

Received : 20 March 2024, Accepted: 15 April 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33282/rr.vx9i2.239>

## **Military Influence on the Parliamentary Democracy in Pakistan: A Comparative Study of PML-Q (2002-2007) and PPP (2008-2013) Regimes**

1. Prof. Dr Javed Akhtar, Department of Pakistan Studies BZU Multan.  
[javedakhtar@bzu.edu.pk](mailto:javedakhtar@bzu.edu.pk)
2. Muhammad Saleem Qazi, PhD Scholar Department of Pakistan Studies BZU Multan  
[saleemtaunsvi82@gmail.com](mailto:saleemtaunsvi82@gmail.com)

### **Abstract:**

*This paper examines the functioning of parliamentary democracy in Pakistan by undertaking a comparative analysis of the PML-Q government (2002-2007) and the PPP regime (2008-2013). This article explores the military's direct and indirect impact on influencing the political process, governance, and state institutions throughout the specified era. Pakistan's history has been marked by periodic military interventions in the democratic system, which have created concerns about military domination. This study aims to examine the strategies employed by the PML-Q and PPP governments in managing the dynamics between the civil and military authorities. The paper examines the dynamics of the interaction between these two parties and the military. Specifically, it explores how the PML-Q developed a strong relationship with the military, while the PPP maintained a more distant relationship. This research aims to provide insight into the varied levels of military influence on Pakistan's parliamentary system and the obstacles encountered by civilian governments through comparative examination of these regimes.*

**Key-words:** Civil-Military Relations, Parliament, Influence, Democracy, Constitution, Intervention

### **1. Introduction:**

Since its creation, the military in Pakistan has exercised direct control over the country. On the other hand, it has served as a protector during the remaining civilian eras, with the exception of a

few years. After Pakistan came into being, there was a significant danger to the newly formed nation, which drove the leaders to put a significant amount of money into the country's defense apparatus at the expense of other institutions. Starting from the very first day of its establishment, the military has developed into a very powerful institution, and its commanders have been regarded as major actors in the system of governance that Pakistan employs. As the leader of the armed forces, General Ayub Khan became a formal partner in the power corridor in 1954. In 1958, the martial law imposed, which was the first step in his (Ayub) rise to power (Ahmed, 2013). A further revision of that military takeover practice was carried out in 1969, 1977, and 1999 respectively.

One further reason for the military's involvement in political events was the support received from foreign nations, specifically the United States of America. Despite professing to be proponents of democracy, they have continuously demonstrated their allegiance to the military authorities of Pakistan, starting with General Ayub and persisting with General Pervez Musharraf (Zhao & Rahman, 2017). The Army's involvement in political activities was influenced by the presence of feeble civilian institutions, as well as an inept, inexperienced, and corrupt political leadership. Currently, it is even more apparent.

The governance system of Pakistan has been significantly influenced by the interaction between the military and civilian rule. The current study specifically focuses on the impact that Pakistan's military had on the country's political system between the years 2002 and 2013. There were two parliamentary governments that were established during this time period: the first one was led by the PML-Q party from 2002 to 2007, and the second one was led by the PPP from 2008 to 2013. The Pakistani military has been highly important in the country's power structure under both of these legislative governments that have been in place. Between the years 2002 and 2007, when the PML-Q was in power through a parliamentary government, the military exerted complete and total influence over the core state apparatus. In the aftermath of the military coup that occurred in October 1999, General Pervez Musharraf assumed control of the government and went on to play a significant part in the establishment of the PML-Q party. Eventually, following the General Elections that took place in Pakistan in 2002, this party was elected to power.

Nevertheless, the period of time between 2002 and 2007, during which the PML-Q government was in power, is seen as the period of time that was dominated by the military. During this time period, Pakistan was regarded as the best example of a praetorian state, and the democracy that existed during this time was a controlled or directed democracy (Hussain & Salyana, 2022). Here the civilian government was almost under the subordination of the military elites.

The Pakistan People's Party (PPP) government, on the other hand, was established following the General Elections in Pakistan in 2008. It was the Pro-Musharraf PML-Q Party that emerged victorious in the General Elections, causing the PPP to suffer a crushing defeat. The Pakistan People's Party (PPP) came to power in 2008, which resulted in the restoration of civil supremacy. As a result, General Musharraf was complicit in his resignation, which took place on August 18, 2008 (The Dawn, 2008). Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that the civilian supremacy was formally reinstated in 2008 through the implementation of a genuine parliamentary system and the introduction of the 18th Amendment, the military continued to exert its significant influence in the affairs of the state, frequently making governance and the implementation of policies more difficult. However, this time period was characterized by a complicated interaction between the two primary pillars of the state, which were the civilian government and the military.

This study will examine the nature of military involvement in civilian affairs by comparing the two parliamentary regimes in Pakistan. This study aims to illuminate the role of the military in the democratic system from 2002–2013 by investigating the parliamentary system, its operations, policymaking, decision-making, and political stability during that time.

## **2. Historical overview of Military's Involvement in the Parliamentary System of Pakistan**

Pakistan is one of the countries where the military has exerted significant influence over its political affairs. The shift to civilian governance commenced immediately following the establishment of Pakistan. Jinnah assumed control of civilian governance as the Governor General by establishing both political and administrative institutions, with the ambitious goal of establishing a republic. Prior to the establishment of Pakistan in 1947, he asserted that democracy is an inherent and fundamental aspect of our nature (Mahmood, 2010). Regrettably, the esteemed founder, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, was unable to witness Pakistan's complete

transformation into a fully democratic nation and passed away on September 11, 1948. Following the demise of Jinnah, Liaquat Ali Khan, the first Prime Minister of Pakistan, assumed leadership and played a role in upholding democracy in the country. However, his tenure was cut short when he was assassinated in 1951 in Rawalpindi. The premature deaths of Pakistani leaders had a negative impact, leading to political turmoil and disorder in the country. The subsequent leadership lacked sufficient organization to effectively assume responsibility for guiding Pakistan towards a democratic trajectory. Following Jinnah, the majority of the leadership possessed regional and local prominence but lacked widespread national appeal. The successors of Jinnah not only lacked his gravitas but also lacked political neutrality. Ghulam Muhammad and Iskander Mirza both engaged in power politics and assumed the role of influential individuals who have the ability to determine the outcome of political events. Both individuals ascended to this prestigious position from the lower ranks of government employment. Additionally, they were devoid of the inclination to participate in parliamentary affairs. Conversely, the swift change in the position of the prime minister exemplified the political and democratic volatility of Pakistan.

In 1953, Ghulam Muhammad removed the cabinet of Prime Minister Khawaja Nazim-ud-Din from their positions. Additionally, on October 24, 1954, he dissolved the National Assembly. The Pakistani leadership lacked the necessary skills to develop an effective constitution during the initial nine-year period. In 1956, Prime Minister Chaudhary Muhammad Ali introduced a practical constitution to Pakistan. The 1956 Constitution of Pakistan established Pakistan as a republic and incorporated democratic ideals by implementing a parliamentary system of governance. Chaudhary Muhammad Ali was forced to resign as prime minister in September 1956 because he publicly supported the fledgling Republican Party. Iskander Mirza succeeded General Ghulam Muhammad as the Governor-General of Pakistan and strongly supported the implementation of controlled democracy in the country (Hussain & Salyana, 2022). It was obvious to Iskander Mirza that he would not be reelected as Pakistan's president if the election were to take place in Pakistan. Therefore, he implemented martial law in the country on October 7, 1958. Subsequently, he designated Gen. Ayub Khan as the Chief Martial Law Administrator (CMLA). However, President Iskander Mirza was forced to leave the presidency within the next

twenty days. On October 27, 1958, General Ayub Khan took over the President of Pakistan, while Iskander Mirza was compelled to go into self-imposed exile.

Ayub Khan sought to rationalize the military coup by asserting that it was necessary to rescue the nation from a state of disorder and confusion. This statement became a recurring principle for all future military coups in Pakistan. Pakistan witnessed the removal of seven prime ministers from office between 1947 and 1958, highlighting the fragility of its political institutions. The initial military coup in Pakistan exemplified Samuel P. Huntington's theory that military interventions are prompted by factors such as inadequate political institutionalization, limited political participation, minimal social mobilization, low economic development, disorder, political chaos, and loss of legitimacy (Huntington S. P., 1965). General Ayub Khan transferred control to General Yahya Khan, who then reinstated martial law and governed Pakistan from 1969 to 1971.

Z.A. Bhutto's dynamic leadership briefly restored democracy to Pakistan following the 1971 Indo-Pak war. Nevertheless, this brief period of democracy was abruptly terminated by Zia-ul-Haq's subsequent military revolution in July 1977. Zia maintained his position of authority for more than a decade following the implementation of martial law in the nation. The military transferred power to the political elites after Zia's death in a plane disaster in August 1988. The democratic process in Pakistan persisted from 1988 to 1999; however, it was impeded by the ongoing indirect military involvement. During this time, the country was alternately governed by Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif; however, no one was able to conclude their five-year term as prime minister. Once more, the democratic process in Pakistan was disrupted by the military in 1999, as General Musharraf ousted the government of Nawaz Sharif in a coup d'état. Musharraf maintained his authority for nine years; however, democracy was reinstated in Pakistan following the 2008 General Elections.

### **3. Parliamentary Regime of PML-Q (2002-2007) and Military Influence**

On October 12, 1999, General Pervaiz Musharraf staged a bloodless military coup that ousted Nawaz Sharif from office as prime minister of Pakistan. Historically, Pakistan's military forces have risen to the

occasion in times of extreme political unrest or economic crisis. Pakistan was the usual site of this occurrence. However, compared to the prior military coups, the circumstances in October 1999 were very different. This is due to the fact that rivalries between General Pervez Musharraf and Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, as well as the civil and military leaderships, clashed during the coup in October 1999 (Belokrenitsky & Moskalenko, 2013). A nationwide state of emergency was declared by Musharraf shortly after he took power. When compared to previous practices, the absence of martial law is striking. This meant that Pervez Musharraf would not be designated as Chief Martial Law Administrator, but he did become Chief Executive. Although several parts of the constitution were temporarily suspended, Musharraf stated in his book that he did not want to become the administrator of martial law and that he wanted to keep the constitution in effect overall (Musharraf, 2006).

The military gained full control in the nation, however the term "martial law" was intentionally omitted to demonstrate deference to the global community. This was stated in the proclamation and the subsequent Provisional Constitutional Order (PCO). Thus, Musharraf assumed the position of Chief Executive. Although as per the Constitution, the Prime Minister occupies the supreme position of authority and assumes the responsibility of leading the government. The proclamation of the Emergency Order was declared on October 14, 1999.

In his inaugural national address on October 17, 1999, he stated plans to restore democracy, develop a new government structure, promote good governance, revitalize the economy, ensure accountability, and continue foreign policy. He also declared that the Constitution has been temporarily suspended to protect the nation and that the Military will not stay longer than necessary to establish a true democracy. His speech outlined seven key goals: rebuilding national confidence and morale, strengthening the federation, resolving inter-provincial conflicts and restoring national unity, revitalizing the economy and restoring investors' trust, ensuring law and order and expediting the judicial process, depoliticizing state institutions, devolving power to local communities, and ensuring prompt and widespread accountability (The Nation, 1999).

Harold D. Lasswell has stated in an article that "we are moving towards a world of "garrison states, which is the most dominant group and they are the specialists on violence (Lasswell H. , 936). Military personnel are experts in violence, with the ability to both inflict and manage violent situations. The military can and may dominate the means of violence and the resources that go along with it. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that a garrison state is one in which the

military plays a significant role. Musharraf, like his predecessors, believed that politicians should be held responsible for their actions (Khan, 2009). Under the National Accountability Ordinance (1999), the National Accountability Bureau (NAB) was established, and the government continues to employ it as a weapon to silence political opponents, all in the guise of holding them accountable. The accused could be held for 90 days without charges according to the ordinance. In addition to dispensing with bail altogether, this act established special accountability courts. Political opponents were pressured to switch allegiances by the NAB, which exerted its authority in this regard. These advancements in military might demonstrated the presence of guided democracy (Hussain & Salyana, 2022).

Musharraf promptly took over the presidency in response to India's offer for bilateral discussions. He wanted to obtain the complete protocol as the head of state during his visit. President Tarrar was unexpectedly ousted from the presidency without either voluntarily stepping down or completing his full term. His tenure was scheduled to be ended in January 2004. Once again, Musharraf demonstrated his autocratic leadership style, which indicates a centralized authority where all power is concentrated in the hands of one individual. In June 2001, General Musharraf consolidated his power by taking on three crucial positions in Pakistan: Chief of Army, Chief Executive, and President. General Pervez Musharraf effectively completed the coup that began almost two years ago when he overthrew the democratically elected government of Nawaz Sharif.

Baxter argues that the governing system in Pakistan can be characterized as a "Vice-Regal system," where one person holds the ultimate authority, regardless of their title as Governor-General, President, Chief Martial Law Administrator, or Prime Minister (Baxter, 2001).

### **3.1 Local Body Elections**

Following the 9/11 tragedy, the United States lifted sanctions on Pakistan, and the provision of economic and other forms of assistance were contingent upon Pakistan's restoration of democracy. Similar to his predecessors, nationwide Musharraf implemented a local government system (LGS) in Pakistan instead of conducting nationwide elections. The implementation of this Local Government System (LGS) was carried out in accordance with the Devolution of Power Plan. He has formulated his policy within the framework of his Seven-Point Agenda. The

primary aim of the Local Government System (LGS) was to transfer authority from the central government to the village level, through the establishment of district councils and union councils. The elections for the three-tier local government system were performed in two phases, from January 2001 to August 2001 (Kamran, 2008). The elections were conducted without the involvement of political parties. Elections explicitly prohibited the participation of political parties. Once again, a military officer is exerting their authority to manipulate both the political and democratic systems according to their own preferences, rather than responding to the public's demands. This approach embodies the concept of directed democracy.

### **3.2 Presidential Referendum**

The 2002 Presidential Referendum exhibited notable distinctions from the preceding Referendum of Zia-ul-Haq. Similar to the previous referendum, electoral lists were available at each polling station, ensuring that registered voters were aware of their designated voting location. However, during the 2002 Presidential Referendum, there was no provision of a voters list to the polling station, allowing individuals to freely cast their votes at any location of their choosing (Khan, 2009, p. 484). The failure to ensure the provision of polling stations and the ability for voters to cast their votes at any polling station was a clear method of manipulating the election and a manifestation of a manipulated or steered democracy. The main elections Commissioner declared the final outcome, stating that around 98% of the votes were in favor of Gen Musharraf continuing as president for another five years.

### **3.3 LFO of Gen Musharraf**

On 20<sup>th</sup> August 2002, General Musharraf presented his the Legal Framework Order (LFO) (Khan, 2009, pp. 485-86). The clause was designed to serve as a fundamental element of the constitution and to be put into effect. The legitimacy of the LFO or any of its components is irrefutable and cannot be challenged in any court. The LFO also included a provision concerning the notion of legal governance, thereby validating orders issued from October 1999 to August 2002. The LFO has verified the legality of the imposition of emergency, the PCO, the referendum order of 2002, the order of appointment, and all of General Musharraf's decisions from October 1999 to August 2002 were considered valid and in conformity with the constitution.



The LFO increased the National Assembly to 342 members to reflect demographic growth. Of the 342 seats, 272 were directly elected in their constituencies, 60 were designated for women, and 10 for religious minorities. Every citizen whose name was registered in the voter list and is 18 years of age or older was granted the privilege to cast their vote for their preferred candidate. Individuals who are a minimum of 25 years old have the opportunity to participate in National or Provincial Assembly elections (Belokrenitsky & Moskalenko, 2013, pp. 374-76).

#### **4. General Elections 2002**

Aqil Shah's book emphasises that the ISI formed a new conservative political party called The Pakistan Muslim League (Quaid-e-Azam) or PML-Q, with the aim of acting as a civilian proxy for the military government (Shah, 2014). In March 2001, a total of 108 out of the 140 former Members of the National Assembly (MNAs) who were elected in the 1997 General Election convened a meeting to officially establish the Pakistan Muslim League (Quaid-e-Azam) party. Mian Azar, the former governor of the Punjab Province, was appointed as the inaugural president of the party (Aziz, 2009). Many former PPP MNAs joined the PML (Q). During Musharraf's dictatorship, politicians with NAB or accountability court cases were readily convinced to join the PML (Q) party to seek safety under the military government. Thus, their cases were retracted (Naazer, Mahmood, & Ashfaq, 2017).

The 2002 presidential referendum granted General Musharraf a further five-year term as the President of Pakistan, along with significant authority over the newly elected government following the October 2002 elections. The 8<sup>th</sup> General Elections in Pakistan were held on October 10, 2002. The military administration has barred Nawaz Sharif and Benazir Bhutto, two key political figures, from participating in the general election. The military government intentionally excluded prominent political individuals from participating in the elections in order to select a leader who would be easily influenced and controlled according to their preferences. This situation exemplifies a typical instance of managed democracy.

The voter turnout for the eighth general election in Pakistan, held in 2002, was 41.68 per cent. The PML-Q secured the highest number of seats in both the National and Punjab Assembly, primarily due to the support of the military administration. Nevertheless, the PML-Q failed to secure an absolute majority.

The PML (Q) emerged as the largest political party, securing 78, however, this number later rose to 118, taking into account the addition of new members and reserved seats. The PPP secured a total of 87 seats, while the MMA won a total of 60 seats, which deviates from the typical results of past elections.

Subsequently, a faction of PPP members reached a consensus to establish a forward block called PPP-Patriot by employing political tactics. The group aligned itself with the government, specifically the PML (Q), after securing the appointment of six ministers and the dismissal of NAB charges. In order to assist such political negotiations, the enforcement of Article 63(A), which prohibited politicians from changing political parties, was temporarily halted. Following the necessary act of changing political parties, Article 63(A) was reinstated on December 31, 2002 to prevent legislators who had switched sides to support PML (Q) from returning to their original party. Zufarullah Jamali was chosen as Prime Minister on November 24, 2002, after reaching the age of majority. He received 172 votes out of 342 in the house. Mr. Jamali maintained a passive stance as Prime Minister, and was very submissive to President Musharraf which he was desirous to have such a yes man (Alam, Bhatti, & Saif, 2020). This meant that General Musharraf maintained his preminent status as president even after a civilian administration was established. He possessed a submissive political party that was easy to manipulate, a prime minister who was eager to carry out his orders, and legislators who were committed to his cause.

#### **4.1 The Seventeenth Amendment**

The civil government commenced its operations with the establishment of legislative and executive institutions. However, the true authority remained in the control of the military, led by General Pervez Musharraf. The military's control over the political system remained strong due to the PML (Q) party's narrow majority in the National Assembly. They relied on the support of the military ruler to prevent ally parties from withdrawing from the coalition at any time (Alam, Bhatti, & Saif, 2020). The aforementioned assumption was confirmed during various incidents, including a quarrel that arose among the associated parties on November 16, 2002, and March 12, 2003, during the oath-taking ceremonies of the National Assembly and Senate, respectively.

An agreement was reached between Musharraf and the MMA, which included the following terms: the withdrawal of the extension of judges' service, the establishment of a National Security Council under a specific law, limitations on the President's use of power according to article 58 (2b), the removal of local government laws from the sixth schedule, the requirement of a vote of confidence from assemblies, consultation with the Prime Minister, and Musharraf's resignation from his military position by December 31, 2004.

The Seventeenth Amendment Bill, which had received the silence support of the MMA, was approved by the National Assembly on December 29, 2003, and by the Senate on December 30, with several changes made to the Legal Framework Order (LFO). The President ultimately granted authorization on December 31, 2003. However, it is worth noting that the opposition boycotted each of these occasions. The mentioned Amendment was a substitute for the 8<sup>th</sup> Amendment, with the same objective.<sup>1</sup> The approval demonstrated the continued fragility and subservience of civilian institutions in the face of military power. Following the ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment, Musharraf proceeded to legitimize his position by obtaining a vote of confidence from the Parliament and all Provincial Assemblies on January 1, 2004. Consequently, he obtained 53% of the votes (658 out of 1170 votes) from the Electoral College (The Dawn, 2004).

The Seventeenth Amendment bill, which restored power to the president. Regrettably, this practice is limited to the Pakistani political system, where the majority of legislators prioritize their own interests over the welfare of the nation and the advancement of democracy in Pakistan. In this context, the military functioned as a significant force of influence or a lobbying group. This statement pertains to S.E. Finer's theory, which categorizes the military's function both prior to and following a coup. During Musharraf regime, the military's involvement in the civilian government can be described as either a pressure group or as a blackmailer. Although these levels are considered legitimate and valid as the military owned the authority with the approval of the parliament.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the Seventeenth Amendment, the President was empowered to remove the sitting cabinet. He was empowered to dissolve the National Assembly. He regains the power to nominate all the services chiefs in the armed forces.

## **4.2 National Security Council (NSC)**

The suggestion to create a National Security Council or a comparable authoritative entity in Pakistan garnered extensive endorsement from the military administration, as well as active and retired military officers, and their civilian counterparts. The primary contention is that the military should have consistent participation in the policy-making process owing to its role in safeguarding national security and managing domestic affairs. Musharraf was determined to pass the Legal Framework Order (LFO) through Parliament, which included article 152-A pertaining to the National Security Council (NSC) (Hussain & Salyana, *Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan: Quest for Power and the Role of National Security Council*, 2021). In addition to keeping an eye on Pakistan's democratic and governance processes, the LFO tasked the NSC with supervising the country's security policy. Musharraf sought to establish the NSC as an institution by transforming it into a constitutional body through the LFO when the Seventeenth Amendment was being considered for passage in Parliament.

The parliamentarian passed the 17th Amendment without the NSC related to Article 152-A. However, the parliamentarian completed the working on NSC in January 2004. Opposition criticized NSC bill. They said the NSC legislation would limit parliament's power. The opposition boycotted both houses of parliament when the NSC legislation was debated. MMA members remained in parliament but did not vote for the NSC bill. The MMA did not object the bill as Musharraf promised to give up his military uniform by December 2004. Parliament passed the NSC Act 2004 on April 19, 2004. The President chairs the NSC, formed by this act. The Prime Minister, Speaker of the National Assembly, opposition leader, Senate Chairman, and four province Chief Ministers made the NSC. Pakistan's National Security Council (NSC) included the Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee Chairman and the Army, Air Force, and Navy Chiefs (Khan H. , 2009, p. 496). Hassan Askari Rizvi argues that giving the National Security Council (NSC) unlimited authority guarantees the direct involvement of military commanders in the constitutional and political framework.

## **4.3 Shift the office of the Premiership**

Although Musharraf handed up control to an elected government in 2002, military generals still ruled the country. General Musharraf was president and Army Chief, with full control over

internal and external state affairs. In most situations, elected Prime Minister Zafar Ullah Jamali has had a minor role. His status was revoked because Musharraf and parliamentarian lost trust in him. For two months in 2004, the country had three prime ministers. General Musharraf first requested Jamali's resignation. The latter named Chaudhry Shujaat Hussain prime minister in June 2014. This reversal, which followed Jamali's meeting with Musharraf, startled parliamentarians and ruling party members. Parliament replaces the prime minister in parliamentary government, not by order. After becoming prime minister in August 2004, Shaukat Aziz was the king's man (Kamran, 2008, p. 188). CM Arbab Ghulam Rahim revealed that General Mohammed Yusuf, the former Vice Chief of Staff of the army, appointed him CM of Sindh. The opposition said that this revelation demonstrated that the military generals appointed their own men to government positions. The Pakistani military was able to exert a significant amount of influence within the country's parliamentary system and operate the state apparatus in accordance with their preferences. Later on, Musharraf reneged on his commitment to step aside from his position as Army Chief, and this time, the pro-Musharraf Party, the PML-Q, also supported his decision to do so.

### **5. Parliamentary Government of PPP (2008-2013)**

On February 18, 2008, the ninth general elections were conducted. Voter turnout was 44% as a result of worries about national security. The elections were free and fair notwithstanding the participation of well-known individuals and an accommodating government. With 113 seats, including reserve seats, the PPP gained a majority in the National Assembly. In the National Assembly, the pro-Musharraf PLM-Q received 55 seats, while the PML-N secured 84 (The dawn, 2008). With 264 votes from the National Assembly, Syed Yusuf Raza Gilani, the PPP candidate, was elected Prime Minister of Pakistan, defeating Pervez Elahi, who only earned 42 votes (The Dawn, 2008). The order to release the judges detained during the Emergency in November 2007 was the first action taken by the newly appointed prime minister of Pakistan. The execution of this order took place without delay.

## **5.1 Ouster of General Musharraf**

The National Assembly launched the impeachment process by accusing Musharraf of Constitutional violations, misbehaviour, and disrespecting the faith of the Pakistani people. The resolution was signed by over 300 National Assembly members, indicating a substantial majority. Following the February elections, the PPP and PML-N had to decide whether to impeach the President. At a meeting on August 5<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup>, 2008, Asif Zardari and Nawaz Sharif decided to impeach the President if he did not quit. The PPP and its leadership, notably co-chairman Asif Ali Zardari, initially hesitated to impeach Musharraf. They believed impeachment was premature and chose to challenge the establishment. After mounting pressure from the PML-N and its leadership, the two parties resolved to impeach Musharraf.

The impeachment procedure ended Musharraf's presidency. Initially, Musharraf resisted calls for resignation, but as the impeachment process progressed, he lost support from important supporters, such as the military and the US. Musharraf resigned in a national address on August 18, 2008 (Daily Jang, 2008). In his resignation speech, Musharraf cited nation-wide political instability as the cause for his departure. He resigned to avoid causing division and controversy in the national interest. In this context, the military played a passive role, clearly providing support for the functioning of the democratic system. Specifically, Army Chief Gen Kiyani endorsed the proper conduct of the general elections held in February 2008. The removal of the military dictator played a significant role in the reestablishment of political stability within the nation. The event marked the conclusion of a time characterized by political ambiguity and governance supported by the military, allowing political parties to exert their power and create a more secure political atmosphere founded on democratic ideals.

## **5.2 The 18<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment**

The Constitutional 18th Amendment Bill was approved by the National Assembly on April 8, 2010, with a majority of two-thirds. This action marked a significant political milestone in Pakistan. Of the total 342 members, a significant majority of 292 voted in favour of the bill, demonstrating robust support for its adoption. The legislation is crucial for the reinstatement of

Pakistan's parliamentary system, as originally conceived in the 1973 Constitution (Jetly, 2010). General Zia-ul-Haq and Pervez Musharraf damaged the Constitution, hence this amendment is a comprehensive constitutional change in Pakistan. These individuals have used the Constitution to legitimize their authority, but this move represents a milestone towards a more democratic and equitable Pakistan.

### **5.3 Strengthening Parliament**

The 18<sup>th</sup> Amendment to Pakistan's constitution restored parliamentary supremacy, formerly damaged by non-functioning parliaments or subservience to powerful authorities. This change represents a substantial shift towards a more democratic governing system. The enactment of the 18th Amendment in Pakistan led to a substantial transformation in the political dynamics by reorganizing the allocation of authority between the President and the Prime Minister. Prior to the amendment, the President possessed substantial power, which encompassed the prerogative to dismiss the Prime Minister at their own discretion. Consequently, an unequal distribution of power emerged, leading to a diminished authority of the Prime Minister and a lack of genuine responsibility towards the public within the administration.

After the 18th Amendment, power dynamics altered substantially. This legislation prohibits the President from removing the Prime Minister without due process. This cemented the Prime Minister's position, allowing the National Assembly—the people's democratically elected body—to only remove him by no-confidence vote (Shah A. , 2012).

### **6. Comparative Analysis**

The military establishment in Pakistan was significantly responsible for maintaining the parliamentary system that was established following the general elections in 2002. Additionally, the system was protected by the military cover. There was a government in Pakistan that was led by the PML-Q, which was also known as the Pro-Military Party. This government poses a threat to the genuine parliamentary system that exists in Pakistan. Due to the fact that it had caused political upheaval, the legitimacy of the parliament was frequently called into question. During

this time period, the military role played a significant and prominent role. It is highly possible that the controversial National Security Council and the 17<sup>th</sup> Amendment Bill were among the controversial bills and changes that this parliament was compelled to accept.

On the other hand, the legislative administration of the PPP, which was installed right after the general election in February 2008, was founded on a genuine democratic system. Despite the fact that this government was confronted with tremendous obstacles, one of which was maintaining political stability, economic stability, and opposition. Without a doubt, the involvement of the opposition posed a significant risk to the stability of the government, and the judiciary was also a risk to the normal operation of the parliament. The civilian administration became weak as a result of the combination of internal and external security threats. In these kinds of situations, the civilian administration was the one that played a vital role in bolstering the parliament. Musharraf was persuaded to resign down from his position as president, which was a significant accomplishment for this parliament despite the fact that it was successful in removing the military dictator from the power corridor. During the process of introducing the 18<sup>th</sup> Amendment, the honest representation of the parliament was brought back into existence. When a civilian-led administration in Pakistan finished its constitutional terms of five years, it was the first time in the country's history of parliamentary government that this had ever happened. Despite the fact that this civilian government was subject to the influence of the military. In relation to Osama bin Laden and the Memo-Gate Scandal, this government was confronted with a number of challenges issued by the military establishment. In addition, the civilian government established friendly relations with the military in order to address concerns regarding *Salala* Check-Post and to conduct operations against terrorists.

## **7. Conclusion**

The parliamentary system in Pakistan from 2002-2007, under the PML-Q Regime, which exemplifies a period in the parliamentary history of Pakistan in which the military was a dominant factor. As the military has changed the entire shape of the parliament and the constitution as per its will. This regime was considered a hybrid regime and Pakistan was



considered a praetorian state. The parliament has decreased its strength while the adoption of the 17<sup>th</sup> Amendment. the PML-Q government was a quasi-military government. The PPP government which faced numerous political challenges and difficulties from its initial days of governments. Even the findings of this research shows that under all the circumstances, the PPP government has restored the true sense of the parliament by ousting the military dictator and the adoption of the 18<sup>th</sup> Amendment and here the statement of Benazir proves absolutely true that democracy is a best revenge of dictatorship.

## **References**

(1999, October 18). *The Nation*.

(2004, January 2). *The Dawn*.

(2008, August 19). *The Dawn*.

(2008, February 20). *The dawn*.

(2008, March 25). *The Dawn*.

(2008, August 19). *Daily Jang*.

Ahmed, I. (2013). *The Pakistan Garrison State: Origins, Evolution, Consequences (1947-2011)*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Alam, S., Bhatti, N., & Saif, A. (2020). Civilianization of Military Rule in Pakistan: A Study of Musharraf Era (1999-2005). *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4(2), 151-163.

Aziz, S. (2009). *Between Dreams and Realities*. Karachi: Oxford university Press.

Baxter, C. (2001). Political Development in Pakistan. In h. Malik, *Pakistan: Founders' Aspirations and Today's Realities* (p. 172). Karachi: Oxford University press.

Belokrenitsky, V. Y., & Moskalenko, V. N. (2013). *A Political History of Pakistan, 1947-2007*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Gohar, A. (1996). *Ayub Khan, Pakistan's First military Ruler*. Karachi: Oxford univrsity Press.

Huntington, S. P. (1965, April). Political Development and Political Decay. *World Politics*, 17, 386-430.

Hussain, M. A., & Salyana, J. A. (2021). Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan: Quest for Power and the Role of National Security Council. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 207-219.

- Hussain, M. A., & Salyana, J. A. (2022, Jan-March). The Transition of Guided Democracy in Pakistan. A Study of Military Regimes. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, III(1), 93-106.
- Jetly, R. (2010). Restoring Parliamentary Democracy in Pakistan. *Institute of South Asian Studies*, 1-4.
- Kamran, T. (2008). *Democracy and gOVERNANCE IN pAKISTAN*. Lahore: South Asia Partnership-Pakistan.
- Khan, H. (2009). *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan* (2nd ed.). Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Khan, K. A. (n.d.). 17th Constitutional Amendment & Its Aftermath: The Role of Muttahidda Majlis-i-Amal (MMA). *Pakistan Vision*, 9(2), 101-121.
- Lasswell, H. (1936). *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*.
- Mahmood, S. (2010). *Political Roots and Development in Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford university Press.
- Musharraf, P. (2006). *In the Line of Fire: A Memoir*. London: Pocket Books.
- Naazer, M. A., Mahmood, A., & Ashfaq, S. (2017, January-June). Political Rights Situation during Musharraf Era: 1999-2004. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal*, 1, 20-31.
- Shah, A. (2012). The 18th Constitutional Amendment: Glue or Solvent for Nation Building and Citizenship in Pakistan. *Journal of Economics*, 6(2), 387-391.
- Shah, A. (2014). *The Army and Democracy: Military Politics in Pakistan*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Zhao, S., & Rahman, S. (2017). Rethinking Civil-Military Relations in a Pakistan: Some Lessons from Turkey. *Journal of Socialomics*, 1-5.