

Military Interventions in Pakistan and Its Implications

Jamshed Ali Baloch*

Ghulam Mustafa Gaho**

Abstract

Military interventions have remained part and parcel of underdeveloped nations. The case of Pakistan is unique in certain extent. Historically, the long spells of military rules are cumulative result of weak state institutions, lack of politically motivated leadership and foreign intervention always give new life to the military dictators; due to its perfidious regional and international interests. Intractable implications of military rules in Pakistan are meager state of economy, weak political and state institutions and derailment of constitutional democracy. Pakistan is tilting towards new trends in its political dynamics as judicial activism, continuation of electoral process, explosion of electronic and social media and democratization.

Keywords: *Pakistan, Military Interventions, Causes, Military, and New Trends.*

Military Intervention

Like other third world countries the phenomena of military intervention has remained the most considerable political factor. Frequent military intervention in; Pakistan in (1958-1977-1999) are the logical consequences of leadership vacuum, weak political institutions, internal political dynamics and regional, geo-strategic compulsion. Many analysts have given detailed study of civil military relations and the direct and indirect role of military into the politics of Pakistan. Writers like Ayesha Siddiqa, Veena Kukreja, Shafquat Mehmood, Hassan Askari Rizvi, and Stephan Cohen have explicitly defined the military ascendancy in Pakistan.

Reasons of Military Intervention

Veena Kukreja has explained the following conditions which facilitate military intervention in Pakistan. (1) The nature of Pakistani military establishment. (2) The strength and weakness of Pakistan's civil and military institutions. (3) The domestic socio-economic and international environment within which military and civilian institutions interact with each other power and are influenced in their behavior by that milieu (1986:51). The military of Pakistan have some vital security, foreign policy, political and economic interests in Pakistan. The clash of those interests resulted many civilian governments lost their power.

a. Internal Political Dynamics

Taking into account the intervention of military in Pakistan it is important to understand internal political dynamics of Political of Pakistan. The first paradox of military intervention in Pakistan is the weak political institutions. Historically, the dilemma of institutional weakness is the result of predictable consequences of late constitution making, superiority of two institutions military and bureaucracy. A sound party system is one of the essential for a stable political order. Politicians without parties are like fish out of water. Likewise parties without organization are also perishable like fish. Both, in a sense were nonexistent before independence. What existence then, was a moment which derived its

momentum from the unifying force of nationalism? Differences suppressed during the struggle were bound to erupt after the struggle was over.

“A strong political system or political control will force the military to take subservient role of the armed forces will be defined by the civilian leadership and primarily limited to internal security. This is significant because it determines the military’s penetration into state and society (2007: 4).

It has had remained irony of political history of Pakistan that political forces has been getting power from undemocratic means. And military of the country has manipulated the situation for its perfidious advantages. Sometimes it establishes its own party when it comes in power. But when military is out of power it plays game of divide and rule. It is widely believed for the prevalent scenario no party can come into power without the support of Army. The alternation between civil and military governments had produced the most unfortunate consequences for the country. The occupants of office either played politics with the affairs of the country or use the state power to perpetuate themselves in authority. The new order had to ensure that either of these things happens again. The ultimate solution lay in the representative character of the legislature and the character of the representative elected by the people.

“The military has three major features which make it distinctive and dynamic. First, most of the organization’s except the military operates within the context of their, own society. Second political leadership of new nations, recognize the need of maintaining strong and effective armed forces to defend and protect the territorial integrity of the state of the actual or political internal and external threats. Third, military is not professional it is way of life (1997:21).

Political parties, free and transparent elections, role of electronic and print media and civil society are the essence of democracy. Unfortunately, in Pakistan these institutions remained dormant. Lack of political leadership during early years of Pakistan had desperately missed the opportunity to establish strong political party system. The Muslim league that won Pakistan for became cat’s paw in the hands of military; it has been observed that Muslim league become party of military establishment.

Where political institutions are strong military rarely hankers towards political business of the country. The role of political parties, the leadership after independence, and influence of bureaucracy are some internal factors of military intervention. The role of Muslim league after the independence became meager. “Unlike the congress party of India, the Muslim league failed to transform itself to a national movement to a party which could lead the nation on the road to democracy, stability and prosperity (ibid: 61).

One of the major factors of successful democratic order in India is its leadership but in case the country desperate in lack of politically motivated leadership. Military of Pakistan bridge that gap. Due to its internal discipline and external support military always rule the country.

Another paradox that gave military chance to intervene into the politics is the quality of leader that figure out a viable road map for the institutionalization of democracy in Pakistan. After the demise of Mohammad Ali Jinnah there was created leadership vacuum at the early stage after the independence. “It has been observed that the failure of charismatic leaders and political parties creates a leadership vacuum which is filled by modernized military profession. The military has, therefore, become crucial institution in power block

(2000:160).

In Pakistan out of sixty six years, military ruled the country for thirty two years and civilian rule thirty one years. In all democratic years only Bhutto era prove democratically effective and showed dominancy of the democratic forces on the military institution. In that specific period the moral of Pakistan's military was down due to defeat in East Pakistan. It was great chance to political leaders to consolidate democracy by establishing democratic traditions in the country.

As matter of fact Pakistani polity has suffered since its inception from what may be called leadership syndrome ,conceptually and perceptually , leadership syndrome means that Pakistani leadership has sometimes ineffective ,inconsistent ,indecisive ,inarticulate and even rootless at other time , there has been apparently articulated effective and visionary leadership but it failed ;because of some negative qualities such as authoritarian tendencies and lack of political discipline.

Third paradox of military intervention into the domestic politics of Pakistan is dependency of political leadership on military in the time of crisis. The Phenomenon of military dependency proved inability of Political leadership and military's professional capacity to deal with civilian matters better than the political strata in the country.

“Where as in Pakistan with passage of time dependence on military increased which not only gave civilian problem but also showed the impotence of the civilian government to settle these problems. This led the military to think that it was the only institution which could lead stability to the nation (Op. cit: 62).

On many occasions political leadership has called military to help civilian governments in flood crisis situation during (1977, 1992) conducting elections due to security reason in Lahore in 1951, In 1990, 1993, and 1996 in Karachi for controlling ethnic clashes, in 1992 for operation against dacoits in Sindh. Including this military try to participate in fields, of constructing high ways, dams and other activities relating to the civilian works.

b. Corporate Interests of the Army

Military's corporate interests is also one of the glaring prospect of political intervention in the country. Ayesha Siddiqa has explicitly defined the corporate interests of the military in her book “Military in corporation.” Ayesha Siddiqa has articulate two points of view regarding civil military relations. First, military's increasing economic interests in Pakistan. Second, the interests of elite class intermingled with the military, and unfortunately it makes authoritarian political system of Pakistan.

“In Pakistan's case traditionally the big entrepreneur have benefited from a coalition with military. It is worth remembering that the entrepreneur class owes its existence Ayub khan helped the establishment of big business, Zia responsible for empowering the business houses reversing Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's nationalization policy. Subsequently, some of the large business houses entered into collations with the civilian governments and later with the Musharaf regime, to benefit from the state's capacity to reward them (ibid: 105).

c. Geo-Strategic and Regional Factors

Since army remains the most disciplined and effective institution it claims to deal internal and external affairs more effectively than the civilian governments in Pakistan. Many

analysts articulate geo-strategic compulsion and Indian factor as great threat to Pakistan's security; the situation gave great impetus to army's role in the domestic politics of Pakistan.

“Generally, the military, bureaucratic regimes in Pakistan have lacked legitimacy and have stressed centralization of power. They play up the bogey of external threat to country's security to justify centralization of power and denial of democracy, the civilian regime too have share tendency to curb opposition (a pre-requisite of democracy) by manipulating in regional content (1997: 144).

Since the very inception of the country the war hysteria and Indian threat perception enhanced military's political position and institutional strength. Due to the fact Pakistan made alliances with international actors, to get military and economic aid. The situation left two crucial impacts on Pakistan's politics. First, army gets chance in decision making of foreign policy and ultimately hijacks the vital elements of the foreign policy issues of Pakistan. It is matter of fact that in prevalent scenario no decision can be taken without the consultation of the army in mater of foreign policy making. Second, externally military and economic support to the Pakistan made army more powerful than the civilian institutions.

“The most important aspect of Pakistan's security and foreign policy is it's over all relations with India. Their geopolitics, culture and ethnicity have placed the two countries in a situation in which they can ill afford to ignore one the other. Even the domestic politics of one country spill over into other. The decision making process and strategic thinking adopted in India have a direct bearing on the similar process in Pakistan. The two countries are locked into a chain of action, reaction and interaction (Op. cit: 32).

The issue of Kashmir has remained focus of military and civilian government's policy. The army has exploited the issue on two fronts first, keeping issue alive can get India engaged militarily and economically, second due to Kashmir issue that Pakistan has increased its defense budget to keep breast with balance of power with India in terms of conventional and non-conventional warfare. It is noteworthy fact that out of four provinces only Punjab and NWFP support the issue.

The military possess uncompromising attitude on the issue of Kashmir. The civilian governments of Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif lost their power due to Kashmir issue. When Benazir Bhutto meets with the Prime Minister of India Rajeev Gandhi; it alienated the Army of Pakistan. Nawaz Sharif meets with the Prime Minister of Indian in Lahore and made historic “Lahore Declaration” in which a vital step were taken to resolve Kashmir issue; unfortunately Pakistan's army right after the visit of Vajpayee created “Kargil” issue with the Indian army.

Consequences of Military Rule

Long military rule have left intractable and spillover impacts on politics, economy, and foreign policy of Pakistan. The most enduring repercussion of the long military rules in Pakistan is it diminished state constitution. Whenever, Army comes into power it figures out its own set of rules. In 1958 Ayub abrogated the constitution of 1956 and gave his own constitution of 1962, Yahya abrogated the 1962 constitution when come in to power, Zia ul-Haq suspended the constitution of 1973, and then when Musharaf come into power he too suspended the constitution of 1973.

Another effect, of military rule is centralization of power that gives birth to provincialism, separatism, and disintegration of the country. Long military rule of Ayub Khan deprived the people of East Pakistan and ultimately, Bangladesh was emerged. During Zia era there was a rise of Sindhi separatism due to belligerent atrocities had done by army.

Thirdly, the military rules in Pakistan has been trickling down the civilian institution especially the parliamentary democracy. Whenever Military Generals come into power they just introduced presidential form of government or strengthen the executive by introducing unconstitutional reforms in the country. General Ayub introduced presidential form of government, General Zia introduced controversial (58,2b) through which the President can dismissed elected governments, the article proved source of political instability in Pakistan in 1990-1999 where elected governments of Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif were dismissed by the president. General Musharraf introduced LFO (legal frame work order).It also brought the structural change in the political structure of Pakistan. The critics of political system of Pakistan are of the view that Pakistan has hybrid kind of political system it is neither parliamentary nor presidential.

Fourthly, on the foreign policy issue the military rulers in Pakistan has adopted uncompromising attitude. Because they don't possess domestic support on the issues they took decisions in terms of their own benefits rather than for the national interest. General Zia compromised the sovereignty of Pakistan during Afghan occupation of Soviet Union and fought proxy war on behalf of America. Again General Pervez Musharraf supported America war against terror in Afghanistan without consulting domestic support.

“A coupe followed by fresh series of problems. As technocrat the military leaders dislike political bargaining and compromises which are very frequently restored to by the political leaders. They firmly believe that political problems can be solved if the dirty politics is checked and disciplined and rejuvenation of the type that makes the organization of the military is enforced in society. They believed that all problems can be overcome if the right order is given (2004:25)

Musharraf Era (1999-2008)

The master mind of Kargil crisis; driving force to oust the elected government by coup; General Musharraf controlled the power on the plea to reform the politico-economic conditions of Pakistan. Another sun of democratic experience has been set by third military coup in October 1999 in Pakistan. General Musharraf said;” it is not by designed that the army step in ; it is because of the governments misdoing adding that the military is the only organized and credible force to the established the situation (Op.cit: 48)

The condition of Pakistan at that time was at its lowest ebb. The military coup, economic down turn, political instability in the country, Pakistan's suspension from common wealth and confrontation with India were the major challenges to Pakistan. Like his predecessors General Musharraf adopted the same strategy: arrested his political opponents, banned the political parties, introducing new set of constitutional amendments especially restoration of (58 2b) to consolidate his power.

“While building its relative positive image, the military embarked upon rebuilding the

political system through creating alternative constituencies and seeking out new set of politicians who would do the GHQ bidding. This process used techniques such as the localization of politics, which was carried out by the previous military regimes, Musharaf regime remained it devolution of democracy.(Op.cit: 9-10)

Till 2001, Musharaf government didn't have legitimate authority to rule Pakistan. The tragic event of 9/11 that turns the political scenario of world politics provided great opportunity to military rule in Pakistan to get international support. "On the eve of September 11, 2001 Pakistan looks like a state that had lost its way, with a stagnant economy, military government, international pariah status, and political and social institutions in disarray. Pakistanis debated vigorously such problem as corruption, bad governance, poor education, weak political parties, domestic disorder and malformed economy (Op.cit: 98.)

Musharaf introduced devolution of power, a local government system that had two major objectives. First, the institution was introduced to legitimize his government Musharaf turned to win support from non-political stakeholders rather than getting support of common people. Second, he wanted to weaken the role of bureaucracy. According to Mohammad Waseem such localization of politics is a sure reap for unbridled centralism.

Political Maneuvering Of Musharaf

Musharaf like his predecessors, introduced political reforms agenda local government, LfO (legal frame work order), setting up of National Security Council and economic reforms. Musharaf got strength from unusual event of 9/ 11 that shock the world politics. Due to the external support Musharaf rule was legitimized.

Seven-Point Agenda and Political Support Soon after his take-over, the Chief Executive promised to act upon seven-point agenda which include:

1. Reconstruct countrywide self-reliance and spirit.
2. Reinforce the Federation, take away inter-provincial dissonance and reinstate National unity.
3. Revitalize the economy and bring back investor confidence.
4. To make sure law and order and dissipate quick justice.
5. Depoliticize State institutions.
6. Decentralization of power to the grass-roots level.
7. To make sure speedy and transversely the embark accountability" (Ibid: 99).

The Event of 9/11

The 9/11 was the most extenuating event of 21st century. It diametrically changed the international scenario of the world. The event of 9/11 marked what Secretary General Kofi Anan, called "seismic shift in international relations." 36 The spillover impacts of the event on Pakistan resulted invincible vulnerabilities in terms of political, economic and security. "To start new future US gave seven point agenda mainly included, dissension Taliban, abandon Islamic jihad, give cover over flights landing rights and territorial admission to all types of actions, and offer astuteness about Taliban and Al-Qaeda (www.sappk.org).

Like General Zia Musharaf got strength from war hysteria. Once unpopular leader General Musharaf had become blue eyed boy of Bush administration. Taking into account the whole scenario; Musharaf for saving his power, got complete U-tern in the foreign policy of

Pakistan.

“In spite of our unrivaled act in obeying the ever coming orders by US we are incapable to go away prints of our devotion and are demands to do more. We have made any possible effort to make them satisfy, even if Pakistan has to experience numerous U-terns or twist on over its head. The strength of their oratory to do more dictates with our every U-tern. For example we are asked to take U-tern on Kashmir, a U-tern on our nuclear scientists, and may be nuclear deterrent itself”. (2007: 257)

General Musharaf had two objectives of this war on terror .First help American in Afghanistan providing logistic support to the Americans and NATO forces against Taliban. Second, Musharaf brought American war inside Pakistan. The operation in Waziristan started in 2004 in NWFP. “The US and the West applauded the Pakistan government for the enlightened leadership, and manifested their solidarity by visits to Pakistan. Never before had so many leaders come to Pakistan as in the months of September, one on the heel of the other and sometimes on the same day (Ibid: 58).

Devolution of Power

The independent Human Rights commission of Pakistan said,” The purpose seems to be depolitisization of governance and to earn a lease of life for the military government behind a sort of democratic facade.” 19) Every military dictator in Pakistan brought local government: Ayub khan introduced “basic democracy” General Zia launched district government, and General Pervez Musharaf gave “Devolution of Power”. There were two reasons to introduce the programs military dictators don’t possess domestic support so they tried to bring around sort of programs that win local support for their rule.

Second, these institutors enhanced centralization of power. Usually in a federal form of government, the powers are transferred from center to provinces then to the district and local units. But it is dilemma with the local government system that is introduced by the military governments that they side lined provincial autonomy and empower the districts. Through these kinds of institutions the army ruler in Pakistan got strength (www.internationalcrisisgroup.com).

Military and Religious Parties

It is considerably contemplated there are three forces in Pakistan that rule the country: Allah, Army and America. “The emergence of religious parties in the October 2002 elections revealed fragility for the future of the country’s political, cultural and social consolidation. For the first time in the history of Pakistan the alliance of religious parties got power in the two provinces of Pakistan for the launch of policy of Taliban. They got the power by propagating anti American and anti-Musharaf stance and wanted to introduce Islamic Law (www.internationalcrisisgroup.com).

War on Terror and Musharaf

9/11 was blessing in disguised for Musharaf. Before it the government of General Musharaf was not recognized after 9/11 Musharaf become close ally to Bush Administration and Pakistan became a front line state in global war on terror.

“President Musharaf was ready to help U.S with reasonable assurance in War on Terror, following the 9/11 attacks. This incorporated conjugal political institutions to serve U.S. benefit; yielding the U.S. admittance to Pakistan's airfields; and explicitly vowing to hold up to the U.S. alliance. Pakistanis do not necessarily ally with the U.S: Public opinion unleashed in urban areas of Pakistanis in, 83 percent is supportive with the Taliban rather than the US and 82% anticipate Osama bin Laden a freedom fighter rather than a terrorist, even though 64 percent also are of the view the attack on the US was an act of terrorism (2001: 94).

The war on terror not only brought sudden economic aid to Pakistan but also reflect a positive image of Pakistan to the world community. America’s policy towards Pakistan is uncertain; conjuncture is based on two prongs. One America perceives military and Musharaf only reliable options to rule the country. Both these are invincible to the Bush Administration in war on terror. Two, U.S think-tank inclined to pressurize on Pakistan engulf Taliban, kill or capture Al-Qaeda members and their leaders the war on terror will be partially win. The perception disregards other threats of religious fundamentalists in Pakistan which are equal to and also responsible and involve in the network of international terrorism (2007: 23).

End of Musharaf Era

There were certain events that put Musharaf era to its logical end; the judges’ movement, the red Mosque episode and the assassinating of the former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto. In the election of 2008, his party Muslim league Quaid-e -Azam group got tremendous defeat .Every military coup has left drastic effects on the socio-political and economic life of Pakistan. Musharaf era gave Pakistan; increasing terrorism, economic deterioration, and social polarization.

For securing his power Musharaf adopted regressive policies especially “in war against terror; it is point to be noted that General Musharaf dragged the war of America into the domestic frontiers of Pakistan. There occurred series of suicide bombing in all over Pakistan, where great deal of civilians lost their lives. The operation “Rahe Rast” was started in NWFP in 2004.The ultimate pressure from international community and domestic front put Musharaf to the resignation from the post of President Ship.

The failure of military to acknowledge consider it as legitimate authority is directly proportional to Pakistan’s democratic failure. “. Excepting an essential reformation of civil-military relations, the prediction for consequential democratization remains severe. Owing to dependence on external economic and military assistance particularly America is pivotal in affecting political freedom, in terms of civilian democracy. Indeed Pakistan’s particular significance to the U.S in war on terror against Al-Qaeda and Taliban members means international pressure. By conducting the elections military has exonerated itself from the pressure of international community.

New Trends in the Politics of Pakistan

There occurred new trends in to the politics of Pakistan which are predicted as pragmatic change for the future Politics of Pakistan. First, is the freedom of electronic and print media, it is because of media’s role during the movement of lawyer’s in Pakistan Musharaf was stepped down. Second, freedom of judiciary will desperately affect the

authoritarian rule in Pakistan; put an end to the “doctrine of necessity” and a great check on democratic governments. Third, there is end of “Troika” and the end of traditional power players in the politics of Pakistan. Forth, the new phrase of “NRO” (national reconciliation ordinance) is become notorious political reality.

Forth, external factor seems remarkable in settling the domestic issues; the consultation of Saudi Arabia, USA and UK are become deterrent political realities.

Conclusion

Optimistic Future Scenario

There are two future political scenarios of Pakistan. First, is optimistic scenario, and the second is pessimistic scenario. Taking into account the optimistic scenario of Pakistan; implacable conclusion can infer from the current political development of the country. First, the election of 2008 has brought much political maturity among the politicians; they have adopted the approach of tolerance and make sure the political stability. Secondly, the judicial activism that was backed by civil society first time in the history of Pakistan will leave pragmatic effects on the institutional development, rule of law, and keep checking the performance of democratic governments. Another effect of the judicial activism is that it put an end of the “Doctrine of Necessity”.

Third, the most significant development that has been occurred in the first decade of 21st century for Pakistan is the role of electronic and print media. Electronic and print media has played significant role in the recent history of Pakistan like in the restoration of Judges of the Supreme Court and ouster of General Musharaf from the post of President in August 2008. fourth , even if, Pakistan has got great deal of lost in war against terror but the war will have positive impacts to root out extremist elements from the country the end result of the war will be the emergence of free liberal and tolerant society .

Pessimistic Future Scenario

The most pessimistic political scenario is its dependence on the IMF and other donor agencies. Since six decades have been passed Pakistan is still not a self-reliant country. The American influence in the internal political matters has become a reality and this situation has impeded democratization in the country. The army becomes more a crucial component of the politics of Pakistan. Despite the judicial activism and revival of democracy in the country army possess power to make another military take over due to its supremacy and political influence in the country. Fourthly it has been critically evaluated that judicial activism can make another imbalance among the institutions.

Now the judiciary is getting such power that it is impeding the usual process of legislation. There will immerge clashes between the superior judiciary and the legislature .Fifth, even if, democracy is revived in the country the new democratic government seems handicapped in its decisions, there is prevalent corruption, mismanagement and inefficiency of the new democratic government to deal with the severe energy crisis, unemployment, terrorism, and inflation. It is point to be noted that the nuclear weapon of Russia could not save it from its collapse because its state institutions became inefficient and corrupt. Same is the case with Pakistan; if Pakistan will collapse it will be because of its corrupt and inefficient institutions.

References

- Veena Kukreja, *Military Intervention In Pakistan*, New Delhi: NBO Publishers distributors, H green Park Extension, 1986, p: 51.
- Ayesha Siddiqa, Agha, *Military In Corporation*, London: Oxford university press, 2007, p: 4.
- Hassan Askari Rizvi, *Military and Politics in Pakistan 1947-97*, Lahore, Sang-e-Meel Publishers, 1997 p: 21.
- Ibid, p: 61.
- Nehal H. Rizvi “Military Intervention In Pakistan” editor, Verinder Grover *Pakistan government and Politics* Deep and Deep publications, New Delhi ,2000, p: 160.
- Op. cit, Ayesha Siddiqa p: 62.
- Ibid: 105.
- Isabel Cordonnier, *Military and political order in Pakistan*, Published by programme for Military and strategic studies Switzerland, 2000, p: 48.
- Mehtab Ali Shah, *The foreign policy of Pakistan: Ethnic impacts on diplomacy*, London: I.B Turis, 1997, p: 144.
- Op. cit, Isabel, p: 32.
- Lawrence Ziring *Pakistan at cross road of history*, Lahore: Vanguard book, 2004, p: 25.
- Op.cit, Cohen p: 48.
- International crisis group, Op.cit , 9-10
- Op.cit: Agha p: 98.
- Ibid p: 99.
- Tahir Kamran” *South Asia Partnership-Pakistan* www.sappk.org Retrieved on 08-10-2013.
- Abdul Sattar *Pakistan’s foreign policy a concise history*, London: oxford university press, 2007, p: 257.
- Ibid: 58.
- www.internationalcrisisgroup.com Retrieved on 08-11-2013.
- www.internationalcrisisgroup.com Retrieved on 08-11-2013
- Amy Zelman, *Terrorism Timeline: Pakistan and the Global War on Terror*, Pakistan Plays Friend and Foe to U.S. *The New York reviews of books* 2001, p: 94.
- Najum Mushtaq, *America’s Musharaf Dilemma* Editor, John Feffer, 2007, p: 23.