

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto



Pakistan Under Bhutto's Leadership

Reproduced by
Sani Hussain Panhwar
Member Sindh Council, PPP

**PAKISTAN UNDER
BHUTTO'S
LEADERSHIP**

**By:
SURENDRA NATH KAUSHIK**

Reproduced by:
Sani Hussain Panhwar
Member Sindh Council, PPP

FOREWARD

Pakistan Under Bhutto's Leadership is a meticulous presentation of a theme intrinsically relevant for understanding politics in South Asia. A leader, of rare charisma, soaring ambitions and pronounced aspirations, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto has secured for himself a niche in the history of the sub-continent. Dr. Surendra Nath Kaushik has effectively brought out the ramifications of the conceptual framework of political leadership and extensively identified Bhutto's emergence as a national leader, his achievements, inhibitions and failures, the compromises he had perforce to make and, above all, his quest for the identity for residual Pakistan. The author argues that Bhutto was a political leader with modern perspective for the future and yet he was overtaken by the inherent pressures and forces of reaction and obscurantism. That he was ultimately betrayed by his own trusted military top-brass does not merely reveal structural contradictions, it is also a pointer to the distortions that emasculate democratic aspirations and urge for national self-reliance in Pakistan. Bhutto's execution may or may not be ascribed to his style of functioning, but he has certainly left as a bequest a blueprint for state building (if not nation building) which the rulers in Pakistan may choose to ignore or belittle at their own peril. If the objective of representative and accountable democracy continues to inspire the people of Pakistan, the military dictatorship notwithstanding, the credit goes to Z.A. Bhutto's democratic experiments during 1971-77.

Dr. Kaushik's doctoral dissertation, modified to suit the objective of publication, is a comprehensive study of the theme. The book should be a useful contribution to perspectives on South Asia, in general, and Pakistan in particular with special reference to Bhutto's era in the politics of the country.

Varanasi-221005
March 16, 1985

(IQBAL NARAIN)
Vice-Chancellor

PREFACE

This study of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's political leadership was inspired by my assignment at the South Asia Studies Centre, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur. My interest in Pakistan studies was articulated by continuous and fruitful discussions with the faculty and area-experts during that association. I am grateful to them.

A study of leadership in any political system is academically challenging and provocative. In the context of a developing society, such as Pakistan, it should invite special attention owing to reasons of historico-cultural and geographical affinities with our own country. In order to comprehend the nature, dimensions and prospects of the political process in Pakistan, a study of political leadership is likely to be conducive to a better understanding of the systemic totality.

The aspirations and expectations, which led to the emergence of Pakistan and the subsequent trends of political process manifest during the preceding three decades and more, could be comprehended with greater clarity if the study of political leadership of a statesman, such as Z. A. Bhutto, is attempted. Whereas it is true that Bhutto assumed political leadership only at a later stage, it is assumed that the nature and content of his role performance were, in a substantial manner, different from the trends of political leadership that preceded, and also followed, his emergence. In addition, the political leadership that emerged after Bhutto's rather questionable removal has shown deviance of intent, content and objectives. The political process in Pakistan is a continuum as it is true of any other system, and yet, the phase of Bhutto's leadership (December 20, 1971-July 5, 1977) marks a change, both when he took over leadership role and also when he was forced to quit.

There is little doubt that Bhutto succeeded in creating a charismatic leadership, perhaps next only to Mohammad Ali Jinnah. It is a different matter that in that quest, Bhutto adopted and executed ideas and programmes that were not essentially conducive to his pronouncements concerning general welfare. Bhutto's dilemmas could be seen in his earlier role as a minister during the Ayub regime; as an opposition leader during the Ayub and Yahya regimes; in the formation and organization of the Pakistan People's Party; in his profession of

Islamic Socialism; and his policies when he assumed almost total authority, both in domestic and international affairs. Perhaps, Bhutto's political leadership could not reverse the inevitable impact of Pakistan's political culture. The whole phase of Bhutto as a political leader is full of substantial possibilities of enquiry and investigation. And that also is the rationale of this study.

Bhutto's leadership assumed significance for me, specifically because during the period he was at the helm of affairs in Pakistan, South Asia per se was passing through convulsive experiences. As a national leader, Bhutto initiated a systemic break-through whatever the aftermath of his exercise. The conflict between charisma and democratic commitment, between structural innovations and functional primacies, between precepts and practice, between historico-cultural antecedents and modernistic perspectives, between symbols of change and systemic anachronism, was as apparent in Pakistan as it was in several other South Asian political systems. Bhutto emerged as a savior to many, and his exit was interpreted by several as that of a martyr, the conviction for alleged complicity in murder notwithstanding. What struck me as a student all the more were the several traits of Bhutto as well as his frailties and failings, which indeed affected his style of functioning, perspectives and policy alternatives. It seemed to me that several constraints influenced the course of Bhutto's life as well as that of Pakistan's political evolution. As a volatile and dynamic political leader, to an extent, Bhutto emerged in systemic confusion and flux, began with a flourish, and was forced to conclude his leadership role abruptly. Whatever the ultimate verdict of history, Bhutto would remain relevant subjects of close study, much more when source-material and data become available.

My methodology had to comply with the nature of the source-material available. It is primarily descriptive and analytical. For this study, I tried to analyze the conceptual aspects of political leadership formulated in some noted works. Bhutto's writings and speeches debates of the Pakistan National Assembly, official journals, newspapers and periodicals were consulted to compensate as much as was possible for paucity of source-material. Among secondary sources consulted were relevant published works bearing upon the making and evolution of Pakistan as well as political history during the preceding three decades and more. Also of considerable use were several works on Bhutto's life and political career.

For making this study possible, I owe a deep debt of gratitude to several benefactors.

Dr. Ramakant, Professor and Director, South Asia Studies Centre, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, very kindly agreed to supervise this study. He suggested academically useful changes in my research plan and as I proceeded with the

analysis, his word of inspiration kept me alive to my obligation. It is not possible to express in words my deep sense of gratefulness for his numerous graces.

Dr. Iqbal Narain, formerly Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, and now Vice-Chancellor, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, has always been a source of strength to me. I am sincerely beholden to him.

Dr. D. B. Mathur, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, very kindly agreed to go through the manuscript. He suggested some pertinent issues for analysis. I am grateful for his help and advice.

Dr. Satish Kumar, Associate Professor of Diplomacy at the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, was of immense help to me in various ways. I am thankful to him.

To authorities of the libraries of Indian Council of World Affairs, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, and Jawaharlal Nehru University, the Ratan Tata Library of Delhi School of Economics, and the Central Library, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, I am indebted for permitting me to utilise available source material.

Surendra Nath Kaushik

CONTENTS

Chapters

Foreword	2
Preface	3

PART I THEORETICAL FORMULATION

1. Political Leadership: A Framework for Enquiry	8
--	---

PART II POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IN PAKISTAN

2. Pre-Bhutto Leadership in Pakistan: The Bureaucratic-Military Dominance	30
3. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's Emergence as a Political Leader	51

PART III BHUTTO'S LEADERSHIP IN OPERATION

4. Bhutto's Leadership and the National – Level Politics	75
5. Bhutto's Leadership aid the Regional Level Politics	99
6. Bhutto's Leadership and Pakistan's Foreign Policy	130
7. Bhutto's Leadership: The Socio-Economic Front	160

PART IV LEADERSHIP CRISIS AND DECLINE

8. The General Election, Erosion of Legitimacy and Deposition	182
9. From Trial to Execution	204

PART V THE SUMMING UP

10. In Conclusion	223
---------------------------	-----

PART I

THEORETICAL

FORMULATION

Political Leadership: A Framework for Enquiry

Leadership is vital to all human organizations—social, cultural, economic and political. The history of human civilization decisively depicts leader-led relationship at various levels in a variety of ways. Irrespective of the ideological diversities, all political systems are shaped and affected to a large extent by the nature and role of leadership.

As an analytical frame of enquiry, however, the concept of political leadership is of recent origin, though some of the ramifications of the concept can be traced back even to the classical Greek political thinking. One of the distinct attributes of the concept of political leadership is that it is capable of presenting both micro and macro—level nuances of the political process simultaneously. At the micro level, a study of political leadership explores the comprehensible aspects of the personality of the individual leader in a given political system. At the macro level, it endeavors to investigate into the more complex interactive aspects, institutional and operational, bearing upon the political process. In political analysis, the concept of political leadership serves as a useful dimension of study and research.

II Meaning and Nature

The phenomenon of political leadership is considerably expensive to be capsulated into a unilateral formulation. It is also quite complex to be identified in entirety, marked by precision of a single theoretical enunciation. It is pertinent, therefore, to begin with some major formulations of 'leadership', in general, and of 'political leadership', in particular.

The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences defines leadership as the 'relation between an individual and a group built around some common interest and behaving in a manner directed by him.'¹ In the same vein, Ralph M. Stogdill treats leadership as 'a relation that exists between persons in a social situation, and that

¹ Richard Schmidt, 'Leadership', Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, pp. 258-284. For elaboration, see International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, 'Leadership', pp. 101-105.

persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations. Leadership is entirely incidental, haphazard and unpredictable.'²

Philip Selznick, on the other hand, states that Leadership 'is a kind of work done to meet the needs of a social situation.'³

Herbert G. Hicks and C.R. Gullett identify leadership as the 'ability to influence the behavior of others in a particular direction.'⁴

J. Ronald Pennock equates leadership with the incidence of 'influencing and guiding of the conduct of others where the followers act willingly, not automatically, and with some consciousness that the leader is acting in acting in pursuit of purposes they all hold in common.'⁵

The principal aspects of leadership emergent from the aforesaid formulations could not thus be identified by the primacy accorded to leadership as a social requirement, as a relational imperative in pursuance of the cognition concerning common interest; as capable of influencing behavior patterns; and also, as manifest in the unpredictability of leadership, though the elements of compliance could not be overlooked. Thus, the concept of leadership presupposes the ability or capacity of a person (leader) to influence the behavior of others (followers) in a specific situational context to achieve the commonly desired objectives.

The concept of leadership is not an exclusive phenomenon. It is relevant only in a relational context. Leadership signifies the interactive aspects of relationship between the leader and the led.⁶ The followers follow the lead of a person willingly and with the consciousness that their leader is capable of achieving the desired collective objectives. If the person in a leadership role fails to motivate, guide and influence the behavior of his followers, he is liable to be rejected as a leader.

² Ralph M. Stogdill, Personal Factors Associated with Leadership', Journal of Psychology, Vol. 25, 1948, p. 65.

³ Philip Selznick, Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation, New York, Harper and Row, 1957, p. 22.

⁴ Herbert G. Hicks and C.R. Gullett, The Management of Organizations, Tokyo, Kogakusa, 1972, p. 446.

⁵ J. Roland Pennock, Democratic Political Theory, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1979, pp. 472-473.

⁶ Andrew S. McFarland defines a leader as "one who makes things happen that would not happen otherwise": Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems, Stanford, Stanford university Press, 1969, p. 154.

The meaning and nature of political leadership can not be explained in totality in terms of definitions of leadership per se. The concept of political leadership refers to a specialized role in terms of both aspiration for and exercise of power through either governmental or non-governmental structures. The key variables that emerge in an analysis of political leadership, therefore, are: power, authority, legitimacy and compliance. These variables, however, are not exclusive analytical categories, but most often overlap and interact with each other. Whereas the core ingredients and requirements of political leadership might not substantially vary, the role-performance differentiates political leadership in one political system from the other.

Earlier studies of leadership focused upon the sociocultural background, economic status and personality traits of individual leaders. The prime concern of these studies was the enumeration of various socio-economic, cultural, psychological and political variables, which play a crucial role in the formation of leadership patterns and styles. The analysts, however, concentrated mainly on describing and statistically tabulating personality traits of individual leaders. Consequently, such studies remained basically individual-centred, depicting and analysing the physical and psychological characteristics of the leader in a formal way.⁷

This perspective substantially influenced the earlier perceptions of political leadership. Thomas Carlyle emphasized the 'heroic' aspect of political leadership.⁸ Likewise, Elite theorists, like Pareto and Mosca, propounded the theory of 'ruling class' on the basis of human inequalities.⁹ Later, Max Weber devised the term 'charisma' from the vocabulary of early Christianity to denote types of authority: 'traditional', 'rational-legal' and 'charismatic.'¹⁰ Robert Merton developed a theoretical model of 'Bureaucratic Personality', identifying a person 'whose interpersonal relations have been habitually formalized by the

⁷ The following works elaborate the personality trait theories of leadership : Hall, Calvin S. and Gardner Lindzey, *Theories of Personality*, New York, John Wiley & Sons, INC, 1957 ; Raymond B. Cattell, *The Scientific Analysis of Personality*, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co., 1965, and Walter Mischel; *Introduction to Personality* ; New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

⁸ For elaboration, See Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero worship and the Heroic in History*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1928.

⁹ Elite theorists, like Vilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Mosca, have concluded that every society is marked by the inequality of individual endowments. In their view, the higher stratum of any society exercises leadership both through governmental and non-governmental institutions over the rest of the masses. See Vilfredo Pareto, *The Mind and Society*, Vol. III, London, Jonathan Cape, 1935, pp. 1422-30, and, Gaetano Mosca, *The Ruling Class*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1939, pp. 50-53.

¹⁰ Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, (ed.) by Talcott Parsons, New York, Oxford University Press, 1947, p. 328.

demands of his work-life and whose responses to new situations are governed by over-valuation of rules'.¹¹ Suggesting a relationship between certain demographic situations and social character, David Riesman distinguished five types of political character: indifferent, moralizer, inside-dopester, anomie and autonomous.¹² T.W. Adorno distinguished 'authoritarian personality' from the democratic personality as 'a person who (among other things) perceives the world as made up of a small glorified in-group and despised out-groups, hierarchically arranged by power relationships, peopled by types rather than individuals.'¹³

The concept of political leadership as an analytical framework, however, drew extensive attention during the behavioral movement in political science, when Harold Lasswell applied the concept in terms of 'personality type'. In his *Psychopathology and Politics*, Lasswell employed psychoanalytic insights to state that political motivations had their roots in the sub-conscious sources framed during the early periods of human life.¹⁴ Later, realizing the limits of the 'personality-type' as a category to understand political dynamics, Lasswell advanced the idea of 'character-structures'. He used this concept as the basis for a typology of political-functional types, such as: the political theorist, the political agitator and the political administrator.¹⁵

The concept of 'character structures' is a notable advance over the previous psychological frameworks which were dominantly personality-centred. This is not to say that personality traits are to be ignored or dismissed, but rather, to emphasize the functional interdependence of leadership-traits and situational factors. Lasswell suggests a synthesis of psychological and socio-political factors for assessing political behavior.

In addition, Lasswell defines leadership in clear terms with reference to 'formal and effective power'. He analyses leadership in a relational context. The political leader 'exercises power, and that he does so accords with the identifications,

¹¹ Robert K. Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality", *Social Forces*, Vol. 17, 1940, pp. 560-568.

¹² For details see, David Riesman; *The Lonely Crowd*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1950, pp. 184-299.

¹³ T.W. Adorno et. al., *The Authoritarian Personality*, New York, Harper, 1950, pp. 181-182.

¹⁴ Sigmund Freud's 'Psycho-analytic' theory considerably influenced Lasswell. Also, Charles E. Marriam's theorisation of the characteristics of 'Universal Leadership' motivated Lasswell in developing an analytical framework of political leadership. For details, see, Harold D. Lasswell, *Psychopathology and Politics*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1930.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 53-152.

demands, and expectations of the group'. In explanation, Lasswell says that 'the differentiation between leaders and rank and file depends on personal characteristics as well as on the structure of interpersonal relationships.'¹⁶ For him the leader as personality type is pre-eminently a politician: his conduct is directed by considerations of the acquisition and enjoyment of deference (mainly through power). Within this general type various sub-types may be identified such as, the leader as an agitator or administrator.¹⁷

The phenomenon of political leadership, however, is ultimately a phenomenon of legitimacy. The leader is respected: 'in part because of his personal qualities, in part because of the possession of power itself, he enjoys prestige.'¹⁸

As mentioned earlier, political leadership operates in a world of interactions. The political leader acts as representative of the group to which he belongs. The leader also acts in the name of the group. Symbols of identification make the relationship of the leader and his followers explicit. This identification also implies a certain level of loyalty of the followers to the leader. Thus, according to Lasswell, 'Leadership may be concisely characterized as the exercise of power with respect and loyalty from the domain.'¹⁹

Lasswell's framework does not take leadership to be a closed universe. Circulation of leadership is less than that of the rank and file, it nevertheless takes place. Ultimately, since the political process involves shaping, distribution and exercise of power, it, therefore, becomes the function of political leadership to achieve that objective.

Emphasizing the relational aspect of political leadership, another behaviouralist, Robert Dahl, discusses it in terms of 'political influence and its distribution.'²⁰ Political influence, according to Dahl, is distributed through a mutual interaction among 'leaders', 'sub-leaders' and 'constituents.'²¹ Michels' concept of

¹⁶ Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, *Power and Society*, New Haven, Yale University Press, III ed., 1957, p. 152.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 153,

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

²⁰ Robert A. Dahl states: "influence is a relation among actors in which one actor induces other actors to act in some way they would not otherwise act." *Modern Political Analysis*, New Delhi, Prentice-Hall of India, Ied., 1965, pp. 40-41.

²¹ Robert A. Dahl, *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1961, pp. 95-96.

'replacement' and Lasswell's concept of 'circulation' of leadership are elaborated by Dahl : 'Leaders who in one context are enormously influential and even rather free from demands by their constituents may reveal themselves in another context to be involved in tireless efforts to adapt their policies to what they think their constituents want.'²² For Dahl, the 'sub-leaders' are also an important variable in the political process, because it is they who provide a link between the political leaders and their constituents.²³

In a study of political leadership, in the broader context of democratic political theory, J. Roland Pennock makes an important distinction between 'leadership and authority', and, 'leadership and domination'. This distinction points out the limitations of the hitherto developed major behavioural frameworks. Pennock is conscious of the fact that 'in a continuing relationship of leading and following, the leader is eventually given the benefit of the doubt by his followers and has less need, to exercise the arts of persuasion than he did at the outset.' However, he adds: 'where to draw the line between willing followership and coerced or automatic response to domination or manipulation is never easy to determine.'²⁴

In a recent study, Glenn D. Paige provides both a comprehensive and precise definition of political leadership: 'Political Leadership comprises decisional initiative, pacific and coercive persuasion, the exacerbation or reduction of conflict, follower-need satisfaction as related to task accomplishment, and action within an influencing but influenceable situational context.'²⁵

This definition is a noteworthy advance over previous explanations of political leadership in that it clearly emphasizes the role of political leadership in terms of decisional initiative, to be implemented through both persuasive and coercive methods, depending on requirements of the situation.

The proceeding formulations of political leadership attempt to identify the relational imperatives; the process of power-seeking; the element of compliances; availability of empowering resources; mutuality of linkages between the leader and the follower; and, the capacity of the leader to acquire, retain and consolidate his political influence.

Thus, keeping in view the variety of available perceptions, it is apparent that no single approach can be suggested as the method to study political leadership,

²² Ibid p. 101.

²³ Ibid., pp. 95-96.

²⁴ J. Roland Pennock: Democratic Political Theory, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1979, p. 473.

²⁵ Glenn D. Paige : The Scientific Study of Political Leadership,. New York, Free Press, 1977, pp. 65-66.

without delimiting the subject matter. An exclusive reliance on any one theory would neither explain the complex reality and manifold ramifications of political leadership nor could it be feasibly reliable to explore the core aspect of political leadership such as the subject of this study.

Therefore, in addition to a synthesis of viable indices of 'personality' and 'role' approaches, an operational definition of political leadership is also considered relevant.

The assumption here is that leadership expectations and, therefore, leadership performance, differ from one system to the other. For instance, in liberal-democratic systems, political leadership can be seen as an open interactive process. Formally, leaders seek legitimacy through elections at regular intervals. In communist systems, on the other hand, political leadership is treated as the symbolic apex of a cadre political party which has definitive ideological fixations. In authoritarian and dictatorial regimes, leadership role is assumed by either a single person or shared among the coterie. That leads to virtual monopolistic leadership. In developing societies, facing various challenges of attainment of nation-statehood in more recent times, it is generally seen that it is possible for a political leader to win at the hustings with relative comfort, in a way the popular mandate being granted owing to several complex socio-economic factors. However, in actual conditions of role performance, a political leader comes under continuous impact of the institutional possibilities and the extent to which he succeeds in controlling and fashioning them either adds to his calibre or puts it to test.

In sum, the real task of leadership lies in the capacity of the leader to respond to critical challenges facing the nation. How he moulds his style in terms of new situational requirements, how he shapes policies in keeping with norms and values of the society vis-à-vis developmental inevitabilities and, in what way he successfully gets his decisions implemented, ultimately reflect the content and quality of political leadership. The success of a political leader, as Deutsch observes, is also 'determined in no small measure, by his ability to anticipate and pre-empt how his prospective followers are likely to react to his policies and programme.'²⁶

III Patterns of Political Leadership

Political systems, varieties of their nature notwithstanding, can not subsist without political leadership. It is this differential among political systems which

²⁶ Karl W. Deutsch, *The Nerves of Government*, Glencoe III; Free Press, 1963, p. 157.

is reflected in the variance of political leadership. By way of explanation, it could be added that in each political system, leadership requirements and expectations are interpreted variously in keeping with the indigenous systemic priorities (which could be ideological, constitutional, or, situational). Two major patterns of political leadership, the 'western-liberal-democratic' and the 'communist', are identified, generally speaking.

The Western-Liberal-Democratic Pattern

It is often claimed that, perhaps, in no other form of government, than in democracy, does political leadership reflect the relational viability so associated,²⁷ for the primary reason that it permits and extends 'free formulation of political preferences through the use of basic freedoms of association, information and communication, for the purpose of free competition between leaders to validate at regular intervals by non-violent means their claim to rule.'²⁸

From the ideological viewpoint, leadership in liberal-democratic systems operates through a process of decision-making in which leaders remain receptive to the preferences of those who are led. In other words, democratic leadership seeks to establish a responsible government which ensures freedom and equal opportunities of political participation to every citizen. In the context of goals and objectives, democratic leadership intends to 'stress the role of the whole group to encourage shared decisions, to decentralize responsibility, to take advantage of the ability and talents of all.'²⁹

Thus, ultimate sovereignty lies with the people who control a democratic system by 'determining who shall govern and broadly to what ends.'³⁰ People in democratic systems exercise a relatively high degree of control over their governors or leaders,³¹ through periodical elections and other constitutional measures.

²⁷ James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, New York, MacMillan, 1909, III Ed., p. 337.

²⁸ Juan J. Linz : "Totalitarianism and Authoritarianism" in Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby, *A Hand Book of Political Science* (eds.), Vol. III ; *Marco Political Theory*, California, Addison-Wesley, 1975, p. 183.

²⁹ Giovanni Sartori: *Democratic Theory*, New Delhi, Indian Ed., Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., 1965, pp. 119-120.

³⁰ Robert M. MacIver: *The Web of Government*, New York, MacMillan, 1947, pp. 198-201.

³¹ Reo M. Christenson et. al.: *Ideologies and Modern Politics*, New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., IV Ed., 1973, pp. 198-199. For a comprehensive and critical analysis of democratic theory, see: C.B. Macpherson, *Democratic Theory*, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1973.

The western liberal-democratic framework rests on certain assumptions, such as:

(i) Popular and Responsible:

Constitutionally speaking, the leaders assume power through the people. They continue to be leaders till they remain acceptable to their constituents. Precisely, leadership is legitimized by compliance, consent and popular will. Successful functioning of leadership depends upon a complex amalgam of attitudinal and intellectual conditions including public spirit, willingness to compromise, and commitment to constitutional procedures. Since the leaders are 'elected representatives of the people', they are expected to act in accordance with the 'consent of the governed'. Moreover, democratic leadership is meant to be responsible and accountable leadership which operates through persuasion, suggestion, motivation and coordination and not entirely through coercive and highhanded measures.³²

(ii) Competitive and Replaceable:

Democratic leadership operates in an environment where various groups compete for power. Democratic system is a 'competitive system in which competing leaders and organizations define the alternatives of public policy in such a way that the public can participate in the decision-making process.'³³ Robert A. Dahl identified democratic leadership as 'Polyarchy' wherein conflicts and contradictions are adjusted and resolved through peaceful competition and not through coercion.³⁴ Thus, leadership in liberal-democratic systems presupposes an on going competition between, 'one set of political leader in office; and one or more sets of recognized leaders competing for office.'³⁵ In a democratic system, regular constitutional opportunities are provided for changing the governing officials, together with a social arrangement that permits the largest possible part of the population to have an effect on important decisions by choosing from among rivals, political leaders periodically.³⁶

³² For elaboration of this theme, refer to the following works : J. P. Plamenatz, *Consent, Freedom and Political Obligation*, London, Oxford University Press, 1968; A.H. Birch, *Representation and Responsible Government*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1964 ; P.H. Partridge, *Consent and Consensus*, New York, Praeger, 1971; and, William G. Andrews, *Constitutions and Constitutionalism*, New York, Van Nostrand and Reinhold Co., 1971.

³³ E.E. Schattschneider, *The Sovereign People : A Realist View of Democracy in America*, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960, pp. 140-141.

³⁴ See: Robert A. Dahl, *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1971. Also, Robert A. Dahl, *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1963.

³⁵ S.M. Lipset, *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*, New York, Doubleday & Co., INC, 1960, p. 45.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

(iii) Institutional and Collective:

Democratic leadership is not a centralized and personalized pursuit. The power of a leader is generally identified in the context of political institutions and organizations. Institutions, not personal qualities, determine the legitimacy of leaders. Institutional norms determine the behaviour of the leader which also prevent the monopolization of power. Thus, in western liberal-democratic systems, institutions are regarded as the mainstay of power. Plurality of power centres and openness of the democratic system ensure institutionalization and decentralization of power, which also identify the nature of democratic political leadership.³⁷

In essence, the liberal-democratic postulation presupposes that the system of recruitment of leaders should be open and leaders should be responsible to their constituents who choose them through elections. The most significant aspect is that leaders exercise their power and authority in their institutional capacity rather than on the basis of their individual preferences.

The liberal-democratic framework of political leadership has some identifiable limitations highlighted by critics.

Elite theorists, such as Pareto, Mosca and Michels have outlined the contradictions of democratic leadership on the basis of human inequalities. Pareto countered the so-called popular ideal of democratic leadership by his conviction that every society is ruled by a minority that possessed qualities necessary for assumption of social and political power. Instead of the consent of the governed, the 'governing elite' rule by an amalgam of force and cunning.³⁸ Mosca assailed the democratic postulates of political leadership on the basis of classification of society into two classes: 'a class that rules and a class that is ruled.'³⁹ Roberto Michels forthrightly stated that leadership and democracy are incompatible. Leadership inevitably becomes 'oligarchic', even in political organizations that start democratically and are committed to a democratic ideology.⁴⁰

³⁷ For details see, C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1956, pp. 116-120. Also, Nelson W. Polsby, "How To Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative". *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 22, August, 1960, pp. 474-484.

³⁸ Vilfredo Pareto, *The Mind and Society*, London, Jonathan Cape, 1935, Vol. III, p. 143.

³⁹ Gaetano Mosca, *The Ruling Class*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1939, p. 50.

⁴⁰ For details see, Roberto Michels, *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*, English trans : Glencoe III., The Free Press, 1949.

Mass theorists, such as Kornhauser and Mannheim, hold that 'mass politics' in a democratic system leads to antidemocratic tendencies. Mass politics is more vulnerable to totalitarianism. Mass participation precipitates 'mass alienation' and electoral competition and plurality of political parties become a superfluous exercise.⁴¹ It is alleged that the open character of democratic society is helpless in precluding various competing groups possessing even dictatorial ambitions.⁴²

The alienation theorists ridicule the liberal democratic system and political leadership thereof, in terms of growing alienation, mass apathy and insecurity. In their view, challenge of industrialization has exposed the myth of democracy, which only succeeds in the weakening of the 'self' of the individual who feel powerless and extremely insecure, Citizens, thus, are free only to elect their masters periodically. All established conventions of democratic systems are inherently repressive, for they deny citizens the freedom to experience the whole range of possible human passions. The people are manipulated and indoctrinated by the mass media, advertising and the military-industrial complex.⁴³

Though, the ideal of equality of opportunity is never fully realized, the politically ruling minority is no longer closed and there are several ways in which it can be approached, as Raymond Aron states:

'Constitutional—pluralistic systems are oligarchic as are all political regimes, but they are less so than most.'⁴⁴

The Communist Pattern

The Communist pattern of political leadership can be analyzed in terms of the basic assumptions of Marxist-Leninist ideology. The Marxist-Leninist argument, based as it is on priorities of economic determinism, historical sequence and class antagonism, qualifies liberal-democratic leadership as a value imposition of the capitalist system. In that context provisions of elections, popular sovereignty, separation and decentralization of power and the consent of the governed,

⁴¹ William Kornhauser, *Politics of Mass Society*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960, p. 16.

⁴² Karl Mannheim, *Man and Society in the Age of Reconstruction*, London, Kegan Paul, 1940, pp. 86-87.

⁴³ Refer to Herbert Marcuse ; *One Dimensional Man : Studies In the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Societies*, Boston, Beacon Press, 1966, pp. i-xi.
Robert A. Nisbet, *Quest for Community*, New York: Oxford University Press, paper back ed., 1976, pp. 248-260.

⁴⁴ Raymond Aron, *Democracy and Totalitarianism*, translated by Valence Ionescu, London, The Camelot Press, 1968, p. 95.

though apparently satisfying and alluring, do not change the 'class essence' of the exploitative capitalist system. According to Marx, democracy, in the substantive sense—'true democracy' was neither liberalist nor Jacobian (or populist) democracy, but a society in which the 'free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.'⁴⁵ The communist framework also, like its western liberal-democratic counterpart, rests on certain basic assumptions, which can thus be identified:

(i) Economic basis of Political Leadership:

In his major work, *Das Capital* (The Capital), Karl Marx propounded the thesis that 'economic' or material factors determine the dynamics of socio-political-cultural variables. In specific terms, the Marxist-Leninist approach implies that the class that holds the dominant position in a given economic structure naturally establishes its political domination. Thus, the class which dominates the economy also dominates politics and all social relations are decisively determined by the mechanics of materialistic forces. Politics, therefore, is the concentrated expression and consummation of economic aspirations of the class which controls the state machine and is able to realize its economic interests with its help.⁴⁶ In essence, political leadership is the instrumental value of the dominant class. According to Lenin, the specific feature of interaction between politics and economics is that 'politics is the most concentrated expression of economics' and that 'politics must take precedence over economics.'⁴⁷

In elaboration of the aforesaid, Engels stated that the 'active role of politics in relation to economics may proceed in three basic directions—either political factors operate in the same direction as economic development, in which case they accelerate it; or else, they operate against the laws of economic development and naturally retard it; or finally, they slow-down the development of economic relations in some directions and push it forwards in others.'⁴⁸

(ii) Political Leadership as the outcome of the historico-evolutionary process:

⁴⁵ See; Dante Germino, *Modern Western Political Thought*, Chicago, Rand McNally & Co., 1972, p. 877.

⁴⁶ Marx explained: "One must be destitute of all historical knowledge not to know that it is the sovereigns who in all ages have been subjected to economic conditions, but they have never dictated laws to them. Legislation, whether political or civil, never does more than proclaim, express in words the will of economic relations." Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Moscow, Foreign Language Publishing House, 1957, pp. 92-93

⁴⁷ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, Moscow, Progress Publishers, revised ed., 1971, pp. 32-83.

⁴⁸ Karl Marx and Engels ; *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow; Progress Publishers, revised ed., 1973, pp. 490-491.

Political leadership is regarded as a natural product of historical circumstances. Leaders do not really make history; instead history produces leaders. Since, 'all recorded history hitherto has been a history of class-struggle; of succession of the rule and victory of certain social classes over others'⁴⁹ the phenomenon of leadership gradually evolves through the ongoing struggle between the two antagonistic classes.

Unlike the general laws of development applicable, to all socio-economic formations, it is believed that class struggle, is a law of 'development of social formations'. Also the relations of production in a society based on class divisions, are relations of exploitation, of domination and subordination, owing to the fact that the 'ruling or leading class has a monopoly of the means of production'. Each class acts in accordance with its status within the system of production and the interests emanating therefrom. The oppressed classes and the class of oppressors are inevitably impelled to struggle with each other because their interests are antagonistic. Originating from private property relations, class-struggle is used by the ruling class as an instrument for consolidating its own domination, whereas class struggle is used by the oppressed and exploited class, as the only means of emancipation.⁵⁰

The aforesaid postulation leads to the inference that the source of all development lies in the struggle of opposing forces and the conception of leadership evolves and changes in terms of historical class-struggle.⁵¹

(iii) Proletarian and Revolutionary core of Political Leadership:

Marxist-Leninist ideology emphasizes upon proletarian and revolutionary aspects of political leadership for the realization of communist ideal. Marx and Engels, in the critique of the Gotha Programme, stressed the need of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat:

'Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.'⁵²

⁴⁹ Marx and Engels, Selected Works: In one volume; Moscow, Progress Publishers, 4 ed., 1977, p. 15.

⁵⁰ For details see, V. Kelle and M. Kovalson, Historical Materialism, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1973, pp. 147-171.

⁵¹ Karl Marx, The Capital, Vol. I, Moscow, Progress Publishers, revised ed., 1972, pp. 310-315.

⁵² Lewis S. Feuer (ed.), Marx and Engles: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy, New York, Anchor Books, Double day, 1959, p. 127. Lenin in this context affirmed: "a Marxist is solely some one who extends the recognition of the class-struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat". V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 25, Moscow, Progress Publishers, revised ed., 1971, p. 112.

Lenin explained that the 'Communist Manifesto' gives a general summary of history which identifies the state as the organ of class-rule. The inevitable conclusion is that the proletariat can not overthrow the bourgeoisie without first winning political power. By attaining political supremacy, they would succeed in transforming the state into the 'proletariat organized as the ruling class.'⁵³

The leading and directing role of the proletariat in the class-struggle belongs to the revolutionary party – 'the fighting vanguard of the workers', without which the scientific control of communist development would be unthinkable.

The communist conception of political leadership is not without limitations as pointed out by the various critics.

It is argued that events and issues in the USSR, Peoples'' Republic of China and the East European countries, assumed different projections from what Marx and Lenin had anticipated. Their forecast about the withering away of the state, and emergence of a classless society, has hitherto proved illusory. Like their counterparts in the west, the socialist systems also do not show any prospects of loosening the hold over state mechanism. In fact, there is little variance among variety of political systems so far as the anticipated roles of political leadership are concerned.⁵⁴ It is further argued that distinctions between the western liberal-democratic systems and the Socialist systems are gradually getting reduced to the minimum, and ideological barriers do not necessarily transform the core-of pervasive bureaucratic leadership in either case.⁵⁵ Despite rigid theoretical norms in all Socialist systems, party leadership is alleged to be subordinate to the personality-cult of a super-political leader,⁵⁶ and state-sponsored interest groups operate to integrate various aspects of community life, confirming final loyalty to the omnipotent state.⁵⁷

⁵³ V.I. Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 2, Moscow, Progress. Publishers, revised ed., 1976, p. 257.

⁵⁴ Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel P. Huntington: Political Power: USA/USSR, New York, Viking Press, 1965, p. 170.

⁵⁵ For details see, Daniel Bell: The Coining of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting, Delhi, Arnold—Heinemann, 1974, p. 41.

⁵⁶ Franz Neumann, Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism, 1933-1944, New York, Oxford University Press, 1944, p. 67.

⁵⁷ Lawrence C. Mayer and John H. Burneth: Politics in Industrial Societies: A Comparative Perspective, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1977, p. 115.

In this context, Milovan Djilas opines that in communist systems the capitalist and other classes had, in fact, been destroyed, but a 'new class, previously unknown in history had been formed. This new class, the 'political bureaucracy', has all the characteristics of earlier classes, as well as some new characteristics of its own'. The communist party is the core of this new class.⁵⁸ The so-called socialist ownership is a disguise for the real ownership by the political bureaucracy.⁵⁹

Mao felt the need of reassessing the Marxist-Leninist theory of leadership in terms of indigenous context. He pointed out, in particular, the inconsistency in Marx-Leninist logic, of pretending that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be dispensed with as long as the classes and the inevitable contradictions between them subsist. Maoist orientation was anti-bureaucratic. He identified bureaucracy as the gravedigger of revolution. Similarly, the party was regarded as only the third element in the trinity: party, army and cultural revolution.⁶⁰

Karl Kautsky assailed leadership as the leadership of a formless mass. In his view, 'a class can rule but not govern.' He insisted that even after a successful proletarian revolution the social stratum, which occupies a middle place between the proletariat and the capitalist class is indispensable.⁶¹

The major thrust of the aforesaid is the danger of the emergence of the personality-cult and militant party – bureaucracy in socialist systems.⁶²

IV

EMERGING PATTERNS OF POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

⁵⁸ Milovan Djilas: *The New Class*, London, Thames & Hudson, 1957, pp. 38-40.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁶⁰ Ghita Ionescu: *Comparative Communist Politics*, London, Macmillan, 1972, P 52.

⁶¹ Karl Kautsky: *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, London, National Labour Press, n.d., pp. 31-32.

⁶² For instance, K R. Popper stated: "The fact is that the Marxists taught the theory of class-war to the workers, but the practice of it to the reactionary diehards of the bourgeoisie. Marx talked war. His opponents listened attentively; then they began to talk peace and accuse the workers of belligerency this charge Marxists could not deny, since class war was their slogan. And the Fascists acted". *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 2, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 5th ed., 1966, p. 164.

The aforesaid patterns of political leadership are alternatives available to developing societies to choose from, as well as to make endeavors to provide a viable pattern to conform to their systemic priorities. A majority of these societies have had fairly long contact with the western liberal tradition. However, the patterns emergent from socialist systems were also considered with some discerning scrutiny and several innovative as well as synergetic alternatives were identified by developing systems. That inevitably led to dilemmas which perhaps are inherent in such an attempt to synthesize.

Any comprehensive study of political leadership in these systems, therefore, is a challenging proposition, owing to the unique and diverse situational realities. An important variable, in this regard has been that these systems are faced with the two-fold task of systemic survival and nation-building. If, therefore, developing systems seem to be in a hurry to attain systemic priorities, it is not wholly unexpected. The character of political leadership in developing societies, therefore, acquires significance. One can not ignore the fact that these systems are undergoing transition, and are not immune to the inherent dilemmas thereof. The dilemmas are pervasive at all levels, leading to the situation wherein political institutions conform to imported political values and ideals, whereas social norms tend to show resistance to radical political and social change.⁶³ These, cumulatively speaking, complicate the task of political leadership.

Keeping in view the context of cultural pluralism, and, socio-political diversity and economic discrepancies, it is not possible to formulate identical patterns of political leadership in the developing countries. An attempt, however, is made here to identify some major emerging patterns in this context:

1. Primacy of Ascriptive Variables

In developing systems, political leadership is generally identified in terms of ascriptive factors, such as personality traits and socio-economic background rather than in terms of political capacity, performance and operational output.⁶⁴ The masses provide legitimacy to charismatic personalities. Their exaggerated faith in charismatic leaders often strengthens trends of authoritarianism.⁶⁵ Once

⁶³ George O. Totten has specifically analyzed the problem of internal and external legitimacy of the adopted models in the context of developing systems. See, "Legitimization of Adopted Models", in Willard A. Beling and George O. Totten (eds.). *Developing Nations: Quest For a Model*, New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1970, pp. 207-247.

⁶⁴ For details see, Fred W. Riggs, *Administration In the Developing Countries: A Theory of Prismatic Society*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964.

⁶⁵ For a comprehensive analysis of charismatic leadership see, Ann Ruth Willner, *Charismatic Political Leadership : A Theory*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, Centre of International Studies, 1968.

elevated to authority-status, leaders tend to monopolize power in their hands and also do not hesitate in enhancing personality-cult in the party and outside, creating the imagery of their infallibility and indispensability. The access or failure of political parties substantially depends upon the personal political influence of leaders. Even membership of political parties is appropriated, in a large measure, by persons of upper classes. Thus, identification of political leadership in terms of socio-economic status and personality traits weakens the process of institutionalization and democratization. Personality of the leader becomes the central thrust of national and international affairs. Even the national ideology emanates from the charisma of the leaders. For instance, some of the most illustrious leaders of the developing states, like Nehru, Nasser, Sukarno, Nkrumah, Kemal Pasha, Tito and Bhutto, during the zenith of their power became the rallying point of society, economy and polity of their respective countries.

2. Centralized and Noncompetitive Leadership

The absence of effective and consistent competitive party system and widespread political apathy, centralize power in the hands of the dominant political party. Elections do not offer a meaningful competition, since opposition parties lack ideological congruence, organizational viability and national commitment. The dominant political party, under its unchallenged leadership mobilizes citizens to participate in well-defined, more or less monopolistic channels. In several systems, where the dominant party fails to provide decisive leadership, a coalition of army officers and bureaucrats intervenes in political affairs.⁶⁶ Thus, notwithstanding the parliamentary constitutional apparatus, bureaucracy and army assume political leadership in the absence of a viable and competitive party system. Military-bureaucratic leadership curbs the freedom of existing political parties and assumes predominant political role. Exploiting the weaknesses of political parties, the military and bureaucratic leadership also politicizes itself in due course. On the pretext of national integrity and stability, nonpolitical forces continue to exercise power. Civilian experts and organizations increasingly serve military leadership and thereby bolster the latter's legitimacy.⁶⁷

3. Mixed Ideological Orientation

⁶⁶ Samuel P. Huntington: "Political Development and Political Decay", World Politics, Vol. XVII, No. 3, April, 1965, pp. 386-411.

⁶⁷ For details refer to John H. Badgley, "Two Styles of Military Rule: Thailand and Burma", Government and Opposition, Vol. IV, No. 1, Winter, 1969, pp. 100-113.

Political leadership in developing societies confronts the dilemma of pursuing a viable ideology. Ideological models of the developed world (liberal-democratic and Marxist-Leninist) generally influence the quest for ideological fixations in the developing polities. For instance, in several developing countries national leaders incorporated 'Democratic Socialism' as the basic core of ideology, thereby equating two different postulates of respective systemic models. However, the experience in this context varies from one country to the other. Leaders of Islamic countries preferred to interpret democratic and socialistic ideals in the specific context of their theological and religious imperatives. Hence, one comes across the confusingly hybrid enunciation of 'Islamic Socialism'.

Ideological amalgamations and consequent vagueness notwithstanding, developing societies could not escape challenges of democratization, nation-building, modernization and economic development. It seems political leadership in these systems opted to syncretise some features of both the developed ideological models in order to stabilize their own rule, without showing adequate concern for redefining and reinterpreting the value postulates of the two established ideological systems and incorporating them within their specific situational context. Generally speaking, in the developing systems, political leaders have tended to idealize the western democratic-liberal traditions in the sphere of politics, and socialism in the sphere of economy in an almost prescriptive manner, which at times creates more problems than it solves.

4. Role Variation and Lack of Functional- Specialization

Political leadership in the developing polities lacks role-specialization. Leaders tend to dominate major spheres of society, economy and polity. The powerful and charismatic leaders extend their sphere of influence to administration and socio-cultural affairs also. Social cohesion, unity and cooperation, rather than competition, are stressed upon as imperative needs. Amelioration of social and economic conditions is assigned a more important position than politics.⁶⁸ Exploiting non-political symbols (religious, sectarian, linguistic, etc.), political leaders often try to transform public opinion in conformity with their predilections correspondingly affecting national policies. This commonly prevalent tendency of the leaders frustrates any consistent understanding between the leadership and the masses. Moreover, at times, political leaders also get involved in their inter-national matters to the detriment of the urgency of domestic issues. Thus, adopting a 'supra-national' role,⁶⁹ they tend to postpone

⁶⁸ Marguerite J. Fisher: "New Concepts of Democracy in Southern Asia", *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. XV, No. 4, December, 1962, pp. 626-636,

⁶⁹ Lucian W. Pye: "The Non-Western Political Process", *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. XX, No. 3, August, 1958, pp. 468-486.

resolution of domestic crises, so long as their own sustenance in power is not jeopardized. On the whole, the functional non-specification not only weakens the process of institutionalization but also minimizes the efficacy of political leadership.

5. Crisis of Identity

By and large, in developing nations, the political value structure and belief system are highly fragmented. The national leadership, seemingly motivated by western secular environment, faces a grave identity crisis in its interaction with regional and local leadership, which gives primacy to the traditional and primordial loyalties. This attitudinal gap sharpens the identity crisis of political leadership.⁷⁰ Owing to this perspectival hiatus, policy-making and implementation become ineffective and hazardous. Local and regional leaders exert pressure on national policy-framers to extract maximum advantage for 'sub-systemic' priorities. In order to seek legitimacy and to win popular mandate, national leaders tend to adopt a soft attitude towards local aspirations, especially during election campaign, assurances are given with little consideration to possibility of their fulfillment in keeping with the overall developmental priorities.⁷¹ Hence, the crisis of identity is sharpened and ideals projected by national leaders lose credibility.

The preceding analysis seeks to identify some major emerging patterns of political leadership in the developing societies in terms of the manifold problems and dilemmas facing these systems. Political leadership in these nations needs a strong national base and effective integrated policy perspective, to remove hiatus between national priorities and entrenched primordial loyalties. A balanced approach by political leaders on different socio-economic and political issues can help resolve the dichotomy of tradition and modernity. Imported political frameworks from various systems need constant care in adaptation in accord with contextual indigenous requirements of the system concerned. Organized and competitive party system can ensure institutionalization, minimizing trends authoritarianism and personality--cult, and in the process, eradicating the baneful interference of non-political institutions and influences, such as those of army and bureaucracy.

V

⁷⁰ For a comprehensive analysis of this aspect, See Edward A. Shils: "The Intellectuals in The Political Development of the New States, World Politics, Vol. XIII, No. 3, April, 1960, PP. 329-354, and Norman N. Miller; "The Political Survival of Traditional Leadership". The Journal of Modern African Studies, August, 1968, pp. 183-198.

⁷¹ See, A.R. Davis and Robertson (eds.); Traditional Attitudes and Modern Steles in Political Leadership, Proceedings of the 28th International Congress of Orientalists, Canberra, Jan. 1971, pp. 1-10.

In Conclusion

Political leadership is not only a key concept of political analysis but also a consolidated index of the totality of a social system. Dynamic and effective political leadership ensures corresponding vitality of the social system. It performs vital role in nation-building, socio-cultural mobilization and economic development, the catalysts of comprehensive change, specifically, in the context of developing societies. It is true that there are manifold problems, beginning with the colonial legacy (in several systems) to threats of bureaucratic and military authoritarianism, or societal obscurantism and orthodoxy. It is assumed that stable and democratic political leadership should, with effectiveness, remove such obstacles. As such, among other factors, strong and committed leadership in respective systems, was instrumental in achieving the objective of national independence, imperialistic and colonial obduracy notwithstanding. There is no reason why that legacy should not be consciously revived and sustained. Whatever be the nature and ideology of a political system, it is ultimately the political leadership that paves the way for achievement of qualitative objectives aspired for.

There are various perspectives of political leadership which identify dimensions for analysis. Useful as they are, they are inadequate in the context of developing societies wherein any imposition of tradition modern dichotomy, without discernment of historical legacies, is likely to mislead the analyst.

One could also indicate to major models of political leadership in keeping with systemic requirements, expectations, emphases and objectives. There are indeed several improvisations and variations of these two models – the western liberal-democratic, and, the Marxist-Leninist Socialist. The ideological care in either model is a decisive aspect and one could, in that light, recognize the fundamental differences as such.

Of considerable contextual relevance, however, are the emerging patterns of political leadership in developing societies. One could discern the multifarious problems and challenges, dilemmas and expectations that go necessarily with systemic evolution and determinants of legacies. Since political systems in developing countries are, in a way, inspired by and modeled after political structures and processes not necessarily indigenous even in conception, one finds improvisations thereof bordering on distortions when it comes to the operational dimension. Therefore, political leadership has to face issues and deviations, which not only account for several of the trends that are as unexpected as they are unpredictable. That is precisely the context of political leadership in developing countries which are at once struggling to rid

themselves of the shackles of the past and also to reach out to heightened expectations of systemic identity. On the whole, the role of political leadership can not be undermined in any political system, since; it affects the entire dynamics of a social system. If a social system influences the political leadership, it is also influenced by the nature and role of political leadership to a considerable extent.

PART II

POLITICAL

LEADERSHIP IN

PAKISTAN

**Pre-Bhutto
Leadership in Pakistan:
The Bureaucratic
Military Dominance**

The nature of leadership in Pakistan before the advent of Z.A. Bhutto was a continuum of the strands of leadership usually identified with the movement in undivided India for a separate Muslim home and.

If one were to take the aftermath of the revolution of 1857 as a convenient historical landmark, perceptible disenchantment with the British rulers grew among Muslims who were apparently nostalgic about their lost imperial splendour. The first decade of the present century, however, saw a transformation in British perceptions of the Muslim factor in India. The partition of Bengal (1905) ; the founding of the Muslim League (1906); the institutionalization of separate electorates for Muslims (Act of 1910) ; the events preceding, and following, passage of the statutes of 1919 and 1935 ; the Lahore Resolution (1940) ; the declaration of Direct Action Day (August 16, 1946) ; and the partition of India (1947), necessitated leadership qualities that could sustain tactical alternatives to conform to the immediate and the instant, as well as the ultimate objectives. The leadership of the movement for a separate Muslim homeland had, therefore, to improvise policies and pronouncements in keeping with corresponding enunciations by the British rulers and the Congress leadership, within the constraints of unpredictability inevitable in a movement, which saw fundamental differentials of political objectives so far as the Congress and the Muslim League were concerned.

The aforesaid could also be taken as some sort of an explanation why and how Syed Ahmad Khan was transformed from an advocate of Hindu-Muslim unity to a protagonist of the inherent plurality of India's society, and, ultimately, to propagation of Muslim separatism based on the two-nation theory. Making minor adjustments to that primary objective and corresponding policy postulates, Muslim leadership evolved through the trying decades prior to the partition, contriving a balancing act to ensure counterpoise against Congress proposals and British alternatives. The apparent compromises identified, for instance, in the Lucknow Pact (1916), the *Khilafat* Movement (1919-1924), and the 'All Parties' Conference (1928), proved to be no more than tactical deviations, not meant to jeopardize or dilute the basic commitment to the two-nation theory.

The nature of Muslim leadership of the movement for separate Muslim state could therefore be generally identified with the unflinching and uncompromising postures of M.A. Jinnah who emerged as the authoritative spokesman of the Muslim separatist cause. One would also not ignore the ramifications of the call for celebration of Congress decision to resign from ministries on December 22, 1939, as the 'Deliverance Day'; or the passage of the Lahore Resolution (March 24, 1940) giving an ultimatum both to the British rulers and the Congress leadership; or, finally, the Direct Action Day (August 16, 1946) which led to avoidable communal violence and carnage.

However, this is not to say that the leadership of Pakistan, after the state was founded, had necessarily to be a replica of that prior to the partition.

Though, the Muslim League succeeded in carving out a separate state on the basis of the two-nation theory, it could not provide stability and dynamism to Pakistan. Owing to its organizational and ideological weaknesses, the Muslim League leadership did not succeed in cementing divisive tendencies in the constituent regions of Pakistan. Soon after the founding of Pakistan, fissures in the Muslim League surfaced. The people, having undergone the harrowing experience of the partition and having gained a homeland, expected freedom to bring about immediate transformation in their lives. However, influential elements of landed aristocracy, civil servants and the entrepreneurs, who virtually controlled the leadership of the party, were not expected to take radical steps for consolidation of democratic frame-work and socio-economic development. The hiatus between the Muslim League and the regional leadership became more acute. The local leaders of the constituent region of Pakistan became apprehensive about the leadership of the Muslim League, since a considerable segment of the Muslim League and its followers were 'outsiders', who had migrated to Pakistan from the Muslim minority regions of undivided India, namely Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Delhi and Bombay. M.A. Jinnah, himself a commercial Khoja Muslim of Bombay faced difficulties in providing a mass base for the Muslim League in Pakistan. The Muslim League could win a case for a separate homeland but it had to exert the initial years after 1947 to be accepted as a popular political party in a free country. In fact, serious differences of opinion were seen in Jinnah's life time when some prominent party members chose to quit over policy issues.¹

¹ M.A. Jinnah, during 1940's, personalized the affairs of the Muslim League under singular leadership. He was not habitual of tolerating any criticism from the other influential members of the party. Consequently, even before the establishment of Pakistan, the Muslim League started disintegrating. G.M. Sayed, then president of the Sindh provincial Muslim League had been expelled (1946) from the party because of his out spoken criticism of the central High Command and the land-owning politicians of Sindh. He allegedly argued that Islam was being used by Muslim League to maintain a reactionary and corrupt social and political system in Sindh. For details see: G.M. Sayed, Struggle for New Sindh, Karachi, Sindh Observer

It is true that Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah gave evidence of giving to Pakistan a secular base, but it is doubtful if he was equally serious about introducing democratic political process in the country. He was aware of the logical outcome of such an experiment which would have meant inevitable assumption of national leadership by representatives of the Eastern-wing, who would have commanded a clear majority. Throughout his thirteen-month tenure as Governor General (August 1947 - September 1948), Jinnah suppressed the demands of regional autonomy and democratic politics based on open competition among different groups and political parties. Highlighting the necessity of ensuring a secular Pakistan, Jinnah took recourse to appeals in the name of Islam.² He virulently condemned the aspirations of regional political parties and expressed the view that parties other than the Muslim League were redundant because only the League was capable of providing effective leadership to Pakistan.³ He also suggested that the future constitution of the country should be democratic in spirit embodying essential principles of Islam.⁴ On the pretext of problems of internal law and order, Jinnah preferred to continue with the former 'viceregal' system based on the Government of India Act of 1935. Consequently, civilian bureaucracy became more powerful in the process diluting the effectiveness of political leadership.

Press, 1949, p. 216. Similarly after Pakistan's establishment, the Muslim League faced unprecedented challenges in East Bengal. In 1949, the Fazlul Huq and Suhrawardy factions of the Muslim League fell out with the Muslim League leadership primarily over the issue of autonomy of East Bengal.

² At various religious congregations, Jinnah referred to the Grace of 'Almighty' God for the creation of Pakistan, eulogizing the great traditions of Islam. See, Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah: Speeches (Karachi, Feroz-sons, 1962) pp. 16-17 and 27-28. Further, in his speech at the University stadium, Lahore on 30th October, 1947, Jinnah said, "...we thank providence for giving us courage and faith to fight these forces of evil. If we take our inspiration from the Holy Qur'an, the final victory will be ours... You have only to develop the spirit of t1-1,. 'Mujahids'. You are a nation, whose history is replete with people of wonderful grit, character and heroism". Ibid., 29-31.

³ For instance, in his public speech at Dacca on March 21, 1948, Jinnah said; "...As long as you do not throw off the poison (of provincialism) in our body-politic you will never be able to weld yourself, galvanize yourself into a real nation. What we want is not to talk about Bengali, Punjabi, Sindhi, Baluchi, Pathan and so on. They are of course, units. Islam has taught us that whatever else you may be and whatever you are, you are a Muslim. Ibid., p. 84.

Concerning the Muslim League, Jinnah said: "Now this is a sacred trust in your hands, i.e., the Muslim League...Any other mushroom parties, that are started at present will be looked upon with suspicion because of their past. The present emergency requires that every Muslim should come under the banner of the Muslim League, which is the true custodian of Pakistan..." Ibid., p. 87.

⁴ Jinnah, on the issue of the constitution of Pakistan, observed that "the constitution of Pakistan has yet to be framed by the Pakistan Constituent Assembly, I do not know what the ultimate shape of this constitution is going to be but I am sure, it will be a democratic type embodying the essential principles of Islam." Ibid., p. 65.

II THE PHASE OF CIVILIAN BUREAUCRATIC DOMINANCE (1947-1958)

Muhammad Ali Jinnah's personality-cult and his enforcement of the viceregal system (in accordance with the Government of India Act of 1935) facilitated dominance of the bureaucracy. Under the viceregal system, the office of the Governor-General became more powerful than that of the Prime Minister. As Governor-General of Pakistan, Jinnah did not follow the accepted parliamentary norms in appointing the Prime Minister. Without taking into consideration the consent of the legislature, he chose Liaquat Ali Khan as the Prime Minister. Similarly, Jinnah exercised his discretion in making and unmaking the provincial governments.⁵ Thus, Jinnah's personalization of power not only weakened the political leadership of the Muslim League but also adversely affected the influence of political leadership in general. The nature of his appointment as the Prime Minister prevented Liaquat Ali Khan from containing growing differences within the Muslim League. After Jinnah's demise, there was no influential leader in the Muslim League who could have integrated the party on sound ideological and organizational lines. Liaquat Ali Khan could not attain the national stature and support which were naturally given to Quaid-i-Azam.⁶ It is surprising that Liaquat Ali showed little concern for the task of constitution-making during 1949-50 when the nation seemed relatively more united and the Muslim League had an overwhelming majority in the Constituent Assembly.⁷

Khwaja Nazimuddin who became Governor-General after Jinnah, also exercised his discretion in the making and unmaking of provincial governments. The Act of 1935 and a special Act, 'PRODA' (Public and Representative Officers Disqualification Act, 1949), enhanced the scope of the discretionary powers of the Governor-General to a substantial extent.⁸

⁵ In April 1948, ministries in the Punjab and Sindh were dismissed by the Governors under the directives of the Quaid-i-Azam, Jinnah. He was not happy with the then Chief Ministers of Punjab (Khan of Mamdot) and Sindh (Muhammad Ayub-Khuhru). Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, *The Emergence of Pakistan*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1967, p. 367.

⁶ It was reported recently that a senior leader of the Muslim League in United India, Sardar Shaukat Hayat Khan, now a veteran political leader of Pakistan, assailed Liaquat Ali Khan for being undemocratic because he refused to hold elections as he did not have an electoral constituency of his own. Also, by facilitating the entry of refugees from India, he wanted to create a political base for himself. *The Times of India* (UNI report), Feb. 7, 1982.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 384-385.

⁸ In October 1948, Pir Ilahi Baksh's ministry in Sindh was dismissed. Similarly, Mumtaz Daulatana's ministry in Punjab was dismissed in 1949 under section 92-A of the 1935 Act. *Ibid.*, pp. 367-370.

Premier Liaquat Ali Khan's assassination in October 1951, further sharpened the leadership crisis within the Muslim League. There was no influential political leader to lead the nation. The then Governor-General, Khwaja Nazimuddin, assumed the office of Prime Minister and Punjabi bureaucrat, Ghulam Mohammad, became the (third) Governor-General of Pakistan. During his tenure (October 1951-August 1955), Ghulam Mohammad exercised his powers rather ruthlessly. That enabled the civilian and military bureaucracy to play a pivotal role in the decision-making of Pakistan. It was only a continuation of the trend that had begun with M.A. Jinnah, and which resulted in consolidation of powers in the hands of the bureaucrats and the military elite.⁹

As against his political associates, Jinnah trusted the civilian bureaucracy to a considerable extent.¹⁰ He did not make substantial efforts to strengthen the Muslim League and very little was in evidence concerning sustained evolution of the party system).¹¹ Jinnah seemed to have been more inclined to perpetuate the administrative structure of the fallen Raj. It would be recalled that the Muslim bureaucrats and military personnel and officers of the undivided India had opted for Pakistan owing more to euphoria of migration to a Muslim state than for any reasons of professional commitments.¹² The political process of Pakistan had, therefore, to bear the consequences of such antecedents.

Governor-General Ghulam Mohammad served the interests of the land-lords, cavil servants, military elite and the entrepreneurs of West Pakistan. Basically, he wanted to perpetrate Punjabi vested interests in national politics, himself being a Punjabi. In April 1953, he dismissed the Bengali Prime Minister Khwaja Najimuddin in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister enjoyed the confidence of

⁹ In 1951, General Ayub Khan took over as Commander-in-Chief of the Army. Major General Iskandar Mirza, then Defence Secretary, was a key figure in the Defence establishment and was instrumental in elevating Ayub to the highest post in the Army. Thus, links between the civilian bureaucracy and the army were consolidated after Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan.

¹⁰ For details see, Khalid Bin Sayeed. "The Political Role of Pakistan's Civil Service", *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. XXXI. No. 2, June, 1958, pp. 131-146.

¹¹ Keith Callard aptly remarked on the limitations of party system in Pakistan: "The system of political parties in Pakistan bears little resemblance to that of most other democratic countries. Politics has begun at the top. Pakistan has neither a two-party system, in which struggle is waged between fairly stable groups, one of which is in office and the other in opposition; nor a multi-party system, in which clear differences of programme or ideology separate a variety of opponents. In Pakistan politics is made up of a large number of leading persons, who with their political dependents form loose agreements to achieve power and to maintain it." Keith Canard; *Pakistan A Political Study*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1957, p. 67.

¹² Kalim Siddiqui, *Conflict Crisis and War in Pakistan*, London, Macmillan Press, 1972, pp. 73-80.

the legislature.¹³ However, the legislature (Constituent Assembly of Pakistan) was incapable of providing alternative leadership. Interested more in prolonging its own tenure, by delaying the framing of the constitution, the legislature had resigned itself to the role of passive acceptance of government policies which were basically fashioned by the bureaucrats.¹⁴ After the dismissal of Nazimuddin from the office of the Prime Minister, the Governor-General invoked Section 10 of the Act of 1935, which stated that 'ministers held office during the pleasure of the Governor-General'. Khwaja Nazimuddin's successor, Muhammad Ali Bogra (the third Prime Minister), followed the dictate of the Governor-General. Following the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in October 1954, the office of the Governor-General became more powerful.

Though premier Muhammad Ali Bogra continued to head the new ministry, known as the ministry of 'all talents', he found himself further divested of powers. During the period when the Constituent Assembly stood dissolved (October 1954 - July 1955), the Governor-General had decided to extend the hegemony of West Pakistan over East Pakistan. On March 27, 1955, the Governor-General issued an ordinance to amend the Government of India Act, 1935, and invested himself with the power to designate West Pakistan as a province under 'one-Unit' scheme.¹⁵

The New Constituent Assembly came into being in July, 1955, with a composition substantially different from that of the preceding one, owing to the overwhelming defeat of the Muslim League in East Pakistan in 1954 provincial elections. The representation of the Muslim League was reduced to two members. All the other Muslim Leaguers in the Constituent Assembly were from West Pakistan. Consequently, the East Bengali Muhammad Ali Bogra, was replaced by a west Pakistani Chaudhri Muhammad Ali as Prime Minister in August, 1955.¹⁶ Governor-General Ghulam Muhammad owing to ill health, gave way to another military-cum-bureaucratic elite, General Iskandar Mirza.

During Governor-General Iskandar Mirza's tenure, one of the important enactments of the Second Constituent Assembly was legitimization of the 'One-

¹³ Khalid Bin Sayeed, *The Political System of Pakistan*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967, p. 71.

¹⁴ Mustaq Ahmad, *Politics Without Social Change*, Karachi, Space Publishers, 1971, pp. 8-9.

¹⁵ Governor-General Ghulam Mohammad and leading Punjabi Members of the former Constituent Assembly desired the integration of West Pakistan as one unit. It is reported that General Ayub Khan had prepared a full-fledged plan for the amalgamation of West Pakistan into one-unit from the strategic and economic view-point. Mumtaz Daulatana, the former Chief Minister of Punjab, drafted the documents pertaining to the integration of West Pakistan into a single Province. For further details, refer to Khalid Bin Sayeed, *Op.cit.*, pp.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 80-81.

unit' scheme. On September 30, 1955, the Constituent Assembly passed the 'Establishment of the Province of West Pakistan Bill'.¹⁷ Amalgamation of West Pakistan into one provincial unit facilitated the task of the Governor-General Iskandar Mirza to curb the regional challenge of East Pakistan.

During the constitution-making period, Governor-General Iskandar Mirza and Prime Minister Chaudhri Muhammad Ali continued to run the administration on bureaucratic lines. On March 2, 1956, the first constitution of Pakistan came into being. It established parliamentary system of government based on the federal principle.

Under the new constitution, Iskandar Mirza assumed the office of the President (September, 1956) and remained in office till the October 1958 military 'coup'. From September 1956 to October 1958, three coalition governments at the centre were formed. Since no party commanded a majority in the Assembly, President Mirza exercised effective powers. In order to counter the leadership of the Muslim League in West Pakistan and of the Awami League in East Pakistan, President Mirza pressurized big land-lords, within the Muslim League to form the 'Republican Party'.¹⁸ Thus with sheer political maneuvering, Iskandar Mirza maintained a facade of parliamentary democracy in Pakistan. He was never a figure-head. According to Article 37(3) of the 1956 constitution, the President was free to exercise his discretion in the appointment of the Prime Minister.¹⁹

The Muslim League leadership was a house divided against itself. Owing to weak party system and personal rivalry of politicians, the parliamentary system soon collapsed. The period between 1947 to 1958 was one of utter political confusion and governmental instability which manifested inherent contradictions of political leadership. The bureaucrats made and unmade governments in a scramble for power. During a decade or more (August 1947-October 1958), there were seven governments at the centre.²⁰ Political leaders did

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 81.

¹⁸ Tariq Ali, *Pakistan: Military Rule or People's Power*, Vikas, Delhi, 1970, p. 70.

¹⁹ Khalid Bin Sayeed, *Op cit.*, p. 81.

²⁰ The Central Government of Pakistan (August 1947-Oct. 1958)

Governor-General/President

1. M.A. Jinnah (Aug. 1947-Sept. 1948)
2. Khwaja Nazimuddin (Sept. 1948-Oct. 1951)
3. Ghulam Mohammad (Oct. 1951-Aug. 1955)
4. Iskandar Mirza as Governor Gen. (August 1955-Sept. 1956)
5. Iskandar Mirza as President (Sept. 1956-Oct. 1958)

Prime Minister

1. Liaquat Ali Khan (Aug. 1947-Oct.1951)
2. Khwaja Nazimuddin (Oct. 1951-April 1953)
3. Muhammad All Bogra (Aug. 1953-Aug. 1955)
4. Chaudhri Muhammad Ali (Aug. 1955-Sept. 1956)
5. H.S. Suhrawardy (Sept. 1956-Oct. 1957)
6. I.I. Chundrigar (Oct. 1957-Dec. 1957)
7. Feroz Khan Noon (Dec. 1957-Oct. 1958).

not hesitate to flout constitutional norms for narrow ends in connivance with the bureaucracy. The trinity of landlords, civil servants and entrepreneurs, ultimately collapsed under the overwhelming lust for power by military adventures.

It might be recalled that the leadership of Pakistan provided opportunity to ambitious and unscrupulous elements among the bureaucracy and the army to aim high and ensure fruits of their choice. The politicians were pre-occupied with their own objectives leaving the field clear for bureaucratic interference and manipulations. In fact, the bureaucracy was, for all purposes, 'the party' permanently in power. The abrupt succession of governments both at the central and the state levels typified erosion of democratic and constitutional norms. The polity became an arena of conflict between politicians, bureaucrats, landed-aristocracy and commercial elite. The two wings of Pakistan were not only geographically apart, they manifested sectarian, linguistic, regional discord as well as socio-economic disparity. In such circumstances, parliamentary norms could not survive for long, and effective power came to be exercised by the bureaucracy-military combine.

III THE PHASE OF MILITARY LEADERSHIP (October 1958-December 1971)

The *Coup d'etat* of October 1958 came as a challenge to political leadership in Pakistan. For almost thirteen years, the military directly assumed political power. The bureaucracy provided full-fledged backing to military dictatorship. Though, Ayub initially suppressed political leadership and curtailed powers of more prominent politicians, he could not succeed in isolating them entirely from the masses. Within four years of proclamation of martial law, Ayub realized the necessity of support consequent from political institutions. For the sake of acquiring legitimacy, he adopted radical measures with regard to socio-economic and political issues, though he did not renounce his basic conservative and dictatorial postures which only exposed the distance separating the pronouncement of radical policies and the actuality of their implementation.

The military leadership that took over reins of power could be divided into two broad phases: The Ayub Phase (1958-1969) and The Yahya Phase (1969-1971).

1. The Ayub Phase (1958-1969)

The Ayub phase can be sub-divided into two distinct periods:

- (i) The Martial Law Period (1958-1962)
- (ii) The Presidential Phase (1962-1969)

(i) The Martial Law Period (1958-1962)

Martial law in Pakistan was imposed by the then President Iskandar Mirza on October 7, 1958, on the plea that the 1956 constitution failed to establish political stability in the country. It was alleged to have brought out political differences among politicians. Iskandar Mirza was never happy with the influence of politicians. A former army top-brass himself, he was not in favour of open and competitive politics. Justifying the imposition of martial law, President Mirza stated so in so many words in the proclamation on 7th October, 1958: 'For the last two years I have been watching, with the deepest anxiety, the ruthless struggle for power, corruption, the shameful exploitation of our simple, honest, patriotic and industrious masses...The mentality of the political parties has sunk so low that I am unable any longer to believe that elections will improve the present chaotic internal situation...To the valiant Armed Forces of Pakistan I have to say that having been closely associated with them since the very inception of Pakistan, I have learned to admire their patriotism and loyalty. I am putting a great strain on them... Present action has been taken with the utmost regret but I have to do it in the interests of the country and the masses.'²¹

The martial law was imposed almost four months before the first ever general elections promised to the people of Pakistan, scheduled for February 1959. The bureaucracy never made secret of its apprehensions about change in regime, consequent upon the intended elections. In order to maintain status quo, the bureaucracy transferred power to only too willing military leaders.²² The then chief of the army General Ayub Khan, assumed office of the Chief Martial Law Administrator (CMLA) subsequently. Within twenty days, General Ayub staged a 'coup' and forced President Iskandar Mirza to resign and himself took over the office of the President on October 27, 1958. General Ayub gave assurances for eradicating the 'mess created by politicians' under the 1956 constitution. He formulated the rationale for military rule to return the country to 'sanity'.²³ Interestingly, the Supreme Court of Pakistan concurred with General Ayub and declared the validity of seizure of power by the military. In a Supreme Court

²¹ Quoted in Herbert Feldman, *Revolution in Pakistan: A Study of the Martial Law Administration*, Lahore, Oxford University Press, 1967, pp. 212-215.

²² The 1956 constitution, under Chaudhri Muhammad Ali's guidance—and presumably with Ghulam Mohammad's conduct in mind—had demarcated the limits of the presidential powers. But, President Iskandar Mirza soon side-stepped these by direct personal support for individual leaders or groups, deftly playing one off against the other to his own position's benefit. He had virtually fathered the Republican party which, so far as most people could see, had no intelligible programme beyond capture or retention of office. Ian Stephens, *Pakistan*, London, Ernest Berm, 1963, p. 247.

²³ Wayne A. Wilcox, "The Pakistan *Coup d'état* of 1958", *Pacific Affairs*, Vol 38, 1965, p. 142.

judgment (delivered by the Chief Justice of Pakistan, Mohammad Munir,²⁴ on October 27, 1958), it was observed that a 'victorious revolution' or successful *coup d'état* was an internationally recognized method of changing a constitution.²⁵ After such legal validation, General Ayub justified the imposition of martial law for safeguarding the broader interests of the common man and the integrity of Pakistan.²⁶ He maintained the myth of socio-economic advancement and evolution of indigenous system of democracy. He strongly condemned the preceding experiment of Westminster democracy in Pakistan. Ayub's qualified notion of democracy was evident in his own interpretation thereof: 'There are two reasons why we in Pakistan can not adhere to a democratic pattern of life and government. In the first place, as Muslims we are brought up on two basic ingredients of democracy, namely, equality and fraternity. Anything to the contrary would be the negation of our spiritual faith and practice. And secondly, we have to fight a long and arduous battle for progress and development in which every man woman and child of Pakistan must participate to the fullest possible extent. Democracy provides the only healthy and dignified way of arousing the willing cooperation of people and harnessing it to a sustained national endeavor, we must, therefore, have democracy... But the question is what type of democracy? It must be formed front within the books of Pakistan.'²⁷

During the martial-law phase, Ayub concentrated on two basic objectives: socio-economic reforms, and, evolution of democracy at the grass-roots level.

On the socio-economic front, General Ayub introduced several martial law measures, proclaimed as radical. For eradication of socio-cultural anomalies, a 'Board of National Reconstruction', under the leadership of the President, was established. Its aims were: the inculcation of ethical and civic values; the development of a character pattern; rising of the cultural and intellectual level; assisting women to overcome social handicaps that confronted them; encouragement of a healthy national spirit; the elimination of sectarianism, regionalism and provincialism; and, teaching of simplicity, frugality, and good

²⁴ Former Chief Justice of Pakistan, who expired in June 1981. In his last days he wrote a book *From Jinnah to Zia*. Because of some controversial aspects, the book has been banned by the military government of General Zia-ul-Haq.

²⁵ Herbert Feldman, *Op.cit.*, p. 11.

²⁶ In his autobiography, *Friends Not Masters*, General Ayub refers to the constant pressure put on him to intervene in politics by his civilian and military friends. For details see, Mohammad Ayub Khan, *Friends Not Masters: A Political Autobiography*, London, Oxford University Press, 1967, pp. 58-68.

²⁷ Field Marshal Ayub Khan, *Pakistan Perspectives: An Analysis of Pakistan's Ideology, Problems and Their Solutions*; Karachi, Department of Films and Publications, (n.d.), pp. 6-7.

taste in living standards.²⁸ Thus, Ayub initially prescribed a new process of political socialization for preparing the ground-work for mature political leadership and a successful democratic polity. However; this also marked his zeal for strengthening the roots of military leadership.

The military regime imposed martial law regulations for eradication of corruption, such as smuggling, black-marketing and hoarding of consumer goods. A Land Reforms Commission (LRC) was constituted for introduction of radical land reforms. For the first time, the LRC recommended land ceilings: 500 acres for irrigated land and 1,000 acres for unirrigated land.²⁹

However, Ayub's socio-economic reforms were not realistic. The military regime, instead of facilitating socio-cultural integration and regional economic cooperation, multiplied inter and intra-regional disparities.³⁰ Landed aristocracy was the main support-base of the military regime. Despite his apparently radical land-reform scheme, General Ayub retained the privileged position of land-lords. The total area of land appropriated by the state from big land-owners was 2.2 million acres and this was distributed among 150,000 tenants. The land-lords (of West Pakistan) were allowed to retain about 6.5 million acres. Thus, the land retained by about 6,000 landlords came to about three times the area given to 150,000 tenants.³¹

On the political front, Ayub introduced 'Basic Democracies Order' (1959) for establishment of democratic system at the grass-roots level. General Ayub's chief objective was to strengthen rural political leadership at the local level for seeking substantial legitimacy for his rule.³² Ayub provided an explanation for the adoption of the terminology 'Basic Democracies': 'We have given (the scheme)

²⁸ For details refer to Herbert Feldman, *Op.cit.*, pp. 84- 102.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 56-67.

³⁰ Rounaq Johan, *Pakistan: Failure in National Integration*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1972, pp. 67-89.

³¹ Mushiaq Ahmed, *Government and Politics in Pakistan*, Karachi, Pakistan Publishing House, (2nd Ed.), 1963, p. 199.

³² General Ayub was a virulent critic of the preceding national political leadership. In his first broadcast to the nation as the Chief Martial Law Administrator (On October 8, 1958), he observed: "Ever since the death of Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan, politicians started a free for all type of fighting in which no holds were barred. They waged a ceaseless and bitter war against each other regardless of the ill effects on the country, just to whet their appetites and satisfy their base motives. There has been no limit to the depth of their baseness, chicanery, deceit and degradation. Having nothing constructive to offer, they used provincial feelings, sectarian, religious and racial differences to set a Pakistani against a Pakistani. Mohammad Ayub Khan, *Speeches and Statements, 1958-1964* (1, 2, n.d.) cited in Rounaq Jahan, *Op.cit.*, p. 55.

the name of 'Basic Democracies' for the obvious reason that we want it to grow and evolve from the very first rung of the political ladder so that it finds its roots among the people starting at the village level in rural areas and at the 'Mohalla' level in towns.³³

In the singular usage, 'Basic Democracy' denotes the small political unit in a system of local government. The Basic Democracies had multiple functions: administrative developmental, local self-government and constitutional. They were intended to decentralize administration, to provide for collaboration between the elected representatives of the people and the higher government officials, and to decentralize planning and seeking coordination of developmental activities at different levels of administration. Moreover, they were entrusted with a wide variety of local, environmental and social service functions. And, finally, they were to operate as the Electoral College for presidential and provincial assembly elections.³⁴

In reality, Ayub wanted to solidify the roots of his regime through the system of 'Basic Democracies'. The basic aim of the military regime was political rather than administrative.

During the last days of martial law, Ayub strongly felt the need of providing for a new constitution for Pakistan. He introduced a new constitution in 1962 in order to gain constitutional validity for the military leadership.

(ii) The Presidential Phase (1962-1969):

Instead of parliamentary system, as had existed earlier, Ayub introduced a modified presidential system under the 1962 constitution. He defended his step as an effective alternative for ensuring political stability and strong central government, essential prerequisites for rapid economic advancement and national integrity.³⁵ General Ayub argued that parliamentary democracy was not likely to work in Pakistan where literacy was low and where the people were not informed, nor mature enough to exercise their discretion in support of corresponding national policies or programme. Moreover, he stressed that parliamentary democracy, through party system, tends to divide people into

³³ Quoted in Herbert Feldman, Op. cit., pp. 103-104.

³⁴ See, Rounaq Jahan, Op. cit., pp. 112-113.

³⁵ Khalid Bin Sayeed, "Pakistan: New Challenges to the Political System", Asian Survey, Vol. VIII, No. 2, February, 1968, P. 97.

'majorities and minorities'.³⁶ In view of Pakistan's transitional context, Ayub suggested presidential system as more relevant and viable.

In reality, General Ayub sought to ensure democratic recognition for army dictatorship under the garb of presidential system. Instead of a genuine representative democracy, the constitution of 1962 established 'constitutional autocracy' in Pakistan,³⁷ which was neither a more viable alternative to the erstwhile parliamentary system, such as it was, in Pakistan, nor did it provide even minimal framework for Pakistan's evolution as a democratic political process.³⁸

Ayub's presidential system, instead of decentralizing powers, made the centre strong and authoritarian. Though Pakistan was declared to be a 'form of federation', the constitution (1962) contained provisions of a unitary and highly centralized form of government. Ultimate decision-making powers were vested in the central government, ostensibly because Ayub also faced vociferous demands for regional autonomy in East Pakistan. It is to be noted that provinces were expected to function as mere 'administrative agencies' not much different from units of local self-government in a unitary system.³⁹

As events showed, Ayub came to realise the added significance and utility of a political party designed to serve as a bulwark of reliable and constant support with a view to preempting public unrest and forestalling aggregation of criticism and protest by leaders and workers of political parties. He sought to achieve that by calculated measures aimed at spreading dissensions within political parties. In 1963, Ayub managed to split the Muslim League: Pro-Ayub elements identified themselves as 'Pakistan Muslim League' (PML), whereas anti-Ayub faction came to be known as the 'Council Muslim League' (CML). General Ayub's contrived formation of the PML was done almost overnight out of a disparate group of opportunists whose only common interest was to share political patronage of military dictators.

Ayub's patronage of the PML was motivated by the realization that political leaders and parties (need to be deflated by formation of separate political party committed and conducive to his own systemic objectives rather than reverting to

³⁶ Khalid Bin Sayeed, Op.cit., pp. 102-103.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 101-126.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 105.

³⁹ For details see, Articles 66, 70, 80 and 82 of the Constitution of the Republic of Pakistan 1962, Karachi, Government of Pakistan Press, 1962.

reliance upon civilian and military bureaucracy. It is to be recalled that Ayub's strategy succeeded in as much as he defeated the opposition candidate, Fatima Jinnah, in the 1965 presidential election. Fatima Jinnah was given unanimous support by the 'combined opposition parties' (COP).⁴⁰ General Ayub's PML won 120 seats in House of 150. The COP secured only 10 seats in East Pakistan and one in West Pakistan. Ayub's PML did not get substantial support in the eastern wing.⁴¹

It was obvious that the 1962 constitution was an attempt to formalize the power of non-representative elite groups (civilian and military bureaucrats) and to curtail the influence of politicians and other elements supporting the parliamentary process.⁴²

The War (1965) with India proved to be disastrous to Ayub's quest for image-building and popular sustenance, not only because the army failed on the battlefield but also because the 'Tashkent Agreement' was interpreted as a defeatist gesture on Ayub's part.⁴³ The Indo-Pak war also adversely affected national economy. For the citizen of Pakistan, the war also proved the fruitlessness of having military dictatorship and yet failing to humble the adversary, and much worse, so it was interpreted, to be forced into third-party mediation as at Tashkent. In both wings of Pakistan, opposition parties, professional elite, students and public forums raised voices of protest against the dictatorship of Ayub. They demanded immediate withdrawal of military rule and restoration of parliamentary democracy through general elections.

Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, after the 1965 war, intensified the autonomy struggle based on six-point programme and demanded end of military regime and transfer of power to the civilian government.⁴⁴ Anti-Ayub campaign of Sheikh

⁴⁰ Tariq Ali, *Pakistan: Military Rule or People's Powers*, London, Jonathan Cape, 1970, p. 126. The COP, set up in August 1964, was an 'unholy alliance of neo-Fascists, liberals and radicals'. The parties which formed a joint-front, viz., COP were, the Council Muslim League, the National Awami Party, the Awami League, the Jamaat-e-Islami and the Nizam-i-Islam Party.

⁴¹ Rounaq Jahan, *Op. cit.*, pp. 152-155.

⁴² Robert La Porte, *Power and Privilege: Influence and Decision-making in Pakistan*, New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House, 1976i. p. 57.

⁴³ Tariq Ali, *Op. cit.*, p. 133.

⁴⁴ The Six-Point Programme of Sheikh Mujib stated:

- (1) A federal government, parliamentary in nature and based on adult franchise.
- (2) Federal government shall deal with only Defence and Foreign Affairs. All other subjects shall be dealt with by the federating states.
- (3) Two separate but freely convertible currencies for the two parts of the country, or one currency for the whole country.

Mujib also inspired young politicians of West Pakistan, and, gradually a large-scale protest movement emerged in Pakistan, so much so that one of the most trusted lieutenants of General Ayub Khan, Z.A. Bhutto, went over the opposition and formed in 1967 the 'Pakistan People's Party' with avowed radical postures. Bhutto took over as the major antagonist of Ayub in the western wing.

The year 1968 was marked by Anti-Ayub regime demonstrations all over the country. To make matters worse, Ayub fell ill and much of his active ardour and authority was dissipated. He came to know that surreptitious moves were being made to replace him. There was intriguing and maneuvering in the army to make the then army chief, General Yahya Khan, head of a 'care-taker government'. This could not please Ayub, but it clearly showed the infinite capacity of the army to influence the power alternatives.⁴⁵ Ayub was judicious to have comprehended the extent of his growing unpopularity and the inevitable apprehensions of increasing dissensions in the army, likely to follow any steps taken to retain himself in power. He acted with foresight; some would call it the only course available to him, and handed over power to the army chief, General Yahya Khan in March 1969. By that decision, Ayub not only saved himself from possible humiliation and worse, and, also saved his family and his property.⁴⁶ In special broadcast (on February 21, 1969), Ayub declared that he would not offer himself as a candidate at the next presidential election, scheduled in January 1970. He also declared formal withdrawal from politics on March 25, 1969, requesting General Yahya Khan to execute his 'legal and constitutional responsibility to defend the country not only against external aggression but also to save it from internal disorder and chaos.'⁴⁷ In his farewell address, General Ayub also stated explicitly that Sheikh Mujib's alternatives proposal, that is, dissolution of 'one-unit' system in West Pakistan and full regional autonomy for East Pakistan were not acceptable. Ayub could not accept that, for the simple reason that alternative was interpreted as a threat to the continuance of army supremacy as well as the dominance of western wing.⁴⁸

(4) Power of taxation and revenue-collection shall be vested in the federating units and not at the centre.

(5) Separate accounts for foreign exchange earnings of the two parts of the country under control of respective governments.

(6) The setting up of a militia or para-military force for East Pakistan.

⁴⁵ Tariq Ali, *Op. cit.*, p. 154.

⁴⁶ Herbert Feldman, *The End and the Beginning Pakistan 1969-1971*, London, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 12.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* p., 13.

⁴⁸ *The New York Times*, March 26, 1969 ; Quoted in Rounaq Jahan, *Op. cit.*, p. 186.

2 - The Yahya Phase (1969-1971)

General Yahya Khan took over as CMLA (Chief Martial Law Administrator), on March 26, 1969, and promptly abrogated the 1962 constitution and imposed martial law. General Yahya Khan justified the action in terms almost identical to those used by Ayub Khan, 'whereas a situation has arisen in the country in which the civil administration can not effectively function...' and so on. However, there was a ray of hope for the effected common man as the new CMLA also promised an early return to democratic political institutions.⁴⁹ On April 1, 1969, Yahya Khan assumed office of the President of Pakistan. With that emerge a set of contradictions because the CMLA claimed that he had no other option left but to impose martial law measures for ensuring systemic stability, and yet, he could not ignore the aspirations of the common-man when he had to harp on the inevitability of restoration of democracy. Yahya lacked charisma and also was not a very popular figure. As events showed, he could not survive in office and also did not succeed in safeguarding the integrity of Pakistan. It was inevitable for political leadership to try and rehabilitate itself, which it did with considerable effect.

General Yahya Khan could not have been oblivious of the mounting abhorrence among the people for reversal to army rule. He was witness to the mass movements during 1968-69 against the Ayub regime. He realized the explosive potential of popular demand for general election as well as for measure conducive to regional autonomy. His strategy, therefore, was to formulate conciliatory policies specifically designed to placate the groups that spearheaded the anti-Ayub movement. Unlike Ayub, who disdained politicians and, instead, aspired for political supremacy himself, Yahya recognised the necessity of both politics and politicians, and decided to play a role of arbitrator among competing political factions. It was difficult under such circumstances to maintain even a semblance of political neutrality because his pronouncements notwithstanding, the army rulers could not have renounced active involvement in the political process, such as it was, even pretending as 'mediator and power broker'.⁵⁰ Yahya Khan, in fact, pictured himself as another Cromwell, 'Lord Protector of the Nation'.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Herbert Feldman, *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁵⁰ Rounaq Jahan, *Op. cit.*, p. 186.

⁵¹ Wayne A. Wilcox, "Political Role of Army in Pakistan", in S.P. Varma and Virendra Narain (eds.): *Pakistan Political System in Crisis*, Jaipur, South Asia Studies Centre, Rajasthan University Press, 1972, p. 41.

Unlike Ayub, Yahya did not ban political parties even under martial law,⁵² nor did he adopt restrictive political measures like, EBDO (Elective Bodies Disqualification Order, 1959), which Ayub ruthlessly imposed. Also, no opposition leaders were arrested. In his first broadcast to the nation, Yahya Khan categorically identified the 'transitional' nature of his regime and stated that his sole objective was 'creation of conditions conducive to the establishment of constitutional government... and smooth transfer of power to the representative of people elected freely and impartially on the basis of adult franchise.'⁵³

To confirm his sincerity, as it were, Yahya stated on November 28, 1969, that polling for a general election would commence on October 5, 1970, for the National Assembly and on October 22, 1970, for provincial assemblies. However, the election dates had to be postponed till December 1970, owing to severe floods in many parts of the country. He also announced the dissolution of 'one-unit' West Pakistan and representation in the National Assembly on the basis of population rather than on parity between the two wings of Pakistan resulting in the event of conclusion of such electoral process, in a clear majority for representatives from the Eastern wing in the Assembly. However, he outrightly rejected Sheikh Mujib's Six-point autonomy programme.⁵⁴

On March 30, 1970, Yahya Khan announced two significant measures with regard to the political process, 'Dissolution Order of the Province of West Pakistan' which provided for the reconstitution of the four provinces of West Pakistan and, the 'Legal Framework Order' (LFO) for future constitutional arrangement. The LFO outlined a broad formulation for drafting of a new constitution based on democratic and federal principles.⁵⁵

It was significant that in the LFO, General Yahya shrewdly incorporated the decisive position of the President, by vesting in that office exclusive power to validate the constitution.⁵⁶ Moreover, the military regime was empowered to control two mechanisms through which it could have a decisive say in the future constitutional order in Pakistan. First, since the general elections to the National Assembly were likely to result in election of representative plurality of political parties, and since the National Assembly was given only 120 days in which to

⁵² There was one exception, Yahya Khan banned the NAP in November 1971.

⁵³ Cited in Rounaq Jahan, *Op. cit.*, p. 187.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 151

⁵⁵ For details see, Herbert Feldman, *The End and the Beginning*, pp. 51-75.

⁵⁶ The Legal Framework Order (LFO) made it clear that the National Assembly would not be a sovereign body. Its decisions were subject to the approval and authentication of the President who was also the Chief Martial Law Administrator. *Ibid.*, p. 69.

frame the constitution, the army strategists, had contrived for themselves a key-role in a likely situation of competitive and antagonistic politics by elected representatives. Second, even if a particular party were to obtain an absolute majority in the National Assembly, Yahya Khan continued to retain the power to refuse validation of the constitutional bill, if it upset the basic interests of the military regime.⁵⁷

Thus, Yahya Khan adopted a dual posture; on the one hand, he wanted to retain absolute powers as President of Pakistan, and, on the other hand, he did not hesitate to publicize reconciliatory attitude towards political leadership. Political parties, nevertheless, accepted the LFO irrespective of the aforesaid limitations. It could be assumed that political leaders did not wish to give any pretext to Yahya Khan to withdraw his offer of general elections and thus throw the country back to another term of army rule.

The first general elections were held in Pakistan in December 1970, on-the basis of Universal adult franchise. The election results surprised analysts by the acute polarization manifesting affinity and identification with one or the other wing of Pakistan. Electoral behavior clearly proved that. For instance, the Awami League won a national majority on the basis of adult franchise and a majority of seats from East Pakistan. The People's Party, emerged victorious in the western wing capturing majority of seats from the Punjab and Sindh. The Awami League won an absolute majority in the National Assembly (160 out of 300 seats). It won a laud slide victory in East Pakistan, capturing all but two of the 162 seats. The People's Party of Z.A. Bhutto emerged as the second largest party in the National Assembly with 83 seats of the total 144 seats.⁵⁸

The 1970 general election results apparently upset Yahya's political calculations and a new threat for the military hegemony emerged in the form of the respective popularity of the Awami League in East Pakistan and the Pakistan People's Party in the western wing, and the former party also commanding majority in the National Assembly. Thus, ambivalence of Yahya Khan's leadership led to the emergence of the aforesaid political parties as major contenders against entrenched army hegemony.

Yahya Khan could scarcely have any premonition of such distorted consequences of his well thought-out stratagem. What was worse was that all the three contenders for power had divergent, conflicting and uncertain perspectives

⁵⁷ Rounaq Jahan, Op. cit., pp. 187.188.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 190. Also see, Craig Baxter, "Pakistan Votes--1970" Asian Survey, March 1971, Vol. XI, No. 3, p. 211.

which made accommodation among them difficult.⁵⁹ But, Yahya Khan had a brief respite in view of the mounting antagonism between the two-wings of Pakistan, specifically in view of the electoral mandate acquired by the PPP in the western wing and the Awami League in the eastern wing as well as at the national level. Yahya's intentions emerged with greater disdain for democratic justice as he sought to play one party against the other. For him, to renounce power to Sheikh Mujib's Awami League, and consequently to the Eastern wing, was an anathema no less than it was to Z. A. Bhutto, the Pakistan People's Party leader. In defiance of the democratic norm of majority's right to form the government, Z.A. Bhutto and General Yahya Khan seemed to have reached unanimity by joining hands to preclude Sheikh Mujib and the Awami League from exercising their right to form the new government.

The PPP leader, Z.A. Bhutto, gave full edged support to General Yahya Khan to disrupt the Six-Point Programme of Sheikh Mujib. Bhutto hoped that by mobilizing anti six-point sentiment in West Pakistan, he could pressurize Awami League leader Sheikh Mujib to share power with his party. Sheikh Mujib persisted with his argument that since his party clearly emerged as the victorious party, it should form the national government in Pakistan. This was a crucial challenge to the traditional elite of West Pakistan. Z.A. Bhutto, for no other apparent reason than to ensure his own and the PPP's future, ignored the rightful claim of the Awami League, primarily because that party symbolized popular mandate of the Eastern wing. Thereby, Bhutto sought to prove his own and his party's commitment to the western wing, as well as to ensure the army's support for that contention. For the moment Bhutto achieved both the objectives, which, however, meant paying a heavy price soon after. In connivance with Bhutto, General Yahya Khan, on March 1, 1971, announced his fateful decision to postpone the National Assembly session which was scheduled to be held on March 3, 1971. On March 25, 1971, however, the Yahya regime sought to break the stalemate by a military 'crack down' in East Pakistan. Military repression, instead of crushing the Awami League, aroused a strong sense of antagonism against the connivance of Yahya and Bhutto and soon after, the protest movement was transformed into a 'liberation movement' for independent Bangladesh. The rest is part of recent history, resulting in the emergence of Bangladesh as a sovereign state and dismemberment of Pakistan within twenty-four years of its foundation. The war with India cost Pakistan heavily in terms of national boundaries, military prestige and economic viability.

It was inevitable for General Yahya to be asked to quit gracefully after Pakistan's defeat in the war and loss of the Eastern wing. Z. A. Bhutto took over as CMLA and President of Pakistan on December 20, 1971.

⁵⁹ Rounaq Jahan, Op. cit., p. 192.

By quirk of political and military events, the majority party in the National Assembly of Pakistan, and the people who gave their overwhelming mandate to that party (the Awami League), had liberated themselves and, thus, had nothing to do with future formulations bearing upon truncated Pakistan's political system. That left Z. A. Bhutto and the PPP with a commanding majority in the National Assembly of 'New Pakistan'. Bhutto emerged, thus, as a popular leader of Pakistan though it would be idle to speculate about the possible turn of events had Sheikh Mujib been allowed his rightful claim to become Prime Minister of erstwhile Pakistan.

The aforesaid seeks to identify major dilemmas of Pakistan's political leadership after 1947. While the major concern of political leadership during the movement for Pakistan was to carve out of the Indian sub-continent a separate homeland for the Muslims, the leadership in Pakistan, before Bhutto's emergence at the helm, showed scant concern for nation-building, national integration, and evolving a stable political system. They failed to transform the bureaucratic system, patterned by the British for specific colonial objectives, into one geared to democratic, welfare perspectives. There never was substantial evidence of a nationalistic vision emerging among the bureaucracy. That was true for the army as well in the sense that instead of confining themselves respectively to their assigned role, the bureaucracy and the army thought it expedient to extend their field of activity to politics, thereby emerging as bureaucracy-military coterie. Recurring relapse of the political system to the influence and domain of this coterie not only showed baneful consequences of constraints of political leadership, there is adequate indication that in the absence of any genuine conviction for representative, democratic values, political leadership in Pakistan, such as it has been, was never seriously committed to formal democratic polity in the first place.⁶⁰

As events showed adequately, long spells of bureaucracy-military predominance over the political process neutralized whatever little hope there was of public opinion finally asserting itself in favour of establishment of popular regime. It was not surprising that during Ayub's regime, it was conceded by responsible people that there were only 'two political parties in Pakistan—the bureaucracy and the army.'⁶¹ There was no substantial change in that situation even during Bhutto's regime, though, for sometime it seemed the coterie had been finally rid of their interfering proclivities. With not specific indices of a modern political system emerging and consolidating, Pakistan continued to be beleaguered by

⁶⁰ Mohammad Ayoob, "The Military in Pakistan's Political Development", in S.P. Varma and Virendra Narain (eds.) *O. p. cit.*, p. 16.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

transient political leadership, as if each incumbent at the top was marking time to be eased out or toppled. Politics of democratic competitive nature could not emerge owing to mushroom growth of political parties providing easy access to forces which symbolized religious bigotry, personality-cult, lack of commitment to socio-economic welfare, all leading to authoritarian trends, weakening and vitiating the political process. Impracticable variations of Islamic ideology were sought to be revived which could neither inspire socioeconomic progress nor vindicate requirements of a modern political system based on the rule of law. The exclusive philosophy of Muslim homeland, embroiled in Islamic political culture, had no potential to ensure systemic stability and national integration. Unpredictability and constraints of political leadership notwithstanding and whatever the nature and potential of the political process Pakistan would have seen relatively better days had politics been permitted to follow a natural course emerging from systemic evolution during the preceding decades. What made matters worse was the growing incidence of Punjabi chauvinism. It is often alleged that the dominant Punjabi lobby has vested interest in perpetuation of bureaucracy-military coterie. On the other hand, the regional entities of Pakistan visualise a ray of hope only in rehabilitation of the democratic parliamentary process and the rule of law. The predilection of political leadership made the dilemma bitter: whenever the coterie assumed political power, the political leadership did not firmly renounce it; and, given the harsh realities of Pakistan's political evolution, once the bureaucracy-military coterie assumed or grabbed political power, as it has done so often, it would unabashedly trample upon democratic urges and aspirations and take recourse to all varieties of subterfuge to negate return of civilian rule. Pakistan's political leadership has itself to blame for not cultivating a viable enough core to ensure spontaneous and unhindered consolidation of the political process.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's Emergence as a Political Leader

The overwhelming victory of Pakistan People's Party (PPP) in the first general elections held in 1970, elevated Zulfikar Ali Bhutto as a popular political leader. For a political system which had, till that time, somehow evaded representative and responsible aspects of government formation, Bhutto's emergence, consequent upon popular mandate, came as a significant departure from familiar bureaucratic-military regimes. Perhaps after Muhammad All Jinnah, Bhutto was the only leader who could sustain popular claims to national leadership, as was soon in evidence when Bhutto came to be referred to as Quaid-i-Awam (leader of the people). Eventually, he became the first political leader to have continued in power for over five and a half years. He also attained international recognition as an astute third-world leader, which was not an inconsiderable accolade. The fact that he was not an imposed leader, but a leader by popular choice, was widely recognised by the people despite the traumatic experience resultant from Bhutto's insistence upon his title to the erstwhile western wing of Pakistan, leading to violent political upsurge and liberation of Bangladesh.

Though it is too early to delineate the manifold aspects, concerning Bhutto's rise to national leadership, it would not be ungenerous to state that Bhutto's socialization and personality traits notwithstanding, he finally failed to assess the inbuilt potential of the military to unsettle civilian political regime and impose its own supremacy. In a substantial way, inconsistencies of Bhutto's personality were responsible for miscalculations and ill-conceived decisions.

The inconsistencies referred to above were inherent in Bhutto's feudal familial antecedents and lineage. For the sake of convenience in analysis, one could identify three more or less distinct phases which cumulatively present Bhutto's socialization and evolution, his initial political apprenticeship, and his emergence as national political leader:

- (i) The Formative Phase: Bhutto's Socialization (1928-1956);
- (ii) The Phase of Initial Political Apprenticeship during Ayub Regime (1958-1969); and,

(iii) Bhutto's Rise to Political Power: The Yahya Regime (1969-1971).

(I). The Formative Phase: Bhutto's Socialization (1928-1956)

Z. A. Bhutto's life and the family background he inherited, help in discerning some major aspects bearing upon the formative phase.

To begin with, one can not ignore the family legacy. Z.A. Bhutto was born on 5th January, 1928 at Larkana (Sindh) at the Sindhi *Wadera* (land-lord) family residence, *Almurtaza*. The Bhuttos were a renowned feudal clan of Sindh, possessing, it is reported, all the vices and virtues of the class, consolidating and extending their sway over considerable areas of Sindh for five or six generations.¹ Originally of Rajput (Hindu) origin, the Bhuttos were converted to Islam and had migrated to Sindh from Jaisalmer (Rajasthan), some four centuries ago.² The Bhutto clan at one time owned 250,000 acres of fertile land spread over Larkana, Sukkur and Jacobabad (Sindh).³

Bhutto's father, Shahnawaz Khan, was an influential personality in Sindh politics⁴ and had made no secret of his wish to install his son as a great politician. The son was provided with the best possible educational facilities as well as uninhibited exposure to higher social milieu. For Shahnawaz Khan, Zulfikar's birth had a special significance as the first male issue born to the second wife, Khurshid.⁵ Bhutto's mother was a Hindu by birth, later converted to Islam. The expression 'Zulfikar Ali' symbolised historical and religious -tradition. 'Zulliciar' was the 'sword' of Hazrat Ali, one of the four caliphs of Islam and himself a great warrior. Historically, the 'sword' of Ali has been long regarded as a symbol of

¹ For an interesting study of the Bhutto clan history, see Salmaan Taseer, *Bhutto: A Political Biography*, New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House, 1980, pp. 11-22.

² *Ibid.*, p. 14.

³ Shahnawaz Khan entered the Bombay Legislative Council in 1921 at the age of 33, and continued as a member till 1936 as a representative of the Waderas of Sindh. In 1934, he was appointed a Minister (Diwan) in the Bombay government. Following Sindh's separation in 1935, he became chief advisor to the Governor for an interim period until a provincial ministry was formed after the 1937 election. Shahnawaz also formed a 'Sind United Party' to advance the cause of the separate identity of Sindh region. He received many official honors from the British government. After the creation of Pakistan, Shahnawaz lived in retirement from political life until his death in November 1957.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27.

⁵ Before her conversion to Islam, Khurshid was known as Lakhi Bai.

struggle against oppression, significant to those who consider such portents as harbinger of forthcoming events.⁶

Bhutto imbibed his father's experiences as the feudal chief and learnt from him the manifold secrets of clan politics. His mother, though married into a feudal family, originally belonged to a humble Hindu middle-class background, which resulted in her being considered an intruder into the clan. Bhutto never forgot his mother's mortification. 'Poverty was her only crime', he would remark later, and attributed his own empathy with his mother's concern for social justice, negated in feudal system.⁷

Owing to his father's distinguished stature in provincial politics, Bhutto came into contact with several erstwhile political entities, such as G.M. Sayed, Ayub Khuhro, Amir Ali Lohari, Kazi Fazalullah, Haji Abdullah Haroon and others. Pakistan's last Governor General and first president, Iskandar Mirza, also a close friend of Bhutto's father, evinced keen interest in Bhutto and was responsible for his entry into Ayub's military government. Awami League leader H.S. Suhrawardy (former Prime Minister of Pakistan) was also a close associate of Bhutto's father. Once he went to Shahnawaz's house and expressed his desire to admit Z.A. Bhutto to his party.⁸ However, Bhutto politely declined the offer. It was obvious that entirely different aspirations were gradually taking shape in Bhutto's perspective, which, in a considerable way, were formulated during a process of learning politics, by observation and experience, as it took shape in the drawing room of Shahnawaz Khan.

Being a devout Muslim, Bhutto's father sent him to the local mosque to learn *Arabic* and to recite the holy Koran, under the care of Maulvis. Shahnawaz's movements from one place to another adversely affected the son's formal education to an extent. He was finally sent to the convent and then to Kindergarten (girls' section) of Bishops High School at Karachi. He passed senior cambridge examination from the Cathedral High School, Bombay, in December 1946.

A month after partition Bhutto was sent to the USA for higher education Los Angeles, University of Southern California in September 1947. He migrated to the Berkeley campus in 1949 to study Political Science. After graduating with honors Political Science in 1950, Bhutto went to the Oxford University and joined

⁶ Salman Taseer: *Op.cit.*, p. 21.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 21

⁸ Dilip Mukerjee, *Op.cit.*, p. 31.

Christ Church College. In 1952, Bhutto got M.A. honors degree in jurisprudence obtaining distinction with 'A' grade.⁹

In addition to excelling in studies, Bhutto took active part in co-curricular activities, especially debating, cricket and students' elections. Some of his writings at that time had a 'quality of political sermons'.¹⁰ As an inquisitive student, Bhutto showed strong leanings toward the demand for Pakistan and commitment to Islam. He was found to be a fanatic supporter of Jinnah's two-nation theory.¹¹

After completing higher education, Bhutto returned to Pakistan in 1953. Before that, for some time he lectured at the University of Southampton (in 1952).¹² On arrival in Pakistan, Bhutto took up legal practice and also taught at Sindh Muslim Law College, in Karachi.¹³ It was soon apparent that Bhutto had little interest in the teaching profession and legal practice. He was drawn to political affairs of Pakistan, domestic as well as international.¹⁴

For any understanding of Bhutto's actions and omissions in politics, one cannot ignore his feudal antecedents¹⁵ and the exposure to higher education in the west.

⁹ The title of his postgraduate dissertation was History of Philosophy since Socrates and Plato and Its Impact on the Theory of International Relations. During this phase, Bhutto took special interest in the works of Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Machiavelli, Mill, Laski, Toynbee and Napoleon Bonaparte. See Salmaan Taseer, Op.cit., p. 29.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 28. II

¹¹ Bhutto's friend Pilloo Mody recalls that "For Zulfi every thing that Jinnah said or did was correct and to me what Gandhi said or did was better. Psychologically I could never accept the partition of India and could not understand its rationale." See Pilloo Mody, Zulfi: My Friend, Delhi, Hind Pocket Books (paper back ed.), 1973, p. 35.

¹² Dilip Mukerjee, Op.cit., p. 30.

¹³ Ibid., p. 31

¹⁴ Ironically, after settling in Pakistan Bhutto also fought a legal battle for eleven years in the Bombay High Court, the Supreme Court of India and in the corridors of power at Delhi, to retain his Indian citizenship. What finally cost him his Indian citizenship and the property in Bombay (including the mansions, Astoria and My Nest), was the conversion of his mother Lakhi Bai into Islam before marrying; the migration of his parents to Pakistan; and, his taking up a job in Karachi as a lecturer in law. The issues of Bhutto's dual citizenship and his eleven years' legal battle for retaining Indian citizenship, were time and again raised in the National Assembly of Pakistan by the members of the opposition parties. The Times of India, April 5, 1979.

¹⁵ Apart from Bhutto's sense of repartee, the following observation gives a glimpse of his innate feudal traits and perceptions: 'In the mid-1960's when Bhutto was gaining popularity for his Pro-Peking foreign policy, he was asked if he was a communist. Bhutto shot at his cuffs from the sleeves of a modish suit-coat, revealing oversized golden-coloured cuff-links. "See these?" he asked "they are solid gold and they are 24-

Despite his early initiation to religious education it is difficult to assert that he could bring into his life, his ideas and actions, a semblance of tolerance and temperance. He emerged as a man of extreme emotions and strong likes and dislikes. And, that 'extreme' trait is also reflected in evaluations of Bhutto. If to some he was a great savior and hero, to others he was a great villain. Khan Abdul Wali Khan (the leader of National Awami Party), one of Bhutto's strong critics, often described him as 'Adolf Bhutto' and the 'destroyer of Pakistan'. Bhutto was regarded by some as a 'Modern Machiavelli'.

As one scrutinizes events and incidents in Bhutto's life he betrays inconsistencies of a feudal aristocrat, given to introvert emotionalism and religious fanaticism (at least in his pronouncements), and yet proclaiming virtues of democratic and socialistic egalitarianism. That Bhutto grew eventually into a charismatic leader cannot be denied. For better, for worse, he was also rated as a sadist and a playboy.¹⁶ His mothers' humble antecedents, paternal feudal lineage and his own perceptions of both, made Bhutto a complex amalgam as a person.¹⁷

It seems he was motivated by a romantic concept of Pakistan's stature but the alternatives he formulated got entangled with enigmatic inconsistencies of his personality make-up. He could not extricate himself from the disparate affiliations to divergent aspirations of feudalism, of democracy and socialism, of Islamic grandeur, of leadership of the third world, and also, of personal glory.

Bhutto excelled as a public speaker though not in the same class so as to be rated as an orator. Yet, he was fluent, captivating and impressive in his speeches which he sprinkled with calculated imagination and caution, depending on the audience—whether students, workers, traders or feudal. He would carefully choose phrases and symbols likely to create lasting influence. How far he could implement his promises and assurances into actual realization is quite another matter.¹⁸

carat and I intend to keep them. Does that answer your question?". Quoted in Asian Recorder, January, 22-28, 1972.

¹⁶ "As a feudal playboy Bhutto was a fan of good movies, dresses, shikars, wine and women". Late Nargis Dutta (a renowned cine artist) once remarked about Bhutto the playboy, as being "very charming and likable, but always reeking of gin and perfume. Bhutto as I knew him was the feudal land-lord, with princely pleasures—drinks, shikars, and dancing with a new girl every night." See: Dilip Mukerjee, Op.cit., p. 28.

¹⁷ Victoria Schofield: *Bhutto: Trial and Execution*, London, Cassell, 1979, p. 2.

¹⁸ Salmaan Taseer in this context succinctly observes: Bhutto "was a politician of egregious guile and shrewdness. Long before other politicians of his time, he recognised the need to direct his appeal to the poor and dispossessed. He cut across traditional political lines with devastating effect, leaving in his wake shattered myths and establishing in the process a whole new type of politics. His rhetoric taught the poor

Bhutto had infinite pride in the lineage and history of his clan and he somehow considered himself a worthy heir to that tradition. There was yet another aspect haunting the Bhutto clan: 'several prominent members of the clan, Bhutto's grand-father Ghulam Murtaza, his two brothers Sikander and Imdad, uncles Wahid Buksh and Elahi Buksh, all died before they could attain the age of fifty.'¹⁹ On a number of occasions, Bhutto expressed grave apprehensions to his friends concerning his own life span. He had a premonition of an early death, and he used to say that he must accomplish whatever he could before the age of fifty. However one might explain the tragedy which overtook Bhutto also, the fact is that he was overthrown by a 'coup' at the age of forty-nine, and, tried for murder and executed on April 4, 1979, when he was fifty one.²⁰

Thus during the formative phase of socialization, there were identifiable strands of interactions, impacts and experiences which cumulatively proved conducive to the choice of an active political career. The feudal lineage and the influential stature of his father in Sindh's politics enabled Bhutto to enter politics with a certain advantage. Bhutto had closely watched the active involvement of his father in the movement for separation of Sindh from the Bombay Presidency, which --was finally conceded in 1935. Taking Jinnah as his hero Bhutto justified the rationale of two-nation theory.²¹ In his view the creation of a separate homeland for the Muslims was the only alternative to safeguard their legitimate rights. Communal riots and consequent tensions strengthened Bhutto's theocratic views. It might be recalled that during 1947, 'Bhutto's father had made persistent efforts to convince the Nawab of Junagarh to merge his princely state with Pakistan. Bhutto could not remain aloof from the bitter partisan politics of Junagarh where Muslims and Hindus were pitted against each other.'²² He often interpreted the struggle for separation of Sindh from the Bombay Presidency as the first step towards the creation of a separate homeland for the Muslim community of undivided India. Since, Bhutto matured in an atmosphere of

masses of Pakistan to hold their heads high, telling them that they were the real fountain of Power". Salmaan Taseer, Op.cit., p.7.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 14.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 14.

²¹ In *The Myth of Independence*, Bhutto observed: "In abandoning his advocacy of Hindu-Muslim unity, the founder of Pakistan left a lesson, which has, with the passage of time, become clearer in its relevance. The fact that the Hindus and Muslims of the sub-continent constituted two separate nationalities formed the foundation of the edifice of Pakistan:" Z.A. Bhutto: *The Myth of Independence*, Lahore, Oxford University Press, 1969, p. 171.

²² Ibid.

protracted communal tensions and fanatical zeal for Islam; it was inevitable for him to justify the cause of Pakistan.²³

After completing his formal education, Bhutto took active interest in the domestic politics of Pakistan. During 1953-1957, he was apparently critically evaluating the nature of politics in Pakistan and was unhappy at the state of continuing political instability. He became vociferously critical of the 'One-Unit' scheme and wrote emphatically in support of a federal constitution for Pakistan. He also criticized the Muslim League and the Republican Party for their parochial approach and personality-cult,²⁴ which encouraged high handedness of the bureaucracy. However, after joining the Ayub government, Bhutto supported the military rule for Pakistan's stability and development.

(II). Political Apprenticeship During Ayub Regime (1958-1969)

During Ayub Khan's military regime, Bhutto came to be recognised, first, as an important member of the cabinet, and, later, as an astute leader of the opposition. This phase showed how Bhutto weighed political issues and alliances exclusively in furtherance of his own political ascendancy. Until 1965, Bhutto utilized the patronage of General Ayub Khan and in the post-1965 phase, Bhutto had no qualms to transform himself into a staunch critic of Ayub's military dictatorship.

As noted earlier also, President Iskandar Mirza was keen, ever since 1954, to enlist Bhutto as a political activist. At the first available opportunity, Bhutto was sent to New York in 1957 as a member of the Pakistan delegation to the United Nations. Again, in February 1958, he was sent to Geneva as leader of the Pakistan delegation to the United Nations conference on the Law of the Sea. After the imposition of Martial Law in Pakistan (on 7th October, 1958), President Iskander Mirza suggested Bhutto's name to be included in Ayub's cabinet. Barring the feudal circle of Sindh Bhutto was a non-entity in national politics. Interestingly, in a press report on the cabinet swearing in, Z.A. Bhutto was referred as 'Zulfikar Ali Bhutto'.²⁵

²³ Bhutto wrote: "Fired by the zeal to end domination and to achieve equality, the Muslims of the sub-continent struggled for a separate state and were successful in attaining Pakistan. Although, there are some who still regret the division of the sub-continent, it is quite evident that without partition none of the Muslim peoples of pre partition India would have been able to protect the values they hold to be supreme and regard as indispensable to a world free from domination." Z.A. Bhutto : *Op.cit.*, p. 30.

²⁴ For details see, Z.A. Bhutto, *Politics of the People: A Collection of Articles, Statements and Speeches*, Vol . I, Hamid Jalal and Khalid Hasan eds., Rawalpindi, Pakistan Publications., 1972, pp. 36-71.

²⁵ There is some confusion about spelling Bhutto's initials. In terms of the Urdu accent, his name has been spelt as "Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto". Dilip Mukerjee has used this spelling in his book. However Bhutto himself spelt his initials as "Zulfikar Ali". In majority of works this spelling has been used. It is reported that some

Nevertheless, the opportunities during his tenure in Ayub's cabinet, enabled Bhutto to learn some significant lessons about national politics.²⁶ Hasan Askari in his article, 'Problems of Leadership' (*Today*, December, 1964) wrote that 'the most probable heir for the mantle of Savior was Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who seemed to be idolized by practically every one.'²⁷ In a way, Ayub was taken up by Bhutto's youth and ebullience. General Ayub was certainly impressed by Bhutto's arduous application to his assignment. However, Ayub failed to perceive the burning ambition of his young Minister. Ayub also did not comprehend the pace of Bhutto's acquisition of political maturity in the given context of national and international exposure.²⁸ It has rightly been observed that Bhutto treated 'Politics like a romance'²⁹

On 27th October, 1958, Z.A. Bhutto became the Minister of Commerce and Industries. He was then scarcely thirty, and the youngest federal Minister to be appointed in the Asian sub-continent.³⁰ A student of law and political science, Bhutto knew very little about commerce and industries. However, his intelligence, ability and capacity for hard work, made all the difference. The Commerce Ministry under Bhutto implemented concrete measures, such as laying down regulations for government quality-control on exports and formation of export-promotion centers. A noted achievement of his tenure as Commerce Minister was introduction of the 'Bonus-Voucher Scheme' designed to help Pakistan's exports.³¹ General Ayub was considerably impressed with the performance of Bhutto. In October 1959, Ayub sent Bhutto to the United Nations as leader of the Pakistan delegation. That was Bhutto's first opportunity to prove his mantle at an international forum. He forcefully expounded Pakistan's

time during his stay at the University of Southern California, Bhutto dropped the softer "Zulfiqar" and persisted with alternative "Zulfikar". See Salmaan Taseer, *Op. cit.*, pp. 27 and 40.

²⁶ Dilip Mukerje, *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

²⁷ Cited in Lawrence Ziring: *The Ayub Khan Era: Politics in Pakistan 1958 -69*. New York, Syracuse University Press, 1971, p. 49.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

²⁹ Victoria Schofeld, *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³¹ The Bonus Voucher scheme was designed by a West-German Economist and had an immediate short-term benefit on the balance of trade. It later developed into a permanent crutch. Eventually Bhutto himself dropped it in May 1972 after he assumed power. Salmaan Taseer, *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

position on disarmament, together with a clear assessment of competing Soviet and British disarmament proposals.³²

In January 1960, Bhutto became Minister of Information and National Reconstruction. His main task was to project the image and achievements of Ayub regime, which seemed to be more suited to Bhutto's proclivity. A few months later, Bhutto was given the additional charge of the vital Ministry of Fuel, Power and Natural Resources, as well as Kashmir Affairs.³³ No fresh evidence of Ayub's trust in Bhutto was needed. Bhutto had already been accepted as indispensable to Ayub. Bhutto's efforts, in a considerable measure, were instrumental in gaining popular support to Ayub's exercise in constitution-making in 1962. In August 1963, Ayub Khan awarded Bhutto the Hilal-e-Pakistan the highest civil award. Bhutto also did not shirk from paying rich tributes to Ayub Khan at various public forums.³⁴

Bhutto's vision of becoming Foreign Affairs Minister was fulfilled in January 1963 when Muhammad Ali Bogra, then Foreign Minister (also former Prime Minister) expired. In fact, during Muhammad Ali Bogra's sickness, Bhutto had informally taken over the responsibility of looking after Foreign Affairs Ministry in November 1962. As Foreign Affairs Minister, Bhutto was apparently in his elements. He tried to give a new perspective to Pakistan's foreign policy and reformulated its priorities and alternatives. From an overt pro-US commitment, Bhutto succeeded, to an extent, in normalizing Pakistan's relations with both the communist countries, the Soviet Union and Communist China. He made no secret of Pakistan's assessment of the global reality. He stated: 'I have always advocated the normalization of relations with the Soviet Union and communist China. I do not believe that our membership of the Pacts (SEATO and CENTO) is incompatible with such an approach. There is a great deal of territory on which we can meet the communist world as friends in the common cause of preserving world peace.'³⁵ In a similar vein, Bhutto also reasserted Pakistan's alleged claims over disputed Kashmir.³⁶

³² Ibid., p. 41.

³³ Ibid., pp. 41-42.

³⁴ Writing in the Pakistan Annual, Bhutto eulogized General Ayub Khan: 'He is an Atatürk, for like the great Turkish leader, he has restored the nation's dignity and self-respect in the comity of nations. And above all a Salahuddin, for like the great Ghazi-ul-Islam, this heir to the noble heritage has regained a hundred million people's pride and confidence, the highest attribute of life, without which a people are soulless.' See Salmaan Taseer, *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

³⁵ Cited in Pilloo Mody, *Op. cit.*, p. 65.

³⁶ Bhutto in his reply to the then Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru wrote (on 11th July, 1963) : "Let it be known beyond doubt that Kashmir is to Pakistan what Berlin is to the west, and that without a fair and

As the 1964 Presidential election drew near, Bhutto supported Ayub's candidature unequivocally : 'Field Marshal Ayub Khan had saved the country from destruction, put it back on the path of good order and unity, brought about admirable progress in the economic life, given honour and stability to Pakistan polity and lifted the banner of the country high on international horizon'.³⁷

Being a supporter of Ayub, Bhutto *ipso facto* commended the Council Muslim League (Pro-Ayub) and assailed the 'Combined Opposition Parties' (COP), a joint front of opposition parties during Ayub regim:

'They (the opposition leaders of COP) could not cope with the dynamics of the present and therefore wanted to drive the country back to the good old days of confusion and apathy. That just could not happen. They might as well reconcile themselves to the historical changes and not allow nostalgia to dominate their ambition.'³⁸

That phase showed Bhutto as being overly critical of India. In keeping with the sustained anti-India stance, Bhutto alleged that India had never reconciled to the creation of Pakistan and was intent upon its annihilation. India, he alleged, sought to exploit all available avenues to weaken Pakistan. Perhaps it was inevitable for him to bolster anti-India hysteria as an extension of his precursors' major preoccupation.

It was understandable that Ayub was impressed by Bhutto's academic brilliance and political ebullience. The former could ill-afford to ignore such a discovery for the primary reason that Bhutto had become the chief exponent of Ayub's policies, and thus an asset. General Ayub needed Bhutto, as much as the latter needed the former, for the simple reason that Bhutto's talent, energy and zeal notwithstanding, perhaps he could have done practically nothing if Ayub's patronage and ready acceptance were not there. Bhutto could be credited to have repaid a major portion of the debt to his benefactor as he succeeded in convincing the people, by and large, of the legitimacy of Ayub's military regime.

But that was true to the extent it served Bhutto's vital interests. The very fact that Bhutto had initiated fresh assessment of Pakistan's foreign policy postures,

proper settlement of this issue, the people of Pakistan will not consider the crusade for Pakistan complete." Quoted in Salmaan Taseer, Op. cit., pp. 58-59.

³⁷ *The Pakistan Times*, June 28, 1964.

³⁸ *The Pakistan Times*, June 28, 1964.

resulting in a shift away from exclusive reliance on the USA and redefinition of relationship with communist countries, posed problems for Ayub. His military dictatorship was solely dependent upon American economic and military aid and moral support. The US government could not permit Ayub's regime either to ignore the vital link with the USA or to foster amicable relations with communist governments. It is believed that pressure was mounted upon Ayub by the USA to get rid of Bhutto.³⁹

During the post-1965 Indo-Pak crisis, it was obvious that Bhutto and his benefactor were not speaking the same language. Ayub found an opportunity of terminating Bhutto's association in the former's quest for a scapegoat so as to explain away the failure to achieve the objectives of the 1965 war with India.⁴⁰ On his part, Bhutto realized that Ayub's days were numbered; first, because the latter had lost some credibility with the USA; and, second, because the conflict with India had created immense problems on the domestic front. Bhutto, however, was himself in no hurry to take the decisive plunge and he waited for the most favorable opportunity to get out of the Ayub circle without harming his own political credibility. Ayub, however, did not wait and on June 18, 1966 Bhutto was ousted from the cabinet.

That freed Bhutto, though; he was faced with dilemmas of variety. In the pre-1965 period, Bhutto had supported the military dictatorship. Under the changed situation, it was a challenge for him to establish his credentials as Ayub's antagonist. Throughout the latter part of 1966, Bhutto was apparently preoccupied in deciding upon the course of action available to him with a view to justifying his opposition of Ayub regime. However, he exercised restraint and did not indulge in direct attacks on Ayub Khan or his policies in the beginning. Bhutto extended his options by seeking avenues of collaboration with several political parties and pressure groups.⁴¹ Most of the parties, at one stage or another, also thought it useful to hold parleys with the deserted political leader. It was believed at that time that Bhutto had considered resuming legal practice and negotiated with at least one lawyer on possibilities of partnership. It was apparent that he was in no unusual haste to take a clear line in politics. Bhutto's sense of timing was manifest, in his extended discussions, deliberations and

³⁹ Tariq Ali, *Pakistan: Military Rule or People's Power*, New Delhi Vikas, 1970, p. 138.

⁴⁰ Salman Tasseer, *Op. cit.*, p. 72.

⁴¹ It is reported that Bhutto wanted to set up a 'Forward Block' within the ruling Council Muslim League, taking at his precedent a similar move made in undivided India by Subash Chandra Bose in 1939 following his differences with Gandhi over the direction of Congress policies. Later, Bhutto visualized the block as taking the shape of a United Front of Opposition like the one Suhrawardy had organised in 1962, See Dilip Mukerjee, *Op. cit.*, pp. 57-58.

negotiations during which he committed himself to none and utilized the opportunity to ascertaining the nature of politics of the time.⁴²

Until late in 1967, Bhutto went around the country trying to strengthen political contacts at the grass-roots level. In some quarters there was apprehension that he was preparing the groundwork for launching a party of his own, though Bhutto did not confide in any-body in that regard. At that time, Bhutto's public utterances and speeches underwent a change, from his former discreet and low-key criticism to harsh and direct attacks on the Ayub regime. It was not difficult for the knowledgeable to point to the inconsistency in Bhutto's assessment of the Ayub regime, first when Bhutto was in office and later when he quit Ayub's company. It was not without reason that Bhutto's 'volte face' was ascribed to the loss of office.⁴³

However, Bhutto had other ideas to stage a decisive comeback to national politics. He chose to present himself as a radical, though one would identify an element of deliberate vagueness in Bhutto's conceptual claims. By November 1967, Bhutto had prepared the groundwork for the formation of a new political party. At the inaugural convention, held at Lahore, On November 30, 1967, the 'Pakistan People's Party' came into being.⁴⁴ Earlier, Bhutto went around the country assuring, in particular, students and workers that his new party would subscribe to socialism and launch a struggle against military dictatorship for restoration of democratic rule in Pakistan. In order to boost his image as a leftist, Bhutto also demanded the release of the Awami League leader, Sheikh Mujib, and supported his 'six-point' programme.⁴⁵ There was expected criticism of Bhutto's new-found convictions which betrayed inherent ambivalence.⁴⁶ The vagueness of his pronouncements notwithstanding, Bhutto was accepted, by and

⁴² Salmaan Taseer, p. 79.

⁴³ Dilip Mukerjee, Op. cit., p. 58.

⁴⁴ At the inaugural convention, three names for the party were proposed in the Foundation Documents: People's Progressive Party; People's Party; and, Socialist Party of Pakistan.

⁴⁵ *The Pakistan Times*, November 3, 1967.

⁴⁶ For instance, Begum Zahida Khaliqzaman, then Provincial Minister for health and social welfare, criticized Bhutto for his contradictory postures. She alleged that the formation of a new political party was just a "ruse to hoodwink the masses and gain his personal political ends." In a press statement she disclosed that "ever changing and vacillating attitude of the former foreign minister was baffling and could convince not even a layman. It was strange that the erstwhile supporter of the Ayub constitution was now disowning it and flirting with the opposition leaders some of whom were inherently opposed to the very creation of Pakistan". Referring to the support given by Bhutto to the Six-point programme of Sheikh Mujib, Begum Zahida remarked that "it was an enigmatic somersault which politicians of his status should not have ventured to make". Dawn, November 1, 1967.

large, by the people who had, for long, been subjected to military dictatorship. Like Jinnah, Bhutto possessed charisma and the ability to appeal to mass sentiments and also to translate mass support into power politics.

With the institutional support of the Pakistan People's Party (PPP), Bhutto launched a massive campaign against the Ayub government. He employed phraseology distinctly supportive of the cause of the poor sections of society. Bhutto argued that Pakistan's polity was not only beset with corruption and nepotism, society as a whole was demoralized, and law and order were adversely affected. The rights and expectations of the workers were being unscrupulously disregarded, resulting in misery for an overwhelming majority of the people of Pakistan.

Justifying the formation of the PPP, Bhutto asserted that the main objective of his party was to usher a new perspective in Pakistan and to liberate the people from military dictatorship. He also called for unity among the opposition parties so that a constitutional struggle could be launched for restoration of democracy and constitutionalism in Pakistan. Bhutto advised opposition parties to identify and maximize common aspects and minimize their differences, to stop criticizing each other fruitlessly, to work out a common opposition platform and, to approach the task of national political revival without preconceived prejudices or personal vendetta.⁴⁷

With his flair for the dramatic, Bhutto sought to highlight the fact of his ouster from the Ayub government as the prime cause of the nation's deteriorating condition. He shrewdly underplayed the fact that till recently he was himself a member of the Ayub government.

Bhutto, however, was not found lacking in effectively presenting his own defence, castigating Ayub regime before the people, appealing especially to susceptibilities of the educated youth, professionals and the working people. The thrust of Bhutto's public speeches revolved around propagation of his party's four fundamental objectives:

'Democracy is our polity; Socialism is our economy; Islam is our religion; and, all power to the people.' Bhutto also propagated the innovative identification of fundamentals of Socialism and Islam as being complementary.

Assailing the criticism that he was pursuing political power for himself, Bhutto pointed out that he had renounced power and that should be evidence enough of

⁴⁷ See, Pilloo Mody: Op. cit., p. 98,

his convictions.⁴⁸ In order to muster popular support, he raised the bogey of Kashmir. He declared that the PPP would not forget the national concern over the Kashmir issue and would continue to regard that as the most pressing issue, that the party would not cease to strive to achieve its objectives and targets, and that in working towards that end it would brook no interference either from the United Nations or the great powers.⁴⁹

It soon became evident that General Ayub could not take Bhutto's challenge lying down and, as apprehended, Bhutto was arrested on November 13, 1968 under 'Defence of Pakistan Rules' (DPR). He was charged with criticizing Ayub government and inciting disaffection 'to bring into hatred and contempt the government established by law. Bhutto's imprisonment, in fact, increased his popularity and, in that proportion, anti-Ayub feelings became stronger. Bhutto was taken from one jail to another till finally in February 1969, he was brought to Larkana and placed under house arrest. On February 13, 1969, Bhutto, to the surprise of all, undertook a 'fast unto death' to compel the government to revoke the state of emergency.⁵⁰ The move caught people's imagination owing to its suddenness, and scores of followers and PPP functionaries promised to join it. Bhutto's declaration of 'fast unto death' compelled Ayub to lift the emergency regulations. Subsequently, Bhutto and other leaders of various political parties were released.⁵¹ Soon thereafter, Bhutto stepped up the intensity and tempo of anti-Ayub campaign.⁵²

In a desperate bid to redeem his position, Ayub invited Opposition leaders to a Round Table Conference (RTC), which was held during March 10 to 13, 1969. However, Bhutto and Maulana Bhashani boycotted the RTC talks. The RTC deliberations ended in a deadlock. Finding himself in a difficult situation, Ayub Khan handed over power to his army chief of staff, General Yahya Khan (on March 25, 1969). Bhutto greeted the change with satisfaction: 'It had to happen, and on the whole it is a good thing. At least we are rid of Ayub Khan and the

⁴⁸ For instance, during a public speech at Abbotabad (October 29, 1968), Bhutto said: "They (military rulers) accuse me of lust for power and say that is why I am opposing this government. I am not interested in power. If I had any desire to hold on to power, I would have been with this government, not out of it. It is this government which is drunk with power. It is holding on to power desperately for the last ten years and is not prepared to give it up under any circumstance." Z.A. Bhutto, *Politics of the People-1966-69*, Vol. II, *Op. cit.*, P. 164.

⁴⁹ Pilloo Mody, *Op. cit.*, p. 99.

⁵⁰ *Dawn*, February 14, 1969.

⁵¹ Salman Taseer, *Op. cit.*, pp. 99-101.

⁵² On February 24, 1969, Bhutto surrendered the award 'Hilal-i-Pakistan', bestowed upon him by Ayub during his tenure as Foreign Minister, *Dawn*, February 25, 1969.

royal family. Unless the military gets a taste of power – and I do not think this is likely – the prospects for a return of democracy look good.⁵³

Bhutto welcomed Ayub's exit because he knew that there was no other aspirant in the army to suppress popular will and reimpose martial regime. At Bhutto's behest, a vigorous movement for restoration of democracy and withdrawal of martial law was launched.

(III). Bhutto's Rise to Political Power: The Yahya Regime

Bhutto's leadership role during Yahya regime can be evaluated in two phases:

- (i) The Pre-election Phase (1969-1970),
- (ii) The Post-election Phase (1970-1971).

It became apparent by Bhutto's skilful political maneuvers that he was aiming at higher stakes, beyond removal of one regime or ruler and their replacement by another, which was confirmed by the role he played during the brief, though eventful, Yahya regime.

(1) The Pre-election Phase (1969-70)

After Ayub's exit, Bhutto called off the movement against the military regime, as a gesture to General Yahya's liberal approach. On March 31, 1969, Yahya Khan issued a 'Legal Frame-Work Order' (LFO), providing for the transfer of power to civilian government. The LFO not only called for holding general elections but also outlined guidelines for the proposed new constitution, after holding general elections. Soon afterwards, Bhutto's wishes were partially fulfilled when Yahya Khan invited him to become his personal advisor on domestic and international affairs.

As elections drew near, it became apparent that Yahya Khan had some misgivings concerning Bhutto's rise to popularity. In January 1970, Yahya Khan appointed his brother, Aga Mohammad Ali, as head of the National Security Council (NSC), with specific instructions to keep a close watch over the PPP.

Bhutto virulently criticized such policy directive⁵⁴ In March 1970, the Yahya regime was accused by Bhutto of an attempt on his life. Notwithstanding such

⁵³ *The Sunday Times* (London), March 30, 1969.

⁵⁴ Pilloo Mody, *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

measures by the Yahya government, Bhutto continued to acquire enormous popularity.

Bhutto drew the election manifesto of the PPP (released on January 4, 1970), with considerable skill and succeeded in creating deep impact in the erstwhile western wing.⁵⁵ People found it radically different from the manifestoes of other political parties which had a clear rightist tilt. The PPP manifesto, on the other hand, combined the ideals of 'Democracy', 'Socialism' and 'Islam' and presented a perspective not hitherto known to the common-man. Handicapped as Bhutto was owing to paucity of publicity media, he sought to more than make up for that by his whirlwind tours across the country, campaign of mass-contact and popular speeches. He was careful not to tread upon sensitive issues and susceptibilities of the common-man. In fact, he sought to project Islamic principles of egalitarianism as contributory to socialism.⁵⁶ Bhutto's radical political style created almost instant support for the PPP (in the western wing), adversely affecting the prospects of right-wing orthodox parties. However vague in content, Bhutto's Islamized socialism (Islamic Socialism) was seen as a potential threat by the *Ulema*.⁵⁷ It was not difficult for a person of Bhutto's erudition and shrewdness to cite in support of Islamic Socialism, views of Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah and Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan. Bhutto declared that 'Islamic Socialism is Musawwat-i-Mohammadi and we should introduce it in Pakistan.'⁵⁸ It is interesting that the expression 'Islamic Socialism' was not mentioned in the official documents of the PPP released at its first convention. In a bid to frustrate Islamic fundamentalists, Bhutto added the expression, 'Islamic Socialism', in the manifesto of the PPP. His retort to the vile propaganda that 'Socialism Kufr Hai' was 'Musawwat-i-Mohammadi', intended to elevate Islamic Socialism to the level of Prophet Mohammad's egalitarian order, and beyond the

⁵⁵ Launching the Election Manifesto of the PPP at Nishtar Park, Karachi on January 4, 1970, Bhutto said: "Our politics is of the masses. It is politics of the open". Criticizing Ayub, Bhutto stated that "Ayub wanted to sabotage the peoples' struggle. He had government officers at his back. The capitalists, the feudalists, the army and the police were supporting him... This is why I did not join his Round Table Conference. We were with the people and could not have betrayed them... He (Ayub) was a hunter but I am a better hunter He could trap others but failed to trap Zulfikar Ali. I escaped the trap because I did not want the people to be trapped. I shall always remain with the people." Cited in, Z.A. Bhutto: *Politics of the People: Marching Towards Democracy; Vol. III*, (A collection of statements, Articles, speeches of Z.A. Bhutto, eds. Hamid Jalal and Khalid Hasan), Rawalpindi, Pakistan Publications, 1972, pp. 1-4.

⁵⁶ The PPP chose, as its election symbol, 'Sword' which has a religious connotation. Even the name of PPP chief 'Zulfikar' signifies the sword of a great warrior of Islam—Hazrat Ali. Throughout Islamic history, the sword of Ali had been a Symbol of struggle against oppression, which, Bhutto felt, should go down well with the people of Pakistan.

⁵⁷ As the election campaign intensified, the *Ulema* criticized Bhutto's Socialism as 'Kufr', anti-Islamic concept.

⁵⁸ See, Z.A. Bhutto, *Politics of the People*, Vol. III, *Op.cit.*, P. 5.

materialistic interpretations of Socialism. Bhutto also assailed Ayub's foreign policy which failed, as he alleged, to secure Kashmir for Pakistan.

By June 1970, it was conceded in knowledgeable circles that Bhutto constituted a major force in West Pakistan. Students, professional groups of lawyers, doctors, professors and journalists joined the band-wagon of the PPP and actively participated in door-to-door campaigning.⁵⁹ Bhutto propagated the view that only the PPP could build a 'New Pakistan.' In his address to the nation over Radio and TV, on November 18, 1970, Bhutto stated:

'We will respect the cultures and languages of all our people. The autonomy of the provinces will be safeguarded; regional rights will come in great measure in the blossoming of our pluralistic society.'⁶⁰

Bhutto's opponents, however, accused him of following the course of opportunism. They cited his previous association with the military dictatorship of Ayub Khan and depicted his playboy character as, antithetical to socialistic claims. According to their view Bhutto was 'the most important cog in the dictatorial machine.'⁶¹

The first ever general elections were held on December 7, 1970.⁶² Election results provided a severe setback to religious and reactionary right-wing parties. At the same time, the regional character of winning parties was also exposed, as no party emerged as a genuine national party. The Awami League of Sheikh Mujib won 160 of the 162 seats in the eastern wing. It did not get a single seat in the western wing. Similarly, Bhutto's PPP emerged victorious (next to the Awami League) capturing 83 out of a total of 144 seats in West Pakistan. However, in West Pakistan, the PPP succeeded only in two larger provinces, the Punjab and Sindh. In Sindh, it captured 44.9 per cent of the popular votes and two-third of the seats in the Punjab; it got 41.6 per cent of the popular votes. In the NWFP, it secured only one out of the 18 National Assembly seats. In Baluchistan, it made almost no impression and got only 2.3 per cent of the popular votes. In the NWFP and Baluchistan, two other parties emerged victorious, the National

⁵⁹ See, Mecnakshi Gopinath, *Pakistan in Transition: Political Development and Rise to Power of Pakistan People's Party*, Delhi, Manohar, 1975, pp. 79-36.

⁶⁰ Z.A. Bhutto, *Politics of the People*, Vol. III, *Op.cit.*, p. 155.

⁶¹ The Pakistan Observer, October 16, 1970.

⁶² Earlier elections were conducted at provincial levels: In 1951, in the Punjab; in 1953, in Sind; and, in 1954 in East Bengal.

Awami Party and Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Islam.⁶³ In all, it was not a very encouraging picture for systemic viability, as the table shows below:

TABLE
Pakistan National Assembly Elections Result (1970)
Province-Wise Results

Name of the Party	Number of seats contested	East Pakistan	Punjab	Sindh	NWFP	Baluchistan	Tribal Area	Indirectly Elected Women's Seats	Total
Awami League	162	160	0	0	0	0	0	7	167
Pakistan Peoples party	122	0	64	18	1	0	0	5	88
Pakistan Muslim League	132	0	1	1	7	0	0	0	9
Council Muslim League	119	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Jamiat-UL Ulema-i-Islam (Hazarvi)	93	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	7
Jamiat-UL Ulema-i-Pakistan	48	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
National Awami Party (Wali Khan)	61	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	7
Jamat-e-Islami	200	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Muslim League (Convention)	124	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pakistan Democratic Party	108	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Independents	350	1	3	3	0	0	7	0	14
TOTAL		162	82	27	18	4	7	13	313

(ii) *The Post-elections Phase: (December 1970-December 1971):*

The post-election phase witnessed a direct confrontation affecting the martial regime, the Awami League and the Pakistan People's Party.

On the basis of election results, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman asked the military regime of Yahya Khan to transfer power to popularly elected representatives. He asserted that the Awami League alone could form the National government in Pakistan. He also insisted upon inclusion of 'six-point' autonomy programme in the new constitution. That posed a clear threat to the political future of both Yahya and Bhutto. In view of Mujib's claims, both were unanimous in their assertion that no future government could be formed without consensual understanding among the three major forces—the army, the PPP, and, the Awami League. Bhutto rejected the claim of the leader of the Awami League to be asked to form the government. On December 20, 1970, Bhutto organised an anti-Sheikh Mujib procession through the streets of Lahore. Addressing a public meeting thereafter, Bhutto declared Punjab and Sindh as the 'bastions of Power'.⁶⁴

⁶³ For a detailed analysis of the 1970 general election results, see Dilip Mukerjee, *Op.cit.*, pp. 93-97.

⁶⁴ Bhutto stated: "Punjab and Sindh are the bastions of power in Pakistan. Majority alone does not count in the national politics. No government at the centre could be run without the cooperation of the PPP which controlled these two provinces.... I have the key of the Punjab assembly in one pocket and that of Sindh in the other. . . The rightist press saying; Why I should sit in the opposition benches. I am no Clement Attlee".

The aforesaid makes it obvious that the norms and values of parliamentary tradition and practice were not upheld by Bhutto's arguments. One explanation of Bhutto's stand could be his support-base comprising supportive segments of the western wing in the Pakistani army, feudal and the bureaucracy.⁶⁵ However, it was directed to preclude the Awami League from forming the national government. Yahya Khan was only too happy to support Bhutto's stand, primarily to safeguard his own interests. He explained that no future government could be formed if the basic principles of the 'Legal Framework Order' (LFO) were violated. Though, Yahya had involved Sheikh Mujib in parleys, their failure was a foregone conclusion.

Bhutto faced another dilemma because the Constituent Assembly was scheduled to meet on March 3, 1971 and Sheikh Mujib was insistent upon his 'six-points'. On February 15, 1971, Bhutto categorically declared: 'My party will not attend the National Assembly session starting on March 3, 1971, at Dacca My party is of the opinion that the constitution based on six-points can not provide a viable future for the country... my party is very keen for the early transfer of power, but not the transfer of Pakistan.'⁶⁶

Clearly, Bhutto and Mujib took two entirely antagonistic positions which gave Yahya the opportunity to make the most of an unstable situation. On March 1, 1971, Yahya Khan announced postponement of the National Assembly session *sine die* in view of the mounting political deadlock and unrest, Yahya finally decided to launch military action in East Pakistan. On March 26, 1971, Yahya ordered massive military 'crackdown' in East Pakistan. It proved to be rash and ruthless in conception and a desperate way out in its execution. What Yahya and Bhutto both seem to have forgotten was that more than upholding the democratic, parliamentary process, the very political system of Pakistan was at stake. Suppressive tactics further aggravated the situation in East Pakistan and it did not take long for the people in that wing to raise the banner of liberation.

There is no available evidence to show if Bhutto was overly concerned at the impending dismemberment of his country. What, in fact was obvious with ensuring his own political predominance in the western wing.

The Pakistan Observer, December 21, 1970. It might be recalled that Clement Attlee, the British Labour Leader, agreed to serve as Winston Churchill's deputy in the war cabinet.

⁶⁵ Dilip Mukerjee, Op.cit., pp. 105-106.

⁶⁶ Dawn, February 16, 1971.

General Yahya could not have been unaware of Bhutto's ultimate objectives, and to give Bhutto a sample of his own therapy, as it were, Yahya announced on June 28, 1971, to hold bye-elections. That was cause enough for Bhutto to worry. Though, Bhutto had apparently supported Yahya's military action in East Pakistan,⁶⁷ the two began drifting apart. It is believed that Yahya Khan clandestinely encouraged anti-Bhutto right-wing forces in West Pakistan. To add to Bhutto's discomfiture, on September 17, 1971, General Yahya announced that the National Assembly would be convened after bye-elections were held to fill-up the seats declared vacant. He proposed to place before the National Assembly a constitution prepared by military experts and allowed ninety days to proposed amendments.

However, Yahya put a precondition that amendments to the new constitution would be acceptable only when passed by a majority in the Assembly, which also included consensus of all the federating units. He also clarified that if it threatened the national interest, an amendment to the constitution could be rejected.⁶⁸ There was little doubt that Yahya was prepared to make popular announcements without compromising his own supremacy.

On October 12, 1971, in his address to the nation, Yahya Khan announced the schedule for the National Assembly session. The constitution was stipulated to be published on December 20, 1971, and the Assembly to meet on December 27, 1971. The bye-elections to the seats declared vacant were to be completed by December 23, 1971.⁶⁹

Yahya's sole objective was to change the complexion of the National Assembly and to impose a constitution of his choice. Bhutto had been watching the political situation with considerable trepidation and was apprehensive of Yahya's ultimate step towards installation of a puppet regime, ignoring and excluding him from power. Bhutto, therefore, acted swiftly and declared that any puppet regime installed by Yahya would be toppled within forty days. He reiterated his demand that in the absence of the Awami League, the PPP's majority should be recognised to facilitate transfer of power.

⁶⁷ On March 23, 1971, Bhutto justified the military action taken by Yahya Khan. At a press conference he accused Sheikh Mujib of wanting to set-up "an independent, Fascist and racist state in East Pakistan" and declared that whatever steps had been taken by Yahya Khan "were in the interests of country", *Dawn*, March 29, 1971.

⁶⁸ Mohammad Ayoub and K. Subrahinanyam, *The Liberation War*, New Delhi, S. Chand & Co., 1972, p. 198.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

Bhutto was in for more shocks as results of bye-elections in East Pakistan began trickling in. As many as 58 of the 79 seats were filled without contest, 52 of them going to seven right-wing parties which had jointly put up candidates and six to Bhutto's PPP. It was obvious that the Yahya regime considered the vacant seats as 'pocket boroughs', as it were, to put pliable men into the National Assembly. Consequent upon bye-elections, Bhutto's strength in the National Assembly went up from 88 to 94, while that of the right wing parties shot up from 37 to 89. With 21 seats remaining to be filled from the eastern wing, it was clear that the military regime had calculatedly planned to contrive a majority comprising rightists to forestall Bhutto's expectations.⁷⁰

The election results proved disastrous to Bhutto's expectations to become the prime minister of Pakistan. He was rightly disturbed as reflected in the resolution passed by the PPP on December 2, 1971, which asserted that transfer of power to the seven party coalition of rightist and reactionaries should be tantamount to capitulation to India and would pave the way for a second and final Tashkent.⁷¹ However, the next day (on December 3, 1971), Bhutto changed his decision and agreed to accept the post of Deputy Prime Minister in a coalition cabinet headed by Nurul Amin.⁷²

Yet another war between India and Pakistan broke out the same day (on December 3, 1971), Yahya Khan accepted Bhutto's proposal and on December 7, 1971 installed Nurul Amin, head of the 'United Front' as the Prime Minister of Pakistan. The decision, however, could not be implemented owing to the rapid and unexpected changes consequent upon surrender of the Pakistan army on December 16, 1971, in Dacca.

Bangladesh came into being as a sovereign independent nation. The decisive defeat of Pakistan's armed forces in the eastern wing was interpreted as a national humiliation and left Yahya Khan a virtual wreck. It was not difficult for Bhutto to ensure his own installation as the ruler of truncated Pakistan.⁷³ Bhutto's assumption of power on December 20 1971, invited mixed reactions

⁷⁰ Bhutto was more worried about power than about democracy or the integrity of the country. As the election results were arriving, Bhutto pressed Yahya Khan for the formation of a 'National Government', reiterating that "old Pakistan is finished. Either we create a new Pakistan or we have to face a catastrophe." Bhutto also assured Yahya Khan of the Chinese assurance of Military aid needed in the course of likely indo-Pak war. However, that was, a fake assurance, which the Chinese government denied. *Time Hindustan Times*, November 28, 1971.

⁷¹ *The Times of India*, December 3, 1971.

⁷² *The Times of India*, December 4, 1971.

⁷³ For details, see Dilip Mukerjee, *Op.cit.*, pp. 147-148.

from the world press. Several newspapers expressed apprehensions about Bhutto's leadership.⁷⁴ However, the government controlled press in Pakistan lauded Bhutto's assumption of Pakistan's leadership at the most critical juncture in Pakistan's life. It expressed hope for a new beginning in Pakistan under the 'democratic' and 'Socialistic' leadership of Z.A. Bhutto.

The preceding analysis sought to present the sequence of Bhutto's emergence as a national political leader. Beginning with the impact of his family, his education in political science, international law, diplomacy and the laws, and his induction into politics, apparently seem to have come to him relatively more easily, primarily owing to his influential socioeconomic position. Several inconsistencies, nevertheless, became more marked as his career unfolded itself and evolved towards added acquisition of political power. The events show that Bhutto was motivated by contradictory strands of feudal antecedents, of democracy and socialism, of third world leadership and national glory, and in all his efforts, he seemed to have cultivated a romantic notion of personal grandeur and invincibility. His affinity with military dictators, such as Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan, and his subsequent renunciation of both, rather unceremoniously, could at best, be synonymous with requirements of political expediency, though, at the

⁷⁴ Following are some of the major press reactions about Bhutto's assumption of power:

The Ottawa Citizen, Ottawa, December 21, 1971, editorially commented: "It is a measure of Pakistan's desperation that in its darkest hour it has to turn for leadership to the very man who helped bring disaster to the country."

Amrit Bazar Patrika, Calcutta, February 2, 1972, commented: "Bhutto's rise has been less due to any mature thinking or faith in ideology. Rather the mini-Mogul cleverly rode the crescendo of popular feelings in reactionary quarters; and with a kind of political flamboyance not unknown in history. He has often sought to take advantage of the situation for the fulfillment of his own ambitions."

The Financial Times, London, December 21, 1971, accused Bhutto of anti-India tirade: "Bhutto had the most consistent and emphatic record of hostility towards India of any leader who has achieved prominence in Pakistan."

The New York Times, January 3, 1971, expressed that the "Sheikh constituted a trump card for Bhutto who would try to make the most of what little he had to bargain with, but also saw a danger that he might over-play his hand."

Frontier, Calcutta, January 1, 1972, interpreted Bhutto's assumption of power thus: "The old Junta in Pakistan has been replaced by a new one."

Mother Land, New Delhi, December 21, 1971, characterized Bhutto's coming to power as the beginning of "new old chapter" in Pakistan.

Patriot, New Delhi, December 21, 1971, observed: "Totally undependable, and free of any commitment to any ideology or political principle, Bhutto will rule for Bhutto's sake."

worst, there was little doubt about the ambivalence manifest in every step Bhutto took to extend and consolidate his power. His philosophy of Islamic Socialism and the ideological core of the PPP were basically antithetical, especially in view of his own deviations thereof subsequently. Committed, as he posed himself to be, to democratic, representative political process, as the only alternative to martial regime, Bhutto did not bother to uphold the values and norms following the electoral verdict, which gave a clear majority to Sheikh Mujib's Awami League.

It was obvious that with the fizzling out of his expectations to become the nation's 'conscience-keeper', Bhutto was determined to sabotage the democratic verdict being implemented, if it left him out of reckoning. One could understand Bhutto's confrontations with Ayub and Yahya, but by negating the overwhelming popular verdict in favour of the Awami League, Bhutto betrayed the inherent ambivalence of precept and practice. If he were genuinely a votary of Pakistan's return to civilian, democratic process, it is enigmatic why he did not accept the Awami League to be given the opportunity to form the national government. Also, if he was sincere in his pronounced dislike for continuation of the martial regime, it was a shortsighted policy to have acquiesced in the crackdown on what then was East Pakistan, because such support, covert or overt, to the Yahya regime, in the hypothetical situation of India's unconcern for the genocide in the eastern wing and its cruel ramifications, as well as in the event of complete subjugation and suppression of resistance movement in that part of erstwhile Pakistan-would have further entrenched the grip and control of the armed forces. Bhutto clearly miscalculated his own capacity to keep ambitious armed personnel under control in the hypothetical situation of an armed forces' victory over resistance movement in erstwhile East Pakistan. He also failed to discern the clandestine machinations within the armed forces after he assumed control of the truncated Pakistan, which subsequently eased him out of power and led to his execution. If there is some answer to the riddles Bhutto revealed in, it is in the enigmatic context of his personality, thinking, activism and expectations.

PART III

BHUTTO'S

LEADERSHIP

IN

OPERATION

Bhutto's Leadership and the National Level Politics

Bhutto was at the helm of national politics for about five and a half years. His tenure (December 20, 1971—July 5, 1977) revealed a complex amalgam of shrewdness, capacity for political maneuvers and an authoritarian streak. That he ultimately failed to discern the elements, waiting in the wings, as it were, who usurped political power and contrived his execution, gives some indication of Bhutto's failure to comprehend the basic ingredients of Pakistan's political culture. His loud advocacy of nation-building, Islamic Socialism and national integration proved inadequate and incapable of saving him, it seems his followers, supporters, and adversaries were all convinced of his inherent thirst for power and personal glory and when the time of reckoning came, his followers and supporters could not rescue him whereas his adversaries struck in a decisive manner. They unseated a popularly elected leader and also had no scruples in subverting a constitutional political system, such as it was.

Be that as it may, there is no denying the fact that initially Bhutto, by and large, was accepted as an alternative, better 'than martial regime. There was considerable popular enthusiasm for his pronouncements and promises, as Bhutto went about propagating tenets of participatory democracy, Islamic Socialism and his oft-quoted vision of 'bread, clothes and living apartments for all'. He had not, however, contended with vested interests, primarily social and economic, which ultimately thwarted even peripheral acquisitions for ameliorating the level of life of the common-man. He also could not convincingly prove his innocence concerning the events leading to Pakistan's dismemberment in 1971. He underestimated the infinite capacity for mischief by fundamentalist and reactionary elements as well as the over-ambitious individuals in the armed forces who never forgave Bhutto for his role during the crisis in erstwhile East Pakistan. The sequence of Bhutto's rise to national level politics also showed that though not a military ruler himself, he was successor to a military regime, discredited though the armed forces stood after the debacle of 1971. As such, Bhutto had inherited a cut and dried authoritarian power structure. It was apparently beyond Bhutto's temperament to renounce authoritarian power once he had tasted it, all his declarations otherwise notwithstanding. Perhaps that was also some sort of an index of Pakistan's political culture as it emerged after its foundation. The armed forces were intent upon proving Bhutto as the villain of Pakistan's dismemberment. Bhutto had to contend with all the aforesaid

challenges at one time or the other, and as events showed, he failed to devise ways and means to counter them effectively.

For the sake of classificatory convenience, Bhutto's role at national level politics, could be discussed in two phases: the transition phase up to August, 1973, and, the Parliamentary phase thereafter, lasting till July 5, 1977.

The Transition Phase (December 20, 1971 to August 13, 1973)

Initially, Bhutto assumed powers of the Chief Martial Law Administrator (CMLA) and President. After the adoption, of an 'Interim Constitution' on April 21, 1972 he formally took the oath of office of President and withdrew from the office of the CMLA. Bhutto continued as President of Pakistan until the adoption of a permanent constitution which came into force on August 14, 1973.

Bhutto's government was the eleventh regime within the first twenty-four years of Pakistan's birth. While it is true that he assumed powers in a flush of popular approval, the nation was reeling under unprecedented challenges on socio-economic and political fronts. Apart from the colossal cost of the war of 1971, Pakistan had lost the entire eastern wing, further aggravating the economic crisis. On the very day of his assumption of power, Bhutto sought to bolster the morale of the people by pledging to build a 'New Pakistan', based on the principles of Democracy and Islamic Socialism. He was virulent in his criticism of India and alleged India's complicity in Pakistan's dismemberment. He reiterated his conviction for a 'United Pakistan', however, irrelevant it might sound. In order to establish his democratic credentials, Bhutto released Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. He also lifted ban on the National Awami Party of Khan Abdul Wali Khan. But, he did not lift the martial law and retained both offices, of the CMLA and of the President. He conceded that his assumption of leadership of Pakistan came at a decisive moment.¹

Bhutto alleged India's complicity and shed tears for Bangladesh as inseparable part of united Pakistan. Either he was playing to popular susceptibilities at home, or refusing to accept the political reality of the day. If one were to go a step

¹ In his address to the Nation (December 20, 1971) Bhutto said: "I have come in at a very decisive moment in the history of Pakistan. We are facing a deadly crisis in our country's life. We have to pick up the pieces, very small pieces, but we will make a new Pakistan, a Pakistan free of exploitation, a Pakistan envisaged by the Quaid-i-Azam. Do not think that we have lost. We have won, because a political victory is much greater than a military victory. India should not get intoxicated by the fact that she has taken over by a preponderance of military force the eastern part of Pakistan ... East Pakistan is an inseparable and indispensable part of Pakistan." Z.A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements as President of Pakistan*, December 20, 1971—March 31, 1972, Karachi, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of information and Broadcasting, Department of Films and Publications, 1972, pp. 1-16.

further and state that all such pronouncements were merely attempts to prove his innocence during the struggle for Bangladesh, it would not be idle fancy. In fact Bhutto offered to install Sheikh Mujib as the 'President', evidently forgetting that only a few months earlier he had sabotaged Mujib's constitutional claims to become Prime Minister of Pakistan. Later, however, Bhutto changed his stance before the National Assembly and held Sheikh Mujib guilty of Pakistan's dismemberment.²

From December 20, 1971 to April 20, 1972 Pakistan had no constitution. Bhutto persisted with martial law till April 21, 1972, when an Interim Constitution was promulgated. Initially, on December 24, 1971, Bhutto announced formation of a Presidential Cabinet, saying that 'the President and CMLA is the Head of the cabinet and will hold portfolios of the 'ministries of Foreign Affairs, Defence, Interior and Provincial Cooperation'. That was meant to be a 'temporary arrangement'.³

It is true that Bhutto had inherited a frustrating legacy. Yet, his style of functioning could be evaluated by his policies and actions. Bhutto persisted with the martial law, primarily to deter his political opponents. He realized that despite commanding support of 88 members in a House of 144, the opposition, comprising the remaining 56 members, could create enough trouble for him. Bhutto also delayed convening the National Assembly, with a view to deferring issues of immediate concern arising out of Pakistan's dismemberment as well as those of framing a permanent constitution.

Bhutto was initially worried about the challenge from the bureaucracy and the military top-brass. Therefore, he took initial steps to curb the privileged position of the army, bureaucracy and the capitalist class. He replaced suspect officers and installed trust worthy and loyal persons instead. None of these postures could be rated as either democratic or responsible. For some time at least, Bhutto could derive there from the consolation that he was relatively safe and secure to consolidate and extend his own power.

² In his Presidential Address in the National Assembly on July 14, 1972, Bhutto said: "Let us face facts, let us face the truth, if you want to hang me, hang me by all means, but the fact remains that I am not responsible for the separation. I believed in the concept of one Pakistan from the age of fifteen. I fought for it. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was responsible for the separation of Pakistan. If there was a single individual in West Pakistan who was responsible for separation, it was Ayub Khan. Yahya Khan was an idiot. Yahya was a drunkard. The real villain of the Peace was Ayub Khan." National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature Debates, Vol. II, No. 5, July 14, 1972, pp. 694-696.

³ For details see Z.A. Bhutto, Speeches and Statements as the President of Pakistan, Op. cit., p. 18.

Former President Yahya Khan and Chief of Army Staff General Abdul Hamid Khan, were both placed under house arrest on January 8, 1972. A three-member judicial Commission headed by former Chief Justice Harnoodur Rahman, was appointed to investigate into the causes of the military debacle in East Pakistan.⁴ In order to 'prevent professional soldiers from becoming professional politicians', Bhutto sacked and elevated military top-brass at will. Even Lt. General Gul Hassan and Air Marshal Rahim Khan, who were instrumental in the transfer of power to Bhutto, were not spared. Bhutto inducted Lt. General Tikka Khan and Air Marshal Zafar Ahmad Chaudhry to replace the former two.⁵ He overhauled the structure of the armed forces with the exclusive purpose of preventing them to stage another comeback, as well as to ensure their unqualified support for his own regime.

Bhutto followed similar policies regarding the bureaucracy. About 1,300 civil servants were dismissed under Martial Law Regulation No. 114. Several civil servants were demoted or suspended. He curbed privileges and powers of the Civil Service of Pakistan (CSP) and other branches of administration, and took measures to eradicate, what he called, the 'viceregal' system of the bureaucracy.⁶

In order to gain favour of workers, labourers, and lower middle class, Bhutto also announced a series of economic reforms, such as land-ceiling and control over private concerns. Employees were directed to take steps to improve the living standard of workers, and provide them with educational and housing facilities.

⁴ On December 26, 1971, Bhutto appointed the Hamoodur Rahman Commission to inquire into the circumstances which led to Pakistani army's surrender and Pakistan's dismemberment. Throughout his tenure, Bhutto, however, did not allow the publication of the Hamoodur Rahman Commission Report. Obviously he wanted to hide his own role in the military debacle. He always had the logic that the publication of this report would damage the morale and image of the Pakistani Army. After his deposition Bhutto accused General Zia-ul-Haq of not releasing the report. In his book "*If I am Assassinated*", Bhutto wrote "Whenever I held a meeting to consider the publication of report, each one of the senior officers of the armed forces vehemently opposed the idea. In deference to their wishes, and out of respect for the army, I did not release the report despite the enormous pressure from the Public and the opposition parties The military regime is not releasing the report because it is a severe indictment of the armed forces and the military hierarchy." Z. A. Bhutto, *If I am Assassinated*, New Delhi, Vikas, 1979, p. 139.

⁵ In his address to the Nation on March 3, 1972, Bhutto insisted that the interests of the country are supreme. 'We have taken the decision to replace the commander-in-chief of the Pakistan Army in the interest of this country. We want to prevent "Bonapartism" from the Armed Forces and to prevent them from engaging into professional politics.' Z. A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements*, Op. cit., pp. 101-111.

⁶ Bhutto abolished the special 'guarantees' for the civil service of Pakistan which were previously ensured in the 1956 and 1962 constitutions. For details see Robert La Porte, Jr., *Power and Privilege: Influence and Decision-Making in Pakistan*, New Delhi, Vikas, 1976, pp. 117-121.

Meanwhile, opposition parties were mounting pressure for withdrawal of martial law. Bhutto realized that he could not defer that any more. On March 6, 1972, he concluded the 'Tripartite Agreement', involving the Pakistan People's Party, the National Awami Party, and the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Islam to withdraw martial law.⁷

As stated earlier, before the completion of the drafting of a permanent constitution, the government functioned under an Interim Constitution. On April 21, 1972, the Interim Constitution, modeled on the Government of India Act 1935 and the Independence Act of 1947, came into force. Like the 1956 constitution the Interim Constitution declared Pakistan an 'Islamic Republic'. It provided for a presidential system at the centre and parliamentary system at provincial levels.⁸ Bhutto had no other alternative, it seems, because he had to ensure his own political survival. He had witnessed how during 1947-1958, dual authority vested in Governor-General and President had facilitated making and unmaking of Prime Minister.

Under the 'Interim Constitution', Bhutto exercised unlimited authority as the President of Pakistan. That was a violation of his pre-election commitments. The PPP manifesto, however, promised to introduce parliamentary form of government. However, Bhutto followed his predecessors when he appointed a committee to draft a permanent constitution under his chairmanship, which was against democratic norms. Acute differences came up between the government and the opposition parties over some issues (which had haunted the constitution-making process of Pakistan even earlier) during the drafting process of the new constitution. The controversial issues were:

- (i) The nature of the executive;
- (ii) The relationship between the state and religion; and
- (iii) The quantum of regional autonomy.

⁷ Under the 'Tripartite Agreement' on March 6, 1972, Bhutto agreed to lift Martial Law with effect from August 14, 1972, the day when the National Assembly would be convened to consider the draft of a permanent Constitution for Pakistan. He stated that the government of the country would be carried on the basis of an 'Interim Constitution' until the permanent Constitution was framed by the National Assembly. For details see, The Pakistan Times, March 7, 1972.

⁸ The Interim Constitution was a 112-page document comprising 290 clauses and seven schedules. At the federal level there was no provision of dual authority. Bhutto combined the offices of Head of state and Head of government. At the provincial level there was a provision of dual authority which included the portfolios of Governors and Chief Ministers. For details, refer to The Interim Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1972. Karachi, The Manager of Publications, Government of Pakistan, 1972.

Rightist 'Islam Pasand' parties, like 'Jamaat-a-Islami' 'Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Islam' and other conservative elements were anxious to protect the so-called values of 'the land of the pure', by incorporating adequate Islamic provisions in the new constitution. Leftists and radicals, on the other hand, insisted upon a constitution based on the ideals of parliamentary democracy and socialism, as promised in PPP's (1970) election manifesto. The constitution-making phase also witnessed intra-party differences in the ruling PPP. On October 6, 1972, the Law and Parliamentary Affairs Minister, Mahmud Ali Kasuri, submitted his resignation, as a sequel to his differences with Bhutto on the 'basic aspects' of the proposed constitution. Bhutto wanted to have a modified version of parliamentary system, providing unchallenged powers to the chief executive. Mahmud Ali Kasuri was insistent upon an 'unqualified parliamentary system' based on the Westminster model. Bhutto accepted Kasuri's resignation and asked him to quit the constitution-drafting committee as well as the National Assembly.⁹ Subsequently, Kasuri was expelled from the PPP in February 1973. Another prominent PPP leader Mairaj Mohammad Khan (minister of state for Political Affairs), also resigned on October 13, 1972, on account of differences with Bhutto's policies on labour and political affairs.¹⁰

In spite of the intra-party dissensions, Bhutto succeeded in gaining consensus of different political parties at the 'All-Party constitutional conference' held at Rawalpindi on October 20, 1972.¹¹ The constitution Committee of the National Assembly completed the draft of a permanent constitution and formally submitted it to the Constituent Assembly on December 31, 1972.¹² The draft of the constitution was, however, a modified version of the agreement arrived at by the All-Party (October 20, 1972) Conference. Bhutto introduced certain amendments in the draft of the constitution making the office of the Prime Minister relatively more powerful in violation of parliamentary norms. That invited criticism from the opposition parties. Khan Abdul Wall Khan, president

⁹ The Pakistan Times, October 7, 1972.

¹⁰ Dawn, October 14, 1972.

¹¹ The major points of agreement on the draft Constitution were
(i) a federal parliamentary system with Prime Minister as the chief executive, responsible to the National Assembly;
(ii) President to be titular head;
(iii) bi-cameral legislature;
(iv) designation of Pakistan as the 'Islamic Republic of Pakistan'; and,
(v) incorporation of two lists, 'federal' and 'concurrent' and all residuary powers resting with the provinces. —Dawn, October 21, 1972.

¹² For details, see Official Report of National Assembly (Constitution-making) Debates, Vol. II, Nos. 1-10, December 31, 1972. pp. 1-200.

of the NAP and leader of the opposition in the National Assembly, accused Bhutto of being a 'counter revolutionary' and castigated him as 'Adolf Bhutto' for following a fascist course.¹³ Protesting against Bhutto's authoritarian tactics, opposition parties observed 'Black Friday' on March 23, 1973 and gave a call for the boycott of the National Assembly.¹⁴ The opposition parties insisted upon introduction of genuine parliamentary democracy in Pakistan.

It might be recalled that the constitutional history of Pakistan is a reflection of all the peculiarities and contradictions of its socio-economic and political developments since independence, for more than a quarter of a century. The disagreement and conflict over specific formulations in various drafts of the constitutions which went on in the legislative bodies often reflected an expression of the clash between the vital interests of the major social groups in Pakistan.¹⁵

Despite controversies and conflicts, Bhutto ultimately succeeded in securing adequate support for approval of the new constitution by the National Assembly on April 10, 1973. In a House of 144 members, the constitution was approved by 125 votes out of 128 present and voting. Surprisingly, the voting pattern was overwhelming in favour of Bhutto and gave the lie to the potential of the opposition. On August 13, 1973, Bhutto assumed the Prime Minister's office and the new Constitution came into force on August 14, 1973.¹⁶

During the transition phase, Bhutto was preoccupied with consolidating and extending the influence of the ruling PPP. He exercised unlimited powers as the CMLA even when he did not belong to the armed forces. Subsequently, his powers were further enhanced on his assuming the office of the President. As President of Pakistan under the interim constitution, Bhutto exercised almost ultimate powers. He did not permit the democratically elected NAP-JUI coalition to form provincial governments in the NWFP and Baluchistan till mid-April, 1972. The NAP-JUI coalition was allowed to form provincial government after persistent pressures by the opposition parties. However, within less than a year,

¹³ See, Asian Recorder, 25 November-1 December, 1972.

¹⁴ The Pakistan Times, March 28, 1972.

¹⁵ See Y.V. Gankovsky and V.N. Moskalenko, The Three Constitutions of Pakistan, Lahore, People's Publishing House, 1978, p. 156.

¹⁶ Bhutto's constitution (1973) was the third permanent constitution in, till then, Pakistan's twenty-six years of crisis ridden political existence. The new constitution contained 280 Articles arranged in 121 parts and six schedules. The constitution provided for a parliamentary-federal form of government. However, after Bhutto's deposition from power, General Zia-ul-Haq suspended the 1973 constitution and promulgated martial law once again. For details see, The Constitution (1973) of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Karachi, Manager of Publications, Government of Pakistan, 1973.

Bhutto dismissed the NAP-Jul governments in Baluchistan and the NWFP and imposed direct central rule in February 1973, it seems that during the transition phase, Bhutto concentrated chiefly on safeguarding and ensuring his own political sustenance. The transition period did not give any assuring instance to prove Bhutto's claim of being a democrat. He wanted to retain presidential system at the centre, but in view of the mounting pressure from the opposition parties, he agreed to adopt parliamentary system in the new constitution. However, the office of the Prime Minister was made very strong and powerful as against the parliamentary norms of responsibility.

The Parliamentary Phase (August 14, 1973-July 5, 1977)

With the introduction of the new constitution (1973), as Pakistan embarked upon the federal-parliamentary phase. Bhutto Prime Minister-elect, reiterated his concern for popular sovereignty and characterized the introduction of a permanent constitution as a great achievement of the people of Pakistan.¹⁷ However, a close perusal of Bhutto's constitution revealed that there was considerable facade and very little of actual potential for democratic viability. At the stage of drafting, several modifications were made, specifically to strengthen the office of the chief executive. Under the pressure of reactionary, orthodox elements, the new constitution (1973) conceded predominance to Islam.

Article 1 of the new constitution designated the polity as an 'Islamic Republic of Pakistan'. Article 2 declared 'Islam' as the 'state religion'. The 'preamble' and Part IX of the 1973 constitution were also primarily inspired by Islamic categoricals.¹⁸ Significantly, Bhutto's constitution, for the first time, declared Islam as the state religion, which was not specifically mentioned in the two preceding constitutions of 1956 and 1962.

¹⁷ As Prime Minister-elect (on August 12, 1973), Bhutto said: 'Today is undoubtedly a day to be remembered. I will not say that it is a historic day; nor will I say that it is a momentous day. But nevertheless, it can safely be said that on this day this country, which has been many tortuous ups and downs and has witnessed many upheavals, is at least embarking on the road of true democratic stability. The people are supreme. They make and unmake their leaders'. Z. A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements*, April 1, 1973, Karachi, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Department of Films and Publications, 1973, pp. 186-187.

¹⁸ The Preamble of the 1973 constitution revealed a contradiction between spiritual and popular sovereignty 'Whereas sovereignty over the entire universe belongs to Almighty Allah alone, and the authority to be exercised by the people of Pakistan within the limits prescribed by him as a sacred trust There is no clear indication that sovereignty belongs to the people. But the preamble stated: 'Wherein the state exercises its powers and authority through the chosen representatives of the people. The ideals of democracy, freedom, equality, tolerance and social justice were confined in the precincts of Islam. Obviously, ideals of democracy, socialism and secularism were made subservient to Islamic orthodoxy.

It is interesting how Bhutto took care to introduce statutory provisions making the office of the Prime Minister exception-ally powerful. There is no such precedence in any democratic constitution. It might be added that parliamentary constitutions do not make the advice of the Prime Minister binding by statutory dictates, as was done in Pakistan's constitution.

Article 48 (1) of the 1973 constitution stated : 'The President of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan shall act in accordance with the advice of the Prime Minister and such advice shall be binding on him'. The constitution also deviated sharply from the Westminster practice with regard to the provision concerning the 'vote of no-confidence' against the Prime Minister. According to Article 96(2), the resolution for a vote of no-confidence against the Prime Minister could not be passed unless the successor to the Prime Minister was identified and the vote of no-confidence required support of a clear majority of the total membership of the National Assembly. Further, Article 96 (5) provided that the adverse vote of a member belonging to a political party shall be disregarded if the majority of that party did not support the vote of no-confidence. This provision was specifically inducted with a view to countering any dissent or formation of splinter group within the ruling party.¹⁹

Through the provision of constitutional amendments, Bhutto made the executive organ of the government more powerful. For any constitutional amendment in the new constitution, two-thirds majority of the National Assembly and simple majority of the Senate were required. With the unqualified support of members of his party, it was not difficult for Bhutto to ensure passage of amendments. It is interesting that out of a total of six constitutional amendments carried out up to 1976, four extended the scope of the powers of the Executive. Also, constitutional amendments III, IV, V and VI, further consolidated the hold of the ruling PPP.

More specifically, the third constitutional amendment (February 1975) empowered the executive to exercise direct authority to extend the period of emergency without prior approval of the Parliament.²⁰ The fourth constitutional amendment (November, 1975) specified the jurisdiction of the Executive

¹⁹ These statutory provisions were intended to ensure the stability of the government in general and of the office of the chief executive in particular. The President was not given the power to remove the Prime Minister and appoint his successor. In, Britain and India, the Head of the state can exercise his discretion if a situation demands. Even in Japan, when the Diet passes a resolution of 'no-confidence' against the Prime Minister, it is not required to name his successor.

²⁰ In the National Assembly, Bhutto justified the introduction of III Constitutional amendment in order to curb the nondemocratic attitude of the opposition parties. He insisted: End of Emergency lies in the hands of opposition. The opposition has embarked on the path of violence. They themselves ruined the atmosphere of dialogue and cooperation For details see National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, February 12, 1975, Vol. II, No. 16, pp. 282-283.

regarding the issuance of orders for preventive detention.²¹ The fifth Constitutional amendment (September 1976) empowered the parliament to bring amendments in the 'basic structure' of the constitution and curtailed the powers of the judiciary with regard to emergency regulations and fundamental rights.²² The sixth Constitutional amendment '(December 1976) excluded special assistants of the Prime Minister, the Chief Ministers, the members of Law Commission and the members of the Council of Islamic Ideology, from being classified as under the 'Service of Pakistan', so as to enable them to contest elections.²³

It is obvious that Bhutto was not content with having secured a popular majority at the national level, nor was he satisfied with his own political rehabilitation as the chief executive. Quite like his predecessors, Bhutto also wanted to induct constitutional guarantees to perpetuate himself in power and establish one-party hegemony in national politics. In fact, the Constitution of 1973 made it crystal clear that the king-pin of the entire governmental structure, whether it concerned decision-making in the central government or whether it related to matters vis-à-vis the provincial governments, was the Prime Minister.²⁴

Bhutto's endeavor to invest the Prime Minister with almost unlimited powers through statutory inductions shows his concern for ensuring a veneer of legitimacy to his authoritarian powers. It is not surprising, therefore, that he ignored constitutional norms, traditions and practices. Bhutto's quest for personal powers was reinforced by two factors, firstly, his Sindhi origin instilled in him insecurity because he could not entirely trust the powerful Punjabi segments nor could he take their support for granted; secondly, like his predecessor Ayub Khan, Bhutto was convinced that given the social and political

²¹ Bhutto's alibi for the IV amendment was: 'The fourth amendment does not impugn the essentials of the Constitution. None of the amendments have eroded the fundamental structure of the constitution. There is no possibility of confrontation with the judiciary by passing some amendments relating to the laws of detention. The Supreme Court, the highest tribunal of the country, has held that the NAP is an anti-national party and that its members have worked against Pakistan. The trouble is that the opposition has not understood its role as an opposition. It flouts the constitution and it wants to impose its will on the majority party. This is a negation of democracy.' National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, Vol. VII, No. 12, November, 1975, pp. 77-79.

²² Bhutto stated in the National Assembly on September 3, 1976 that 'the fifth Constitutional amendment shall in no way affect the basic features of the constitution. The Parliament has the legal and moral right to bring amendments in See Dawn, September 4, 1976.

²³ The sixth amendment was introduced with the objective of enabling the supporters of the PPP to contest general elections. Bhutto wanted to politicize the career of his advisers and assistants. Dawn, December 23, 1976.

²⁴ Khalid Bin Sayeed, Politics in Pakistan: The Nature and Direction of Change, New York, Praeger Publisher, 1980, pp. 104-105.

heterogeneous conflicts of Pakistan, only a strong centralized government, presided over by an unassailable President or Prime Minister, could keep the country together and united.

And in that quest, it is interesting to note, though Bhutto denounced Ayub in no uncertain terms, often over-stepping expectations of normal courtesy, the former did not basically differ from the latter in seeking opportunities to consolidate political power. In fact, Bhutto did not entirely reject Ayub's model of 'constitutional autocracy'²⁵

Bhutto and the Opposition

Bhutto's quest for survival also extended to his dealings with the opposition parties, which did not escape the consequences of his authoritarian policies.

Undoubtedly a man of overwhelming political ambition, Bhutto tried to seize every opportunity for consolidating power. Throughout his tenure, Bhutto assailed the opposition and held it responsible for Pakistan's disintegration (1971) and for non-implementation of his own radical programme.²⁶

With a view to refurbishing the image of the PPP rule, Bhutto resorted to coercive and repressive tactics towards the opposition instead of following a democratic approach of competitive politics and of implementing policies of welfare and development. It was not merely that he belittled the opposition on specific issues, his whole approach towards the opposition parties was that of intolerance and vilification. He gave adequate evidence of his intolerance of the opposition, and, it seems he had no scruples to make a show of his alleged democratic commitment along with his manifest autocratic core. Through various statutory laws, emergency regulations and constitutional amendments, Bhutto succeeded in suppressing the opposition at the level of national politics. His parliamentary, democratic rule, such as it was, turned out to be not very different from the military authoritarianism of his immediate predecessors, Ayub and Yahya Khan.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 104.

²⁶ In his address to the National Assembly on July 10, 1973, Bhutto condemned the opposition leaders as 'political charlatans' and held them responsible for Pakistan's dismemberment. He said that opposition parties are a conglomeration of individuals who have got together to block the progress of the country. Citing the contradictions of opposition leaders Bhutto said that 'they have a common denominator which is hatred, not only against me; I am but an individual, a passing factor in the scheme of things. There unity lies in hatred, against Quaid-i-Azam, the concept of Pakistan, the struggle of Pakistan'. See, Z.A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements*, April 1, 1973-August 13, 1973, Op. cit., pp. 134-137.

It gives some indication of Bhutto's unpredictability that during the Ayub regime, he consistently assailed the 'combined opposition parties' (COP), for hindering the process of dynamic political change and socio-economic transformation launched by Ayub Khan. Till 1964, Bhutto was an ardent advocate of Ayub Khan and his 'Council Muslim League'. During the Yahya regime, Bhutto assailed Sheikh Mujib's 'Awami League' for Pakistan's disintegration. After assuming power, Bhutto launched a massive vilification campaign against the 'National Awami Party' of Khan Abdul Wali Khan. In his political career, Bhutto was consistent in his attack on the opposition, which was neither warranted nor desirable. It speaks adversely of Bhutto, as a protagonist of democracy, that he considered only PPP's rule as democratic and constitutional.²⁷

Bhutto's justification in this context is revealing. Identifying 'politics' both as an 'art' and as a 'science', Bhutto-considered himself as a 'man of principles' and stated that politics as a science was meant only for those who were qualified and not for mere novices. He treated the opposition parties of Pakistan as no more than 'novices' and incompetent to engage in the art and science of politics.²⁸ Bhutto, time and again, assailed the opposition parties as 'counter revolutionary', 'parochial', and, 'conglomeration of self-seeking and opportunist elements', and characterized his own PPP as the 'revolutionary party with one leadership, one manifesto and one party machinery and with an outstanding record of national performance'²⁹

However, even when Bhutto was ousted and imprisoned, he did not spare the PNA, a combination of opposition political parties, and castigated the martial regime of General Zia as well, for connivance against him and the PPP.³⁰

²⁷ In his speech at a Public meeting in Karachi on January 3, 1973, Bhutto criticized the role of opposition and justified the rule of the PPP. He asserted that 'the country was today blessed with true democracy for the first time after twenty-five years. Ever since the death of Quaid-i-Azam and Quaid-i-Millat, the democracy was never allowed to flourish in this country by these very leaders whose caliber and real intentions stood exposed before the people of Pakistan.' *Z.A. Bhutto, Speeches and Statements*, January 1, 1973-March 31, 1973, Op. cit., p. 10.

²⁸ Bhutto, in his speech at Karachi (January 3, 1973), also said that 'Politics was a science, and meant for those who were qualified and not for novices'. *Ibid.*, p. 10. In a message on Quaid-i-Azam's death anniversary (Sept. 11, 1972, Bhutto. said : 'I am a man of principles But please remember that politics is an art with marry colours but underneath the variety of colours there are certain immutable principles. The immutability of principles must remain without affecting either flexibility or versatility. This is why politics is an art.' See, *Z. A. Bhutto, Speeches and Statements*, July 1, 1972-September 30, 1972, Op. cit., P. 237.

²⁹ See Dawn, May 12, 1976.

³⁰ Bhutto wrote: 'The clutches of law exist only for Pakistan People's Party and its leadership. The only political party that falls under the shadow of law is the PPP. PNA has done no rigging as the white paper shows. PNA is like a snow-white Swan in 'Swan Lake', the delicate, little innocent thing that can do no wrong. The law of absolute Martial Law is limited to PPP and its leaders. Only PPP and its leaders are not

It would, however, be true to say that during his tenure; Bhutto showed overwhelming intolerance towards the National Awami Party of Khan Abdul Wali Khan. Antagonists in politics, Bhutto and Wali Khan, could not discipline their manifest postures and thus vitiated relations between respective parties.

It might be recalled that the NAP, emerged as a potential opposition party at the national level during 1970 general elections. It emerged as the single largest party in provincial assemblies of the NWFP and Baluchistan. Thereafter, Bhutto spared no opportunity to malign Khan Abdul Wali Khan, erode his popular image, and thwart his political objectives. Barring Sheikh Mujib, Khan Abdul Wali Khan was the only political figure capable of challenging Bhutto's leadership. Through propaganda offensive, the federal government extensively publicized NAP as an anti-national force intent upon further disintegration of Pakistan. The government controlled media gave full-fledged publicity to the alleged 'London plot' for yet another dismemberment of Pakistan, assailing NAP leaders' role and alleging their complicity.³¹

There is no authentic evidence, however, to substantiate that accusation.

In February 1973, the federal government dismissed the democratically elected NAP-JUI coalition government in Baluchistan on alleged charges of conspiratorial activities. Two years later, the federal government imposed a ban on the National Awami Party (on February 10, 1975). The Supreme Court of Pakistan upheld the government's action on October 30, 1975. It seems Bhutto was devising ways and means to prevent the NAP from contesting the next general elections with a view to ensuring unchallenged position of the PPP in provinces where it had not secured majority earlier. The NAP leader, Khan Abdul Wali Khan, as leader of opposition in the National Assembly (before the

above the gallows and the lashes, the jails, the fines, the confiscations and disqualifications. Herein lies the lawlessness of the Martial Law'. Z. A. Bhutto, *If I Am Assassinated...* New Delhi, Vikas, 1979, P. 113.

³¹ The issue of the alleged 'London Plan' was also raised in the National Assembly on September 12, 1972. The then Interior Minister Abdul Qaiyum Khan moved a resolution. He said, 'According to reports in *Nawe-i-Waqt* (10-9-1972), which were based on reports of London Times, Akbar Bugti, Ataulah Mengal, Ahmed Nawaz Bugti, Malik Ghulam Jilani, Yusuf Haroon, Mohammad Haroon, Khan Abdul Wali Khan, Zafar Ali Shah gathered in London, I am reading press report, on one pretext or the other, to formulate the plans called the London-Plan, with a view to disintegrate (west) Pakistan into four independent States, to be linked in the shape of confederation which would include Bangladesh also. The confederation would later embrace Afghanistan and Bharat also. After the plan becoming successful, Khan Wali Khan, Bugti, Jilani, Haroon would become governors of NWFP, Baluchistan, Punjab and Sindh, respectively. These leaders reportedly held discussions with Sheikh Mujib and his associates in London and Geneva. These leaders have also allegedly urged Sheikh Mujib to use his influence with India to prevent withdrawal of Indian Forces from Pakistan's occupied areas before September 15, 1972. The National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, September 12, 1972, Vol. 1, No. 22, pp. 124-125.

imposition of ban on the NAP), challenged Bhutto's authoritarian posture and policies, and virtually accused him of violating the norms of parliamentary democracy and federalism. It is true that Khan Wali Khan repeatedly asked for provincial autonomy and reminded Bhutto of similar logic which Bhutto had him-self put across before Sheikh Mujib soon after declaration of 1970 general election results.³²

Bhutto's selective antagonism against political parties had -a discernible pattern. In order to counter the influence of the NAP of Wali Khan, soon after his assumption of power, Bhutto negotiated with anti-NAP and anti-Wali Khan elements. In Baluchistan, Bhutto encouraged pro-Pathan faction of the NAP, led by Abdus Samad Achakzai (also known as Baluchi Gandhi).³³ Similarly, in the NWFP, Bhutto arrived at a compromise with his erstwhile antagonist, Khan Abdul Qaiyum Khan, to counter the challenge of Wali Khan. In a calculated move, Bhutto inducted him into the Federal cabinet as Minister for Home and Frontier Affairs.³⁴

Bhutto tactfully dealt with the Islamic sentiments. With a view to winning over the Islam pasand rightist parties, he included Islamic provisions in the programme of the PPP as well as in the new constitution. The declaration of Ahmadiya sect as a 'non-Muslim minority' (through constitutional II amendment Bill, September 7, 1974) by Bhutto's government, was a step to appease the dominate conservative Islamic sects of Pakistan.

Bhutto continued with his anti-India tirade, especially with regard to the Kashmir issue. In order to show his firm Islamic commitment, he strengthened

³² For instance, in the National Assembly on June 19, 1974, Khan Abdul Wali Khan said 'I would like to remind you the speech of Chairman of the PPP when he was dealing with Sheikh Mujibur Rahman just before that constitutional dead-lock came. He (Bhutto) said: 'Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, although you have a majority in the National Assembly, but because your majority is confined to one province of Pakistan it does not entitle you to rule over the other province without their consent and cooperation.' Now, Mr. Speaker, sir, supposing instead of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman I put Chairman Bhutto and put myself in the shoes of Chairman Bhutto and repeat the very arguments which he used against Sheikh Mujib, where do we stand today? That although you have a majority, not in Pakistan, in whatever is left of Pakistan, but because your majority is confined to one province... Now where do you stand according to your own argument...?' National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, Jun 19, 1974, Vol. IV, No. 18, pp. 597-600.

³³ Baluchi Gandhi, Abdus Samad Khan Achakzai, was a traditional rival of Wali Khan. He was assassinated on December 2, 1973, in a grenade attack. The pro-government media accused Khan Abdul Wali Khan's NAP of assassinating the Baluchi Gandhi. That was Bhutto's strategy to create Ultra-provincial tensions in Baluchistan.

³⁴ It is reported that by encouraging the Muslim League faction Iced by Abdul Qaiyum Khan, Bhutto also aimed at weakening the hold of Muslim League faction led by Pir Mardan Shah of Pagaro, his staunch rival.

Pakistan's relations with Muslim countries. He sought to sustain the rationale of the 'two-nation' theory, even after the emergence of Bangladesh.

Disorganization and parochialism of the opposition parties gave added strength to Bhutto's leadership. Bhutto's PPP became more assertive and powerful in view of the prevailing weaknesses of the opposition parties. Even the joint ventures of the opposition parties could not challenge Bhutto and his PPP substantially. The United Democratic Front³⁵ (UDF March 1973) proved less formidable in countering Bhutto's leadership since it did not provide a purposive orientation to the leadership of the opposition parties. The UDF confined its activities to boycotting of the National Assembly sessions and demanding fresh general elections. After the announcement of the date of general elections, the constituent parties of the UDF³⁶ formed a new alliance known as the Pakistan National Alliance (PNA). The PNA also failed to provide an alternative to Bhutto's leadership. Like the erstwhile UDF, the PNA lacked unity and positive orientation.³⁷ On the whole the leadership of the opposition parties failed to establish popular trust and support in Pakistan. The opposition parties did not rise above condemning Bhutto's make-shift democratic measures and repressive approach.³⁸ Thus, the common weaknesses of the opposition parties led to the hegemony of the PPP in Pakistan.

Bhutto and the Pakistan People's Party

Though the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) attained popular and dominant position in the political system of Pakistan, it, however, remained exclusively identified with Bhutto's personal quest for absolute power. The PPP instead of becoming a cadre party based on viable ideology and organization revolved exclusively around, Bhutto's charisma. The socialistic and reformatory pronouncements of the PPP could not be implemented owing to the numerical

³⁵ In March 1973, the eight opposition parties, NAP, JUI, JUP, Janiaat-e-Islam, PDP, PML (Pagora), Khaksar Tehrik and Muslim Conference formed a joint front, namely, the United Democratic Front.

³⁶ After the imposition of ban on the NAP, a newly formed party the 'National Democratic Party' headed by Sherbaz Mazari assumed the role on behalf of the NAP in the activities of the UDF.

³⁷ The Tehrik-i-Istiqlal of Air Marshal Asghar Khan, which remained outside the UDF, also joined the PNA.

³⁸ In this context, the following is a succinct analysis 'On the whole in Pakistan, the ruling elite instead of heeding and understanding opposition view-point have always tried to suppress it with iron hand. The opposition failed to achieve its real status in the absence of general elections. Another factor was recurrence of political crises in the country perpetually. Many years were wasted on the debate whether there should be a parliamentary or presidential form of government, whether constitution should be theocratic or secular, whether electorate should be joint or separate. Whatever was achieved in one period was lost in the next. Every regime tried to start afresh. Not a single party could attain the real national stature.' See, Public Opinion Trends and Analyses, (POT), Pakistan Series, June 21, 1976.

strength of conservative elements in the PPP and Bhutto's intolerance of criticism of his radical association. As Bhutto consolidated his power, infighting in the PPP became more acute. Gradually Bhutto took measures to ousting radical members (most of them were the founder members) of the PPP, and permitted massive entry of reactionary and feudal elements. He seems to have been motivated by the exclusive consideration of ensuring his own unchallenged position in the PPP. He came to look upon the PPP as an institutional prop to legitimize his quest for personal power.

(i) The Formative Phase of the PPP and Bhutto's Leadership (1967-1970)

The Pakistan People's Party was a product of crisis. After his dissociation with the Ayub regime, Bhutto had no alternative but to form a party of his own. It seems, Bhutto did not have look for the basic ingredients of ideological formulations in the sense that Bhutto was intent upon offering an entirely different image and seemingly a better alternative than those for which the Ayub regime was discredited.

Bhutto was aware of the economic crisis faced by the common-man and strains upon the political system. He thought it opportune to appeal to the masses on radical and progressive lines. But it was difficult for Bhutto to delink himself from his feudal – aristocratic past, and yet he had no choice but to speak in the radical idiom. During the period of his political wilderness, he had decided to present himself before the common-man as a savior, dissociating himself from the rigid postures and orthodox ways of political parties of the day. He also realized that the disarray of political leadership presented to him an opportunity he could utilize. Displaying considerable self-confidence, at times even bravado, and also opportunism, Bhutto took maximum advantage of the political flux then prevalent, and with the founding of the PPP, he sought to project a national alternative.³⁹

The Pakistan People's Party⁴⁰ was formed at the house of Mubashir Hassan, a left-wing supporter of Bhutto, on November 30, 1967. The party ideology was

³⁹ Bhutto's first public indication of his intention to form a new party was at a press conference in Hyderabad (Sindh) on September 16, 1967 at the home of his friend Mir Rasul Buksh Talpur. He did not indicate on what lines the party would be organised or the type of the programme except that it would be 'progressive'. For Details see, Salmaan Taseer, Bhutto: A Political Biography, New Delhi, Vikas, 1980, p. 86.

⁴⁰ The name of the party was chosen after a long discussion. Three names were proposed, 'People's Progressive Party', 'People's Party', and, 'Socialist Party of Pakistan'. Finally, the name Pakistan People's Party was chosen. It might be recalled that the same name was previously chosen by the Red Shirt Party leader, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, for his party.

summed up thus: 'Islam is our faith, Democracy is our polity, Socialism is our economic creed, all power to the people.'

The foundation documents of the PPP were not Bhutto's own creation. They were formulated in collaboration with leftist members like J.A. Rahim, Mubashir Hassan and Hanif Ramay. But after consolidating his power, Bhutto expelled all these members from the PPP.

In its initial phase, the PPP continued to show a tilt towards the left. Enchanted by Bhutto's radical pronouncement, a large number of socialists and Marxists of various hues joined the PPP. The common objective of the leftists was to dislodge Ayub Khan from power. After Ayub's fall, intra-party differences came up in the PPP on the issue of contesting the general elections. The ultra-leftist members, like Mairaj Muhammad Khan, strongly opposed the issue of contesting the general election announced by the new military regime of General Yahya Khan. The leftist hard core gave the argument that for a revolutionary party, it was ideologically inconsistent to contest a general election in a bourgeois military regime. Since Bhutto's main objective was to contest the general election, he supported the view point of the more moderate forces in the party. He got full-fledged support from rightist members of the PPP to contest the general elections. The intra-party differences of the PPP became more apparent at the Hala Conference held on July 1, 1970.⁴¹

On the organizational front, the PPP could not claim ideological clarity in the accepted sense because it did not truly represent the class which it sought to elevate and, there-fore, it could also not be the decisive vehicle to be the savior of the downtrodden. It was inevitable that the PPP turned out to be yet another forum of power seekers. Bhutto might have performed a role that was 'evangelical' and not essentially 'organizational'⁴² He did not pay heed to building a cadre base of the PPP.

In view of the mounting criticism of *Ulema* and right-wing parties during the 1970 general elections, Bhutto diluted PPP's original ideology of 'Socialism' and identified it as 'Islamic Socialism' in the (1970) election manifesto of the PPP.⁴³

⁴¹ See, Salmaan Taseer, Op. cit., pp. 91-92.

⁴² Ibid., p. 93.

⁴³ The Election Manifesto of the PPP (1970) identified the basic objectives 'The ultimate objective of the party's policy is the attainment of a classless society, which is possible only through Socialism in our time. This means true equality of the citizens, fraternity under the rule of Democracy in an order based on economic and Social Justice. These aims follow from the political and social ethics of Islam. The party thus strives to put in practice the noble ideas of the Muslim faith.' The Election (1970) Manifesto of Pakistan People's Party, Karachi, Pakistan People's Party Publications, 1970, p. 13.

The terms 'Islami Musawaat' and 'Musawaat-i-Mohanimadi' were specifically added for realization of socialist economy and a social order, based on justice, fraternity and equality. Countering the allegation of rightwing parties that 'Socialism Kufr Hal' (Socialism is anti-Islamic), Bhutto cited Quaid-i-Azam's views on Islamic Socialism and tried to show similarity between the ideals of 'Islam' and 'Socialism'. Bhutto reiterated that Socialism is not antithetical to 'Koranic' laws, because Islam is basically a socio-economic Movement. Owing to his Islamic pronouncements, Bhutto succeeded in defeating the rightist and reactionary parties in 1970 general elections.

(ii) The Power Phase of the PPP (1971-1977) and Bhutto's Style of Functioning

It might be recalled that Bhutto's PPP, after winning the 1970 general election, repeated the tactics employed by the Muslim League in 1937. After the 1937 provincial elections (in undivided India), the Muslim League refused to accept the genuineness of majority won by the Congress party and its right to form the government. Similarly, Bhutto's decision to stay away from the National Assembly was repetition of Muslim League's refusal to participate in the Indian Constituent Assembly in 1946-1947.⁴⁴ How Bhutto finally succeeded in preventing Sheikh Mujib and his party from positions of power is now part of history. Once in power, Bhutto acknowledged his gratitude to the party for placing him at the helm of affairs.⁴⁵ However, Bhutto's posture underwent almost instant transformation, and by 1973 (after the assumption of Prime Ministership), the PPP was relegated to secondary importance whereas Bhutto's charismatic personality came to be glorified and idolized. Bhutto's infinite ambition and intolerance for criticism grew in intensity.

Throughout his tenure Bhutto showed little concern for institutionalizing the party process. Growing trends of personality-cult and authoritarianism made it obvious that Bhutto was more concerned with short-term gains rather than achieving long-term objectives of party-building. His pronouncements bearing upon socialistic and democratic society became secondary in the operational sphere. As stated earlier also, his associates and founder-members of the party were forced to quit because they did not approve dilution of ideological

⁴⁴ Dilip Mukherjee, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto: Quest for Power. New Delhi, Vikas, 1972, p. 114. Bhutto subsequently reflected upon these events and confessed that once the National Assembly session was held (on March 3, 1971) the initiative would have passed entirely into the hands of the 'Awami League'. For details, refer to Z.A. Bhutto, The Great Tragedy, Karachi, Pakistan People's Party Publications, 1971, pp. 16-23.

⁴⁵ In a speech in the National Assembly on July 14, 1972, Bhutto said: 'I would tell my party-men that I am beholden to them. They have put me in this place. My party made me. I am beholden to the party. The Party is not beholden to me.' See, Z.A. Bhutto: Speeches and Statements, July 1972-September 30, 1972, Op. cit., p. 21.

formulations and also did not become party to Bhutto's personalized style of functioning. The unfortunate stance gradually emerged as Bhutto often stated at party meetings 'I am the people's party and they are all my creatures.'⁴⁶ Thus, Bhutto's domination over the party exceeded that of Jinnah's over the Muslim League.

As seen earlier, Bhutto failed to carry with him the radical elements within the PPP. The radicals were apprehensive of Bhutto's inclusion of reactionary forces in the party and in the government. They assailed Bhutto's apathetic attitude towards loyal PPP workers. There were rumblings against Bhutto's holding of two offices simultaneously, that of the head of the government and chairman of the party. Similarly, despite Bhutto's show of Islamic fervor, the rightist elements continued to suspect him and never took his avowed Islamic invocations seriously.

It might be recalled that disenchantment with Bhutto's dictatorial and authoritarian ways had begun to surface at the beginning of the 1970 general election campaign. Maulana Nuruzzman, an active PPP leader from Dacca, was the first among those expelled from party membership for criticism of the party chairman's dictatorial functioning.⁴⁷ After the 1970 general elections, Ahmad Raza Kasuri revolted against Bhutto's decision to stay away from the National Assembly session scheduled for March 3, 1971, in Dacca, because he considered it to be a posture at cross-purposes with avowed objectives of the PPP. A militant socialist from Lyalipur, Mukhtar Rana, who was also an active labour leader, apprehended 'fascism' within the party. He lost his National Assembly seat in April 1972 after having been sentenced for five years under martial law regulations. Mahmud Ali Kasuri was expelled from the PPP in February, 1973 for criticizing Bhutto's authoritarian postures. He was vice-chairman of the PPP, leader of the House, and federal Law Minister.⁴⁸

Similarly, Mairaj-Mohammad Khan, a Student leader of Karachi, who represented the ultra-leftist segment of the PPP, expressed his disenchantment with Bhutto, specifically, on socio-economic and political policies. He was expelled from the PPP in October 1972. Later, other founder members of the PPP,

⁴⁶ Quoted in Lawrence Ziring, 'Pakistan A Political Perspective', Asian Survey, July 1975, Vol. XV, No. 7, p. 632.

⁴⁷ *Pakistan Observer*, February 2, 1970.

⁴⁸ Kasuri submitted his resignation from the Constitution Drafting Committee in October 1972, owing to differences with Bhutto. Kasuri favored a truly parliamentary constitution, whereas Bhutto was insistent upon making the office of the Prime Minister stronger through a specific provision of the vote of 'no-confidence' against the Prime Minister. Kasuri accused Bhutto of going back on the Manifesto of the PPP.

J.A. Rahim, Khurshid Hasan Mir, Ghulam Mustafa Khar,⁴⁹ and Hanif Ramay, were also expelled from the party. Their crime was that they spoke up against Bhutto's dubious intentions and pronouncements. They were critical of Bhutto's swing towards excessive and unbearable authoritarian ways. They called Bhutto a 'civilian dictator', intent upon right-wing consortium.⁵⁰ They criticized Bhutto's manifest proclivity to compromise, at the cost of principles, for instance, with Jamaat-e-Islami and Pakistan Muslim League led by Khan Abdul Qaiyum Khan.⁵¹ By the end of 1974, the PPP had come to be an organization in which orthodox and conservative elements had gained prominence, consequent upon the expulsion of leftist and radical elements by virtual immobilization of those who still remained within the party whereas rightist and reactionary elements were patronized by Bhutto.⁵²

In January 1975, Bhutto called a convention to 'reorganize' the structure of the PPP on ideological lines. However, PPP's organizational ambivalence persisted owing to Bhutto's mounting personalism in party affairs. On one pretext or the other, Bhutto continued to avoid the issue of holding party elections. His plea was that party elections should be held only after the general election.

Practically, the whole of 1976 was devoted to making preparations for the general elections. Bhutto was looking for alibis that could stick, so as to prove his own innocence. In view of the mounting criticism, Bhutto explained that party members adopting an overly critical posture causing split and disharmony

⁴⁹ Among these members, Ghulam Mustafa Khar's case was exceptional. Khar was a chief advocate of rightist forces within the PPP. He was expelled from the PPP (in 1975) owing to his criticism of Bhutto's nationalization policy. However, Khar again joined Bhutto's PPP in 1977. He announced his full-fledged support to Bhutto during PPP-PNA confrontation.

⁵⁰ *ALFATAH*, (August 9, 1974) published in interview of Khurshid Hasan Mir, then Pakistan's minister for communications and deputy secretary general of the PPP, which deplored the ascendant role of 'rightist exploiters' in the affairs of the ruling PPP, as a result of which the ruling party had ceased to be a live organ and had to look up to Bhutto for decisions at all levels. 'The party having shed its Socialistic character, lost its revolutionary elan also, and, enabled the rightists to increase their political influence'. Cited in POT, Pakistan Series, August 12, 1974, p. 460.

⁵¹ For details, see Khalid Bin Sayeed, 'How Radical Is The PPP,' Pacific Affairs, Vol. 48, No. 1, Spring, 1975, pp. 42-60.

⁵² For consolidating his personal and unchallenged authority, Bhutto did not hesitate to expel even those associates who had vindicated their commitment to the cause of the PPP. These were the same men, of proven fidelity, who extended unqualified support to Bhutto in his anti-Ayub and anti-Mujib crusades. These were the persons, who gave meaningful enunciations of radical socialistic programme incorporated in the PPP foundation documents. However, Bhutto did not tolerate these elements, firstly, because he was himself neither a committed radical nor a socialistic; secondly, he suspected these elements in the larger context of the power game. Nevertheless, even if Bhutto personally gained some reprieve by ousting these elements, the PPP ultimately lost its radical and socialist image and there is no doubt that also depleted the ranks of party supporters and followers.

within the party ranks, could be classified thus: Among the first type were those who did not have a clear understanding of the historical processes which brought the people's party manifesto into being. Such elements were liable to be swayed by petty considerations, much to the detriment of principles and party discipline. The second type comprised small landlords whose only purpose was attainment of power. In Bhutto's view, these small land-lords caused maximum damage to the party, creating factions and divisions among party members, identifying some members as 'progressive' and others as 'non-progressive'. The third type comprised 'idealists' who were sincere in their motives but were inexperienced and were in a hurry. They wanted to do everything in capsulated form, as it were, by forcing the pace of change. They were not aware of the realities of adjustment strategy.⁵³

Bhutto, however, continued to believe that it would be possible to reorganize the PPP by enforcing discipline and organizational viability.⁵⁴ He launched a massive drive for reorganization of the party at central, provincial, district and tehsil levels. As if that could transform the image of the party, membership of the party was thrown open to all, and opportunistic, reactionary and obscurantist forces joined the PPP with relative ease, motivated primarily by possibilities of obtaining the PPP ticket to contest elections. The influx of members with hybrid ideologies throughout 1976, created additional problems, adversely affecting the party's organizational structure. A large number of party tickets for the 1977 general election were given to the new recruits with local influence, such as Sardar Shaukat Hayat Khan, Mian Sallahudin and Nur Hayat Noon among many others.⁵⁵

Though Bhutto's PPP got sweeping electoral victory in March 1977 general elections, it lost the esteem and faith of the people of Pakistan. The opposition parties alleged that the PPP had indulged in massive rigging. They refused to accept the legitimacy of the party's electoral victory. After prolonged confrontation between the PPP and the opposition parties, Bhutto was deposed from power by the military on July 5, 1977. Those who had hastened to join the PPP during 1976, with equal haste came out of its fold and joined the *Junta*.

⁵³ See, Satish Kumar, 'Bhutto Reorganize Party,' The Hindustan Times, February 2, 1976.

⁵⁴ Addressing a party meeting at Muzaffarabad on April 29, 1976, Bhutto said: 'I want the Pakistan People's Party to be reorganized on sound and solid foundations with complete discipline in its ranks. Dawn, April 30, 1976.

⁵⁵ See, Salmaan Taseer, Op. cit., pp. 158-159.

In sum, Bhutto's leadership at the national level presents an amalgam of achievements, missed opportunities and unrealized ambitions. Assuming the reins of power after the dismemberment of Pakistan in an atmosphere of national humiliation by the surrender of armed forces in the eastern sector, with the political system virtually in shambles and the country reeling under socio-economic crises of variety, Bhutto faced the unenviable task of rehabilitation of Pakistan's identity. Gradually, he enforced measures to ensure a semblance of political stability, perhaps never before so acutely endangered. Revival of national morale and socio-economic recovery became constant priorities in his pronouncements and policies. There was undoubtedly a time when people came to think of Bhutto as a savior and nation-builder next only to M.A. Jinnah. Bhutto succeeded in being regarded by ever growing numbers of citizens as a leader of considerable charisma. His public meetings, held all over the country, and his pronouncements peppered with emotional exhortations, became widely popular. None would deny that Bhutto was the first national leader to have given Pakistan a parliamentary constitution, having secured consensus of all the political parties. He introduced the people to the efficacy of the electoral process leading to legitimacy of popular, representative institutions. And in that process of rehabilitating the supremacy of civilian government, he clearly devised a subsidiary, not equal, role for the armed forces and the bureaucracy, both the latter in preceding decades having succeeded in intruding in the political process of the country.

But Bhutto's difficulties also emanated from his apparently positive perspective and pronouncements. The pretentious aspects of his pronouncements for nation-building and national integration, participatory and responsible democracy, Islamic Socialism and just socio-economic order, were gradually unfolded. So long as these pronouncements did not adversely affect his own plans for political sustenance, his loud advocacy of each became a habit with him. Also, he did not hesitate to interpret each of these in a manner conducive to his own political sustenance it is significant that Bhutto did not revoke the state of emergency and, for all practical purposes, he enjoyed rare perquisites of power. In the absence of hardcore institutional efforts, national integration remained a mere slogan. He did purge the armed forces and the bureaucracy, but that was primarily an index of his own predilection rather than a principled step for the better. As a consequence, neither the armed forces nor the bureaucracy came under his complete control.

During the Bhutto regime, militarization of civilians and 'formation of (para) military units like Federal Security Force, -the National Guard (composed of Mujahids), and *Janbaz*-forces, was undertaken, specifically for consolidation of the PPP's rule. Bhutto's rationale was to foster a closer liaison between civilians

and the armed forces. His dream, in addition to the formation of Pakistan People's Party, was to create what be called a 'people's army'.

It has been pointed out earlier how Bhutto antagonized the radicals and the obscurantists both, not only by a 'personified' political leadership but also because each saw through the -vener of his pronouncements. In fact, 'Bhuttoism' became the dominant ideology and Bhutto's claims to indispensability -could hardly win friends. Bhutto's last book, *If am Assassinated*, which he wrote in the death cell, reveals his acute concern for his own security, survival and romantic political ideals. Among several others such extracts, the following is self explanatory in this context

'I was born to make a nation, to serve people, to over come an impending doom. I was not born to wither away in a death cell and to mount the gallows to fulfill the vindictive, lust of an ungrateful and treacherous man. I was not born to be humiliated and insulted by a barbaric and spiteful clique.'⁵⁶

Problems adversely affecting Bhutto's leadership were also inherent in the founding of the PPP, in his unthinking parting. of ways with reliable associates, and, in converting the party into a vehicle of his political aspirations and populist propaganda.

It seems that with the rising tide of his popularity, Bhutto ignored the thrust of his own pronouncements. He drifted into making apparently harmless assertions which did not take long to have assumed unnecessarily authoritarian context. His perspective of national politics was submerged in his assumed infallibility as well as indispensability. As he came to realize the despair and helplessness of parties and leaders in the opposition, he did not hesitate to enforce restrictions and curbs over them. Normal and healthy political process, thus, was vitiated to that extent. With foresight and imagination, Bhutto could have established an understanding with the opposition parties based on democratic norms. It is surprising that he did not realize the efficacy of granting recognition to the opposition, such as it was. Perhaps in the name of expediency, he could have kept the leaders of the opposition patties in good humor instead of antagonizing them for reasons, whether valid or not so valid.

It is astonishing that Bhutto failed to learn a lesson from Pakistan's recent political history that whenever politicians failed to manage the political process, the bureaucracy and the armed forces only readily set them aside and filled in the breach in the name of systemic sustenance. In the proportion that.

⁵⁶ Z.A. Bhutto, *'If I am Assassinated . . .'* New Delhi, Vikas, 1979, pp. 142-143.

Bhutto ignored to fulfill his obligations, his dependence on the bureaucracy and the armed forces increased and much as he assumed that he was in complete command, the bureaucracy and the armed forces were conniving to displace him, the only political leader to have devised for Pakistan a democratic political process. That Bhutto's charisma failed to save him, exposed the myth of charismatic leadership.

It seems Bhutto could not live up to his democratic pronouncements, even pertaining to the freedom of the media and the press. He, thus, gradually lost vital opportunity to feel and assess the pulse of the people. Without that sort of a feed-back continuum, Bhutto himself was the primary sufferer. With dissidence within the PPP assuming uncomfortable dimensions and the opposition somehow closing ranks for a decisive onslaught, it was inevitable that those in the bureaucracy and the armed forces itching to challenge Bhutto's authority, gathered courage and ousted him, compounding Bhutto's own lapses and miscalculations. Thus the democratic alternative offered by Bhutto's leadership was subverted.

Bhutto's Leadership and the Regional Level Politics

Despite overwhelming claims for the fruition of the 'two-nation' theory, the founding of Pakistan did not dilute the divisive potential of regional diversities. Mohammad Ali Jinnah's declaration to build a secular and viable Pakistani nation also proved ineffective in the decades to come.¹ The two-nation theory might have served the limited purpose of euphoric sustenance of *jehad* for a Muslim homeland, but whether it is likely to be a reliable enough base conducive to fostering and consolidating national stability and integration, needs careful scrutiny.

However, in spite of the Islamic appeal inherent in the two-nation theory, it could neither resolve regional tensions and aberrations nor ensure systemic integrity which manifested in the emergence of Bangladesh. Part of the explanation for regional proclivities could be ascribed to sustained apathy and unconcern for regional susceptibilities, expectations and genuine grievances. For well over three decades now, the constituent provinces of truncated Pakistan, comprising Punjabis, Sindhis, Pashtoons and Baluchis, expected the central leadership to safeguard and foster their socio-cultural and ethnic characteristics. Political leadership in Pakistan, however, refused to accept the writing on the wall that Islam alone was neither competent nor adequate to weld the regional pluralities into an integrated society, till the Bangladesh imbroglio vindicated the primacy of regional autonomy.

It is doubtful if the obvious lessons from Pakistan's dismemberment have been learnt by the ruling elite of Pakistan. The national leadership continues to assert that in Islamic polity, there is no geographical, racial, linguistic, ethnic and communal distinction. All followers of Islam are integrated and indivisible. The Islamic concept of nationalism is founded on 'one God', 'one leader' and 'one centre of power.'² However, the logic does not seem to have convinced the

¹ The founder of Pakistan, M.A. Jinnah, in his first address to the Constituent Assembly stated: '...You will find that in course of time Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims not in the religious sense, because that is personal faith of each individual, but in the Political sense as Citizens of the state.' See, Constituent Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, August 11, 1947, Vol. I, No. 2, PP. 18-20.

² For bases of Pakistani nationalism, see, Shafique Ali Khan, Two Nation Theory: As a Concept, Strategy and Ideology, Hyderabad (Sindh), Markez-i-Shaoor-o-Adab, 1973, pp. 1-15.

respective regional leaders of Pakistan. They continue to reject the 'supra-natural' and spiritual theory of Pakistani nationalism and aspire for a clear recognition of their multi-national, multi-ethnic and multi-lingual existence, within the over-all frame-work of Pakistani nationalism.³ The regional leaders also believe that the rulers of Pakistan have confused nationalism of Pakistan with supremacy of religion. Under the garb of religion it is held that the ruling elite went to maintain their unquestioned and unchallenged authority. The regionalists concede that they did opt for Pakistan out of religious commitments but they can not renounce their socio-cultural bases and historical and tribal antecedents under the banner of Islamic categorical. It is argued that on the basis of religion, Pakistan attained 'state-hood', but it has yet to attain a truly national identity.

The issue of national identity of Pakistan has been identified as a complex problem since its inception in 1947. Like Israel, it was the only other state where religion played a crucial role in its creation, but while Judaism has helped integrate the multi-ethnic Jewish communities immigrating to the Israeli state, Islam failed to integrate the fissiparous tendencies of the state of Pakistan.⁴ The crucial dilemma in this context remains unresolved.

The National leadership has consistently identified Pakistan as an 'ideological state', but there is no concrete content therein of political ideology, apart from Islam. Religion can not be taken for granted as the decisive national ideology of Pakistan.⁵ The advocates of 'four-nationality' concept (in present Pakistan) Ghaus Bux Bizenjo, Khan Abdul Wall Khan and others, refer to the 'two-nation' theory as the theory of the dominant ruling class of Pakistan. Specifically, the Punjabi elite continue to harp on the 'two-nation' theory, primarily for safeguarding their supreme position in the totality of the systemic frame-work. It was for that reason also that since its inception, certain elements have been insisting upon declaring Pakistan an 'Islamic State'. The controversy of Islamic state was debated in all the three Constituent Assemblies. The three constitutions (1956, 1962, and 1973) of Pakistan gave explicit re-cognition to Islam. Statutory declaration, however, failed to grant legitimacy to the issue of Islamic state and the nation. The debate between the liberal multi-nationality theorists and the

³ For details, see M.M. Qureshi, —Pakistani Nationalism Reconsidered, Pacific Affairs. Winter 1972-73, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 556-572.

⁴ Asaf Hussain, 'Ethnicity, National Identity and Praetorianism: The Case of Pakistan', Asian Survey, October 1976, Vol. XVI, No. 10, pp. 919-930.

⁵ For a comprehensive and comparative study of religion and politics in the context of South Asia See, Donald Eugene Smith (ed.), South Asian Politics and Religion, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1966. For Pakistan's context, see, part III, pp. 337-428.

orthodox Islamic fundamentalists on the issue of religion and politics continues to threaten the very rationale of Pakistani nationalism. Bhutto could not positively resolve the issue of regionalism versus national integration. In the more recent past, Zia-ul-Haq's sudden enthusiasm for Islamic fundamentalism could not be discerned as emanating from a popular mandate for such a revivalist policy affecting the nature and operation of the political system.

There is an inherent contradiction in the Islamic concept of nationalism because it is left deliberately vague whether the follower of Islam should give priority to religious loyalty or loyalty to the nation. According to Islamic spiritual theory, Islam presupposes a 'world government', transcending all petty differences and barriers of life, enabling its followers to cooperate in a spirit of brotherhood and natural trust rather than antagonistic competition. If one scrupulously follows this theory, the national identity of a citizen of Pakistan fluctuates between his religious faith and his commitment to the state and to the nation. If a citizen considers himself to be a Muslim first and Pakistani thereafter, he transcends national loyalties in favour of Pan-Islamism. If he claims to be a Pakistani first and Muslim thereafter, his faith gets minimized. Also, if, he treats himself as a Pakistani, naturally he could be a Punjabi, Sindhi, Baluchi, Pashtoon or a Muluulir (immigrant Pakistani). There is no end to a discussion on this score.

After Pakistan's creation, various regional entities faced this dilemma of national identity. Is a person living in Pakistan a Muslim first, Pakistani next, or, Punjabi, Baluchi, Pashtoon and Sindhi thereafter? The ruling elite, as noted earlier, always held, for obvious reasons, that every citizen of Pakistan is a Muslim first.⁶ The diverse regional entities of Pakistan, on the other hand, considered their ethnic and cultural identity as primary. While, they did not deny their being Pakistanis, they asked for specific recognition of their socio-cultural identity and economic priorities.

Z.A. Bhutto, like his predecessors, faced the regional challenge but failed to resolve the crisis of national identity and regional integration. In fact, his tenure witnessed, more than ever before, a growing trend of inter and intra-regional challenge to his leadership. Like his predecessors, Bhutto thought it safer to maintain status quo in that regard. He found it difficult to convince citizens of the two under-developed provinces of Pakistan—the North 'West Frontier Province (NWFP) and Baluchistan—that he was as solicitous for their welfare and development as lie should be. However, events proved that Bhutto's word was never taken seriously in the aforesaid provinces and citizens of the aforesaid

⁶ The rulers of Pakistan adhered to the religious interpretation of nationalism. According to Islamic theory, there can be no distinction and prejudice among the Muslims on the basis of race, cast, class, country, continent, language, colour and geographical location. See, Shafique Ali Khan, *Op.cit.*, p. 14.

provinces apparently did not hide their dissatisfaction and despair. They also alleged that the two prosperous provinces, the Punjab and Sindh, gained maximum favour from Bhutto, owing to the electoral victory gained by the Pakistan People's Party in those provinces.

A close study reveals inbuilt contradictions in Bhutto's approach to the regional issues. When he was in power, he subscribed to the conservative view of Pakistani nationalism based on the 'two-nation' theory. But, when he was out of power, he expressed his views differently. For instance, before 1956, after his dissociation from the Ayub regime, and after his deposition from power, Bhutto gave priority to liberal, secular and multi-ethnic orientation of Pakistani nationalism. He had written several papers favoring regional autonomy before he joined the Ayub government. He had also virulently criticized the imposition of 'one-unit' scheme in Pakistan.⁷

After his exit from Ayub government, however, Bhutto gave support to Sheikh Mujib's six-point programme in the first instance.⁸ But, soon afterwards, he changed his stance and on the eve of 1970 general elections, Bhutto had no hesitation in condemning Sheikh Mujib's 'six-point' programme as a secessionist plan. Again, after his deposition by General Zia, Bhutto was back to his former advocacy of liberal democratic and secular vision, pervasive in his book 'If I am Assassinated'.⁹

However, during his days in power, both in the Ayub government and between 1971-1977, Bhutto showed clear inclination to accommodate conservative and reactionary forces and reverted to his advocacy of the two-nation theory as the

⁷ Bhutto wrote in VISION, Karachi, August 1954, an article entitled "Pakistan: A Federal or Unitary State". Favouring the irreversibility of the nature of federal policy, he stated:

"In Pakistan, the problem of constitution-making has been sui generis... The founder of Pakistan (Quaid-i-Azam) envisaged a federal constitution not because of any pre-conceived prejudices against other forms of government but because he was determined to give the country a constitution which would suit the genius of the people. In view of ethnic, linguistic and cultural differences of our relatively decentralized Social Order, and, in view of the chasm of one thousand miles between East and West Pakistan, only a federal government could foster the Solidarite Sociale of the people." In another observation, he assailed the one-unit' scheme: "Out of the provincial rivalries of two major Units, a scheme is born which boasts of being the iconoclast of provincialism. Indeed, if executed it will unquestionably annihilate the geographical boundaries of the smaller units but, with the same decisiveness, it will perpetuate provincialism." Cited in, Z. A. Bhutto, Politics of the People, Vol. 1, 1948-1966. (A collection of Articles, Statements and Speeches) (eds.) Hamid Jalal and Khalid Hasan, Rawalpindi, Pakistan Publications, pp. 37-39.

⁸ The Pakistan Times, 3 November, 1967.

⁹ Z.A. Bhutto, "If I am Assassinated...", New Delhi, Vikas, 1979, pp. 119-120. Cf., Z.A. Bhutto, My Pakistan. New Delhi, Biswingsadi Publications, 1979, pp. 97-98.

cementing force for national integration.¹⁰ Though Bhutto introduced a federal constitution in Pakistan, his response towards the issue of regional autonomy remained negative.

It would be in order to enquire into the nature and content of regional issues in some detail in the constituent provinces of present Pakistan and also to outline Bhutto's role thereof.

Punjabi Regionalism

To begin with, we may take the case of Punjab, which has always been in a strong bargaining position with successive federal governments of Pakistan. Being the most populous and prosperous province, Punjab continued to be the citadel of power-politics under Bhutto's tenure. Bhutto, a Sindhi and a non-Punjabi, could not have assumed power and continued as he did, without the support of Punjab. He was conscious of the fact that Punjab's decisive political say could not be undermined. The PPP in 1970 general election secured 88 of 144 National Assembly seats, of which 64 seats were won from Punjab. Similarly, the PPP won 119 out of 186 seats in the Provincial Assembly of Punjab. When Bhutto launched a struggle against Sheikh Mujib's Awami League (which had won majority of seats in 1970 elections), he repeatedly referred to Punjab and Sindh as the 'bastions' of Pakistan.¹¹

Of Pakistan's total land area of 307,374 square miles Punjab covers 70,284 square miles.¹² According to the 1972 census, Punjab had more than half of the total population of entire Pakistan. The province has been the agrarian base of the nation, being the leading producer and supplier of the nation's demand of staple food, wheat and rice.¹³ In addition to its predominant contribution in the field of agrarian production, Punjab has a much larger share in the personnel manning government administration and defence forces. Ever since the formation of Pakistan, the Punjabi elite have been predominant in the power-politics of Pakistan.

¹⁰ See, 'President Bhutto's Address to the National Assembly', National Assembly of Pakistan (Constitution-making) Debates. August, 14, 1972, Vol. I, No. 1, p 11.

¹¹ The Pakistan Times, December 21, 1970.

¹² The data referred to in this study is based on the report of 1972 census published by the Government of Pakistan statistical division. On the basis of this report. The Pakistan Economist (March 5, 1977) collated the following details pertaining to province-wise area, population and density, as shown in the table on p. 144.

¹³ See Table (b) on page 106

In 1955, the whole of erstwhile West Pakistan became one province under the 'one-unit' scheme to counter the demands of regional autonomy in erstwhile East Pakistan. Punjab's dominant position was not adversely affected even then. The 'one-unit' scheme proved more fruitful to the Punjabi elite. However, after the dissolution of 'one-unit' scheme in 1970, the elite in Punjab became more perturbed for fear of losing their control over the political affairs of Pakistan.¹⁴ During Bhutto's tenure, Punjabi land-lords bureaucrats and army top-brass, did not relent in their search for levers of greater control of power. Being a Sindhi, Bhutto cautiously struck a balance in the distribution of power and resources and seemed to have acted with care when it come to a comparative estimate of Punjab and Sindh.

TABLE (a)

Province / Territories	Area Sq Miles	1961 Population	1972 Population	Density per Sq. mile
Punjab	70,284	25,483,643	37,507,855	473
Sindh	54,407	8,367,065	14,007,722	257
NWFP	28,773	5,730,991	8,337,385	290
Baluchistan	134,050	1,353,484	2,405,154	18
Federally Administrated Tribal Areas (FATA)	10,510	1,847,195	2,485,867	237
Islamabad Federal Capital Territory	350	94,000	235,749	670
Total: Pakistan	307,374	42,880,378	64,979,732	211

However, other sources have identified truncated Pakistan's total area as 310,403 Sq. miles. The following references need attention: Rafiushan Kureishi, *The New Pakistan*, London, G. Bell & Sons, 1977; Rounaq Jahan, *Pakistan: Failure in National Integration*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1972; and, K.L. Gauba, *Pakistan Today*, Bombay, Thakers., 1977.

¹⁴ On March 30, 1970 Yahya Khan promulgated the Province of West Pakistan (Dissolution) Order and on June 30, 1970, the four provinces were reconstituted.

TABLE (b)
STRUCTURE OF PROVINCIAL INCOME IN PAKISTAN
1968-69* (Rs. Million)

Province	Agriculture	Percent	Manufacture	Percent	Service	Percent	Total
Punjab(1)	9,907	46	3,157	12	9,084	42	100
Sindh(2)	3,157	30	2,588	26	4,060	44	100
NWFP	1,432	41	484	11	1,798	48	100
Baluchistan	307	39	49	6	413	55	100

Source: The Fourth Five-Year Plan (1970-1975), Planning Commission, Government of Pakistan, July 1970

Although the available statistics are For 1968/69, the structure of provincial income has not changed substantially, except for the differentially actual figures (in Rs. million) owing to inflationary trends.

(1) Punjab leads in all the areas.

(2) Karachi (Sindh) has a major share in manufacturing the industrial production. In 1968-69, it was estimated that with a fifth of Pakistan's population residing in Sindh, nearly half of the country's industrial output is produced in Sindh, 40 per cent in Karachi alone.

Bhutto played his cards carefully when he allocated important portfolios to ambitious Punjabi politicians, just as he upheld the interests of the dominant land-owning class of Punjab. It is significant that important positions, such as those of Governors and Chief Ministers were largely given to influential Punjabi Zamindars. Punjab's notable feudal land-lord, Ghulam Mustafa Khar, enjoyed considerable power during Bhutto's rule. He was often called the Quaid-i-Punjab. He was first appointed Governor of Punjab on December 22, 1971. He remained in that office till November 12, 1973. After the adoption of permanent constitution, Khar was made the Chief Minister. From November 1973 to March 1974, he functioned in that post wielding considerable powers.¹⁵

¹⁵ During the interim constitution phase (April 1972-August 1973), G.M. Khar enjoyed absolute powers as the Governor of the province. Because the new constitution (1973), being a parliamentary constitution, strengthened the position of Chief Minister, Khar bargained for Chief Ministership of Punjab and assumed that office in November 1973. However, owing to ideological differences and constant pressures from the radical lobby, Bhutto dismissed G.M. Khar from Chief Ministership in March 1974 and appointed a radical PPP leader, Mohammad Hanif Ramay, as the Chief Minister of Punjab.

Thereafter, G.M. Khar challenged land-reform and nationalization measures of Bhutto and organised strong opposition against Hanif Ramay.¹⁶ Bhutto once again appointed Khar as the Governor of Punjab in March 1975. But Khar was not satisfied with the subservient role of Governor under the new constitution. He created hurdles for the then Chief Minister, Hanif Ramay. Bhutto dismissed both, Governor G.M. Khar, and Chief Minister Hanif Ramay in July 1975. He replaced Hanif Ramay by another feudal land-lord, Sadiq Hussain Qureshi, who continued till Bhutto's ouster. Similarly, G.M. Khar was replaced by another influential Nawab, Mohammad Abbas Abbasi of Bahawalpur. It was obvious that by distributing political spoils, Bhutto had intended to neutralize antagonistic elements.

However, Bhutto's political tactics could not contain the challenge of Punjabi regionalism. Opposition parties, like Pakistan Muslim League (Pagaro group), *Jamaat-e-Islami* and *Tehrik-i-Istiglal*, assailed Bhutto for ignoring the interests of Panjab province. Bhutto's erstwhile supporters, G.M. Khar and Hanif Ramay, after their expulsion from the ruling PPP (in September 1975), joined the Pakistan Muslim League (Pir Pagaro group) and launched the 'Save Punjab Movement' in October 1975. That posed a serious threat to Bhutto's political sustenance and national leadership.¹⁷ Punjabi militants also demanded release of 'Hamoodur Commission Report' before the general election. Influential members of the National Assembly (MNAS) from Punjab, accused Bhutto of ignoring the vital interests of their province. They virulently criticized Bhutto's socialistic land-reform measures in the National Assembly. Such elements were critical of Bhutto's alleged prejudice against Punjab and Punjabis, and of ignoring the economic and developmental requirements of Punjab. It was claimed by them that they, on their part, were open-minded and unprejudiced as proven by the fact that they chose Bhutto (a Sindhi), as their leader.¹⁸

¹⁶ G.M. Khar, after his ouster from the office of the Chief Minister, launched a crusade against Bhutto and Hanif Ramay. He utilized the Vanaspati Ghee Lobby, 'Pakistan Kisan Council', and, 'Cotton Traders' Association' lobbies to bargain with the federal government.

¹⁷ For instance, Ahmad Raza Khan Kasuri (MNA from Kasur district, Punjab) criticized Bhutto government for introduction of land-reforms in Pakistan. On November 3, 1975, he said in the National Assembly: "Now (with the introduction of the Land Reforms Amendment Bill 1975) deliberate attempt is being made to destroy the agricultural economy of Pakistan. By hanging the sword of Damocles on the heads of the agriculturists class of this country (the government), is taking the Jagirdari system. There exists only Zamindari System. If you were to take the initiative out of the hands of the agriculturists, who gear up the economy of Pakistan, who give shoulder to the edifice of Pakistan. Do not destroy them because you have to establish that you are a socialist, but for God's sake do not destroy this great class." See, National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates. November 3, 1975, Vol. VI, No. 4, pp. 202-204.

¹⁸ Sardar Shaukat Hayat Khan (MNA) stated in the National Assembly on March 7, 1973: "Punjabis have chosen their leader from Sindh, showing their broad-mindedness, showing their large-heartedness. We want

Other religious and reactionary elements of Punjab also posed a severe threat to Bhutto's leadership. A case in point was the Ahmadiya controversy. Orthodox elements revived the old issue of Ahmadiya sect¹⁹ and demanded that the sect be declared a non-Muslim minority. Ultimately, Bhutto succumbed to pressures of Islamic fundamentalists. Through the-Second Constitutional Amendment Bill (September 7, 1974), more than 40,000,00 members of Ahmadiya sect were relegated to 'non-Muslim minority'. To hide his own political discomfiture, Bhutto declared in the National Assembly that the decision was "democratic, being the people's decision".²⁰ Similarly, during his tenure, Bhutto had to face conflicts among different Islamic conservative sects—*Sunnis, Shias, Sayeds* and *Shiekhs*. The dominant *Sunni* sect of Punjab, accused Bhutto of favoring the minority *Shia* sect, because Bhutto belonged to the latter sect.

In addition to sectarian conflicts and tensions, linguistic controversy also added to the problem of intra-regionalism in Punjab. The liberal and progressive groups in Punjab stood for 'Punjabi' as the official language and medium of instruction, in all educational institutions of Punjab province. '*The Punjabi Adabi Sangat*', representative organization of liberal and progressive Punjabi Muslims, expressed deep concern over continuation of 'Urdu' as the official language of the province. The liberal Punjabis alleged that the 1947 exodus brought from U.P., Delhi and Bombay, Urdu-speaking immigrants who settled in Punjab. Those elements constituted the Urdu lobby and acted in ways detrimental to the interests of the 'Sons of 'the Soil'. The 'Urdu-speaking' settlers also raised the

peace in the country. We want unity in the country. No Punjabi will like the country to break-up". See, National Assembly of Pakistan (Constitution-making) Debates. March 7, 1973, Vol. II, No. 15, p. 805.

¹⁹ The conflict, fundamentally, was a clash between two religious sects—the Ahmadiyas and conservative Sunnis which continued to be in existence for more than a period of 90 years. Ahmadiya movement was founded by Mirza Ghulam Ahnied, in 1882, at his birth place Qadian, a village in the district of Gurdaspur in East Punjab. In March 1882, Mirza Ghulam Ahmed claimed to have had a revelation (ilham) to the effect that he had been entrusted by God with a special mission to preach and spread Islamic teachings. He became the "Khalifa and Imam" to his supporters who were identified as "Qadianis" or "Ahmadiyas". The Conservative Muslim sects basically, the Sunni and Shia sects, who believed in the "finality" of the Prophet hood of Hazrat Mohammad, challenged the formation of the new sect. After the partition of India, the Ahmadiyas settled in Lyallpur in West Punjab. Violent clashes between the Ahmadiyas and the conservative Muslim sects became widespread in March 1953. The Majlis-e-Aural formed (January 1953) by the orthodox followers of prophet Mohammad raised a demand for the declaration of Ahmadiya sect as non-Muslim minority. During Bhutto's tenure, the problem became more critical. Ultimately, Bhutto, under the pressure of orthodox religious leaders, declared Ahmadiya Sect as a 'non-Muslim minority'.

²⁰ Bhutto said: It is a national decision. It is a decision of the people of Pakistan. It represents the will and aspirations of the Muslims of Pakistan...The problem is 90 years old and with the passage of time it has become more complicated... Previous regimes have suppressed the problem rather than resolving it. Pakistan is a Muslim state, it came into being because the Muslims of the sub-continent wanted a separate homeland". For details see National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, September 7, 1974, Vol. V, No. 39, pp. 565-570.

bogey of 'Indian hegemony', on the ground that if 'Punjabi' were declared the official language of the province, it would foment divisive tendencies. It was alleged that once, 'Punjabi' became the official language of the province, it would be inevitable that people across the border in India's (East) Punjab would raise the demand for the merger of the two Punjabi-speaking regions. They also expressed the apprehension that since "Punjabi" script is based on 'Gurmukhi', it would cause harm to 'Persian' and 'Arabic' scripts.²¹

Another intra-regional controversy in Punjab, which posed a strong challenge to Bhutto's leadership, was the demand of a separate 'saraikistan' province. Inhabitants of Bahawalpur and Multan divisions of Punjab revived their movement for a separate *Saraiki Suba* during Bhutto's rule. Members of the National Assembly from Bahawalpur alleged that the federal government had persistently neglected socio-economic interests of the people in their region and had favored the interests of the central region of Punjab instead.²² It might be recalled that after the dissolution of 'one-unit' scheme, the Saraiki-speaking people formed a '*Saraiki Suba Mahaz*' in 1970, and launched a separate *Saraiki Suba* movement. The Saraiki-speaking regionalists demanded establishment of 'Saraikistan', comprising districts of Multan, Muzaffargarh and Dera-Ghazikhan in the former state of Bahawalpur. They argued that Bahawalpur was an independent socio-cultural region and was never a part of Punjab, and for well over three hundred years, it had a separate identity.²³

By the middle of 1975, the demand for separate province of Saraikistan became so acute that Bhutto had to appoint the ex-ruler of Bahawalpur, Nawab Abbas Abbasi, as the Governor of Punjab (in July 1975) primarily to assuage separatist susceptibilities.²⁴

²¹ For details refer to POT (Pakistan Series), December 3, 1975 & January 17, 1975; Cf., The Times of India, January 11, 1976.

²² For details see National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, June 19, 1973, Vol. III, No. 21, pp. 1529-1532., National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, February 9, 1974, Vol. I, No. 17, pp. 243-244.

²³ In fact, advocates of Saraiki Suba stated that Maharaja Ranjit Singh had invaded Bahawalpur and annexed it to become part of the trans-Sutlej territories, and likened their relationship with Punjabis akin to that the French and the British in the past. Also, they argued that the NWFP, which was part of Punjab previously, had been separated, from Punjab in 1901, to assume separate provincial status on the basis of distinct culture and language. Similarly, Baluchistan got a separate provincial status after the dissolution of one-unit scheme. Therefore, on the basis of the creation of NWFP and Baluchistan, the regionalists of Bahawalpur area also claimed to have a separate provincial existence. For details see, Riaz Hashmi, Brief for Bahawalpur Province, Karachi, Bahawalpur Suba Mahaz, 1972, pp. 113-123.

²⁴ See News Review on South Asia, August, 1975.

The aforesaid shows how Punjab, in addition to being the largest province territory-wise and the most prosperous region of Pakistan, also has always been a vital determinant of national politics. Bhutto realized that, and so long as he did not ignore Punjab's claims of being treated as such, the latter continued to support and sustain the former politically. Before and consequent upon, the introduction of the 'one-unit' scheme, Punjab did not lose its predominance. Punjabi landlords, bureaucrats and the army top-brass did not relent in their search for greater political control over national politics. Bhutto had to move with caution to keep all such elements in good humor without either giving them cause to be offended or permitting them unusual access to power. And yet, regionalism could not be entirely contained as seen in demands basically motivated by Punjab's assumed predominance and Bhutto's alleged prejudice. The decisions concerning Ahmadiyas and the *Punjabi Adabi Sangat*, however unpalatable, only showed the potential of regional forces. Similarly, the Saraiki movement was a challenge to Bhutto and he had to act swiftly to assuage popular susceptibilities. However, an overview shows that Bhutto had to take recourse sometime to appeasement and at others to patronage, to blunt popular appeal of regional forces. It is doubtful, Bhutto's efforts notwithstanding, if regionalism was either effectively contained or eradicated. Bhutto's downfall, in fact, could be attributed partly to the potential for political intrigue; regional forces were capable of mustering.

Sindhi Regionalism

Sindh comprises an area of 54,407 square miles. According to 1972 census, the population of the province was 14,007,722, with a density of 257 persons per square mile. From the commercial angle, Sindh has always had a special significance. After the emergence of Bangladesh, Karachi port was left as the only centre of foreign trade and transportation activities. Sindh possesses the vital hinterland of industrial potential, which contributes nearly half of the total industrial output of Pakistan.

Traditionally, Sindhis are deeply conscious of their distinct historical, cultural and linguistic affinities. The answer goes back to their sufferings from various invasions over several centuries, which resulted in transforming the culture and traditions of the area and yet the sense of belonging and identity remained conspicuous among the people. During the final phase of the British empire, Sindhi politicians demanded restoration of their separate cultural identity. Z.A. Bhutto's father, Shahnawaz, fought for the separation of Sindh from the Bombay presidency on the plea that there was no logic in keeping Sindh as part of the Bombay presidency, since Sindh was not only far away from Bombay, the cultural characteristics of Sindh differed considerably from those of Bombay. The

British government, under the government of India Act of 1935, declared separation of Sindh from Bombay presidency.

After the creation of Pakistan, veteran Sindhi leader G.M. Sayed, took the lead for revival of the original cultural and literary identity of Sindh. The erstwhile 'Sindh United Party', formed by Bhutto's father Shahnawaz (1937), was renamed 'Sindh United Front', which under the leadership of G. M. Sayed, organised The Sindh Movement' for regional autonomy.²⁵

The 'Jiye Sindh Movement' was suppressed after the integration of West Pakistan under 'one-unit' scheme (1955). After dissolution of the 'one-unit' scheme, G.M. Sayed revived 'Jiye Sindh Movement'. During the 1970 general elections, Sayed supported Bhutto's PPP and put forward a demand for declaration of 'Sindhi' as the state language and preparation of voters' list in 'Sindhi' along with 'Urdu'. As Bhutto assumed power, Sayed once again, vociferously put forward the demand for regional autonomy of Sindh. He pressurized Bhutto for the recognition of 'four-nationality' concept. The National Awami Party of Sindh also supported Sayed's 'Jiye Sindh Movement'.²⁶ Echoing the 'six-point-programme' of Sheikh Mujib, Sayed demanded full-fledged autonomy of Sindh. He asserted that provincial governments should be completely autonomous as envisaged in the Pakistan Resolution of the Muslim League adopted in Lahore in 1940.²⁷

G. M. Sayed also disclosed that the 'Jiye Sindh Movement' had two alternatives: viewed from the positive angle, Jiye Sindh Movement aims at greater regional autonomy as well as decentralization of the economy and political power; in view of the negative approach of the federal government, the 'Jiye Sindh Movement' could also take a separatist posture like that of Bangladesh, aspiring for an independent 'Sindhu Desh'.

Assailing Bhutto's authoritarian postures, Sayed warned: "We are sick of the present state of affairs. We would not remain under the present set-up any longer. Either they come to terms with us or there will have to be an independent Sindhu Desh."²⁸

²⁵ The provincial government of Sindh formed a 'Sindhi Adabi Board' in 1951 for producing a chronological history of Sindh from the pre-historic times till the birth of Pakistan. This board has produced nine volumes covering different periods of Sindhi culture and civilization. The basic objective of this organization was to foster distinct socio-cultural and linguistic identity of Sindh.

²⁶ For details see The Hindustan Times, March 4, 1972 and The Times of India, March 18, 1972.

²⁷ The Pakistan Times, July 24, 1972.

²⁸ Ibid.

'The Jiye Sindh Front', a militant wing of the Sindh United Front representing the cause of the 'Old Sindhis' (local Sindhis) demanded more jobs in government and administration. The 'Sons of the Soil' (Old Sindhis) constituted 60 per cent of the total population of Sindh. They alleged that despite being in majority and being original inhabitants of Sindh, they were treated as second-rate citizens by the immigrant (New Sindhis) people, Muhajirs, who came to hold monopoly over industries, lands, government and administration.

The 'New Sindhis' (Muhajirs) threatened Bhutto's leadership with a counter movement for 'separate Karachi province'. They constituted about 40 per cent of the total population of Sindh and about 70 per cent of the total population of Karachi region. The 'New Sindhis' were also dispersed in sizeable numbers in other major cities of Sindh, such as, Hyderabad, Sukkur and Jacobabad. Owing to their majority in the urban areas of Sindh, the new Sindhis demanded retention of 'Urdu' as the state language of Sindh. The Jamaat-e-Islami, supporting the cause of New Sindhis, accused Z.A. Bhutto and his 'talented cousin' Mumtaz Ali Bhutto, then Chief Minister of Sindh, of favoring the separatist 'Sindhu Desh Movement' led by G.M. Sayed.²⁹

Bhutto was aware of the serious implications of the growing antagonism between the 'Old' and 'New' Sindhis. He tried to keep himself away from favoring any one particular group of Sindhis. He announced a 'compromise-formula' with regard to the language controversy in Sindh. Violence broke out in the major towns and cities of Sindh after the passage of the 'Language Bill' (on July 8, 1972) by the Sindh Provincial Assembly, declaring 'Sindhi' as the official language of the province, the New Sindhis (Muhajirs) violently protested against the declaration of 'Sindhi' as the provincial language. They accused the provincial Chief Minister, Mumtaz Ali Bhutto, of prejudicial treatment towards their socio-economic and linguistic interests. A week after the passage of the language bill, Z.A. Bhutto announced a 'peace-formula' on July 15, 1972, to appease the 'New Sindhis'. Bhutto declared in a special broadcast to the nation: "I feel a sense of satisfaction in announcing to the people of Sindh in particular and to the people of Pakistan as a whole that a mutually agreed solution has been found to the language controversy... For a period of twelve years no person, otherwise qualified for appointment or promotion, would be discriminated

²⁹ After assuming power, Z.A. Bhutto appointed his cousin Mumtaz Ali Bhutto as the Governor of Sindh on December 22, 1971 and made him Chief Minister in May 1972. M.A. Bhutto continued as provincial Chief Minister till October 1973. Owing to strong opposition from the New Sindhi Muhajirs, Z.A. Bhutto replaced Mumtaz Ali Bhutto with a non controversial person, Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi who remained Chief Minister till Bhutto's deposition. However, Bhutto appeased his 'talented cousin' by inducting him into the federal cabinet as Minister for Communications.

against only on grounds of want of knowledge of Sindhi or Urdu.”³⁰ Bhutto also had his own interpretation of the linguistic issue. He held the capitalist class of Sindh responsible for deepening the language crisis in Sindh.³¹

Bhutto was confronted with yet another challenge. The *Jamaat-e-Islami* demanded job security for 1,30,000 repatriated Bihari Muslims from Bangladesh and insisted upon their permanent settlement in Karachi and other ‘Muhajir’ dominated towns. The ‘Old Sindhis’, led by G.M. Sayed, threatened the federal government with dire consequences if the Bihari Muslims were to be settled in any part of Sindh province. The apprehension of the ‘Sons of the Soil’ was that such a policy would adversely affect the economy of the province and would also threaten the age-old opportunities available to local Sindhis, especially in government jobs. In fact, efforts were made to deny the Biharis’ request for granting them Pakistani nationality.

Throughout 1973, violent clashes continued in Sindh between the ‘Old’ and the ‘New’ Sindhis, especially among militant student organizations. On June 26, 1973, students of Liaquat Ali Medical College, at Jamshoro, pulled down the portrait of Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah and smashed it into pieces. Such activities were resented by the Muhajirs as anti-national and parochial on the part of the ‘Old’ Sindhis’.³² The old Sindhis refused to recognise M.A. Jinnah as Quaid-i-Azam since he belonged to the ‘Muhajir’ (Khoja) Community.

It was a testing time for Bhutto. He could not afford to be unaffected and unmoved. He could also not act in a manner ultimately reflecting upon his being a Sindhi himself. Bhutto restricted the activities of ‘Jiye Sindh Front’ under the Defence of Pakistan Rules. He kept the veteran Sindhi leader G.M. Sayed under prolonged house-arrest and banned publication of material in Sindhi, prejudicial to Pakistan’s interest. Though Bhutto succeeded in containing the challenge of Sindh regionalism, posed by both the ‘Old’ and the ‘New’ Sindhis, he ultimately proved a failure in resolving the mounting antagonism between the two groups. The representative body of the New Sindhis, the *Jamaat-e-Islami*, continued to be critical of the Bhutto government for alleged support to the separatist movement

³⁰ *The Pakistani Times*, July 16, 1972.

³¹ The next day (on July 16, 1972), Bhutto said: “My Urdu-speaking brothers and sisters please do not be misled. Those who pose themselves as your leaders only want to maintain capitalistic hold on you. They want to perpetuate injustice. I have documentary evidence that to incite the present trouble as much as thirty lakh rupees were thrown about by the capitalists. They talk of the funeral of Urdu. I ask them which funeral, when did Urdu die? How can Urdu die? That can never happen. Before Urdu dies, we will all be dead.” *The Pakistan Times*, July 17, 1972.

³² See, National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislative) Debates, July 30, 1973, Vol. III, No. 31, pp. 2340-41.

of G.M. Sayed.³³ On the contrary, the 'Jiye Sindh Front' leader, G.M. Sayed, vehemently criticized Bhutto for ignoring the genuine grievances of the local Sindhis. In view of Bhutto's repressive approach, Sayed gave full-fledged support to anti-Bhutto political parties. During PPP-PNA conflict (after March 1977 general election), Sayed supported the PNA for dislodging Bhutto from power. Ironically, Sayed also justified the death sentence given to Z.A. Bhutto by the Lahore High Court (in March 1978).³⁴

Sindhi regionalism was a challenge with a difference because Bhutto himself was a Sindhi. If he seemed to be even remotely sympathetic to an issue, genuine or otherwise, raised by regional leaders of his own province, he would have invited criticism. If he chose to take the stance of caution in that regard, he would have accused of ignoring interests of his own province. That was undoubtedly Bhutto's dilemma.

Sindh's record of cultural and political aspirations was dynamic and consistent. Aspirations for regional autonomy were not a recent phenomenon. The influx of Muhajirs further complicated the regional situation and Bhutto was hard-pressed to resolve the challenges arising there from, especially those affecting linguistic, cultural and developmental aspects. Further complications arose regarding settlement of 'Bihari' Muslims in Sindh, which the sons of the soil opposed, for they apprehended that the economic balance of the province would be ruined. Bhutto employed repressive tactics to control regional demands which however, did not resolve the basic issues. Also, such tactics did not either appease Bhutto's political antagonists or win for him the support of the Muliajrrs. However, Bhutto's policies succeeded in substantially raising the developmental level of Sindh.

Pashtoon Regionalism

The people of the North-West Frontier Province (NWFP), their tribal and hitherto neglected status notwithstanding, are acutely conscious of their distinct socio-cultural identity, political aspirations and socio-economic advancement.

³³ See, National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, January 27, 1975, Vol. I, No. 5, pp. 19t.-197; Notional Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, January 28, 1975, Vol. I, No. 6, pp. 260-262.

³⁴ After the announcement of death sentence to Z.A. Bhutto, G.M. Sayed said: "I have committed a mistake in supporting the demand for Pakistan before 1947. The rulers of Pakistan have not given positive response towards the genuine demands of the Sindhi people. Even a Sindhi Prime Minister failed to recognize our genuine demands... Bhutto is a criminal and a symbol of crimes. He has not only plundered the country but also ruthlessly suppressed the Sindhis. He killed and tortured them and turned Sindh into a big jail. Emergency steps should be taken to wipe out his imprints from the country... We supported the PNA movement only to wipe out Bhuttoism." *Jasarat*, March 30, 1978, Quoted in POT (Pakistan Series), April 1, 1978.

The NWFP covers an area of 28,773 square miles with a population around 8,337,385, and a density of 290 persons per square mile. Inhabited largely by 'Pashto-speaking' people, who identify themselves through a unified cultural code Pakhtun Wali, the region is renowned for its cataclysmic antecedents. There are also some non-Pashtoon dominated areas in the NWFP. The non-Pashtoons form majority in Hazara, Chitral, Dera Ismail Khan and Peshawar.³⁵

Historically speaking, Pashtoons never reconciled with any outside power which tried to subjugate the natives. Even during the British regime, Pashtoon leaders demanded reunification of all 'Pashto-speaking,' regions into a cohesive state, namely 'Pashtoonistan'. They refused to recognize the legitimacy of artificial geographical boundaries dividing them into different groups. It might be recalled that in 1893 the British administrator, Sir Mortimer Durand, concluded a treaty with the Afghan ruler (Amir), Abdur Rehman, and divided the Pashtoon areas by a geographical boundary, the 'Durand Line'. Pashtoons of the Southern part of the Durand line came under the sovereignty of Afghanistan and Pashtoons living on the Eastern part of the Durand line came under the jurisdiction of British India. The British, in 1901, integrated the Pashtoon areas under their jurisdiction into the 'North-West Frontier Province' (NWFP). However, the Pashtoons did not relent in their demand for re-designation of their region as 'Pashtoonistan'. After the withdrawal of British imperialism, the people of NWFP, through a referendum opted to join Pakistan.³⁶ At the time, the Red Shirt Party leader, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan (Sarhadi Gandhi), placed before the Muslim League a plan for regional autonomy :

- (i) Removal of artificial boundaries and integration of all 'Pashto-speaking' areas of erstwhile British-India into an integrated state, called Pashtoonistan;

³⁵ For details see, Ahmad Abdullah, *The Historical Background of Pakistan and Its People*, Karachi, Tanzeem Publications, 1973, pp. 200-206.

³⁶ The referendum, which took place in July 1947, violated the most elementary democratic norms. Only those who were granted suffrage under the 1935 constitution, i.e., 15 per cent of the population of North-West Frontier Province, were qualified to participate. Of the total 573,000 electors, only 293,000 cast their vote, with 289,000 or 49 per cent of the total electorate voting in favour of Pakistan. The referendum issue became a bone of contention between the governments of Pakistan and Afghanistan. The government of Afghanistan challenged the validity of the referendum and alleged that the referendum was a unilateral act which violated all norms and expectations. The imposed referendum was boycotted by a substantial segment of the Pashtoons. Since then, the Afghan rulers have been insisting for a fresh referendum to be held in Pashtoon areas on either side of the Durand Line. This controversy has thwarted purposive mutual relations between the two countries. See Gankovsky and L.R. Gordon Polonsky, *A History of Pakistan*, Moscow, Nauka Publishing House, 1964, p. 95.

- (ii) Abolition of traditional exploitative feudal Sardari system; and
- (iii) Equal representation of Pashtoons in the socioeconomic and political fields of national life of Pakistan.³⁷

However, the rulers of Pakistan persistently resorted to mass repression to crush the Pashtoon regional autonomy movement. The Muslim League leadership adopted negative approach towards the demands of Pashtoon regionalists. With the imposition of 'one-unit' scheme the bureaucratic and military leaders ruthlessly suppressed the regional claims of Pashtoons.

After the annulment of one-unit in 1970, Pashtoon leaders again revived their long suppressed regional autonomy movement. The victory of the National Awami Party in 1970 gave added strength for the regional autonomy movement. With the tragedy of Bangladesh still fresh, soon after assuming power, Bhutto became apprehensive of the Pashtoon regionalism and the leadership of the National Awami Party which posed a direct challenge to Bhutto's PPP in the 1970 general election. Bhutto, on one pretext or the other, tried to suppress the National Awami Party's renewed regional autonomy movement. Initially, Bhutto did not revoke martial law till April 21, mainly owing to the threat posed by the NAP. Immediately after assuming power, Bhutto appointed an anti-NAP person, Hayat Mohammad Khan Sherpao (pro-PPP member) as the Governor of the Province. Hayat Mohammad Khan Sherpao was a staunch political adversary of Khan Abdul Wali Khan and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. However, as pressure was mounted by the NAP, Bhutto agreed to allow the formation of representative and democratically elected (NAP-JUI coalition) government in the province. On April 29, 1972, Bhutto appointed the NAP member Arbab Sikandar Khan as provincial Governor in place of Mohammad Hayat Khan Sherpao.³⁸

The NAP-JUL government made concerted efforts to convince the central government about the need to extend opportunities of political freedom and socio-cultural and economic development. From the outset, Bhutto was apprehensive about the popularity of the NAP of Khan Abdul Wali Khan. In order to counter the threat of NAP, Bhutto elevated anti-NAP feudal and reactionary elements to important positions in the federal cabinet. Ironically, Bhutto compromised with the Pakistan Muslim League (Q) leader, Abdul Qaiyum Khan (once Bhutto's staunch rival). Bhutto inducted Qaiyum Khan into the federal cabinet as Minister for Home Affairs and Interior affairs. Thus, Bhutto adopted a dual approach: on the one hand, to ensure a make-believe of

³⁷ Ibid., p. 157

³⁸ See, *The Pakistan Times*, April 30, 1972 and May 2, 1972.

democratic and constitutional commitment, he allowed the formation of opposition government in the province; on the other hand, he cultivated anti-NAP feudal and reactionary forces to create hurdles in the smooth functioning of the opposition government in the province.

The Red Shirt leader, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, returned to Pakistan on December 24, 1972, after eight years of self-imposed exile in Kabul. He made an unconditional offer of cooperation to the Bhutto government, with a view to establishing a purposive dialogue between the Pashtoon people and the government of the country. He said: "I never opposed Pakistan as such but only those who wanted to create foothold for the British in the name of Islam."³⁹ The Frontier Gandhi also launched a 'peace-movement' in the country to promote understanding and harmony among the people of various regions of Pakistan among people of neighbouring countries, specially India, Iran and Afghanistan.⁴⁰

Bhutto misinterpreted the call of the Frontier Gandhi, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, for peace movement. He did not show a cooperative attitude towards the 'Octogenarian' Pashtoon leader who gave full-fledged support to Bhutto's leadership. Bhutto imposed restrictions on the activities of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan to his native village Charsadah and accused the provincial NAP-JUI government of having sympathy towards the alleged "separatist" leader, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan.

Bhutto was only too willing to pay concerted attention to public denunciations of the Maulana Mufti government and the NAP leadership, accusing them of fomenting 'separatist' feelings in Pakistan. In order to establish pro-PPP rule in the NWFP, on one pretext or the other, Bhutto interpreted every policy, action and measure of the NAP-JUI government, as anti-national and secessionist. Time and again, Bhutto publicized the 'Pashtoon regional autonomy movement' as a separatist 'Azad Pashtoonistan' movement.

One might recall the incidence, stage-managed or otherwise, of discovery of arms in the Iraqi Embassy in Islamabad. The federal government maligned the NAP-JUL government for complicity in the alleged smuggling of arms for anti-national activities.⁴¹ On February 15, 1972, Bhutto announced the dismissal of the

³⁹ *The Pakistan Times*, December 25, 1972.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Referring to the alleged discovery of veritable arsenal at the Iraqi Embassy, Bhutto said that 'some people say that these armaments were not to be used against Pakistan but were meant for a third country. Which could that third country be? Certainly this was not going to be used against India The fact is that the arms were meant to be used in Pakistan and against us.' For details, see, *Z.A. Bhutto, Speeches and Statements*, January 1, 1973-March 31, 1973, pp. 90-92.

provincial Governor, belonging to the NAP. That act of intervention by the central government in the provincial affairs was represented by the provincial Chief Minister, Maulana Mufti Mahmud. Though Bhutto tried to persuade the frontier Chief Minister Maulana Mufti Mahmud (of JUI) to continue in the office, the latter refused and resigned on February 17, 1972 in protest against the undemocratic action of the federal government.⁴²

Bhutto appointed a less ambitious person, Aslam Khattak, as the new Governor of the NWFP to succeed the pro-NAP Governor, Arbab Sikandar Khan. The province remained under presidential rule till April 15, 1973. Bhutto, thus, succeeded in having a provincial government of his own choice. On April 15, 1973, a new coalition government (of PPP, QML and UFI), headed by Inayatullah Khan of Gandapur, was installed. The total strength of the government was 22 in a House of 42 members. The break-up was: Pakistan People's Party-4, Qaiyum Muslim League-4, and, United Front of Independents (UFI) 14.⁴³ Since the PPP's membership was limited to only four seats, the coalition (PPP, QML & UFI) government failed to ensure stability and curb the challenge of the Pashtoon regionalists.

The federal government resorted to repressive approach. To cow-down the active regional elements, Bhutto imposed the Defence of Pakistan Rules (DPR) throughout the province. Despite repression, NAP activists and militant youth organizations, like *Zalme Pashtoons* and *Khudai Khidmatgars* were actively involved in the struggle for regional autonomy. By the end of 1973, the militant Pashtoon leaders came out in open revolt against Bhutto's interventionist policies. The NAP leaders, including the Red Shirt Party leader Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, accused Bhutto of disrupting democratic rule in the country.⁴⁴ Khan Abdul Wali Khan threatened to launch a separatist movement for an independent Pashtoonistan state, if the government continued with its repressive measures.⁴⁵

⁴² *The Pakistan Times*, February 16, 17, 1973.

⁴³ *Dawn*, April 16, 1973.

⁴⁴ In his public address (on July 22, 1974) Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan said : "I returned to Pakistan in the hope that Bhutto will really transform the country into a prosperous state and fulfill his promises of providing the people with bread, clothing and shelter, but things turned out to be contrary." *Dawn*, July 23, 1974.

⁴⁵ In a public meeting in *Qazi Khel* near Charshada on July 14, 1974, Khan Abdul Wali Khan said: "The time of appeals has passed and will now realize our rights not through demands but with force". He was reported to have said in another public meeting held in Islamabad (on July 17, 1974) that he would launch a secessionist movement in Pakistan as Quaid-i-Azam was first to launch a secessionist movement in India. For details, refer to, *Morning News*, July 17, 1974, and, *Dawn*, July 18, 1974.

The NAP leaders made no secret of their conviction that Pakistan would have to choose between its territorial integrity and democracy, on the one hand, and Z.A. Bhutto's leadership, on the other. In view of the mounting repression the NAP clarified its stand on Pashtoon issue and stated that there would not have been any problem between Pakistan and Afghanistan if the rulers of Pakistan had conceded "the right of self-determination to the Pashtoon people."⁴⁶

Instead of resolving the Pashtoon problem through constitutional and political measures, Bhutto heavily relied on police, para-military force and military might. Bhutto's repressive approach further strengthened the secessionist activities of the Pashtoon regionalists. The militant youth organizations of Pashtoons resorted to violence which was the only answer left for the coercive approach of the federal government.

On February 17, 1975, Bhutto dismissed both the I.K. Gandapur ministry and the provincial Governor, Aslam Khattak. He accused the provincial government of inability to curb violent and secessionist activities of the Pashtoon regionalists.⁴⁷ The newly appointed Governor, Sayad Sher Ghawas, was granted unlimited governmental powers as agent of federal government, until the mid of May 1975, when the PPP succeeded in forming a new coalition (PPP-QML) government headed by Nasrullah Khan Khattak, which, in effect, was a PPP dominated government. Nasrullah Khan Khattak, who had been appointed provincial PPP chief, after the death of Sherpao, got elected to the Provincial Assembly in April 1975 to fill in the vacancy owing to the murder of Hayat Mohammad Khan Sherpao. By September 1975, the Nasrullah Khan ministry achieved clear majority, commanding the support of 21 in a House of 42 members. Owing to defections, the strength of PPP's coalition partner QML was reduced to only 4 members.⁴⁸

The PPP dominated Nasrullah Khan Ministry continued to hold office till Bhutto's deposition. It suppressed the Pashtoon regionalism by enforcing the strict emergency regulations. In the absence of NAP (since the NAP was banned), and in view of the growing strength of the PPP, both at the federal and the provincial levels, the Pashtoon regionalists could not successfully organise their

⁴⁶ *Dawn*, 'July 24, 1974.

⁴⁷ Bhutto was specifically perturbed over the assassination of PPP leader and provincial Home Minister Mohammad Hayat Khan Sherpao on February 8, 1975. He accused the NAP of inciting violence in the province and on February 10, 1975, a ban was imposed on its activities throughout Pakistan. For details, see, *Dawn*, February 11 & 18, 1975.

⁴⁸ For details, refer to *News Review* on South Asia and Indian Ocean, IDSA, New Delhi, Specifically the issues, May, June and October, 1975.

regional autonomy movement. A large number of regional activists were imprisoned and put on trial for indulging in activities prejudicial to the integrity of Pakistan. However, Bhutto's repressive approach was not a viable solution to the problem of Pashtoon regionalism.

The Pashtoon leaders, after their release by the military ruler, General Zia-ul-Haq, in December 1977, publicly denounced Bhutto. They gave full-fledged support to General Zia for erasing 'Bhuttoism' from the polity of Pakistan and demanded regional autonomy for the Pashtoons.⁴⁹

It would be seen that regional aspirations in the context of Pashtoon areas also could neither be contained nor given-purposive, integrative direction by Bhutto. It seems Bhutto was intent upon suppression of the voice of the regionalists if they were at variance with his own interpretation of national unity and centralization of power.

Baluchi Regionalism

Like Pashtoon regionalism, Baluchi regionalism also posed considerable challenge to Bhutto's leadership. Baluchistan has been, and continues to be, the most backward region of Pakistan. Its multi-ethnic tribal context and harsh physical terrain hamper the task of socio-cultural integration and modernization. However, it is believed to be a treasure-house of natural resources, mostly untapped. The Sui area of Baluchistan possesses big reservoirs of oil, iron-ore, and coal according to recent geological surveys (conducted in 1976-1977). The ruling elite of Pakistan have never been seriously concerned at this region's problems nor have they shown enthusiasm for their resolution.

Comprising 134,050 square miles of rugged terrain, Baluchistan accounts for more than 40 per cent of Pakistan's total land area. However, owing to harsh geo-physical terrain, it has a population around 2,405,154, with the lowest density of 18 persons per square mile.⁵⁰ Only fifty per cent. of the population of

⁴⁹ The NAP leader, Khan Abdul Wali Khan, after his release on 6 December, 1977, praised General Zia and demanded general amnesty for all regionalists jailed by Bhutto. He eulogized General Zia for saving Pakistan by rescuing it from the clutches of a ruthless dictator and demanded complete elimination of 'Bhuttoism'. He said: "Unless traces of Bhuttoism were removed from the body-politic of the country, no positive achievement could be made in any direction." Morning News, December 11, 1977. Bhutto's retort in this context is relevant: "Why is he (Wali Khan) supporting Dictatorship and Mullahism and abandoning autonomy, democracy and secularism? It is nothing else but the fear of Bhutto and Bhuttoism. Wali Khan is so much afraid of Bhutto and Bhuttoism that he is prepared to become a lackey of the Martial Law and to eat all his words". Z.A. Bhutto, *My Pakistan*, New Delhi, Biswin Sadi Publications, 1979, p. 65.

⁵⁰ Thy Imperial Gazetteer pertinently described the geophysical context of Baluchistan: "Rugged, barren, sunburnt mountains, rent by huge chasms and gorges, alternate with arid deserts and strong plains..."

Baluchistan is of Baluchi origin. The non-Baluchi tribes constitute the rest of the population. Of the ten districts of Baluchistan, Quetta-Pishin, Zhob and Loralai are overwhelmingly Pashtoon regions. Two districts, Karachi and Lasbela are inhabited by Rajputs, Jats, Punjabi Muhajirs and Gilgits. The remaining five districts, Sibi, Chagi, Kalat, Makran and Kharan, are dominated by 'Baluchi' and 'Brohi' tribes.⁵¹ There are six main dialects, Baluchi, Brohi, Lasi, Kurd, Pushto and Jatki. Baluchi is spoken by nearly one-third of the total population, but it has no script of its own.⁵²

Baluchistan was never politicized like other three provinces of Pakistan. In 1880, Robert Sandeman integrated Baluchi-speaking tribal areas for administrative convenience and designated the new area as Baluchistan.⁵³ After the creation of Pakistan, Baluchistan was not identified as a separate province. Prior to the imposition of 'one unit' scheme, it was a federally administered region. With the introduction of 'one unit' scheme, Baluchistan was merged into the province of West Pakistan. Baluchistan became a full-fledged province during Bhutto regime. The interim constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (April 1972) formally recognised the provincial existence of Baluchistan.

As if replicating his policies concerning NWFP, Bhutto adopted an unimaginative approach towards regional leadership of Baluchistan. He appointed an anti-NAP person, Ghaus Baksh Raisani, as Governor of Baluchistan, who continued in office till April 23, 1972. Primarily owing to efforts made by the NAP chief, Khan Abdul Wali Khan, Bhutto agreed to allow formation of democratically elected government in Baluchistan. The NAP commanding a majority of seats (8 in a House of 20), formed an alliance with the Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Islam (JUI) which had won 3 provincial assembly seats in 1970 general election.⁵⁴ On April 29, 1972, the federal government agreed to appoint the NAP

Quoted in Ainslie T. Embree (ed.), *Pakistan's Western Borderlands*, New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House, p.xi, 1977.

⁵¹ Ahmad Abdulla, *The Historical Background of Pakistan and Its People*. Op. cit., p. 200. The Baluchis are divided into a number of sub-tribes: Mengal, Marri, Bugti, Zehri, Bizenjo and Raisani.

⁵² Linguistic regionalism could not emerge as a challenge to the federal government as it took decisive shape in other three provinces of Pakistan. There is no script of Baluchi as such. It is written in Roman Script. See POT. (Pakistan Series), October 25, 1974.

⁵³ For details, see James W. Spain, "*Political Problems of A Borderland*," in Ainslie T. Embree (ed.), Op. cit., pp. 12-13.

⁵⁴ The NAP won 8 directly elected seats. It also got 1 indirectly elected seat meant for women. The JUI captured 3 seats. The other parties were in minority. The PML (Q) got 2 seats, NAP (Pakhtoon Khwa) got 1 seat, Baluchistan United Front won 1 seat and Independents got 5 seats. For details, see, Craig Baxter, "Pakistan Votes", *Asian Survey*, March, 1971, Vol. XI, No. 3, p. 211.

member Mir Ghaus Baksh Bizenjo, as the governor of Baluchistan to replace pro-PPP Governor Ghaus Baksh Raisani. Governor Bizenjo invited the leader of the NAP-JUI coalition Ataullah Mengal to form provincial government which offer the latter accepted on May 1, 1972.⁵⁵ Soon after the formation of NAP-JUI government, Bhutto issued specific warning against attempts to disrupt policies and actions of the federal government. As later events showed, during the nine-month tenure of NAP-JUI government, direct confrontation between the federal and the provincial governments was a permanent feature.

The NAP-JUI government headed by Ataullah Mengal took specific measures for socio-economic reforms, and also endeavored to convince the central government about granting greater regional autonomy. However, the central government termed the actions of the provincial government as anti-national and secessionist. Owing to his traditional rivalry with NAP leader Khan Abdul Wali Khan, Bhutto was not reconciled to the opposition government in Baluchistan. The provincial Chief Minister on his part, time and again, assured the federal government 'that his government was only engaged in socioeconomic development and in restoring democratic environment in the province.

To begin with, the provincial Chief Minister announced withdrawal of section 144 in Quetta-Pishin region of Baluchistan and lifted ban on the press. He also promised measures introducing land reforms, abolition of Sardari system, and strengthening cultural and ethnic bonds of the Baluchi people. The federal government interpreted these reformatory measures as anti-national and instructed the provincial Governor to suppress the activities of the NAP-JUI government leading to the creation of 'Azad Baluchistan'.⁵⁶

The provincial Governor assured the central government that the NAP-JUI government was far removed from working against the integrity of Pakistan and, in fact, was trying to create democratic conditions in the province. However, Bhutto was contriving pretexts to disrupt unhindered and normal functioning of the NAP-Jul government.

The federal government unleashed a massive campaign against the NAP-JUI government. The alleged conspiratorial 'London-plan' was given wide publicity for denigrating the NAPJUI government in September 1972. The pro-establishment media accused the Baluchistan Chief Minister, Atauliah Mengal and Khan Abdul Wali Khan of dismembering the country into a confederation of semi-autonomous provinces during their stay in London (for medical

⁵⁵ *The Pakistan Times*, April 30, 1972 and May 2, 1972

⁵⁶ See *Asian Recorder*, June 24-30, 1972.

treatment).⁵⁷ The provincial governor Bizenjo denied the existence of such plan and described it as a 'figment of imagination'. Bhutto indirectly referred to the so-called 'London-plan' in his speeches delivered during the second week of September, 1972. Alluding to Sheikh Mujib's 'Six-point' programme, Bhutto, in his speeches, said that whereas he was prepared to negotiate on the Six-points and to accept them with certain adjustments in the formula relating to foreign trade and taxation in new Pakistan, there was no genuine regional problem like that which existed before 1971. No region of Pakistan was separated as before. The essentially relevant aspect was contiguity of the four constituent provinces. Therefore, the objective was a united province of Pakistan based on a unitary constitution, not a confederation of the four provinces based on confederal constitution, retaining effective authority with the central government. For establishing a golden-mean, the central government need not be transformed into an old widow without a pension.⁵⁸

The federal government, more out of panic and partisan-interests, finally dismissed the NAP-JUI government as also the provincial Governor, Ghaus Baksh Bizenjo, on February 15, 1973, accusing them of conspiring against the state of Pakistan. The NAP-JUI government was accused of smuggling arms and ammunition from an enemy country. The alleged discovery of arms cache in the premises of Iraqi Embassy at Islamabad was given as the sole cause for the dismissal of democratically elected government in Baluchistan.⁵⁹ The province came under presidential rule. The new Pro-PPP Governor Akbar Bugti continued the central rule until the formation of a coalition (PPP-QML-JUI) government headed by Mir Jam Ghulam Qadir Khan on April 23, 1973.

One would see that Bhutto's frantic haste in maligning and dismissing a democratically elected government did not find favour with thinking men in and around Pakistan. It was a thoughtless policy and in its execution, it betrayed an acutely inconsiderate aspect of Bhutto's thinking. Instead of winning over the

⁵⁷ *The Pakistan Times*, September 10, 1972.

⁵⁸ Z.A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements*, July 1, 1972-September 30, 1972, Op. cit., p.239. Bhutto in his speech at the Annual Dinner of the Karachi Chamber of Commerce and Industry (on September 15, 1972) indirectly referred to the so-called 'London plan', I can not say categorically if there is any truth in the so-called London plan. ..If there is London-Plan, I have Master Plan to deal with it". Ibid., pp. 229-239.

⁵⁹ On February 22, 1973, Bhutto stated in the National Assembly: "For the first time a representative government was formed in Baluchistan and it was expected of them to run the government in the interest of the people. Instead, the government embarked on tribal vendetta and went to the extent of not only killing but also taking calculated measures to starve Baluchis in Lasbela. In this connection he took the constitutional steps in removing the provincial government". Z. A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements*, January 1, 1973-March 31, 1973, Op. cit., p.91.

opposition or making self-respecting political accommodation a reality, Bhutto handled the situation with little thought for political consequences.

Following the dismissal of democratically elected NAP-JUI coalition government, the province witnessed acute tribal insurgency. The NAP activists and other Baluchi militant organizations, like the Baluch Student Organization (BSO) and “The Baluchistan People’s Liberation Front For Arms Resistance” (BPLFAR), demanded reintroduction of the NAPJUI government in the province. They accused (pro-PPP) Governor Akbar Bugti of following a policy of ‘Gold and Gun’, buying-off citizens and providing arms to fight against dissidents. They also alleged that foreign powers, namely, the USA, China and Iran, were giving armed assistance to Bhutto’s government for launching military crackdown in Baluchistan. By May 1973, five divisions of the Pakistan army were deployed in strategic areas of Baluchistan, Quetta, Kharan, Mushik, Turbat and Khuzdar.⁶⁰

The opposition parties of Pakistan also criticized Bhutto’s policy of military ‘crackdown’ in Baluchistan. In protest against the military repression the United Democratic Front (UDF) of eight opposition parties observed 20 July, 1973 as ‘Baluchistan Day’ and urged the federal government for restoration of constitutional rule in the province.⁶¹ The problem of Baluchistan was also raised in the National Assembly. Even the members of National Assembly from Punjab sympathized with Baluchi people and assailed Bhutto’s tyrannical and fascist policies.⁶²

As Bhutto assumed the office of Prime Minister under the permanent constitution (August 1973) the NAP chief Khan Abdul Wali Khan again warned that “if the political and constitutional solution (restoration of NAP-JUI government in the province) was not enforced by the federal government, the tragedy of Bangladesh may repeat itself in Baluchistan.”⁶³

Apparently all such words of caution, advice and warning, symbolic of premonition, were of no avail. Repression was renewed with greater vigour.

⁶⁰ See, News Review on South Asia and Indian Ocean, New Delhi, IDSA, May & June 1973.

⁶¹ *The Pakistan Times*, 21 July, 1973.

⁶² Ahmad Raza Kasuri, MNA from Punjab, said: “...the people of Baluchistan are fighting a battle for democracy and rule of law against the forces of Fascism and tyranny.... Is Baluchistan Vietnam or Korea? The bureaucrats, who are dancing to the government’s tune and prosecuting innocent people and who are the friend of the present government, they will be the biggest enemy of the future government... Pakistan People’s Party is responsible for all this chaos”. National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, May 25, 1973, Vol.III, No.2, pp.87-90.

⁶³ *Dawn*, August 14, 1973.

Tribal insurgency spread in the major Baluchi areas, Marri, Mengal and Bugti. As tribal insurgency spread in Bugti region (area of Governor Akbar Bugti), the provincial Governor resigned on October 31, 1973 accusing the federal government of intensifying military crackdown in his tribal (Bugti) area. He disclosed that the army's handling of the tribal rebellion created more enemies for his administration. Akbar Bugti was also not willing to accept the dominant position of the Chief Minister under the permanent constitution. The federal government accused Akbar Bugti of failure to control tribal insurgency and disregarding the provisions of the new constitution. In his place, Bhutto appointed a loyal and less ambitious person, Mir Ahmad Yar Khan of Kalat, as provincial Governor (on December 31, 1973). The Khan of Kalat continued as Governor till Bhutto's down-fall. These changes were of no consequence as tribal insurgency assumed disturbing proportions.⁶⁴

The federal government justified deployment of army in Baluchistan for construction of roads and other welfare purposes. Bhutto reiterated that the problem of Baluchistan was not basically political and constitutional in nature. It was basically an economic problem. He explained that tribal insurgency was not against federal government but against the tyranny of the local tribal Sardars and feudal-chiefs.⁶⁵ It is doubtful if such reasoning convinced the Baluchi regionalists. Nevertheless, Bhutto announced a plan of 'general amnesty' (in April 1974) to Baluchi rebels and promised for the withdrawal of army units from Baluchistan by May 15, 1974. The NAP chief Khan Abdul Wali Khan described Bhutto's amnesty plan as a "big fraud", since it was a partial amnesty offer, which excluded important NAP leaders like Ataullah Mengal, Ghaus Baksh Bizenjo and Sher Baksh Mari.⁶⁶ The amnesty offer did not yield expected results. Tribal insurgency continued unabated. Khan Abdul Wali Khan clarified in the National Assembly on June 19, 1974 that the only solution of the problem lay in the recognition by Bhutto of the 1970 general election results.⁶⁷ He reiterated later

⁶⁴ See, News Review on South Asia and Indian Ocean, November-December, 1973 and January 1974.

⁶⁵ Speaking on the Baluchistan Situation in the National Assembly (February 14, 1974) Bhutto said: "The problem of Baluchistan is not the creation of this government. It is an old problem which existed before the creation of Pakistan. The down-trodden masses are being exploited by a handful of feudal lords and Sardars. We took the help of army for constructing roads, providing electricity and water to poor Baluchis... The Sardari system will come to an end itself through its own inner contradictions. We will continue to bring out their contradictions." National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, February 14, 1974, Vol.1, No.21, pp. 764-774.

⁶⁶ See, Press Asia International, (PAT), Pakistan Service, London April 25, 1974.

⁶⁷ Khan Abdul Wali Khan stated in the National Assembly that 'in the so-called democratic regime of Z. A. Bhutto one province remains unrepresented. The people of Baluchistan are getting bullets and bombs. The dismissal of provincial government by Z. A. Bhutto was due to personal causes and was not on constitutional grounds.' National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, June 19, 1974, Vol. IV, No. 18, pp. 595-609.

that the only crime that the people of Baluchistan had committed was that they had voted for the NAP in the 1970 general election. He also revealed that the national army of Pakistan was killing its own nationals at somebody's orders.⁶⁸ The NAP leaders put three pre-conditions for negotiations with the federal government:

- (i) Withdrawal of the army from the interior of Baluchistan;
- (ii) Release of all political detainees including leaders of the NAP; and,
- (iii) Withdrawal of all cases against them.⁶⁹

Apparently, the federal government failed to assess the gravity of tribal insurgency. It issued a 'White Paper on Baluchistan' on October 19, 1974, claiming that the provincial situation was normal. The Baluchi leaders asserted that the extent of the rebellion was far worse than conceded by the White Paper. They claimed that about 5,000 Baluchi rebels were in jails. The army and militia had not only made large-scale arrests but had also burnt villages and food-stock. Through planned genocide, the federal government was trying to impose 'one-party hegemony'.⁷⁰

For all practical purposes, it became evident that the federal government was trying to overawe and neutralize its chief political rival, the NAP, and also, in process, to annihilate the regional challenge in Baluchistan. In the beginning of 1975, the government owned media started accusing the NAP for instigating 'four-nationality concept' as against the national ideology (two-nation theory) of Pakistan. The finale of the crude federal policies came in the form of ban on the NAP on February 10, 1975. The Supreme Court of Pakistan put legal stamp over that action on October 30, 1975.⁷¹ As if that was not enough to complicate matters, the federal government unseated legislators of the banned NAP from the

⁶⁸ National Assembly of Pakistan (Legislature) Debates, June 27, 1974, Vol. IV, No.24, pp. 1230-1231.

⁶⁹ *New Times*, August 10, 1974.

⁷⁰ The White Paper on Baluchistan (October 19, 1974) claimed that arm contingents were ordered to withdraw from Baluchistan. By October 17, 1974, 5,501 Baluchi rebels had surrendered. The total number of rebels killed and wounded was not more than 385. However, Baluchi rebels gave their own estimates contradicting the information contained in the White Paper. They claimed that 80,000 to 100,000 army personnel were deployed in Baluchistan. About 3,000 army men were killed and 3,000 were wounded. Baluchi rebels also gave their own casualty figures: 500 dead and 2,000 wounded. They recalled that these casualty figures were comparable to those of the liberation war of Bangladesh. For details see, White Paper on Baluchistan, Islamabad, Government of Pakistan, 1974. .

⁷¹ *The Pakistan Times*, September 1, 1975.

National Assembly and Provincial Assemblies for five years under a Special Ordinance issued on December 26, 1975.⁷²

Despite outlawing the NAP, tribal insurgency in Baluchistan continued unabated on 31 December, 1975. Bhutto dismissed the make-shift provincial government, headed by Mir Jam Ghulam Qadir Khan owing to its failure to prevent regional tribal insurgency.⁷³ The province came under the central rule which lasted almost eleven months. In view of the forthcoming general elections, Bhutto lifted central rule from Baluchistan and installed another pro-centre government, headed by Mohammad Khan Barozai on December 6, 1976.⁷⁴

During the campaign of March-1977 general election, Bhutto gave assurances for resolving the problems of Baluchistan. 'The Abolition of Sardari System Bill' (April 8, 1976) was given wide publicity and projected as a great achievement of the PPP. Bhutto reiterated that the tribal rebellion in Baluchistan was not directed against the PPP government but against the feudal Sardars of Baluchistan.⁷⁵

The gestures and policies, such as they were, failed to assuage the feelings of Baluchi regionalists, who did not renounce their demand for autonomy. The nine-party opposition alliance (PNA), supporting demands of Baluchis, boycotted provincial elections in Baluchistan held on March 10, 1977. Baluchi regionalists became so hostile to Bhutto that they welcomed his deposition by the military ruler, General Zia-ul-Haq, and supported military crusade for eradication of 'Bhuttoism'. The former (NAP) Governor of Baluchistan, Ghaus Baksh Bizenjo, revived the autonomy movement under the military regime. Refuting General Zia's Islamic theocracy, Bizenjo questioned the legitimacy of the oft-quoted 'two-nation theory' and demanded the recognition of 'four-nationalities' concept. The issue, however, had been taken to a point of no return with Zia's martial law entrenching itself against voices of caution, moderation and conciliation.

The preceding analysis confirms the trend of antagonism, denial and repression against voices in favour of regional autonomy. Bhutto proved to be no different from his predecessors despite the traumatic experience of Bangladesh. The thrust on two-nation theory persisted. His stock answer to demands of regional

⁷² *Dawn*, December 27, 1975.

⁷³ For details see, *News Review on South Asia*, January, 1976.

⁷⁴ *The Pakistan Times*, December 7, 1976.

⁷⁵ *News Review on South Asia and Indian Ocean*, February, 1977.

autonomy was reiteration of the 'two-nation theory'.⁷⁶ Whatever the nature of the polity Bhutto aspired for, unitary or federal, he could not have escaped his obligations for uniform and balanced development of each region and resolution of problem thereof in a manner mutually acceptable. A leader of Bhutto's stature could have integrated Pakistan in a more coherent manner through redefining Pakistani nationalism.

To keep himself in power, Bhutto raised the bogey of Pakistan's further disintegration, if regional autonomy were to be conceded. Instead of conciliatory and consensual policies, he preferred to malign, suppress and neutralize advocates of regional autonomy. Backward and neglected regions asking for regional autonomy invited the wrath of Bhutto. Provinces not voting his PPP to power were identified for brutal repercussions. Democratically elected provincial governments in NWFP and Baluchistan were summarily dismissed on flimsy and contrived grounds. Two other provinces, relatively prosperous, Punjab and Sindh, almost exclusively cornered developmental allocations and facilities. Bhutto sought to resolve the regional crises through partisan and repressive measures which negated his own profession of fair-play, democracy and national integration. Bhutto, for all his political understanding, failed to correctly assess the intensity of regional susceptibilities. During his power phase, it became apparent that Bhutto was a votary of unqualified unitary and centralized government and at no time gave evidence of his sincere concern for consolidating a polity, that was basically plural in its socio-cultural make-up. He failed to evolve institutional mechanism to uphold and sustain the distinct pluralities unique to each region of Pakistan. Living from one ad hoc policy to the other, Bhutto invited the stigma of a cavalier leader.

In fact, the problem of regionalism was compounded by ambivalence of Bhutto's leadership. It was his avowed objective to emerge as a national integrationist and nation-builder after Quaid-i-Azam, Jinnah. He repeatedly swore by high ideals of democracy, socialism, equality and brotherhood. On the contrary, in pursuance of the politics of survival he resorted to unimaginative and crudely executed

⁷⁶ In his address to the National Assembly (August 14, 1972) Bhutto gave the rationale of the two-nation theory. He said: "The two-nation theory has not been invalidated by the separation of the eastern-wing. The two-nation theory visualized the future of Muslims of the subcontinent in terms of contiguous Muslim majority areas. This undoubtedly was Allama Muhammad Iqbal's concept of Pakistan. Pakistan as visualized by the Quaid-i-Azam was also to be state comprising contiguous Muslim majority areas. The Pakistan ideology had two aspects: the Muslims as the people and the state comprising the sacred territory called Pakistan. They do not stand in mutual defiance of each other. On the contrary, they complement, inter stress and reinforce each other. They are not anti-thetical. It was a combination of Muslim Separateness and territorial nationalism that brought about Pakistan's existence as a sovereign independent state". National Assembly of Pakistan (constitution-making) Debates, August 14, 1972, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 11.

methods. Through a variety of legislative measures and emergency regulations, Bhutto sought to silence the voice of regionalists. In the name of the nation's integrity, he made use of bureaucracy, army and para-military forces. Almost exclusive reliance on personalized government left Bhutto with little elbow-room in which to formulate alternatives with a view to resolving regional crises. His approach and policies antagonized regional aspirants to such extent that they manifested defiant alienation, for all purposes removed from the national mainstream.

Recent history is witness to Bangladesh emerging primarily owing to denial of regional claims and imposition of the two-nation theory which had outlived its utility long ago. Bhutto erred in the case of erstwhile East Pakistan and he ignored the lessons of that traumatic experience, which created not only several problems for his regime but which also ultimately precipitated his predicaments.

Bhutto's response to regional aspirations of cultural, financial and political parity was manifest in tendering patronage to feudal elements which was not very different from politically dubious appeasement, coming as it did from a national leader whose propagated watch-words were 'Democracy, Socialism, Islam and All Power to the People'. Bhutto apparently leaned towards avowedly feudal and reactionary elements in a bid to consolidate the support-base of the PPP. Some noted feudals in this context were: G.M. Khar in Punjab, Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi in Sindh, Abdul Qaiyum Khan in NWFP, Ghulam Qadir Khan in Baluchistan. Conceding for a moment that such elements accorded some satisfaction to Bhutto, in effect, they proved to be transitory and tentative.

Yet another method Bhutto adopted for handling the regional challenge was equally counterproductive. With a view to maligning and denigrating regional aspirants, he hurled unsubstantiated accusations against them, alleging that they were attempting to collude with foreign powers, such as, India, Afghanistan and the Soviet Union, for further dismemberment of Pakistan. On the other hand, Bhutto himself was responsible for denying regional aspirations, especially in NWFP and Baluchistan, and it was repeatedly alleged by the regionalists that in this context he sought and received substantial military aid from the USA, China and Iran.

The fact that he was an elected representative of the people was expected to have been reflected in Bhutto's perceptions, formulations and behavior with his associates and adversaries. But that expectation was belied as Bhutto refused to recognize the credibility of political activists who were also popularly elected, simply because they happened to belong to other political parties. Bhutto's claim of being a democrat and a socialist became meaningless and ambivalent policies and actions highlighted his undemocratic and authoritarian postures.

Bhutto's handling of regional issues, at best, served as palliative and made a mockery of his claim of ushering in a 'New Pakistan'. His rule, however, witnessed no respite in regional antagonism and sectarian schism, which, in a way, were aggravated by Bhutto's ruthless policies. Bhutto, like his predecessors, failed to perceive the futility of the 'two-nation theory' as an imposed compulsion in the context of multi-nationality and multi-ethnic priorities of the people. Bhutto sought to assuage regional demands by resorting to repeated doses of 'Islamic Unity', a device which General Zia seems determined to enforce with a distinct fundamentalist vengeance. As in Bhutto's time so also now, the seemingly positive approaches to counter regionalism were nation-building activities, determined formulations for national integration and an explicit recognition of multi-nationality and diverse socio-cultural context of Pakistani nation. Bhutto ignored the lessons to be drawn from the futile exercises of his predecessors. On the other hand, General Zia is seeking to devise ways and means to escape Bhutto's fate by denying the very existence of legitimate regionalism as a systemic 'reality in, Pakistan.

Bhutto's Leadership and Pakistan's Foreign Policy

The foreign policy objectives of a country are determined in the context of a variety of factors, such as, geo-strategic situation of a given country, the nature of the balance of power in a particular region, the overall international political milieu and domestic socio-economic and political compulsions.¹ However, much depends upon the nature and perception of national leadership. A foresighted leader can shape a dynamic and balanced foreign policy adjusting it to the domestic requirements and global power-politics. In fact, the foreign policy that a leader pursues is only a means to an end—the basic objectives of a given society.

THE THEORETICAL DIMENSION

Despite ambivalence and inconsistencies, Bhutto came to be recognised as an architect of Pakistan's realistic foreign policy. The preceding bureaucratic–military leadership did not formulate a balanced and comprehensive foreign policy. Before Bhutto's appointment as the Foreign Affairs Minister (during Ayub regime), the foreign policy of Pakistan was apparently dove-tailed with that of the USA. In keeping with the foreign policy objectives laid down by 'Quaid-i-Azam' Jinnah and 'Quaid-i-Millat', Liaquat Ali Khan, Bhutto refashioned Pakistan's foreign policy in the contextual reality of global power-politics. He realized the significance of alternatives and options instead of almost abject dependence on the USA. The resultant conciliation with China, if not a stroke of genius, was assuredly a decisive step which paid dividends. Bhutto echoes the obvious when he wrote that "Pakistan must determine its foreign

¹ For theoretical analysis of Pakistan's foreign policy, refer to following works:

S.M. Burke, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis*, London, Oxford University Press, 1973.

Mustaq Ahmed, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*, Karachi, Space Publishers, 1968.

Latif Ahmed Sherwani, et al., *Foreign Policy of Pakistan: An Analysis*, Karachi, The Allies Book Corporation, 1964.

Sangat Singh, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Appraisal*, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1970, and,

Aswini K. Ray, *Domestic Compulsions and Foreign Policy: Pakistan in Indo-Soviet Relations-1947-1958*, New Delhi, Manas, 1975.

policy on the basis of its own enlightened national interest uninfluenced by the transient global requirements of the Great Powers.”²

Nurturing his foreign policy postulates on the basic strands identified soon after Pakistan’s birth, Bhutto did not hesitate to bring them in conformity with the geo-strategic setting.³ Well-versed in international law and diplomacy, Bhutto took specific interest in Pakistan’s foreign affairs ever since his student days. Later, as Minister of Commerce, Fuel, Power and Natural Resources in Ayub’s cabinet, Bhutto showed a special concern for reassessment of Pakistan’s foreign policy in terms of the changing context of international environment. It became a regular feature at cabinet meetings for Bhutto to enlighten his colleagues on matters affecting Pakistan’s foreign policy. A major thrust of his argument was that perception of international politics and diplomacy should not be guided by prejudice or bias, which tends to harm national interest. It was during such discussions that Bhutto advanced the logic of extending reciprocal amity with China, irrespective of the nature of political and ideological strands of that country. It is believed that he tried to convince General Ayub that in the context of the Sino-Soviet and Sino-Indian antagonism then existing, it was in Pakistan’s interest to take the initiative and normalize relations with China. Bhutto believed that Sino-Pak friendship would greatly enhance Pakistan’s bargaining capacity vis-à-vis India and the USA.⁴

For years, the bureaucratic and military leadership, intent upon its own survival, had adopted a pro-US foreign policy, though it was contended that Pakistan was the only Asian Country which the United States could truly depend upon, given the latter’s commitment for containment of international Communism. It became apparent soon that the call for Islamic identity was meant to serve the limited purpose of ensuring the status and predominance of the bureaucratic and military elite, who were overly dependent on the USA.

² Z.A. Bhutto, *The Myth of Independence*. London, Oxford, University Press, 1969, p. 134.

³ Jinnah stated: “Our foreign policy is one of friendliness and, goodwill towards all the nations of the world. We do not cherish aggressive designs against any country or nation. We believe in the principles of honesty and fair-play in national and international dealings and are prepared to make our utmost contribution to the promotion of peace and prosperity among the nations of the world.” Quoted in Mustaq Ahmed, *Op. cit.*, p. 143. Similarly, Liaquat All Khan had explained: “The underlying idea of the movement for the achievement of Pakistan was not to add one more country to the conglomeration of the countries in the world. Pakistan came into being as a result of the urge felt by the Muslim of this sub-continent to rescue a territory, however, limited, where the Islamic way of life could be practised and demonstrated to the world. A cardinal feature of this ideology is to make Muslim brotherhood a living reality”. Quoted in Latif Ahmed Sherwami, et al., *Op.cit.*, p.13.

⁴ See, B.N. Goswami, *Pakistan and China : A Study of Their Relations*, New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1971, p.78.

When Bhutto became Foreign Affairs Minister in 1963, he was considerably disenchanted with Pakistan's exclusive reliance on the USA because that implied closure of other options. Bhutto saw for himself how during the 1962 Sino-Indian conflict, the USA did not hesitate to extend variety of aid to India. The implication was that the USA could not be eternally taken for granted as an ally. To further consolidate bases of his foreign policy formulations, Bhutto stepped up anti-India campaign and alleged that India had always harbored aggressive designs against Pakistan. If one added to that his discerning assessment of Sino-India antagonism, it would become easier to comprehend why Bhutto chose to be friend both the USA and China.

International situation had changed substantially by the time Bhutto assumed control over truncated Pakistan in December 1971. He became an advocate of the theory of 'inter-dependence' and 'bilateralism' as the guiding principles of the foreign policy of New Pakistan. During the Indo-Pak (1971) war, Bhutto came to understand the changing mode of 'super-power diplomacy'. The big powers, the USA, Soviet Union, China and France, had entered an era of 'detente'. There was some hope that war, as an instrument of resolution of conflicts, would not be relied upon as a decisive alternative. The gradual transformation in relations between the USA and the USSR, and, the USA and China, had come under serious review. Bhutto saw no purpose being served by outright anti-American stance. He appealed to the USA to maintain power-balance in the South Asia region through resuming arms supply to Pakistan. Bhutto succeeded in getting massive Chinese military and economic aid, and also, developed good relations with other nuclear powers like France and Canada. Extending the national perspective to West Asia, Bhutto got substantial military and economic assistance, especially from Iran. For resolution of immediate problems arising from the Indo-Pak (1971) war, Bhutto eventually conceded the efficacy of the bilateral approach.

In 1973, Bhutto examined the fundamental issues concerning Pakistan's foreign policy and, in an academic vein, identified the retrospect and prospect thereof. Bhutto contended that by maintaining friendly relations with all the great powers, on the basis of principles and not expediency, Pakistan hoped to avoid involvement in disputes and struggle between them. He referred to Pakistan's withdrawal from the SEATO, in which Pakistan had in any case taken little part over the preceding few years. His alternative was recourse to 'bilateralism', with greater flexibility. It was recognised that in a climate of confrontation between two great powers, such a policy is, no doubt, subjected to severe tests. But in the climate of negotiations and conciliation which was inaugurated in 1972, bilateralism came to be recognised as the only policy which could respond to the demands of the situational historical phase of international affairs. Bhutto declared that "his country welcomed the new trends, not only on the grounds of

principle but also, because Pakistan seeks and received no benefit from the conflict between any two great powers.”⁵

In October 1976, Bhutto wrote a 38-page signed article entitled, “Bilateralism-New Directions”, in which he identified bilateralism as the guiding principle of Pakistan’s foreign policy. He maintained that bilateralism was, however, not incompatible with alliances with great powers and loyalties to multilateral arrangements. He added that prior to the adoption of bilateralism; Pakistan’s foreign policy was at worst capricious and, at best, one of pragmatism planted on half-forgotten ideology. He argued that “with the adoption of bilateralism, Pakistan sought to steer itself through the treacherous shoals and currents that menace the passage of strategically placed states in the complex contemporary age.”⁶ It would be relevant to recall in this context, Bhutto’s assessment of the vital geo-strategic dimensions of Pakistan. Bhutto conceded that Pakistan’s destiny is inevitably intertwined with that of the sub-continent, which did not mean that the geo-political position was circumscribed by the sub-continent. He referred to the 371-mile long border between China’s Sinkiang region and Pak-occupied Kashmir, in the past reputed for the Silk route. For well over 188 miles, the Wakhan corridor separates Pakistan and the USSR, varying in width from 7 to 31 miles. Bhutto recalled that Pakistan, situated at the head of the Arabian Sea, flanks the entrance to the oil-rich Persian Gulf. That ensures Pakistan’s strategic importance vis-à-vis the Middle East region, the Suez canal, and sea lanes from Europe to the Indian ocean.⁷

Of the other major dimensions of foreign policy postulates of Bhutto were: unity and solidarity among Afro-Asian countries, futility of nuclear armaments race; all the oceans, specifically the Indian Ocean, as nuclear-free peace Zones; new economic order of the third-world countries to minimize their dependence on the developed world; and, non-alignment as morally the only valid and practically the only effective policy. He elaborated that if non-alignment was to become a movement of great value, once again, it had to restore its pristine image, redefine its objectives and re-determine its priorities. Pleading for the inclusion of all the Third-World countries regardless of geographical location, power alignment, race, religion or ideology, Bhutto cautioned that “any movement, grouping, any

⁵ For details, see, Z.A. Bhutto, “Pakistan Builds Anew,” *Foreign Affairs*, April 1973, Vol. 51, No. 1, pp. 541-554 also included in Z. A. Bhutto: *Speeches and Statements*, April I, 1973-August 3, 1973. Karachi, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Department of Films and Publications, 1973, pp. 78-80

⁶ *Morning News*, October 31, 1976. Later, Bhutto developed this article into a book. See, Z. A. Bhutto, *Bilateralism—New Directions*, Islamabad, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Department of Films and Publications, 1976.

⁷ Z.A. Bhutto, ‘Pakistan Builds Anew’, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 51,. No. 3, April 1973, p. 553.

maneuver retarding third world's unification for mobilization of its energies would involve the censure of being little-minded.”⁸

In a 14-page signed article, released on September 5, 1976, Bhutto gave a blueprint for 'Third World Mobilization' and called for a third world summit around March 1977 in Pakistan, because he had been elected chairman of the 'Group of 77' at the United Nations for that year. Bhutto affirmed that the conference of third world countries would initiate the process of gaining immunity from the threat of a simmering and potentially disastrous confrontation and maximization of the promise of a global partnership. He declared that the third world message should not be clothed in the jargon of a bygone age, nor be tailored to the political ends of any country or group of countries. If the opulent and the powerful can combine, as they invariably do at critical moments, to maintain their dominance on the basis of their wealth and technology, it would be perpetrating a wrong on humanity if the poor nations should dissipate their relatively limited resources and capacity and widen the gulf between the poor and the poor.⁹

The preceding observations by Bhutto symbolize brave words, apparently fired by a romantic vision of the infinity of the world order. However, Bhutto also could not rise above certain predilections in his foreign policy formulations. Like his forerunners, Bhutto also fell prey to tempting objectives of Islamic ideology, two-nation theory and Pan-Islamic loyalties. The constitution of 1973 specifically mentioned (Article 40) that Pakistan would strive for preservation and strengthening of fraternal relations among Muslim countries based on Islamic unity and brotherhood. It is strange that Bhutto had to fall back upon Islamic affinities for legitimizing his rule, instead of identification and consolidation of rational, secular and modernizing determinants. He sought support of religious elements, both at home and abroad. To establish his own credentials, Bhutto launched anti-India tirade and painstakingly elaborated the relevance of the two-nation theory.¹⁰ If one were to critically examine Bhutto's thesis of the two-nation theory despite the dismemberment of Pakistan and emergence of Bangladesh, there would be no dearth of glaring distortions, lack of logic and summarily improvised inferences.¹¹

⁸ Morning News, October 31, 1976.

⁹ This article was also developed into a book. For details see Z.A. Bhutto, *Third World : New Directions*, London, Quartet Books, 1977, pp. 1-10.

¹⁰ Z.A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements*, December 20, 1971- March 31, 1972. Op. cit., pp. 2-5.

¹¹ Justifying the rationale of the two-nation theory, Bhutto observed : “It has been said that the dismemberment of Pakistan has destroyed the two-nation theory on which Pakistan was founded. The break between East and West Pakistan does not, however, mean that Bangladesh is willing to be absorbed into India. On the contrary independence which can only be predicted upon her distinctive Muslim character

To begin with, Bhutto was voicing a populist argument when he stated that the two-nation theory survives because Bangladesh was a free and sovereign country, having no intention to be merged with India. Bhutto ignored the fact that a people fighting a war of liberation do not, when the objective is achieved, stoop down of abject surrender of their sovereignty, won by ordeal of blood and iron. Bhutto was wrong again to have emphasised upon the so-called distinctive Muslim character of Bangladesh because that country has proven the decisiveness of cultural affinity as the core of national integration and aspirations. Indeed, Bangladesh owed its existence, as Bhutto insisted, to Pakistan, but not for the reasons he tried to fabricate. In simple terms, religion was waived as of no consequence and quest for cultural identity and survival as self-respecting people became the rallying points of disparate elements in erstwhile East Pakistan. Bhutto was on slippery grounds again to have alluded to India's alleged non-acceptance of the partition of 1947 as a fact. Facts and history speak entirely otherwise.

It could seem that Bhutto was trying to earn the sympathy and affinity of Islamic countries, evoking Pan-Islamic sentiments through his reiteration of the two-nation theory, however, in a distorted fashion. In fact, Bhutto needed no alibis for his newly acquired West Asia perspective, because truncated Pakistan left him with no other strategic options. The logic in his following statement seems sound enough though one fails to understand the relevance of emphasis on Muslim brotherhood because the Muslim countries of West Asia very much existed even before 1971. Bhutto stated:

*"The severance of our eastern limb by force has significantly altered our geographic focus. This will naturally affect our geo-political perspective... There is whole uninterrupted belt of Muslim nations... Clearly we have to make a major effort in building upon the fraternal ties that already bind us to the Muslim world."*¹²

Eulogizing the solidarity of the Muslim world, Bhutto once observed that "Muslim solidarity *per se* had no permanent antagonism. The divisions or

and separateness Bangladesh owes her existence to Pakistan... To foreigners, the issue sounds somewhat academic, but it constitutes the very basis of the agreement on which the sub-continent was partitioned. In practical terms, therefore, it involves the relations between the states of the sub-continent. Unhappily, India never fully accepted the premise on which partition was founded and the relationship between India and Pakistan was consequently distorted." Z. A. Bhutto, 'Pakistan Builds Anew' Foreign Affairs, April 1973, Vol. 51, No. 3, p. 545.

¹² Quoted in Lawrence Ziring, "Bhutto's Foreign Policy," in J.H. Henry (ed.) Co temporary Problems of Pakistan, The Netherland, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1974, p. 63.

differences between some of the Muslim states were but after-effects of the colonial exploitation.”¹³

It could be said to his credit that Bhutto identified more pragmatic options for foreign policy formulations rather than the confined insularity of military alliances or the unthinking reliance on the USA as an ally. The emphasis on bilateralism and allied aspects was also an attempt to devise a refreshing framework. The contradictions were evident however, when he talked about solidarity of the Muslim world as well as solidarity of the third world, forgetting the inherently rigid and irreversible strands in each.

Despite his advocacy of major components of Pakistan’s foreign policy formulations, as seen in the preceding analysis, Bhutto failed to rise above India-phobia, and also could not bring about any meaningful transformation in Pakistan’s relations even with a Muslim country, Afghanistan. His pronounced criticism of foreign interference in third world affairs notwithstanding, Bhutto himself relied on foreign powers for economic and military assistance. In spite of his periodical pronouncements favoring socialism, his leanings towards Islam within Pakistan and Pan-Islamism as an objective, presented inconsistencies which, in some measure, explain the nature of his leadership.

THE OPERATIONAL ASPECT

Bhutto’s theoretical perception notwithstanding, it would be relevant to enquire into Pakistan’s relations with other countries in keeping with the following classification:

- (i) Pakistan’s relations with South Asian countries;
- (ii) Pakistan’s Relations with global Powers; and,
- (iii) Pakistan’s Relations with third-world countries.

(i) Pakistan’s Relations with South Asian Countries

Bhutto pursued Pakistan’s foreign policy towards South Asian countries within the framework of his philosophy of bilateralism.¹⁴ Analyzing the entire network

¹³ Dawn, September 14, 1976.

¹⁴ After becoming the foreign minister in January 1963, Bhutto propounded the theory of ‘bilateralism’ in the changed context of global-power politics. He insisted that “smaller nations should evolve a policy to maintain normal bilateral relations in a perfectly understandable gradation, based on enlightened national interest”. See, *Myth of Independence*, pp. 22-24. Speaking at a dinner given by His Royal Highness Prince Karim in Rawalpindi on March 6, 1976, Bhutto clarified his concept of bilateralism: Bilateralism must mean, first, deciding issues on merits, being impartial and universal in approach and not getting entangled in the conflicts of the Super Powers or the great powers. Second, there must be a minimum *quid pro quo* in

of global-power politics Bhutto insisted on a rational and realistic assessment of Pakistan's relations with the other South Asian countries. He took concrete steps to mend relations with the People's Republic of China so as to minimize the influence of the two super-powers, the USA and the USSR, in the South Asian region. Apprehending the dominant position of India in the region, Bhutto sought to maintain 'equilibrium' in superpower politics. His basic objective was to consolidate Pakistan's political and economic stability after the trauma of the separation of erstwhile East Pakistan.

As one takes a closer look at Pakistan's relations with India during Bhutto's tenure, it would be seen that despite bilateral talks and negotiations, Pakistan persisted with anti-India tirade. Bhutto projected the Kashmir issue as the major cause for contention between the two countries. Like the preceding rulers, Bhutto identified India as a source of potential threat to Pakistan's sovereignty. He referred to the emergence of Bangladesh as the outcome of India's hegemonistic designs.

Soon after assumption of power, Bhutto unleashed an anti-India campaign, primarily to dilate political opposition at home, and to project his image as the 'savior' and 'heroic figure', capable of ensuring Pakistan's integrity and stability. In his first broadcast to the nation, Bhutto asserted his country's determination "to take revenge, to put right the humiliation inflicted upon her by India."¹⁵ That was also the time when he recklessly referred to Indo-Pak confrontation as a confrontation of 1,000 years. Perhaps, he was largely catering to populist appeal. However, such expression of mere sentimental outburst hardly approximates to considered policy postures.

It is true that Bhutto's hands were full with problems arising from the war of 1971. The release of prisoners of war (POW) and civilians interned in India (during the war) and Bangladesh, and, retrieval of Pakistan's 5,000 square miles territory from India's control were two crucial issues before Bhutto to establish

that relationship for it to be a meaningful bilateral foreign policy". He insisted that Pakistan cannot have a bilateral relationship with countries which do not recognize its frontiers or accept its basic interests. However, Bhutto made it clear that his saying that Pakistan was following essentially a bilateral foreign policy must not be considered as exclusive to a multi-lateral responsibility. He said: "... the central theme of Pakistan's foreign policy is bilateralism, but it does not mean that it is in contradiction with our other multilateral responsibilities." Morning News, March 8, 1976.

¹⁵ Bhutto's style at that time could be assessed from an extract of his speech delivered on December 20, 1971: "Mr. Jagjivan Ram should know that it is not the end of war. This is the beginning of war, of a new state of affairs. He should not gloat over temporary military victories. India should not get intoxicated with the military take-over of East Pakistan. We will continue to fight for the honour and integrity of Pakistan. The People of Pakistan would never compromise no matter what happened. They would fight for one Pakistan". Cited in Asian Recorder, January 22-28, 1972.

his domestic legitimacy. Since the POWs were largely from Punjab and Sindh, Bhutto was under constant pressure for their immediate release.

During January and February 1972, Bhutto visited various countries, eliciting sympathy of other nations and for building up a case against India. He appealed to nations not to recognize Bangladesh as a separate nation, because it was 'forcibly separated by India'. However, Bhutto did not get any concrete support from foreign powers against India. Only China extended verbal support. Several foreign leaders suggested to Bhutto to recognize the existence of Bangladesh and to resolve problems through bilateral negotiations. As the aggrieved, as well as the vanquished party, there was no alternative for Bhutto except going to the negotiation table. In March 1972, Bhutto apparently showed some change in his belligerence and agreed to hold bilateral negotiations with India.¹⁶

During the last week of April, 1972, India and Pakistan held emissary-level talks at Muree for setting the modalities of forthcoming talks between the heads of respective governments at Simla. Consequently, on June 28, 1972, the two heads of government, Z. A. Bhutto and Indira Gandhi, met at Simla, and after considerable apprehensions of a breakdown, arrived at a bilateral agreement on July 2, 1972. The Simla Agreement was signed in accordance with the principles of the UN charter binding the two countries to their respective sides of the international border and laid down various steps to be taken by them for normalization of relations step by step, in the field of communications and restoration of cultural, economic and diplomatic relations. Moreover, the agreement provided for the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir, resulting from the ceasefire of December 17, 1971, to be respected by both countries. The leaders of the two countries also agreed to hold subsequent meetings to discuss the issue of the repatriation of POWs and of civilian internees, and also issues related to Kashmir.¹⁷

Soon after the Simla Agreement, Bhutto reverted to anti-India tirade and refused to recognize Bangladesh. He demanded the release of all the POWs without any precondition, whereas the Bangladesh government had insisted upon trial of 195 POWs who were accused of severe crimes committed during the liberation war. It was obvious that Bhutto used the Simla Agreement as an instrument to assuage the feelings of hurt and anger of a people who saw how the army had inflicted upon them humiliation and disaster. Bhutto would never have agreed to

¹⁶ On March 14, 1972, at a press conference, Bhutto for the first time, since he took power, showed interest in bilateral talks. He said: "I am allergic to third party intervention. It is high time that the nations of the subcontinent solved their disputes without having to turn to outside umpires for help." Asian Recorder, April 22-28, 1972.

¹⁷ For the text of Simla Agreement, See, Asian Recorder, July 15-21, 1972.

the delineation of the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir, if he knew that the withdrawal of Indian troops from its territories could be achieved without that. He would not have betrayed unusual haste about the withdrawal of Indian troops, were it not necessary for him to pacify the people of Punjab, his mainstay of power. His concern for normalizing inter-state relations in the subcontinent was not overbearing.¹⁸

Emissary-level talks between Pakistan and India were held in Rawalpindi from July 24 to 31, 1973, to review the progress made in the implementation of the Simla agreement. Pakistan expressed concern at the issue of trial of 195 POWs by Bangladesh. The foreign minister of Pakistan, Aziz Ahmed, warned that if Dacca persisted with its decision to hold trial of 195 POWs, the entire fabric of peace in the sub-continent would crumble. Earlier, Bhutto during his visit to London in July 1973, has stated that Pakistan could not accept the so-called non-Bengalis whom Sheikh Mujib wanted to be repatriated from Bangladesh.¹⁹

Talks between India and Pakistan were again held at Delhi from August 18 to 28, 1973, culminating in the signing of the Delhi Agreement. The 'Delhi Agreement' (August 1973)²⁰ provided that the process of a simultaneous repatriation of Pakistani POWs and civilian internees in India, of Bengalis in Pakistan and of Pakistanis in Bangladesh should begin immediately. It was agreed that during the entire period of repatriation, no trials of the 195 POWs should take place and that after the repatriation was completed, or earlier, if they so agreed, Bangladesh, India and Pakistan would discuss and settle the question of the 195 POWs. However, Bangladesh made it clear that it could participate in such a meeting only on the basis of sovereign equality. Bhutto was adamant to secure the release of 195 POWs without their trial and without recognizing Bangladesh.

¹⁸ See Satish Kumar, *The New Pakistan*, New Delhi, Vikas, 1978. The author has pointed out some major compulsions affecting Bhutto's concurrence to conclude bilateral agreement at Simla : (a) Pakistan would like to normalize relations with India and Bangladesh only to the extent it was absolutely necessary for political and economic stability; (b) Pakistan would like to maintain an optimum level of tension with India and Bangladesh, which was necessary to retain for itself a modicum of importance in international politics, and without which it would stand to lose its relevance for, major powers; (c) the economic advantages which should accrue to Pakistan from normalization of relations with India and Bangladesh were not considered indispensable by the Pakistani Leadership because alternative avenues of economic intercourse had meanwhile been developed for the country; and (d) Pakistan did not fear that military expenditure necessary to sustain the optimum level of tension with India and Bangladesh would prove unbearable to the country because of foreign powers which were always ready to feed its military machine, pp. 271-272.

¹⁹ For details, see *News Review on South Asia*, New Delhi, IDSA, August 1973.

²⁰ *The Times of India*, August 29, 1973.

To enhance his personal image, Bhutto widely publicized the Simla Agreement in Pakistan as a positive achievement of the Pakistan People's Party government. Speaking at Peshawar on September 10, 1973, Bhutto recalled:

“We went to Tashkent with pride because we had thwarted the enemy's plan, taken a larger area of its territory and' held a larger number of POWs. It was India, which had pressed for a ceasefire then. Contrary to this, he went to Simla with the position that half the country was lost, 5,000 square miles of West Pakistan territory was captured, and 90,000 of our own men were prisoners. In view of these objective realities, the Simla Agreement was signed and it was a positive gain to Pakistan.”²¹

He took pains to reiterate that by supporting the Simla' agreement, Pakistan had not compromised her national interests, especially on the issue of Kashmir. In his UN speech (September 20, 1973), Bhutto observed that normal relations between India and Pakistan can not be established overnight, the two peoples had a thousand year history, a history of coexistence and antagonism, osmosis and divergence, interplay' and mistrust.²²

In February 1974, during the 'Islamic Summit' held at Lahore, Bhutto sought to publicize his decision as one of honour and dignity. As a strategic move to resolve the impasse, Bhutto declared Pakistan's intention to recognize Bangladesh. Consequently, on April 5, 1974, Bangladesh, Pakistan and India signed a trilateral agreement, incorporating Bangladesh's announcement releasing 195 POWs without insisting on their trial.²³

Having achieved two major objectives, repatriation of the POWs without trial and getting back 5,000 square miles of territory, Bhutto reverted to anti-India tirade and recurrent demand for resolution of the Kashmir problem in accordance with the resolutions of the UN General Assembly. Meanwhile, explosion of a nuclear device by India on May 18, 1974, gave Bhutto a pretext for repeating allegations against India's hegemonistic designs.”²⁴ Bhutto unilaterally called off talks with India on resumption of communication links and diplomatic ties. He accused India of effectively destroying the two years' relations between

²¹ Dawn, September 11, 1973.

²² The Pakistan Times, September 22, 1973.

²³ The Hindustan Times, April, 1974.

²⁴ On May 19, 1974, at a news conference at Lahore, Bhutto said: “Pakistan would never succumb to nuclear blackmail by India. The people of Pakistan would never accept Indian hegemony or domination in the sub-continent. Neither would it compromise its position on the right of the people of Kashmir to decide their own future.” Dawn, May 20,-1974.

the two countries by nuclear blackmail.” He accused India of violating the 1963 Moscow agreement barring nuclear test in the atmosphere, under water and in space, and stated that “it is very difficult to be assured of India’s bonafides.”²⁵

Though, the Foreign Secretaries of India and Pakistan met twice (in November 1974 and in May 1975) to resume the process of normalization between the two countries, nothing positive came out of their talks. Pakistan expressed concern at India’s alleged attempts to impose hegemony in the South Asian region. When Sikkim acceded to India in April 1975, Bhutto accused India of “illegal annexation of Sikkim”. He said that by “Swallowing up the tiny Himalayan Kingdom of Sikkim, India has given new credibility to Pakistan’s appeals for the United States to resume military assistance. Through a total take-over of Sikkim, India has introduced a dangerous element of instability in a highly sensitive region.”²⁶

Foreign Secretaries of India and Pakistan met again in the second week of May 1976 at Islamabad. The agreement arrived at, showed that the process initiated at Simla, four years earlier, had resulted in resumption of civilian over-flights, goods, and passenger traffic, through rail and road links, and resumption of diplomatic relations, though inter-state trade did not reach the expected level. Also, some kind of resolution of the Kashmir issue continued to be a distant possibility.²⁷

However, Bhutto did not relent in raising the Kashmir issue which primarily served propagandist purposes. During his visit to Peking (Beijing), Bhutto declared on May 29, 1976 that “advance from normalization of relations to peaceful coexistence between India and Pakistan could be achieved only after a settlement of Jammu and Kashmir dispute.”²⁸ It was a reference he could have avoided if he sincerely desired to uphold the Simla spirit.

As Bhutto had decided to hold general elections by the end of 1976 it also became necessary for him to counter the criticism of the opposition parties that he had by-passed the Kashmir issue at the 1972 Simla Agreement. Bhutto reiterated that he signed the Simla Agreement for safe-guarding Pakistan’s immediate national interests and never for a moment did he resile from the view that the final

²⁵ The Pakistan Times, July 18, 1974.

²⁶ The Pakistan Times, September 14, 1975, Cf., Morning News, April 26, 1975.

²⁷ News Review on South Asia and Indian Ocean, Jun; 1976.

²⁸ Dawn, May 30, 1976.

solution of Indo-Pak problems lay in the acceptance of UN General Assembly resolutions.

It was one of Bhutto's major obsessions to seek parity in armaments with India.²⁹ He allocated nearly 50 per cent of Pakistan's total national budget and nearly 10 per cent of its GNP to defence expenditure. During the financial year 1975-1976, Pakistan's defence expenditure was estimated to be Rs. 702 crores, whereas before the liberation of Bangladesh the defence budget totalled Rs. 444 crores.³⁰

It was absolutely inconsistent of Bhutto to have extolled his recourse to bilateralism with India and yet project adamant postures with regard to the problem of Kashmir, disregarding India's offer at Simla to resolve all issues, including that of Kashmir, bilaterally and peacefully. The fact that Bhutto sought to internationalize the Kashmir issue did not show positive perception of the problem. In addition, his quest and concern for parity of arms with India further confirmed that he was not sincere towards the philosophy of bilateralism with regard to India, beyond a certain point.

Pakistan's relations with Bangladesh, to begin with, were determined by the nature of emergence of the latter, consequent upon dismemberment of the former indeed for twenty-six months, Bhutto continued to maintain the myth of a united Pakistan and called Bangladesh, "Muslim Bengal".³¹ Interestingly, in the 1973 constitution, [clause (3) Article 1] it was added that "the constitution shall be appropriately amended so as to enable the people of the Province of East Pakistan, as and when foreign aggression in that province and its effects are eliminated, to be represented in the affairs of the federation." After the recognition of Bangladesh by the government of Pakistan (on February 22, 1974, at the Islamic Summit), this clause was deleted through the first constitution amendment on April 23, 1974.

It might be recalled that Bhutto continued to refer to the emergence of Bangladesh as the consequence of foreign conspiracy and an armed intervention by India which caused the dismemberment of Pakistan, conveniently forgetting

²⁹ In a public meeting at Hyderabad (Sindh), Bhutto said (on January 24, 1976) that "days are not far off when Pakistan would be forceful and formidable nation so strong that none would be able to cast an evil eye on her. Pakistan was bound to be the strongest nation in this sub-continent." Ibid., April 5, 1976.

³⁰ Indian Express, February 24, 1976.

³¹ In his first broadcast to the nation on December 20, 1971, Bhutto appealed to the people of Bangladesh to "forget and forgive" the wrongs of military regime and pledged to strive for a loose arrangement between the "Eastern and western parts of the country, put within the framework of one Pakistan". He claimed that "East Pakistan is an inseparable and un-severable part of Pakistan". Asian Recorder, January 22-28, 1972.

his intransigence in not accepting Mujib as the leader of the majority party, elected by popular mandate. Bhutto appealed to China to veto the entry of Bangladesh to the United Nations and till February 1974, he withheld recognition of Bangladesh.³²

Before the Islamic Summit Conference met, Bhutto invited delegates from Bangladesh to attend the conference to be held at Lahore in February, 1972, without any pre-condition, in the larger interest and solidarity of the Muslim world. He maintained that recognition of Bangladesh was a separate issue and should not be linked with the Islamic Summit. In order to gain sympathy of Muslim countries, Bhutto advanced a totally unsubstantiated argument that "Muslim Bengal was under the control of anti-people forces anti India's domination was complete."³³

After the mediation of the members of leading Islamic countries, and the recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan, Sheikh Mujib agreed to attend the Islamic Summit conference. Sheikh Mujib also agreed to repatriate 195 POWs without any trial. Bhutto also visited Bangladesh on June 20, 1974 for holding talks with Sheikh Mujib for resolution of problems pertaining to the division of assets and repatriation of 4,00,000 non-Bengalis who had opted to go to Pakistan. Owing to Bhutto's obstinacy, the talks between Sheikh Mujib and Bhutto were in vain. However, for the first time Bhutto recognised the separate identity and existence of Bangladesh. He said: "We lived as one nation, we are now separate and independent nations but it does not mean that we can not join hands to overcome staggering poverty and improve conditions of our peoples for happiness and progress."³⁴

It was evident that whereas Bhutto kept up with his emphasis on "Muslim" prefix, the Bangladesh view-point considered "Bangla" as the decisive dimension of relationship. Bhutto failed to assess, even after emergence of Bangladesh, the

³² In the National Assembly (On August 14, 1972), Bhutto said: "It would be a 'mistake' on the part of Dacca administration to believe that since it had been recognised by 78 countries it could secure UN membership without Pakistan's recognition." See Asian Recorder, August 26-September 1, 1972.

³³ On January 28, 1974, speaking at Khairpur stadium, Bhutto said: "The conference was a historic occasion for the Muslims all over the world and Muslim leaders from Morocco to Indonesia will be attending the conference." Inviting the people of Bangladesh, Bhutto said: "If you do not want to meet your Pakistani brothers, you can meet Heads of Muslim States, as you represent seven crore Muslims of Muslim Bengal." Dawn, January 29, 1974.

³⁴ Bangladesh Observer, June 29, 1974. More than 2,000 demonstrators showed black flags and placards reading "We condemn genocide". They raised slogans "Bhutto go back", "Butcher Bhutto", when Z. A. Bhutto went to pay homage to the martyrs of Bangladesh liberation war at the 'National Martyrs' Monument' at Savar, 25 miles from Dacca on June 28, 1974.

intensity of Bangla culture and nationalism and popular commitment in that regard. Bhutto's call for Bangladesh to return to the so called federal system of Pakistan was meant for popular consumption and it blatantly ignored the realities of the political situation.

Alter the military 'coup' (on August 15, 1975) in which Sheikh Mujib and members of his family were assassinated, Bhutto's posture towards Bangladesh showed definite change. Pakistan's response to the ghastly crime was characterized by general euphoria and it reflected Bhutto's dislike and antagonism for Sheikh Mujib. Within 24 hours, Pakistan recognised the new regime, while Sheikh Mujib's regime was accorded recognition after twenty-six months. Pakistan's generous offer of 50,000 tons of rice, 10 million yards of long-cloth and 5 million yards of bleached mull to Bangladesh was an obvious evidence of Bhutto's satisfaction with the change of regime.³⁵

Pakistan's response to Mujib's murder was based on some clearly identifiable assumptions: first, the new regime had initially declared Bangladesh an 'Islamic Republic'; second, that the new regime showed no friendly posture towards India. However, within a few days, the new president of Bangladesh, Khondokar Mustaq Abmad declared that Bangladesh would remain a secular state and would continue to be known as "People's Republic" and not an "Islamic Republic."³⁶

The revised decision caused considerable disappointment in Pakistan. The clarification by responsible official circles in Bangladesh notwithstanding, Bhutto continued to highlight alleged vindication of the two-nation theory and persisted with 'big brotherly' attitude towards Bangladesh.³⁷

Bhutto assured resumption of diplomatic relations and persuaded the new government of Bangladesh to sign a treaty with Pakistan, on the pattern of the Indo-Bangladesh treaty, for resuming bilateral relations.³⁸ Bhutto declared his intention to have a "special relationship" with Bangladesh and vowed to stand

³⁵ See, Satish Kumar, *The New Pakistan*, Op. cit., p. 306.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 307.

³⁷ Replying to questions at a press conference, before his departure from Sri Lanka (on December 19, 1975), Bhutto said that "the best thing was to let the people of Bangladesh chalk out their future destiny without any meddling". He warned that "If any country tries to interfere and regulate the affairs of Bangladesh this would make matters worse." *Dawn*, December 20, 1975.

³⁸ *The Times of India*, January 1, 1976.

by that country in all trials and tribulations.³⁹ The contradiction was so obvious in his refusal to recognize “Bangla culture” as the basis of Bangladesh. Bhutto’s identification of Bangladesh as Muslim Bengal was merely vicarious delight which had no operational relevance.

Pakistan’s relations with other South Asian countries, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bhutan, did not show any controversial aspects during Bhutto’s regime. Bhutto sought to develop mutually beneficial relations with these countries on the basis of bilateralism. However, he cautioned these nations to oppose the hegemony of any major power in the region.

(ii) Pakistan’s Relations with Global Powers

Theoretically speaking, Bhutto claimed to maintain bilateral approach in Pakistan’s relations with USA, USSR, UK, France and Peoples’ Republic of China. He reiterated that under a new foreign policy, Pakistan would refrain from participating in multilateral alliances and pacts which were basically counter-productive. It would be more correct, however, to say that Bhutto’s over-bearing consideration was with the nature of relationship each of these nations tended to adopt towards India. Constantly harping on India’s alleged hegemonistic designs in South Asian region, in general, and in the sub continent in particular, Bhutto utilized the exercise for procuring economic and military aid from various sources. Bhutto’s foreign policy postulates could be comprehended with greater understanding if one took into account his perception of protracted Sino-Indian estrangement and Indo-Pak hostility and distrust, on the one hand, and Pakistan’s growing understanding with the USA and Communist China, on the other.

India’s growing amity with the USSR, especially the Indo-Soviet treaty (1971), further explained Pakistan’s search for alternative diplomatic bases. And, yet Pakistan’s relations with the USSR, even during the systemic crisis of 1971, however non-specific, were not estranged, and did not affect mutual economic, trade, cultural and scientific relations.

Viewed from the limited options available in foreign policy formulations, that was not a minor achievement. Nevertheless, one would not ignore the fact that so long as the USA perceives Pakistan as relatively more reliable outpost to meet

³⁹ Enunciating Pakistan’s foreign policy, Bhutto said in Rawalpindi (on March 6, 1976) that there was a “special relationship” between Pakistan and Bangladesh. However, Bangladesh was “today a separate country” and “we respect its sovereignty”. He declared that “we will stand by each other in every moment in every trial and tribulation just as we did in the glorious struggle for Independence.” The Pakistan Times, March 7, 1976.

the Soviet offensive as well as to serve US global objectives within the region and outside, Pakistan would continue to derive some satisfaction and gains, however trivial ultimately, as a result of US-Pakistan friendship. This is true for China also owing to Sino-Soviet rift, Sino-Indian estrangement and Sino-US detente, all the factors proving conducive to Pakistan's initiative in fostering her relations with these states which may not go well with the USSR.

After the 1971 war, Bhutto showed apparent approval of US policies during the conflict and sought supply of arms to Pakistan in order to ensure parity in the South Asian region. Bhutto was believed to have expressed his gratitude to the USA for preventing India from an all-out assault on West Pakistan and Pak-occupied Kashmir.⁴⁰ Bhutto showed inclination for reviving and strengthening bilateral defence agreements with the USA, with a view to procuring US arms to replenish the loss of equipment during 1971 war. He appreciated President Nixon's statesmanship and also asked for steps to consolidate Sino-American detente for restoration of stability in the power balance in Asia.

However, the US government refused to sign a defence pact with Pakistan in view of the arms embargo which was imposed in 1965. Bhutto was unhappy that the USA did not give due importance to Pakistan vis-à-vis India. On November 8, 1972, Pakistan announced withdrawal from the SEATO of which it was a founder member. Bhutto, however, retained the membership of CENTO on the plea that separation of East Pakistan had substantially changed the geo-political perceptions of Pakistan towards South and West Asia.⁴¹

US-Pak relations did not show any material change till 1973 when President Nixon assured Bhutto (September 20, 1973) of US support for Pakistan's independence and territorial integrity as a "guiding principle of American foreign policy". Under the Ford administration, Bhutto again asked for resumption of arms supply to Pakistan. He reiterated that Pakistan was the only ally which had been denied arms. He threatened that if the US refused to resume military supplies, Pakistan would have to seriously consider quitting the CENTO. Bhutto insisted that since Pakistan was entitled by the bilateral agreements of 1954 and 1959 to acquire arms, the US should resume arms supply to Pakistan as

⁴⁰ On February 10, 1972, Bhutto told the New York Times columnist C.L. Sulzberger: "I think that the world and my own people should know that the USA, in the interest of peace and civilized conduct among states, did put its foot down. If there had been no US intervention, India should have moved hard against Pakistan's occupied Kashmir and also the Southern front in Sind." Asian Recorder, March 18-24, 1972.

⁴¹ Ibid., December 2-8, 1972.

a “legal obligation.”⁴² Bhutto’s strategy succeeded eventually. The Ford administration lifted the ten-year old arms embargo on February 24, 1975.⁴³

It may also be mentioned that before formalization of that decision, Pakistan had already got substantial US military and economic aid. During 1972-1974, sale of US armaments to Pakistan rose to about \$ 82 million. Moreover, Pakistan got anti-tank missiles, jeeps and other military vehicles worth about \$ 100 million from the USA.⁴⁴

In the beginning of the year 1976, Pak-US relations began to show signs of deterioration on the issue of establishing nuclear reprocessing plant in collaboration with France. The US administration strongly opposed Pakistan’s nuclear deal with France and maintained that Pakistan’s basic objective in that nuclear deal was to counter the threat of India’s nuclear capability.⁴⁵ The US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger disclosed on March 10, 1976 that the USA was making the strongest representation to contain the spread of nuclear weapons by opposing the sale of nuclear technology and equipment to ‘sensitive’ regions and countries such as Pakistan. Kissinger also pointed out that the US administration had persuaded six other nuclear supplier countries, the USSR, France, West Germany, Britain, Canada and Japan, to meet in June 1976 to discuss hopefully the strengthening of an informal pact made in November 1975 by these countries on applying safeguards and controls on exports of nuclear technology.⁴⁶ The US government, time and again, cautioned Bhutto that if he goes ahead with the purchase of a nuclear fuel reprocessing plant from France, Pakistan will be facing stoppage of American military and economic aid. The newly elected US President, Jimmy Carter, persuaded the French government to stop the supply of nuclear assistance to Pakistan. Bhutto disapproved of US policy in that regard and expressed apprehensions about the usefulness of alliance with the USA.⁴⁷

⁴² On July 9, 1974 Bhutto said that in seeking arms-aid from the USA, he would not “go on bended knees to ask for them”. “We are entitled to it. This is a legal obligation on the part of the US government.” The Times of India, July 10, 1974.

⁴³ Ibid., February 25, 1975.

⁴⁴ The Statesman, February 25, 1975.

⁴⁵ Ibid., February 27, 1976.

⁴⁶ The Times of India, March 12, 1976.

⁴⁷ In an interview published on November 6, 1976, in the Daily Telegraph, Z. A. Bhutto accused the USA of not treating Pakistan as an ally. He criticized the US President-elect, Jimmy Carter, for blocking the planned sale of French nuclear installations to Pakistan. Bhutto said that “I know I have never let myself go against the Americans as I am doing now, but they have made it disagreeable. Under these circumstances, I cannot place any great value on the alliance with America.” The Statesman, November 7, 1976.

While Bhutto grew more insistent in his resolve to acquire a nuclear reprocessing plant, the US attitude also hardened. Perhaps, it was inevitable that after he was deposed, Bhutto accused the US administration of connivance in the July 5 military 'coup'.⁴⁸

It is understandable why the US government did not permit Bhutto to follow an independent nuclear policy. It is equally clear why Bhutto aspired to make Pakistan a nuclear -power. Perhaps, Bhutto's obsession with achieving parity with India along with his consuming desire for personal glory left him with no other alternative.

Pakistan's relations with the USSR, in the overall context of global and regional politics, particularly the Indo-Soviet friendship, were by and large, confined to cultural, scientific, technical and trade relations. Bhutto did not approve of the role of the Soviet Union in South Asia region, especially during the December 1971 Indo-Pak conflict. Despite Bhutto's close links with the USA and China, Soviet leaders believed that Bhutto was relatively a progressive leader. They appreciated Bhutto's support for bilateralism for resolution of problems in the sub-continent.

The Soviet Union after Bhutto's visit to Moscow in March 1972, agreed to restore mutual scientific, technical, trade and economic relations. Bhutto was not successful, however, in securing favorable response from the USSR in terms of political and military affairs. In an interview published in *Kayhan International* on April 15, 1973, Bhutto pointed out that he had gone out of his way to repair relations with Moscow but "we can not be expected to take everything flat on our backs. We are more than ready to forge the best of relations, with the USSR provided they respect our dignity and integrity."⁴⁹

Bhutto was at one with the USA and China in apprehending Soviet designs and strategy in South Asia and remained critical of Indo-Soviet understanding.

Bhutto played a major role in establishing closer links with the People's Republic of China. Since the sixties, he had been consistently pleading for Sino-Pak amity. To counter the threats from India and the Soviet Union, Bhutto considered China to be a more reliable ally, especially in view of China's geopolitical situation. He

⁴⁸ Soon after his release from protective custody, Bhutto (on August 10, 1977), addressing a PPP meeting, said that "the US was opposed to him because his government has stood by Arabs and Palestinians; that he upheld the cause of the Third world and had refused to cancel a deal with France for a nuclear reprocessing plant." *Patriot*, August 11, 1977. Bhutto also expressed his antagonism with the USA in his two last books : (i) *My Pakistan*, New Delhi, Biswin Sadi Publications, 1979; pp. 79-82 (ii) "If I am Assassinated", New Delhi, Vikas, 1979

⁴⁹ For details see *News Review on South Asia*, New Delhi, IDSA, May, 1973.

found no ideological hindrance in improving Pakistan's relations with China and strongly insisted that Pakistan's relations with China were motivated by positive factors and not by transient exigencies affecting another country.

In the *Myth of Independence*, Bhutto observed:

“It has been insinuated that the ideologies of Pakistan and China are incompatible and that a friendly working arrangement cannot therefore be sustained between them. It is further argued that Pakistan's friendly relations with China, being of a subjective character, will be unable to withstand the stress of time. These are fallacious arguments. States deal with States, as such, and not with their social systems or ideologies. If such an argument were carried to its logical conclusion, Pakistan should have friendly relations only with Muslim states and isolate itself from the rest of the world. It is a historical fact that Islam, as a political force, has suffered more at the hands of Christian states than of others... It is unlikely that China is going to be responsible for the fall of Granada of Pakistan or for wresting of Jerusalem from the Muslim states. Our reactions are based on the Bandung principles and on the adherence to the concept of non-interference. No where is it mentioned in the scriptures of Islam that fostering friendship with non-Islamic states involves a compromise of identity.⁵⁰

Bhutto consistently supported the cause of China in international forums. He insisted on China's entry into the United Nations and called for representation of China in Asian Development Bank.⁵¹ The People's Republic of China, in turn, provided vital arms aid to Pakistan as the latter country came to be known as the biggest recipient of Chinese military aid among non-communist countries.⁵²

China also consistently supported Pakistan's stand on the Kashmir problem based on the UN General Assembly resolutions. The Chinese leaders supported Pakistan in accusing the Soviet Union and India of dismembering Pakistan in 1971.

Till May 1974, Pakistan received \$ 300 million military aid from China. It also received other important military equipment including MIG-19, T-54 and T-59

⁵⁰ Z.A. Bhutto, *The Myth of Independence*, pp. 132-133.

⁵¹ Bhutto argued: “As an underdeveloped country, Pakistan would like to see the United Nations reformed, so that it would be in a better position to protect the interests of weaker nations, but this is inconceivable without the participation of the People's Republic of China, a Great Power entitled, in its own right, to a place in the Security Council.” *Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁵² *The Hindustan Times*, April 1, 1976.

tanks, automatic rifles and machine guns.⁵³ Bhutto explained that he was strengthening Pakistan's ties with China, because Pakistan could not depend upon the US to resume arms aid. In November 1971, China agreed to provide Rs. 1,000 million interest-free long-term loan to finance development projects in addition to Rs. 540 millions, pledged in the past.⁵⁴ At Bhutto's request China also agreed to cancel a \$ 110,000,000 debt growing out of the 1965 Indo-Pak war. Though China declined to sign a defence-pact with Pakistan to counter-balance the Indo-Soviet Treaty of 1971, it assured Pakistan of assistance as and when the occasion demanded.⁵⁵ China not only helped Pakistan to more than make-up for the war losses suffered during the conflict of 1971, it extended substantial help for building the infrastructure for armaments production and modernization plans for Pakistan's defence preparedness. During the decade of US arms embargo (1965-1975), Pakistan got substantial arms from China. The congruence of interests of the two countries enhanced the scope of Sino-Pak friendship.⁵⁶

It might be stated that in the context of arms-embargo imposed by the USA, as well as obvious Soviet reluctance to be of any help in that regard, Bhutto had to turn to France for the nuclear plant and to China to replenish her arsenals. There was possibly no other way out for Bhutto. Also, the Chinese appeared to have a high stake in supporting the Bhutto administration and ensuring that Pakistan continued to depend on China for its arms supplies as well as political support. As the Sino-Soviet dispute intensified, the Chinese commitment to Pakistan became more firm. In fact, sole objective was to countervail the growing Soviet interest in the sub-continent.⁵⁷

Pakistan's relations with the United Kingdom and France remained cordial during the Bhutto regime. Though Bhutto chose to withdraw Pakistan from membership of the Commonwealth as a protest against Britain's recognition of Bangladesh,⁵⁸ he continued to extend diplomatic, cultural and trade relations

⁵³ Bangladesh Observer, May 24, 1974.

⁵⁴ The Pakistan Times, November 15, 1971.

⁵⁵ For details see, News Review on South Asia, April, 1973.

⁵⁶ China's policy towards Pakistan is analyzed in detail in Amitava Mukherjee and Sudhir Banerjee, *China's Policy Towards Asia*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1975.

⁵⁷ K. Subramanyam, "The Interest of External Powers in Pakistan," *The Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis Journal*, Vol. V, No. 3, January 1973, pp. 417-433.

⁵⁸ On January 30, 1972, Bhutto announced the withdrawal of Pakistan's membership from the Commonwealth. Bhutto's announcement of leaving the Commonwealth was a dramatic gesture of national self-respect and independence in view of Britain's recognition of Bangladesh. *The Times of India*, January 31, 1972. Further, in his article, "Pakistan Builds Anew" (*Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 51, No. 3, April 1973), Bhutto stated: "However, as a forward looking nation, we reject the legacy of the past which has outgrown

with the United Kingdom. After Bhutto's persistent efforts, Pakistan and France signed a bilateral agreement for the construction of a nuclear fuel reprocessing plant on March 17, 1976.⁵⁹ However, owing to US intervention, Bhutto could not materialize the nuclear deal with France. With other major European and East European countries, Bhutto promoted cordial cultural, economic and diplomatic relations.

(iii) Pakistan's Relations with the Third World Countries

Bhutto gave ample evidence of his aspiration to play a leading role in the third world. He reiterated Pakistan's commitment to the principles of Afro-Asian solidarity, initiated at the historic Bandung Conference in 1955. He firmly criticized the common tendency among developing countries to rely on developed nations. In the *Myth of Independence*, Bhutto observed:

"The question before the smaller nations of today is how they should conduct their affairs in such a manner as to safeguard their basic interests; to retain their territorial integrity and to continue to exercise independence in their relationship with the Global powers as well as with the smaller nations. The relationship between the Global powers and the smaller countries is on an unequal footing, whereby the former can exact a multitude of concessions without responding in sufficient, let alone equal, measure. No small nation can possibly bring a Global power under its influence on the plea of justice or because of the righteousness of its cause. In the ultimate analysis, it is not the virtue of the cause that becomes the determining factor, but the cold self-interest of the Global powers which shapes their policy, and this self-interest has better chances of prevailing in an endless and unequal confrontation between a Global power and smaller nations. Should the smaller nations, therefore, obediently follow the dictates of Global powers and exchange their independence for material gains and promises of economic propriety? The answer is an emphatic 'No'... The force of freedom must triumph because it is stronger than any other force for which man will lay down his life. It is still possible for smaller nations, with adroit handling of their affairs, to

its usefulness. Hence, Pakistan has recently left the Commonwealth which had long since ceased to have any practical meaning. This has become more evident since Britain stepped into Europe by joining the European Economic Community. p. 554.

⁵⁹ Dawn, March 20, 1976. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has approved Pakistan's agreement with France for setting up a plutonium separation plant at Karachi. Premier Bhutto revealed this at a press conference in Ottawa on February 24, 1976.

maintain their independence and retain flexibility of action in their relationship with Global powers.”⁶⁰

Bhutto remained critical of racial discrimination and the policy of apartheid and insisted upon elimination of racism and colonial oppression in Africa and elsewhere.⁶¹

In order to reduce foreign economic domination in the third-world countries, Bhutto suggested establishment of a ‘new economic world order’. He envisaged to create an “equitable economic order so that world resources and technology, common heritage of the entire mankind, were available for the benefits of humanity rather than be controlled by the few for their exclusive consumption.”⁶² Moreover, Bhutto insisted on the necessity of calling a Third World Summit Conference to dismantle the prevailing economic relations in the third world. He argued that “the time has come for the third world countries to take cognizance of their vital interests and to resolutely strive for fundamental remedial action to redress the grave injustice to the poorer nations of the world.”⁶³

These ideals notwithstanding, Bhutto could not hide his preferential perception of Islamic countries of the developing areas. On the one hand, he advocated third world unity; on the other hand, his emphasis was on unity and solidarity among Islamic countries. Bhutto’s relations with developing countries, however, were largely conditioned by the context of their relations with India.

With the exception of Afghanistan and Iraq, Bhutto persisted with seeking ‘special’ relations with Islamic countries, specifically of West Asia. Pakistan’s constitution (1973) contained a provision (Article 40) to preserve and strengthen fraternal relations among Muslim countries based on Islamic unity and brotherhood. Soon upon assumption of power, Bhutto singled out the Muslim bloc of nations as having demonstrated close friendship towards Pakistan. After the emergence of Bangladesh, Bhutto gave a new orientation to Pakistan’s

⁶⁰ Z.A. Bhutto, *The Myth of Independence*, Lahore, Oxford University Press, 1969, pp. 12-13.

⁶¹ In a message on the International Day for the elimination of racial discrimination, Bhutto reiterated Pakistan’s pledge to support all those engaged in the struggle against racism and oppression in Africa and elsewhere. *Dawn*, March 21, 1976.

⁶² *Dawn*, February 20, 1976.

⁶³ See, Bhutto’s banquet speech delivered at Pyongyang in North Korea; Cited in *Ceylon Daily News*, May 27, 1976.

foreign policy, ensuring for amity with Islamic countries in the context of transformed geo-physical situation.⁶⁴

Bhutto's enunciation of Pan-Islamic fraternity meant "imperishable affinities born of culture, religion and historical experience" which bind Pakistan to other Muslim nations and underline their community of interests.⁶⁵ Pakistan received massive military and economic assistance from Iran owing to closer understanding between Bhutto and the Shah of Iran. Identifying Pakistan's integrity with that of Iran, Bhutto pointed out that "if Iran was overrun, Pakistan would find it very difficult to resist the avalanche".⁶⁶ Similarly, the Shah of Iran also supported the view about Pakistan's integrity and reiterated that Iran would not tolerate further disintegration of Pakistan.⁶⁷

Bhutto also strongly pleaded for revitalizing the organization called, 'Regional Cooperation for Development' (RCD). The RCD was formed in 1964 by three countries—Pakistan, Iran and Turkey, as a mutual assistance arrangement. Bhutto insisted that the RCD should be responsive towards the multifarious challenges faced by the member countries.

In a signed article released on April 19, 1976, Bhutto insisted that the three countries, Pakistan, Iran and Turkey, no longer needed a specifically oriented alliance: they needed an organization which will be responsive to the multi-dimensional challenge they face and which "will ensure the security, stability, and progress of the entire region". He said that according to his perception of the association, "it was not oriented to military terms; it is focused on the psyche of contemporary age. If socio-political and psychological factors are not in their proper place on the chess-board of international politics, no military acquisitions

⁶⁴ In an interview with Spectator, Bhutto stated: "The divisions or differences between some of the Muslim states are but after effects of the operation of colonialism for more than a century. The historical fact is that most of the Muslim countries had been either directly subjugated or subjected to enormous colonial pressures. It is only for two or three decades, in some cases less, that they have enjoyed a freedom from alien domination... Muslim solidarity per se can have no permanent antagonism: when it is true to its character, the Islamic community is always outward looking, never ingrown." Dawn, September 14, 1976.

⁶⁵ See, Z.A. Bhutto, Speeches and Statements, April 1, 1973-August 13, 1973, P. 75.

⁶⁶ In an interview with US Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, Bhutto said that the security of Pakistan is "indivisibly linked with that of Iran". He regretted that "the American Administration has an enigmatical tendency to equate Pakistan with India. In the past, India had used China as an excuse for building military power, which went down very well with many Americans." Dawn, September 14, 1976.

⁶⁷ In an interview with the chief editor of the Daily Musawaat, May 9, 1976, the Shah of Iran said that "Pakistan's progress is Iran's progress and Pakistan's problems are our own." He reiterated that Iran would not tolerate further disintegration of Pakistan. Morning News, May 10, 1976.

can provide security against challenges and threats of our times.” He reminded that the three countries had a “complementarily in resources and skill” and insisted that “economic collaboration without political security arrangements carried no practical meaning.” Referring to the membership of the CENTO, Bhutto said that “it provided useful opportunities of contact, but it was not meant to be an expression of the Iranian-Turkish-Pakistani community.”⁶⁸

Bhutto consistently supported the Arab cause with regard to Palestine. He insisted upon implementation of various resolutions of the UN General Assembly for resolving the West Asian crisis. According to him, it was beyond the competence of the UN General Assembly to divide an indivisible entity, and he argued that Pakistan had opposed the partition of Palestine as a “perversion” of the principle of self-determination.⁶⁹ The West Asian oil producing countries, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Syria and Jordan, provided substantial economic aid to Pakistan. Up to 1975, Pakistan had received economic assistance amounting to \$ 1,000 million from oil-producing countries of West Asia.⁷⁰

In pursuance of ‘Pan-Islamic solidarity’, Bhutto held international conferences in Pakistan. At the Lahore Islamic Summit conference (February, 1974), Bhutto stated that Pakistan’s strength was the strength of the whole Muslim world and the armies and soldiers of Pakistan were the armies and soldiers of Islam. He warned that if Pakistan was further dismembered, could Persian Gulf stability remain intact? He claimed that Pakistan’s solidarity ensured the solidarity of the entire West Asian region. The concept of ‘unity of the Muslim World’ implied solidarity, stability and survival of Pakistan, especially to safeguard Pakistan from the threat coming from any side, Christian, non-Christian, communist and non-communist.⁷¹ Again; at the International *Seerat* Congress, which met in Rawalpindi on March 3, 1976, Bhutto called upon all the Muslim countries to actively support the cause and national aspirations of Muslims in Kashmir, Palestine, Eritrea, Comoro Islands, Cyprus, Thailand and the Philippines.⁷²

⁶⁸ See Dawn, April 20, 1976.

⁶⁹ Dawn, November 23, 1974.

⁷⁰ The Hindustan Times, March 13, 1976.

⁷¹ See, News Review on South Asia, March 1974.

⁷² Inaugurating the International *Seerat* Congress in Rawalpindi (on March 3, 1976) Bhutto declared: “Islam is committed morally and historically to the struggle against domination and exploitation. The life and teachings of the Holy Prophet Mohammad have been the cornerstone of my government’s foreign policy and our land, labour, law, education and numerous other reforms. They are the governing principles of the Pakistan People’s Party.” Dawn, March 4, 1975.

Bhutto expressed his resolve to build Pakistan into a 'mighty fortress of Islam' and appealed to all the Muslim countries to unite under an 'Islamic umbrella' to challenge the enemies of Islam.⁷³

Thus, Bhutto shrewdly equated Pakistan's geo-political interests with 'Pan-Islamic' objectives. His Islamic postulates, however, failed to provide any convincing answer to his estrangement with Afghanistan, a Muslim country. Though Bhutto demanded the right of 'self-determination' for the people of Kashmir and Palestine, he suppressed a similar demand of 'self-determination' raised by Afghanistan, bearing upon the right of self-determination for Pashtoon people living in the North-West Frontier Province. Bhutto accused Afghanistan of expansionist designs in connivance with India and the Soviet Union. He could not convince Afghanistan about his bonafides and mutual antagonism persisted. In the post-March 1977 general elections phase, Bhutto appeared to have lost his credibility in the estimate of the Muslim countries of West Asia. The Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) succeeded in acquiring sympathy and support of the Muslim world. It is widely believed that General Zia-ul-Haq got direct moral and material support from the Muslim countries of West Asia, to master-mind a 'coup' against Z.A. Bhutto. Specifically, Saudi Arabia provided legitimacy to General Zia's regime, because he was considered a reliable upholder of Islamic values.⁷⁴

In summation, it would be seen that Bhutto had the advantage of academic insight bearing upon international politics and diplomacy, which he was expected to incorporate as a viable basis of his obligations as Foreign Minister and as Head of the Government. He, apparently, was inclined to emotional consideration of issues, a significant aspect being his obsession with India. He aspired for parity with India and never reconciled to the fact of India's vital position in South Asia. Such a notion stemmed from Bhutto's overbearing

⁷³ On March 13, 1976, at a reception hosted in honour of the delegates to the International Seerat Congress, Bhutto called for the 'study of Islam in its totality, in the historical process.' He made a fervent call for the unity of Arab and Muslim countries and affirmed his objective to make Pakistan "a mighty fortress of Islam." Dawn, March 14, 1976.

⁷⁴ On September 9, 1977 General Zia, in an interview with Saudi Press Agency correspondent, Hassan Kaleem, disclosed that his government had received moral support "in abundance from all Arab countries, particularly from Saudi Arabia. In answer to a question as to what extent his government had received moral and material support from the Arab countries, the CMLA, General Zia said: "I will not touch the financial aspect as I never consider financial help as a constructive help. What is more important that I got moral support." General Zia paid rich tributes to King Khaled of Saudi Arabia for his concern and solicitude For Pakistan. He said that it was through the Saudi Monarch's initiative and mediatory efforts that a stage of agreement was reached between Bhutto's government and the PNA. But unfortunately, an accord could not materialize, and consequently, the country could not avail itself of the assurance given by King Khaled himself to get implemented the accord reached by the contending parties. Morning News, September 11, 1977.

preoccupation with the two-nation theory and his assumption that India had not, and would not be, reconciled to Pakistan's creation and sustenance.

Similarly, the spill-over of this obsession with India clouded Bhutto's perception of the Kashmir issue. There is no evidence to suggest that Bhutto genuinely desired a peaceful and mutually satisfactory solution. In fact, one would state that keeping the Kashmir issue alive and smoldering from time to time, had always been an expedient modus operandi of Pakistan's ruling elite and Bhutto was no exception in that regard. It suited Bhutto admirably to rake up Kashmir issue at will, primarily to elicit aid and armaments from several sympathetic quarters as also to keep alive a pretext for presenting Pakistan as the aggrieved party. Bhutto seemed to have perfected his political style to mirror his injured innocence, cleverly hiding the 'original' and the 'real' from the scrutiny of the inquisitive. It is not for nothing that Bhutto, like his predecessors, never looked upon India as an immediate neighbor worth cultivating by mending fences. That affected his foreign policy postulates.

What inhibited Bhutto further from extending friendship, understanding and cooperation to India was his policy of expediency in extolling Islam and Socialism, which, in reality, did not vindicate any reliable commitment to either, but which did create an element of apprehension among those who wished to take Bhutto's policy pronouncements seriously. Bhutto never endeavored to explain his alternatives to resolve the likely mix-up owing to the duality of Islam and Socialism. As for the countries in South Asia, the enigma ultimately mattered little because the predominance of Bhutto's personalized style seemed to have made a mockery of both, Islam and Socialism.

Bhutto's bilateralism, therefore, was an attractive device but it lacked the sincerity of purpose without which, as events proved, Indo-Pak relations never attained the stature of reciprocal trust and confidence. Bhutto's stance before, during and, after the Simla conference shows how he was keen to turn even the minimum concessions to maximally elevate his personal image as negotiator and ruler. Mutually arrived at agreements at Simla were subsequently interpreted by him to be extractions, as it were, from unwilling Indian counterparts. For popular consumption such tactics might be useful for a limited time but at the international level, they prove to be counterproductive.

Bhutto's refusal to recognize the reality of Bangladesh was yet another instance of his ambivalence. Bangladesh, even when Bhutto cleverly called it 'Muslim Bengal', was not likely to forget the turbulence of 1970-71 and could not have undone a vital chapter of recent history. Bhutto released Sheikh Mujib (whether it was in desperation, or under international pressure, or as acceptance of 'fait accompli', is not easy to say), and yet he would not accord formal recognition to

Bangladesh. If Bhutto's concern for Muslim brotherhood and Pan-Islamic solidarity were genuine, there was nothing to prevent him from acting with vision, compassion and confidence, when the political process was subverted in erstwhile East Pakistan. What was of concern to Bhutto was not the self-respect of Bangladesh (albeit a Muslim majority state), but truncated Pakistan's continuing hegemony over that state. Bhutto's personal dislike of Sheikh Mujib was reflected in the fact of Pakistan's hastening to grant recognition to the new regime in Bangladesh after the bloody 'coup' (August 15, 1975).

Bhutto's seeming enthusiasm for Islamic conference ultimately exposed his quest for identifying and procuring aid-giving co-religionist states in West Asia, which does not prove his Islamic fervor.

Bhutto's perception of global powers was motivated by his aversion for India and her friends. In fact, Bhutto received a considerable segment of that perception as a legacy of his predecessors. There was little he could do instantly to disown Pakistan's closer links with the USA, even when Bhutto might have aspired to do so on occasions. Also, he could not permanently shut-down a reliable source of procuring arms and economic aid. Quitting the SEATO- was symbolic because, as such, it had lost much of its vitality owing to transformed global context. The USA, in turn, looked upon Pakistan as a reliable outpost in South Asia, but not as an aspirant to assume nuclear status. Bhutto's ambivalence of perspective failed to discern that particular aspect of US munificence, and eventually, he had to pay the price for his determination to seek French help.

It is true that Pakistan's cultivation of China was a stroke of sensibility on Bhutto's part but it was made possible largely owing to US-Soviet, Sino-Soviet and Sino-US relations at a point of time. Nevertheless, Pakistan's relations with the USA and China did not create a positive outlet for Bhutto vis-à-vis the USSR, which should have been the first priority of any ruler of Pakistan. The same argument applies to Bhutto's Afghan policy. Recourse to Islamic alternative further complicated matters as Bhutto failed to assess Afghanistan's historical affinity with the USSR and the latter's national interest in the kind of government in the former state. Such ambivalence resulted in continuance of flux so far as Bhutto's foreign policy was concerned. Ultimately, the USA did not approve of his independent policies; the USSR remained watchful and not trusting Bhutto entirely; China, for all her aid, did not operationally vindicate her pronouncements; and, India stood at a distance cautious and apprehensive. It is doubtful if Islamic countries genuinely trusted Bhutto's foreign policy owing more to inter-state suspicion and antagonism among themselves.

On the other hand, however, in addition to playing a leading role in formulating and exercising domestic policy, Bhutto also gave a fresh perspective to Pakistan's

foreign policy. However ambitious it might sound, he visualized a self-respecting role for Pakistan in the arena of international politics. He was apparently dissatisfied with his country being taken for granted by neighbours and super powers. A flutter was caused in diplomatic circles by Bhutto's success in forging closer links with People's Republic of China. He was also aware that exclusive dependence on either super power would only preclude Pakistan from exercising the freedom to identify foreign policy options. That apparently seemed easy, though Bhutto had to act very carefully, avoiding cause for apprehension by either super power while ensuring better relations with both. The Indo-Soviet treaty of friendship and cooperation and the Bangladesh crisis notwithstanding, Bhutto did not express Pakistan's disapproval of the role of USSR. Whereas Pakistan's insistence on resumption of supply of armaments and continuance of economic aid by the USA created certain irritants, Bhutto finally succeeded in his quest.

However, Bhutto's determination to make Pakistan a member of the comity of nuclear nations, primarily to counter India's capability, did run into rough weather. If recent reports from Pakistan were to be taken as even partially authentic, and if that country is likely to acquire nuclear capability in the near future, the credit for laying the foundation for such a policy to materialize, rightly goes to Bhutto. Similarly, Bhutto continued to draw maximum benefit from reciprocal relations with the USSR in other spheres, as mentioned earlier, though he did not succeed in transforming the Soviet stance on matters political and military. Bhutto's achievement was, however with regard to People's Republic of China despite Pakistan's relatively close links with the USA. That, however, should also be evaluated in the light of initiation, of Sino-US detente. Sino-Pak relations, therefore, were not affected, one way or the other, by Pakistan's relations with super powers. That reflected Bhutto's pragmatism and keen perception of global politics. Apart from winning the friendship of an influential Asian power, Bhutto also acquired for Pakistan considerable aid, military and economic.

Bhutto also deserves credit for supporting bilateralism in international politics. That implied an effort to keep issues from being vitiated by super power perspectives and consequent impact or imposition of alternatives, however subtle and indirectly indicated. He did not flinch from advocating third-world unity, and his faith in a new economic world order, were indices of his conscious efforts to create a place for Pakistan not only among the developing world but also at the global level. Bhutto's concern for Islamic states unifying as a force to reckon with, should also be seen in the context of his aspiration to make Pakistan's voice heard with respect among a powerful section of West-Asian states and elsewhere. It might not be true that Bhutto wanted to be a leader of the third world, but it would not be entirely out of place to mention that he certainly

aimed high as a political leader and aspired to make Pakistan relevant in international politics. In a way, Bhutto did not fail on that score. As a political leader that was not an inconsiderable achievement.

Bhutto's Leadership The Socio-Economic Front

Consequent upon the 1971 war with India and breakaway of the erstwhile eastern wing, Bhutto inherited an economy in shambles.¹ He had thus been confronted with the challenge to revitalize the strained socio economic conditions of the residual Pakistan. He projected the PPP's objectives of realization of socio-economic justice in conformity with the manifesto issued for the 1970 general elections. In part it read: "The party's aim is the attainment of a classless society, which is only possible through Socialism in our time, in conformity to political and social ethics of Islam."² Bhutto sought to extend that enunciation to policy formulation as well.

It might be recalled that ever since the founding of the PPP (in 1967), Bhutto emerged as a vehement critic of the capitalistic and exploitative nature of Pakistan's economy. Blending the core postulates of Islam and Socialism, Bhutto sought to highlight his commitment to evolve a 'people's economy'.

Through the several announcements with regard to radical economic measures, he visualized an economically and industrially advanced Pakistani society based on development of scientific and technological viability. In spite of the conservative social milieu of the country, Bhutto persistently supported the rights and welfare of women. He did not hesitate to propagate the priority of family-planning irrespective of the opposition of the orthodox *ulema*. What he wanted to achieve was popular awakening in that regard leading to popular acceptance of the measure which had far-reaching economic implications. Bhutto's constitution (1973) guaranteed 'state protection' to women against

¹ With the creation of Bangladesh Pakistan had lost one refinery with an annual capacity of 1.5 million tonnes, one steel plant with a capacity of 1,50, 00 tonnes, more than 30 jute mills, 22 textile mills, 7 sugar factories, 28 aluminum plants and a fertilizer factory. Truncated Pakistan, after 1971, also lost considerable segments of land rich in production of rice, wheat and sugar. Moreover, the loss of important cash crops like jute and tea adversely affected Pakistan's export potential. Though geographically (West) Pakistan possessed 85 per cent of its land area, it lost 75 million of its manpower. For details see, News Review on Pakistan, New Delhi, IDSA, January 1972.

² The Election Manifesto of Pakistan People's Party, 1970, Karachi, Pakistan People's Party Publications, 1970, p. 9-11.

exploitation by men. The constitution also incorporated specific provisions for promotion of social justice and for eradication of prevalent social anomalies in the society.³

Bhutto's perception of socio-economic issues was certainly different from that of the preceding bureaucratic-military rulers. He was the first political leader in Pakistan to take radical measures directed to socio-economic transformation. Though M.A. Jinnah spoke of Islamic Socialism,⁴ he did not incorporate it as a part of the ideology of the Muslim League. Bhutto, on the other hand, based his party ideology on Islamic socialism and endeavored to synthesize the core values of Islam and socialism. Against the slogan of the rightist parties—*Socialism Kufr Hai*—Bhutto insisted on interpreting Islamic laws in the context of transformed socio-economic priorities. He argued that 'real Islam requires a socialistic order and 'Koranic' laws are not antithetical to socialism'.⁵ That, in some measure, indicated Bhutto's pragmatism.

In order to translate electoral promises of 1970, Bhutto introduced various socio-economic reforms in Pakistan. The initial years of his leadership witnessed a series of measures in accordance with his premise of socialistic economy. Bhutto's performance on the socio-economic front can be discussed in two related phases: first, Bhutto's measures for transformation of socio-economic system; and, second, a brief economic survey of Bhutto's rule.

I

MEASURES FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION

(i) The Initial Measures

Bhutto's first move in the direction of economic reforms was related to curtailment of privileges of the dominant economic elite of Pakistan. On December 22, 1971, he impounded the passports of members of "22-capitalist families" of Pakistan who virtually controlled the national economy. These families were known to have owned more than 60 per cent of Pakistan's industrial assets, and, controlled nearly 80 per cent of insurance business of Pakistan before the emergence of Bangladesh.

³ For details see, *The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan-1973*, Part III. Karachi, Government of Pakistan's Publications, 1973.

⁴ For details see, Nasim A. Jawed, "Islamic Socialism—An Ideological Trend In Pakistan in the 1960's", *The Muslim World*, Vol. 65, No. 3, July 1975, pp. 196-215.

⁵ See, NUSRAT, Special Issue on "Islamic Socialism," Lahore, October 1966.

In his first broadcast to the nation, Bhutto had already warned that if there was any lessening of industrial or agricultural production to frustrate his reforms, he would nationalize and acquire property in the name of the people. He cautioned that those who wanted to obstruct the reforms would have to pay a very heavy price.⁶

Soon after, through a presidential order, Bhutto announced “abolition of privy purses and privileges of the ex-rulers of the princely states.”⁷ The presidential order affected about seventy Nawabs, Wazirs and Sardars of states and principalities merged with Pakistan. This was later amended.⁸

On January 2, 1972, Bhutto nationalized the “basic” industries specifying his aim to achieve a ‘happy blend of public and private sectors’. Subsequently the government took over the management of 20 private firms with assets of about \$ 200 million.⁹ However, the presidential order excluded foreign-owned petro-marketing companies. Cotton textile manufacturing industry, in fact the largest single industrial group in Pakistan, was not included in the nationalization policy. The measure, far from being comprehensive and radical, with subtle intentions excluded several big industrial groups both local and foreign. The major entrepreneurs and big businessmen were also not unduly disturbed because they knew that the government had only taken over the ‘management’ of some private firms and not their ‘financial control’.¹⁰ Bhutto might have succeeded in creating some sort of popular image by that measure but it also exposed elements of ambivalence in his policy. Whereas he would publicize a measure as socialistic and egalitarian, he did not mean to antagonize the big entrepreneur.

This became obvious when addressing a meeting of prominent industrialists and businessmen in Rawalpindi on March 5, 1972; Bhutto announced lifting of restrictions on their travel abroad and restoration of passports of nearly 200

⁶ See, Asian Recorder, January 22-28, 1972.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ On January 12, Bhutto, reversed this decision and agreed to restore allowances of former rulers of princely states. Radio Pakistan announced that Bhutto took this decision “in deference to the assurances given by Quaid-i-Azam, M.A. Jinnah”. This decision, however, did not restore the privileges of former rulers. Asian Recorder, February 19-25, 1972.

⁹ On January 16, 1972, the government took over management of eleven more companies: General Iron and Steel Works; Pakistan Steel Fertilizer Company; two Pakistan Cement Plants ; Central Refinery Limited; Gandhara Diesel Limited; Model Steel; Karimi Industries; and, Rawalpindi Electric Supply Corporation. By that date, the PPP government took over 31 private firms. Asian Recorder, February 19-25, 1972.

¹⁰ Asian Recorder, February 5-11, 1972.

businessmen, confiscated in December 1971. The hint to bid business community was loud and clear when he said that the government-managed section of industries was very small and the remaining field was wide open for private enterprise.¹¹ However, a measure of minor import was nationalization of the 'Life Insurance' on March 19, 1972, affecting 39 Pakistani and four foreign companies.¹²

(ii) The New Labour Policy

On February 10, 1972, Bhutto announced certain labour reforms under the 'new labour policy', incorporating the following salient features: effective participation in the management of industry by workers; increased share of workers in annual profits; introduction of the shop steward system; strengthening of existing laws for expeditious settlement of disputes; and, restoration of the right of clerical staff of banks for collective bargaining. It was anticipated that consequent upon these reforms, workers' share of annual profits would be raised to 4 per cent; and, workers' effective participation in the management of industry would be progressively increased to the extent of 20 per cent at factory level. The government also declared that if the workers succeeded in raising productivity, they could receive an additional 10 per cent share of increased profits.¹³

(iii) The 'Revolutionary Land Reform' Measures

On March 1, 1972, Bhutto announced, what he called, 'revolutionary land reform measures', incorporating drastic lowering of land-ceiling; security of tenure; state take-over of land in excess of ceiling without compensation; and, deterrent steps to undo, what he termed 'shameful land grabbing' by those in power till recently. The land reform scheme lowered ceiling on irrigated land from 500 to 150 acres and on un-irrigated land from 1,000 to 300 acres. According to Bhutto, this represented a drastic 70 per cent slashing of ceilings, without taking into account major concessions and exemptions granted under the 1959 Land Reforms initiated by General Ayub Khan.¹⁴

(iv) The 'New Education Policy'

¹¹ Ibid., April 1-7, 1972.

¹² Ibid., April 22-28, 1972.

¹³ However, Bhutto assailed resort to *Gheraos* and *Jalao* activities by industrial workers. He said: "This unruly and rowdy practice, negative in its purpose, anarchist in its approach, has been endured regrettably by the government and people." Ibid., March 18-24, 1972.

¹⁴ Ibid., April 1-7, 1972.

Bhutto declared on March 15, 1972, nationalization of private schools and colleges as part of the 'new education policy'. In a broadcast to the nation, Bhutto said that the aim of the policy was 'democratization, with a view to catching-up with the fast changes in the world of science today'. He specified a '16-point' education plan, which included setting up libraries in villages and measures to ameliorate the lot of teachers.¹⁵

For development of scientific and technological know-how, Bhutto established a separate Ministry for Science, Technology and Production on January 20, 1972. He also stated that he would appoint a non-partyman to head the newly created Ministry and added that he intended setting-up a pool of 100 scientists to encourage and attract scientific talent to remain in Pakistan. Bhutto expressed the hope that Pakistani scientists abroad would return home to serve their country.¹⁶

In order to remove disparity of sex, Bhutto provided for statutory recognition of women's eligibility for posts in central and foreign services. The Federal Public Service Commission recognised the measures on October 3, 1972.¹⁷

(v) The Fiscal Measures and Bank Nationalization

On May 11, 1972, Bhutto announced devaluation of Pakistani currency, to equate eleven Pakistani rupees to one American dollar. The parity value before devaluation was Rs. 4.75 (Pakistan) to the US dollar. The devaluation abolished the 'bonus voucher scheme', introduced during the Ayub regime on the advice of a West German expert as a 'temporary measure' to boost exports and improve the balance of payment position. However, according to Bhutto, the scheme was used by industrial tycoons for their own selfish interest. Consequently, Pakistan's foreign debts, on March 31, 1967, amounted to \$ 1,753 million, which tended to multiply over the years, and on March 31, 1971, stood at 8 3,381 million. On June 3, 1972, the Bhutto government demonetized old five-rupee and ten-rupee notes in order to eradicate hoarding and smuggling.¹⁸

For weeding out large-scale malpractices in the banking system, the government announced on May 19, 1972, a series of 'banking reforms'. The government empowered the State Bank of Pakistan to nominate a director to the board of every private bank to serve as watch-dog. In addition to putting an end to

¹⁵ Ibid., April 22-28, 1972.

¹⁶ Ibid., February 19-25, 1972.

¹⁷ Ibid., November 11-17, 1972.

¹⁸ Ibid., June 24-30, 1972.

malpractices, the government clarified that the reforms were aimed at giving necessary direction to channelize funds into priority economic sectors such as agriculture, small borrowers, housing and non-traditional' exports, which did not have adequate credit facilities. The-government also clarified that these reforms would require the banks eventually to have paid-up capital of not less than 5 per cent of their deposits, compared with the prevalent average of less than 3 per cent, so as to progressively bring the capital base of all banks to 10 per cent of deposits.¹⁹

Comparing, the devaluation of the national currency to 'surgical treatment of a man', Bhutto pointed out that the "country's economy was sick and needed this operation... The national economy would also suffer some temporary setbacks resulting from devaluation which in the long run would be conducive to its health... The resolution of the problem of rising prices lay in increased production and self-sufficiency in the commodities of daily use."²⁰ The price spiral, Bhutto explained, was the natural outcome of devaluation of currency and owing to a fall of over-all production following the war with India.²¹

The aforesaid explains Bhutto's dilemma as well as his efforts to find out alternative measures of reform. It might be recalled that soon after assuming the office of the Prime Minister under the New Constitution (1973), Bhutto promulgated an ordinance on September 1, 1973, empowering the government to acquire all or part of the shares of 18 industries taken over by the government early in 1972. However, shares held by foreign investors and institutions were exempted from the acquisition order. The government also nationalized units producing vegetable oil.²² On January 1, 1974, Bhutto nationalized all Pakistani banks, taking over their ownership, management and control together with all shares held by private persons. The federal government also took over management of companies involved in marketing petroleum products or engaged in the shipping industry.²³

(vi) Revitalization of Land and Labour Reforms 1977

¹⁹ Ibid., June 24-30, 1972.

²⁰ See, Z.A. Bhutto, Speeches and Statements, January 1, 1973-March 31, 1973, Karachi, Government of Pakistan, p. 52.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 50-51.

²² Dawn, September 3, 1973.

²³ Ibid., January 2, 1974.

Thereafter, Bhutto revitalized land reform measures in the beginning of 1977, with an eye on the forthcoming general (March 1977) elections. On January 5, 1977, the federal government abolished the age-old revenue system and replaced it by an agricultural income tax system. Simultaneously, Bhutto announced a second installment of land reforms to further slash individual ownership to 100 acres of irrigated land or 200 acres of un-irrigated land and reduced the limit from the 12,000 produce-index units to 8,000 units.²⁴ He also assured workers and government employees about impending benefits of higher basic pay, bonus, compensation, insurance, pension and housing facilities. These measures were incorporated in the election manifesto of the PPP (1977).²⁵

In addition to the aforesaid measures to restore the country's economic health, Bhutto persistently relied on making emotional appeals eliciting people's cooperation to translate these measures into reality. Time and again he called the industrial workers "the real power of the nation" and appealed to them to work hard and increase production for reviving national economy.²⁶ He appealed to the students to devote their energy towards education and learning of science and technology, so that Pakistan could be elevated from the age of Mohenjo-Daro.²⁷ He assailed recourse to violent demonstrative tactics by students, harmful to nation's prestige and prosperity.²⁸

Despite his love for the dramatic and the idealistic, Bhutto conceded that he could not perform miracles. He explained: "Our target in our socio-economic programme is not only a statistically gratifying increase in the GNP but an improvement in the lot of the common-man, in the living standards of workers and peasants and a radical change in the social milieu. Such a change has to be felt by the people, and not only measured by economists, if it is to be real."²⁹

THE RATIONALE

Bhutto sought to provide a rationale for his measures in the light of his claim to establish an egalitarian society:

²⁴ Ibid., January 6, 1977.

²⁵ Ibid., January 25, 1977.

²⁶ See, Z.A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements*, July 1, 1972-September 30, 1972, pp. 79-81.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 99-100.

²⁸ Z.A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements*, January 1, 1973-March 31, 1973, p. 45.

²⁹ Z.A. Bhutto, *Speeches and Statements*, April 1, 1973-August 13, 1973, p. 71.

“We are endeavoring to do this by imposing state control on a limited number of basic industries, by the enactment of effective measures for land reforms and the introduction of new labour laws. The economy we envisage is a ‘mixed’ one, in which private enterprise is neither crippled nor allowed to appropriate the nation’s wealth for the benefit of the few”.

Referring to land reforms, Bhutto pointed out that Pakistan was basically an agricultural country:

“We can not embark upon a large-scale programme of industrialization without first improving our agriculture which contributes 60 per cent of our GNP and employees 80 per cent of our population.”³⁰

Concerning the new education policy, Bhutto affirmed:

“Under the new education policy, the government plans to provide massive aid to the educational institutions. It is imperative that the Universities should be revitalized and they should become centers of excellence... There has been very little coordination between the authors of our development plans, our industry, our Universities and training institutes. The present government fully recognize these shortcomings and is taking effective measures to rectify this situation.”³¹

Broadly speaking, Bhutto’s socio-economic measures did give some inkling of the overall reformist vision that had emerged in Pakistan after 1971, and which was intended to form the core of initial steps toward nation-building and socio-economic reconstruction. However, Bhutto could not go beyond the critical point in his bid to rid the economy of the control of big business. Bhutto had his limits exposed when he seemed to have cautioned himself in his enthusiasm for economic measures: ‘thus far and no further’. Mere nationalization of ‘management’ did not drastically affect the big entrepreneurs’ power over capital, profit, production and distribution. In that, being the real and decisive aspect of economic discretion and power lay the answer to Bhutto’s problem, also the problem in several developing societies. Bhutto had the ideology and programme of action but he did not devise the infra-structure expected to transform even limited postures of nationalization into purposive acquisitions.

Similarly, his supposed offensive against 22-top tycoon families was diluted to make a mockery of the initially generated expectations. In fact, Bhutto later asked these families to invest in business and revamp the economy of the nation.

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 66-71.

³¹ Ibid., pp. 64-65.

Bhutto had to further dilute his stand when he invited the business community of Pakistan to cooperate in formulating the taxation policy.³² The fact is that despite his warnings concerning inevitability of stringent measures against defaulters and opponents, Bhutto failed to discipline the hardcore entrepreneurs who, of course, never seemed to have taken Bhutto's warnings seriously.

Bhutto's measures for stabilizing the economy, such as they were, could not be operationally effective because any such reform efforts require conducive social system and political will, both of which seemed to be lacking despite Bhutto's claims to the contrary. His despair was evident when conceding the aberrations consequent upon devaluation of currency, he insisted upon its enforcement. Measures, such as demonetization, also could be of little avail in the absence of ensured technological and agrarian productivity and a viable infrastructure.

On the other hand, one would not hesitate to state that if the administrative mechanism under Bhutto's control had scrupulously enforced even a part of the measures he had initiated, perhaps the economy would have received a much needed boost. The ambivalence of Bhutto, as the national leader, permeated the policy-execution framework, as it were, and instead of a genuine revival of economy, the intended measures did not materially change the economic challenges faced by the common-man. It would be small consolation if one were to advance reasons, factors and unforeseen events as partly or wholly responsible for Pakistan's economic ills. Perhaps, a far more convincing answer would be found in the systemic constraints which Bhutto could not remove or resolve at will and which had to be accepted as part of the socioeconomic reality.

However, it would be unjust to ignore Bhutto's perception of the primacy of socio-economic measures or to belittle his boldness as a political leader to formulate policies and measures accordingly. The very fact that he was the first political leader of Pakistan to have addressed himself to socioeconomic realities and also to have endeavored to identify corresponding socio-economic policy formulation, but Bhutto in a different category as a political leader. Despite his failings it would be difficult to ignore the potential for change in his reform measures concerning property and land, labour welfare, education and industry. It would be in order to trace the nature of Pakistan's economy during Bhutto's leadership through a brief economic survey.

II A BRIEF SURVEY OF PAKISTAN'S ECONOMY DURING BHUTTO REGIME

³² Asian Recorder, March 12-18, 1973.

Bhutto inherited not only a truncated Pakistan but also a sluggish economy. 1972 proved to be perhaps the most difficult year in Pakistan, so far as the economy was concerned. Spiraling prices, set off by the impact of the economic burdens of the Indo-Pak conflict (1971) on an acutely stagnant economy posed serious problems. For instance, consumer price of sugar, wheat and vegetable oils rose sharply and affected the viability of the common wage-earner in Pakistan. While the official figures of price rise estimated it at 16 per cent, the wholesale price index, at the consumer level rose from 30 to 35 per cent.³³

According to the official annual economic survey for 1972-73 (released in the second week of June, 1973), though the economy had shown signs of remarkable recovery in 1972-73, it had barely succeeded in overcoming the setbacks of the preceding two or three years. The GNP showed an increase of 0.5 per cent, but, the per-capita income had hardly regained the level of 1971-72. Even with a bumper wheat crop of 74,00,000 tonnes, harvested in May 1973, the country had to import substantial quantities of food grains from abroad. The investment ratio was considerably lower than that attained during 1964-65. Domestic savings financed only 69 per cent of gross domestic investment. The wholesale price index showed a steep rise of 18.5 per cent during July 1972-March 1973 with prices of food items spiraling substantially.

However, explaining the economic trends, the survey pointed out that the progress during 1972-73 had prepared the economy for a major thrust forward. The revival of economic activity was led by the export sector, which recorded a remarkable increase of 30 per cent over the preceding year. Imports, largely consisting of raw materials, increased by 24 per cent. Agriculture, which continued to occupy pivotal position in the economy (constituting 38 per cent to the total value of gross domestic produce and absorbing 55 per cent of the entire labour force), recorded a growth rate of above 3 per cent. Wheat production increased by 9 per cent and sugarcane production by 7 per cent. Industrial production increased by 6.3 per cent, mainly owing to better utilization of existing capacity. Construction activity expanded by 13 per cent. Also, foreign exchange reserves increased from \$ 170.9 million in December 1971 to \$ 341.7 million in March 1973. The net utilization of foreign aid was about \$ 200 million. The foreign trade sector expanded much faster than the national income, with exports amounting to \$ 750 million, showing an increase of 27 per cent over the preceding year. The ratio of exports to GNP was estimated at 14.5 per cent.

It was, however, conceded that the economy was considerably strained owing to abnormal price hike. The worst phase of price spiral was reflected in the indices

³³ Ibid., March 12-18, 1973.

of the first half of 1972. Renewed price pressures were observed during 1972-73 owing to various factors, such as rupee devaluation and relaxation of the anti-inflationary phenomenon originating in developed industrial countries.

The wholesale price index increased by as much as 18.5 per cent during July 1972-March 1973, over the corresponding period of 1971-72 when the price rise was only 7.4 per cent. The consumer price indices at different places recorded an increase ranging from 10 per cent to 16 per cent.

By the end of 1973, Pakistan's economic worries were aggravated, owing to natural calamities and as a fall out of absence of balanced and rational economic planning. The worst ever floods hit the country in August 1973, not only creating a colossal problem of human rehabilitation, but also disrupting the entire economic system. Heavy destruction of crops and food-grains accompanied by large-scale disruption of communication channels created a serious problem. Essential items, like wheat, vanaspati, sugar, kerosene and vegetables, were scarce.

Major crops, such as wheat, rice and cotton, were heavily damaged. Nearly 4.3 million bales of cotton (the major foreign-exchange earner) – almost a quarter of the total annual produce were destroyed. It was proposed to increase exports during 1973-74 by 12.5 per cent over the previous year's figure of Rs. 825 crores. Pakistan's cotton produce constituted 33 to 40 per cent of total world cotton exports during 1972-73. But achievement of the aforesaid target became extremely difficult, particularly owing to ban on cotton export in order to fulfil the essential requirements of the domestic market. Also, spurt in cotton prices in the world market made it difficult for Pakistani cotton to achieve competitive viability.³⁴

The economic survey for the year 1973-74 stated that the picture of the economy was not so gloomy, particularly in the context of natural calamities. In addition, the oil crisis, following the 1973 war in West Asia, created problems for Pakistan's economy also. It might be stated that Pakistan's domestic production of crude oil meets hardly 15 per cent of its total consumption of crude and finished product. The oil import bill increased from \$ 60 million to \$ 225 million in 1973-74 and was projected at \$ 387 million for the year 1974-75.³⁵ Similarly, fertilizer prices were considerably affected and the country had to spend \$ 150 million on fertilizer imports, as against \$ 40 million in the preceding year. The same was true of wheat, edible oils, chemicals and technical equipments.

³⁴ News Review on South Asia and Indian Ocean, New Delhi, IDSA, July, 1973.

³⁵ Asian Recorder, September, 17-23, 1974.

According to official estimates, Pakistan lost nearly \$ 500 million after adjusting the gains owing to high export price of rice as well as against losses due to high import prices of petroleum, fertilizers, raw materials and technical equipment. The import bill was estimated to have gone up to \$ 1450 million in 1973-74, as against \$ 797 million in 1972-73, without any significant increase in the imported items. The year, it was expected, would close with a balance of payments deficit of \$ 165 million.

Floods, inflation and steep rise in the import bill of petroleum and petroleum products, were identified as three major factors that adversely affected the economy of Pakistan during the year 1973-74. Dollar 600 million on account of floods, dollar 178 million for additional burden resulting from international inflation, and, dollar 165 million for the increase in oil bill, added up to dollar 943 million as the cost of triple set-back.

During 1972-74, the support price of rice was raised from Rs. 20 to Rs. 39 per maund, of Basmati rice from 38 to Rs. 90 per maund, of sugarcane from the minimum of Rs. 2.25 to Rs. 4.50 per maund and of wheat from Rs. 17 to Rs. 25.50 per maund. The cotton farmer who was receiving less than Rs. 40 per maund of Phutti (seed cotton) was set to receive a price more than double this figure.³⁶

1974-75 proved to be no better for the economy of Pakistan. According to the economic survey released by Pakistan's Ministry of Finance, the GDP (Gross Domestic Produce) fixed at 7.2 per cent was reduced to 2.6 per cent as against the population growth rate of 3 per cent. The GNP (Gross National Product) came down from the envisaged growth of 10 per cent to 4.4 per cent. There had been a general decline in both agricultural and industrial production. However, the expenditure on defence rose substantially. Out of the total revenue of Rs. 1200 crores, the defence expenditure amounted to Rs. 615 crores. Specifically, the budget for 1974-75 earmarked Rs. 558 crores for defence.

The wholesale price index maintained an upward trend and rose by 25.9 per cent during 1974-75. The deficit in the balance of trade increased to an all time high of Rs. 1038.3 million. Exports increased by 1.2 per cent, while imports went up by over 53 per cent. The GDS (Gross Domestic Savings) rate came down from 7.5 per cent in 1973-74 to 6.8 per cent in 1974-75.³⁷

Though the fiscal year 1975-76 began in a climate of hope and optimism, the economic progress made by Pakistan during this period was insubstantial. As during the preceding years, the domestic as well as international factors

³⁶ See, POT (Pakistan Series), June 10, 1974.

³⁷ See, News Review on South Asia and Indian Ocean, July, 1975.

adversely affected the economic situation during 1975, international prices of 'quality' rice declined drastically. The market for cotton textiles also did not show the level of recovery anticipated earlier. On the other hand, the enhanced prices of petroleum products further strained the economy. On the domestic scene also, unforeseen developments presented challenging propositions. Continued problems at 'Tarbela' dam restricted additional flow of water for irrigation. Cotton production fell owing mainly to heavy rains, floods and a massive pest-attack. Against the target of 40 lakh bales, the actual production was only 29 lakh bales. Pakistan was also denied its share of upward trend in international cotton prices. Consequently, difficulties of textile industry were considerably aggravated. Furthermore, the decline in the availability of cotton-seed oil led to larger imports of edible oil.

The economic survey claimed that Pakistan's GDP recorded a growth rate of 5 per cent during 1975-76. The agriculture sector registered 4 per cent increase. Despite heavy damage at 'Tarbela' complex, wheat production went up to 8.1 million tonnes, half a million tonne more than in the previous year. The country also registered increase in the production of maize, rice and sugarcane. Substantial increase was also recorded in sugar, vegetable-oil and fertilizer production. The GNP rose to 4.3 per cent against that during the preceding year (1974-75). In spite of world wide recession, export of yarn and cotton-cloth had shown 8 per cent increase in 1975-76 over 1974-75. Figures for population growth, however, far exceeded expectations, thereby adversely affecting economic plans during 1975-76. Population figures in July 1976, were estimated at about 72.37 million, showing an annual growth rate around 3.6 per cent.³⁸

Similarly, during the fiscal year 1976-77, the final phase of Bhutto regime, the economy showed considerable stagnation. The GNP grew only at the rate of 1.2 per cent against the projected 8.1 per cent target. Excluding the effect of net remittances by Pakistani nationals abroad, the upward trend was a bare 0.5 per cent, with the population (about 74 million) growth showing 3 per cent increase. Growth of GDP, during the same period, was stalled by a fall in cotton output, as seen earlier. Also political unrest inhibited economic projects and scared investment. Tax collection went down and remittances from abroad showed decline. In all, industrial production was in dismal state.

Textiles amounted for 26 per cent of large-scale manufacturers but production declined by 18.3 per cent for yarn and 13.2 per cent for cloth (with the cotton crop estimated at 2.4 per cent million bales), almost 40 per cent below the 4 million bales target. The overall agricultural output rose by only 2 per cent, with the

³⁸ POT (Pakistan Series), June 16, 1976.

result that per-capita availability of food grains fell, compounded by population explosion.

Exports amounted to \$ 1,129 million against a target of \$ 1,400 million. Imports rose to \$ 2,301 million from \$ 2,947 million during the previous year (1975-76), leaving a deficit of \$ 1,172 million. Home remittances of \$ 575 million provided major support to balance of payments. The 'current accounts deficit' was about \$ 7 million compared with about half of that in 1971. Domestic inflationary pressure persisted, revised estimates for 1976-77 showing a tally of Rs. 2,230 million but the actual deficit added up to Rs. 5,650 million. Though 33 per cent of the annual development outlay of Rs. 17,000 million came from deficit financing, the result was a staggering monetary expansion, amounting Rs. 8,310 million, i.e., 18.6 per cent.³⁹

The aforesaid brief economic survey of Bhutto regime shows that, like his predecessors, Bhutto also failed to restore economic health to Pakistan. It seems that successive regimes and rulers in Pakistan were more ardently concerned with giving exaggerated importance to political survival rather than making concerted efforts to revitalize the national economic infrastructure. True, there was never a let-up in pronouncing high promises which raised popular expectations but the hiatus between commitment and actual systemic output continued to widen and deepen. Perhaps, the failure was compounded by the choice of a developmental model, quite beyond the inherent capabilities of Pakistan's economy to sustain.

The agrarian sector suffered as much as the industrial sector, with the production targets of both going down or remaining virtually stagnant. Production rise was neutralized by several factors, some of which were beyond control, but some others, like population increase and priority to defence spending, did not receive the regime's realistic appraisal. The rulers of Pakistan failed to identify specific dimensions of modernization and industrialization and also did not heed the likely consequences of dove-tailing Pakistan's economy with international economic trends. In fact, Pakistan's vulnerability to global influences is several times more than that, for instance, of India since 40 per cent of the former's economic activity is susceptible to world influences.⁴⁰

Like the preceding rulers, Bhutto also squandered precious national wealth in proliferation of security agencies, paramilitary organizations and massive administrative network. Moreover, Bhutto did not lessen Pakistan's heavy reliance on foreign-aid and continued to multiply spending on ornaments.

³⁹ POT (Pakistan Series), June 12, 1977.

⁴⁰ The Pakistan Economist, June 11, 1977

Foreign economic aid, ultimately, is not expected to boost and prop up national economic infra-structure, development and growth. There was a five-fold increase in OPEC aid (from \$ 110.5 million in 1975-76 to \$ 554.4 million in 1976-1977) and a marked decline in consortium aid from \$ 809.0 million to \$ 730.7 million during the same period. Besides changing the terms of trade, heavy consortium debts reduced the utility of aid, since about 25 per cent of export earnings went to service external debts. On a modest calculation, every \$ 100 of aid granted \$ 33 of income, but \$ 11 out of this was paid back as interest and other charges.⁴¹

Moreover, Bhutto allocated more than half of the total national budget for defence which heavily retarded developmental prospects of other sectors. According to reliable sources, Pakistan's defence budget had one up to Rs. 702 crores in 1975-76 from Rs. 560 crores in 1974-75, While Pakistan's defence budget before the liberation of Bangladesh totaled Rs. 444, during Bhutto regime, it registered an increase of 58 per cent more, for less than half the earlier area.⁴²

It would be relevant to refer to an assessment⁴³ by a prominent economist of Pakistan, published in the issues of Dawn on August 7 and 8, 1977. The Pakistani analyst Zafar Iqbal, has attempted a comparative estimate of Bhutto's economic performance with that of the decade preceding the Bhutto regime (1959-60 to 1969-70). With due deference to the acumen and academic honesty of the analyst, one can not help mentioning that this analysis was published under a martial regime which can not, in fairness to its structural inhibitions, permit an objective review.

However, Zafar Iqbal characterized the preceding decade (1959-60-1969-70) as one of 'sustained economic growth'. He assailed Bhutto for introducing 'paper reforms'. Though Yahya Khan was initially at fault, Bhutto's share of the blame was considerable because he sought to enhance partisan interests to the detriment of economic priorities and developmental obligations.

Zafar Iqbal insisted that a comparative economic estimate of pre-Bhutto phase with Bhutto's tenure showed that over 60 per cent of import related to capital

⁴¹ India Today, March 1-15, 1978

⁴² See, News Review on South Asia and Indian Ocean, March, 1976.

⁴³ At this stage of our analysis, it might be mentioned that non-availability of source material from Pakistan has hampered a detailed analysis. Source material such as it is available can not be testified as reliable in the absence of sources of cross-verification. A word of caution is called for owing to the fact that whereas during Bhutto's regime, official documents were available informing about relevant aspects of socioeconomic trends and output, there is considerable difficulty in securing even official documents of Zia regime, especially those bearing upon Bhutto's term in office. Also, the element of credibility of official pronouncements is in doubt, more so owing to the complexion of the regime which sponsored the said information. Therefore, the data identified in this chapter is culled from sources accessible for this study.

goods of raw-material for capital goods. The average for the period 1972-73 to 1975-76 was 40 per cent for capital goods and raw-materials for goods and 60 per cent for consumer or raw materials for such goods. Obviously, the composition of imports decisively shifted from development goods to consumer goods. As a matter of fact, finished consumer goods which amounted for 10 per cent in 1969-70, accounted for almost 30 per cent of total imports in 1972-73 and about 22 per cent of total imports in 1975-76. The main purpose of imports was to look after increased consumption instead of increased investment. The trend was neither productive nor welfare-oriented.

Similarly, between 1970 and 1975, savings in the private sector dropped from over 12 per cent of the GDP to 6.5 per cent and in the public sector from -1- 0.9 per cent to - 0.9 per cent.

Investments in the private sector were adversely affected by Bhutto's ambivalence concerning private and public sectors. That did not help either the prospects of investment or extension of benefits of nationalization. In fact, extended pronouncements concerning the latter acted as disincentive to the former.

In 1969-70, investment in manufacturing industry accounted for about 35 per cent of all private investment in fixed assets. By 1975-76, such investment was only 15 to 16 per cent of fixed capital in the private sector. Inflation continued to provide high profits. However, instead of investing the profits productively, wasteful consumption, hoarding and speculation, or flight of capital abroad were rampant owing to laxity in economic discipline.

In the public sector also the trend was far from satisfactory. While investment in public sector rose, its deployment was, by and large, inefficient. A large number of schemes were started, but none proved to be productive. Also, for reasons valid or otherwise, the bureaucracy was adversely affected by trends which encouraged emergence of a 'sychophant' breed of careerists. It also adversely affected decision-making in the public sector. Development resources, instead of being concentrated for maximum effect, were squandered away owing to partisan decision-making.

It is interesting that while the total amount of investment in the public sector went up, Pakistan's own contribution thereto diminished. Foreign resources available to the public sector increased from Rs. 2,180 million in 1969-70 to Rs. 12,580 million in 1975-76. Pakistan's abject dependence on foreign borrowings led to serious economic difficulties.

In 1969-70, external resources contributed 44 per cent to development expenditure financed by the federal government. In 1975-76, such contributions were total (100 per cent). As a matter of fact, external resources were far in excess of development expenditure and Pakistan's own contribution to development in the public sector came down to a mere trickle.

It needs no undue emphasis to infer that in the specific context of an underdeveloped country, with limited natural resources, savings and investment are among the more relevant imperatives of the development process. In such situations, a natural assumption is that avoidable expenditure would be tightly controlled. That, however, was not in evidence considering the consistent manner in which successive regimes in Pakistan paid little attention to thrift, savings, and economy. For instance, while revenue receipts in 1975-76 were a little over twice the level prevailing in 1969-70, expenditure in 1975-76 was more than three times the level of 1969-70. The administrative wing failed to curb extravagant expansion programmes. The federal government secretariat had 700 section-officers in 1971, whereas their number rose to more than 2,000 in 1975-76.

From 1964-65 to 1969-70, agriculture output had grown more or less steadily at an average rate of over 6.3 per cent per annum. In the subsequent period up to 1975-76, agricultural output went down to an average rate of 1.4 per cent per annum. The output of agricultural crops was equally dismal. Though between 1964-65 and 1969-70, crop production increased more or less steadily at the rate of 7.8 per cent per annum, after 1969-70 it stagnated, and the rate of production went down to 1.2 per cent, per annum. Output per acre of wheat and maize, to begin with, steadily rose. Output of rice showed erratic trends and sugarcane output per acre also declined over this period. Cotton reached a level of 3.9 maunds per acre in 1971-72, which was retained till 1973-74. However, there was deterioration in this respect, and in 1975-76, the yield per acre had fallen by 10 per cent as compared to that in 1969-70. Growth in agricultural productivity, as a whole, became a cause for concern.

Industrial output also showed decline. Though during the period 1965-66 to 1969-70, industrial output grew at an average annual rate of 8.2 per cent per annum, from 1969-70 to 1975-76, corresponding average annual rate came down to 2.0 per cent per annum.

As one recalls the fact that almost one-third to a half of manufacturing industry had been nationalized since 1972, the bulk of investment during the next five years was diverted to public sector. However, the results did not vindicate validity of over-reliance on expansion of public sector. It also became obvious that the objectives of nationalization were neither economic nor social but were

directed to acquire additional levers of political power regardless of economic consequences.

Another dimension of the preceding analysis is apparent when we consider that whereas the rate of growth of population went on increasing by 3 per cent per annum, per capita agricultural and industrial outputs kept on declining. That had serious implications for the economy.

The devaluation of 1972 had started the process of sharp increase in prices. The government built on this base, a mix of irresponsible monetary and fiscal policies combined with extravagant public expenditure. Such policies have inevitably led to severe inflationary pressures in the economy.

A word about the consumer's plight is called for. Prior to 1971-72, the prices in Pakistan were relatively stable. Between 1959-60 and 1969-70, prices rose at the annual rate of 2.8 per cent. Between 1969-70 and 1971-72, in sharp contrast to past trends, the prices rose by about 22 per cent per annum till 1975-76, presenting a situation in which price rise, by and large, was about two and a half to three times more from the time the PPP took over. Bhutto's tenure, therefore, did not alleviate the plight of the common-man.

Reference to global implications and consequences of price hike in oil and oil products, has already been made earlier. Zafar Iqbal's view-point is that while oil prices have had an influence mainly through changes in the terms of trade with developed countries, their effect on Pakistan's economy had been grossly exaggerated. In 1969-70 petroleum products valued at about \$ 44 million were imported. In 1975-76, these imports rose to \$ 378 million. Between 1972-73 and 1974-75, the value of imports increased by five times. Even at these prices, oil imports were, however, only about 3 per cent of the GDP.

Also, as far as the foreign exchange impact of oil prices is concerned, it has been compensated for by increased remittances from Pakistani workers abroad. Between 1973-74 and 1975-76, such remittances have increased by about \$ 200 million per annum which, more or less, matched the increased outlay on oil imports over the same period. In addition, such earnings (not passing through banking channels) are also financing imports of luxury items as well as encouraging considerable quantum of smuggling, which further increased the availability of consumer goods in Pakistan.

During Bhutto's leadership the position with regard to currency in circulation was also not very encouraging. During June 1965 to June 1970, the currency in circulation increased by 41 per cent (which showed an average annual rate of a little over 7 per cent). During June 1972 to June 1976, the currency in circulation

registered an increase of 140 per cent, yielding an annual rate of 25 per cent. Total money supply over the same period expanded at the rate of 17.2 per cent per annum as compared to about 11 per cent during June 1965 to June 1970. It might be stated that Pakistan also fought a war with India during this period.

Zafar Iqbal's analysis attempts to show that during the Bhutto regime, the interactive effectiveness between money-supply, prices and production output was of a low order. Instead of bringing about stability to the economy, Bhutto's pronouncements went astray with regard to fulfillment of objectives. Political priorities and unthinking economic formulations resulted in a situation which was inevitably beyond retrieval.⁴⁴

III

The foregoing analysis shows that much of where Bhutto erred was in his declarations seeking national revival of Islamic Socialism. There was no identification or explanation of the ideal concept, especially how Islamic philosophy was sought to be juxtaposed with that of Socialism. There was an element of symbolism for popular consumption in Bhutto's utterances, and the operational aspect clearly showed wide divergence between precept and practice. Bhutto, seemingly, was over-anxious to enlist sympathy and support of different segments of society, some of them not even minimally supportive of his alternatives, besides being mutually antagonistic. His 'Socialism' was not averse to 'mixed economy' which, in turn, did not have the potential, capacity or inclination to weaken the hold and control of the entrepreneur and big business. Bhutto sought to woo the common-man by 'inviting' slogans and symbols whereas he was helpless in challenging the entrenched power of the private sector.

The common-man assessed the seriousness or otherwise of Bhutto's intentions and intensity of his policies by the simple fact of his failure to curb price-rise of consumer goods and other economic malpractices which could not be remedied. For the common-man, the alibi of Indo-Pak war of 1971 as the cause of economic difficulties soon lost its meaning. Inconsistency of economic policies antagonized the big business because they grew suspicious of Bhutto's socialism. Even the marginal inconveniences Bhutto made them face were resented. The radicals, never trusting Bhutto as such, became all the more critical as the veneer of socialism was exposed. Moreover, if one took Bhutto's pronouncements seriously, there was only disillusionment in store owing to his failure to implement them effectively. As the initial enthusiasm of the people wore off, they came to realize

⁴⁴ For details of Zafar Iqbal's analysis, see, POT (Pakistan Series), August 10, 11, 1977. Also refer to, Pakistan Economist, August 27, 1977.

that Bhutto failed to transform their daily lives. The tribulations of the common-man did not even marginally abate. The farmer, labourer, industrial worker, all felt the impact of failure of Bhutto's precepts. The bureaucracy and the armed forces, having tasted political power in the past, were also not prepared to play the second fiddle to Bhutto. As later events amply proved, the armed forces came back with a vengeance to oust Bhutto and to undo a popular civilian exercise in governance. The bureaucracy, it seems, was only too willing to comply with the word of the army top-brass.

It is obvious that Bhutto's socio-economic precepts and objectives notwithstanding, his primary consideration was political. Given the systemic reality of Pakistan, he could not afford to alter or reverse the order of priorities. It flowed from the ambivalence manifest in his style of functioning that the 'socio-economic' was meant to be subservient to the 'political'. Also, it is obvious that Bhutto's socio-economic precepts were motivated by considerations, political and populist. The assumption is not unfounded that if Bhutto were to transform the socio-economic precepts into effective reality, perhaps he could have avoided the frustrating consequences of populist egalitarianism. Despite his limitations, there was marginal euphoria among a handful, though the thinking people knew that Bhutto was perhaps a better alternative as leader than the army-bureaucracy combine. However, there was also the obvious apprehension that Bhutto also proved to be helpless in acting differently from any other leader, given the political heritage and systemic reality of Pakistan.

However, the situation was compounded by the fact that Bhutto was not a socialist by conviction. It was necessity which prompted him to rely on symbols. There is evidence to show that Bhutto left economic management largely to his Finance Minister Mubashir Hasan, an engineer by profession and a left-winger, whose aversion for private enterprise was pronounced. Whereas the Finance Minister took Bhutto's word seriously and began in earnest to implement the framework of nationalisation and other economic policies, Bhutto himself became vague, and diluted his earlier stand-point. Bhutto paid the price for transforming his socio-economic precepts into an exercise in public relations.⁴⁵

Whereas Bhutto propagated social-economic reforms, more for seeking popular support, a lack of determination was betrayed in the recurring theme of his public speeches when he implored the people to appreciate the manifold problems Pakistan had to face owing to the war of 1971 and separation of the eastern wing. He talked of a 'just society' and his words, often repeated, sought to look for explanations bearing upon difficulties faced by developing societies

⁴⁵ Salmaan Taseer, Bhutto: A Political Biography, p. 153.

and the inevitability of staggered social change. That was good, so far as it went, but it did not resolve Pakistan's problems nor facilitated Bhutto's claims for leadership credibility. On several occasions, Bhutto sought the blessings and munificence of supreme supernatural power to rescue Pakistan.⁴⁶ Bhutto ignored the prevalent power-structure in Pakistan's society and the vested interests of economic forces. His pronouncements raised popular expectations which were soon deflated owing to non-performance or misplaced priorities.

It would not, however, be denied that Bhutto was the first political leader of Pakistan to have initially identified and recognised the urgency for socio-economic amelioration of the people. Intimately acquainted with the antecedents and contemporary mechanics of domestic politics, Bhutto exhibited the capacity to establish a rapport with the people of Pakistan. In his concern for the welfare of the common-man, Bhutto was a prodigy, as it were, in as much, as the fact that he outlined a programme of radical socio-economic reforms. Perhaps he could not visualise the systemic constraints that ultimately left him with no alternative but to dilute his objective. Nevertheless, Bhutto could not be faulted on that score specifically in the overall context of his endeavors to consolidate civilian political rule, representative and responsible, as the hard-cord systemic reality to foster socio-economic welfare.

⁴⁶ In a speech at Quetta in 1972, Bhutto promised colleges, schools and hospitals, and ended by saying: "Where will the money come from? *Allah Tallah de ga* ; God Almighty will provide it." Ibid., p. 153.

PART IV

LEADERSHIP CRISIS

AND

DECLINE.

The General Election, Erosion of Legitimacy and Deposition

Bhutto was as much a product of the 1970-electoral process in Pakistan as he was of the systemic disruption that followed, leading to the emergence of Bangladesh. As the popularly elected national leader, he faced numerous problems and challenges flowing from the Indo-Pak war (1971) and the realities of a new, and different, Pakistan restricted to the western wing. When Bhutto took over national leadership in December 1971, he could not have been under any illusion with regard to the predicaments in store for him. But, it must be stated that he gave ample evidence of seriousness with which he faced issues. It must also be said to Bhutto's credit that he reiterated his conviction about transforming the political system of Pakistan into one based on democracy. On the other hand the opposition parties did not take Bhutto's democratic pronouncements seriously and took to the path of political defiance and confrontation. What led to apprehensions about Bhutto's approach concerning sustenance of popular politics needs a brief review.

In March 1973, eight opposition parties formed a United Democratic Front (UDF) against the ruling Pakistan People's Party and demanded fresh general elections. After Bhutto's assumption of Prime Ministership under the permanent constitution (August 1973), the UDF apprehended that Bhutto would not hold 'free and fair' general elections. There was some basis for that because allegations of manipulation by the ruling party in several by-elections held since 1972 were voiced by the opposition parties on several occasions. Bhutto's bonafides were in doubt after he imposed a ban on the National Awami Party in February 1975. He had also passed several special ordinances disqualifying members of opposition parties from holding their seats in the National Assembly or provincial assemblies and also from contesting elections. The Federal Review Board (FRB) was set-up to watch activities of opposition leaders. These trends made opposition parties and leaders skeptical about Bhutto's intentions.

Though in January 1976, Bhutto had expressed his intention to hold general election, he did not specify any definite schedule thereof but repeatedly stated that 'free and impartial' general elections would be held before the expiry of the term of the National Assembly. To the opposition demand for specifying the date of general elections, Bhutto's response, reminiscent of preceding bureaucratic and military regimes, was that general elections of December 1970 and former

provincial assembly elections caused greater disharmony in the nation. He stated that 'the experience in the past had been that prior to elections, the political climate of Pakistan tended to degenerate into chaos and confusion, which could prove detrimental to the integrity of the nation.' Bhutto recalled that unqualified freedom during the first general elections (December 1970) caused Pakistan's dismemberment and the provincial elections held during the life time of Shaheed-e-Millat, Liaquat Ali Khan, spread the virus of provincialism, sectarianism and parochialism.¹

In any case, Bhutto was in a position to defer elections till he so wished; or till he was convinced that the exercise of election would not adversely affect his own political base. For narrational and evaluative convenience, the relevant aspects bearing upon this chapter could be classified as hereunder:

I. The Pre-Election Syndrome: 1976.

II. The Election (March 1977) : Strategy, Campaign and Verdict.

III. Post-Election PPP-PNA Confrontation and Bhutto's Deposition.

I. The Pre-Election Syndrome: 1976

Throughout the year 1976, Bhutto mobilized the governmental and administrative machinery to ensure electoral victory of the ruling Pakistan People's Party. From the very outset, Bhutto launched a major offensive against the opposition parties. He wanted no loopholes and no alibis either. There was some trace of nervousness in his utterances and actions, and he did not seem to be as confident as he was in 1970. The reasons were obvious. The opposition parties were more determined in their bid to wrest power from Bhutto; there was mounting disillusionment with Bhutto's policies and professions; regional challenges had mounted in intensity; and, Bhutto was facing problems of discipline and unity within the PPP.

Bhutto began by overhauling the administrative and military structures to cope with the expected challenges prior to and in the conduct of elections. This move was defended for facilitating establishment of 'Vigilant Democracy' in Pakistan. Bhutto reshuffled his cabinet on February 5, 1976, and ordered reorganization of the Federal Secretariat and provincial administrative structures as well as restructuring of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.² It soon became clear that the media were entrusted with the specific task of projecting the image

¹ Dawn, January 2, 1976.

² Morning News, February 6, 1976.

of Bhutto and the PPP and with exposing the incompetence of the opposition parties.³ The government prepared a 'broad publicity strategy' to project the achievements of the Bhutto regime or, national and international fronts. Specifically, it publicized Bhutto's role as a builder of New Pakistan and defender of Islamic ideology; as an exponent of a new socio-economic order; as a great Muslim and third-world leader and as a statesman of international stature. The cost of such massive offensive was indeed overwhelmingly heavy.⁴ The Ministry of Finance also sanctioned additional assistance for field publicity. The directorate of news documentaries prepared five special 'shorts' in 1976-77 at a cost of Rs. 13 lakhs projecting the image of Bhutto.⁵

About that time, several books were produced eulogizing the role of the ruling PPP and of Prime Minister Bhutto. The information wing of the Prime Minister's secretariat, headed by the additional secretary Hamid Jalal, planned and produced a book entitled, Promises and Performance, specifying the implementation of Pakistan People's Party Manifesto in English, Urdu, Sindhi, Baluchi and Pushto. In all, 30,000 copies of various versions were published during January-March 1977. The total cost, excluding that of the offset paper used, amounted to over Rs. 10 lakhs.⁶ The government agencies concerned

³ Immediately after taking over as Information Minister (on February 5, 1976), Mohammed Hanif Khan, made an emergency review of the structure and activities of the various media and submitted a brief report to Bhutto on February 15, 1976. For details see, White Paper on Misuse of Media, Islamabad, Government of Pakistan; August, 1978, December 20, 1971-July 4, 1977.

⁴ Financial grants to the PNC (Pakistan National Centre) an organization almost totally devoted to the PPP's political projection escalated from about Rs. 50 lakhs in 1975-76 to about Rs. 1 crore and 25 lakhs. In addition, PNC was given Rs. 38,68,000 for 'new measures' in 1976-77. The Pakistan Broadcasting Service grant increased from about Rs. 5 crores in 1975-76 to about Rs. 7 and a half crores in 1976-77, including a supplementary grant of about Rs. 1 crore and 60 lakhs. Similarly, allocation for publicity of government activities on television increased from Rs. 64 and a half lakhs in 1975-76 to over Rs. 5 crores 70 lakhs in 1976-77, more than eight times. Ibid., pp. 243-44.

⁵ These shorts were

1. 'A Nation re-born' (*Pakistan ke Pichley Paanch Sanl*).
2. 'Achievements of the People's Government'.
3. 'Dharti Ke Lal'.
4. 'Prime Minister Bhutto—*The Man of the People*'.
5. 'Prime Minister Bhutto—*The Servant of Islam*'.

For details see, White Paper on Misuse of Media, pp. 247-248.

⁶ Moreover, under the orders of the then Minister for Information Mohammed Hanif Khan, the Ministry of Information published in February 1977, three books, viz.,

1. *The Architect of New Pakistan*, by Main Said Rasul Rasa (English);
2. *Yadon Ke Jazeeray* by Raza Hamdani (Urdu); and
3. *Ulsi Hindara*, by Prof. Afzal Raza in Pushto.

These three books were part of the election campaign for March 1977 general elections. The expenditure, excluding the cost of the paper, was estimated around Rs. 40,000. About 1,000 copies of each book were produced. See, White Paper on Misuse of Media, p. 248.

arranged special weeks devoted to minorities, women, peasants and defence personnel, from June 1976 to January 1977, for public relations affirmation. The expenditure on celebration of the 'Peasant Week' alone cost the public exchequer more than Rs. 24 lakhs.⁷ The staggering cost of all the aforesaid pre-election publicity exercises could only be imagined.

According to the White Paper on the conduct of the March 1977 general elections,⁸ released by General Zia-ul-Haq, Bhutto ordered his special assistants to prepare a detailed working-plan, dealing with the infra-structure, techniques and credibility of general elections. The then information adviser Pir Ali Mohammed Rashdi had specifically designed the pre-election strategy. Bhutto's Special Secretary, Rao Rashid, suggested drastic revision of electoral laws to counter the likely moves of opposition parties. He also suggested weeding out undesirable and undependable officials and outlined various plans to preclude strong prospective candidates of the opposition parties from filing nomination papers. The then political adviser to Bhutto, Mohammad Hayat Tamman, suggested that the forthcoming elections should be so controlled as to flow in regulated channels. For this purpose, he advocated establishment of a 'central control room' as the nerve centre for regulating the conduct of entire election campaign. Hayat Tamman also recommended establishment of a secret cell/policy cell, statistical cell, a publicity cell, a mapping cell, a finance cell, an administration and transport cell and a field cell, to regulate the election process.

On October 9, 1976, the then Minister for Production, Rafi Raza, called a special committee meeting to consolidate various electoral plans and blue-prints. Rafi Raza committee submitted a cumulative report to Bhutto which got the approval of Prime Minister on October 10, 1976.⁹

Bhutto also ensured passage of special constitutional measures to ensure the victory of the PPP. The National Assembly passed the constitution Fifth Amendment Bill on September 5, 1976 curtailing the powers of the judiciary.¹⁰

⁷ Ibid., p. 250.

⁸ White Paper on the Conduct of the General Elections In March 1977, Rawalpindi, Government of Pakistan publications, July 1978.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 17-24.

¹⁰ According to the fifth constitutional amendment, the powers exercisable by the Supreme Court were made subject to clause 2 of Article 175 of the 1973 constitution whereby the Supreme Court could exercise only such powers as were conferred by the constitution or under any law, and not go beyond its jurisdiction. More specifically, it had been brought about to safeguard any law, rule or order made in pursuance of the Emergency provisions against any challenge on the ground of inconsistency with any of the Fundamental Rights. The Pakistan Times, September 6, 1976.

In November 1976, the Peoples Representation Bill' was passed to debar leaders of the defunct NAP from contesting general elections.¹¹ Similarly, the sixth constitution amendment Bill was passed in December 1976 to enable Bhutto's special assistants and advisers to make them eligible to contest general election.¹² Such statutory measures were designed to ensure electoral success of PPP activists and sympathizers as well as providing constraints for the opposition parties.

The federal government declared economic concessions to various interests in order to enlist support to the PPP in the forthcoming general elections. The government revised the price structure during the year 1976. Specifically, to enlist the support of the peasants of Punjab and Sindh, the federal government raised the price of staple cotton from Rs. 125 to 300 per maund for the year 1976-77. Prices of all chemical fertilizers were lowered. The government removed permit system for the sale of tractors. Similarly, prices of maize, potato and onions were fixed at Rs. 32, 25 and 18 per maund respectively.¹³ Moreover, the amount of agricultural credit was increased from Rs. 120 crore (in 1971) to Rs. 1200 crore to boost agricultural production. The expenditure on fertilizers was raised five-fold as compared to that in 1971. The amount of subsidy, which was Rs. 20 crore during 1975, was raised to Rs. 36 crore.¹⁴

In the industrial sector, the federal government sanctioned loans to major industrial projects totaling Rs. 6.2 crore including a foreign exchange component of Rs. 5.30 crore by the Board of Directors of the Industrial Bank of Pakistan.¹⁵ The investment corporation of Pakistan sanctioned Rs. 9 crore as assistance to

¹¹ 'The People's Representation Bill' (PRB) had been introduced (in November 1976) to disqualify a person from being elected as a member of an Assembly in case he was an office-bearer of a dissolved party under sub-section (2) of section 6 of the Political Parties Act, 1962. The PRB also provided for a deterrent punishment for corrupt practices during elections, such as imprisonment up to five years or a fine up to Rs. 5,000. The ceiling on election expenses was put at Rs. 40,000 for National Assembly elections and at Rs. 25,000 for provincial assembly elections. Dawn, November 19, 1976.

¹² The sixth constitution amendment Bill provided for exclusion of special assistants and advisers to the Prime Minister and provincial Chief Ministers; and chairman and members of Law Commission and of the Council of Islamic Ideology from the 'purview' of the definition of 'Service' of Pakistan. Article 260 of the constitution was amended by this constitutional amendment. Dawn, December 24, 1976.

¹³ Dawn, April 16, 1976.

¹⁴ The Pakistan Times, May 9, 1976

¹⁵ Dawn, April 17, 1976.

major industrial projects. The deluxe hotels in Karachi also got ample financial assistance from the government.¹⁶

Interestingly, the government announced that 'foreign capital invested in Pakistan would not be nationalized'. In an interview with Iranian journalists in Karachi, in February, 1976, Bhutto promised to provide a favorable climate to foreign investment, with a view specifically to attract massive investment from Iran and oil-rich Arab Countries.¹⁷

In May 1976, the government announced a national scheme for cooperative farming and agro-industries under an ordinance. The scheme envisaged formation of cooperatives with a minimum area of 500 acres with the exception of the NWFP where it was 300 acres.¹⁸

On June 30, 1976, the federal government announced a 'liberal import policy' for the fiscal year 1976-77, with the 'free list' increased from 389 to 407 items and the 'tied list' reduced from 29 to 18 items. The new import policy sought to accelerate the liberal pattern of imports introduced by the government in 1972, providing ample provisions for import of tractors, fertilizers, and pesticides to boost agricultural production. Also, several essential consumer goods were placed on 'free list'.¹⁹ In addition, the government extended priority considerations to attract foreign investment agencies in Pakistan.²⁰ Specific measures were taken to give wide publicity to the report of 'World Bank Mission', which highlighted the impressive recovery of Pakistan in the economic field since 1971. The report lauded the efforts of PPP government in the field of economic growth and self reliance. It also stated optimistic prospects of 'green revolution' in Pakistan.²¹

Such sustained and calculated measures gave Bhutto the confidence he had needed for creating the base on which to build-up his electoral strategy. Not unexpectedly, therefore, in the third week of December 1976 he announced his decision to hold general elections and added that the elections would be 'free and fair'. In his speeches Bhutto pointed out that his party and government were not afraid of going to elections. The elections would not be postponed just

¹⁶ Morning News, April 24, 1976.

¹⁷ Dawn, February 17, 1976.

¹⁸ The Pakistan Times, May 26, 1976.

¹⁹ Dawn, July 1, 1976.

²⁰ Business Recorder, October 29, 1976.

²¹ The Pakistan Times, October 30, 1976.

because some other Asian countries had done likewise, alluding apparently to India.²²

II. The March 1977 Election: Strategy, Campaign and Verdict

On January 2, 1977, the Election Commission announced the final electoral list for the National Assembly and four provincial assemblies. Bhutto stated in the National Assembly on January 7, 1977 that general elections in Pakistan would be held on March 7, 1977 and the National Assembly would be dissolved on January 10, 1977.²³ The then President of Pakistan, Fazal Elahi Chaudhury, formally dissolved the National Assembly on January 10, 1977, and said that elections for the National Assembly would be held on March 7, 1977 and for the four provincial assemblies on March 10, 1977.²⁴

A day after the dissolution of the National Assembly, Pakistan's opposition parties made a surprising announcement for the formation of new opposition alliance. The United Democratic Front (UDF) ceased to exist and the nine opposition parties (on January 11, 1977) formed 'Pakistan National Alliance' (PNA) to contest the elections for the 216 National Assembly seats and more than 400 seats in the four provincial legislatures. The nine-party PNA comprised: The Muslim League (Pagaro), Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Pakistan, Jatmiat-Ulemai-Islam,

²² Addressing a Press Club meeting at Lahore on December 23, 1976, Bhutto declared that "he had faith in democracy" and as evidence thereof, he was "willing to hold general election in the country according to the constitution." Bhutto asked: "why should we postpone elections? —there was no need for such an attitude." Without naming a neighbouring country, Bhutto said that "though there was a democratic system in that country, since its inception they had put off their elections twice—firstly for one year and then for a period of two years." He said that there were a number of other countries also where elections had been postponed, and added that he would not name those countries because it would result in a diplomatic protest from them claiming that they still had democracy in their country. Bhutto further observed that Pakistan is fortunate to have both a democratic and constitutional government, Morning News, December 24, 1976.

²³ Z.A. Bhutto stated on January 7, 1977: "You know how previous general elections were manipulated. First of all, direct national elections were never held until 1970. You know how provincial assemblies' elections were held. You know how preceding governments extended their terms of office so that they could bring in almost all members of the National Assembly as Ministers as well as make all sorts of other petty arrangements and intrigues just to remain in office beyond the period permitted by law... I know that politicians like to avoid elections as much as the generals like to avoid wars, but the point is that political battles have to be fought, political elections have to be fought according to a time schedule. For wars there is no time schedule. For Politicians, elections are the test of their leadership, they are also the test for political parties." Cited in White Paper on the Conduct of the General Elections in March 1977, p. (iii)

²⁴ The Pakistan Times, January 11, 1977.

Tehrik-i-Istiglal, Jamaat-e-Islami, Pakistan Democratic Party, The National Democratic Party, Khaksar Tehrik, and Muslim Conference.²⁵

Initially, it seemed, Bhutto was taken aback at the decision of the opposition parties to form a new alliance. Instructions to the government controlled media were issued not to use the nomenclature 'Pakistan National Alliance', but to continue to refer to each political party by its original identity, or as an alternative, to identify the PNA as a mere 'combination of nine political parties'. Simultaneously, propaganda was launched to expose the heterogeneous character of the PNA and its consequent incapacity to form a stable government.²⁶

The first shock wave emanated from Baluchistan. The presence of the armed forces in that province was always widely resented. Bhutto's mounting offensive against the PNA further complicated matters and the PNA President, Maulana Mufti Mahmud, decided not to put up candidates for any of the seven National Assembly and 40 provincial assembly seats of Baluchistan, in keeping with the decision taken by the National Democratic Party chief, Sardar Sherbaz Khan Mazari, to boycott elections in Baluchistan, unless the army was withdrawn before the last date of filing nomination papers. The nomination papers were filed on January 19 and 22 for the National Assembly and provincial assemblies respectively. On completion of nomination formalities, it was found that the PPP had bagged 17 National Assembly seats and 39 provincial assemblies' seats unopposed. Bhutto was also declared elected unopposed from his home constituency, Larkana, in Sindh. That, however, sparked off a fierce controversy which, it could be stated now, was to prove the beginning of catastrophe for Bhutto.

The PNA challenged Bhutto's unopposed election and accused the government of kidnapping their candidate, Maulana Jan Mohammad Abbasi, who was alleged to have been taken 80 kms away from Larkana constituency and kept in confinement for two days, thus preventing him from filing his nomination papers. Maulana Abbasi lodged a complaint with the Election Commission challenging the unopposed return of Bhutto. The charges were denied by the

²⁵ The Times of India, January 12, 1977. On January 20, 1977, Mohammad Hanif Khan, then Information Minister, submitted a note to Prime Minister Bhutto, giving a preliminary review of the 'election oriented projection'. He stated, "so far the major thrust of the projection campaign is directed towards a ruthless exposure of the 'Pakistan National Alliance' .. The objective is to alienate the masses from the Alliance by portraying it as a worthless combination of different political elements with no ability to serve the masses either before or after the election,... There is also an effort to impress upon the masses that the Pakistan People's Party is the only party which has the capacity to serve the masses." White Paper on the Misuse of Media, pp. 264-265.

²⁶ The Pakistan Times, January 22 and 23, 1977.

government and the Election Commission demanded documentary evidence from complainants.²⁷

Reports of kidnapping and arrest of the PNA candidates were first suppressed, and, finally, sought to be drowned in the 'loud din' raised over Bhutto's unopposed election. Correspondents of major newspapers were asked to link-up the unopposed election of Bhutto with his massive popularity and to highlight in their reports his services to the people of his constituency (Larkana), the province of Sindh and the Nation as a whole, specifically various reforms introduced by him during his five years of rule to establish an egalitarian socioeconomic order in the country, and also his family tradition of philanthropy and contribution to the cause of people's welfare.²⁸

Bhutto formally released the PPP election Manifesto at a press conference in Rawalpindi on January 24, 1977 promising wide-ranging economic and social benefits and a stronger defence mechanism, if returned to power. The manifesto promised 50 per cent increase in national production, attaining self-reliance in steel, fertilizers, petroleum and wheat. It outlined measures to combat the menace of inflation. Rededicating itself to four fundamental principles. Islam as faith, democracy as polity, socialism as economy and all power to the people, the PPP pledged to strengthen the foundations of progress and consolidate the results achieved in order to bring about a qualitative improvement in the common man's life, providing job opportunities for the unemployed and housing facilities for the downtrodden, of both the rural and urban areas.²⁹

Every election speech of Bhutto was given audio-visual coverage on national level. No opposition leaders were given that facility. Their speeches were briefly reported in newscasts. The government machinery was geared exclusively to project the personality of Bhutto and the achievements of the PPP government. It is to be noted that in his speeches Bhutto referred to the PNA as the "Gang of Nine."³⁰

²⁷ The Pakistan Times, February 1, 1977.

²⁸ White Paper on Misuse of Media, pp. 265-266.

²⁹ In the Foreword of the Manifesto, Bhutto stated: "We in the past five years restructured the economy and from this will follow, in the next five years, a qualitative improvement in the living standards of our people. This Manifesto is inspired by the idealism with which we launched the movement against dictatorship and the capitalist system and balanced by realism derived from experience." Dawn, January 25, 1977,

³⁰ Addressing an election rally, Bhutto stated on February 4, 1977: "The people would never entrust their destiny into the hands of those who opposed the Quaid-i-Azam and establishment of Pakistan and who had now ganged-up to re-establish a system based on the exploitation and suppression of masses".

Bhutto let loose a barrage of virulent criticism when the PNA election manifesto was released. The PNA manifesto was truly a statement of ultra-conservative priorities, manifesting Islamic orthodoxy. It specified that all laws must conform to the teachings of the 'Quran' and the 'Sunni'. If elected, it promised to quit the CENTO and to observe strict neutrality in foreign affairs. The manifesto declared its dissatisfaction with the 1966 Tashkent and 1972 Simla agreements with India. It assured the right of self-determination to Kashmir and reversal in prices to the level of 1970. Moreover, the manifesto promised introduction of 'Zakat' (Islamic Tax), non-compliance of payment of installments of interest on foreign loans, denationalization of industry and prohibition and eradication of gambling.³¹

Bhutto claimed overwhelming popular support owing to his proven role in stabilizing Pakistan after the trauma of 1971, promulgating a permanent constitution and implementing a wide-range of reformative measures. The entire election campaign, lasting two months, was marked by mounting violence and estrangement between the ruling PPP and the PNA. The federal government had drastically curbed freedom of the press. 'The Pakistan Federal Union of Journalists' (PFUJ) demanded unfettered freedom of the press in their 'Seven-point' demand charter and alleged that "the forthcoming general elections without a free press would be an exercise in futility."³²

Allegations of grave irregularities and coercion were leveled against the PPP by the PNA President, Maulana Mufti Mahmud, who also demanded that the Election Commission should seek assistance of the army for supervising the conduct of the elections at every polling station.³³

In another election rally at Sahiwal, Bhutto said that "Pakistan will be mortgaged to its enemies and face disintegration if the opposition coalition wins the March 7 general election. He urged the people of Pakistan "not to gamble with the destiny and existence of the country by casting their votes to the opposition." See *The Pakistan Times*, February 5, 6, 1977.

³¹ *Bangladesh Observer*, February 10, 1977.

³² The seven-point demand charter of the PFUJ was as follows:

1. Repeal of all undemocratic law;
2. An announcement by the government that it would not resort to arbitrary and abnormal laws against the press and journalist;
3. An unequivocal commitment by the government against the use of official advertisement and newsprint quota as instrument of political favour or chastisement;
4. Dissolution of the National Press Trust (NPT);
5. Reconstruction of the Press Commission;
6. Freeing of radio, TV, and news agencies from the government control ; and,
7. Complete freedom of trade-union activities as guaranteed by ILO conventions.

—*Bangladesh Observer*, Feb. 5, 1977.

³³ *Pakistan Times*, March 5, 1977.

Violence erupted unabated and in a climate of tension the polling for National Assembly seats was held on March 7, 1977. By midnight, however, it was clear that Bhutto's PPP had ensured a sweeping victory over the PNA. Eventually, the PPP was again returned to power with considerably increased strength in the National Assembly, capturing 155 seats in a House of 200 (elected seats). The PNA secured only 36 seats, independent candidates got 8 and a solitary seat went to the Pakistan Muslim League (Q), Pakistan People's Party's gain was reflected in the dramatic increase of its share of about 60 per cent at the time of election to almost 80 per cent after the 1977 election, as the table I below shows:

TABLE I
Final Party Position in the National Assembly
Punjab (1) Sindh NWFP(2) Baluchistan Total

Seats	116	43	34	7	200
PNA	108	32	8	17	155
PPP	8	32	17	0	36
PML (Q)	0	0	1	0	1
Pakistan Inqalabi Mahaz	0	0	0	0	0
Pakhtoon Khawa	0	0	0	0	0
NAP	0	0	0	0	0
JUI	0	0	0	0	0
Pakistan Mazdoor party	0	0	0	0	0
Other Parties	0	0	0	0	0
Independents	0	0	8	0	8

Source: Dawn, March 9, 1977 .

(1) Includes one seat for Islamabad Federal Capital Territory.

(2) Includes eight seats for federally administered tribal areas. Cited in News Review on South Asia and Indian Ocean, March, 1977.

Completely taken aback by its reverses at the National Assembly polls, the PNA boycotted elections for four provincial assemblies held on March 10, 1977. They only facilitated sweeping victory of the PPP in provinces also. The PPP bagged 437 of the 460 (elected) seats of the four provincial assemblies. 17 seats went to independents, 2 to PML(Q) and one to JUI (Hazarvi group). Results of three constituencies were not declared. Interestingly, in Sindh, the PPP made a clean sweep capturing all the 100 seats, while it had gained an overwhelming majority in the other three provinces. The final party position in the four provincial assemblies on March 12, 1977 is shown in Table II below:

TABLE II
Final Party Position in the Provincial Assemblies

	Punjab	Sindh	NWFP	Baluchistan	Total
Seats	240	100	80	40	460
<i>Parties</i>					
PNA(1)	0	0	0	0	0
PPP	232	100	71	34	437
PML (Q)	0	0	2	0	2
JUI (hazarvi)	0	0	1	0	1
Pakistan Mazdoor party	0	0	0	0	0
Independents	7	0	5	5	17

Source: Morning News, March 12, 13, 1977

(1) PNA Boycotted the Provincial Assembly polls.

A notable feature of the polling for the National Assembly was the voter-turnout. According to a survey conducted by All-Pakistan Press (APP), it was seen that over 17 million men and women, out of 31 million registered voters, had cast their votes. This worked out to about 50 per cent turnout. During the 1970 general election, the turnout of voters in West Pakistan was about 52 per cent. This estimate, however, did not take into account the 19 uncontested constituencies comprising about 3 million voters.

Out of the estimated 17 million votes cast in the NWFP, the PPP candidates polled 637,000 votes and the PNA 816,000 votes, a difference of about 11 per cent.

In Punjab, about 12.5 million votes were cast. Of these, the PPP polled 61 per cent (7.6 million) votes and the PNA 36 per cent (4.4 million), the difference being nearly 3.2 million.

In Sindh, out of the total 2.7 million votes cast, the PPP polled 1.7 million (64 per cent) and the PNA 843,000 (31 per cent), which indicated that the PPP secured more than twice the votes compared to those polled by the PNA.

Of the 135,000 votes cast in Baluchistan, the PPP polled about 50 per cent votes. The PNA did not contest the election in Baluchistan.³⁴

It would be observed that electoral news from Pakistan, as other news also, was scanty, especially voting figures and related information. The difficulty later became more pronounced when, after Bhutto's execution, the Election

³⁴ Dawn, March 13, 1977.

Commission of Pakistan, under the orders of military regime, declared the March 1977 general elections null and void. On April 23, 1979 the Election Commission issued an order that it would not publish any report on the March 1977 general elections.³⁵ Therefore, one could lay one's hands on whatever data made available.

III. The Post-Election PPP-PNA Confrontation and Bhutto's Deposition.

The landslide victory of the PPP notwithstanding, Bhutto failed to establish his legitimacy in Pakistan. The allegations of the opposition (the PNA specifically) that Bhutto's PPP had resorted to rigging the election, caused a severe setback to Bhutto's leadership image. The PPP leader initially described the rigging charge as 'completely false' and claimed that the PPP gained popular support owing to 'free and fair elections'.³⁶

The General Council of the PNA rejected the validity of March 7 general election and urged its elected nominees to the National Assembly to resign from the Assembly with immediate effect.³⁷ The PNA leaders insisted upon fresh elections under the direct supervision of army with a care-taker government in office.³⁸ Thus, the PNA openly demanded Bhutto's resignation as a pre-condition for re-conducting free and fair elections.

Bhutto persisted with his adamant posture in justifying the legitimacy of the PPP. In view of the growing political turmoil, Bhutto offered on March 12, 1977, to have a dialogue with the PNA if the latter had any complaints. However, in a broadcast to the nation, Bhutto ruled out the possibility of holding fresh general elections.³⁹

The PNA leadership had mixed reactions on the issue of the dialogue offer by Bhutto. The PNA chief, Maulana Mufti Mahmud, in an emergency meeting of the General Council discussed the issue of negotiations with Bhutto. The extremists, protesting against Mufti Mahmud's observation, insisted upon not holding any

³⁵ The Pakistan Times, April 24, 1979.

³⁶ The Pakistan Times, March 9, 1977.

³⁷ The Pakistan Times, March 10, 1977.

³⁸ Dawn, March 11, 1977.

³⁹ Making an impassioned plea to the opposition to accept their defeat in 'good grace', Bhutto insisted that "he was always ready for a dialogue except for re-thinking over the National Assembly elections, which were a settled matter and could not be dismissed." The Pakistan Times, March 13, 1977.

dialogue with Bhutto. They urged upon the moderate leaders of the PNA to continue with the demand of Bhutto's resignation and holding fresh general election. Ultimately, the extremists of the PNA won.

The PNA unanimously decided to launch protest rallies from March 14, 1977, until acceptance of its two major demands: (i) resignation by Bhutto and members of the election commission, and, reconstitution of a new election commission; and, (ii) arrangement of fresh, 'free and impartial' general election, under the supervision of judiciary and the army.⁴⁰

On March 14, 1977, violent clashes, between the armed forces and PNA's protest marchers, resulted in death and injuries to many agitators. After arresting important leaders of the PNA, Bhutto issued orders on March 19, for imposition of curfew in trouble-torn areas. Karachi was the first city which came under curfew on 19 March 1977.⁴¹

On March 20, 1977, Bhutto again wrote to the President of the PNA offering to initiate a dialogue to devise ways and means for resolution of the political crisis. Bhutto clarified that "it was not as chairman of the PPP that he had extended the invitation for dialogue with the PNA president. It was as the chief executive of the country that he was endeavoring to accommodate those demands of the opposition which might be legitimate. His party had secured an overwhelming vote of confidence from the electorate, which no false charges of rigging, no matter how strident and sweeping, could throw into dispute."⁴² However, the PNA rejected Bhutto's conditional dialogue offer and gave a call for mass strike on March 26, 1977. To disrupt PNA's strike, the federal government issued 'shoot at sight' orders. Despite heavy presence of the police and the army, the PNA's strike paralyzed normal life in the major towns and cities.⁴³

⁴⁰ Dawn, March 13, 1977.

⁴¹ The federal government alleged that "the PNA leaders despite repeated warnings, had created lawlessness in the country, by unconstitutional means". The statement named the six detained PNA leaders, who had deliberately courted arrest by violating the government ban on public gatherings: Air Marshal (Retd.) Asghar Khan, Maulana Shah Ahmed Noorani, Sherbaz Khan Mazari, Mahmud Ali Kasuri, Mahmud Azam Farooqi and Mir Ali Ahmed Talpur. The General Secretary of the PNA was also arrested on the same day after his arrival from Lahore to Karachi.
Dawn, March 20, 1977.

⁴² The Pakistan Times, March 21, 1977

⁴³ On March 27, the PNA's General Council in its resolution stressed that the people of Pakistan have totally rejected the March 7, elections which were rigged by the ruling party and it is confirmed by the nationwide demonstrations held on March 26, 1977 in Pakistan.
Dawn, March 28, 1977.

Soon after taking oath of office as Prime Minister (on March 28, 1977), Bhutto reiterated that he was prepared for a 'grand consensus' with the PNA. Bhutto's offer of grand consensus was a calculated move. He agreed to lift the state of Emergency, provided the opposition gave an understanding of democratic approach, return to the National Assembly and gave up politics of street agitation. Bhutto also agreed to release the detained PNA leaders and to further relax curbs on the Press. But, he categorically ruled out the possibility of dissolution of the National Assembly.⁴⁴ The PNA rejected the proposal of grand consensus as a mere facade and persisted with the demand of resignation of Bhutto and dissolution of the National Assembly.

On April 11, 1977, the PNA called for 'civil disobedience' to protest against alleged rigging of March 1977 general elections. The PNA leaders and activists urged citizens not to pay taxes, withdraw deposits from banks, and refuse to buy transport tickets and not to pay loans taken from state organizations. They also called on tax and other public-fund collectors to extend their cooperation in the civil disobedience movement of the PNA. The PNA sources claimed overwhelming popular support for the call of civil disobedience.

It seems Bhutto was shaken by the growing menace created by the PNA. On April 13, he offered to dissolve the National Assembly and to conduct fresh elections, if the opposition first wins a 'two-thirds majority' in fresh provincial assembly elections proposed by him. Again, Bhutto's conditional proposal was rejected by the PNA. Though, Bhutto offered to personally negotiate with the opposition leaders, he also categorically stated that he would not hesitate to call out troops to restore normal conditions, if conditions so warranted.⁴⁵

The General Council of PNA on April 18, 1977, reiterated that the Alliance did not recognize Bhutto as a legitimate Prime Minister of Pakistan and would not hold a dialogue with him in the capacity of Prime Minister. The General Council of PNA also gave another call for holding mass demonstrations in, Pakistan on April 19, 1977. However, Bhutto, in order to counter PNA's proposed demonstration, organised a counter rally of 30,000 PPP workers on April 18, 1977 in Lahore. It could now be stated that Bhutto's moves were neither confident nor correct. He seemed to have been greatly frustrated and his hurry to counter the PNA offensive was apparent in his thinking also. Bhutto failed to control the

⁴⁴ Dawn, March 29, 1977.

⁴⁵ Bhutto warned that "there must be a dialogue and soon, or the country could fall into the hands of the extremists on the Left and Right." He also claimed to have the 'whole-hearted' support of the Pakistan People's Party. He said: "I am not isolated." The Statesman, April 13, 1977.

PNA demonstrations on April 19, 1977, which had the backing and support of 26 labour federations and several student organizations.⁴⁶

In desperation, the federal government clamped martial law on April 21, 1977 in Karachi, Lahore and Hyderabad which was extended to Lyallpur on March 22.⁴⁷

With every passing day, the PNA seemed to be gaining greater support and more extensive acceptance. Despite the martial law, business centers in major cities and town of Pakistan remained closed on April 22, 1977, in response to the call for a nation-wide strike by PNA. On April 23, PNA leaders decided to meet the army chief, General Zia-ul-Haq to explain to him that “the imposition of martial law was a conspiracy against the people and the army of Pakistan.” Bhutto, however, got arrested 48 PNA leaders in Lahore early in the morning on April 24, 1977 and prevented them from meeting the army chief.⁴⁸

The General Council of the PNA adopted a resolution on April 25, condemning proclamation of martial law to “protect the illegal and unconstitutional government of Bhutto”. The General Council described Bhutto’s attempt as a conspiracy to get the army fight against the people.”⁴⁹

In view of the government’s recourse to repression, coercion and violence, a virtual reign of terror followed. The economic situation worsened ominously.⁵⁰ Taking a leaf out of the tactics, as it were, of Jayaprakash Narain in India, extremist leader of the PNA, Air Marshal (Retd.) Asghar Khan appealed to the armed forces to disobey orders of administration.⁵¹

⁴⁶ Dawn, April 20, 1977.

⁴⁷ According to the Government press release, “the martial law had been imposed because internal disturbances posed a grave danger to Pakistan’s integrity and all efforts to solve the political problems by legal and constitutional means had been thwarted by certain people apparently bent on creating anarchy in the country.” The Pakistan Times, April, 22, 23, 1977.

⁴⁸ Kayhan, April 24, 1977.

⁴⁹ On April 25, leaders of seven student organizations in Rawalpindi and Islamabad formed a single front, viz., ‘Pakistan Student Alliance’ (PSA), to support the PNA agitation. The PSA virulently criticized police and military excesses against the opposition. The Times of India, April 26, 1977.

⁵⁰ The political deadlock between the PPP and the PNA adversely affected the economy of Pakistan. The cost of damage to the economy caused after March 7, 1977 general elections had been estimated at between \$ 500 and \$ 1,000 million. Pakistan’s total export earning indicated a decline of about \$ 13 million as compared to the export earnings during 1975-76. The situation was comparable to the 1971 national crisis. For details see, Business Recorder, April 14, 1977 and June 12, 1977.

⁵¹ Asghar Khan’s appeal had been supported by the former Army Chief, General Gul Hasan and Air Marshal Rahim Khan, who had resigned from their ambassadorial posts, in April 1977, as a protest against Bhutto’s repressive policies. It might be recalled that General Gut Hasan and Air Marshal Rahim Khan

The moderate wing of the PNA proposed on May 5, 1977, a '32-point plan' for resolution of constitutional deadlock. The proposals were divided into two phases. In the first phase, the PNA demanded immediate withdrawal of martial law, release of all PNA detained leaders, annulment of all amendments to the constitution not unanimously agreed upon (3, 4, 5 and 6), apportioning time for opposition over Radio and TV, and, an end to press censorship. The second phase included dissolution of the National Assembly to be followed by simultaneous general and local elections within 30 days and Bhutto's resignation immediately after dissolution of the National Assembly, complete reorganization of electoral machinery, military's responsibility for security at polling booth, appointment of acceptable governors in the provinces and dismissal of certain senior civil servants.⁵²

Bhutto did not hide his displeasure over PNA's fresh demands. He was not prepared to resign as Prime Minister just for the asking. He had another card up his sleeve when he suggested that the PNA should seek a vote of confidence through a nation-wide referendum to prove the opposition claim that the PPP no longer commanded popular trust. That would also decide whether Bhutto was to continue as Prime Minister. The General Council of the PNA accused Bhutto of "foisting one-party hegemony" and condemned the referendum move as "a fraud upon fraud."⁵³

Not to be overawed, Bhutto ensured passage of 7th constitutional amendment Bill on May 16, to provide for a nationwide referendum before the end of September 1977.⁵⁴ Thereafter, PPP-PNA confrontation became more acute. As such, Bhutto had not played his cards judiciously and showed lack of confidence in his policy, seeking intervention of the armed forces and manipulating the constitution at will. To seek legitimacy, Bhutto, time and again, referred to 'foreign conspiracy' for encouraging PNA agitation against his democratic government.⁵⁵

were sacked by Bhutto, soon after he assumed power, and were given ambassadorial posts in Greece and Spain, respectively. Kaylian, May 2, 1977.

⁵² The Times of India, May 6, 1977.

⁵³ The Times of India, May 15, 1977. PNA's decision not to accept Bhutto's proposal of referendum coincided with a report published in the daily Millar Gujarati, May 6, 1977, in which the Chief Election Commissioner, Justice Sajjad Ahmad Khan was reported to have admitted that "the elections (March 1977) have been completely rigged in more than half of the constituencies". Cited in Hindu, May 15, 1977.

⁵⁴ Pakistan Times, May 17, 1977.

⁵⁵ For instance, in a joint-session of the Parliament on April 28, 1977, Bhutto stated: "The current violent agitation of the PNA to topple the legal government was not really indigenous but a massive international

Bhutto also turned to Islamic countries to save Pakistan from impending disaster. Prominent leaders from Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait and Libya approached both, the PPP and PNA leaders, for resolution of the political deadlock. It was widely believed that the Arab countries were prepared to provide financial assistance for holding fresh general elections in Pakistan. Their efforts bore fruit and the contending parties again agreed to resume negotiations for settlement of the impasse. The PNA acting chief, Pir Pagaro, listed 'seven-point' demands:

1. Release of all those arrested during the PNA agitation and withdrawal of cases against them;
2. Withdrawal of martial law;
3. Release of central leaders of the PNA to participate in the negotiations;
4. Stoppage of propaganda against the PNA;
5. Financial help to those injured during the agitation;
6. Lifting of emergency; and,
7. Removal of restrictions on the press.⁵⁶

On June 3, 1977, the PPP and the PNA resumed negotiations to diffuse the political crisis. Bhutto ordered release of 2,000 PNA supporters along with major PNA leaders. By June 7, according to government sources, 12,900 persons, arrested for allegedly violating the law, had been released. Bhutto also announced that martial law imposed in major cities was being lifted as talks with the opposition made progress towards a settlement over the protected political crisis.⁵⁷

By the middle of June 1977, Bhutto seemed to have considerably diluted his approach and conceded the PNA demand for fresh general elections. In a joint-statement the PPP and PNA declared on June 15, 1977 that "they had agreed on a date and arrangements for the fresh general elections, putting an end to the country's three-month old political crisis." A two-member committee comprising

conspiracy against the Islamic State of Pakistan". He said that "they want my head". "The political blood hounds" were after his blood because as Prime Minister, he was the symbol and pillar of Pakistan's stability and was opposed to US policies on a number of international issues—especially, French nuclear assistance.

The Pakistan Times, April 29, 1977.

⁵⁶ The Pakistan Times, June 2, 1977.

⁵⁷ The Times of Lydia, June 8, 1977.

a representative each of PPP and PNA, was set-up (on June 15, 1977) to work out details of the basic issues of the agreement.⁵⁸

However, on June 16, 1977, Bhutto again acted rather hastily and made a surprise announcement in the National Assembly that “final accord between the government and the PNA would be signed only after his return from a ‘four-day’ visit to West Asia.”⁵⁹ The government representative, Abdul Hafeez Pirzada, disclosed on June 18, that fresh election will be held in the first week of October 1977. This announcement came on the day Bhutto left for a visit to West Asian countries.⁶⁰ After his return from West Asia, Bhutto introduced some changes in the proposals of the two-member committee set up earlier. On June 25, differences between the government and the PNA re-surfaced over the issue of dissolution of the National Assembly. The government and PNA representative held a final round of talks on July 2, 1977, and agreed over technical aspects of elections. The PNA representative, Ghafoor Ahmed, however, remarked that the agreement would be placed before the General Council of the PNA for final approval. In the General Council meeting of the PNA, the extremist wing led by Air Marshal (Retd.) Asghar Khan, refused to sign the agreement, owing to Bhutto’s amendments in the original agreement (reached between the PPP and PNA), before Bhutto’s visit to West Asian countries.⁶¹ Negotiations between the government and the PNA were stalled on July 4, 1977. Bhutto accused the PNA of violating the agreement reached between the government and the opposition. The failure of the government and the PNA to settle the political impasse proved disastrous in the ultimate reckoning. Events over-took Bhutto and belied his expectations and anticipations.

On July 5, 1977, the army deposed Bhutto and set aside civil administration. The Chief of the Army Staff, General Zia-ul-Haq, declared martial law in Pakistan. The Chief Martial Law Administrator (CMLA) General Zia-ul-Haq, in his first broadcast to the nation, asserted that the army could not have been a silent spectator, with both the ruling PPP and the PNA failing to arrive at an acceptable

⁵⁸ The members of the committee were: the then Pakistan’s Finance Minister Abdul Hafeez Pirzada and PNA Secretary General Ghafoor Ahmed. *The Pakistan Times*, June 16, 1977.

⁵⁹ *The Pakistan Times*, June 17, 1977.

⁶⁰ *The Pakistan Times*, June 19, 1977.

⁶¹ Asghar Khan pointed out that Bhutto’s amendments would strengthen PPP’s hold in the provinces. The amendments introduced by Bhutto were: the provincial governments should be dissolved in the second week of July 1977; and, the provinces should be placed under direct federal rule through Governors appointed by the central government.

Bangladesh Observer, July 4, 1977.

solution. Since the country had been rapidly receding into a political crisis, the army had to intervene to protect the interests of the people.⁶²

As revealed later, the army takeover was not an instant happening. Various factors and forces, domestic as well as international, combined together to manifest such an eventuality. Some analysts insisted that a 'coup' was 'on the cards' ever since Bhutto assumed power in December 1977. It seems the growing discontent within the army over Bhutto's handling of civil and military affairs in a cavalier manner, spread dissatisfaction in the armed forces. Through purges and periodic overhaul of the military set-up, Bhutto not only adversely affected the morale of military leaders but also diluted their faith in the civilian leadership and sharpened differences within the armed forces. Also, it might be recalled that Bhutto's dependence on the army with regard to the administration of Baluchistan and the NWFP and his resort to martial law during PNA agitation, were happenings which enabled the army to regain its self-confidence which was seriously affected as a demoralizing consequence of the war of 1971.

More than ever before, the armed forces were convinced that civilian government was neither equipped nor capable of administrative control. Even in normal civilian administration, calling out the army to suppress turbulence, for instance, in Baluchistan and the NWFP, further emboldened the top-brass and added to their determination to stage a comeback.

Declaration of Martial law in four major cities of Pakistan in April 1977, seemed to have served as a dress-rehearsal, as it were, for the armed forces to make the most of the opportunity. The period of political turmoil, involving the PPP and the PNA, only helped the army to take stock of the situation and convert small gains into decisive acquisitions. The call, given by the PNA, for fresh elections under the aegis of the army and the judiciary, only confirmed that the armed forces continued to be perceived as more reliable, and also more honest, by none else but political leaders themselves. That, however, was not a new phenomenon. The army had been in control of government previously also. When Sheikh Mujib had won a decisive political victory, Yahya Khan and Bhutto did not hesitate to neutralize it by ordering the army to suppress the popular upsurge in erstwhile East Pakistan. The repeat performance, though in a different version, came when the PNA rejected Bhutto's and PPP's victory on the ground of rigging. All these precedents were cumulatively encouraging and favorable so far as army calculations to regain political power were concerned. And, in that context, none else than Bhutto's chosen army chief betrayed him ultimately.

⁶² The Times of India, July 6, 1977.

Apart from other things, one cannot deny Zia his share of praise for out-witting a person of Bhutto's caliber and political maturity. The elements of surprise and suddenness more than made up for Zia's other deficiencies which have come to light in the recent past. But, did not Bhutto himself rely so heavily on the army, and, if he had to pay the price, there was an element of poetic-justice in that as well. Bhutto assuredly erred in over-rating his own charisma and in under-rating the army's capacity for intrigue in Pakistan.

Bhutto's whole approach and strategy, employed in the March 1977 general elections ultimately led to erosion of his legitimate political leadership. There is little doubt that the PPP and Bhutto, both continued to enjoy widespread popular support. There was little, by way of challenge posed by the PNA, to disturb Bhutto's control over Sindh and Punjab. Bhutto was equally aware of the weaknesses of the PNA as a viable opposition. It is, therefore, amazing and beyond comprehension that Bhutto turned a blind eye to, or connived with, or gave the go-ahead to, or rejected outright, even partially corroborated allegations of rigging. Even in March 1977, it was a safe assumption for Bhutto to concede the demand for fresh elections. He, however, chose dilatory tactics and his undesirable nervousness led to his frustrating decision to ignore the Chief Election Commissioner's admission, after due investigations, that March 7, 1977 general elections were rigged almost wholesale in more than half of the constituencies. After Bhutto had finally agreed to PNA's proposals (on June 14) to hold fresh general elections, his ambivalent postures surfaced again soon after his return from a tour of West Asian countries, as he sought to induct, unfairly of course, qualified interpretations of the agreement.

Bhutto's aversion to perceive the undercurrents of growing distrust and disillusionment among the former bases of support, only deepened the crisis. He miscalculated the nature and extent of PNA's agitative politics which began as inconsequential conglomeration of disparate elements and soon caught the imagination of such rightist people as had the mortification to face the reality of electoral rigging and coercive tactics. Perhaps, the last opportunity to redeem himself was when he could, with good grace, order fresh elections, instead of trying to salvage bits and remnants of his fractured political ambitions. The dilemmas inherent in his perceptions led to his taking the PNA for granted without realizing the gravity of the growing support it had been acquiring in direct proportion to Bhutto's rigid postures and intransigence.

Not that Bhutto alone was responsible for the political crisis. The PNA was also to blame. As such, the PNA was a house divided among obscurantist orthodox elements and ultra-Islamic visionaries. Initially, the PNA did not impress a sizable section of the masses. The split of the PNA, between liberals and extremists, helped Bhutto only for a short while. As he kept blundering from one

miscalculation to the other, the PNA succeeded in getting relatively more cohesive and could also enlist more extensive mass support.

Bhutto's limitations notwithstanding, it would not have been so smooth to oust him unless, it is alleged, some powerful external forces had not been active. Pakistan has always been held high in the reckoning of US policy-makers as a dependable out-post in South Asia, in spite of minor irritants. Bhutto's insistence upon nuclear deal with France, it is believed, could not be acceptable to the USA (Carter administration). Bhutto had clearly incurred the wrath of not only the USA but also of oil-rich countries, like Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, which found the PNA and the army top-brass distinctly committed to orthodox Islamic values. Ever, the diluted socialistic postures of Bhutto were an anathema to both, the USA and West Asian states. General Zia's subsequent policies and actions seem to confirm the assumption that without dependable external patronage, his days would have been numbered, delicately balanced as he seems to be even now. However, it would not be idle conjecture to state that Bhutto's ambivalence, more than any other factor, aggravated issues aid policies concerning conduct of general elections and the PNA. Bhutto lost because he failed to contain and discipline over-enthusiastic elements in the PPP who mistook popular support for license to take the law into their own hands. It was such permissiveness which proved disastrous to Bhutto's legitimate political leadership.

From Trial to Execution

After the imposition of martial law in Pakistan (on July 5, 1977), Chief Martial Law Administrator General Zia-ul-Haq, arrested political leaders of both the PPP and the PNA, including the deposed Prime Minister Bhutto. General Zia stated that these leaders were taken in 'protective custody'. He described the coup as a military 'contingency plan' to end political deadlock and conflict created by antagonism of political parties on the issue of conducting 'free and fair elections'. In his first broadcast to the nation, General Zia made a dramatic announcement to show his political-neutrality. He denied personal political ambitions, and called the coup a '90-day Operation Fair-Play'.¹

The CMLA suspended the 1973 constitution² and assured that fresh general elections would be held by October 1977. However, Zia soon gave some inkling of his intention to stay in power playing his political cards cautiously. On July 6, 1977, he released two religious leaders of PNA, Pir Pagaro (Pakistan Muslim League) and Mian Tufail Mohammad (Jamaat-e-Islami) from 'protective custody'. These leaders, soon after their release, demanded 'open trial' of Bhutto before holding fresh general elections.³

I

Bhutto's Trial and Execution

Irrespective of the innocuousness of Zia's actions at that time, there was little doubt that he had a well thought-out strategy, which he was determined to put

¹ General Zia stated: "I want to make it absolutely clear that neither I have any political ambition nor does the army want to be taken away from its profession of soldiering... I was obliged to step into fill in the vacuum created by the political leaders. I have accepted this challenge as a true soldier of Islam. We are absolutely determined to carry out at '90-day Operation Fair-Play' leading up to free and fair general elections."

The Pakistan Times, July 6, 1977.

² In 34 years of its crisis-ridden existence, Pakistan had three permanent constitutions and four stop-gap statutes (interim constitutions). General Zia introduced an interim constitution on March 24, 1981. After the 'coup' (July 5, 1977), he suspended Bhutto's (1973) Constitution and promulgated martial law. Till March 24, 1981, the administration of Pakistan was managed through martial law regulations. For details see, *The Times of India*, March 27, 1981.

³ *The Pakistan Times*, July 7, 1977.

into action. On July 14, 1977, for the first time, General Zia announced that 'Bhutto and other interned political leaders would be released shortly and the army will provide Bhutto's PPP and the opposition equal facilities in campaigning for the promised October 18, 1977 general election'.⁴

But, General Zia simultaneously initiated appointment of enquiry committees against different institutions and officials of the former (Pakistan People's Party) government. The Federal Security Force (FSF) was the first target. To strengthen his hands, General Zia issued a special martial law order on July 22, 1977 for detention of any person without explanation for 'activities prejudicial to the interests of the country'.⁵

As a follow-up step, Zia ordered on July 23, full-fledged enquiry into charges of corruption and misuse of power by the officials during Bhutto regime. Bhutto and other political leaders were released from 'protective custody' on July 28, 1977.⁶ The newly appointed Chief Election Commissioner, Justice Mushtaq Hussain declared on August 1, 1977 fresh elections to the National and Provincial Assemblies to be held on October 18, 1977. Nomination papers were called during August 8 to 18, 1977.⁷ On August 3, Bhutto announced his party's decision to contest general elections. He filed nomination papers from three National Assembly constituencies, Lahore (Punjab), Larkana and Thatta (Sindh).⁸

Zia's anti-Bhutto stance became more pronounced thereafter, especially when Zia had come to realize the widespread popular support Bhutto was regaining steadily. Obviously, the military top-brass and the PNA leaders feared Bhutto's comeback in the promised October elections. The PNA leaders insisted upon Bhutto's trial before general elections for charges ranging from corruption to political murders which were under investigation. The opposition leaders also stressed the need to usher and ensure a process of 'accountability' before the

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ The Pakistan Times, July 23, 1977.

⁶ After his release from 'protective custody', Bhutto remarked, that he still held the key to solving Pakistan's national crisis. He stated that 'you will see as time passes that that people are with me... while the situation appeared fine under the present martial law, the present crisis was at least as serious as that of 1971, the year of secession of Bangladesh and the war with India.' Bhutto further observed that 'he had informed General Zia that he would like to face a tribunal and vindicate himself. Honour and respect were more important to him than winning or losing elections. Any decision he might make about contesting October elections did not mean, he accepted the present constitutional position.' Tribune, July 30, 1977.

⁷ The Times of India, August 2, 1977.

⁸ The Times of India, August 20, 1977.

October elections.⁹ In view of the mounting vilification campaign against the PPP and also countless charges pending against himself, Bhutto (on August 31, 1977) cautioned martial law authorities that postponing scheduled elections would 'deepen and accentuate the political crisis'.¹⁰

On September 3, 1977, the Federal Investigation Agency arrested Bhutto for alleged complicity in the murder of Nawab Ahmed Khan father of Ahmed Raza Kasuri, member of National Assembly. The Director General of Federal Security Force, Masud Mahmmod, formally accused Bhutto of ordering him to plan the ambush against Ahmed Raza Kasuri (MNA) in which Kasuri's father was killed instead. It might be recalled that in the last week of July, 1977, Ahmed Raza Kasuri had lodged a complaint in the session court of Lahore (Vide FIR, U/S 302, 170B, PPC) against Bhutto for his direct complicity in the ambush which resulted in the killing of his father on November 10, 1974.¹¹ Bhutto was released on bail on September 13, 1977. The Lahore High Court set bail for Bhutto at Rs. 50,000 with two sureties of like amount.¹²

Bhutto plunged into the electoral fray once again. However, the military authorities again detained him on September 17, 1977, only two days before the

⁹ The National Democratic Party leader, Begum Nasim Wali Khan suggested that before conducting 'free and fair elections, a National Government should be set-up in the country for at least five years, to extricate it from the morass of Bhuttoism'. The Pakistan Times, August 22, 1977.

Similarly, Asghar Khan, leader of the 'Tehrik-i-Istaklal' stated that 'Bhutto should be tried even if it means postponing the October general election'. He demanded Bhutto's trial in an ordinary court and not through a special tribunal. The Statesman, September 1, 1977.

¹⁰ The Times of India, September 1, 1977.

¹¹ Ahmed Raza Kasuri was a founder member of the PPP. He was expelled from party membership in October 1972. Thereafter, he joined the opposition 'Tehrik-i-Istaqlal party and became a staunch critic of Bhutto. On a number of occasions, Ahmed Raza Kasuri complained that armed attacks were made to eliminate him at the instance of Bhutto. On the night of November 10, 1974, when Ahmed Raza was driving home from a wedding reception with his father, Nawab Ahmed Khan, some armed men ambushed his car. A bullet which was allegedly aimed at Ahmed Raza, hit his father instead. Nawab Ahmed Khan died after a few hours. At a nearby police station, Ahmed Raza Kasuri lodged the FIR (U/S 302, 120B, PPC) and named Bhutto as the prime suspect. On November 20, 1974, speaking before the National Assembly, Ahmed Raza Kasuri directly accused Bhutto of murdering his father. Moving a privilege motion, he showed members of the National Assembly a bottle full of his father's blood and his father's blood-stained shirt. Ironically, Ahmed Raza Kasuri rejoined Bhutto's PPP before the March 1977 general elections. Bhutto refused to give him the party ticket. Infuriated and humiliated, Ahmed Raza Kasuri dissociated from the PPP (on April 8, 1977) during the PPP-PNA confrontation and formed a new-party, viz; 'Pakistan Awami Jamhoori Party'. After Bhutto's deposition, Ahmed Raza Kasuri came out with determination to put Bhutto in the dock for the alleged murderous attack on his father.

¹² The Times of India, September 14, 1977.

opening of the election campaign. Initially, General Zia disclosed that military courts would be set up to try cases in which Bhutto was allegedly involved.¹³

On September 19, 1977, Begum Nusrat Bhutto filed a petition in the Supreme Court of Pakistan challenging the detention of her husband and ten of the co-accused. The CMLA, General Zia, questioned the Supreme Court's jurisdiction and publicised that ample evidence existed against Bhutto and his associates proving their involvement in a number of subversive and illegal activities. An interesting development took place soon after. General Zia sacked the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Yakoob Ali Khan on September 22, 1977 and elevated a trustworthy senior Supreme Court Judge, Sheikh Anwar-ul-Haq, as the new Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pakistan.¹⁴ The newly appointed Chief Justice refused to dismiss murder charges against Bhutto in response to a 'habeas corpus' petition filed in the Supreme Court on behalf of Begum Nusrat Bhutto.¹⁵

On October 1, 1977, General Zia announced his decision to postpone general elections scheduled to be held on October 18, 1977 and banned all political activity throughout the country. He declared that Bhutto and his associates would be tried in open civilian courts instead of by military tribunals.¹⁶

On October 9, 1977, a full bench of Lahore High Court cancelled the bail granted to Bhutto earlier and remanded him to judicial custody. The trial, 'State versus Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and others', opened on October 11, 1977 at the Lahore High Court. It was the first time in contemporary history that a former Head of the Government was being tried by a civil court for alleged murder committed while in office.¹⁷

¹³ The Times of India, September 18, 1977. Ironically US daily New York Times (21-9-1977) called for a postponement of October polls until after the completion of the trial proceedings against Bhutto.

¹⁴ General Zia removed Justice Yakoob Ali by revoking an amendment to the constitution made during Bhutto's regime which extended the retiring age to 70. Instead, the retiring age was reduced by General Zia to 65 years. Zia was obviously incensed with Justice Yakoob Ali because he admitted (on September 20, 1977) a petition challenging the detention of Bhutto filed by Begum Nusrat Bhutto. The Times of India, September 23, 1977.

¹⁵ On November 10, 1977, the Supreme Court dismissed the habeas corpus petition of Begum Nusrat Bhutto. All the nine judges, including the Chief Justice, returned a unanimous verdict on the petition. The Times of India, November 11, 1977.

¹⁶ The Times of India, October 2, 1977.

¹⁷ The Section of the Penal Code, under which Bhutto was charged, left no doubt as to the intentions of the military regime:- Section 120B (criminal conspiracy), Section 301 (murder) and Section 307 (attempt to murder), each, except the latter, carried the death sentence.

A word about the Chief Justice, Maulvi Mushtaq Ahmed of Lahore High Court is called for here. During Bhutto's Prime Ministership, Maulvi Mushtaq was superseded by a junior judge, Aslam Riaz, which the former had resented. There were innumerable instances when the Chief Justice, Maulvi Mushtaq, showed his antipathy against Bhutto during trial proceedings, resulting in 'intermittent threats, snubs and invectives'. Bhutto did not take such treatment lying down and issued a series of statements accusing the 'junta' and the Lahore High Court bench of prejudice and subversion of law. He also announced his decision to boycott the trial. The court ordered continuance of the trial 'in camera'. After the trial had dragged on for five months, the High Court found Bhutto guilty and sentenced him to death, a decision which surprised no one, given the anti-Bhutto campaign and statements before and during the trial.¹⁸

The Lahore High Court gave its verdict of death penalty to Bhutto on March 18, 1978. The five-member bench 'unanimously' convicted Bhutto and his four associates, awarding them death penalty. The court also ordered payment of a sum of Rs. 25,000 as compensation to the family of the man killed. After the announcement of the Lahore High Court verdict, Bhutto was shifted to the death-cell in Kot Lakhpat jail in Lahore.¹⁹

Bhutto filed an appeal before the Supreme Court. It was reported that Bhutto had also insisted upon removal of the Chief Justice, Sheikh Anwar-ul-Haq, since the former apprehended calculated mockery of trial under the latter's tenure. The army 'junta', however, did not entertain Bhutto's plea. And in May 1978, Bhutto was transferred to the Rawalpindi Central Jail.

In May 1978, a nine-member full bench of the Supreme Court began hearing of Bhutto's appeal. Bhutto was absent on the first day. His lawyer, Yahya Bakhtiar, identified the case against his client as 'politically motivated and part of international conspiracy'. Soon after, the initial nine-member bench was reduced to seven-member bench following the retirement of Justice Qaiser Khan and owing to the sickness of Justice Wahieeduddin Ahmed.

After nine months of tortuous proceedings, the Supreme Court confirmed the Lahore High Court verdict on February 6, 1979, awarding death sentence to Bhutto and four other co-accused, Mian Muhammad Abbas (Director Operations and Intelligence), Ghulam Mustafa (Inspector), Arshad Iqbal (Sub-Inspector), and, Rana Iftikar Ahmed (assistant sub-inspector). It might be recalled that all the co-accused, during the Lahore High Court trial, had pleaded guilty and confessed

¹⁸ Salmaan Taseer: Bhutto: A Political Biography, pp. 179-83.

¹⁹ The Pakistan Times, March 19, 1978.

that they were helpless and were pressurized to take part in the murder plot by the then Director General of Federal Security Force, Masud Mahmood.²⁰

The Supreme Court verdict (February 6, 1979) was a split-verdict, four judges (who belonged to Punjab) upheld the Lahore High Court verdict, while the other three judges (two belonged to Sindh) wave a verdict acquitting Bhutto.²¹

Consequent upon the split-verdict against Bhutto, his counsel Yahya Bakhtiar filed a petition for a review of judgment. On March 24, 1979, the same seven-member bench 'unanimously' rejected the review petition. However, the verdict included the provision suggesting reference to executive clemency, and supported Yahya Bakhtiar's claim that 'the sentence should be commuted to life imprisonment, because Bhutto did not wield the murder weapon and was not present at the scene of crime'.²²

Bhutto, however, refused to agree to suggestions for seeking executive clemency since that would have meant admission of guilt. Disregarding international appeals for granting clemency to Bhutto, General Zia chose to put his seal on the sentence of execution of Bhutto. The sentence was carried out at 2 a.m. on April 4, 1979 in Rawalpindi Central Jail.²³

II General Zia's Quest For Survival

Bhutto's trial involved both, the military administration and the judiciary. The manner in which restrictions were reimposed on political activities of Bhutto prior to the scheduled elections of October 1977, clearly showed how little

²⁰ Interestingly, in the beginning of Lahore High Court trial, three of the accused, former Director General of Federal Security Force, Masud Mahmood, former Inspector Ghulam Hussain, and, Bhutto's former Chief Security Officer, Saied Ahmed Khan, turned approvers and confessed their involvement in that murder of Nawab Ahmed Khan in November 1974.

²¹ Justice Dorab Patel in his dissenting note pointed out that the prosecution had failed to corroborate the testimony of the police officers in the strictest legal sense. He stated that 'the evidence was equivocal' and Bhutto's conduct was 'reasonably capable of an innocent interpretation'. Justice Muhammad Haleem and Justice Ghulam Safdar Shah specified that the prosecution had totally failed to prove its case against Bhutto.

The Pakistan Times, February 7, 1979.

²² The Pakistan Times, March 25, 1979.

²³ The Times of India, April 5, 1979. General Zia also rejected mercy pleas of the other four co-accused who were convicted with Bhutto on charges of complicity in a political murder. The four co-accused, Mian Mohammad Abbas, Rana Iftikar, Arshad Iqbal and Ghulam Mustafa Bhatti, were also hanged on July 25, 1979, nearly four months after Bhutto's execution.

The Times of India, July 26, 1979.

General Zia trusted his own survival once elections were permitted to be held. From all accounts, Bhutto's popularity had not been adversely affected. That further compromised Zia's own objectives.

Notwithstanding distortions and fulminations against Bhutto, one cannot ignore the phenomenon of Bhutto's removal by an army 'coup', led by no less a person than Zia, who was believed to have received Bhutto's favors out of turn. It was that miscalculation which ultimately led to Bhutto's complete and final exclusion from national politics. No 'coup' leader would have willingly permitted Bhutto's legitimate rehabilitation as a national leader, for the apprehension was not entirely unfounded that once Bhutto regained authority, he would not have spared his tormentors. Be that as it may, Zia's conduct after Bhutto's last arrest on the eve of elections, that were never held, was a pointer to the shape of things to come.

Zia launched a massive anti-Bhutto campaign and sought to intensify it by his declaration of 'Islamisation' of Pakistan as the only alternative for national resurgence. What he sought to achieve by elimination of so-called 'Bhuttoism' was characterized by his avowal for 'Islamisation'. He offered to the people what ultimately turned out to be puritanic and orthodox fundamentalism, pinning high hopes on popular religious susceptibilities. That was intended to be a rallying point of fundamentalist elements within Pakistan as well as those spread over Muslim states of West Asia. That was also calculated to be an expedient for rallying anti-Bhutto elements by Zia's enormous powers as head of the 'junta' to ensure his own survival in office. By contrast, political parties, other than the PPP, the bureaucracy and the judiciary, so long as they continued to uphold Zia's anti-Bhutto policies and plans, were extended his unequivocal patronage. It soon became evident that both, the Chief Justice of Lahore High Court and that of the Supreme Court, were persons with few qualms for judicial integrity of conscience. On September 22, 1977, Zia amended the oath of office prescribed for the judiciary by deleting the pledge 'to preserve, protect and defend the constitution', and on pain of loss of office, compelled the sitting judges to act according to his plan.

In staging the 'coup', in postponing the promised October general elections, and, in instituting judicial action against Bhutto, Zia had assuredly played his cards effectively and to calculated stratagem. He had no other option except that of eliminating Bhutto, as far as possible through the judicial process, to make it look a consequence of fair legal trial. Bhutto also hoped that, perhaps, by agreeing to a judicial trial he would be vindicated. But he had not reckoned with Zia's capacity to outwit him by interfering with the judiciary, its personnel, procedure and processes, in fact, a leaf out of Bhutto's own inclination and example in that regard while he was in office. With the self-proclaimed success of his bloodless

'coup' and Islamisation as the alternative, Zia was concerned primarily with forcing the pace of the trial ensuring a verdict in conformity with his stratagem.

Zia dreaded the day when, and if, Bhutto returned to power, the former would himself have to face charges of high -treason. Zia was trapped in a most unenviable situation of his own creation. According to the 1973 constitution (Article 6), "any person who abrogates or attempts or conspires to abrogate, subverts (or attempts to subvert) the constitution by use of force or show of force or by other unconstitutional means shall be guilty of high treason", inviting the 'death penalty'. General Zia was aware of that and, therefore, he was in no doubt as to the sequence of decisions he had to take and implement for survival. Zia seemed to have assumed that with the removal of Bhutto from playing active role as the leader, the PPP was already broken and on the way to -eclipse. Also, that the PNA parties, the judiciary, the army and the bureaucracy would faithfully uphold his fiat. Zia had no hesitation to order implementation of the judicial verdict against Bhutto, whose refusal to seek executive clemency must have been gleefully acknowledged by Zia.

General Zia ignored international appeals for clemency and described them as merely 'formal' and 'best example of political trade-unionism'. One wonders if it was in good taste for Zia to have stated that 'Bhutto was not sentenced as the Prime Minister of Pakistan but as an ordinary culprit.'²⁴

A brief reference to the split (4-3) verdict against Bhutto is called for here. The same court also rejected Bhutto's review petition unanimously. The obvious implication is that the three dissenting judges (from Sind) were promptly inveigled into doubtful judicial unanimity. One cannot fail to notice that the four judges, who favored Bhutto's execution, belonged to Punjab and the three judges, who favored Bhutto's acquittal, belonged to Sind. It evidently confirmed the regional aberrations adversely affecting the judicial process, compounded by the phalanx tactics of Punjab judges and stratagem of the 'junta'. One would naturally ask, if the judges from Sind wished to uphold judicial integrity, did they not have the option to stick to their earlier verdict or to abdicate under protest, thus publicly exposing Zia's misdemeanors. Perhaps, the judges had that option but the willingness to abide by that option seemed to have been nullified by the horrifying penalty for uprighteous conduct in the 'junta' regime. That, however, did not exonerate the judiciary. If the Punjab judges could be indicted for gross impropriety, the Sind Judges were guilty of cowardice and of having developed cold feet.

²⁴ Asia World, March 16-31, 1979.

The prolonged legal proceedings against Bhutto were interpreted as no more than a mere 'eye-wash', just as Bhutto's execution was identified as a 'judicial murder', to consummate political vendetta. Legal luminaries stated that the case was not based on substantive evidence. The entire trial was conducted on the basis of verbal accusations and statements made by the then Director General of Federal Security Force, Masud Mahmood. The Supreme Court might have pleaded helplessness if only there were incontrovertible evidence against Bhutto, who was consistently identified as the 'principal accused'. Even according to specific provisions of the penal law, Bhutto, if at all, could have been accused of abetment of crime because he was not present on the scene of alleged killing, nor did he actually wield the weapon alleged to have resulted in the killing of Nawab Ahmed Khan. The verdict, in that eventuality, also could not have been execution. Bhutto's execution was also not in conformity with the tenets of Islam. According to Islamic *Shariat* laws, punishment in a murder case is awarded on the principle: 'life for life only for the actual killer'. The Supreme Court conceded that Bhutto was not the actual killer. A French lawyer deputed by the European Human Rights Commission, stated that 'the case could not stand in a French court for even a few minutes'. The former US Attorney General, Ramsay Clark, stated that 'a possible five-four split decision (in case there were a 9-member original bench) in favour of acquittal and release of the former Prime Minister was converted into a four-three split decision in favour of conviction.'²⁵ The high drama of the Bhutto trial left people in doubt and confused with several apprehensions. There was, however, one person, General Zia, who seemed never to have been in doubt.

III Bhutto's Appraisal

We might now turn to Bhutto's perception of, and reaction to, what had been inflicted upon him soon after his fall from authority.

Bhutto must have had some inkling of Zia's ultimate intentions after being detained on September 3, 1977 and the subsequent sequence of calculated aggregation of serious allegations. It is also apparent that Bhutto never took the trial as a serious threat either to his life or his popularity. He somehow remained convinced that his prolonged, and, what he believed, wrongful incarceration would invite popular wrath and sustained mass protest against Zia. Bhutto, however, had the mortification of watching spasmodic supportive protests being ruthlessly suppressed and a virtual reign of retribution by Zia.

²⁵ The Times of India, February 7, 1979.

During his one and a half years confinement, Bhutto wrote rejoinders to counter the allegations leveled by the military regime. Bhutto chose to direct his allegations and appeals to the people of Pakistan and sought to meet the threat blow by blow. Before the court, and in his writings from the prison, Bhutto did not give much credibility to allegations of murder against him. Instead, he concentrated on unfolding the lies and treachery, as he saw, of the military 'junta'. He took pains to elaborately recall achievements and contributions of his regime.

From Kot Lakhpat jail, Lahore, Bhutto wrote the 100-page foolscap rejoinder to the allegations made in the material placed before the Lahore High Court (September 15, 1977) by the military authorities. Bhutto's rejoinder was placed before the Lahore High Court on March 6, 1978, against his illegal and improper detention. Later this rejoinder was smuggled out of Pakistan to London and was published in book form, entitled 'My Pakistan'.

In the aforesaid work, Bhutto compared himself to Plato's 'Philosopher King' and Carlyle's 'Hero'.²⁶ He narrated dated experience of his 'protective custody', after the July 5, 'coup'; his release from protective custody; and, finally, his re-arrest on murder charges on September 3, 1977. Referring to his post-deposition phase, Bhutto remarked that 'until the 28th August 1977, he had not turned into a villain but was treated as a national hero'.²⁷

Bhutto did not spare Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Khan Abdul Wali Khan and Maulana Maudoodi, who, he alleged, were also responsible for his discomfiture. He assailed Zia's 'coup' as part of a 'global conspiracy' and challenged Zia to contest the general elections to test his claims of popularity.²⁸ Bhutto asserted that his faith in the people was founded on the crux of his services which they could never forget.²⁹

²⁶ Bhutto stated that "the conspirators remove Plato's 'philosopher King', the clique removes Aristotle's 'political animal', the blood hounds remove Carlyle's 'hero'. They remove the 'sword of Ali' and fill the stage with clowns and charlatans." Z.A. Bhutto, *My Pakistan*, New Delhi, Biswin Sadi Publications, July 1979, p. 35.

²⁷ Referring to the allegations presented in the Lahore High Court by General Zia on September 15, 1977, Bhutto wrote: "This means that in a matter of two days on the basis of the Flimsiest material I turned from a 'saint' into a 'satan', from a 'prince' into a 'prisoner', from embodiment of a Pakistani to a personification of a parochialist, from the first elected Prime Minister and President of Pakistan into a terrible traitor, from a 'Saviour' rote a 'sinner'. Ibid., p. 55.

²⁸ Bhutto stated: "Let us have the litmus test. Let the CMLA take off the funny-looking belt he puts across his chest and context an election anywhere in Pakistan not against me but against my daughter Benazir. I can guarantee that he would forfeit his Security deposits. Let such contest decide all charges, true or false, honest and dishonest..." Ibid., p. 71.

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 71-72.

When informed of the harassment of members of his family, Bhutto was disturbed and from his helpless isolation, he castigated the 'junta' in no uncertain terms.³⁰ Countering General Zia's characterization of Bhutto as the 'modern Machiavelli', Bhutto called Zia the 'Modern Macbeth'.³¹

After the announcement of Lahore High Court verdict awarding his death penalty, Bhutto filed a petition before the Supreme Court of Pakistan. With a view to denigrating Bhutto, the military government brought about a voluminous White Paper, in July 1978, *On the Conduct of March 1977 General Elections*. Obviously, the military regime wanted to malign Bhutto at the time of the hearing of his petition in the Supreme Court. During his confinement in the stinking death-cell in Rawalpindi Central Jail Bhutto got the opportunity to write a rejoinder to the White Paper dealing with the conduct of March 1977 General Elections.³² He entitled the rejoinder: *If I am Assassinated*, which was not allowed for publication in Pakistan.³³

Bhutto dismissed the allegations of the White Paper as a 'bundle of white lies', and assailed Zia for not holding the promised October elections.³⁴ He refuted the charges of preparing a pre-electoral plan to rig the election. Bhutto affirmed that (in the contrary, pre-electoral preparations of his government were aimed at ensuring smooth and systematic conduct of general elections.³⁵

³⁰ In this context Bhutto wrote: "Now my life is to be silenced, dragged to a tribunal and threatened with rigorous imprisonment for fourteen years. One law for you another law for us. He is playing with fire. Is there no fool among fools to stop him from this foolishness". Ibid., p. 111.

³¹ Bhutto stated: "I have been branded as the 'Modern Machiavelli'. But what about the 'Modern Macbeth', who, fearful of retribution, has embarked relentlessly on a bloody and sinful road of no return". Z.A. Bhutto, *My Pakistan*, p. 112

³² The Military regime brought about another White Paper (On Misuse of Media: December 20, 1971-July 4, 1977) in August 1978. Finally, before the announcement of the verdict by the Supreme Court, General Zia, in January 1979, produced yet another White Paper on the 'Performance of the Bhutto Regime' in 4 volumes.

³³ The material of Bhutto's rejoinder was smuggled into India and published by Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi in 1979.

³⁴ Bhutto wrote: "His (Zia's) dereliction is more serious than mine; his sin is graver than mine, if indeed I committed any. How does the General exonerate himself for not holding elections at all?". Bhutto insisted that Zia has made the charges but not provided a solution. The object of the military regime is to prejudice the mind of the people of Pakistan against Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, to seek to generate hatred and resentment against him, to demolish his image." Z. A. Bhutto, *If I am Assassinated*, New Delhi, Vikas, 1979, p. 5.

³⁵ In his defence, Bhutto wrote: "From the age of nine, I learnt a cardinal lesson from the elections of 1937 and that was to leave nothing on chance and never to be over-confident. This, however, in no way indicates that malpractices or rigging should take place. ... If I wanted to rig elections, I would not have made model

Reacting to the appearance of the first White Paper on the eve of his defence before the Supreme Court, Bhutto assailed the 'junta' for pressurizing the judiciary "directly through this document to condemn me." Bhutto asserted that "this is a pincer movement aimed at out-flanking and encircling the defence."³⁶

In his denunciation of calculated attacks on him in the first white paper, Bhutto, in fact, went far beyond the confines of the White Paper and raised vital issues concerning civilian democracy versus martial law. It was not surprising that, as' on earlier occasions, we gave a comprehensive catalogue of the achievement of his government. Indeed, at times he tended to exaggerate. But, he was on valid ground to have put forth the vital poser of the legitimacy of martial regime as an alternative to civilian democracy. He recalled how eight military 'coups' of one kind or the other proved no better than thoughtless palliatives and failed to resolve the fundamental issues denuding the political process.³⁷ Narrating the bitter consequences of various military 'coups' all over the world, Bhutto specifically cautioned the third world against the threat of, what he called, the 'coup-gemony'³⁸

In this context, one would recall Bhutto's role prior to the violent imbroglio in erstwhile East Pakistan and thereafter, leading to the break-up of the country and liberation of Bangladesh. When Bhutto was in power, he had sought the favour of the military elite. When he was out of power (during 1967-1971 and after July 5, 1977), he virulently attacked the military establishment and held it responsible for problems and anomalies faced by Pakistan's political system.

plans.... My Government and my party were preparing for 'battle to fight' and not to 'rig' an election." Ibid., p.23.

³⁶ According to Bhutto, the White Paper on the conduct of March 1977 general elections was 'released with aplomb on July 25, 1978, at a time when my Defence Counsel was on his feet in the court of the last report'. Z.A. Bhutto, *If I am Assassinated*, p.39.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 123-125.

³⁸ Bhutto observed:

"The greatest threat to the unity and progress of the third world is from 'coup-gemony'. ... The third world has to guard against hegemony, but the best way to guard against hegemony is to prevent 'coup-gemony'. The biggest link of external colonialism is internal colonialism, which means that hegemony can not thrive in our lands without the collaboration of coup-gemony. Military 'coup d'états' are the worst enemies of national unity Coup-gemony is the bridge over which hegemony walks to stalk our lands." Ibid., p. 169.

Bhutto was critical of the pro-PNA attitude of the army regime as well as the regime's clear tilt towards obscurantist elements. He also exposed the closer links between General. Zia and the Jamaat-e-Islami.³⁹

Bhutto, in his comprehensive critique of the White Paper, also referred to the 'external crisis' and reiterated that his ouster was a calculated move as part of an international conspiracy. Reiterating the relevance of the 'Two-Nation Theory', Bhutto was critical of India for being "incapable of representing the genuine aspirations of Muslims,"⁴⁰ and disapproved of Zia's alleged softness towards India. Bhutto warned that "the dispute between India and Pakistan over Jammu and Kashmir will not be dissolved by a dance."⁴¹ He identified himself as a leader who directed singular efforts to make Pakistan a nuclear power vis-à-vis India.⁴²

The verbose and yet brilliant indictment of the military 'junta' which Bhutto could compile in his death-cell has its elements of self-glorifications. But that, perhaps, was an essential trait of Bhutto's personality. He did not blush when boasting and used powerful and incisive words to stunning effect.⁴³

Bhutto claimed that he "was born to make a nation, to serve a people, to overcome an impending doom, that he was not born to wither away in a death-cell and to mount the gallows to fulfill the vindictive lust of an ungrateful and

³⁹ He wrote: "Since February 1977, PNA and the CMLA (General Zia) have been in league with each other. The agitation was a common affair. Jawans dressed in civilian clothes or in Muftis were sent to PNA demonstrations PNA reopened the negotiations under orders from the Chief of the Army Staff. The mutuality of interest is of a continuing nature. The white paper is obliged to defend PNA. The Chief of the Army Staff has been an admirer and a follower of Maulana Maudoodi and Jamaat-e-Islami for a long time". Ibid., p. 165.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 134.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 133.

⁴² Bhutto stated, "I have been actively associated with the nuclear programme of Pakistan from October 1958 to July 1977, a span of nineteen years -- Due to my singular efforts, Pakistan acquired the infrastructure and potential of nuclear capability... When I assumed charge of atomic energy, Pakistan was about twenty years behind India's nuclear capability. When I ceased to be Prime Minister at the most, Pakistan was five to six years behind India". Ibid., p. 137.

⁴³ Bhutto insisted: "All these years I have tried jealously to guard my reputation. I have many weaknesses. I have openly admitted my frailties in mammoth public meetings. I am full of error but whatever my error, I am not a corrupt person. It is very painful to be chastised in this ungrateful manner. There is bound to be retribution. My tormentors have brought disgrace to the name of Pakistan. Thirty to thirty-five years service stands behind me. Time will tell whether my name will be bracketed with the criminals of the sub-continent or with the heroes who have waded across its lands. My name and my reputation is safe in the custody of the people and in the heart of history." Ibid., p. 192.

treacherous man.”⁴⁴ In spite of the suffocating environment of the stinking death-cell, Bhutto took the courageous step to write a thought provoking rejoinder to the allegations leveled against him in the White Paper.⁴⁵

IV

Political Gambit of the Junta

While it would remain a subject of animated discussion for years to come, with a fair share of predilections one way or the other, Bhutto’s trial was a political event because it was a consequence of a politically motivated act, the ‘coup’, which ousted Bhutto and marked the return of the armed forces to take charge of the political process. It was a political trial because the new masters of Pakistan, the army top brass, were playing a political game to denigrate Bhutto and his achievements, such as they were. It was a political trial because Bhutto’s misdemeanors and misadventures notwithstanding, the army ‘junta’ did not care either to ensure a fair and just judicial trial or to scrupulously avoid taking sides within and without the judicial proceedings. If Bhutto was accused of tampering with the judiciary during his regime, there was all the more reason for Zia to prove by example that he was concerned primarily with dispensation of justice and not with hastening Bhutto’s conviction. Bhutto’s apprehension in that regard, therefore, was valid and he sought to counter the political fixations of the judicial trial by a calculated political offensive. Whether he was well advised to have done so is not very relevant for it could now be stated that Bhutto’s stand, one way or the other notwithstanding, he would have met the fate he ultimately did, given the army ‘junta’s’ blatant commitment to remove him.

One could also debate upon the fact that the army and the bureaucracy, Bhutto had seemingly cultivated so assiduously, ultimately turned against him. Was it, therefore, Bhutto’s misadventure as a leader that led to his downfall; or, was it the ambitious armed forces that could not, beyond a certain point, be confined to the barracks; or, was it that a growing disenchantment with the former situation made the latter alternative inevitable. What is enigmatic is that despite his personal experience during the army regimes of Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan, Bhutto failed to improvise a genuinely reliable framework in which the army and the bureaucracy could be put under rigorous discipline, beyond even the remotest chance of mischief. May be, Bhutto could not do any better owing to the

⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 142-143.

⁴⁵ He wrote: “Through sheer will-power, in conditions that are adverse in the extreme, I have written this rejoinder. Let all the White Papers come. I do not have to defend myself at the bar of public opinion. My services to the cause of our people are a mirror in front of them.” Ibid., p. 193.

precedents of army's ambitions becoming successful in the past. Whatever Bhutto's limitations, one would not readily accept the army 'junta' as an alternative for the better. The indictment for murder against Bhutto notwithstanding, the way he was sought to be removed, so far as Zia was concerned, did not speak highly of the General's political foresight.

As for Zia's role in this regard, as referred earlier also, one could argue that had he withdrawn from political power and permitted elections, it would have been an invitation to his own destruction. Another assumption in this context would be in that case, perhaps, public opinion in the country would have gone in favour of Zia's compassionate action, making it difficult for Bhutto not to take cognizance of that fact. On the other hand, however, different the other concomitant aspects, Bhutto did permit Mujib to be released from confinement which, it was widely apprehended, could lead to his summary execution.

In any developing system, the citizens, by popular mandate or through constitutional devices, have the right to choose the kind of structures and process, but the legitimacy of devising and imposing these on a people under martial law and army 'junta' is always suspect. Such exercise by the armed forces could be a convenient expedient and not a symbol of political sagacity. The situation is compounded by the fact that during the recent past, the army 'junta' has sought to 'Islamise' Pakistan with a vengeance. So long as the army 'junta' manages to last, popular verdict on such a policy is discredited or deferred. There is no inevitability that the fundamentalist priorities would be scrupulously supported and enforced if people had the freedom to decide. Besides, the last word about the efficacy of fundamentalism, as essential to systemic sustenance, has not been said.

On other counts also, Zia's gamble in ensuring Bhutto's removal has not paid. It seems the common-man in Pakistan is not likely to indict Bhutto as a murderer or an accomplice. Perhaps, Zia has made Bhutto a martyr. Bhutto's trial only added to confirmation of his stature as an exceptional national leader. The trial only magnified it, as it became increasingly evident, consequent upon blundering step Zia took more out of panic and much less on impartial and just considerations that Zia was behaving with scant respect for Islamic humanism. Zia's soft corner for the PNA could be explained on extraneous grounds and not on sound principles and durable trust.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Both, Zia and the PNA; detested Bhutto's return to power, in the event of fresh elections. But once Zia's purpose had been achieved, he made no secret of his aversion for the PNA also. The internal situation in Pakistan, aided and abetted by external determinants, might yet grant Zia a lease of power, longer than anticipated, but if he continues to defer or ignore popular aspirations for elections now or in the near future, and if some other ambitious elements choose to displace Zia, these elements could only emerge from within

The prospects, in the absence of general elections and reestablishment of civilian rule, are not very optimistic. And, once civilian rule is restored, it would be difficult to erase the memory of Bhutto and his execution.

V

Bhutto's Constraints

Bhutto's own constraints were, in some measure, responsible for his sorry plight. During his leadership Bhutto successfully ensured return of prisoners of the 1971 war regained territories lost to India, rebuilt the armed forces, reformulated relations with the USA and China, and, above all, gave Pakistan a democratic constitutional system. And, yet, by his policy of depending on the armed forces to suppress political protest and dissent, he was made to look as if his dependence on the armed forces was no less than that of his predecessors. He did not always manifest his capacity to resolve political issues by political alternatives.

A political leader of stature, Bhutto was expected to deal with important opposition political leaders like Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Wali Khan and others, with greater imagination. Political antagonism should not have been reduced to the level of political vendetta. It would also have been to Bhutto's political advantage to have dealt with the PNA at the political level. As popularly elected leader, Bhutto should have shown sympathetic consideration for regional issues in conformity to the federal framework of the polity.

It is also to be noted that whenever Bhutto faced crises threatening his political leadership, he would direct his appeals to the masses. During his disagreement with Ayub Khan, during the tortuous phase after Pakistan's dismemberment, during the PPP-PNA confrontation, and, from his death cell, Bhutto called out to the people. On the other hand, he was also inclined to rely on the army top-brass, on the bureaucracy, on reactionary and feudal elements, and, on religious elite. Such a situation led to apprehensions concerning Bhutto's intentions, overt and covert. As for public protests against treatment meted out to Bhutto by the martial regime, it might be added that in spite of their frequency and intensity, they could not be sustained when confronted against the ruthless potential of the armed forces. Also, one could say that a partisan looking protest movement, spearheaded by the PPP, could not be the same thing as a popular upsurge

the armed forces, or else, they might be civilians with or without, foreign assistance-and might resort to violent means.

against actions and omissions of the Zia regime. As it happened, Zia succeeded in suppressing pro-Bhutto demonstrations.

It is true that Bhutto's eloquence and logic did not spare him from the consequences of the verdict of the judiciary, primarily because the nature and process of the proceedings were vitiated to a large extent. And to some extent, Bhutto allowed himself to fall into the trap calculatedly laid out, in as much as that instead of refuting and rebutting the allegations leveled against him, point for point, he spoke more about his services to the people. The exercise proved futile.

Bhutto seemed to have been overly reassured by his pronouncements and policy measures, purported to help the poor, the worker, the farmer, the youth and the common-man. He could not however, ensure pervasive implementation thereof, and, consequently, a section of society was apparently disenchanted or was antagonized. Bhutto's attempts to placate everyone, as it were, by diluting welfare policies proved his undoing. His vision was expansive and global but when it came to implementation of policies, he faltered. Perhaps if Bhutto had attempted a reappraisal of the style of functioning, the efficacy of his intended measures would have been far more reliable.

The judicial verdict of execution notwithstanding, Bhutto was prone to arrogance and authoritarian style of functioning, in as much as the fact that he did not ensure even marginal reliability of the means he employed. His objective, therefore, came in for critical scrutiny. The very fact, that he let the PPP, advertently or otherwise, behave and rule in an almost autocratic manner, was not a factor conducive to Bhutto's democratic image. His charisma could not hide the partisanship displayed by the youthful activists of the PPP. What compounded his own fall was his under-estimation of the army's potential for intrigue. In that, Bhutto was, in a way, responsible for, and was victim of, the bloodless 'coup'. However, Zia would find it difficult to justify conversion of the bloodless 'coup' into an execution contrived by a captive judiciary.

VI

The Summing Up

The initial hopes, raised by Bhutto's political leadership that Pakistan had at last turned the corner and that the political structures and processes would get strengthened on popular, democratic formulations, were ultimately not realized. That was not so much an index of failure of Bhutto as a political leader. More so, it signified failure to strengthen roots of civilian politics over time as well as weaknesses inherent in the body-politic. Since its founding, Pakistan's political

system has been deprived of popular, democratic and responsible governments, expected to lead to popular involvement, participation and mature civic and political articulation. Consequently, civil political evolution and consolidation have been ignored, with the armed forces and the bureaucracy contributing to asserting sustained suspicion of the incapacity of the politicians and the ineffectiveness of civilian leadership. One can not ignore the potential, to resist and weaken civil-political process, of feudal forces, land lords and entrepreneurs, as well as the *Ulema*, who have always considered their segmental interests as decisive determinants, to the detriment of evolution of a political culture conducive to restoration of popular aspirations.

The aforesaid, in some measure, indicates the several constraints precluding Bhutto from performing the role assigned to him. Perhaps, the most significant lesson obvious there from is that the alternative to civic politics is not recourse to martial regime. Bhutto's political leadership vindicated the fact that for all its limitations, a civilian political process has no substitute. If at all, the alternative is more effective and committed civilian political leadership. A greater success of Bhutto's leadership is apparent in the more recent movement for restoration of democracy (MRD) in Pakistan, notwithstanding the potential and capacity for repression by the military authorities. The very fact that political parties of various hues have accepted the relevance of restoration of civilian rule confirms that Bhutto's political leadership has shown the only way, however tentatively, which could be legitimate and popularly responsible. In the ultimate analysis, that goes to prove Bhutto's political vision.

PART V

THE SUMMING UP

In Conclusion

This study of Bhutto's political leadership is based on some assumptions in the context of a developing society. Political leadership is assumed to play vital and decisive role where nation-building, integration and systemic sustenance are primary considerations. Such systems also face multifarious problems and challenges, historical, socio-cultural, political and situational. Political leadership is assumed to possess the capacity to resolve these in a manner whereby their popular acceptability is not seriously endangered. The duality, resulting from indigenous and external influences, cannot be ignored. The systemic antecedents of paternalistic, authoritarian trends as well as historical experiences and impacts, have to be taken into account. And, finally, a political leader's personality make-up, his perceptions and alternatives available to him at a point of time play crucial role.

Political leadership is expected to effectively manage external influences as well as decisively assume control of national expectations. Expectations about a successful political leader are not entirely unfounded. He had, however, to act and pursue the objectives within the confines of what is possible of achievement in a given situational framework. The idealistic notion of perfection of political leadership has to be weighed against the realistic aspects which are inherent in the political process. It would be appropriate to recall that politics is primarily the art of the possible which no political leader could ignore.

Political leadership could not be isolated from the nature of the political process. It is directly connected with the nature of authority and popular acceptability. So long as political leadership is able to manage, control, guide and direct systemic process to the satisfaction of the people, there is no real threat to authority. Otherwise, political leadership fails to sustain popular acceptability which, in turn, adversely affects the political process.

An analysis of political leadership is perhaps as exciting as it is complex. That is so largely because the political leader, as a person, may have traits of behavior and action that affect his role performance one way or the other. Personal predilections and preferences sometimes become dominant. If ambivalence becomes manifest, and tends to influence decision-making and execution of policies, fulfillment of role expectation is not satisfactory. However, one would

not dispute that relative evaluation of political leadership would be more helpful instead of looking for perfect models of political leadership.

II

In the context of this study, Bhutto's political leadership seems to be an essential outcome of his objective of acquiring power. That, however, did not alter the situation that a political leader is not only 'leading' but is also being 'led' by the obligations of responsibility, accountability and responsiveness. Bhutto had to carefully identify sources capable of facilitating his objective. He had to cultivate a mutual interaction with his followers and in that he had to establish a political party for support and sustenance. He had also to cultivate an effective relationship with legislators, the armed forces and the bureaucracy. He established a viable linkage with the common-man in Pakistan. All these requirements also necessitated his taking recourse to democratic political process. His search for legitimacy and survival could be seen in his conscious efforts as a political leader.

The constraints of Bhutto's leadership have to be seen in the context of the systemic problems of Pakistan's political system. Pakistan was created in a specific context. The colonial power had decided to quit. However, the national movement did not succeed in ensuring freedom for a united country but for two separate states. The political evolution of Pakistan showed that democratic process had to face innumerable constraints and conscious resistance before Bhutto assumed power. During that period, however, Pakistan experimented with a variety of alternatives, dominated by bureaucratic and military rule, which did not genuinely help in the development of popular and democratic institutions. That was not a very encouraging legacy which Bhutto had inherited.

A study of political leadership of Bhutto would, therefore, not ignore the several challenges, he as political leader, and Pakistan, as political system, inherited and which included religio-cultural belief-system and trends of centralization, non-competitiveness, and mixed ideological orientations. However critical one might be of these legacies in developing societies, it is not possible to deny their presence.

This study shows that Bhutto's charismatic personality was a vital factor in his assumption of political leadership. His distinct socio-economic background facilitated his initiation into Pakistan's political life. There is little doubt that he gradually succeeded in acquiring unprecedented popular support. Bhutto was the first elected leader who showed commitment towards the welfare of the common-man. His initial policy pronouncements were optimistic in that regard. Later, however, he had to make compromises which diluted his precepts.

There is no denying the fact that Bhutto acquired charismatic influence. His charismatic appeal was deeper and widespread as compared to the preceding charismatic figures like M.A. Jinnah and Ayub Khan. Bhutto possessed tremendous capacity to divert non-political symbols, such as religious susceptibilities, sectarian, linguistic and regional affinities, to his own and to his party's advantage. However, in the absence of mature political institutions, Bhutto had to rely on the support of armed forces and bureaucracy.

The opposition political parties were also at fault in weakening the democratic process initiated by Bhutto. Motivated by theocratic and cultural prejudices, the opposition leadership could not claim to have offered comprehensive alternatives in consonance with democratic expectations. If Bhutto were to be critically viewed for persisting with personality-cult and assorted ideology, the opposition seemed to be little concerned about evolving a viable ideology for national integration, economic development and social change, barring the thrust on Islamic revival. On the other hand, Bhutto initiated a civilian political set-up to rehabilitate democratic and constitutional leadership in Pakistan. He also aspired for attaining acceptability for Pakistan to play a key role at international forums. The systemic constraints which finally overwhelmed Bhutto did not detract from his initial efforts to consolidate political leadership and transform Pakistan into a modern, democratic political system. That shows Bhutto's distinctiveness from the preceding political leadership of Pakistan.

III

In the specific context of Z. A. Bhutto's political leadership, it would be useful to briefly recount the dilemmas flowing from the national movement in undivided India and the emergence and consolidation of dissonance on issues concerning secular and communal perceptions on integrated national sustenance and commitment to the two-nation theory. But once Pakistan came into being, it was expected that perceptions about systemic essentials and priorities would change for the better. That, however, took a direction not basically consistent with popular expectations. Bhutto could not escape the consequences of such trends.

It was one thing to succeed in getting Pakistan on the platter, as it were, and quite another to formulate a cohesive national ideology for the new-born nation. It was not necessary to perpetuate the two-nation theory in an independent Pakistan as was shown by the challenge posed by the emergence of the demand for separate Bangladesh. Whatever populist objective the two-nation theory might have had in the formative days of Pakistan there was little justification for its repeated assertion over decades. That was, in part, the legacy Bhutto had inherited.

The consequences that followed need to be recounted briefly. Bhutto had no qualms to approximate Islam with Socialism. He would go lyrical in his commitment to usher a New Pakistan based on democratic and representative values. On the other hand, he chose to go along with the populist measure of statutory discrimination against the Ahmadiyds. He would call for national cohesiveness and integration and also encourage subtle support to regional affiliations. He would proclaim the ideals of 'Musawwat-e-Muhammadi' and aspire for paradigms of a modern political system. He would provide for statutory democratic, federal, constitutional process and yet, he was forced by domestic compulsions, and also for partisan interest, to condone, as it were, measures that were intended to subjugate the legislature and erode freedom of the judiciary. He would launch a publicized nationalization programme and would support fixed economy of sorts, which left the private entrepreneur free and virtually unhindered.

Bhutto took pains to declare supremacy of the civilian regime and yet relied on the armed forces for political sustenance. He would call for national consensus and reconciliation and also invoke repressive measures against the opposition. He would pledge to sustain people's supremacy and constitutional safeguards thereof, and yet, perpetuate the national emergency throughout his rule. He would seek to cultivate democratic norms for national party process, but would not ensure that his own PPP would abide by them and not go beyond the critical point of responsible and acceptable conduct.

Bhutto would appease the provinces of Sindh and Punjab and subject NWFP and Baluchistan to neglect and suppression. He would resolve to convert the armed forces into the "finest fighting machine" in the South Asia region and also deploy the armed forces to subvert civilian governments opposed to the PPP, by taking recourse to martial actions and devices to resolve political issues of dissent and protest.

Bhutto would project a radical image of himself and of the PPP, and yet, at the first opportunity, purge the party of potential radicals, apprehending a threat to his own leadership. He would take credit for institution-building, such as the PPP, and would not exercise caution to differentiate between those committed to him and to the party-programme, from those aspiring to ride the PPP band-wagon. He would testify to his democratic convictions and yet would be unwilling to prevent personalization of the decision-making mechanism, converting for instance, the PPP into virtually his personal *gendarmerie*.

Launching a tirade against India, Bhutto would talk of historical antagonism as the index, and yet, would seemingly seek to resolve situational issues by bilateral

efforts. He would take credit for advocating democratic norms, and yet, would not tolerate alternative opinions, dissent and protest. He would not conceal his aspiration to assume leadership role in the sub-continent, and yet, would encourage super and big power intrusion and rivalry in South Asia, by seeking to align with one or more of them.

The aforesaid could serve as a modest catalogue of Bhutto's ambivalence as a political leader, which affected his role, leadership-style and performance. It would be seen that Pakistan's systemic constraints restricted his options and what he was forced into pursuing as policy-programme was not always consistent with what he had initially identified as his obligations.

IV

Bhutto was not an ordinary political leader. Nor was he casual, average and colorless. But he could not possibly disown the legacy he had inherited, nor could he entirely escape the consequences flowing there from. In that context, we could recount the nature and objectives of the leadership of the movement for a separate Muslim homeland, before and after the foundation of the Muslim League.

Vacillating between loyalty to the British and aversion for their role during the crisis of 1857; undecided about cooperation and conciliation, or, antagonism and opposition, vis-à-vis the Congress and its objectives; taking recourse to rigid, irreversible postures and consenting to participate in discussions to sort out the dilemmas of Indian nationalism and the ultimate objectives of independence; advancing impossible demands for a separate monolithic Muslim state, and yet, agreeing to a Pakistan identifiable in two geographically separated wings, the leadership of the Pakistan movement showed, essential ambivalence. That could be said to have served their purpose of acquiring a separate Muslim state, though the consequences of such a narrow perspective could not be averted. There could be no more eloquent indictment of the leadership's failure to resolve the dilemmas of its own creation than the fact that a little after Pakistan's foundation, the Muslim League (which could rightly claim credit for its decisive role in achieving Pakistan), lost legitimacy. The popular support of pre-partition years suddenly was no longer there and for much of its failure to sustain legitimacy, the Muslim League leadership and followers, as well as its policies and programme, were to share the blame. It was a lesson of considerable meaningfulness for Bhutto to remember and learn from.

The role of the Muslim League in the past notwithstanding, its organization, membership and leadership patterns did not conform to the aspirations, expectations and emergent priorities of Pakistan's masses, a segment among

whom had emigrated from India causing apprehensions in the minds of those who had been living for ages in regions that constituted Pakistan. The political vacuum thus created was compounded by the failure of other viable political parties emerging in Pakistan. That, in turn, facilitated the armed forces and the bureaucracy to assume coalitional roles. Beyond a point, the call for Islamic unity also failed to resolve pressing systemic issues and problems. Bhutto had to contend with such trends and patterns.

The political leadership in Pakistan, before Bhutto's emergence, failed to live up to the expectations of objectives of nation-building, national integration and systemic sustenance based on democratic and secular values. There is no evidence to substantiate that the political leadership in Pakistan, prior to 1971, had either the inclination or the capacity to transform the colonial bureaucratic perspectives into a sustained commitment to popular, responsible and accountable system. Despite vociferous claims, a deep-rooted national perspective and vision were lacking in the coalition of the armed forces and the bureaucracy. The result was that political leadership became transient and secondary and the army-bureaucracy coalition assumed political leadership by proxy, as it were, creating precedents which did incalculable damage to competitive democratic political evolution. The indices of citizens' rights, political party process, electoral alternatives, secular perspectives and, overall faith in open society came under a cloud under army-bureaucracy combine. Instead of extending democratic political alternatives, such a coterie in the past sought to survive and flourish under subterfuge of Islam and aggressive nationalism, which together, from time to time, were ill-directed to raise anti-India postures.

Bhutto could not have escaped the consequences of inheriting such systemic distortions. That he ultimately failed to take corrective measures proved detrimental to his own survival. An amalgamation of feudal antecedents, aspirations for democracy and socialism, Islamic glory, an exaggerated concept of third-world leadership, and, Pakistan's place in the comity of nations, did not resolve Bhutto's dilemma. His idealistic precepts and predilections could not entirely remove apprehensions about his earlier association with martial regimes of Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan. His claims to usher in a New Pakistan were sometime taken as pretexts of political expediency. The slogan of Islamic Socialism and the ideological bases of the PPP continued to be flexibly manipulated to conform to the need of the hour. It is to be recalled that Bhutto had defied implementation of the popular verdict in favour of Mujib's Awami League, the reasons advanced being neither logical nor in keeping with democratic norms. His call to save Pakistan from the apprehended hegemony of the Awami League only resulted in Pakistan's dismemberment. Bhutto was ill-advised to have asked Yahya Khan to seek military solution of the political problem of erstwhile East Pakistan. And in

doing that, Bhutto inadvertently confirmed that in times of domestic crises, the armed forces alone were capable of ensuring systemic order and sustenance. It was ironic that the armed forces and the top-brass, he had relied upon from time to time, ultimately engineered his downfall.

Bhutto's role as political leader was also clouded owing to his reluctance to decentralize political power. There was no evidence of strengthening institutional bases and efforts, or of mass mobilization to achieve the proclaimed democratic socialistic objectives. Despite his claims of civilian rule, Bhutto tended to rely on the armed and para-military forces. That was not a reassuring aspect of democratic leadership.

In his capacity as a political leader, Bhutto antagonized both, radicals and obscurantist, primarily because the former were dissatisfied with his half-way house commitments and the latter, in any case, never trusted Bhutto as a genuine upholder of Islamic values. Perhaps, he would have succeeded in evolving an acceptable alternative had he made greater efforts to establish his bondages with the former and to win over the latter by tolerant and persuasive means. The resilience which Pakistan's civilian political system seemed to be lacking could be explained by such challenges faced by Bhutto.

V

Bhutto was not an advocate of regional aspirations to the detriment of national integration. He faced several such challenges of expectations of the four major regions of Pakistan-Punjab, Sindh, NWFP and Baluchistan. It would have been a different situation had Bhutto rejected regional aspirations as mere pejorative projections. But, Bhutto had undergone the unhappy experience of such a disposition imposed on the erstwhile eastern wing of Pakistan. He had, therefore, to deal with the situation with considerable caution and restraint. In the face of deep-rooted antagonism and frustration, Bhutto had to sort out regional issues and avoid systemic instability.

Whereas Bhutto strongly believed that the two-nation theory was relevant to uphold national integrity so long as India's views, as he saw them, did not get convincingly transformed, he also felt that excessive emphases on regional autonomy would ultimately be prejudicial to Pakistan's national interest. He was not averse to regional demands but as movements in various regions became aggressive, and to an extent, unreasonable, he had to resort to seemingly drastic measures. For instance, the dismissal of democratically elected (NAPJUI) governments in Baluchistan and NWFP was interpreted as a politically motivated act because both the provinces had non-PPP governments. It was

perhaps a coincidence. No political leader could permit chaos and violence irrespective of the genuineness of grievances and aspirations in any region. Perhaps Bhutto employed relatively drastic measures in both these regions. As a measure of precaution, Bhutto did not revoke emergency regulations. For maintenance of national integrity, Bhutto was compelled to lean upon the army, paramilitary forces and the bureaucracy. To be fair to him, it should be said that Bhutto preferred to project primacy of national integrity as against submission before regional parochialism.

VI

Bhutto's foreign policy postulates gave a clear indication of his perceptions in that regard. He could not be a passive spectator to the emerging requirements of Pakistan's geopolitical situation and realities of domestic compulsions. He was not motivated by mere utopian objectives when he conceded the necessity for safeguarding Pakistan's integrity, sovereignty and national interest it was not unnatural for Bhutto to be apprehensive of India's presence as a powerful neighbor. The complexes of a small nation's leader were also understandable. His belief that since India had not accepted the two-nation theory in the pre-partition phase, and no material change in that regard was perceived even after the emergence of Pakistan, was more in keeping with the trends of Indo-Pak relations over the years. It did not truly reflect Bhutto's latent realization and appreciation of the political imperative of sustaining Indo-Pak amity. Perhaps, he was compelled by domestic compulsions to keep reminding the people of the potential of India's powerful presence and yet he would project bilateralism as a basic operative reality to stabilize inter-state relations. Bhutto had come to realize that the Kashmir issue notwithstanding, Pakistan could neither force the pace of conflict resolution nor dictate a final solution. However, Bhutto was for ever cautious. Domestic compulsions had further restricted his options.

As a national leader, with considerable academic comprehension of the dynamics of international politics as well as experience gained over time at various international forums, Bhutto had the capacity to take innovative decisions and ensure maximum national advantage there from. Of the notable achievements to his credit in this regard were his forging successful links with China and the USA, the Arab countries and those of West Asia. In addition, Bhutto could claim to have done so without adversely affecting relations with the USSR. The Simla agreement with India was another significant achievement of Bhutto's foreign policy. However, towards the final phase of his time in office, he was disenchanted with the US perceptions of Pakistan's nuclear ambition, and Bhutto did not hesitate to express his displeasure irrespective of a long-time record of US-Pak cordiality. If Bhutto could take the initiative on China policy and had

expressed displeasure at US attempts to influence Pakistan's nuclear policy, it clearly indicated his capacity as a political leader to uphold Pakistan's national interest.

VII

It would not be an exaggeration to state that in the context of Pakistan, no other political leader had either identified or announced national priorities on the socio-economic front, as essential to systemic purposiveness. It was Bhutto who took the first step towards socio-economic transformation as a vital pre-requisite of political stability. And in that, he was put to test by a variety of constraints and forces of resistance.

Bhutto began with the promise of ensuring 'bread, clothes and living apartment'. The follow-up economic measures included 'take-over' of privately managed business and trade. Reforms were initiated for the labour and workers, banking and currency, land, educational system, industrial production, science and technology, public services and administration. However, in view of the state of the economy he had inherited after the country's dismemberment, these were interpreted as unpleasant economic decisions. It is true that Bhutto had to accept various compromises in that regard which diluted his earlier policy pronouncements. It was not his fault that the economic, industrial and agrarian infra-structure he had inherited was rooted in monopolistic, feudal and unrestrained trends. His dilemma could be seen in his commitment to socio-economic justice and to raising the level of life of the common-man. He could not enforce instant alternatives in that context. The developmental model he had envisaged had to strike a balance between systemic possibilities and socio-economic realities. He did not minimize the importance of agrarian and industrial sectors. He was conscious of the demographic imbalance and the unavoidable defence allocations. He realized both, the necessity of foreign-aid and its implications. It was his objective to bring about viability for money supply, prices and production output. And he conceded that in a democratic set-up, all such objectives anticipated patience and national effort.

The common-man was enthused by Bhutto's declarations and welcomed measures to control price rise, corrupt trade practices and administrative incapacity. Bhutto's efforts were neither to unnecessarily antagonize the producer and the entrepreneur nor to ignore consumer interest. If he gave symbols and slogans, his major thrust was to communicate to the people in expressive and simple terms that the government headed by him was representative as well as responsive. That was a clear departure from the preceding governments and political leaders, both being averse to socio-economic development of the people and to extension of democratic processes.

VIII

Bhutto had the courage and willingness to expose the people to democratic processes. It was not his fault if the PNA failed to project itself as a viable national alternative. That the PPP would sweep the polls was never in doubt. The allegations of rigging elections, even if true in stray cases, did not conclusively prove that Bhutto either needed such malpractices to win at the hustling or that he approved of them. The same applies to the so-called 'Larkana Plan' which seemed to have been intended to malign Bhutto. There is no evidence to show Bhutto's connivance or involvement. In fact, Bhutto gave relatively more credibility to his faith that so long as he commanded popular support for the PPP; he would continue to enjoy acceptance and legitimacy.

It defies the realm of feasibility to suggest that Bhutto could have ordered, on his own, fresh elections not only to disprove the allegations of rigging but also to rehabilitate his own and his party's image in keeping with democratic norms. Had he done that he would have, by implication, corroborated the allegations leveled against him. In any case, as voices of protest grew in intensity, Bhutto considered it his moral responsibility to hold elections afresh. Consequently, Bhutto's antagonists and detractors seized upon the opportunity and assailed him for his initial indecision to hold elections as well as for his resiling from the agreement with the opposition parties. Exaggerated accounts of political corruption and electoral malpractice were given. However, it would not be doing justice to Bhutto if one were to ignore the basic aspect that Bhutto did not resile from the democratic obligation to appeal to the forum of the people. Where Bhutto seemed to have faltered was in his seeking the support of and compliance by the top-brass of the armed forces. As events showed, Bhutto was not aware of the clandestine conspiracy to oust him by 'coup'. As far as one could gather from accounts made available, it goes to Bhutto's credit that he did not put up any resistance either as he had thought that thereby he was preventing unnecessary violence and possible bloodshed. However, Bhutto did not anticipate that the bloodless 'coup' was not the culmination of the designs of the martial administration and that he was a marked man from the outset. There is little doubt that the 'coup' was an inelegant way to ease out a civilian and democratically elected leader like Bhutto. The 'coup' proved to be a prelude to return of the martial rule without any alibis. It is unfortunate that the political culture of Pakistan has hitherto failed to devise viable instrumentalities for consolidation of competitive alternatives. The recurrence of 'coup' alternatives is anachronistic to the democratic experiment which Bhutto initiated. It was Bhutto's civilian political leadership which restored much of the national self-respect and self-confidence; the adventurist martial authorities had lost in 1971. That Bhutto's civilian political leadership succeeded in regaining areas lost to

India during the 1971 war; that he subsequently ensured strengthening of the armed forces; that he formulated relations with the USA and Communist China; and above all, that he established a democratic framework, could neither be ignored nor dismissed as of no consequence. Perhaps none else than the people of Pakistan are more conscious of Bhutto's relevance as a political leader, especially when one perceives the systemic dilemmas mounting gradually under the present administration which is neither representative nor responsive.

It was his faith in the impartiality of the judicial process that Bhutto agreed to face the trial and present the pith of the factual aspects as against the foregone verdict inflicted by martial rulers. It was only when Bhutto realised that the judicial trial could neither be free nor fair that he addressed his defence to the tribunal of public opinion. That he failed ultimately showed the intensity of vengeance on the part of the military rulers and the helpless anger of the people. It might be recalled that despite the ring of mystery and clandestine manner in which Bhutto's execution and burial were carried out by the military rulers, there were spontaneous and angry protests in Pakistan even when the people were aware of the consequences of open support of sympathy for Bhutto. In fact, one would venture to recall the lesson of history that tactics of snuffing out a representative political leader are neither forgotten nor condoned despite repression.

For all his capacity and qualities, Bhutto also had his limitations. One would not grudge him a fair share of both, the positive and the negative dimensions of personality. Political leaders have been known to possess both, in varying latent and manifest degrees. But, it 'seems, Bhutto had to pay the price disproportionate to his errors of omission and commission whereas lesser leaders in history with proven misdemeanors managed to maneuver and escape.

Notwithstanding his limitations, Bhutto was a path-finder as much as he formulated a democratic framework for Pakistan and sought to expose the people to a representative political process. The relevance of Bhutto lies in his conviction that the military-bureaucracy collusion was not an alternative. The very fact that he could execute and operate the democratic experiment for whatever time permitted him, should go down in history as not merely a departure but as the beginning of a new vista for posterity. Bhutto's political leadership, therefore, was in several ways, a pioneering precedent.

IX

In the context of developing societies, the profile of political leadership projected by Bhutto is not altogether unexpected. Bhutto might have nursed visions of

idealistic political leadership. Perhaps he had thought in terms of absolutes of perceptions and implementation of ideas and alternatives concerning national consolidation and development. Events, however, showed that he could not ignore or deny variety of constraints which he had inherited and with which he was confronted as a political leader. One might find faults with the method and manner of his handling then. But, the most decisive question should not be lost sight of precisely, whether Bhutto could perform and achieve beyond the confines of systemic possibilities, which are characteristic to developing societies. It seems the answer, in fairness to Bhutto, should be in the negative.

It is to be noted that Bhutto was initiated into active politics more owing to his lineage and much less on the basis of apprenticeship and proven experience or capacity. That his potential for political leadership was conceded by politician friends of the family would have been futile had Bhutto himself not made concerted efforts to extend his academic comprehension to political activism. In that endeavor, if he quickly acquired self-assurance, it was a measure of his capacity to learn and evolve.

Bhutto's political leadership also shows that socio-economic and historico-cultural constraints notwithstanding, the political alternatives have to be democratic and constitutional.

The democratic experiment, despite being a pre-requisite, has to contend with authoritarian and orthodox forces. At times the latter overcome the former though the transient natures of the latter and ultimate durability of the former are not in doubt. It is sometimes held that in developing societies there is a limit, however, indefinite, beyond which it is not possible to defy popular expectations. Bhutto had come to realise that truth earlier than either his predecessors or his successor. One might say that the aforesaid priority of democratic political process and popular aspirations can not be ignored indefinitely in the context of South Asia and the Afro-Asian political systems.

Looking at the preceding issue from another angle, one might argue that given the political context of Pakistan and with the army-bureaucracy already comfortably entrenched; it would be futile to expect a democratic revival in Pakistan. The pattern is sometimes seen in other developing societies also. However, one answer to that could be that the democratic experiment was never given a fair, extended trial in Pakistan, and once the people had been exposed to that new experience, it might not be for ever to keep them under authoritarian regime. The potential of popular urges was what kept Bhutto in power and the same is likely to rehabilitate the democratic process, whatever the duration of delay. That is a valid hope for developing societies.

The present study is based on Bhutto's leadership and is confined to a vital dimension of Pakistan's political process. Nevertheless, some of the findings thereof may be fruitfully assessed in comparable situations in the broader context of developing societies and in South Asian countries specifically. Perhaps an important aspect to be seen is that the nature of politics perceived by political leadership remains a significant trend. Bhutto's assertion and experiment of the democratic political leadership was identifiable in his attempt to synthesize the modern perspective of socialism and the cultural core of Islam, the former to fulfill the developmental objective and the latter to bring about national integration. It would be fair to Bhutto to state that he avoided taking extreme postures vis-à-vis both, Socialism and Islam. The inference that could be drawn from such an attempt would be that in keeping with systemic objectives, political leadership has to amend, improvise and restate conceptual enunciations.

It is also evident that Bhutto did not intend to disown or forget the nature of Pakistan's political evolution because he wanted it to serve as a reminder to the people that the alternative to democratic process had consistently been the imposition of one form of authoritarianism or the other if only to keep off popular endeavoring to prove the basic difference between the two anti-thetical processes so that the people who had for long endured authoritarian process could be cultivated about their civic rights in a popular and competitive political system. Bhutto did not fully dissociate himself from the preceding political process, though being critical of it all the same, for his objective was to prevent the army and the bureaucracy from staging a comeback. That only shows the under-current of authoritarian forces, sometimes dormant in developing societies, raising their head whenever civilian political leadership fails to control and manage the systemic processes. The necessity for strengthening institutions and processes, beyond personalized objectives, can not be overemphasized. Bhutto's political leadership adequately identified that aspect.

This study also shows that in a political system such as Pakistan's, the challenges are far too many to expect instant and immediate resolution. If there is even a limited possibility of achieving a break-through in that regard, authoritarian alternatives can not be depended upon for durable redress, whereas democratic political process alone ensures at least a meaningful beginning with expected optimism for more effective efforts to consolidate the gains thereof. Bhutto's experiment confirmed that assumption to an extent.

Bhutto's political leadership showed that the systemic antecedents notwithstanding, it is possible to direct efforts towards economic development, mutual inter-state relations and sustaining the national political process if the political system is not constantly under stress and strain resultant from military alliances, low priority to economic aspects and preoccupation with gaining

credibility and acceptance for authorities who are neither representative nor responsive. The lesson to be drawn is obvious.

One would also see that the requirements and gains of development, socio-economic and political, depend on the nature and objectives of political leadership. An authoritarian leadership is not enthusiastic about comprehensive development because if that is identified as a priority and pursued on a national scale, the consequences to authoritarianism are likely to be unpleasant. Bhutto's experiment sought to reverse that process with a view to enabling such traits of political culture to emerge and consolidate as would ensure durability of the democratic political process. His failure is all the more reason to enquire into the factors that resulted in a setback; one hopes it is temporary, to democratic rehabilitation.

To the discipline of political science in general and South Asian studies specifically, one might address some pertinent issues. Perhaps a more comprehensive analysis in this regard would be feasible on the availability of the source material, it is apprehended, which has somehow not been accessible. Nevertheless, one could look into more specific Influences which tend to adversely affect relatively more popular and charismatic leaders. One could enquire into the forces and pressures which restrict and inhibit even influential leaders from constantly pursuing popular objectives and developmental goals. Also, if there are forces inspired by international situations and compulsions which tend to dilute or undo a political leader's efforts and expectations. In this context, it has been widely alleged that the USA and her allies have not taken kindly to the emergence of popular political systems and durable leadership in developing societies. Such powers tend to extend and perpetuate their neo-colonial objectives preferably through authoritarian rulers who have been found to be pliable and amenable to influence. Popular leaders and democratic political systems, on the other hand, committed as they are assumed to be to fostering national objectives, would normally resist any neo-colonial influences and, in keeping with systemic priorities, would be only too willing to invest national resources exclusively for comprehensive development. That seems to have been applicable to Pakistan also, resulting in disastrous consequences.

Similarly, one could look into the prospective nature and functions of political institutions and the political process to identify amendments and re-specification in keeping with a given political culture and popular aspirations. The aforesaid seem to be pertinent aspects bearing upon developing societies.

A study of Bhutto's leadership points to the necessity for a national consensus to review the national objectives and also to restate statutory and functional devices which could successfully negate the apprehension of recurrent army-

bureaucracy coalition. However difficult the task may seem, there is no alternative other than that. In other words, politics of the people has to take precedence. By undoing that contribution of Bhutto, the detractors have succeeded in emphasizing, though unintentionally, that a people are more likely to endure a working democratic system as against the impositions of authoritarian regimes.