resulted in Pakistan becoming a battlefield for intra-Islam proxy war. Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and other Gulf countries funded Pakistani madrasas especially after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and these became the epic centres of Sunni militancy in Pakistan.⁹⁷

Due to 9/11 Musharraf had to completely change his foreign policy course from supporting the Afghan Taliban to becoming a trusted US ally in the anti-terror campaign. However, this policy change has had severe domestic repercussions, as many tribal areas in Pakistan have

⁹⁵ Z. Hussain *Frontline Pakistan: The Path to Catastrophe and the Killing of Benazir Bhutto*, 2010, p. 30

⁹⁶ *loc. cit.*

⁹⁷ *op. cit.*, p. 93

turned to militant bases where they can plan their next attacks whilst retaining their hold in the tribal belt with violence spreading into adjacent Northwest Frontier Province.⁹⁸ With the recovery of the Afghani Taliban, some militant Pashtun factions formed TTP with the aim of helping its Afghani allies in their fight against the United States and NATO forces with the end goal of creating an Islamic emirate in Pakistan. In its founding stage the TTP only consisted of a few extremely separated factions, but after a call by the Afghan Taliban for the sake of unity among the divided tribes in order to fight the foreign invaders and their local allies, the factions formed a pact with a liaison and conflict resolution council under the leadership of Baitullah Mahsoud, later on under his brother Hakimullah Mahsoud after Baitullah's death. With the support of the seven strongest militias in the border region, the organisation controlled the majority of the southern tribal region until 2009, fighting aggressively against the Western influence in Afghanistan. Unlike Taliban, home-grown TTP is seen by the Pakistani government as a direct threat to its sovereignty and authority, and thus it has launched many military attacks against the TTP with the support of the US. However, TTP has waged many successful terror attacks against the Pakistani government for example against the regional headquarters of Pakistan's intelligence services as a response to government's military campaigns leading to a vicious cycle of constant violence in the tribal region. Operating with the same model as its Afghani counterpart, the military campaigns include a psychological element designed to render support within the local inhabitants, whilst developing relations with al-Qaeda and other jihad organisations.⁹⁹

Due to the growing terror threat in both countries President Zardari and President Karzai reaffirmed a commitment to working together to resolve bilateral tensions and to fight the Taliban insurgency in autumn 2008, and have highlighted the role of economic development and poverty decrease as tools to counter the terrorist threat.¹⁰⁰ However, the previously discussed India-Afghan agreement has already deteriorated Pak-Afghan relations, and Hamid Karzai's government accused Pakistani-based groups of arranging a suicide bomb attack which killed the former Afghan President Burhanuddin Rabbani in late September 2011. Rabbani was leading efforts to initiate a peace deal with the Taliban and other insurgent

⁹⁸ B. Rubin and A. Siddique, 'Resolving the Pakistan-Afghanistan Stalemate', United States Institute of Peace, 2006, available from: www.cic.nyu.edu/afghanistan/docs/stalemate.pdf, p. 3

⁹⁹ Y. Schweitzer and S. London, 'Obama's Afghanistan-Pakistan policy: Challenges and Objectives', Strategic Assessment, vol. 12, no. 4, 2010, available from: [www.inss.org.il/upload/\(FILE\)1267610000.pdf](http://www.inss.org.il/upload/(FILE)1267610000.pdf), p. 104-105

¹⁰⁰ Kronstadt, op. cit., p. 58

groups to bring them into the Afghan government and to end the 10-year war according to US terms. As a result of his death Karzai's regime suspended its talks with Taliban and instead will conduct direct talks with the Pakistani government implying that the insurgency was nothing more than a front for Islamabad,¹⁰¹ and therefore the Pak-Afghan relations are facing a stalemate.

¹⁰¹ Cogan, op.cit.

III DEMOCRACY

3. 1 Defining factors of democracy

After looking at the theoretical framework and the roots of the complex democratic and security situation, the thesis will move on to look at the defining factors of liberal democracy, that is, the role of the judicial and police forces related to the separation of powers, good governance meaning public interest and absence of corruption, the general and equal right to vote, and the freedom of opinion, speech, press, mass media and human rights.

3.1.1 Judicial

In Pakistan the judicial system is generally slow with the court cases that sometimes drag on for years, but an important development for a better judicial system and rights for people occurred when Rangers were sentenced for life imprisonment for killing a young man in June 2011. Normally such acts go unnoticed, but this brutal act by 3 Rangers kicking a boy to death was released on TV channels thus receiving wide press and public protests across the country. Generally, the armed and security forces are viewed in a positive light in Pakistan, but since the spring 2011 with Osama bin Laden's death and the apparent failure of the security apparatus to deter a small group of militants from taking control of a naval air base in Karachi as well as the killing of the unarmed young man by the Rangers has seen a decreased level of public confidence in the security forces.¹⁰² The Rangers are a paramilitary organisation acting under the authority of the Ministry of Interior (MOI), whereby armed forces are responsible for external security and at times the army is also handling domestic security responsibilities.¹⁰³ This situation has also resulted in wide criticism over a poor human rights record and the government's failure to control the police and the army which appear to be acting with impunity. Zohra Yusuf, the Head of the independent Human Rights Commission of Pakistan stated that this is an indication of the law enforcement agencies becoming 'trigger happy' and because of the impunity enjoyed by such personnel this has

¹⁰² Hindustantimes.com, Pakistan charges six Rangers over killing of civilian, 2011, available from: <http://www.hindustantimes.com/rssfeed/Pakistan/Pakistan-charges-six-Rangers-over-killing-of-civilian/Article1-715178.aspx>

¹⁰³ US Department of State, 2009 Human Rights Report: Pakistan, 2009, available from: <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2009/sca/136092.htm>

only added to the growth of such instances across the country.¹⁰⁴ In footage shot by a cameraman from Awaz television a young man, Sarfaraz Shah, 19, was attacked by a group of Rangers near Benazir Bhutto park in Karachi, and as he plead for mercy, one of the rangers shot him twice, and he fell to the ground screaming in pain. According to a senior police official, the Rangers saw the incident as tackling an armed criminal, and the news of this innocent death was televised and shown on the front pages of all newspapers in Pakistan. A few days earlier a prominent journalist was tortured to death after having reported that a PNS Mehran air base attack was conducted by al-Qaeda. But these are not the only incidents. Last year teenage brothers were beaten to death and later strung up on a metal pole during the day whilst police overlooked this incident. Following the Ranger incident, the Daily Times wrote in its editorial that military, paramilitary forces, police and intelligence agencies which violate human rights should be held accountable for their actions.”The security and law enforcement forces that do not respect the law themselves are inviting anarchy, which arguably is already underway.”¹⁰⁵ However, this time the government took notice of the incident and Prime Minister Gilani announced an inquiry into solving this case, but the general public has very little faith in the government institutions and a retired soldier Mohammad Sultan said that “what we saw on television shows that now there is the law of the jungle in this country and no one is accountable for his action or deeds. This is pathetic.”¹⁰⁶

However, the government kept its word and Sultan Khawaja, a senior police officer in Karachi, was appointed by the Supreme Court of Pakistan to investigate the case. According to his report, the Rangers murdered the young man and thus ought to be given the maximum punishment. Furthermore, Khawaja called the incident an act of terrorism which had an effect on the whole nation. As a result, in a positive development for Pakistani democracy, an Anti-Terrorism Court (ATC) on 12th August 2011 led by a judge Bashir Khoso sentenced Shahid Zafar, one of the Rangers, to death for shooting and killing the unarmed man, whilst the five other Rangers were sentenced for life. Justice Rashid A. Rizvi, a former President of the High Court Bar Association and prominent figure in Pakistani legal circles was satisfied with the court’s decision to impose capital punishment on the main perpetrator and life imprisonment

¹⁰⁴ HRCP.web.org, HRCP condemns murder of young man by Rangers, 2011, available from: <http://www.hrcp-web.org/showprel.asp?id=217>

¹⁰⁵ M. Georgy, Shooting video another blow to Pakistan’s security forces, 2011, available from: <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/10/us-pakistan-killing-video-idUSTRE75923220110610>

¹⁰⁶ loc. cit.

for five others rangers who watched and exhorted Zafar kill the youngster. Rizvi continued that the court had to set this incident as an example to prevent others in the future. Iqbal Haider, Co-Chairman of the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan also commended the court's decision, as the Rangers' duty is to protect citizens, not to kill them on false grounds causing increased insecurity among the general public. According to Haider, the strict court's verdict will hopefully discourage such incidents and compel security forces to abide by the law whilst maintaining the peace.¹⁰⁷ Therefore, in this rare action against Pakistan's powerful security establishment, the judicial system prevailed, and proved to be acting for justice of innocent people. Though hailed as a big achievement in a road to better democracy, it is uncertain whether these Rangers will actually serve their full sentences, when the general public forgets the incident. Perpetrators of crimes, even for acts of terrorism, often are pardoned and go scot-free in Pakistan.

In many instances, court cases even drag on for many years, and in this time general public loses interest. Generally, the civil, criminal, and family court systems in Pakistan provide for a public trial with a presumption of innocence coupled with cross-examination by an attorney, and an appeal of sentences. Pakistan does not have jury trials, but defendants have the right to an attorney and bear the cost of attorney in lower courts, but in session and appellate courts attorneys are provided at public expense. Cases generally take years with frequent court appearances by the defendant because of a limited number of judges, immense build-up of cases, prolonged court procedures, frequent adjournment, and political pressure with case starting over with the change of an attorney.¹⁰⁸ Having visited the civil court in Karachi whilst accompanying a friend in her court case, the court rooms are divided among many floors, tiny rooms next to each other with the judge and the note taker, and each hearing generally takes less than 30 minutes to make room for the next hearing. The judge or the witnesses do not even appear every time, and the case gets dragged on, and in 4 months author's friend went to circa 10 hearings with hardly any progress.¹⁰⁹ However, there are special streamlined courts for people charged with violent crimes, terrorist activities, crimes against the state and acts or speech to create religious hatred charged under the Anti-terrorism

¹⁰⁷J. Mahmood, Ranger gets death sentence; other 5 get life for murder, 2011, available from: http://centralasiaonline.com/cocoon/caii/xhtml/en_GB/pakistan-features/caii/features/pakistan/main/2011/08/12/feature-01

¹⁰⁸ US Department of State, op.cit.

¹⁰⁹ Author's personal experiences from September-October 2011

Act, and such cases need to reach a verdict within seven working days, though judges are allowed to extend the time period. This expedited system has been criticised by human rights groups, as it is prone to political manipulation. Another inconsistency with the judicial system is that courts often failed to secure the rights of religious minorities, and judges were pressurised to act strongly against any offence to Sunni beliefs. Furthermore, the courts hardly ever dealt with discrimination cases involving religious minorities, and blasphemy laws are still used against Christians, Ahmadi community, and members of other religious groups, counting Muslims. Most strikingly, the lower courts regularly do not even require sufficient evidence in blasphemy cases, which resulted in few accused and convicted people to spend many years in jail before higher courts ultimately repealed their convictions or set them free. Courts frequently denied bail in blasphemy cases, on the basis of defendants facing death penalty, they were assumed to flee. In addition, the lower courts often delayed their decisions on such cases, and encountered intimidation and thus refused bail for fear of reprisal from extremist groups.¹¹⁰ Therefore, despite the positive development with the Rangers' sentence, there are still many inconsistencies in the Pakistani judicial system, but the overall trend is toward a more positive direction.

¹¹⁰ US Department of State, *op.cit.*

3.1.2. Corruption

Second important issue constituting liberal democracy is good governance i.e. an absence of corruption which is not the reality in Pakistan. Corruption is widely spread in every level of society, and since 1995, when Pakistan was included in the Corruption Perception Index (CPI), it has been among the most corrupted countries and scored 2.4 out of 10 in 2007, with 1 being the most corrupted country and 10 being the least corrupted country.¹¹¹ According to World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report 2007-08, corruption was the third biggest issue for any company practicing business in Pakistan, only after government bureaucracy and poor infrastructure. Similarly, Global Corruption Barometer 2007 lists Pakistan among the top countries in terms of petty bribery whereby over 44% of the respondents said to have paid a bribe for obtaining a service, and 52% thought government efforts to tackle corruption were ineffective and 59% were on the opinion that corruption would only increase in the next three years. Interestingly, according to National Corruption Perception Survey (NCPS), every first phase of government (i.e. Bhutto, Sharif and Musharraf) was seen as less corrupt than the second time the person held power.¹¹² According to 2006 survey, the three most corrupted institutions in Pakistan are police with 64%, power sector 11% and judiciary 9%, and it was seen that the reasons for corruption were lack of accountability, poor salaries and discretionary powers. It is remarkable that according to 2002 survey 100% of the respondents had confronted corruption among the police, and 44% of the respondents had to pay a bribe to get access to electricity. In dealing with government institutions, respondents also had to pay a bribe, and the rate of petty bribery is worrisome and has not decreased over the years.¹¹³

Even in court cases judges are bribed, and lawyers bribe the police to speed up their cases. In July 2011 the author witnessed a bribing when a lawyer encouraged the defendant's friends to give money to the police in order to smooth the police case against the defendant, which did help in dropping some charges and ease the court case. Like the various reports state, corruption among the police remains rampant, whereby low salaries and poor working conditions especially for low-level officials contributed to the problem. According to the US

¹¹¹ M. Chene, Overview of corruption in Pakistan, 2008, available from: <http://www.u4.no/helpdesk/helpdesk/query.cfm?id=174>

¹¹² loc. cit.

¹¹³ op.cit., p. 4

Human Rights Report of 2009 police charged fees to register genuine complaints and took bribes for registering false complaints as well as for avoiding charges. Furthermore, some people pay the police to disgrace their opponents and to retaliate on personal grievances.¹¹⁴ It is evident from the surveys and personal experience that also the government offices are extremely corrupt and generally do not work without such service fees or work with extreme slowness resulting in immense inefficiency and even year long delays. Another example of rampant corruption in the public services is the gas and electricity suppliers, which also ranked high in the surveys. One generally has to pay some extra money to get electricity or gas bills sorted out and when electricity is literally cut with scissors one has to go to the office again to pay for extra services to get electricity back on.¹¹⁵

In the business world, most of the companies from a small corner shop to a multinational firm have to pay some charges for the government offices or political parties, for example textile mills and small shops residing in restless Landhi area in Karachi pay money to Awami National Party (ANP) for their protection, whereby in adjacent Korangi area businesses pay money to MQM.¹¹⁶ This money is paid in form of forceful donations, whereby political party officers haphazardly evaluate the value of the business and issue them donation slips accordingly. This vicious circle of forced donations keeps the political parties alive, and businesses aligned with them. The ruling party PPP, which used to fight against corruption under Bhutto, is guilty of the same practices, and the former party leader, the current President Asif Zardari, is known for asking for money from businesses. Some businesses went bankrupt, or their CEOs fled to abroad, as he has asked in some cases for over 15 karole rupees, which is nearly 13 million Euros.¹¹⁷ As a former business man himself, Zardari is argued to be conducting such dirty business, because whilst he suffered for a few years in prison, his fellow businessmen did not support him, and now in power he is taking revenge at his former colleagues at the price of growth of the many enterprising local businesses, ultimately having a negative impact on the overall economy. Ultimately, the many forms of corruption are continuing to be rampant in Pakistan with financial, political corruption, nepotism and misuse of power and thus it can be said that good governance does not prevail in Pakistan.

¹¹⁴ US Department of State, op.cit.

¹¹⁵ Author's personal experiences from July 2010

¹¹⁶ Author's personal experiences from July 2011

¹¹⁷ loc. cit.

3.1.3 Freedom of opinion

Third important factor constituting a liberal democracy is press freedom, which drastically improved in Pakistan during the course of the 1990s and early 2000s, but despite the improvements, Pakistan still ranks 151st out of 178 countries in Reporters Without Borders press freedom index.¹¹⁸ In Pakistan there are laws that provide for freedom of speech and of the press, and citizens by and large are free to talk about public issues, though the government frequently impedes criticism through the monitoring of political activity and extending control to the media. Numerous independent English and Urdu daily and weekly newspapers and magazines exist with the Ministry of Information controlling and managing the Pakistan's primary wire service, the Associated Press of Pakistan, which is the official carrier of government and international news to the local media. The military has its own media wing, Inter Services Public Relations (ISPR) in addition to two sections to oversee the media. It is important to point out that there were no newspapers in the FATA, and in Azad Kashmir the owners of newspapers and periodicals had to get permission from the Kashmir Council and Ministry of Kashmir Affairs to publish them, whereby such bodies were not likely to permit publications sympathetic to an independent Kashmir.¹¹⁹ Foreign magazines and newspapers are freely available, and many foreign correspondents operate freely within the country, although some of them have issues in getting visas as journalists. In terms of radio, the government owns and controls Pakistan Television and Pakistan Broadcasting Corporation, which runs radio stations across the country reflecting government views in news coverage. However, private radio stations exist in major cities, but their licences do not include news, though some channels discuss news in talk shows but still being careful to avoid domestic political discussions. Again the Pakistan Electronic Media Regulatory Authority ordinance did not extend to the FATA or NWFP, though with permission of FATA secretariat, independent radio stations can broadcast in FATA, and such restrictions have led to circa 150 illegal radio stations operated by militants and religious groups. As for the internet, the government does not reportedly limit public access, but it has tried to control some extremist and pro-Baloch independence web sites. According to the International Telecommunication Union there were more than 18.5 million Internet users in Pakistan as of June 2009, and service was extended to almost all of the urban and semi-urban areas. In

¹¹⁸ Reporters Without Borders in Dawn.com, Web journalist Faisal Qureshi murdered in Lahore, 2011, available from: <http://www.dawn.com/2011/10/08/web-journalist-faisal-qureshi-murdered-in-lahore.htm>

¹¹⁹ US Department of State, op.cit.

November 2008 President Zardari issued the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Ordinance, stating that cyber terrorism leading to a death can be punished by a death penalty or life time imprisonment.

Newspapers (including the web papers) often criticise the government, political leaders, and military operations, though media outlets that did not practise self-censorship were sometimes targets of retribution. Furthermore, many journalists and their families were arrested, beaten, intimidated, abducted by militants, criminals, political parties and security forces and even killed resulting in the practice of self-censorship. In the past year there have been many instances of press freedom being violated: the first one being an incident in August 2010 with GEOTV and the second one being the deaths of 16 journalists since the beginning of 2010.¹²⁰ In August 2010 GEOTV covered President Zardari's visit to the UK where someone threw a shoe at him which was reminiscent of a similar occasion with George W. Bush. When GEOTV showed a video clip of the event, which enraged PPP supporters who gathered at the GEO TV premises and protested against their leader being portrayed in a negative light,¹²¹ which is clearly against press freedom, GEOTV had to subsequently take out this footage. Coincidentally that day the author was leaving work early, and was wondering why there was no public transport around. The author started walking along I. I Chundigargh Road toward the GEOTV building, and was stuck in the middle of angry-looking PPP protestors with bats and gunned police men, military and Pakistan Rangers protecting the security of the supporters and the general public.¹²²

The second instance of violation of press freedom is the deaths of many journalists in Pakistan, for example Saleem Shahzad on 31st May 2011 in Islamabad killed due to his coverage of relations between rogue navy officials and al-Qaeda. Most recent case is from 7th October 2011, when Faisal Qureshi, writer for online publication London Post, was killed in Lahore.¹²³ According to his brother Shahid Qureshi, he and his brother had gotten death threats from supporters of MQM, and he was allegedly killed due to the articles London Post had published on MQM leader Altaf Hussain or over Sharif and Zardari gaining over

¹²⁰ loc. cit.

¹²¹ GEOTV, 2010, available from: www.geo.tv/8-8-2010/69653.htm

¹²² Author's personal experiences from August 2010

¹²³ Dawn.com, Web journalist Faisal Qureshi murdered in Lahore, op.cit.

\$8billion overseas wealth by stealing US foreign aid. According to the Asia programme co-ordinator for Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ), Bob Dietz “CPJ is concerned by the emerging details of this case, which is being watched closely by the international community. Given the circumstances, we call for the appointment of an independent committee to investigate this murder,” “Pakistan has a record of impunity which they must overcome.”¹²⁴ Due to such instances, Pakistan currently ranks 10th on CPJ’s global Impunity Index, which highlights countries where journalists are often killed and where authorities are not able to solve these crimes. If the reason for Qureshi’s death is confirmed as him being journalist, he is the fourth journalist in 2011 to have died due to a targeted killing.¹²⁵

In a response to this instance, Prime Minister Gilani stated on 16th October 2011 in a press conference at Lahore press club that: “I have already announced the establishment of endowment fund of 2 million rupees for the welfare of journalists and the families of journalists who lost their lives in the line of duty. It is our top priority to resolve the problems of journalists.”¹²⁶ Gilani also said that journalists play an important role in the restoration of democracy and that their sacrifices for the freedom of expression have opened the way for rejuvenation of democracy in Pakistan. According to Gilani, the PPP government had given such freedom of press that had not been extended by any past government and continued that the government had cancelled all ‘black laws’ imposed to limit media freedom and had restored Press Council to counter press linked problems and finally announced a grant of Rs 10 million for the Lahore Press Club consisting of 1200 journalists.¹²⁷ However, it is questionable in the light of the GEOTV protests and the killing of many journalists that the government will actually adhere to their commitment on press freedom, and only time will tell whether Gilani’s words hold truth.

¹²⁴ CPJ, Pakistani journalist killed in Lahore, 2011, available from: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4e9c1fb1ce.html>

¹²⁵ loc. cit.

¹²⁶ M. Hassan, Govt believes in freedom of media: Gilani, 2011, available from: <http://www.thenewstribune.com/2011/10/16/govt-believes-on-freedom-of-media-gilani/>

¹²⁷ Pak Tribune, Power aspirants should wait till next elections: PM Gilani, 2011, available from: <http://paktribune.com/news/Power-aspirants-should-wait-till-next-elections-PM-Gilani-244409.html>

3.1.4 Human rights

Pakistan's 62 year old history is filled with human rights violations. Although Zardari's civilian government has taken some positive steps, the overall human rights situation is still poor. Major issues include extrajudicial killings, torture, and disappearances as well as prolonged trials and failures to prosecute culprits for abuses coupled with poor prison conditions, arbitrary arrest, and extended pre-trial detention, which have led to a culture of impunity. Furthermore, rape, domestic violence, sexual harassment, and abuse against women in addition to honour crimes and discriminatory legislation has had impacts on women's and religious minorities' rights. In addition, widespread trafficking in people, child labour, child abuse, commercial sexual exploitation of children, discrimination against people with disabilities, and lack of respect for workers' rights have remained huge issues. It is important to note that the violations have only increased in the last 10 years with the fight against terrorism, whereby thousands of civilians have been killed in terror and counter-terror attacks.

Some of the grossest violations occur in FATA which is situated between Afghanistan and Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, covering circa 27,000 sq km with a population of 3.5 million, of which more than 60% live below the poverty line with incomes of \$1 or less. Due to its location in-between two poorly administered countries with weak border controls, it offers a perfect place for criminal activity, including cross border terrorism. The US often accuses Pakistan of providing a safe haven for terrorists, specifically in this region. However, since 2004 the CIA has fought a covert anti-terror war in the region through drone attacks coupled with 3,000 Afghan and 100,000 Pakistani military staff.¹²⁸ According to the Bureau of Investigative Journalism (TBIJ) up to 2,292 people out of whom 775 civilians including 168 children had been killed in drone attacks, which have only increased under Barack Obama. Currently they are occurring every four days in an effort to counter the Haqqani network based in North Waziristan launching cross-border attacks on US forces in Afghanistan.¹²⁹ Sam Zarifi, Asia-Pacific Director of Amnesty International, states that "the Obama administration must explain the legal basis for drone strikes in Pakistan to avoid the

¹²⁸ K. Aziz, FATA reforms and militancy, 2010, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/78371/fata-reforms-and-militancy/>

¹²⁹ R. Crilly, 168 children killed in drone strikes in Pakistan since the start of the campaign, 2011, available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/8695679/168-children-killed-in-drone-strikes-in-Pakistan-since-start-of-campaign.html>

perception that it acts with impunity. The Pakistan government must also ensure accountability for indiscriminate killing, in violation of international law that occurs inside Pakistan".¹³⁰ First these drone attacks (unmanned aerial vehicles) targeted Taliban and al-Qaeda top leadership, but Obama broadened the attacks to include militants who are trying to destabilise the Pakistani government. According to Daniel Byman from Brookings Institution, drone attacks may kill around 10 civilians for every militant killed,¹³¹ whilst New America Foundation states that 20 per cent of the killed were civilians,¹³² whereby according to the CIA 600 militants have been killed since May 2010 without incurring any civilian casualties.¹³³ In March 2010 US State Department legal advisor Harold Koh argued that the drone attacks were legal under the right of self-defence, as the US is waging an armed conflict against al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and their affiliates and thus the use force is consistent with the right of self-defence under international law.¹³⁴

However, Pakistan has time after time condemned these attacks as an infringement of their sovereignty, especially after civilian deaths, including women and children have occurred angering Pakistani government and people. A spokesman for the Pakistani army, Major Murad Khan, said "border violations by US-led forces in Afghanistan, which have killed scores of Pakistani civilians, would no longer be tolerated, and we have informed them that we reserve the right to self defence and that we will retaliate if the US continues cross-border attacks."¹³⁵ However, Washington Post reported in 2008 about a secret deal between Pakistan and the US on drones.¹³⁶ At the same time the US officials have denied the August 2011 report of Bureau of Investigative Journalism saying the number of over 700 civilians killed is too high, and claim that since 2010 600 militants have been killed and allegedly no civilians. In addition to

¹³⁰ S. Zafiri in Crilly, op. cit.

¹³¹ D. Byman, Do targeted killings work?, 2009, available from:

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2009/0714_targeted_killings_byman.aspx

¹³² Nation.com.pk, US drone strikes fails to mobilise Pakistan masses, 2011, available from:

<http://nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Regional/Islamabad/31-Oct-2011/US-drone-strikes-fail-to-mobilise-Pakistan-masses>

¹³³ S. Shane, CIA is disputed in civilian toll in drone strikes, 2011, available from:

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/12/world/asia/12drones.html?_r=2&hp

¹³⁴ H. Koh in Global Research, 'At war' US justifies drone attacks in Pak as act of 'self-defence', 2010, available from: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=18375>

¹³⁵ Press TV, Pakistan threatens to retaliate against US, 2008, available from:

<http://www.infowars.com/pakistan-threatens-to-retaliate-against-us/>

¹³⁶ A. Akhtar, DPC seeks details on 'secret deal' on drone attacks, 2011, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=76279&Cat=7>

doubting the numbers the US officials doubted one of the report's sources, Mirza Shahzad Akbar, a Pakistani lawyer who is pursuing a lawsuit against CIA on behalf of civilians who have lost their loved ones in drone attacks. "One of the loudest voices claiming all these civilian casualties is a Pakistani lawyer who's pushing a lawsuit to stop operations against some of the most dangerous terrorists on the planet." His publicity is designed to put targets on the backs of Americans serving in Pakistan and Afghanistan. His agenda is crystal clear.", whereby the US official was referring to his alleged links with the Pakistani intelligence.¹³⁷

When looking at the drone attacks from his perspective, Mirza Shahzad Akbar is in charge of legal proceedings on behalf of over 25 families whose relatives were killed by drones, and he began his case against CIA after Kareem Khan, a Pakistani journalist, started a campaign for justice after the deaths of his son and brother in Mirali in December 2009. Akbar thinks that the recent TBIJ's study supports these people in getting their voices heard. According to Akbar "the drone reports so far have been made from listening to intelligence agencies chatter in Peshawar and Islamabad, which is ironic as it's only the victor's history", whereby civilian losses are overlooked. "TBIJ's work is important in this regard and I believe it will strengthen our stance that there is a larger number of civilian deaths than reported and we need to independently investigate. Once we settle this basic question, then we can move on to redressing the harm done to victim families."¹³⁸ Akbar points out that his first client, Kareem Khan, could have joined the Taliban fight against the US, but rather surprisingly he relied on the legal system, and thus Akbar initiated the legal case against CIA and the US Secretary of Defence in November 2010 for the deaths of Kareem Khan's family, and since then over 35 Pakistani families have joined the legal proceedings. Since this case Mr Akbar has been denied a US visa to speak about his case to legal community at Columbia University,¹³⁹ and when the author met him in his small office in Islamabad in December 2010 right after he filed his case, he said to have received death threats, and was afraid for his life, but wanted to pursue the case for the innocent lives lost in the drone attacks.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁷Express Tribune, US officials slam report on Pakistan drone war dead, 2011, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/230583/us-officials-slam-report-on-pakistan-drone-war-dead/>

¹³⁸ J. Rugman, Study reveals 168 child deaths in Pakistan drone war, 2011, available from: <http://www.channel4.com/news/study-reveals-168-child-deaths-in-pakistan-drone-war>

¹³⁹ M.S. Akbar, Pakistan's civilian victims of drone strikes deserve justice, 2011, available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/jun/29/cia-drone-strike-civilian-victims>

¹⁴⁰ Personal encounter with Mirza Shahzad Akbar in December 2010

Not only drones, but the people in FATA have for over a century suffered from human rights violations under the draconian Frontier Crimes Regulations (FCR), a law that has not been amended since 1901 and which allowed officials to arrest an individual and all members of their tribe and confiscate their business for crimes. Thus, the region to date stayed as a judicial black hole, where terrorists were allowed to reign, and where over one million people are displaced by the ongoing conflict with health, education, and other human development indicators among the lowest in whole Asia.¹⁴¹ However, at the eve of 62nd Independence Day of Pakistan, on 12th August 2011, Pakistani government announced FATA reforms which extended Political Parties Act to FATA allowing political parties the right to campaign freely as well as amendments in FCR bringing it in nearer to modern human rights standards; curtailing the powers of tribal area administrators, disallowing imprisonment of children under 16 and women over 65 years old in addition to giving the residents a right to challenge official decisions in government-appointed tribunals. According to a businessman-turned-politician, Munir Khan Orakzai, a leader of FATA lawmakers in Pakistan's parliament, the acceptance of political parties to campaign in these tribal valleys will attract people to the mainstream and take youth away from guns and violence.¹⁴² The reforms were welcomed by all political parties, but critics were saying they were not enough, and the tribal people should have been consulted over them, and Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf (PTI) was demanding for a complete abolishment of FCR.¹⁴³ These reforms are indeed a positive development, and will contribute to the improvement of human rights in the tribal areas of Pakistan, which have demanded such reforms for many years. Though they had been endorsed by nearly all political parties, civil society organisations and human rights groups, no other government in the past has taken successful actions for such reforms. These reforms can have long-standing effects for the whole country in fulfilling the aspirations of the violated people in bringing in social and political developments in FATA which can decrease the home-grown terrorism better than any drones can do. However, the implementation of these reforms is a difficult task, as the government control needs to be established in FATA, as many regions especially in South and North Waziristan are completely under militant control belong to different

¹⁴¹R. A. Khan, Reforms in FATA, 2009, available from: <http://nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Opinions/Columns/25-Aug-2009/Reforms-in-FATA/1>

¹⁴² A. Siddique, Pakistan's tribal area reforms too little, too late, 2011, available from: http://www.rferl.org/content/pakistan_fata_tribal_reforms/24302628.html

¹⁴³ S.A. Khan, Parties term FATA reforms historic, 2011, available from: <http://nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Politics/15-Aug-2011/Parties-term-Fata-reforms-historic>

factions of TTP, where security forces are attacked, pro-government tribal leaders killed, and suicide bombings still occur.¹⁴⁴

Though FATA suffers from the grossest violations of human rights, other provinces have not been spared from this problem. According to a July 2009 HRCP report, circa 100 political workers were killed in Karachi in 6 months in interparty clashes belonging to the Mohajir Qaumi Movement (MQM-Haqiqi), MQM, PPP, and ANP. According to the same report, 938 persons were killed in Karachi in 6 months in 2009 due to political and ethnic violence, gang wars, targeted killings, police encounters, personal enmity and honour killings in addition to 256 victims of targeted killings in the latter half of the year according to Minister of Interior Rehman Malik. According to him there were around 1,291 missing people in the country, which were linked to terrorism and national security, and human rights groups said that many Sindhi and Baloch nationalists were among them coupled with children disappearing with their relatives.¹⁴⁵ Not only interparty clashes, disappearances, but there were 2,300 cases of torture by police, mostly in Punjab, reported by the NGO SHARP. One must also note that in NWFP and Balochistan torture is frequently underreported and would only increase this number with many torture cases leading to death or serious injuries. According to human rights organisations methods of torture include beating with batons and whips, burning with cigarettes, whipping soles of the feet, prolonged isolation, electric shock, denial of food or sleep, hanging upside down, and forced spreading of the legs with bar fetters- activities which both police and intelligence services engage in. Some policemen committed such acts due to political interests and police and prison officials often used the fear of abuse to extract money from prisoners and their families. In addition, police frequently failed to look after members of religious minorities from societal attacks such as Christians, Ahmadis, and Shias, just like the prosecutors often used blasphemy laws in convicting them on false grounds. Though government has not reportedly refused to register any religious groups, the religious law states that the Ahmadi community, which sees itself as a Muslim sect, to be a non-Muslim minority. Therefore, the law prohibits Ahmadis, around two million followers, from being involved in any Muslim practices like the use of Muslim greetings, naming their places of worship as mosques, reciting Islamic prayers, using specific Islamic terms, and taking part in

¹⁴⁴ R.A. Khan, op.cit.

¹⁴⁵ US Department of State, op.cit.

the Hajj or Ramadan fast in addition to prohibited from altering conviction, gathering or distributing literature. Anyone seeking to be listed as a Muslim must denounce the founder of the Ahmadi faith, required in government forms like passport applications and voter registration documents. Ahmadiyya Foreign Mission states that in 2009 11 Ahmadis were killed because of their faith in addition to nine targeted attacks that led in many serious injuries; and 37 Ahmadis were tried under blasphemy laws coupled with 57 Ahmadis being charged under Ahmadi-specific laws. According to the blasphemy laws there is death sentence or life imprisonment for blasphemy against the Prophet Muhammad and life imprisonment for desecrating the Koran and up to 10 years in prison for insulting the religious beliefs of another person with the intention to offend the religion.¹⁴⁶

Human rights groups are also concerned about criminal groups with ties to militant groups, which engage in extortion and kidnapping activities in Pakistan targeting diplomats, foreign nationals, religious minorities, and NGO workers among others. On 1st February 2009 the head of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) Balochistan office, John Solecki, was kidnapped and his Pakistani driver was killed, with the Balochistan Liberation United Front (BLUF) claiming responsibility for the kidnapping. On 4th April 2009 BLUF militants released Solecki after 61 days of captivity. In the same month Taliban militants announced to have beheaded a Polish engineer Pieter Stanczak, whom they had abducted from the Pind Sultani area in 2008. On 1st June 2009 alleged Taliban militants kidnapped 120 students and six teachers of Cadet College Razmak in North Waziristan Agency, in the Bakakhel area of Frontier Region Bannu, when they had been travelling in vehicle convoy carrying up to 400 people including students, teachers, and their relatives, and some of them were at first freed by the army and then the rest were released on 4th July 2009. On 21st August 2009 French tourist, Anthenio Sarsaperla, who had been kidnapped in the Dalbandian area of Balochistan was released. On 10th September 2009 masked gunmen abducted Thanasis Lerounis, a Greek volunteer for a humanitarian organisation in northwestern Pakistan and he was held captive until the end of the year in southeastern Afghanistan in Nuristan Province. As ransom, the release of several comrades from a Pakistani jail, \$2 million, and his conversion to Islam was demanded by the perpetrators.¹⁴⁷ These are only some instances of kidnappings which happened during 2009, and such kidnappings frequently happen especially in Balochistan region. The author once accidentally

¹⁴⁶ loc. cit.

¹⁴⁷ loc. cit.

interacted with people linked with the independent Baloch movement, which frequently conduct kidnappings, in a private party which ended in a shoot out and in Taleh Bugti and five other people being killed.¹⁴⁸ Taleh Bugti was the grandson of Nawab Aktar Bugti who was a leader of Baloch independence movement and Balochistan Liberation Army (BLA), which conducts killings and kidnappings to further their cause, and their leader Akbar Bugti was killed in air raid on 26th August 2006,¹⁴⁹ for which President Musharraf is accused of.¹⁵⁰

This independence struggle in Balochistan remains a point of contention between Baloch authorities and the government, and is ripe with human rights violations from the both sides. According to some estimates, Pakistani attacks on Balochistan have led to 3,000 people killed and up to 200,000 displaced among the course of the conflict in addition to the kidnapping and torture of Baloch human rights activists. In 2009 Pakistani government admitted that over 1,100 Baloch people were taken by the security forces and then disappeared. Despite the democratic transition in 2008 these human rights violations still continue. Encountering domestic and international criticism, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Syed Raza Gilani, made a public apology on the persecution of the Baloch people and promised to stop the military assaults in Balochistan in May 2008: “it has been decided that no army action will be carried out in the province (of Balochistan) until a strategy is formulated in consultation with representatives of the provincial government to deal with the issue of law and order in the province.” However, despite the grand pledges the attacks have continued and been aided by military equipment from UK and the US in the form of small arms, artillery, helicopter components, military communications equipment and F-16 attack aircraft, which have been used to indiscriminately bomb Balochistan leading to civilian and livestock being killed in order to intimidate the population by using starvation among other means. Not only random bombing, Baloch nationalists suffer from disappearances, torture by Pakistan’s police, military and intelligence forces according to Amnesty International. In addition, many of the nationalists like Akbar Bugti have been assassinated. In fact, 26 of his colleagues were killed in 2006 by the Pakistani army, and in November 2008 another leading nationalist leader Balach Marri was killed in addition to April 2009 founding of Ghulam Mohammad’s body,

¹⁴⁸ A. Jung, Akbar Bugti’s grandson among six killed in Karachi firing incident, 2011, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/196639/defence-shooting-four-dead-seven-injured-in-shooting-incident/>

¹⁴⁹ A. Basit, Nawab Akbar Shahbaz Khan Bugti, 2011, available from: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/6543897/Akbar-Bugti>

¹⁵⁰ Express Tribune, Akbar Bugti case: Investigation team demands red warrant against Musharraf, 2011, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/204547/akbar-bugti-case-investigation-team-demands-red-arrest-warrant-against-musharraf/>

Chair of the Baloch National Movement (BMN), decomposed in toxic chemicals. The aim of these assassinations is to get rid of Baloch nationalist leadership and terrorise its people, and to make matters worse, Pakistani government does not allow international aid agencies to give humanitarian assistance in most of Balochistan and restricts media access in an attempt to cover up its human rights violations. The saddest thing about Balochistan is that it accounts for around 43% of Pakistan's territory, and is rich in natural resources like oil, gas, coal, silver, copper, gold and cobalt, but yet the region is the poorest in Pakistan. According to the 2009 Asian Human Rights Commission's report "88% of the population of Balochistan is under the poverty line. Balochistan has the lowest literacy rate, the lowest school enrolment ratio, educational attainment index and health index compared to the other provinces. 78% of the population has no access to electricity and 79% has no access to natural gas."¹⁵¹ Due to living in such conditions and suffering from discrimination and suppression from the Pakistani government, it is not surprising that Baloch nationalists keep on struggling for their cause, though their side also commits killings and kidnappings, and thus the vicious cycle of killings in both sides continue. One of the absurd paradoxes in the Balochistan region is that the Pakistani government has even turned a blind eye to the strengthening of the Taliban in the region, as they support the government cause of getting rid of Baloch nationalists, but this in fact deteriorates the overall security situation in Pakistan when Taliban grows stronger in wide and resource rich Balochistan and conducts attacks in Afghanistan and in other parts of Pakistan.¹⁵² Until a long-term strategy for Baloch autonomy is made by the Pakistani government and the extra judicial killing halted, this vicious cycle which deteriorates national security and leads to gross human rights violations will not end. Due to domestic political power plays, the future of the human rights situation in Balochistan seems bleak. However, after the historic FATA reforms and expected improvement of the human rights situation in FATA, one can only hope that the government will make some headway also in Balochistan and also imposing some restrictions on extra judicial killings by the army and the security forces.

¹⁵¹ P. Tatchell, Pakistan's neo-colonial rule in Pakistan, 2011, available from: <http://www.nakedpunch.com/articles/129>

¹⁵² loc. cit.

3.2. 2008 elections

After understanding what democracy is, and how democracies work and after looking at the recent developments in Pakistan, the thesis will look at the main political actors to understand what their notion of democracy is and how does one of the most important aspects of democracy, that is, elections, functions in Pakistan in order to examine whether democracy works in Pakistan. This section will first sum up the manifestos of the main political parties in order to understand their definition of democracy and their values and promises to the public, and secondly it will examine the media debate about the elections, and thirdly look at the outcome of the elections and finally the current difficulties with PPP-led coalition government.

According to its 2008 manifesto The Pakistan Peoples' Party (PPP) is the only federal and democratic party providing equal opportunities for all. Its founding principles are based in Islam as a religion promoting tolerance and treating people from different religions with respect; and commitment to democracy, freedom and fundamental rights as well as social democracy offering equal opportunities for everyone and bridging the gap between the rich and the poor. PPP manifesto states that it is the voice of the poor and it wants to bring about a social market economy in order to meet the basic demands of education, health, water supply and sanitation as well as full employment. PPP is known for its commitment to 'Roti, Kapra Aur Makaan' that is food, clothing and shelter for every poor person in Pakistan through full employment and it claims to be the only party with a coherent vision about creating a welfare state in Pakistan. The outlying principle of PPP is 'all power to the people', and in their manifesto they promise lower inflation, full employment, riddance of terrorism, quality education, health care, making Pakistan a business friendly country, protection of the rights of poor and disadvantaged, women empowerment, elimination of energy shortages, strong defence, better provincial autonomy, protection of environment and good governance. PPP claimed that under their governance Pakistan was perceived as one of the emerging markets in the world, but after Benazir Bhutto's reign since 1996, Pakistan has been characterised with the spread of terrorism and extremism and thus PPP was needed back in power.¹⁵³

¹⁵³PPP.org, PPP Manifesto 2008: towards peace and prosperity in Pakistan, 2008, available from: <http://www.ppp.org.pk/manifestos/2008.pdf>

According to its manifesto Muttahida Qaumi Movement (MQM) is the only political party of Pakistan which represents working, middle classes and the poor people in Pakistan, and it is against the feudal system which is hampering democracy and equal rights which MQM aims for. Its main goals are eradication of political authoritarianism, abolition of feudal system, promotion of cultural pluralism, devolution of power and maximum provincial autonomy, thereby offering empowerment for all.¹⁵⁴ In its 17 point manifesto they address provincial autonomy, education, health, agrarian reforms, poverty alleviation and unemployment, urban development, industries and labour, financial and fiscal measures, good governance, women, children and religious minorities, human rights, media and freedom of expression, judiciary, environment, culture and sports, family welfare and foreign affairs but interestingly democracy is not explicitly a separate point, but addressed throughout the manifesto and understood as free, fair elections, independent judiciary, freedom of expression and democratic rights for everyone irrespective of colour, creed, language, ethnicity, gender, belief and religion, as their vision is for establishing a truly democratic, progressive and egalitarian society in Pakistan.¹⁵⁵

The Pakistan Muslim League (Nawaz) (PML-N) manifesto starts with a historical background in stating that no elected government has ever fully completed its term in office, and frequent military interventions have characterised the political landscape harming the integrity and solidarity of the country. As a result, Pakistan has been unable to maintain neither political stability, sustained economic growth nor a unified national solidarity. According to PML-N “the 1973 constitution, which has the consensus of all the federating units, has been amended by the autocratic rulers beyond recognition. What we see today is continuing military rule, with a façade of democracy.”¹⁵⁶ The party understands democracy as having a sovereign parliament, an independent judiciary and a free and fair electoral process, and say that during Musharraf’s 8 years in office all of them were violated. Due to the non-adherence to the political agenda set by the Musharraf or previous governments, Pakistani people were losing faith in the political manifestos of the majority of the parties and are disillusioned by the implementation of political manifestos. PML-N claims that if their rule

¹⁵⁴MQM.org, Manifesto, 2008, available from: <http://www.mqm.org/>

¹⁵⁵ loc. cit.

¹⁵⁶ GEOTV, PML-N manifesto, 2008, available from: http://www.geo.tv/election2008/manifestos_pml_N2008.html

was not interrupted in 1999 the things would be different, as during their rule in 1997-1999 many of the points in their previous manifesto were implemented. In their 22 point manifesto from 2008 the revival of democracy, good governance, independent judiciary and the rule of law, civil military reforms, corruption and accountability, tolerant and pluralistic society, extremism and terrorism, education, health, science and technology, poverty reduction, employment, inflation control, rural and agricultural development, industrial development, women, youth, labour, minorities, national security and foreign policy are addressed. The PML-N pledged to seek national reconciliation, national dialogue, and national consensus on the future of Pakistan, and promised to seek broad based consultation and participation of all sectors of society in making its vision of democratic institutions a reality along with the rule of law and prosperity for all, regardless of gender, religion, region, or language, which was their 'Pledge with the Nation'.¹⁵⁷

The Pakistan Muslim League (Q) (PML-Q) manifesto is in stark contrast with other parties' manifestos, because as a ruling party at the time of 2008 elections it tried to portray the positive things they have accomplished under their rule. As the inheritor of Muslim League and the legacy of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the key for their vision is to respect its founding fathers' legacy and thus the commitment to Islam and thus they first and foremost stand for Islamic values: live and let live; decency, tolerance and harmony; ensuring justice and freedom of expression; family values; dignity of the common citizen; protection and promotion of the rights of the female population and providing freedom from fear and oppression; opposing hypocrisy and double standards; protection of the rights of minorities; promoting human rights and respect for the rule of law; stating 'Kalima-e-Haq' (truth). Their 5 point manifesto is based on democracy, development, devolution, diversity and defence, and it contains the most extensive views on foreign policy among the political parties and states very clearly its standing on Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, Palestine among others. Before addressing their views on democracy, PML-Q manifesto quotes the founder Jinnah from April 1943: "I am sure that democracy is in our blood. It is in our marrows. Only centuries of adverse circumstances have made the circulation of the blood cold. But the blood is circulating again, thanks to the Muslim League's efforts."¹⁵⁸ Manifesto goes on to say that Pakistan is a product of the democratic process led by Muslim League under the leadership of

¹⁵⁷ loc. cit.

¹⁵⁸ loc. cit.

the Quaid-i-Azam. Thus, democracy is the key to their belief and manifesto states that “we are convinced that the right to vote, without fear or favour, is sacrosanct and there should not be any infringement of this fundamental right.”¹⁵⁹ PML-Q supports parliamentary democracy, fair and free elections, democratic political culture with inner-party democracy where all party members have the right for their own opinion. Furthermore, the President and the Secretary General should hold a maximum of two successive terms in office, and the opposition is deemed as vital for strengthening democracy as the government, and thus PML-Q is in favour of an institutionalised role for opposition so that it should be consulted in all crucial decision making and allocated key committees of parliament. Furthermore, PML-Q believes that a party-based democratic political process in FATA would be the best cure for terrorism and extremism and bring peace and stability in the region. Ultimately, PML-Q promises to promote a culture of reconciliation and reject the culture of revenge, which they deem as one of the key reasons for recurring political instability.¹⁶⁰ They say that despite multiple crises in the past, Pakistani people have been resilient and showed a ‘can do’ attitude which has helped to overcome all odds and PML-Q promises to restore citizens’ faith in national institutions and the fight against sectarianism, extremism and terrorism, the biggest threats to security. Despite these odds PML-Q sees that Pakistan is moving forward supported by an accelerated economic growth, an emerging middle class, independent judiciary and a free media and PML-Q will only strengthen these positive forces for a more democratic future. “As the party that successfully led the struggle for freedom 60 years ago, the Pakistan Muslim League will, Insha-Allah, succeed in building a better and stronger Pakistan with the support of the people. We remain committed to our motto: live and let live. Giving hope to the hopeless, Pakistan Zindabad, Pakistan Muslim League Zindabad” (translated as ‘long live Pakistan, long live the Pakistan Muslim League’).¹⁶¹

Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf (PTI) manifesto starts with their ideology which is in contrast with other parties, which do not spell out their ideologies in their manifestos but merely focus on their promises of a better future. The PTI agenda of resurgence spells out the long neglected wishes of Pakistani people and envisions a modern Islamic republic promoting tolerance, moderation and religious freedom with a future of political stability, social harmony, and

¹⁵⁹ loc. cit.

¹⁶⁰ GEOTV, PML-Q manifesto, 2008, available from:
http://www.geo.tv/election2008/manifestos_pml_Q_2008.html

¹⁶¹ loc. cit.

economic prosperity for all. PTI states that it is more than a political party: it is a broad movement addressing interests of all Pakistani people despite their cultural or ethnic background. One of the main aims of PTI is to provide a credible leadership that is able to re-establish Pakistan's political and economic sovereignty with an active participation from the people. PTI's ideology is based on dignity and self-respect in that without recovering the self-esteem of Pakistani people and their faith in the political institutions it is extremely difficult to tackle the crises Pakistan is facing and thus PTI wants to follow the three key principles as voiced by the nation's founder: "unity, faith and discipline". Their ideology is further based on transparency, federalism, functional autonomy of the provinces according to the fundamental principles of parliamentary democracy as spelled out in the 1973 Constitution. According to PTI this can be done through human development, as people with diverse culture backgrounds can be Pakistan's biggest asset, and simultaneously family values, rights of women and children must be upheld, as family values keep the society together and investments in women and children would guarantee that the family structures are retained. PTI's mission states that "whilst establishing the rule of law and ensuring protection of human rights through an independent and honest judiciary, strive for the social development and economic prosperity of our citizens, especially the poor and underprivileged masses".¹⁶² Therefore, the 12 point manifesto addresses some of the same concerns than the other parties but also puts forward more drastic changes and talks about national sovereignty, democratic and religious rights, government accountability, education revolution, health care, poverty alleviation, equal opportunities for employment, private sector growth, replacement of VIP culture with simple lifestyle, elimination of unchecked power of police and agencies, self-reliance without foreign aid and promotion of regional peace.¹⁶³

When looking at the recent two elections, in 2002 elections PPP got 7.39 million votes and 63 national assembly seats, whilst PML-Q got 7.30 million votes and 78 seats and PML-N got 3.34 million votes and 14 seats, and MQM with 0.92 million votes and 17 seats. A major surprise factor in the elections was Muttahidda Majlis-e-Amal (MMA) success with 3.29 million votes and 54 seats due to the US invasion in Afghanistan, Pashtun grievances, and the unity within the religious parties first time in Pakistan.¹⁶⁴ At the dawn of the 2008 general elections, the newspapers were commenting on elections boycott, party ideologies, feudalism

¹⁶² PTI, The manifesto of PTI, 2011, available from: <http://insaf.pk/AboutUs/Manifesto/tabid/138/Default.aspx>

¹⁶³ loc. cit.

¹⁶⁴ Elections.com, Elections 2008: Benazir Factor May Affect the Results, 2008, available from: <http://elections.com.pk/article/details.php?id=31>

among other topics. Feudalism is an important factor affecting Pakistani politics and society at large and one of the most respected newspapers Dawn wrote that “over the decades, society in Pakistan has undergone many changes but one major component of our body politic has resisted all change: the feudal control of the country’s political institutions... According to the report, the three mainstream national parties- PPP, PML-N, PML-Q -and the Sindh-based Pakistan Muslim League Functional (PML-F) have made no efforts to diversify class representation in parliament and have continued to give party tickets in overwhelming numbers to feudal lords”.¹⁶⁵ The News similarly points out that “in recent years, the gradual disappearance of ideology -except that adhered to by religious parties - from politics in Pakistan has in fact left behind a situation where policies regarding key issues such as privatisation, welfare and taxation no longer figure in electoral campaigns. Instead, the exercise has been reduced largely to tussles between powerful individuals, whose personal standing, influence and wealth decides the outcome of the contest for a particular seat. In other words, elections have become little more than a kind of wrestling contest between such ‘strong men’, and occasionally women, whose success or failure are at best only vaguely related to the programme of their parties”.¹⁶⁶

The manifestos were also discussed in the media and Dawn writes that “like all manifestos, the PML-Q’s programme contains aims and promises that, if fulfilled, can help end poverty, create equality, spread education, give the people a higher standard of living and take Pakistan into the 21st century. However, once in power, the parties tend to ignore their election pledges, and it is the bureaucracy that draws up and implements plans that often conform to the conditionalities imposed by the aid donors”.¹⁶⁷ At the same time The News writes similarly ” it is also true that both the two detailed manifestos released so far, with their carefully planned words and their mottos, have something in them that resembles a charter put out by a group of boy scouts or some similar organisation. There is something a little childish about the focus of the whole effort, particularly since the document, as is the case with the one by the PPP, makes no effort to provide insight into the ideological basis of

¹⁶⁵ Dawn in F. Nawaz, Editors view about elections 2008 in Pakistan, 2009, available from: <http://www.articlesbase.com/self-publishing-articles/editors-view-about-elections-2008-in-pakistan-1168422.html>

¹⁶⁶ The News, Taking the lead, 2007, available from: <http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=83844&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

¹⁶⁷ Dawn.com, The manifesto season, 2007, available from: <http://archives.dawn.com/2007/12/12/ed.htm>

the policies the parties hopes to follow, but reads essentially as a list of promises, or solemn pledges. This also says something about the wider role of manifestos in Pakistan's politics. The fact is that the assertions made in these documents are rarely, if ever, implemented. And the knowledge of this reality is perhaps one of the reasons why parties can afford to allow so many high-sounding words and phrases to dominate them, confident that in a system where checks and balances have increasingly slipped away or been thrust aside, and the powers of people to retain or throw out leaders taken away from them by interventions from the outside, or tampering with the election process itself, they are unlikely to be called on to fulfil the promises made.... Whereas in its manifesto, and in the speeches made at its launch, party leaders of the PML-Q spoke of democracy within and outside the party, the reality is that during its five years in office, the party has done little to build such a culture".¹⁶⁸ The News continues to criticise PML-N manifesto "using the acronym 'restore', the PML-N has joined the sudden flurry of manifesto announcements by political parties, with the stress laid on the return of deposed judges and an end to the military's role in politics. The seven letters in the word 'restore' stand for restoration of the judiciary, democracy and the 1973 constitution; elimination of the military role in politics; security of life and property; tolerance; overall reconciliation; relief for the poor and education and employment. Like the ones announced by the PPP and the PML-Q over the past month, the agenda of the PML-N is quite obviously an impossibly ambitious one".¹⁶⁹

Besides feudalism and ideologies, another widely talked-about- issue in the 2008 elections was boycotting. Thirty-two parties who were opposed to Musharraf joined together in a loose political alliance named All Parties Democratic Movement (APDM), whilst the largest opposition party PPP was not a part of it. Due to Musharraf's statement on elections being held under 2007 Pakistani state of emergency, PML-N, JI and PTI announced to boycott the elections. According to a joint statement by opposition parties elections could not be fair, because under the state of emergency most opposition candidates were jailed and therefore not able to file nomination papers needed for the candidature.¹⁷⁰ The News wrote that "at the

¹⁶⁸ The News, The five D's, 2007, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=85632&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

¹⁶⁹The News, Restoration theme, 2007, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=86597&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

¹⁷⁰ Times of India, Pakistan opposition parties announce boycott of polls, 2007, available from:

http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2007-11-12/pakistan/27965409_1_emergency-rule-transparent-elections-poll-announcement

same time President Musharraf's firm assertion that general elections would go ahead as scheduled, in January 2008, and that 'no one would be allowed to create a hindrance in the transition to democracy' are welcome. They give an indication of the resolve to make a full return to the interrupted process of democracy. Given the examples that exist from the past, political parties would be well advised to participate in the process, rather than staging a boycott. Full participation by groups representing all shades of opinion is in fact the best way to strengthen the system".¹⁷¹ Few days later The News continued that "the one issue on which every party is raising its voice loud and vociferously is the credibility of the regime to hold a genuinely free and fair election. This is the biggest challenge facing President Musharraf and he has already indicated that if the results of the January 8th poll are unacceptable, he may quit the scene. This may be seen as a sign of weakness but his best option as the civilian president of the country would be to honestly and sincerely rise above the political fray, stop patronising some of his past allies, sit down with the main political leaders giving them due respect, create a transparent and fear-free atmosphere and that way he will make the elections non-controversial and more about the issues rather than his own person".¹⁷² The News criticises the politics of boycott and writes that "boycott is much on the lips of politicians as we move towards the election of January 2008, and it is as yet unclear which of the parties, if any at the end of a period of ritualised posturing, will boycott the polls. Boycotts have a very mixed history in terms of success, and any 'boycott' of the electoral process by the parties is likely to inflict greater wounds on themselves than on the institutions and processes they are boycotting. It could be argued that in the present case a boycott of the process would move those so engaged even further from the levers of power than they already are, and do little to revive their parties which are still recovering from years of absentee landlordism".¹⁷³ The Dawn is on similar lines by writing that "the boycott drama, which should have been behind us now, has taken a bizarre turn. Having failed to reach a consensus on the boycott issue in their critical meeting, the APDM participants had glossed over their disagreements by announcing that all component parties were free to go their own way. Not to anyone's surprise, the PML-N decided to enter the electoral fray only to find itself being thrown out of the APDM that Nawaz Sharif had himself founded in... How the participating parties fare in the elections now depends on numerous factors such as their ability to enter into seat-sharing

¹⁷¹ The News, A step into the future, 2007, available from:
<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=83702&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

¹⁷² The News, Pressure cooker, 2007, available from:
<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=84358&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

¹⁷³ The News, Mr. Boycott, 2007, available from:
<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=85292&Cat=8&dt=12/10/2007>

arrangements, and their success in mobilising the voters who have been depoliticised over the years and are, by and large, apathetic and cynical vis-à-vis the game of politics that is being played out in the country”.¹⁷⁴

Despite the election criticism Dawn wrote that “participation by a majority of the mainstream political parties in the election is the right decision, though the PPP and the PML-N have said that they are taking part under protest. As the big two failed to agree on a charter of demands as a prerequisite for their participation, the hope that the polls could be held under a more even-handed dispensation is now all but dashed. It is clear that those who have chosen to stay away have left the field open to their opponents, which may achieve little else besides disappointing their committed voters. The JI is perhaps atoning for its sin of being a party to the 17th Amendment and now refuses to do anything that might be seen as approving Mr Musharraf’s tailor-made system yet again. Mr Imran Khan and the nationalists have no faith left in the current system because they believe the next parliament, like the outgoing one, will remain under the president’s thumb”.¹⁷⁵ Despite the talks of boycott only lawyers continued with it, for which Dawn commented that “Mr Aitzaz Ahsan’s decision to finally withdraw from the election seems to be in keeping with the legal community’s boycott of the January 8 vote. The lawyers’ stand is that those who are taking part in the general election are legitimising the Musharraf government.... The politicians have not shown unanimity on boycott. Maulana Fazlur Rahman’s decision to go for election has divided the MMA, and the boycott camp collapsed when the PML-N virtually defected to the other side. The boycott is now confined to the Jamaat-i-Islami, besides some small parties. The legal community’s principled stand against the President’s March 9 decision and the promulgation of the Provisional Constitution Order (PCO) will go down in history as unprecedented in terms of the sacrifices rendered. However, one often feels uncomfortable about the danger of the legal community getting politicised”.¹⁷⁶

Another development that affected the legal community was covered by The News “it is a fact that hundreds of district judges, additional district judges and civil judges throughout the

¹⁷⁴ Dawn in Nawaz, op. cit.

¹⁷⁵ loc. cit.

¹⁷⁶ loc. cit.

country were transferred with immediate effect by the chief justices of provincial high courts just before the announcement of the election schedule. It is these lower court judges who will become returning officers and are crucial cogs in the electoral process. Appeals against their decisions will go to the high courts and the current Supreme Court, and all of these are now manned by judges who took a fresh oath under the PCO. Thus the entire election edifice has been constructed in such a manner that any unwanted political candidate can be excised from the process at any stage. That is where the system could be rigged as has been amply demonstrated by the rejection of nomination papers of both Nawaz Sharif and Shahbaz Sharif".¹⁷⁷ Besides rigging, the elections suffered from pre-election violence, whereby politicians and political rallies were targeted. At the ANP rally on 9th February 2008 in Charsadda a suicide bomb killed 27 and injured over 50 people,¹⁷⁸ and on 16th February 2008 near PPP candidate Riaz Shah's residence in Parachinar a suicide bomb killed 37 and injured 93 people, whilst in Bajaur a polling location was demolished by the militants.¹⁷⁹

Another intriguing factor about Pakistani politics and elections is pointed out by Dawn "answerability to the people is a basic tenet of democracy. True we are currently living in dictatorial times, but public opinion has been largely inconsequential in Pakistani politics even in times of democracy, engineered or otherwise. Our leaders in recent decades, be it Benazir Bhutto, Nawaz Sharif or Pervez Musharraf, have all looked to foreign shores for validation and subsequent consolidation of power. When out of office and on the wrong end of the power equation, our politicians make a beeline for Washington or London in an attempt to destabilise the incumbents in Islamabad. Their true constituency, it seems, is not the people of Pakistan but the US and its allies in Europe and the Middle East -and of course the General Headquarters (GHQ) in Rawalpindi, in some cases.... The image abroad is clearly more important than opinion at home. When elections can be rigged, losing votes and the confidence of the people is not a primary worry. Ours is a country that has imported two prime ministers, one from the World Bank in Washington and the other from Citigroup in New York. Yet, our leaders talk of 'sovereignty' and waste no opportunity to condemn foreign interference... We have only ourselves to blame for any meddling in our internal

¹⁷⁷ The News, The middle path, 2007, available from:
<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=84749&Cat=8&dt=12/7/2007>

¹⁷⁸ CNN.com, Pakistan blast toll rises to 27, 2008, available from:
<http://edition.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/asiapcf/02/10/pakistan.blast/index.html>

¹⁷⁹ Pakistani Defence Forum, Suicide attack kills 37 as Pakistan vote campaign ends, 2008, available from:
<http://forum.pakistanidefence.com/lofiversion/index.php/t73394.html>

affairs. ‘Advice’ from overseas has been kowtowed to all along, so why should it be surprising that the Saudi envoy can meet Iftikhar Mohammad Chaudhry when former prime ministers of Pakistan and the deposed Chief Justice’s colleagues, friends and admirers cannot? Or that foreign diplomats have been dispensing advice to local politicians in the run-up to elections, or visiting the offices of media outlets banned under the emergency? The Turkish president recently met with leading Pakistani politicians, going so far as to coach them on how to deal with the military. No doubt he has some experience in this matter but purely in the context of Turkey”.¹⁸⁰

One of the most interesting factors in 2008 elections was the rise of Asif Zardari, Sindhi landlord and businessman, who married Benazir Bhutto on 18th December 1987. During her first tenure as a prime minister the couple suffered from internal attacks within PPP and Benazir was ousted on corruption charges, and Zardari was imprisoned in 1990 on charges of kidnapping and extortion until 1993. After that the corruption allegations only increased and he became known as ‘Mr Ten Percent’ meaning that he was taking shares from government contracts during Bhutto’s tenure. Despite the allegations, he was a member of National Assembly in 1990-1993 and attended sessions from prison, and in 1993-1996 under Bhutto’s second tenure he became Minister of the Environment and then Investment simultaneously seeking control of PPP but was criticised within and outside of PPP and came into rivalry with Benazir’s brother Murtaza and this conflict ended when Murtaza was shot in September 1996. Thus, Zardari was arrested for corruption, money laundering and murder and was in prison in 1997-2004 but still elected to senate from the prison. Along with Bhutto he came back to Pakistan in autumn 2007 and was pardoned for his offenses, and after Benazir’s death he named their son Bilawal the Chairman of the PPP whilst making himself the party Co-Chairman, and PPP went to win the elections with 1/3 majority in February 2008 and later on in September 2008 following the ousting of Musharraf, Zardari became the President of Pakistan.¹⁸¹ According to analysts the death of Benazir Bhutto affected the election result of 2008 due to a sympathy vote for PPP. They calculated prior to elections that it could even add 10% to the share of PPP resulting to 110 out of 272 seats with PML-Q winning 42 seats and PML-N winning 62 seats, whilst PML-Q was thinking it would only affect urban population

¹⁸⁰ Dawn in Nawaz, op. cit.

¹⁸¹ Britannica.com, Asif Ali Zardari, 2011, available from:
<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/1351439/Asif-Ali-Zardari>

i.e. the share of PML-N only. In the previous elections from 1988-2002 PPP's share has varied from 24 to 39% and it was thought that a sympathy vote would increase this ratio especially in the seats reserved for women.¹⁸² As a result, in 2008 elections held on 18th February 2008 PPP won with 30% of the vote with 124 seats PML-N getting 20% with 90 seats and PML-Q with 23% with 54 seats whilst MQM being the fourth biggest party with 7% and 25 seats from 340 total seats.¹⁸³ Prior to the elections PPP and PML-N agreed on 21st February 2008 to form a coalition government 'to be together in our struggle for democracy' according to Zardari, and according to analysts this coalition meant a great challenge for Musharraf's reign.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸² Elections.com, op.cit.

¹⁸³ A. Carr, Legislative Election, 2008, available from: <http://psephos.adam-carr.net/countries/p/pakistan/pakistan2008.txt>

¹⁸⁴ China.org.cn, Pakistan's PPP and PML-N to form coalition government, 2008, available from: <http://www.china.org.cn/english/international/243499.htm>

3.2.1 Beyond 2008 elections

A couple of years before the election the opposition parties PPP and PML-N had agreed on co-operation and had signed a Charter of Democracy (CoD) in May 2006 in London between the party leaders Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif and this was the backbone of their coalition government. This charter covered a wide range of factors for nascent democracy like judiciary, press freedom, elimination of corruption, and inspired ordinary Pakistani people, as the two exiled leaders whose parties have a long history of political tussle agreed on co-operation and the charter was an extraordinary move in favour of democracy. Both parties realised that there had been a lot of damage done due to the constant wrestle and that the system could only operate if they worked together for the charter, and therefore one of the main pledges written in the charter was not to revoke the politics of hostility between different political parties which had previously led to military interventions. However, the expelling of the PPP's ministers from the Punjab Government in early 2011 meant a serious blow to the promotion of democracy and politics of reconciliation. Nawaz Sharif announced at a press conference that he was expelled after indecisive talks with the government on PML-N 10-point agenda and its implementation, which was a surprise for many people considering that the dialogue process is deemed necessary for a democratic system hailed by PML-N. PPP minister of Inter-Provincial Co-ordination, Raza Rabbani said that PPP has taken the PML-N agenda into serious consideration, and added that "Pakistan People's Party always believed in the policy and politics of reconciliation and took all the major decisions jointly by taking all its coalition partners on board".¹⁸⁵ Zahid, a student of PhD at Quaid-e-Azam University Islamabad said that "I am shocked at the PML-N move as at a time when we are confronting so many challenges, we cannot afford such things. But I am still optimistic that finally the sanity will prevail, paving way for nascent democracy to flourish in our country".¹⁸⁶ In addition to negative public reaction the recent PML-N and PPP break up in February 2011 was termed bad for the economy, as International Monetary Fund (IMF) aid suspension would continue and renowned economist and former economic advisor to the Ministry of Finance Dr Ashfaq Hassan Khan said this political development to be harmful for the economy: "the situation would not enable the government even to think of initiating any major reform." Thus, it would become more difficult for the government to implement important reforms like one concerning taxation and retaining the relations with Pakistan's

¹⁸⁵S. Raja, PPP-PML-N break up runs counter to political stability, 2011, available from: <http://www.dawn.com/2011/02/28/ppp-pml-n-break-up-runs-counter-to-political-stability.html>

¹⁸⁶loc. cit.

major lending partners like IMF, World Bank and Asian Development Bank.¹⁸⁷ He said that \$11.3 billion IMF programme will remain suspended and further loans will not be dispensed in such highly volatile situation. The political parties wasted 45 days during which the oil prices went up and according to Ashfaq “no one paid attention to this issue and did not try to agree on a mechanism to save the economy from a looming oil shock.”¹⁸⁸ Furthermore, Saqib Sherani, Economist and former Principle Economic Advisor to Ministry of Finance considered this as a major blow to the economy, as even before the PML-N break up from the PPP, the Karachi stock market dived by over 400 points, which meant considerable losses to investors. This political development only amounted to further uncertainty for Pakistan’s economy and had an adverse affect on the International Financial Institutions’ (IFI) and investor’s confidence in the economy. “It was hoped that this dialogue would help revive the ailing economy and provide a path for putting it on sustainable development but things have turned bad.”¹⁸⁹ The relations with major lenders of the country were already volatile and this development would only further degrade these relations, as without political support government is not able to implement any much-awaited economic reforms. This whole development is viewed in some military circles in such a way that after such failed political dialogue, it would be the time for the military to take over,¹⁹⁰ as during army rule the economic and security situation has been considerably better than during democratic rule.

Due to the difficulties with PML-N, PPP was forced to seek alliance with MQM even before the PML-N break up and this alliance has not been an easy one. Especially since the late 2010 MQM has frequently resorted to withdrawing from the coalition followed by PPP agreeing to MQM’s terms due to erupting political violence especially in Karachi caused by the MQM. The PPP and MQM fragile alliance is frequently under contention especially in Sindh province which is divided into rural and urban class with many ethnicities. According to analysts the main bone of contention in Sindh is over which party controls the financial capital Karachi and over the significant provincial ministry of Local Government (LG) currently headed by Agha Siraj Durrani. Karachi has a lot of significance not only economically but also historically, as it was Pakistan’s first capital. However, in 2001 the

¹⁸⁷M. Yahya, PPP-PML-N split termed bad for economy, 2011, available from:

<http://www.defence.pk/forums/national-political-issues/95110-ppp-pml-n-split-termed-bad-economy.html>

¹⁸⁸ loc. cit.

¹⁸⁹ loc. cit.

¹⁹⁰ loc. cit.

governance of Sindh was changed with devolution plan to city district governments with each town having its nazim i.e. mayor, and PPP won the first local body elections when MQM boycotted these elections.¹⁹¹ However, in the second local body elections in 2004, MQM and PML-Q won the elections with Mustafa Kamal becoming the mayor and under his leadership Karachi experienced unprecedented development. However, at 2008 elections with PPP victory and with the appointment of Agha Siraj Durrani as provincial minister for local bodies, some changes were made, for example, he discontinued funding for local governments and took over Karachi Building Corporation Authority (KBCA) and Karachi Water and Sewerage Board (KWSB) which had been considered as MQM's domain. Since then the two parties have been at war with each other with MQM pushing for LG elections and with PPP delaying the elections in a desperate attempt to maintain its hold in Karachi. However, in March 2011 President Zardari intervened and announced the year 2011 as the year of LG elections in Sindh.¹⁹² However, in October 2011 the long-sought LG elections were again postponed in the major cities and they are scheduled for April 2012, because the Election Commission of Pakistan (ECP) is in the process of electoral polls revisions, to be completed by April 2012.¹⁹³

When looking at the power struggle between MQM and PPP, it is indeed quite intriguing. MQM tends to leave the government if PPP does not accept its demands, and then generally creates chaos in Karachi in order to get PPP to agree on its demands and as a result PPP pays a higher price every time for getting MQM to come back to the coalition government. Especially this past year has been tumultuous and has seen many PPP-MQM bickering and MQM quit the coalition for the first time on 27th December 2010 after disagreements over the local government elections in Sindh mentioned earlier. Just days after on 3rd January 2011 MQM pulled out of the government due to PPP's inability to address peoples' problems but after Prime Minister Syed Yousaf Raza Gilani's visit to MQM headquarters in Karachi on 7th January 2011 MQM rejoined the coalition and restored its parliamentary majority. However, until the contentious Sind Home Minister Zulfiqar Mirza was given a forced leave in April 2011, the MQM members did not join provincial cabinet until 4th May 2011. Despite the

¹⁹¹ A.K. Chishti, Local governance: the great tussle, 2011, available from <http://www.thefridaytimes.com/04032011/page4.shtml>

¹⁹² loc. cit.

¹⁹³ M. Baig, PPP prefers to remain silent on revival of LGS, 2011, available from: http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2011\10\15\story_15-10-2011_pg7_25

forced leave, Mirza criticised MQM for its alleged role in targeted killings in Karachi in early February and March 2011, but MQM chief Altaf Hussain was pacified to stay in the government in the name of continued democracy by President Zardari.¹⁹⁴ After a week-long separation in March 2011 MQM returned to the coalition. The President's Spokesperson Farhatullah Babar said that the partners renewed their commitment to solve their issues for the sake of political stability. This time conflict between the two parties was a reaction to the Sindh Home Minister Zulfiqar Mirza's announcement that People's Amn Committee (PAC) is a subsidiary of the PPP which has long been a domain of MQM. As a result of the public admission MQM announced to review its position as a coalition partner and set a week-long deadline to renounce PPP patronage of the PAC. Although PPP did not renounce PAC, it was able to handle the situation in a way to keep its coalition with MQM intact.¹⁹⁵ However, the uneasy relations continued to wail, and MQM's latest exit on 27th June 2011 from PPP-led coalition government was heralded as the end of a three-and-a-half-year relationship. This time the conflict sued due to PPP's alleged interference in the polls for the Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK) legislative assembly, which brought forward accusations of rigging, when the polls for two Karachi based seats under the refugee quota were postponed. For this MQM claimed that PPP was trying to get MQM to give up one of these seats from the recent AJK elections, and when MQM refused, polls were deferred.¹⁹⁶ However, MQM no longer holds bargaining power because PPP secured the support of PML-Q and does not necessarily need MQM to continue its simple majority in Sindh Provincial and National Assembly. Though this split was not termed to have major short term effects, it might have had medium or long term effects adding to the instability already prevalent in Pakistani politics at a time when the country is suffering from multiple crises on the domestic and foreign fronts with growing militancy, deteriorating in US-Pakistani relations, and the unpredictable situation in Afghanistan. Therefore, domestic instability is only going to add to the worsening law and order situation in Karachi which is suffering from political killings, extortions, large scale criminal activity and acts of terrorism. With a fragile provincial government it is difficult to tackle these issues, because the political parties are competing for power instead of resolving the issues at hand. Thus, PPP found itself in a difficult place especially after MQM was the

¹⁹⁴A. Majeed, PPP-MQM alliance: a thorny wedding, and acrimonious divorce, 2011, available from: <http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2011/06/ppp-mqm-alliance-a-thorny-wedding-an-acrimonious-divorce/>

¹⁹⁵I. Aligi, PPP-MQM coalition: deadline expires, alliance survives, 2011, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/132745/ppp-mqm-coalition-deadline-expires-alliance-survives/>

¹⁹⁶R. Jesly, Break-up of the MQM-PPP alliance in Pakistan, 2011, available from: <http://blog.nus.edu.sg/southasiansoundings/2011/07/04/break-up-of-the-mqm-ppp-alliance-in-pakistan/>

third party to leave the coalition government after PML-N and the JUI –F.¹⁹⁷ This volatile security and political situation were exactly the reasons as to why PPP again conceded to MQM's demands, and finally the MQM rejoined the coalition in October 2011, as seen below.

In early August 2011 PPP gave into MQM's demands for the restoration of the local government system (LGS) in the first phase in Karachi and Hyderabad, whereby in the 21 other districts of Sindh the commissionerate system will be upheld. In the second phase, commissionerate system will be abolished or revised so that office of commissioner is compliant to nazim (mayor). MQM is calling for simultaneous removal of Local Government Ordinance 1979, Police Act 1861 and the commissioner system, whereby PPP is in favour of abolition in phases. At the same time MQM and PPP came to a mutual conclusion that their leaders would not issue provocative statements of the other party, and future differences will be solved in closed doors,¹⁹⁸ which is referring to former Sindh Home Minister Zulfiqar Mirza's fiery statements and criticism of MQM's stance on LGS especially since spring 2011, which dissatisfied rest of PPP leadership and ultimately led to his resignation from the government in late August 2011. However, even in mid-October 2011 Mirza was still calling for PPP-MQM break up, as the LGS is not aligned with late party leader Benazir Bhutto's wishes, and would allegedly have negative effects on PPP.¹⁹⁹ Despite their differences, Sindh Governor Ishrat-ul-Ibad Khan, announced on 5th October 2011 that "the MQM has always supported the government. We have no decided to rejoin the government in the interest of Pakistan and its people and the external and international challenges facing the country," which signified the MQM rejoining the government. Khan continued that "in light of the challenges facing Pakistan, the President and the Prime Minister said it would be better if the MQM returns to the government". The MQM had pulled its ministers out of the government in late June 2011 as a protest against PPP's "undemocratic and dictatorial attitude" among other things. Interestingly, even though MQM ministers had left in June, Prime Minister

¹⁹⁷ loc. cit.

¹⁹⁸ GM. Jamal, Breakthrough PPP-MQM: the deal has been done, 2011, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/225440/breakthrough-ppp-mqm-the-deal-has-been-done/>

¹⁹⁹ Express Tribune, PPP should part ways with MQM: Mirza, 2011, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/275178/ppp-should-part-ways-with-mqm-mirza/>

Gilani never accepted their resignation.²⁰⁰ The rejoining came at a critical time, as PPP government has been facing criticism over a failure to cater basic facilities and rehabilitation for people displaced by heavy rains, and MQM had placed its protest within the National Assembly due to the power crisis just a day earlier whilst PML-Q federal ministers submitted their resignation to the party chiefs. However, Sindh Governor Ishrat-ul-Ibad Khan, said the leadership of the MQM and PPP had concluded that is better to counter the external and internal challenges together and put national interests ahead of political interests. Khan stated that the rapprochement was driven by a mutual wish to guarantee a peace and political stability in Karachi which has suffered from immense political violence in the past months. Ultimately MQM rejoined thanks to Asif Zardari's and Altaf Hussain's efforts and their adherence to their 2008 commitment to be coalition partners. Prime Minister Gilani thus assured that "we were together and will remain so in future" and steer the country out of its crisis.²⁰¹

²⁰⁰ PTI RHL, MQM to rejoin government in Pakistan, 2011, available from: <http://news.in.msn.com/international/article.aspx?cp-documentid=5490897>

²⁰¹ Columnspk.com, MQM rejoins Sindh and federal government, 2011, available from: <http://www.columnspk.com/mqm-rejoins-sindh-and-federal-government/>

IV OPENING THE PARADOX BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND SECURITY

The thesis has examined the first factor of the paradox in the second section, that is, historical developments in Pakistan related to upswings of democracy and security in depth, and has addressed its important relations with its neighbours, which act as deterring factors to democracy. In the third section the thesis analysed the defining factors of liberal democracy, and discussed the 2008 elections as an important case study, which were linked to the second factor of the paradox i.e. different understandings of democracy among the different actors. Throughout these sections, fifth and sixth factor of the paradox, i.e., the power struggle and importance of elite governance have become apparent. Finally, the fourth section will further open the paradox discussing the fifth factor of paradox in terms of ISI dominance, the third factor of paradox, i.e., economic development, and fourth factor, i.e., education.

4.1 Dominant patterns detrimental to democracy

4.1.1 ISI influence

As seen before, the one element, which was supporting the military rules and pursuing covert conflicts in India and Afghanistan, was also the same element which played a major role in bringing down democracy in the 1990s; the all-powerful, globally infamous ISI. Many critics define Inter Services Intelligence (ISI) as a state within the Pakistani state, and it was set up only a year after the independence struggle as the intelligence department of the army following a failure of inter-services intelligence in the Indo-Pak war. It was the Afghan war in 1980s, however, which changed the ISI, as Pakistan was used as a base by the CIA to wage the war against Soviets, whereby all training of Afghan fighters was conducted by ISI in consultation with the CIA, making ISI the most important establishment in the decade-long conflict. Amir Mir argues that due to the role ISI played in this Afghan conflict, it turned into a classically overgrown security agency conducting covert operations whilst having a specific world view with a role in both foreign and domestic politics and not accountable to the civilian government. ISI has, especially since the 1980s, dominated Pakistan's Afghan and Indian policies.²⁰² After the Afghan war ISI continued to lend support to the Taliban in the 1990s including diplomatic recognition and military training until 9/11. Due to the close relations between ISI and Taliban, there has been many questions about ISI and al-Qaeda relations, and it is thought that the links with Osama bin Laden and ISI go back to the mid-

²⁰²Amir, op.cit., p. 364

1980s to the Afghan conflict, when Osama was an ISI-trained fighter against the Soviets. During the 1990s Osama bin Laden continued to enjoy ISI protection, and ISI even facilitated the contacts between Osama and Taliban, as during his absence he allegedly played no role in the accession of Taliban rule in Afghanistan. As the objectives of Osama and ISI colluded (i.e. creating havoc in Kashmir, and strengthening Taliban in Afghanistan), ISI facilitated some training camps in Afghanistan, and continued its protection over Osama and al-Qaeda also due to their pro-Islamic and anti-Western shared views even after Musharraf's coup in 1999.

With 9/11 ISI went from supporting Taliban, Osama and al-Qaeda to be the most important actor of the US-led war on terror trying to catch its old ally, Osama bin Laden. However, the international community is to date sceptical about whether ISI has truly let go of their strategic goal of regaining their lost power in Afghanistan and are still supporting Taliban-led resistance in Afghanistan.²⁰³ “The army’s dual role in combating terrorism and promoting six-party religious alliance-the Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal at the same time, besides supporting the Taliban through the ISI is coming under closer and closer international scrutiny. Indirectly, Pakistan has been supporting terrorism and extremism through the ISI, whether in London on 7/7 or in Afghanistan or Iraq”.²⁰⁴ Another report, by US National Commission states that Pakistan was a benefactor of al-Qaeda-Taliban-ISI relationship, as al-Qaeda camps also trained militants for Kashmir struggle, whilst al-Qaeda used Pakistan and Afghanistan as bases to support Islamic insurgencies in Tajikistan, Chechnya and Kashmir.²⁰⁵ Shaun Gregory states that 9/11 had tremendous effects on Pakistan, as “Pakistan was co-opted by the US as a necessary if uncertain partner for the war on terrorism and as an indispensable forward base for the overthrow of the Taliban which became a sine qua non for the destruction of al-Qaeda. The military government of Pervez Musharraf was given no choice other than to assist the US and was offered lavish rewards of aid, debt write-off and the lighting of Pressler’s sanctions and the additional restrictions imposed after the Pakistan’s nuclear tests in 1998”.²⁰⁶ Writing about ISI, he states that it facilitated the arrest of many hundreds of suspected al-Qaeda and Taliban members, including many leading al-Qaeda

²⁰³ op.cit., p. 365-66

²⁰⁴ BBC report in Mir, op.cit., p. 368

²⁰⁵ US report in Mir, op.cit., p. 369

²⁰⁶ S.Gregory, The ISI and War on Terrorism, Pakistan Security Research Unit, 2008, available from: <http://spaces.brad.ac.uk:8080/download/attachments/748/Brief28finalised.pdf>, p. 9

figures. In addition, ISI helped in figuring out details for some international terrorist operations, but the US and UK criticise ISI of being unhelpful in specific investigations like London 7/7, as it is not proactive in bringing required intelligence forward. It is also accused of manipulating the information for its own domestic and geopolitical purposes, as crucial for ISI is Pakistan's geopolitical interest and a promotion of pan-Islamist jihad, therefore making ISI an unstable ally of the US. Furthermore, ISI's support for Sunni Islam is problematic, and the ISI victories over al-Qaeda have decreased since 2003, and the al-Qaeda operations from Pakistan have only risen. Thus, ISI's role in the war against terror is a huge problem for Pakistan and the West.²⁰⁷

According to Hussain Haqqani, Pakistan's Ambassador to the USA, who resigned from his post in November 2011, "instead of just protecting Pakistan from enemies identified by a lawful government, which is what an intelligence or security service is supposed to do, the ISI defined what is or is not good for Pakistan. The ISI is convinced that India is Pakistan's eternal enemy, Kashmir can be won by weakening Indian resolve to hold on to it through unconventional warfare and Afghanistan should be the backyard of Pakistan in every war. Instead of just implementing the state policy, the ISI virtually makes its own policies for the state. Historically, the intelligence agencies that have grown so large, so powerful and so unaccountable, as the ISI, finally cause problems for the state they control. Instead of the ISI controlling Pakistan, the Pakistanis should be controlling the ISI. Otherwise, covert terrorist operations abroad will continue to undermine Pakistani democracy and keep the country engaged in conflicts with Afghanistan and India".²⁰⁸ For such accusations, the former President Musharraf answered that only some rogue elements consisting of retirees of Afghan conflict might have links to terrorist organisations, and they are being monitored, and thus ISI is not involved in spreading terrorism.²⁰⁹ However, Musharraf was criticised in the press over this, as it is not possible that some rogue elements "can make or break ISI policy which is made by the national security establishment headed by none other than President Musharraf himself."²¹⁰ With the change to civilian government, Prime Minister Gilani and President Zardari tried to bring ISI under civilian control especially after US pressures,²¹¹ but their

²⁰⁷ Gregory, op. cit., p. 9-11

²⁰⁸ H. Haqqani in Mir, op.cit., p. 373

²⁰⁹ P. Musharraf in Mir, op.cit., p. 373-4

²¹⁰ Daily Times in Mir, op.cit., p. 373

²¹¹ Mir, op.cit., p. 374

attempt was curtailed by the army leadership. ISI not only continues to be a point of contention in the domestic and international arena but it also continues to disrupt the evolution in democracy in Pakistan as seen in the 1990s when ISI played a role in destabilising Bhutto and Sharif governments.

Not only affecting international relations and destabilising governments, ISI also carefully monitors all foreigner activities in the country. In June 2011 ISI was about to cancel a visa of a Russian girl due to 'bad remarks' which generally mean espionage, probably due to photographs of Manora Island, a military facility, and this all sparked the visa cancellation and she was prompted to leave the country. In July 2011 ISI prompted Pakistani police to arrest another Russian girl, who was subsequently set on bail and charged in court for a visa overstay, and only after 4 months the court case was resolved and she was deported.²¹² Generally, for a visa overstay up to 1 year, one pays heavy fines and gets deported, but in her case ISI prompted the police which then led to a court case which meant that probably she was off the record charged for espionage and could have faced 3 years in jail. In the event of the innocent girl getting jailed for 3 years in Pakistan, the author also got involved with the court case after getting her a lawyer for free. In September-October 2011 the author accompanied her to court three times, and was chasing up her original visa application documents from a company X and only managed to get notarised photocopies, as originals were nowhere to be found. The author also got help from an influential businessman and got verification from the concerned bank that the Rs 40,000 paid for her visa was never deposited at the bank meaning that the concerned person at company X had committed a fraud and taken the money and lied to the author and the Russian girl about the progress of her visa. ISI was tapping the Russian girl's phone, so either ISI did not like that another foreigner was helping her in the court case or the company X did not like that the author was snooping around trying to get hold of the originals and the bank verification which could have exposed a fraud they had committed thus making the author the key witness in the possible court case against the company X, ISI prompted to Ministry of Interior (MOI) and Board of Investment (BOI) who liaised with IB to cancel author's visa due to 'security precautions'. Although the author was only trying to help her Russian friend and an intern of her previous organisation,

²¹² A. Jung, Russian national with expired visa detained by police, 2011, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/218395/russian-national-with-expired-visa-detained-by-police/>

ISI deemed her as ‘security threat’ and ordered an immediate visa cancellation which generally only happens at diplomatic level for high treason like espionage, and thus the author had to leave the country within 5 days, which is another example of the power of the ISI and how suspicious they are of any foreigner activities and if 3 innocent girls were found suspicious, then one can only start imagining how many people every year are caught by the ISI under different pretences.

The case is also an example of powerful elites, as most probably the cancellation was ordered by the company X which did not want the author to sue them for the fraud they committed over the visa application, as the company X had previously threatened her over email and also called the lawyer to back off the case, which means the company was trying to hamper her court case to save their own reputation, and had the author leave the country in order not to have a court case against them. The author was the only person who had contradictory evidence against them in the form of emails and text messages, and the company X had a lot of contacts in military and security services, and thus it was all too easy to get them to prompt author’s visa cancellation.²¹³ This only begins to show the complex relations between the security services, military and the business elite of Pakistan and the extent of the power the elites hold, and to what great extent everything revolves around elites in Pakistan and their obsession with power, and to what lengths such elites are willing to go in order to retain their influence at the same time disrupting democratic judicial processes, and most probably bribing the security authorities to pull such strings to get four institutions to play along specific elite interests (MOI, BOI, ISI, IB). Though one must note here that the company X used to be a partner of the author’s previous organisation and had supported the organisation for 6 years in the past and is known to support other philanthropic causes. But when it came to the reputation of the company, amicable relations turned sour and their own interests were only ones which mattered, not the life of an innocent girl or the author’s career.

²¹³ Author’s personal experiences from September-October 2011

4.1.2. Madrasas and lack of education in Pakistan

Due to a lack of educational opportunities and sense of insecurity, the religious schools, i.e., madrasas have flourished since the 1980s, and while providing education for children, they have also produced many militants and terrorists with a shared common hatred toward westernised Pakistani elite, the US, India and Israel. Madrasas are the only option for poor children whose parents cannot afford them. Further issues contributing to the dire situation are incompetence in governance and lack of funds for the public education. It is indeed a shame that Pakistan is a country which has produced a Nobel Prize winner in physics, top notch physicians, high technology geniuses and talented air force pilots, yet has wasted so many resources due to an inadequate mass education system, which has led to lack of opportunities for millions of people. Pakistani government has instead of investing money to schools and hospitals spent billions of dollars on defence, that is, acquiring F-16s and submarines and other military equipment, which has provided security only to military, political and bureaucratic elite, whilst the masses have suffered from hunger and misery,²¹⁴ pertaining to the elite governance and serving solely elite interests.

Madrasas came to international debate post-9/11, and Musharraf pledged for a comprehensive madrasa reform, but it was only in summer 2007 when military launched an attack to Lal Masjid in Islamabad which has been used as a breeding ground for terrorists and suicide bombers. This Operation Silence made evident to the whole world that madrasas have been hideouts for hardcore militants, and as the operation in heart of Islamabad took one week, one can start to imagine how madrasas in other parts of the country might be. Though Musharraf had made statements for reforming madrasas, they were retained untouched, which meant that conducting extremist activities in the capital only emboldened the clerics and increased the delusion that militants within religious seminaries are beyond the law. In 2002 Musharraf launched a madrasa reform whereby madrasas would teach English Mathematics, Science and Computer Studies with Islam in an attempt to turn them into welfare institutions, as they already provide free board and lodging. After his grand televised speech in 2002, a reform was launched in four provinces of Pakistan excluding Azad Kashmir after they had conducted a survey to ascertain the number of madrasas within the country. The survey results revealed that there were 20,000 madrasas in Pakistan, which had taught around 2 million youngsters,

²¹⁴ Abbas, op.cit., p. 238-39

whereby Deodandi sect had 12,000 schools, Bareilvis 3,500, Ahl-e-Hadith 380, Jamaat-e-Islamni 405, and Shia 390 schools of which 8,000 were in Punjab, 5,500 in Sindh, 5,000 in NWFP and 1,500 in Baluchistan, FATA and Kashmir combined. The reform of 2002 aimed at targeting 8,000 madrasas in 5 years, and by the end of the reform in summer 2008 the Federal Education Ministry had only reached 507 of them and had spent Rs 223 million out of the Rs 5.76 billion allocated for the project blaming lack of coordination between federal and provincial governments for the reform's failure.²¹⁵ The real reason, however, was brought forward by International Crisis Group in 2004 stating that "the failure to curb rising extremism in Pakistan stems directly from the military government's own unwillingness to act against its political allies among the religious groups."²¹⁶ Like other military rulers in the past Musharraf co-opted the religious parties to gain constitutional cover for his military rule, and therefore he was reliant on the religious right for his regime's survival.²¹⁷ Three years later ICG proclaimed that "banned sectarian and jihadi groups, being supported by networks of mosques and madrasas, continue to operate openly in Pakistan's largest city, Karachi, and elsewhere", and urged that international aid should be dependent on improving weak public school system to counter the issue.²¹⁸ Though not all madrasas are breeding grounds for militants, even those with no relations to acts of violence promote a narrow ideology which legitimates such acts, and research shows that students of madrasas are more narrow-minded and intolerant than students in normal schools. After Musharraf's ouster, President Zardari also announced madrasa reform to separate students from extremists to provide them with a modern education in addition to the religious education. But within one year they had not even set up the promised Madrasa Welfare Authority as the task was not assigned by Ministries of Interior, Education and Religious affairs.²¹⁹

When looking at the historical development of madrasas, until the 1970s they followed Dars-e-Nizamia curriculum directed to purification of faith and knowledge, but this changed in the late 1970s and the early 1980s with the Zia's attempt to execute Islamic law in Pakistan.

²¹⁵ Mir, op.cit., p. 180-183

²¹⁶ International Crisis Group, Unfulfilled promises: Pakistan's failure to tackle extremism, 2004, available from: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/asia/south-asia/pakistan/073-unfulfilled-promises-pakistan-failure-to-tackle-extremism.aspx>

²¹⁷ loc. cit.

²¹⁸ International Crisis Group, Karachi's Madrasas and Violent Extremism, 2007, available from:

http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/asia/south-asia/pakistan/130_pakistan_karachi_s_madrasas_and_violent_extremism.pdf, p.3

²¹⁹ Mir, op.cit., p. 186

Many madrasas then dropped Maths and other subjects and changed the focus in the teaching of Koran and key principles of prayer, charity, pilgrimage and jihad. They were teaching that world was divided into believers and unbelievers and thus there was a need for Islamic warriors of jihad to liberate different regions from unbelievers and purify Islamic nations to establish Islamic caliphate where pure Islam would be practiced. Subsequently, jihadi madrasas were born which got mixed with politics under General Zia, as he promoted the madrasas to gain support of religious parties for his authoritarian rule and to recruit militants for the Afghan war, and thus opened madrasas for international funding especially from Saudi Arabia. After the Soviet withdrawal the rapid spread of madrasas only continued in Pakistan thanks to money inflows from Saudi Arabia. It was also during the Zia regime when Pakistan increased its defence spending leaving nothing for education, as the US and Saudi money flowed freely to Pakistan due to the Afghan war.

In the 1990s after the US imposition of economic and military sanctions due to the nuclear programme, the economy went to a brink of a collapse, whereby the education system quickly deteriorated. In this situation, the madrasas were an attractive option for the poor people, as they offered free boarding, food and education, compared to the non-existent government-funded secular schools. In fact, the successive governments even encouraged this development in order not to spend in education sector, whilst Pakistani army favoured the madrasas, as they viewed the madrasa-trained jihadi fighters as an asset for its covert operations in Kashmir and Afghanistan.²²⁰ Therefore, it has been in the interests of the political, military and bureaucratic elite to retain the madrasa domination over education, and all the government-whether military or civilian-efforts for madrasa reforms have been half-hearted. The only way to tackle growing number of madrasa-jehadis is to create a meaningful alternative to the religious schools with the promotion and the funding channelled to state-led schools and getting students to return to mainstream education instead of narrow madrasa education. This remains a huge challenge for any government, and continues to disrupt the development of democracy in Pakistan by giving rise to religious extremism whilst eradicating the state-led school system.

²²⁰ Mir, op. cit., p. 194-96

4.1.3. Economic development and the military

When looking at the link between military rule and economic development which is an important factor bringing about stability, one can look at the economic statistics of Pakistan, and they clearly show higher growth rates under military rules i.e. Field Marshall Ayub Khan in 1958-68 and General Yahya Khan in 1969-72 with an average growth rate of 5-7%, General Zia ul-Haq in 1977-1988 with a growth rate of 6,5% and finally General Pervez Musharraf 1999-2007 with a growth rate of from 3.2 to 6,8%, with praetorian democracy under Prime Minister Muhammad Khan Junejo 1988-1988 and Prime Ministers Zafarullah Khan Jamali and Shaukat Aziz 2002-2007 with real power held by General Zia and Musharraf respectively. Whereby during civilian rule from 1947-1958 with many governments including Liaquat Ali Khan growth rate was 2,9-3,3%, and during the second civilian government under Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto the growth rate was 4,4-4,8%. During the third civilian rule under Benazir Bhutto 1988-1990 and 1993-1996 and under Nawaz Sharif 1990-1993 and 1997-1999 with three caretaker governments in-between the average growth rate was 4,6%.²²¹ Therefore, general public and even elite terms that military rule is 'better' for Pakistan, because it led to higher development, and this is true when you purely look at the financial figures above.

When looking at the historical development of the economy, the first civilian rule 1947-58 was characterised by an unstable domestic situation and millions of refugees, whereby the provision of basic necessities and national survival was the focus of the government, and it is not surprising that economic development was at a primitive level considering the lack of direction, poor economic, social and political base.²²² The following military, Ayub Khan era, has been termed by economists as the 'decade for development' with Pakistan seen as a model capitalist economy, which is explained by the security-political stability, land reforms and the direction and support provided by military-bureaucratic government to the state-led development coupled by huge amounts of the US aid by 1965 contributing to 5-6% of Gross Domestic Product (GPD). However, the model favoured Punjab and Sindh with the neglect of East Pakistan leading to large regional variations coupled with increasing income disparities

²²¹ S. Akbar Zaidi, *Military, Civil Society and Democratization in Pakistan*, 2011, p.74-75

²²² *op.cit.*, p. 76

with wealth concentration to certain individuals and businesses,²²³ and this development can be seen as one of the contributing factors to the dissatisfaction and the departure of East Pakistan and the increased power of the wealthy elite at the expense of the masses. Bhutto's era was characterised by the highest ever growth rates under civilian rule, and his tenure laid the basis for future development, as basic industries and a foundation for a capital goods industry was created which later on brought growth into the country. Ironically, the Middle East boom, a creation of Bhutto's government, helped General Zia sustain his rule in the 1980s. Bhutto undertook land reforms, nationalised industries, banks and health and educational institutions, and in 1974-75 health expenditure was 1.7% of GDP which was the highest in Pakistan's history, and in 196-77 the development expenditure was 11% of GDP again the highest ever figure. It has to be noted that during Bhutto era the oil prices arose after 1973 oil crisis, and the US aid was greatly reduced due to the socialist leaning policies of Bhutto, and despite these adverse factors, especially social development was impressive during Bhutto era,²²⁴ not matched to date by any subsequent government.

General Zia's era in the 1980s was the most liberal government in economic terms, and the increasing liberalisation of the economy backed by immense US and international aid due to Afghan war in addition to increased remittances from Pakistani workers in the Middle East of over \$20 billion assured increased economic growth. The middle classes emerged again, private businesses flourished, and even remote areas developed largely thanks to foreign remittances, which gave rise to unskilled workers becoming shopkeepers, transporters and so on. However, the debt increased to astronomical figures which contributed to the slowdown of the economy in the 1988-99 period.²²⁵ The following civilian rules by Bhutto and Sharif in the 1990s were severely curtailed in economic terms because of several factors: poor governance; frequent changes in government (11 governments in 11 years); poor law and order situation especially in the financial capital Karachi leading to a loss of foreign investors; debt burden from Zia era which was 60 % of the annual budget in addition to 25 % allocated to defence; IMF and World Bank structural interventions enforced majorly due to the debt burden. This was all made worse by the sanctions on nuclear proliferation and later detonation of a nuclear bomb in 1998, which led to a freeze in all foreign aid and severe

²²³ op.cit., p. 77-78

²²⁴ op.cit., p. 78-80

²²⁵ op. cit., p. 80-82

economic sanctions to Pakistan, which had become largely dependent on foreign aid resulting in a near economic breakdown.²²⁶ Thus, in the first 3 years of Musharraf's government the economy performed even worse than during the 1990s due to the debt burden and growing interest payments. But after Pakistan's change of course after 9/11 huge amounts of debt were written off and \$12,5 billion was rescheduled and the quota for Pakistani exports for the US and the EU was increased, and IMF and World Bank re-installed their financial support to Pakistan.²²⁷ Thanks to these changes, GDP rose from \$ 63 billion in 1999 to \$ 162 billion in 2008, growing at an average of 7% in 2004-2008, per capita income increased from \$435 to \$ 925, exports rose from \$ 9 billion to \$ 17 billion, remittances were at a record \$ 5.5 billion, FDI increased from \$ 300 million to \$ 6.5 billion, and Public Sector Development Programme (PSDP), rose from Rs.80 billion during the 1988-99 period to Rs.520 billion in 2008.²²⁸

However, the economic growth was focused on upper and upper middle classes that increased income disparities especially in urban areas, and sectors such as rural development, rural electrification and low cost housing were largely neglected. This inequality led to elite getting richer and the poor getting poorer due to the distortions in the availability and quality of health, education and infrastructure services.²²⁹ In the fourth civilian era under President Zardari, Pakistan was faced with global economic crisis, domestic instability and worsening Pak-US relations. Therefore, according to Zaidi two of the main reasons for military regimes' economic development are the US support and suppression of dissent and opposition leading to domestic stability conducive for development. Thus, the civilian leaders after Ayub Khan, Zia and Musharraf had to deal with consequences of military-led development with growing political instability following from so to speak opening of a lid of dissent with the transition to democracy.²³⁰ Ultimately, "democracy and development in Pakistan continues to be compromised by global and international players. 'Stability' is seen to be far more important than the possibility of democratic evolution through a process of elections, participation and representation".²³¹ Thus, global factors, governments and priorities keep on having a big impact on Pakistan's democratic future.²³²

²²⁶ op. cit., p. 82-84

²²⁷ op. cit., p. 84-86

²²⁸ Zaidi, op. cit., p. 86-87 and GEOTV, PML-Q manifesto, op.cit

²²⁹ GEOTV, PML-N manifesto, op.cit.

²³⁰ Zaidi, op. cit., p. 88, 91

²³¹ op. cit., p. 92

²³² op. cit., p. 90

V CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

It has become evident in the earlier parts of the thesis that the paradox continues to haunt Pakistani politics, and the first section analysed the theoretical framework for Pakistani democracy examining elite governance theory, bureaucratic polity, semidemocracy, delegative democracy and democratic developmental state and concluded that elite governance and delegative theories combined best explain the state of Pakistani democracy. But none of the theories was able to fully explain the situation, but provided for explanations especially for fifth and sixth factors of the paradox, i.e. power play and elite governance respectively.

As the second section showed, the predicament with India and historical background constitute the first factor upholding this paradox, and it only seems that history is only repeating itself with the current patterns of Indo-Pak-Afghan relations coupled with ever worsening US relations and growing domestic instability. Indian focus has always diverted attention away from domestic policies, and there has been always a need to show off in international arena (as with nuclear programme), and seek US support and aid, whilst the general population suffers in the midst of lack of reforms for education, health and infrastructure. The second section also opened up some prominent patterns. For example none of the civilian governments ever ended their full term, and they were always dismissed by the President or the army, and always after civilian governments the general public has wished for a military rule due to political party conflicts (what happened in Bhutto and Sharif in the 1990s and currently with Zardari). In addition, all civilian governments have ended with alleged corruption, mistakes in appointment of Army Chief, whilst focusing on foreign relations at times of growing insurgency at home. Furthermore, the pledges to democracy have not always been authentic, and for example Sharif's second civilian government was all about retaining power at all costs. In the current government the MQM-PPP power play disrupts the domestic stability and in such situations minority rights and education are ignored which is linked to the fifth factor of the paradox, i.e. power struggle, which has characterised every government whether civilian or military. Like was previously pointed out, every change of government since the independence has been applauded by the majority

of the public, which signified disenchantment with the outgoing government or a hope for a better future. However, this hope did not have positive connotations, but often had a negative meaning that the situation at least could not worsen from the current one.²³³

In the third section the defining factors of liberal democracy were analysed, that is, the role of judicial and police related to separation of powers, good governance meaning public interest and absence of corruption, the general and equal right to vote, freedom of opinion, speech, press and mass media and human rights. It became clear that judicial is relatively free in Pakistan, and judicial system was able to bring the members of the powerful security forces into justice. But one must exercise some scepticism here, because many perpetrators of crimes including terrorists are often tried in courts but then their sentences are not implemented or are shortened, and thus there is an issue with the implementation of the sentences. However, judicial played a big role in the 2008 elections with lawyers movement boycotting the elections after a public uproar on Musharraf's dismissal on his Chief Justice, and it is the lawyers again who are waging battle against the US drone wars and fighting for more rights for innocent civilians. Moving onto good governance, Pakistan has huge room for improvement here, as its history is ripe with poor governance, and mounting corruption among the elites, which only adds to the plight of the masses and consolidates the elite governance. The situation is the worst in Karachi, where all political parties use forced donations to finance their operation and reign in terror of non-protection, whereby in other towns and regions the protection is provided by the powerful feudal lords. In terms of press freedom, Pakistan is relatively free, as there is an increasing number of TV, radio channels and information flows freely among the public. But the issue remains as to whether journalists are allowed to write freely about sensitive issues, as there have been many cases of journalists killed for their work, and that is why Pakistan ranks high in global impunity index. This adds to the growing human rights issues, which have only become worse with the counter terror war, with both sides violating human rights, and especially the drones having become a very contentious issue in this fight, and thus Pakistan continues to be ranked high on Freedom house 'Freedom of the World' index with overall score of 4.5 out of 7.²³⁴ In terms of free elections, Pakistan has a long history of election rigging, and military rulers

²³³ Abbas, op.cit., p. 177

²³⁴ Freedom House, Combined average ratings-Independent countries, 2011, available from: [http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/fiw11/CombinedAverageRatings\(IndependentCountries\)FIW2011.pdf](http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/fiw11/CombinedAverageRatings(IndependentCountries)FIW2011.pdf)

cancelling elections or calling façade elections to consolidate their rule, but the 2008 elections, though deferred, were an example of democratic elections. However, even then the party pledges followed the same pattern of making many promises for the future and their inability to deliver has yet again led to public disenchantment with the political parties, which has increased the calls for a military-led government. As it became evident in this third section that all political actors from judicial to government and political parties have different understanding of democracy which is the second factor of the paradox. All of the actors instead of developing the country and providing help for the masses continue to be involved in the power play and thus consolidating the elite governance only adding to the fifth and sixth factors of the paradox.

The fourth section brought forward some important patterns which are detrimental to democracy in Pakistan, most important being the ISI dominance, the so-called state within a state, which dictates the domestic and foreign security preferences for Pakistan, and destabilises civilian governments serving their own purposes in their imminent fight against India whilst seeking strategic depth in Afghanistan. This relates to the first factor of the paradox i.e. historical developments as well as fifth and sixth i.e. power struggle and elite governance, as ISI controls the power especially in the foreign front, and is led by powerful elites with the narrow interests of consolidating their own power in Pakistan. Apart from ISI the lack of education in Pakistan adds to the ill-functioning democracy and constitutes the fourth factor of the paradox, as the masses are not educated, and only madrasa network is able to provide free education for the poorest segment, which then increases the home-grown terrorism in the country, and adds to the ever so prominent security predicament which overshadows calls for democracy. Economic factors only complicate the democratic dilemma and comprise of the third factor of the paradox, as military governments have been more successful in economic terms, whereby during civilian rule the country has experienced slower growth rates, and this further increases the preference for a military rule. Though one must remember here that military rules would not have been so successful in economic terms had it been without immense US aid, which was offered to the military rulers due to geopolitical or security political considerations (Afghan war in Zia era, counter terrorism fight in Musharraf era), and thus foreign powers continue to negatively affect the development of Pakistani democracy.

5.2 Way forward?

Due to the current security and political situation, many people even in the educated class of Pakistan do not have a high respect toward democracy, as their priorities lie in the ability to support their families and build a good future for their children. Most people view the Musharraf era as the era of prosperity for Pakistan, as under his leadership the economy grew, the country was relatively stable, and the security situation was better, and Pakistan had better relations with the USA and its neighbouring countries receiving massive financial assistance especially from the USA. Many think that Pakistan needs a stern leader to take the country forward, as in general the people need a lot of guidance and a stick and carrot to perform their duties at work and in their private lives, and thus many people even in the educated elite think that democracy does not work in Pakistan and that a military or more authoritarian rule is better for the country. It is evident that the Western style of democracy does not necessarily work in Pakistan, and its population would first have to be educated for any kind of democracy to work, as their priorities lie mostly in the survival of their families, not in human rights, press freedom etc. However, as much as the elite and political parties talk about the importance of education, most governments or feudal lords or business men are not willing to contribute to the improvement or provision of education, as the more educated people are the more knowledgeable they become, and that would weaken their power. Though most people are dissatisfied with the current President and government, not many people think another party in power would make much difference, as even Imran Khan and PTI would have to cater for powerful feudal lords or business men's wishes in order to gain more support or stay in power, thus compromising on their values and ideology, which can be argued to have happened to PPP whilst in power.

With the worsening security situation especially in Karachi, people are missing the glorious Musharraf era of stability. Since 2007 the security situation has worsened every year, and 2009 was the most devastating year in terms of people killed in bomb blasts, whilst 2010 scored highest in terms of people killed in drone attacks.²³⁵ With a successful attack on a navy base nearby Karachi or with over 100 people killed in political shootings in June 2011

²³⁵ Pakistan Body Count, Analytics, 2011, available from: <http://pakistanbodycount.org/analytics>

in Karachi²³⁶ or with a bomb blasting in a peaceful Defence Housing Authority in Karachi in late September 2011, which is two streets away from the authors' flat, the security situation in the financial hub of Pakistan with over 20 million inhabitants has drastically become worse following the death of Osama bin Laden and the political squabbles between the ruling parties, making the future of multi-party democracy in Pakistan very fragile. Especially the rioting sent shock waves in the general public over the immense number of people killed in 3 days in June 2011, recently coupled with a bomb blast in Defence Housing Authority which is considered the safest place in Karachi. TTP immediately claimed ownership of the terror attack which was directed to a policeman Chaudry Aslam, who is known for anti-terrorist stance and has hunted down many terrorists, thus receiving many death threats. However, he was not killed in the attack which left 8 civilians dead and over 10 houses and dozens of cars damaged and traumatised many inhabitants of the area.²³⁷ Due to the highly volatile security situation in Pakistan, it can be argued that many symptoms of a civil war exists in present day Pakistan with the state fighting many militias in FATA for the control of many districts, an argument which has been voiced by the former Federal Investigation Bureau (FIA) Director General Masood Sharif Khan Khattak among others. Furthermore, according to a criteria set by Fearon and Laitin for civil wars, this ongoing domestic violence can be classed as a civil war, and according to Mia Bloom's theory Pakistan has gone beyond the second iteration of the conflict which means that when more conventional means have been depleted, the insurgents resort to the use of suicide bombing which has especially since 2007 and events in Lal Majid increased across Pakistan.²³⁸

Though Musharraf's era has been hailed as successful especially in economic and foreign policy terms, in the current nostalgia people often forget the negative sides of his rule. The parliament was denied its role in policy making and was practically downgraded to a rubber stamping body, and therefore it was not even able to elect a Prime Minister for the country; and the Chief Justice of Pakistan was removed unconstitutionally in March 2007, and later in November 2007 55 additional Supreme and High Court judges were forced to retire in order

²³⁶ A.Rehman, Karachi violence, over 100 dead, 2011, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/205202/karachi-violence-live-updates/>

²³⁷ Dawn.com, Heavy bomb blast in Karachi, 2011, available from: <http://www.dawn.com/2011/09/19/heavy-bomb-blast-in-karachi.html>

²³⁸ J. Lanche, 'Suicide Terrorism in Pakistan: An Assessment', APCS Special Report 84, 2009, available from: www.ipcs.org/pdf_file/issue/SR84-Jeremie-Suicideterroism.pdf, p. 3

to have a pliant judiciary to continue military rule under a civilian façade; and previously the 2002 general elections and the 2005 local body's polls were rigged, which effectively destroyed the credibility of Pakistan's electoral process. In the 8 years of Musharraf the military took control of most of the key economic sectors in Pakistan in addition to retired or serving military officers holding most important positions in the country. The process of accountability intentionally excluded the army, and was centred on politicians, businessmen and bureaucrats, whereby the National Accountability Bureau was used as a political tool to force turn-coat politicians into playing second fiddle to military dominance in issues which are merely civilian in a democratic state. During the military rule there were many constraints to democratic freedom and press freedom, and opposition parties were pressurised and politicians were maligned in order to justify military rule and prevent the rise of strong political alternatives. Opposition parties argued that the military government completely failed to accomplish any of the objectives of its seven point agenda from October 1999, because there was a pointed rise in prices, unemployment and poverty coupled with a deteriorating law and order situation with increases in car thefts, burglaries, bank robberies, political and sectarian violence. Furthermore, the relations between the centre and its provinces heavily deteriorated due to water issues and distribution of financial resources under National Finance Commission (NFC), and especially in Baluchistan, the situation got out of hand resulting in an armed conflict between the federal authorities and local leadership. Not only conflicts in Baluchistan, the situation worsened also in NWFP and the tribal areas due to the mishandling and heavy use of force in the region without forgetting the domestic backlash of 9/11 in the form of terrorist activities and bomb blasts in various areas of Pakistan.²³⁹

However, despite the setbacks and undemocratic development during military rules, these eras have been more beneficial in economic and security terms, and civilian eras have not done much for the country's development and have only increased the domestic political instability in the country. Therefore, it is questionable whether democracy will work in Pakistan especially when the masses are not educated and can thus be easily manipulated, and when political parties are always engaged in a constant power struggle, instead of focusing on the national interests, and where elite governance pertains in all spheres of society. Due to

²³⁹ GEOTV, PML-N Manifesto, op.cit.

this current situation, it is not surprising that among the general public, President Zardari is a hated figure and many students are wishing for a change in PPP-led government. But people are apathetic, and they are not willing to do anything, as they think that President Zardari can only be deposed with the help of the military. Only with the worst floods ever in summer 2010, when over 1,600 people died, the government and civil society came together to help the flood victims. However, it is striking that during the floods President Zardari was abroad and not fully supporting the government flood efforts which were uncoordinated and received a lot of criticism.²⁴⁰ However, the army saved over 100,000 flood victims and army flood camps were very coordinated. The author visited one of them in Makli, Sindh arranged by the Pakistan navy; the tents were in straight line and living conditions good with sufficient medical facilities. Yet, the children did not have proper areas to play, and the people were beaten up if they disobeyed the rules, and the camp was heavily guarded to deter other affected people from flocking in. During food delivery times the place would go into mayhem with people trying to get more food or water for their family, some on verge of being hit by a bat, or when foreigners came to the site money was thrown among the victims as entertainment and tens of men and women rushed for the rupee notes, when the army guard was looking at the sight with an amused face.²⁴¹

One of the prime examples of apathy among the general public are the unfortunate events of bomb blasts. In October-November 2010 two major bomb blasts happened in Karachi, one on 7th October 2010 at a local Sufi shrine killing 8 people and wounding around 65 people.²⁴² The following day a friend of the author went to see the blast site, and being a foreigner he was allowed to take extensive pictures, whilst police was controlling the situation. On 11th November 2010 another major blast happened near all major hotels in Karachi,²⁴³ targeting the police and intelligence, and the following day the author passed by just 500 metres from the blast site on her way to work, and all one could see anymore was a lot of police and guards, but the life in the streets both times went on as usual. Many people had been killed,

²⁴⁰ S. Shah, Pakistan floods: army steps into breach as anger grows at Zardari, 2010, available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/aug/08/pakistan-floods-army-popular-zardari-anger>

²⁴¹ Author's personal experiences from September-October 2010

²⁴² A. Khan, Blast kills 8 at Sufi shrine in Pakistan, 2010, available from: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/7/blasts-kill-4-sufi-shrine-pakistan/?page=all>

²⁴³ S. R. Hassan, Bomb and gun attack rocks in Karachi, 2010, available from: <http://www.dawn.com/2010/11/12/bomb-blast-at-cid-building-at-least-five-killed.html>

and the security in both situations had failed, but the general public had stopped caring about such events, and continued their lives as usual. Though the general public is suffering from apathy, at times civil society rises its head, and comes together, what happened for example with Charter for Compassion, initiative launched by Karen Armstrong around the world to spread the message of compassion, and school curricula have been developed around this message and many companies and NGOs are adopting the Charter as a part of their ethics.²⁴⁴

Another recent, positive development is the political movement generated by Imran Khan and his party PTI, who had struggled for 15 years in Pakistani politics and been unable to use his cricket fame into election success. But in a rally in Lahore in late October 2011, he managed to gather 100,000 people in his campaign against rampant corruption, insecurity and co-operation with the US because of the civilians killed in drone attacks. According to a study by Pew Research Center from June 2011, he is the most popular political figure in Pakistan, and this rally was the biggest ever gathered by PTI.²⁴⁵ Khan said that: “as I stood there, watching them, I knew the moment had come. Now nothing can stop us. This is a revolution, a tsunami. We will not just win the next elections – we will sweep them.” The rally is something that has not been seen in Pakistan since the death of Benazir Bhutto in the late 2007, as it gathered middle class Pakistanis, young, old, urban, men, women, educated, and Khan’s political opponent from PML-N, Ayaz Amir, said that “this is the emergence of a new force. The cry for a change is resonating across Pakistan. Young, old, professionals, women – I’ve never seen such people at a public meeting in Pakistan before.”²⁴⁶ However, it is uncertain how many votes Khan will get in the next elections, as his playground, Punjab, is also the stronghold of PML-N, and the splitting of votes between PML-N and PTI might only benefit the ruling party PPP. Even though Imran Khan is very vocal in his government criticism, it is also unclear what policies he would undertake to fix the current situation.²⁴⁷ Khan has a huge task at hand, because he has no seats in parliament, as he boycotted the 2008

²⁴⁴ Charter for Compassion, 2011, available from: www.charterforcompassion.org.pk/

²⁴⁵ Telegraph.co.uk, Imran Khan leads 100,000 rally against Pakistan’s US alliance, 2011, available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/8858550/Imran-Khan-leads-100000-rally-against-Pakistans-US-alliance.html>

²⁴⁶ D. Walsh, Imran Khan predicts ‘a revolution’ in Pakistani politics, 2011, available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/nov/06/imran-khan-revolution-pakistani-politics>

²⁴⁷ Telegraph.co.uk, Imran Khan leads 100,000 rally against Pakistan’s US alliance, op.cit.

elections, and many of his young supporters have never voted before, and thus the next senate elections in March 2012 will be setting the ground for the general elections in 2013.²⁴⁸

Pakistan is ultimately a country which has a lot of potential in terms of natural resources and a huge population of nearly 180 million people, but the resources are misused and concentrated in the hands of a few, and mass population is not educated to even claim their rights on the abundant resources. As stated before, Pakistan does not have a Western style liberal democracy, but elite governance and delegative democracy concepts define the state of its democracy better. As it became evident earlier, none of the ingredients of liberal democracy are wholly fulfilled in Pakistan, but it has only partial freedom of expression, weak adherence to human rights, and hardly any glimpse of good governance especially in terms of corruption. But when looking at judicial and elections the reality is more positive.

However, in the current foreign-security political situation with worsening US relations coupled with setbacks in Afghan-India front in the form of their mutual agreement, it is unlikely that the security predicament will decrease its importance in the next few years, and the significance of this first factor upholding the paradox will yet again turn the national priorities toward the security and foreign policy aspect with the cost of not addressing domestic concerns and adding to the plight of democracy in Pakistan. However, it is interesting to note that whilst the decision makers are obsessed with the US, India and Taliban, 85% of the 414 people polled by Centre for Research and Security Studies (CRSS) in Facebook, which is used by the educated Pakistanis, believed that corruption and deficient rule of law and ruling elite are the biggest threats instead of Taliban with 12%, the US with less than 3 % and India with less than 1%.²⁴⁹ This means that the educated people are more concerned about domestic political matters like rampant corruption than the political elite which many times is trying to evade growing domestic problems with the foreign-security political predicament. However, bearing in mind the current, unstable domestic political situation with PPP-MQM-government coalition and upcoming LG elections coupled with political unrest especially in Karachi, the future of democracy in Pakistan remains highly

²⁴⁸ Walsh, op.cit.

²⁴⁹ Pakistan Today, Ruling elite- a threat bigger than Taliban, 2011, available from: <http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2011/08/ruling-elite-%E2%80%93-a-threat-bigger-than-taliban/>

volatile. If the current government manages to stay in power until the next elections scheduled for February 2013, it will be the first democratically elected civilian government to have completed its full term in power, as all of the civilian regimes in the past were interrupted because of either corruption or ended in military coup. Consequently, the paradox between democracy and security is upheld in Pakistan resting on the elite governance and power play among the elected and unelected elites. Ultimately, the hope for a change rests largely on Imran Khan and his party PTI and on the youth which are the major supporters of his movement against corruption and for a more stable Pakistan; the success of which remains to be seen in next elections.

Bibliography

Books and journal articles

Abbas, Hassan (2005) *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army and America's War on Terror* (New Delhi: Pentagon Press)

Amin, Shahid M (2010) *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: A Reappraisal* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, second edition)

Case, William F. (1996) 'Can the 'Halfway House' stand? Semidemocracy and Elite Theory in Three Southeast Asian Countries', *Comparative Politics*, vol. 28, no. 4, p. 437-464

Dawisha, Karen (1997) 'Democratization and political participation: research concepts and methodologies' in Dawisha, Karen and Parrott, Bruce (eds.) *Democratic changes and authoritarian reactions in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) p. 40-65

Diamond, Larry, Linz, Juan. J, and Lipset, Seymour Martin (1995) *Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers)

Fillingham, Zachary (2009) 'The Pakistan Taliban', *Geopolitical Monitor*, p. available from: <http://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/the-pakistan-taliban> [10/10/2010]

Held, David (1996) *Models of Democracy* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, second edition)

Hussain, Zahid (2010) *Frontline Pakistan: The path to catastrophe and the killing of Benazir Bhutto* (London: I.B. Tauris&Co Ltd)

Kronstadt, Alan K. (2009) 'Pakistan-US relations', CRS Report for Congress, p. 1-116, available from: www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33498.pdf [10/10/2010]

Lanche, Jermie (2009) 'Suicide Terrorism in Pakistan: An Assessment', APCS Special Report 84, p. 1-8, available from: www.ipcs.org/pdf_file/issue/SR84-Jermie-Suicideterminism.pdf
[10/10/2010]

McCargo, Duncan (1998) 'Elite governance: business, bureaucrats and the military' in Maidment, Richard, Goldblatt, David and Mitchell, Jeremy (eds) *Governance in the Asia Pacific* (London: Routledge) p. 126-150

Mir, Amir (2009) *Talibanization of Pakistan: From 9/11 to 26/11* (New Delhi: Pentagon Press)

O'Donnell, Guillermo (1994) 'Delegative Democracy', *Journal of Democracy*, vol.5, no. 1, p. 55-69

O'Donnell, Guillermo (1992) 'Delegative Democracy?', Working Paper, p. 1-17, available from: <http://kellogg.nd.edu/publications/workingpapers/WPS/172.pdf> [19/10/2011]

Rubin, Barnett R and Siddique, Abubakar (2006) 'Resolving the Pakistan-Afghanistan Stalemate', United States Institute of Peace, available from: www.cic.nyu.edu/afghanistan/docs/stalemate.pdf [10/10/2010]

Schweitzer, Yoram and London, Sean (2010) 'Obama's Afghanistan-Pakistan policy: Challenges and Objectives', Strategic Assessment, vol. 12, no. 4, p. 101-113, available from: [www.inss.org.il/upload/\(FILE\)1267610000.pdf](http://www.inss.org.il/upload/(FILE)1267610000.pdf) [10/10/2010]

Sethi, Anand (2010) The trouble with Pakistan, speech at Finnish-Indian Trade Association, 22nd March 2010

White, Gordon (1998) 'Constructing a Democratic Developmental State' in Robinson, Mark and White, Gordon, *The Democratic Developmental State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) p- 17-51

Zaidi, S. Akbar (2011) *Military, Civil Society and Democratization in Pakistan* (Lahore: Vanguard Books)

Internet

Aligi, Irfan (2011) PPP-MQM coalition: deadline expires, alliance survives, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/132745/ppp-mqm-coalition-deadline-expires-alliance-survives/> [29/08/2011]

Akbar, Mirza Shahzad (2011) Pakistan's civilian victims of drone strikes deserve justice, available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/jun/29/cia-drone-strike-civilian-victims> [20/10/2011]

Akhtar, Amin (2011) DPC seeks details on 'secret deal' on drone attacks, available from: <http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=76279&Cat=7> [17/11/2011]

Aziz, Khalid (2010) FATA reforms and militancy, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/78371/fata-reforms-and-militancy/> [29/08/2011]

Baig, Moazam (2011) PPP prefers to remain silent on revival of LGS, available from: http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2011\10\15\story_15-10-2011_pg7_25 [20/10/2011]

Basit, Abdul (2011) Nawab Akbar Shahbaz Khan Bugti, available from: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/6543897/Akbar-Bugti> [19/07/2011]

BBC News (2006) US ‘threatened to bomb Pakistan, available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/5369198.stm [10/10/2010]

Britannica.com (2011) Asif Ali Zardari, available from: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/1351439/Asif-Ali-Zardari> [29/08/2011]

Byman, Daniel (2009) Do targeted killings work?, available from: http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2009/0714_targeted_killings_byman.aspx [20/10/2011]

Carr, Adam (2008) Legislative Election, available from: <http://psephos.adam-carr.net/countries/p/pakistan/pakistan2008.txt> [29/08/2011]

Charter for Compassion (2011), available from: www.charterforcompassion.org.pk/ [29/08/2011]

Chene, Marie (2008) Overview of corruption in Pakistan, available from: <http://www.u4.no/helpdesk/helpdesk/query.cfm?id=174> [17/11/2010]

China.org.cn (2008) Pakistan’s PPP and PML-N to form coalition government, available from: <http://www.china.org.cn/english/international/243499.htm> [29/08/2011]

Chishti, Ali K (2011) Local governance: the great tussle, available from:

<http://www.thefridaytimes.com/04032011/page4.shtml> [29/08/2011]

CNN.com (2008) Pakistan blast toll rises to 27, available from:

<http://edition.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/asiapcf/02/10/pakistan.blast/index.html> [29/08/2011]

Cogan, James (2011) India-Afghan pact poisons Aghan-Pakistan relations, available from:

<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2011/oct2011/afgh-o06.shtml> [20/10/2011]

Columnspk.com (2011) MQM rejoins Sindh and federal government, available from:

<http://www.columnspk.com/mqm-rejoins-sindh-and-federal-government/> [20/10/2011]

CPJ (2011) Pakistani journalist killed in Lahore, available from:

<http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4e9c1fb1ce.html> [20/10/2011]

Crilly, Rob (2011) 168 children killed in drone strikes in Pakistan since the start of the campaign, available from:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/8695679/168-children-killed-in-drone-strikes-in-Pakistan-since-start-of-campaign.html> [20/10/2011]

Daigle, Katy (2011) India, Pakistan say bilateral relations are on right track, available from:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/27/india-pakistan-bilateral-relations-right-track-_n_910651.html [29/08/2011]

Dawn.com (2011) Heavy bomb blast in Karachi, available from:

<http://www.dawn.com/2011/09/19/heavy-bomb-blast-in-karachi.html> [27/09/2011]

Dawn.com (2007) The manifesto season, available from:
<http://archives.dawn.com/2007/12/12/ed.htm> [29/08/2011]

Dawn.com (2011) Web journalist Faisal Qureshi murdered in Lahore, available from:
<http://www.dawn.com/2011/10/08/web-journalist-faisal-queshi-murdered-in-lahore.html>
[20/10/2011]

Democracy-building.info (2011) A short definition of democracy, available from:
<http://www.democracy-building.info/definition-democracy.html> [29/08/2011]

Elections.com (2008) Elections 2008: Benazir Factor May Affect the Results, available from:
<http://elections.com.pk/articledetails.php?id=31> [29/08/2011]

Express Tribune (2011) Akbar Bugti case: Investigation team demands red warrant against Musharraf, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/204547/akbar-bugti-case-investigation-team-demands-red-arrest-warrant-against-musharraf/> [19/07/2011]

Express Tribune (2011) PPP should part ways with MQM: Mirza, available from:
<http://tribune.com.pk/story/275178/ppp-should-part-ways-with-mqm-mirza/> [20/10/2011]

Express Tribune (2011) US officials slam report on Pakistan drone war dead, available from:
<http://tribune.com.pk/story/230583/us-officials-slam-report-on-pakistan-drone-war-dead/>
[20/10/2011]

Freedom House (2011) Combined average ratings-Independent countries, available from:
[http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/fiw11/CombinedAverageRatings\(IndependentCountries\)FIW2011.pdf](http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/fiw11/CombinedAverageRatings(IndependentCountries)FIW2011.pdf) [29/08/2011]

Freedomhouse.org (2011) Country report: Pakistan 2011, available from:
<http://freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=22&year=2011&country=8108> [29/08/2011]

Georgy, Michael (2011) Shooting video another blow to Pakistan's security forces, available from: <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/10/us-pakistan-killing-video-idUSTRE75923220110610> [29/08/2011]

GEOTV (2010), available from: www.geo.tv/8-8-2010/69653.htm [29/08/2011]

GEOTV (2008) PML-N manifesto, available from:
http://www.geo.tv/election2008/manifestos_pml_N2008.html [29/08/2011]

GEOTV (2008) PML-Q manifesto, available from:
http://www.geo.tv/election2008/manifestos_pml_Q_2008.html [29/08/2011]

Global Research (2010) 'At war' US justifies drone attacks in Pak as act of 'self-defence', available from: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=18375>
[20/10/2011]

Gregory, Shaun (2008) 'The ISI and War on Terrorism', Pakistan Security Research Unit, available from: <http://spaces.brad.ac.uk:8080/download/attachments/748/Brief28finalised.pdf>
[20/10/2011]

Hassan, Mirza (2011) Govt believes in freedom of media: Gilani, available from:
<http://www.thenewstribune.com/2011/10/16/govt-believes-on-freedom-of-media-gilani/>
[20/10/2011]

Hassan, S. Raza (2010) Bomb and gun attack rocks in Karachi, available from:
<http://www.dawn.com/2010/11/12/bomb-blast-at-cid-building-at-least-five-killed.html>
[27/09/2011]

Hindustantimes.com (2011) Pakistan charges six Rangers over killing of civilian, available from: <http://www.hindustantimes.com/rssfeed/Pakistan/Pakistan-charges-six-Rangers-over-killing-of-civilian/Article1-715178.aspx> [29/08/2011]

HRCF.web.org (2011) HRCF condemns murder of young man by Rangers, available from: <http://www.hrcf-web.org/showprel.asp?id=217> [29/08/2011]

International Crisis Group (2007) 'Karachi's Madrasas and Violent Extremism', available from: [http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/asia/south-asia/pakistan/130_pakistan_karachi_s_madrasas_and_violent_extremism.pdf](http://www.crisisgroup.org/~/media/Files/asia/south-asia/pakistan/130_pakistan_karachi_s_madrasas_and_violent_extremism.pdf) [20/10/2011]

International Crisis Group (2004) Unfulfilled promises: Pakistan's failure to tackle extremism, available from: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/asia/south-asia/pakistan/073-unfulfilled-promises-pakistans-failure-to-tackle-extremism.aspx>
[20/10/2011]

Investors.com (2011) India, Pakistan lay down timeline to normalise trade relations, available from: <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Newsfeed/Article/136412257/201109282219/India-Pakistan-agree-to-lay-down-timeline-to-normalize-trade-relations.aspx>
[20/10/2011]

Jamal, GM (2011) Breakthrough PPP-MQM: the deal has been done, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/225440/breakthrough-ppp-mqm-the-deal-has-been-done/>
[20/10/2011]

Jesly, Rasjree (2011) Break-up of the MQM-PPP alliance in Pakistan, available from: <http://blog.nus.edu.sg/southasiansoundings/2011/07/04/break-up-of-the-mqm-ppp-alliance-in-pakistan/> [29/08/2011]

Jung, Ahmed (2011) Akbar Bugti's grandson among six killed in Karachi firing incident, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/196639/defence-shooting-four-dead-seven-injured-in-shooting-incident/> [19/07/2011]

Jung, Ahmed (2011) Russian national with expired visa detained by police, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/218395/russian-national-with-expired-visa-detained-by-police/> [03/08/2011]

Khan, Ashraf (2010) Blast kills 8 at Sufi shrine in Pakistan, 2010, available from: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/7/blasts-kill-4-sufi-shrine-pakistan/?page=all> [19/07/2011]

Khan, Rashid Ahmad (2009) Reforms in FATA, available from: <http://nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Opinions/Columns/25-Aug-2009/Reforms-in-FATA/1> [20/10/2011]

Khan, Said Alam (2011) Parties term FATA reforms historic, available from: <http://nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Politics/15-Aug-2011/Parties-term-Fata-reforms-historic> [20/10/2011]

Mahmood, Javed (2011) Ranger gets death sentence; other 5 get life for murder, available from: http://centralasiaonline.com/cocoon/caii/xhtml/en_GB/pakistan-features/caii/features/pakistan/main/2011/08/12/feature-01 [29/08/2011]

Majeed, Aamir (2011) PPP-MQM alliance: a thorny wedding, and acrimonious divorce, available from: <http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2011/06/ppp-mqm-alliance-a-thorny-wedding-an-acrimonious-divorce/> [29/08/2011]

MQM.org (2008) Manifesto, available from: <http://www.mqm.org/> [29/08/2011]

Nation.com.pk (2011) US drone strikes fails to mobilise Pakistan masses, available from: <http://nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Regional/Islamabad/31-Oct-2011/US-drone-strikes-fail-to-mobilise-Pakistan-masses> [17/11/2011]

Nawaz, Farman (2009) Editors view about elections 2008 in Pakistan, available from: <http://www.articlesbase.com/self-publishing-articles/editors-view-about-elections-2008-in-pakistan-1168422.html> [29/08/2011]

Pakistan Body Count (2011) Analytics, available from: <http://pakistanbodycount.org/analytics> [20/10/2011]

Pakistani Defence Forum (2008) Suicide attack kills 37 as Pakistan vote campaign ends, available from: <http://forum.pakistanidefence.com/lofiversion/index.php/t73394.html> [29/08/2011]

Pakistan Today (2011) Ruling elite- a threat bigger than Taliban, available from: <http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2011/08/ruling-elite-%E2%80%93-a-threat-bigger-than-taliban/> [23/11/2011]

Pak Tribune (2011) Power aspirants should wait till next elections: PM Gilani, available from: <http://paktribune.com/news/Power-aspirants-should-wait-till-next-elections-PM-Gilani-244409.html> [20/10/2011]

PPP.org (2008) PPP Manifesto 2008: towards peace and prosperity in Pakistan, available from: <http://www.ppp.org.pk/manifestos/2008.pdf> [29/08/2011]

Press TV (2008) Pakistan threatens to retaliate against US, available from: <http://www.infowars.com/pakistan-threatens-to-retaliate-against-us/>
[20/10/2011]

PTI (2011) The manifesto of PTI, available from: <http://insaf.pk/AboutUs/Manifesto/tabid/138/Default.aspx> [29/08/2011]

PTI RHL (2011) MQM to rejoin government in Pakistan, available from: <http://news.in.msn.com/international/article.aspx?cp-documentid=5490897> [20/10/2011]

Rajghatta, Chidanand (2010) Pak army may be paying compensation to slain 26/11 terrorists' skin: US lawmaker, available from: http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2010-03-13/us/28148791_1_terrorist-state-pakistan-army-mumbai-attacks [10/10/2010]

Raja, Shafique (2011) PPP-PML-N break up runs counter to political stability, available from: <http://www.dawn.com/2011/02/28/ppp-pml-n-break-up-runs-counter-to-political-stability.html> [29/08/2011]

Rehman, Atika (2011) Karachi violence, over 100 dead, available from: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/205202/karachi-violence-live-updates/> [29/08/2011]

Rugman, Jonathan (2011) Study reveals 168 child deaths in Pakistan drone war, available from: <http://www.channel4.com/news/study-reveals-168-child-deaths-in-pakistan-drone-war> [20/10/2011]

Shah, Saeed (2010) Pakistan floods: army steps into breach as anger grows at Zardari, available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/aug/08/pakistan-floods-army-popular-zardari-anger> [29/08/2011]

Shane, Scott (2011) CIA is disputed in civilian toll in drone strikes, available from: http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/12/world/asia/12drones.html?_r=2&hp [20/10/2011]

Siddique, Abubakar (2011) Pakistan's tribal area reforms too little, too late, available from: http://www.rferl.org/content/pakistan_fata_tribal_reforms/24302628.html [20/10/2011]

Tatchell, Peter (2011) Pakistan's neo-colonial rule in Pakistan, available from: <http://www.nakedpunch.com/articles/129> [17/11/2011]

Telegraph.co.uk (2011) Imran Khan leads 100,000 rally against Pakistan's US alliance, available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/8858550/Imran-Khan-leads-100000-rally-against-Pakistans-US-alliance.html> [23/11/2011]

Telegraph.co.uk (2011) US drone strike in Pakistan kills three Egyptians, available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/8830186/US-drone-strike-in-Pakistan-kills-three-Egyptians.html> [20/10/2011]

The News (2007) A step into the future, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=83702&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

[29/08/2011]

The News (2007) Mr. Boycott, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=85292&Cat=8&dt=12/10/2007>

[29/08/2011]

The News (2007) Pressure cooker, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=84358&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

[29/08/2011]

The News (2007) Restoration theme, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=86597&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

[29/08/2011]

The News (2007) Taking the lead, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=83844&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

[29/08/2011]

The News (2007) The five D's, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=85632&Cat=8&dt=11/1/2008>

[29/08/2011]

The News (2007) The middle path, available from:

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=84749&Cat=8&dt=12/7/2007>

[29/08/2011]

Times of India (2007) Pakistan opposition parties announce boycott of polls, available from: http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2007-11-12/pakistan/27965409_1_emergency-rule-transparent-elections-poll-announcement [29/08/2011]

Unicef (2011) Pakistan statistics, available from: http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/pakistan_pakistan_statistics.html [17/11/2011]

US Department of State (2009) 2009 Human Rights Report: Pakistan, available from: <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2009/sca/136092.htm> [09/11/2011]

Walsh, Declan (2011) Imran Khan predicts ‘a revolution’ in Pakistani politics, available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/nov/06/imran-khan-revolution-pakistani-politics> [23/11/2011]

Yahya, Muhammad (2011) PPP-PML-N split termed bad for economy, available from: <http://www.defence.pk/forums/national-political-issues/95110-ppp-pml-n-split-termed-bad-economy.html> [29/08/2011]

APPENDIX I EXPLANATION OF ACRONYMS

AJK= Azad Jammu and Kashmir

ANP= Awami National Party

APDM= All Parties Democratic Movement

ATC= Anti-Terrorism Court

BLA= Balochistan Liberation Army

BLUF= Balochistan Liberation United Front

BOI=Board of Investment

CDNS= Council for Defence and National Security

CEO=Chief Executive Officer

CFL= Cease Fire Line

CIA=Central Intelligence Agency

CoD= Charter of Democracy

CPI= Corruption Perception Index

CPJ= Committee to Protect Journalists

CRSS= Centre for Research and Security Studies

ECP= Election Commission of Pakistan

FATA= Federally Administered Tribal Areas

FCR= Frontier Crimes Regulations

FDI= Foreign Direct Investment

FIA= Federal Investigation Bureau

GDP= Gross Domestic Product

GHQ= General Headquarters

IB= Intelligence Bureau

IFI= International Financial Institutions

IMF= International Monetary Fund

ISI =Inter-Services Intelligence

ISPR= Inter Services Public Relations
JI=Jamaat-i-Islami
JUI-F=Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Islam-Fazlur
KBCA= Karachi Building Corporation Authority
KWSB= Karachi Water and Sewerage Board
L.e.T= Lashkar-e-Toiba
LFO= Legal Framework Order
LG= Local Government
LGS= Local Government System
LOC= Line of Control
MMA= Muttahidda Majlis-e-Amal
MOI=Ministry of Interior
MQM= Muttahida Qaumi Movement
MQM-Haqiqi= Mohajir Qaumi Movement
NAB=National Accountability Bureau
NCPS= National Corruption Perception Survey
NATO= North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NFC= National Finance Commission
NWFP= Northwest Frontier Provinces
PAC= People's Amn Committee
PCO= Provisional Constitution Order
PDPA= People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan
PML-F= Pakistan Muslim League Functional
PML-N= Pakistan Muslim League Nawaz
PML-Q=Pakistan Muslim League Quaid-i-Azam
PPP=Pakistan's Peoples' Party
PSDP= Public Sector Development Programme

PTI= Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf

SAFTA= South Asia Free Trade Agreement

SEATO=Southeast Asia Treaty Organization

TBIJ= Bureau of Investigative Journalism

TNSM= Tehreek-e-Nafaz-e-Shariat-e-Mohammadi

TTP= Tehrik Taliban Pakistan

UN= United Nations

USA,US=The United States

APPENDIX II LIST OF PEOPLE

Abbas, Athar= Major General, Director General of Inter Services Public Relations i.e. Spokesperson for Pakistan's army since 2008 and served in the army since 1976.

Ackerman, Gary = Member of US House of Representatives since 1993.

Ahsan, Chaudry Aitzaz= Barrister, lawmaker and politician of PPP, who led the lawyer's movement, which boycotted 2008 elections. He was arrested multiple times in the final months of Musharraf rule due to his arguments against Musharraf's eligibility to contest the 2008 elections. He was awarded Asian Human Right Defender Award in 2008 and was voted in 2008 as the 5th topmost intellectual person in the Top 100 Public Intellectuals by UK Prospect Magazine and US Foreign Policy magazine for his literary contribution and work for human rights.

Akbar, Shahzad Mirza= Lawyer who is pursuing a lawsuit against CIA since autumn 2010.

Amjab= Lieutenant General of Pakistan in charge of NAB in 1999-2000.

Armitage, Richard = Deputy Secretary of State of the USA in 2001-2005.

Aslam, Chaudry= Karachi policeman specialised in anti-terrorism. He was a target of a suicide bomb attack in autumn 2011.

Aziz, Shaukat= Prime Minister of Pakistan in 2004-2007.

Badar, Farhatullah= President Zardari's Spokesperson. He has previously served in the Pakistani parliament from PPP ranks.

Bhutto, Benazir= Prime Minister of Pakistan in 1988-1990 and in 1993-1996, also the leader of PPP. She was killed in suicide bomb attack in December 2007.

Bhutto, Murtaza= Member of Pakistani Parliament from PPP ranks, also a brother of Benazir Bhutto. He was killed in controversial circumstances in 1996.

Bhutto, Zulfikar Ali= President of Pakistan in 1971-1973, Prime Minister of Pakistan in 1973-1977, also the leader of PPP. He was hanged by Zia ul-Haq in 1979.

bin Laden, Osama = Saudi leader of al-Qaeda which was responsible of 9/11 terrorist attacks. He allegedly died in a US covert attack in May 2011 in Pakistan.

Byman, Daniel = Analyst at Brookings Institution.

Carney, Jay= White House Press Secretary since 2011.

Chaudhry, Iftikhar Mohammad = Chief Justice of Pakistan in 2005-2007, who was deposed by President Musharraf in 2007 and re-installed in 2009.

Clinton, Bill = President of the USA in 1993-2001.

Dietz, Bob =Asia programme co-ordinator for Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ).

Durrani, Agha Siraj= Chief Minister of Sindh i.e. the leader of the Karachi Local Government since 2008, member of PPP.

Gandhi, Mahatma = Leader of Indian National Congress in 1921-1948. He was assassinated in 1948.

Gilani, Yousaf Raza= Prime Minister of Pakistan since 2008.

Haider, Iqbal = Co-Chairman of the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan.

Haqqani, Hussain= Pakistan's ambassador to Sri Lanka in 1993-1995, journalist, and a special advisor to three Prime Ministers in the 1990s. Most recently Pakistan's Ambassador to the USA in 2008-2011. He resigned from his post in November 2011.

Haqqani family= Leaders of an ethnic Pashtun militant group which was at first place armed and by financed by CIA and ISI in the Afghan war and now conduct terrorist attacks from Pakistan into Afghanistan.

Hussain, Altaf = Founder and a leader of MQM since 1984. He has lived in exile in UK since 1992 after surviving an assassination attempt.

Iqbal, Saudi Sufi and Lieutenant General GM= The perpetrators in charge of the failed coup in the mid-1990s.

Jamali, Zafarullah Khan = Prime Minister of Pakistan in 2002-2004.

Jianzhu, Meng = Minister of Public Security of China since 2007.

Jinnah, Muhammad Ali= Founder, and the first Governor-General of Pakistan in 1947, and a leader of All-India Muslim League in 1913-1947. He was assassinated in 1947 and is referred as Quaid-e Azam i.e. Great Leader in Pakistan.

Junejo, Muhammad Khan = Prime Minister of Pakistan in 1985-1988 (the next one after Bhutto, as the post was abolished in 1977-1985).

Kamal, Syed Mustafa= Mayor of Karachi in 2005-2010, member of MQM. Due to his achievements especially in the economic sector, he was shortlisted for World's Mayor Price 2010.

Kakar, Abdul Waheed = General and Chief of Army staff in 1993-1996.

Karzai, Hamid= President of Afghanistan since 2004.

Kennedy, J.F. = President of the USA in 1961-1963.

Khan, Dr Ashfaq Hassan= Economist and former economic advisor to the Ministry of Finance.

Khan, Ghulam Ishaq = President of Pakistan in 1988-1993.

Khan, Imran= Founder and leader of PTI since 1996, and cricketer 1971-1992 and cricket captain in 1982-1992 to the Pakistan's national cricket team which won Pakistan's first and only world's championship in 1992.

Khan, Ishrat-ul-Ibad/Ishrat ul-Ebad= The longest serving Sindh Governor since 2002 and formerly a senior leader of the MQM.

Khan, Kareem = The first tribesman who issued a complaint against the US drone war and is represented by lawyer Shahzad Akbar Mirza.

Khan, Muhammad Ayub= Field Marshal, Army Commander-in-Chief in 1951-1958 and President of Pakistan in 1958-1969.

Khan, Muhammad Yahya= General, Army Commander-in-Chief in 1966-1971 and President of Pakistan 1969-1971.

Khan, Liaquat Ali= Prime Minister of Pakistan in 1947-1951.

Khan, Murad= Major, a Spokesman for the Pakistani army during Musharraf's rule.

Khan, Sahabzada Yaqub Ali = Lieutenant-General and Pakistan's Ambassador to the US, France and Soviet Union in 1972-1982, Foreign minister of Pakistan in 1982-1991, caretaker Foreign Minister in 1996-1997 and Pakistan's UN representative in the 1990s.

Khar, Hina Rabbani= Foreign Minister of Pakistan since summer 2011.

Khattak, Masood Sharif Khan = Director General of Intelligence Bureau in the 1990s, Vice President of PPP under Benazir Bhutto in the 1990s. He was in charge of a famous intelligence operation in 1990 called 'Midnight Jackals' which tried to overthrow the PPP government. Senior Vice- President of PPP 2002-2007, who in November 2011 joined the ranks of PTI.

Khawaja, Sultan = Senior police officer, who headed the inquiry against the Karachi Rangers in summer 2011.

Khoso, Bashir =Judge who sentenced Ranger Shahid Zafar to death for shooting and killing an unarmed man in June 2011.

Koh, Harold= US State Department legal advisor.

Leghari, Farooq = President of Pakistan in 1993-1997, a member of PPP.

Lerounis, Thanasis = Greek volunteer for a humanitarian organisation in northwestern Pakistan, kidnapped in autumn 2009.

Lincoln, Abraham= President of the USA in 1861-1865.

Mahsoud/Mehsud, Baitullah = Former leader of Pakistani Taliban, who died in 2008.

Mahsoud/Mehsud, Hakimullah = Brother of Baitullah Mahsoud, and a leader of Pakistani Taliban since 2008.

Malik, Rehman= Director-General of Federal Investigation Agency (FIA) in 1993-1996, and Advisor of Interior Affairs and Narcotics Control to Prime Minister Gilani since 2008, and was later appointed as a Minister of Interior.

Marri, Balach= Baloch nationalist leader, killed in November 2008.

Mirza, Zulfiqar = Sindh Home Minister of PPP in 1998-2011, a critic of PPP-MQM coalition. He was forced to resign from his post in June 2011 due to his criticism.

Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat = French political thinker who invented the famous separation of powers in the 18th century.

Muhammad, Ghulam= Chair of the Baloch National Movement (BMN), found dead in April 2009.

Musharraf, Pervez= General, Chief of Army staff in 1998-2007, Chief Executive of Pakistan in 1999-2001, and President of Pakistan in 2001-2008.

Nehru, Jawaharlal = Prime Minister of India in 1947-1964.

Obama, Barack= President of the USA since 2009.

Orakzai, Munir Khan = Businessman-turned-politician, a leader of FATA lawmakers in Pakistan's parliament.

Qureshi, Faisal = Writer for an online publication London Post, killed in October 2011.

Qureshi, Shahid = Brother of the killed journalist Faisal Qureshi.

Rabbani, Burhanuddin = President of Afghanistan in 1992- 2001, Head of Afghan Peace Council. He was killed by a suicide bomb in September 2011.

Rabbani, Mian Raza= Senator of Pakistan in 1994-2000, Leader of the House of Senate, and PPP minister of Inter-Provincial Co-ordination since February 2011

Rizvi, Rashid A. = Justice, and a former President of the High Court Bar Association and prominent figure in Pakistani legal circles.

Sarsaperla, Anthenio = French tourist, kidnapped in spring 2009.

Shah, Riaz=PPP candidate at 2008 elections.

Shah, Sarfaraz = Youngster, who was killed by Karachi Rangers in June 2011.

Shahzad, Saleem = Journalist, killed in May 2011 due to his news coverage.

Sharif, Nawaz= Prime Minister of Pakistan in 1990-1993 and in 1997-1999, also the leader of the PML-N.

Sharif, Shahbaz= PML-N candidate at 2008 elections.

Sherani, Saqib= Economist and former principle Economic Advisor to Ministry of Finance.

Solecki, John=Head of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) Balochistan office, kidnapped in 2009.

Stanczak, Piotr= Polish engineer, abducted in 2008.

ul-Haq, Muhammad Zia= General, Chief of Army staff in 1976-1988 and President of Pakistan in 1979-1988.

ul-Rahman, Maulana Fazl = Leader of Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Islam-F (JUI-F).

ur-Rahman, Sheikh Mujib = Member of Muslim League and later the leader of Awami League in 1965-1971. Also, the founder of Bangladesh in 1971, Prime Minister of Bangladesh in 1972-1975 and President of Bangladesh in 1975. He was assassinated in 1975

Vajpayee, Atal Behari = Prime Minister of India in 1996 and in 1998-2004.

Zardari, Asif Ali= President of Pakistan since 2008, also a Co-Chairman of PPP, and the husband of the late Benazir Bhutto.

Zardari, Bilawal= Chairman of PPP, and the son of Benazir Bhutto and Asif Zardari.

Zarifi, Sam = Asia-Pacific director of Amnesty International.

Yew, Lee Kuan= Prime Minister of Singapore in 1959-1990.

Yusuf, Zohra = Head of the independent Human Rights Commission of Pakistan.