

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18534520>

The Process Of Democratization And Role Of Opposition Parties In The Formative Years Of Pakistan: A Historical Analysis



Dr. Khial Ghani Assistant Professor in Pakistan Studies, Govt College Dara Adam Khal,
ghaniafridi093@gmail.com

Dr. Tariq Amin Lecturer, Pakistan Study Centre, University of Peshawar
tariqpsc@uop.edu.pk

Abstract: *This research paper provides a historical analysis of the role played by opposition parties both within and outside the parliament concerning political stability in the Pakistan. Pakistan's political history is marked by a lack of significant instances of unified efforts towards establishing democracy, often leading to discord and disrupting processes, ultimately, resulting in military dictatorships. Within the parliament, the opposition has frequently failed to consistently fulfill its expected role, often obstructing reformative legislative initiatives proposed by the government. Conversely, the government has frequently neglected to provide adequate space for the opposition to engage in constructive criticism. This ongoing lack of coordination between these two vital parliamentary components have resulted in political instability in the country. The research paper provides a contextual background for the study, supporting the argument that the disproportionate influence of the opposition in Pakistani politics has contributed to instability. It contends that without the constructive engagement of the opposition, democracy cannot flourish in Pakistan.*

Keywords: Democratisation, Opposition Parties, Parliamentary Politics, Political Stability, Democratic Development, Pakistan

Introduction

Democracy a form of government founded on the principles of freedom and equality, allow citizens to collectively shape policies and governance. Similarly democratization is the process by which a society moves from being ruled by an autocratic regime to achieve minimal democracy, and ultimately, substantive democracy. This journey is not simple or smooth and comes with many challenges. In parliamentary democracies, the role of opposition parties is imperative

for upholding democratic values and mitigating the risk of authoritarian inclinations. The history of Pakistan with democracy and the democratization process has been fraught with challenges since its inception. Among the critical factors contributing to this struggle, are the leadership vacuum following Jinnah's death, the decline of Muslim League as the founding party, delays in constitution making, self-serving politicians, undue interference by the head of state, lack of free

and fair elections and the imposition of martial law. The role of different entities like ruling parties, opposition parties and head of the state in nascent phase of democratization is discussed with detail.

CONSTITUTION MAKING PROCESS AND THE COLLAPSE OF DEMOCRACY

The introduction of the parliamentary democracy by the British in India had brought schism, as it compelled the Muslims to unite under the flag of All India Muslim League against existing powers as opposition party for the safeguard of socio-political and economic interest. Throughout the constitutional battle, the League wanted a federal system of government where all residuary subjects to be held by the provinces, whereas the India National Congress (INC) was in favor of strong center. The constitutional deadlock reached its apex during Simla Conference (1945-46) held for making consensus on Wavell Plan (Parveen, *The Politics of Pakistan: Role of the Opposition*(1947-58) , 2013).

INC rejected the plan because the Muslims were granted parity in the Viceroy Executive Council. INC insisted that one Muslim representative should be taken from her party side. It is on the basis of this question as to which party is the real representative of Muslim community, that elections were announced by the then Viceroy of India at central and provincial levels in 1946. The elections results demonstrated that Muslim

League was the sole representative of the Muslims of India. Most of the historians and political scientists agreed that the masses favored the Muslim League. Shortly after the elections, Muslim League, under the leadership of Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, established Pakistan on the 14th Aug 1947, through the power of vote in a democratic way (Mahmood S. , *Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999*, 2002).

Constitution Making in Pakistan

Framing Constitution was one of the major challenges for the newly established Pakistan. Among many hindrances the most surmounting hurdles included the quantification of representatives in the federal set up and the geographic division of the country. Similarly, the nature and character of future constitution and the role of Islam in it, the national language issue and the distribution of powers between center and provinces were the issues that delayed the constitution making in Pakistan. Temporarily, the 1935 Act was taken as interim constitution for running the state machinery. The task for framing the constitution was given to the Constituent Assembly having legislative purposes as well. Being a founding party, Pakistan Muslim League did not have to deal with much problems because there was no useful resistance in the assemblies until the end of 1954. As there were only ten members of the

Pakistan National Congress (PNC) party and three members of the Azad Pakistan Party (APP) inside the house. In order to demonstrate the image of Pakistan as liberal and secular state, the above mentioned parties sat together on the opposition benches. Objective Resolution was the first mile-stone which was achieved by the constituent assembly in 1949, which provided a preamble for the future constitutions (Choudhury, 1963).

THE OBJECTIVE RESOLUTION (1949) AND THE OPPOSITION PARTIES

The Objectives Resolution, which outlines the goals and objectives of Pakistan's future constitution, was approved with remarkable speed, marking the first step towards the making of a new constitution. Among the other points, the major one, which was criticized by the opposition parties, was that “sovereignty belongs to God and the authority, He has transferred to representatives of the state through people as a sacred trust and would be within the limits prescribed by Him. Jugindar Nath Mandal, the Minister of Law and Justice resigned from his post by stating that the Muslim League leaderships want to make Pakistan an Islamic country and declare Islam as the only remedy of all evils on earth, which is not acceptable to the minorities of the country. The opposition parties objected in a sense that it mixes politics with religion and

that would reduce the status of minorities. The unhappy Hindu leader of PNC, Mr. Chattopadhyaya showed his distrust and objected to the Objective Resolution regularly through speeches during assembly sessions from 05 March to 12 March 1949. According to him, he didn't think the standards of Islam as understood by the religious majority for the best interests of the country's minorities. Other PNC members swiftly determined that the resolution was not in line with the Jinnah's perspectives of his 11th August speech to the assembly. Rather, it reflected the consensus of the country's Ulemas. Therefore, they made certain proposals as alterations in the draft of Objective Resolution. Because of this, it was suggested that the assembly should decide on all the changes that the Non-Muslim party members had suggested. Even though, every member of the PNC (Pakistan National Congress) voted for the changes, they were not accepted by the Assembly. Instead, they were turned down by a vote of twenty-one to ten. Mia Iftikhar u Din was the only Muslim member of the Constituent Assembly, who did not vote in favor of the Objective Resolution. He thought that the political freedoms spelt out in the resolution would not be possible until the country's economic structure could be changed on a large scale. It is very interesting that some orthodox Ulema were even not contented with the resolution on the plea that it had provided many concessions in terms of

rights to the Non-Muslims (Debates of the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, 1949).

THE FIRST REPORT OF THE BASIC PRINCIPLE COMMITTEE

In order to expedite the process of constitution making a committee called the Basic Principle committee (BPC) having members from both ruling as well as opposition parties was formed. The BPC submitted its first interim report on September 28, 1950 to the Constituent Assembly. The report was subjected to severe criticism from all corners of the country. First, the Islamist parties disowned it because it had no Islamic character as given early in Objective Resolution. Secondly, the Bengali leaders objected on the quantification of seats as the largest province in terms of population was equalized with other small provinces in the Upper House and the number of seats in the Lower House was not fully mentioned, whom they thought injustice and contradiction with the principles of federalism. The Bengali members also objected on the proposals of strong center. Due to utmost opposition from Bengalis to the first report of BPC, the assembly stopped its considerations on its proposals for a while and decided not to publish it (Committee, 1950).

THE SECOND DRAFT OF BPC

Khawaja Nazimudin, who became the second Prime Minister after the assassination of

Liaquat Ali Khan, presented the final report of the BPC to the constituent Assembly in the last month of 1952. He provided the parity formula to solve the representation problems of both major parts of the country. It had equal numbers of seats for East Pakistan portion as well as the nine administrative units of the West Pakistan areas. The second report of the BPC caused more tension and political instability in the country. Both, leaders from Punjab and Bengal rejected it on their own grounds. Politicians from Punjab thought, it tried to make Bengal more important than other parts of the country. The leaders of Punjab thought if the small provinces of Western wing of Pakistan, like Sindh and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), joined hands with the Eastern wing of Pakistanis, they might be able to cut Punjab off and take over the whole country. On this report, well-known political figures and a range of political parties took positions on many problems. When Mian Mumtaz Daultana, advocated for the parity principle, other opposition groups having roots in Punjab rejected his stance. As a result, the House postponed discussing the report (Islam F. u., 2018).

Hussain Shaheed Suhrawardy, a prominent leader from Bengal, also did not like the parity formula because he thought it went against the democratic principles, where representation is not given on the basis of population. According to him, what the ruling elites of Pakistan want to equalize

fifty five percent population with forty five percent, it would be totally against the interest of the people of Bengal and contrast to the democratic norms as well.

Nevertheless, other political parties, including the United Islamic Front (UIF) and the Khilafat-i-Rabbani Party (KRP), extended their support to the prominent leaders of the Awami League. The aforementioned political parties advocated for the establishment of a unicameral legislature, whose representation would be determined by population size. Additionally, both parties put up the proposition that the central government should retain power solely over the defense, monetary matters, and foreign affairs ministries (Khan H. , 2001).

There was proposal for the establishment of Ulema Boards both at central and provincial level, who had the virtual veto on the legislation made by the central legislative body as well as provincial legislative bodies (Khan H. , 2001).

The opposition members from the minorities inside the Constituent Assembly, objected to the creation of Ulema Boards as check on the legislatures first, and secondly, they vehemently criticized the clause of the report which had said that no laws will be made which is not in line with Quran and Sunnah, meant that our personal laws regarding our faith are to be exempted. They very harshly criticized the clause that the

Head of the State and Head of the Government of the country would be Muslim only, meant we are declared second class citizens of the state after Muslims (Kazmi, 2009).

As this report was under severe criticism and objections from both Bengali and Punjabi groups, the BPC Report is famously known as Punjab-Bengal Crisis report by the historians (Mahmood S. , Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999, 2002). The Punjabi politicians were in favor of strong center while Bengali politicians wanted weak center with provincial autonomy. Many top leaders from Punjab who were part of this twenty nine members committee did not signed the report. Among those, who did not show their assent to the report were Mian Mumtaz Daulatana, MA Gormani and Choudry Nazir Ahmad worth mentioning. It is due to lack of consensual politics among the politicians of East Wing and West Wing of Pakistan that bureaucracy and military became stronger (Mahmood S. , Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999, 2002).

Meanwhile, Khwaja Nazimuddin, the PM of Pakistan, was ousted by the then Governor General Ghulam Muhammad from his office with the reason of mismanaging the security situation as well as food crisis in the country but especially on the agitation against Ahmadis in Lahore. Prominent religious scholar and Ameer of Jamaat Islami as well

as many other religious leaders went to jail in these crisis, due to which for two months martial law was imposed in Lahore. This was the first time that military was involved in the civilian administration which paved the way for the subjugation of politicians to the power of executive in the country (Talbot, 2012).

Muhammad Ali Bogra succeeded Khwaja Nazim u Din as new head of the government. It is highly improbable, Khwaja Nazim u Din had just passed the budget from the assembly before his dismissal and majority of the assembly members had trust in him. Thus, the step taken by Ghulam Muhammad was totally wrong and astonishing in this regard. Secondly, it was implausible on the part of the Constituent Assembly to cast vote of confidence for Muhammad Ali Bogra from Bengal, an ambassador of Pakistan to USA, having no political connections. As soon as Bogra took over as leader of the house, he knew that the political impasse between the ruling party and the opposition had to be fixed right away. Within a short time of less than six months of being appointed, he had a lecture on October 7th, 1953, presenting his formula, which became known as the Bogra Formula. According to this formula, the Lower House had a different number of members based on the population of each of the five units among which, 165 will be given to East Pakistan and 135 seats will be allocated to the remaining four units of West

Pakistan. On the other hand, the Upper House had the same number of places, with 10 members from each of the five units i.e. 10 seats will be reserved for East Wing single province, while 40 seats have to be given to the four units of West Pakistan. While keeping in mind the demand of opposition parties, especially Bengalis of East Pakistan, he applied the principle of population in the lower house and treated all units equally in upper house. So, through this method, he not only sorted out the problem of those who demanded for their weightage of population and for West Pakistani as well by bringing parity principle to the legislature in totality. Both the Houses had the same amount of power. When both the houses meet together, a majority of them will back a vote of confidence, no-confidence, or an election for the head of state, as long as at least 30% of the members from each zone are present in the parliament. There were two main ideas that drove the Muhammad Ali Bogra formula. To begin, the idea of parity was introduced in a new way. Second, it provided rules of election for the head of the state. The formula suggested if PM from is West Pakistan then Head of the State will be from East Pakistan. Muhammad Ali Bogra said that his formula would not only make sure that the two wings are treated equally, but it would also help them depend on each other and be more linked. In particular, Bogra stressed that this kind of change

would hurt the desire for provincialism and would eventually, lead to the merging of the different groups (Sayeed K. B., 1967).

Another important modification made in this formula was replacement of the role of Ulema body with Supreme Court to ensure whether the laws passed by the legislature were repugnant to the Quran and Sunnah. All these suggestions in the Bogra Formula were under discussions mainly in the month of October and November 14, 1953 sessions of the Constituent Assembly. A drafting committee was also constituted to draft all those provisions endorsed by the Assembly. But Ghulam Muhammad, Governor General of Pakistan dissolved the assembly in October 1954, without any proper reason. It was the second attempt from Governor General, Ghulam Muhammad in a short span of only eighteen months that the assembly was again dissolved in 1954. All these illegal actions proved very fatal for the parliamentary democracy in the country (Mahmood S. , Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999, 2002). The hegemony of executive power over the parliament was legalized by the apex Judiciary who validated the decision of Governor General through “Doctrine of Necessity”. Hence, from the very beginning the role of politicians was marginalized through the working fusion of beaurocracy, executive and Judiciary. The inclusion of in-service general in the new cabinet by Ghulam Muhammad, set a new example in

the parliamentary history of Pakistan. The entry of military in the executive body further darkened the future of democracy (Mahmood S. , Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999, 2002).

The composition of second constituent assembly had changed completely because the Muslim League was completely wiped-out by the United Democratic Front (UDF), a league of nine political parties from East Wing of Pakistan during 1954 provincial elections. The Unification of Bengal-based political parties occurred, because Muslim League was presenting the West Pakistan interest. The death of Muslim League Bengal Chapter caused political instability not only in Bengal, but through-out Pakistani politics. The politics of UDF was revolving around the regional autonomy, leaving only foreign affairs, defense and currency for the federal government from the day one of its foundation. As the Muslim League had no proper and strong organizational set-up like Congress party of India after partition so disintegrated into another political group inside the Punjab called Republican Party, a party which was the brain child of Iskandar Mirza, bureaucrat-turned politician (Talbot, 2012).

In the new house, no single party got complete majority so, a coalition government of Muslim League and UDF was formed under the premiership of Choudhry Muhammad Ali, another retired

bureaucrat from Muslim League. As there was cold war running between the centripetal and the centrifugal forces, in which the executive especially the bureaucratic establishment, leaderships of the Muslim League were on one side, while the leaders of Bengals and other smaller provinces were on another side. So in order to practice the parity formula and to settle the issue of constitutional deadlock, the executive envisioned to unite the West Pakistan provinces into one unit popularly known as One Unit Scheme (Mahmood S. , Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999, 2002).

Opposition to the One Unit Scheme

The introduction of the bill regarding the One Unit Bill in the provincial assemblies of West Pakistan, presented a significant challenge to the government-opposition dynamics, hence, tested their relationships once again. The provincial legislative assemblies of the then NWFP now Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) approved the province's union with other federating units on November 25th, 1954. Pir of Manki Sharif, leader of Awami League of the KP branch, was the one, who denounced the KP Assembly's Bill for One Unit Scheme and boycotted the session along with his co-workers. Outside, the parliament Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, leader of Khudai Khidmatgar, openly criticized the scheme of one unit. Sardar Abdur Rasheed (Chief

Minister KP) had shown his dissent opinion before the passage of this scheme, on October 20th, 1954. According to him, the scheme, though looked good, but practically, it is not implementable, therefore it cannot be approved. According to him, making any decision about the scheme, the dissented opinion of the representative body and general masses to be found-out (Khan H. , 2001).

In the province of Sindh the situation on the issue of one unit was also not favorable. Although, the Sindh Assembly passed the resolution in favor of the scheme on December 12th, 1954 with majority, but at the same time Abd-us-Sattar Pirzada the then Chief Minister (CM) of Sindh province gathered the signatures of seventy four dissented members of the assembly out of total one hundred and ten. He also received backing from prominent political figures hailing from the province of Sindh, in opposition to the One Unit policy. It was on account of his disagreement over this particular issue that he was dismissed from the post of CM and a new member, named Ayub Khoru, was appointed as new CM of the province (Waseem M. , 2021).

The One Unit issue had made things worse between the government and the opposition in Sindh day by day. Resultantly, CM Muhammad Ayub Kaoru, arrested a number of politicians; like Abd-us-Sattar Pirzada, G.M. Syed, Pir Ilahi Bakhsh and Qazi

Fazlullah, on charges of planning to kill cabinet members. The administration had done this job in order to stop people from speaking out against the One Unit plan and speed up the Sindh Assembly's acceptance to the cause. Soon after this development, the Assembly session was convened on emergency basis where majority of the members of Sindh Assembly voted in favor of the one unit scheme. But, the process was vehemently criticized by Sheikh Abdul Majeed (member of Sindh Assembly). He claimed that Hyderabad was turned into a military camp where constitutional issues were decided in their entirety. The unification of provinces bill had been approved forcefully from the Assembly members by putting pressure on them (Ahmad M. , 2017).

The situation in the province of Punjab was peaceful as majority of their leaders both from ruling as well as opposition side, were in favor of the scheme. So there was no serious threat or pressure that might have prevented the House from passing the One Unit Bill. So, in the very first meeting, the Assembly of Punjab approved the One Unit bill on November 30th, 1954. Although, despite not being present in the house during the passage of law, the opposition leader, Mian Abdul Bari promised his party's complete support to the cause of One Unit Scheme in a message. In order to get through the bill in the State of Bahawalpur, the cabinet of Mian Hassan Mehmood was

dismissed. Thus, after this move the legislative bodies of the states of Khairpur and Bahawalpur expressed their support for the incorporation into One Unit plan. In Balochistan the leaders of the States Union of Baluchistan, comprising Kalat, Kharan, Makran and Lasbela, had firstly merged themselves into the provincial entity of Baluchistan in October, 1954. As there was no assembly in Balochistan so, these states authorized, Khan of Qalat to make assent in favor of One Unit Scheme, which he did later on. It meant no substantial opposition was shown to the federal government in Baluchistan in this connection. But very soon, the tribal uprising started in Qalat and nearby areas in 1958. The man behind these violence and agitations was Prince Farim, the Khan of Qalat (Talbot, 2012).

After this, Khan Abdul Jabbar Khan famously known as Dr. Khan Sahib and Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani were appointed to chair the province of West Pakistan as CM and Governor, respectively. In the meantime, the Federal Court ruled in *Mawlvi Tamizuddin vs. Government* that the Governor General lacked the authority to combine the various Units of West Pakistan into a single province. As a result, on August 23, 1955, the One Unit Bill was brought to the second Constituent Assembly. Sardar Amir Azam Khan, highlighting the key provisions of the bill, stated that the Governor General would have the authority to alter the name of East Bengal to East

Pakistan and to combine the existing administrative divisions of West Pakistan into a single province of West Pakistan (Khan H. , 2001).

Even though, the Awami League (AL) was strongly against the One Unit Bill but the government's alliance partner, the Krishak Saramik Party, supported the scheme. A well-known politician from Bengal Mr. Fazlu Rehman opposed the scheme because it would divide the country into two parts i.e. Bengalis and non- Bengalis. Similarly, Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, a prominent leader of the Awami League, vehemently opposed the One Unit Bill for three distinct reasons. One main argument was the unsuitability of the name "East Pakistan" for East Bengal, due to the rich historical significance linked with the term "Bengal." On the other hand, if such a change was to occur, it should only be realized with the consensus of the Bengali people. Secondly the One Unit system shouldn't be looked at in isolation from other important issues, like the language of Bengali, autonomy of province and joint electorates. People from East Bengal, will show their nod to the idea of One Unit as long as all the important conditions are met. Thirdly, many people from different parts of West Pakistan are against the idea of one unit. So, it was suggested that their points of view should be properly accepted and taken into account through a vote of referendum (Ahmad M. , 2017). Mian Iftikhar-ud-Din (leader of Azad

Pakistan Party from Punjab) emerged as a noticeable critic of the One Unit plan also. He vehemently denounced the notion that centralized authority would foster unity. In the coming years, opposition to One Unit gave rise to a long series of street demonstrations, public rallies, and the West Pakistan Assembly witnessed the delivery of critical speeches, articles, editorials in the newspaper, student boycott of classes, and a general alienation among intellectuals, party cadres from smaller provinces. Various political groups, forums and parties emerged against the notions of One Unit scheme. The West Pakistan Assembly passed a resolution against this scheme in 1957, but to no avail. Between 1955-1970, many movements started against one Unit, which was finally did away with by President Yahya Khan in 1970 and restored the original status of the four provinces. This decision took away a major source of conflict that was ripped since its creation among the smaller provinces against the center (Sayeed K. , 2017). One Unit scheme, though it had its importance for providing easiness in framing the constitution but still it is considered the most controversial act performed by the second constituent assembly of Pakistan. According to the movers of this scheme, the adoption of this scheme would discourage the regionalism, parochialism and provincialism but in reality it caused hatred among different ethnic groups. However, finally the

constitution that was enacted on 23th March, 1956, was abrogated after two and half years in 1958 (Khan H. , 2001). In this period, the seed of Bengali nationalism was grown, which was ripped after 1970 elections in the shape of the dismemberment of Pakistan. In the very first nine years, the political development and especially the constitution making process had always been stuck by the political intrigue, opportunism by the politicians both inside and outside the parliament. Early in 1956, the constitution-making process was accelerated, putting more pressure on the government and opposition's relationship. The proposed constitution was submitted to the Second Constituent Assembly of the country by Ibrahim Ismail Chundrigar, who served as the Minister of Law during Choudhry Muhammad Ali's administration. Numerous factions, particularly those from East Pakistan, expressed their opposition against the Islamic elements incorporated into the draft of the constitution. The elected lawmakers from the Awami League and Gantatri Dal expressed their opposition towards the Islamic sections included in the draft of constitution. An important member of Awami League, Abul Mansur Ahmad, asserted that the constitution was neither federal nor republican nor Islamic in origin. (Ahmad M. , 2017).

Opposition to Islamic Provisions in Constitution

The opposition leader, Suhrawardy, argues that Pakistan should only be referred to as an Islamic State if majority of its citizens had access to basic necessities like food, clothing, housing, jobs, medical care, and educational opportunities. He further said that the inclusion of Islamic articles in the draft of constitution will hurt the sense of minorities. B.K. Das, head of the PNC, said that calling Pakistan the Islamic Republic, will hurt the people who live in this country but follow other religions, as it was also the home country of Christians, Hindus, and other religious groups. People in charge of AL, GD, and PNC spoke out against the clause of the constitution that only Muslims could be the Head of the State, was totally discrimination and was not needed because 86% of Pakistan's population is already Muslim community. Members of the second Constituent Assembly from minority put forward two important changes that were well accepted by the assembly and were not resisted. The principle articulated in his statement affirms the right of all religious communities to establish and oversee educational institutions of their own preference, and the state will have no right to interfere (Sayeed K. , 2017). These constitutional clauses expressively worked against East Bengal. On the last day, the elected members of Awami League showed their disagreement by leaving the house and not signing the Constitution. Unlike other Bengali members, the opposition leader

Hussain Shaheed Suhrawardy, performed the role of a great statesman and ultimately signed the Draft Constitution on March 23, 1956, for the sake of the country and for the future of parliamentary democracy as well. Finally under Article 22 of the 1956 Constitution, the Second Constituent Assembly was converted into National Assembly whose members had been given the charge to elect the first Head of the State (President).

Political Instability in Pakistan (1956-58)

Iskandar Mirza was chosen mutually as the first elected President of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. the Pakistan Muslim League (PML) and United Front (UF) government, led by Choudhry Muhammad Ali, was given permission to carry out its duties. But the Prime Minister, who faced lots of problems from the less cooperative Muslim League (Choudry, 1963). During this time, he nominated Dr. Khan Sahib as the CM of West Pakistan's United Provinces (UP). This decision had caused political instability as the Muslim League Parliamentary Party (MLPP) had decided that only a MLPP member can be the Chief Minister of the province. The Muslim League Parliamentary Party (MLPP) passed a motion in which their stance of MLPP member be the Chief Minister of the province was reaffirmed on April 3, 1956. However, Iskander Mirza had his complete support with Dr. Khan. So, in opposition of

Muslim League, Iskandar Mirza, the first President of Pakistan made another party Namely republican party by producing rift among the parliamentarians of the League. So, the politicians instead of bringing political unity among their ranks, further divided for self-interest. As leader of a national alliance, Pakistan's PM Choudhry Muhammad Ali was in a difficult position because the parliamentary committee of his own party in West Pakistan advocated for Dr. Khan Sahib's dismissal from his position as CM. He submitted his resignations from both the Muslim League and the position of Prime Minister on September 8, 1956. The Prime Minister's decision to quit occurred during a period in which he held the trust of the National Assembly and commanded a significant majority in Parliament. He had perceived himself as the leader of the entire alliance, rather than solely the leader of the Muslim League. The political situations of both wings were almost the same. Despite the implementation of the Constitution, the Ministry of the United Front, under the leadership of Abu Hussain Sarkar, continued to maintain its authority. During the whole duration of fifteen months, the incumbent government displayed minimal regard for legislative and parliamentary customs and processes, and functioned autonomously from the legislature. On August 30, the Ministry tendered its resignation without undergoing a vote of no confidence from the legislature, so,

concluding a discreditable tenure characterized by a flagrant contempt for principles of parliamentary democracy (Nizami, 2022). At the central level, the Awami League and Republican Party formed a coalition government after Muslim League. But the government of Hussain Shaheed did not last for more than one year. He had the ability to produce national harmony between East and West Pakistan due to his popular support. As he wanted elections sooner under the 1956 constitution where Iskander Mirza felt insecure about his future position so, he removed him from office by taking resignation from him on 11th October 1957. After this, the un- broken series of the politics of give and take and political instability was started. Politicians were used to change their allegiances overnight. Floor crossing reached to such extent that every new ministry became unstable after some time. Therefore, the two other prime ministers such as II Chandrigar and Feroz Khan Noon's government were dismissed in short span of less than one year. This uncertain situations in the political arena of the country hampered the developmental activities as well as economic activities throughout. The political leaderships instead of focusing on the welfare of the people, were busy to secure their own positions in terms of attaining of power. One the other hand, people came out against the one unit and in favor of the provincial autonomy (Mahmood

S. , Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999, 2002).

There was no one from the political parties who could end, this political instability. Iskander Mirza under severe pressure finally gave the date of election in March, 1959. Hussain Shaheed was the only politician who worked hard for bringing unity among politicians through reconciliation. Iskander Mirza was afraid of political gatherings and re-conciliatory politics of Suharwardi. He thought after new elections his position would diminish as he had no political ground in the general public. He issued the proclamation of Martial Law and abrogated the constitution on 07th October 1958. There was no moral and legal cause behind this act. Instead of conducting early elections, he attempted to cure the Political instability through force. (Khan H. , 2001).

Throughout the nine years after independence witnessed the struggle for power that continued among the politicians. The unrepresentative structure of the governments after Liaquat Ali Khan had damaged the parliamentary norms of democracy. The same unrepresentative character could be seen in the provincial governments as well. Similarly, the opposition parties continuously attempted to destabilize the government while the ruling party was busy in suppressing the oppositions. (Nizami, 2022).

Conclusion

Pakistan came into existence through the valid system of democracy. But, unfortunately, after the early demise of the founder of the nation, no one had been able to drive the country on right direction in its formative years. Muslim League, the founding party, soon fragmented into many groups because of lacking democratic spirit, organization structure and lack of grass-root contact. Similarly, the lack of unrepresentative nature of the assemblies, lust for power, regional outlook instead of national integration further destabilized the country. The unnecessary delays in the constitution making and bureaucratic intervention in the dismissal of governments in the first ten years stopped uniform institutional growth and brought political instability which ultimately plunged the country into unending military rule.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abass, M. (2024). *Selector si Selected Tak Sangason per KOn*. Lahore: Books Paradise.
- Abida, S. (1999). *Social Change and the Politics of Religion in Pakistan*. Islamabad: Vanguard Book Publishers.
- Adil, M. (2021). *ROLE OF OPPOSITION IN PAKISTANI PARLIAMENT (2008-2018): A CRITICAL ANALYSIS*, PhD thesis submitted to Islamic International University Islamabad. Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Ahmad, M. (2017). *Government and Politics in Pakistan*. Karachi: Royal Book Company.
- Ayaz, B. (2013). *What's Wrong With Pakistan*. India: Hay House.
- Choudhury, G. W. (1963). *Democracy in Pakistan*. Dacca: Green Book House.
- Choudry, G. (1988). *Pakistan: Transition from Military to Civil Rule*. England: Buckhurst Hill Publishers.
- Christophe, J. (2016). *Pakistan at the Crossroads Domestic Dynamics and External Pressure*. India: Penguin Random House.
- Christophe, J. (2016). *The Pakistan Paradox Instability and Resilience*. India: Penguin Random House.
- Christophe, Jaffrelot. (2016). *Pakistan At the Crossroads-Domestic Dynamic and External Pressure (ed)*. Haryana: Penguin Random House India.
- Cohen, S. P. (1998). *The Pakistan Army*. Karachi: Oxford University Press).
- Cohen, S. P. (2005). *The Idea of Pakistan*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, .
- Committee, I. R. (1950). *Interim Report of the Basic Principles Committee*. Karachi:
- Huntington, S. (1991). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, Oklahoma United States: University of Oklahoma Press,.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). *The Third Wave: Democratization in The Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Islam, F. (2018). *Constitutional Development in Pakistan*. Lahore: Danyal Publishers.
- Kazmi, M. (2009). *A Concise History Of Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Khan, Hamid. (2023). *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford Publishers.
- Lodhi, M. (1994). *akistan: Encounter with Democracy*. Islamabad: Vanguard Books Publishers.

- Lodhi, M. (2024). *Pakistan Search for Stability (edited)*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Lodhi, Maleeha. (2011). *Pakistan Beyond the "Crisis State"*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.
- Lodhi, Maleeha. (2024). *Pakistan Search for Stability*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Mahmood, S. (2002). *Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999*. Karachi: Oxford Paperbacks.
- Mahmood, S. (2002). *Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Mariam Mufti, et al. (2020). *Pakistan's Political Parties Surviving between Dictatorship and Democracy*. Lahore: Folio Books.
- Mariam Mufti, S. S. (2020). *Pakistan Political Parties Surviving between Dictatorship and Democracy*. Lahore: Polio Books.
- Masood, S. (2024). *Fall Out Power, Intrigue and Political Upheaval in Pakistan*. Lahore: Vanguard Books.
- Mehboob, A. B. (2022, March 12). How Expensive is Democracy? *Opinion*. Islamabad, Pakistan, Islamabad: Dawn.
- Mehmood, K. (2022). *Political Economy of Slavery in Pakistan*. Lahore: Fiction House.
- Mia Raza, R. (2016). *Biography of Pakistani Federalism Unity in Diversity*. Islamabad: Leo Books.
- Mir, H. (2023). *Such Bolna Mana HI*. Lahore: Aks Publications.
- Momand, S. (2023, April 12). Elections of Pakistan. (K. Ghani, Interviewer)
- Mufti, M. (2014, August 12). *Herald Exclusive: Divided they rule*. Retrieved from Dawn: <https://www.dawn.com/news/1124682>
- Muhammad Mushtaq, et al. (2011). Examining the Favourable Factors for Consociational Democracy in Pakistan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 275-287.
- Naeem, M. O. (2023). A Step-by-Step Process of Thematic Analysis to Develop a Conceptual Model in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*.
- Nizami, Q. (2022). *Jarnail aur Seyasatdaan Tareekh kee Adalat Mai*. Lahore: Elam O Irfan Publishers.
- Parveen, K. (2013). *The Politics of Pakistan and Role of the opposition Parties(1947-1958)*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Qazi, W. (2013). The State of Democracy in Pakistan. . *International Journal of Education and Research Vol. 1 No. 1 January*.
- Qureshi, P. M. (2000). *Political Culture in Pakistan*. Islamabad: Dost Publications.
- Rabbani, M. R. (2016). *A biography of Pakistani Federalism : Unity in Diversity*. Islamabad: Leo Books.
- Rahim, T. (2023). Political parties and democratic development in Pakistan: Military regimes and democratic Transformative struggle .
- Rizvi, A. (2014). *The Political System of Pakistan: A Constitutional Study* . Karachi,: Paramount Publishing Enterprise.
- Rizvi, H. A. (2003). *Military, state and Society in Pakista*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications.
- Sayeed, K. (2015). *Politics in Pakistan: The Nature and Direction of Change*. Lahore: Peace Publications.
- Sayeed, K. (2017). *The Political System of Pakistan*. Lahore: Peace Publishers.
- Sayeed, K. B. (1967). *The Political System of Pakistan* . Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

- Shah, S. M. (2023, July 13). Establishment and Judiciary. (B. M. Ashfaq, Interviewer)
- Siddiq, A. (2013, April 27). Discovering Democracy: Five Years of Political Rule in Pakistan . *Economic and Political Weekly*.
- Stokes, A. P. (1999). *Democracy, Accountability and Representation*. . Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press.
- Talbot, I. (2012). *Pakistan A New History*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Talbot, Ian. (2015). *Pakistan A New History*. Karaxhi: Oxford Press.
- ULLAH, Y. (2020). THE POLITICS OF SIT-IN'S (DHARNA'S) IN PAKISTAN (2013–2017).
- Waseem, M. (2021). *Political Conflict in Pakistan*. London: C. Hurst and CO.
- Wasim, Amir. (2017, November 14). "CCI breaks deadlock on Delimitation". Retrieved from Dawn: <https://www.dawn.com/news/1370333>
- Younis, S. (1993). *Seyesi Itehad aur Pakistani Seyasat per us kay Asrat* . Lahore: Jang publishers.
- Yousaf, H. (1983). *Pakistan in Search of Democracy*. Lahore: Afroasia Publications.
- Zehra, Ailia. (2023, November). Where Does Pakistan's Democracy Go From Here? *Monthly Current Affairs Digest of Pakistan*.