

THE PARLIAMENTARY DECADE OF TURMOIL: INSTITUTIONAL INTERFERENCE AND POLITICAL SELF-SABOTAGE IN PAKISTAN (1988–1999)

DR. SHOUKAT ALI

Parole officer, Home department Govt. of Punjab

Email: alishoukat_45@yahoo.com

DR. ARFAN LATIF

Assistant Professor Sociology, University of Okara

Email: arfanlatif9292@uo.edu.pk

DR. ZUBAIDA ZAFAR

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Virtual University of Pakistan

Email: zubaida.zafar00@gmail.com

GUL FRAZ MAHMOOD

M.Phil. scholar Government College University Faisalabad

Email: raigulfaraz454@gmail.com

Abstract

The parliamentary decade of 1988–1999 marked a critical period in Pakistan's democratic evolution, characterized by political instability, fragile governance, and repeated interruptions to democratic continuity. While the military and undemocratic forces are often highlighted as primary destabilizing agents, this paper critically examines the role of democratic political actors, particularly Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif, in undermining the democratic process. Drawing on historical and political analyses, the study explores how personal rivalries, patronage politics, and institutional neglect contributed to weakening democratic institutions. The research highlights the cyclical nature of political instability during this period, wherein democratic leaders, instead of consolidating democratic norms, pursued short-term power struggles, often at the expense of parliamentary sovereignty and political stability. By scrutinizing these dynamics, the paper offers a nuanced understanding of how internal democratic failures, combined with external pressures, led to the fragility of democracy in Pakistan. The findings underscore the necessity for introspection within democratic frameworks to ensure sustainable political development and institutional resilience.

Key Words: Democracy, Nawaz Sharif, Benazir Bhutto, Personal Politics

Introduction

Pakistan is a South Asian state which lacks the democratic practices throughout its entire political journey. There are numerous factors which halted democracy and disrupted the political system of the country (Ahmed, 1987). Whenever, the democracy is discussed, the powerful stakeholders also walk side by side. If the political situation of the country is analyzed critically, the contradiction may be reported as the whole blame is given to the military interventions. In reality the political parties and leaderships themselves provided the ways to the military interventions. During the different regimes, political leaderships did not agree to sit on same table to resolve the political issues democratically which created the political chaos and resultantly the military gained the opportunity to assume the political control. As a whole, the both political leadership and the powerful stakeholders are responsible for derailed democracy in Pakistan (Rizvi, 1987). But the point is that the major responsibility to consolidate democracy was laid on the political leadership and why they provided the opportunity to other powerful stakeholders to destabilize the democratic process in Pakistan? This article deals with the different political and administrative loopholes responsible for derailing democratic setup in Pakistan with special focus on the parliamentary decade of 1988-99.

Background

It does not mean that military is excluded from the entire system but the actual topic is that why democratic leadership did not take steps to strengthen the democratic system in the

country whenever gained opportunity i.e., during 1947-1957, 1970 (Afzal, 1976), and 1988-1999. These were primarily three regimes that democratic political parties could strengthen democracy but their mutual rivalries did not allow them to do so (Callard, 1957). This could only happen through their consensus which unfortunately never developed. The military got benefits from the mutual tussles of political leaders and gained the control of the country many times. The political parties allied themselves with military and both of them i.e., military and political parties enjoyed the powers. During different times different political juntas sought benefits with the assistance of military establishment. The same was the case with military too so the concerns of the both sides were attached reciprocally (Wilder, 1995). The passion of the democracy has been penetrated among the veins of the masses as it represents the popular will which is not confined to a specific group (Jalal, 1995). But in the case of the developing countries, the masses are being fed up from the undemocratic practices in the name of democracy (Embree, 1997). Despite the authoritarian tendencies, always there had been a will of democracy in Pakistan. This was the long military rule that people started to favor dictatorship in the country which granted benefits to further military interventions (Gardezi, 1983). The role of civil society is critical in the democratic developments of the country. Today the developed countries of the west and Europe are very successful in the democratic practice. The studies show that this is mainly due to active participation of the civil societies in the form NGOs and different organization that fight for the civil rights. But contrary to that civil community had not been as much active in Pakistan due to undemocratic tendencies.

The local government system is the main platform where the civil community may participate in the political and administrative matters at the grass root level. But unfortunately, Pakistan had been failing in establishing a sound local government system. This is worth mentioning that main local government setups were initiated during the military rules which is another determinant of the weaker democracy in the country. This is actual responsibility of the democratic political parties but they always hesitated in sharing politico-administrative powers. The number of the political parties continued to increase but the practice of democracy gradually declined (Inayatullah, 1997). The question is that why the democratic practices declined with the increasing number of political parties? This is the actual reason that all of the political parties in Pakistan confined themselves to particular benefits and they neglected democratic cause. There are only a few political workers found in every political party who actually demand and struggle for democracy. But unfortunately, they belong to middle class so they are not as influential as the feudalism is (Inayatullah, 1997).

Overview of Fragile Democratic Journey (1947-1988)

Pakistan has experienced periodical democratic rules as the military interventions halted the democratic system many times. Soon after the independence, the first decade was associated with the first constitution making. During this period, there was a tug of war between the eastern and western Pakistani wings (Zarrin, 2013). This was the reason that it took almost a decade to promulgate the constitution of 1956. The military and bureaucratic spheres took advantage of this rivalry and imposed the first martial law in the country with the mutual consensus of both Iskender Mirza and Ayub Khan. Pakistan and India got independence from British at the same time but both of them now differ in many strands especially in governing system. Both of them got help from existing constitutional developments of the British but India sooner developed its constitution with the leading role of Ambedker and adopted the democratic track but Pakistan could not adopt the same democratic and constitutional track (Talbot, 1988).

Another reason of the lack of democratic values in Pakistan was the dominant role of the feudalism of west Pakistan. The political leaders from the eastern Pakistan mainly belonged

to the middle class and were full of democratic spirit which was culminated by the western wing. The political workers of the eastern Pakistan were disheartened by the authoritative attitude of the western Pakistan. This gradually infiltrated in separation of the both wings (Jaffrelot, 2002). The inclusion of the landlords into the Pakistani politics was not sudden and surprising because these landlords had political roots which can be traced back to the British rule in the form of Unionist Party in Punjab. But soon after the elections of 1946 they were aware about the fame of Muslim League and switched to this political party. This inclusion of the feudalism into the Pakistani politics disrupted the democratic system since its very first day after the sudden demise of Jinnah (Waseem, 1994).

After the feudalism, there was another prominent factor which halted the democracy in Pakistan known as ethnic diversity. There were five major linguistic groups in Pakistan i.e. Punjabi, Baluchi, Sindhi, Pashto and Bengali. The migrated people of the same linguistic group gathered at one place like Urdu speaking people in Karachi and formed pressure groups. These pressure groups also played a critical role in dominating the political system. All of the ethnic groups desired their supremacy in their respective areas (Jaffrelot, 2002). The tussle among the different political parties especially from the eastern and western wings provided a golden chance to the military and bureaucracy to handle the political matters during the early years of inception. Again, in military, the prominent figures were from western Pakistan especially from the Punjab who tried to influence the political system of the country (Jaffrelot, 2002). This bilateral race between the political leaders of both eastern and western wings aired the waves of military rules and ultimately the first martial law was imposed and Ayub Khan became the chief martial law administrator (later president).

After suspending the first constitution, Ayub Khan controlled the entire political system of the country. In order to legitimize his rule, Khan introduced many social and economic reforms and initiated basic democracies (a form of indirect democratic system). Another important initiative taken by the Khan was to introduce the second constitution of the country in 1962 (Pardesi, 2012). Despite many socio-economic reforms, the undemocratic indicators like corruption, rigging, favoritism and nepotism prevailed during this tenure. Although this martial law period introduced many reforms but the political and democratic system of the country was largely affected as Ayub Khan. Ayub Khan's administration targeted different political leaders from both wings (Pardesi, 2012).

The martial law period started in 1958 lasted till 1971 and destroyed the entire political system of the country and resultantly eastern wing of Pakistan was separated and became Bangladesh. After a long black episode, a flame of hope embarked with the restoration of democracy when PPP under the leadership of Zulifqar Ali Bhutto came into power. Bhutto's foremost success was the promulgation of the constitution 1973. This constitution introduced the parliamentary form of government. Bhutto was the first elected Prime Minister of Pakistan who came into power after more than twenty years of independence. It shows the fragileness of democratic system of the country during the initial years of independence (Bibi et al, 2018).

Pakistan could not enjoy the fruitfulness of the democracy for a long period because once again the same political drama was staged against the popular rule of Bhutto and the similar situation was created in the country as it was during the early years of Pakistan. All of the prominent political parties made an alliance to dismantle the democratic government of Bhutto which resulted another martial law in Pakistan. Bhutto was hanged to death and Zia-ul-Haq assumed the power in 1977 and lasted till his death in 1988 (Bibi et al, 2018).

Destabilized Democracy during 1988-1999

In the post-Zia period, a short period witnessed the revival of democracy. The Zia regime also targeted the democratic political groups same like Ayub Khan. This time PPP was the

primarily under the target of the military rule which was tried to culminate through the assassination of Bhutto. The military dictatorship considered that PPP rule will end with this assassination but military forgot that one day this authoritarian rule had to be ended. At last, Zia regime came to an end in 1988 and the democratic flower started to flourish once again in the post-Zia period (Talbot, 1998).

Benazir's First Term 1988-90

At the time of Zia-ul-Haq's death Ghulam Ishaq was the Chairman of Senate. So, after the death of Zia, he became the president of Pakistan. After the detailed discussion with powerful stakeholders, it was decided to hold general elections in country. Consequently, national and provincial assemblies' elections were announced on 16th and 19th of November 1988 respectively (Raza, 2001).

After the announcement of the general elections, the political activities were resumed. The popularity of the PPP was pre-assumed by the military and its rival parties so they started to organize. The rival group of political parties formed an alliance known as Islami Jmahori Ittehad (IJI). The objective of this alliance was to counter PPP with assistance of establishment and intelligence agencies (Shaikh, 2000). The IJI alliance was consisted of nine political parties which included Jamat-e-Islami, National Peoples Party, Markazi Jamiat Ehl-e-hadith (Lakhvi group) Jamiatulma-e-Islam (Darkhwasti group), the PML (Fida Faction), Jamiat-ul-Mashaikh (Sahabzada Fazle Haq Group), the Fakhr Imam Group, the Hizb-e-Jihad and the Independent Parliamentary Group (IPG) (Khan, 2005). This alliance was primarily founded by Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi and this introduced Nawaz Sharif in the mainstream of Pakistani politics (Khan, 2005).

The important point to note here is that IJI was basically triggered by the establishment to build pressure on PPP to avoid taking revenge from military. But at the same time other important point is the greedy attitude of the democratic political leadership that allied with military cause. This was one of the major factors to restrict the democratic practice in the country as all of the major and minor political parties sought help from the military (Shaikh, 2000).

Role of Opposition

Apart from the military and political opposition, PPP had to face another prominent opposition from religious community. This was first time that a woman was contesting elections (as PM) who was expected prime minister of the country. The religious stakeholders termed both Benazir and her mother Nusrat Bhutto as "Gangsters in the bangles". The ulemas also gave fatwa against the woman rule in the country and termed it contrary to the teachings of Islam. The masses are blindly attached with religious sentiments and most of them don't know the actual verdicts of Islam about the different matters. The same was in the case of Benazir which created a streak of hate against her without any solid reason (Akhund, 2000). The culture of Pakistan is feudal and male dominant especially in the political domain which is not ready to accept the middle class or a woman on the apex administrative level. This feudal and male dominant culture was also not in the favor of Benazir and the democratic political parties were also opposing the same with the help of religious and powerful stakeholders. This put great pressure on PPP during the elections of 1988 (Lamb, 1991).

Another point the opposition raised during the election was to blame Benazir as the agent of the west in Pakistan. The IJI leadership stated that this lady was launched by the west so that the western culture might be promoted in the country. The population of Pakistan has strong religious association so the religious community was also incorporated who requested the masses not to cast votes in the favor of PPP as it was against the national interest and serves other's interests. According to them, if this lady wins, the whole social and cultural system of the country will be disturbed (Lamb, 1991).

When all of the tactics did not prove successful, personal attacks were started to target the political career of Benazir Bhutto. The main leader of the opposition was Nawaz Sharif who even distributed the unethical pictures of Benazir and her mother among the masses. Despite all of such tough and unethical opposition campaign, the PPP under the leadership of Benazir continued its political campaign and contested election.

Finally, the general elections were held and PPP rose as the main political party of the country that secured seats across the country. PPP won 93 seats which secured about the 45% of the total seats. On the other hand, the opposition party IJI could secure only 54 seats despite the help of different stakeholders. Similarly, there were other minor political parties too that also won a few seats i.e., JUI (F), MQM, National Party, Pakistan Awami Ittehad etc. But the main competition was between PPP and IJI i.e. Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif (Waseem, 1989).

Another important point of this election was related the popularity of these political parties and leaderships as PPP secured more or less seats from all provinces of Pakistan which ranked Benazir at the eve of the most popular leader of the country. Contrary to that, IJI won most of its seats from Punjab i.e., 80%. Being the most popular leader of the country, it was the political and constitutional right of Benazir to be the Prime Minister of the country but the opposition continued to derail the democratic process. This had been the practice of the democratic leadership which assisted the undemocratic rule in the country. Now being the popular leader, Benazir had constitutional right to be given the control of the country but the opposition and hidden hands hesitated to do so that US had to mediate for the transfer the powers. The US Convey met both Benazir and military to resolve the matter (Mitra, 1990). After assuming the political control, PPP could not get the ideal circumstances as IJI formed its government in Punjab. At the same time, the pro-military bureaucracy was also in power. This halted the smooth functioning of PPP government (Kamran, 2008).

The common perception is prevailed among the masses that military and intelligence agencies halted the democratic process in the country. But in actual the bitter reality is something different as the impartial studies highlight that the democratic governments themselves put hurdles in the democratic ways. When Benazir came into power, Nawaz Sharif assisted the president not to provide friendly circumstances to PPP so that her government might not work efficiently. President had extreme influence over elected assemblies that time under his constitutional powers vested upon him under 58 (2) (b) (Khan, 1989).

Role of Benazir

At the same time, the attitude of Benazir also was not democratic as she promised before gaining power. She too adopted indifferent attitude and targeted her opposition primarily Nawaz Sharif (Maluka, 1995). Being the head of the executive administration, it was her duty to create friendly and cordial relations with other political parties to initiate the long-lasting democratic practice. But contrary to that she stuck herself to party-based benefits and neglected to maintain cordial relations. The financial assets were used by both sides to gain more and more representatives as well (Nasr, 1992). She also could not maintain amiable relations with her allied parties i.e. MQM and ANP which also became one of the reasons to end her government (Siddique, 2002).

Consequently, the weak collaboration with her allies and president, the government of Benazir was dissolved by the president while using his power under 58 (2) (b). Benazir was accused of corruption, political confrontation, administrative malfunctioning, horse trading and disrespect towards senate and courts of law (Bashir, 2015). All of the charges imposed on Benazir were rejected by her. She termed the dissolution of the government is unlawful and unconstitutional (Ziring, 1991).

Nawaz Sharif's First Tenure 1990-93

After the end of Benazir's government in 1990, the caretaker government was set up. It was promised that the unbiased caretaker government will be formed but this promise did not come true as Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi was appointed as the caretaker prime minister. He was the opposition leader during the PPP's government (Khan, 2005). PPP had reservations regarding the appointment of Jatoi as the caretaker prime minister. According to Benazir, it is not possible to hold free and fair elections in the presence of biased PM (Shāh, 2001).

PPP adopted the same opposition attitude as the former opposition played and established an alliance with other political parties including Tahrik-i Nifaz-i Fiqh-i Jafariyyah (TNFJ), Muslim League (Qasim Group) and Tehrek-e-Istaqlal (TI). This alliance was named as Pakistan Democratic Alliance (PDA). This divided the political parties into two groups i.e., PDA led by Benazir and IJI by Nawaz Sharif. The elections were held on October 24, 1990 and IJI rose as the leading political group with 106 seats in national assembly while PPP under PDA could gain only 44 seats. PDA rejected the election results and termed it rigged elections (Jaffrelot, 2004).

The general elections of 1990 voted Nawaz Sharif as the most popular leader of county. Nawaz Sharif formed government not only in the center but in all provinces as well. Up to the elections, Nawaz Sharif had good relations with both president and establishment. But with the passage of time, new issues and complicated situations disturbed this closeness and put the government on the same track like previous (Kukreja, 1991).

Bilateral Contention

As Nawaz Sharif assumed the power, Benazir opted the same role as Nawaz Sharif did when he was in opposition. Benazir also assured the president that she would not support Nawaz Sharif to minimize the presidential powers (Talbot, 1998). This helped the president to play his role accordingly. Furthermore, Benazir also assured him to remain president during her next term (Jaffrelot, 2002).

The bilateral rivalry of both political groups aided to dismantle the democracy because they both could restore democratic rule in the country with mutual consensus but they differed each other and assisted the undemocratic means in the country. Collectively, they could control the presidential powers to dissolve the sitting government for what one of them had to sacrifice once but they did not to do so. Resultantly, Benazir provided free ground to president and wished to dissolve the government of Nawaz Sharif (Khan, 1993). During each term of this democratic decade, there could not be built liaison between Nawaz Sharif and the opposition. The situation continued to wither away with time and IJI failed to develop cooperation neither with President nor with opposition. (Khan, 1993).

Other Aspects

It is obvious that military had been a strong and powerful institution whose major focus rests upon the military developments. It was hoped that Nawaz Sharif will restore the US military support which was factor to support him during general elections of 1990 (Lodhi & Hussain, 1992). But this hope did not come true and Pakistan was put in the watch list by US. This also detached military support from Nawaz Sharif which created another vacuum other than president and opposition (Rizvi, 1998).

Another reason of the dismissal of democratic government of Nawaz Sharif was the hunger of power. President, establishment and the Prime Minister were three main stakeholders of this power-seeking plan. Establishment wished to run both President and Prime Minister by its own. President demanded to work prime minister under his guidelines. Contrary to earlier both, Nawaz Sharif tried to make PM stronger than both of the above-mentioned stakeholders. He hoped to minimize the powers of president and sought to remove the powers of 58 (2) (b). Earlier the relationship between both PM and president was smooth and

warming but as the president came to know about the plan of Nawaz Sharif to minimize the president's power, this closeness was diminished (Ziring, 1997).

This issue could be sorted out with the bilateral cooperation of both Nawaz Sharif and Benazir. They both could restore democracy but they failed. Contrary to that, they pulled each other's legs and helped the undemocratic stakeholders which derailed democracy in Pakistan. At the same time tussles between PM and president Ishaq Khan continued to be worsened over time that blue eyed Nawaz Sharif became the confronting prime minister. In the meanwhile, the opposition under the leadership of Benazir gave a call of long march if the fresh elections were not announced. Under this tough situation, the government of Nawaz Sharif was dismissed by the president (Abbas, 1993). Although later Supreme Court reinstated his government but the writ of government was weakened.

Benazir's Second Term 1993-96

After the end of the Nawaz Sharif's government, both Benazir and Nawaz Sharif got ready for their second terms. Up till both of them had been tested in military and presidential relations and in the administrative responsibilities as well. General elections were held where PPP gained 86 seats in the national assembly while at the same time PML (N) could secure 72 seats as well. PPP succeeded to form a coalition government (Amin, 1994).

This again provided opportunity to both Nawaz Sharif and Benazir to decrease the powers of president through collaboration but they adopted apathetic attitude towards each other which prolonged the powers of president and damaged the democracy in the coming years too. The tussle between president and Benazir grew day by day chiefly after the death of Benazir's brother which created estranged relationship between the both. The prime minister wished to dismiss the president through impeachment. At the same time, president was in the hunt of situation to remove her from her office (Hussain, 2010). The situation between the PM and president deteriorated more when Benazir alleged the president in the murder of her brother. According to Benazir, her brother was murdered in a police encounter ordered by the president Laghari (Rizvi, 1998). The tug of war between president and PM enlarged that both of them were seeking an opportunity to teach a lesson each other. Here the episode of Nawaz Khokhar was also highlighted by PM because she knew that Nawaz Khokhar had rivalry with Laghari over the Mehran Bank scandal (Kamran, 2008).

Undemocratic Attitude of All Political Parties

The same confrontation also remained between Benazir and Nawaz Sharif. The personal attacks and humiliation of each other was adopted the tool to win over each other. Similarly, other minor political parties like MQA, JUI and ANP were in the search of political benefits from any side i.e., Nawaz Sharif, Benazir, President or military. Hence, they collectively provided a road to the undemocratic means in Pakistan (Kamran, 2008).

As during the previous government of Nawaz Sharif, Benazir warned of long march, this time Nawaz Sharif launched train march from Karachi to Peshawar. Benazir just gave warning of long march but Nawaz Sharif started the march in order to show his popularity. This long march deteriorated the political situation. The PPP's government tried to handle this political rivalry with iron hands and arrested plenty of anti-government activists (Wynbrandt, 2009).

The long march led by Nawaz Sharif was staged on one side and on the other hand Jimaat-e-Islami also campaigned against the PPP government in 1996. This campaign turned into violent when the government dealt the political workers with coercive means and in result three of the JI workers lost their lives. Furthermore, nine other political parties organized against the government and gave a call for strike. All of the opposition collectively demanded the dismissal of Benazir's government. The opposition alliance on one side and the tussle

with president on the other side put great pressure on the PPP government which almost halted the democratic government. She was also alleged of not having capability to maintain the law-and-order situation (Jr, 1997). Finally, president Laghari dismissed the government on 5th November, 1996. This decision was also supported by the military along with whole opposition. Like previous, this time too Benazir's government was accused of corrupt political practices (Khan, 1996).

Nawaz Sharif's Second Term 1997-99

After the dismissal of PPP government in the second term, the elections were held in 1997 and this time Nawaz Sharif rose as the supreme political leader of Pakistan (Rizvi, 1999). He gained the sweeping majority which helped him to establish his governments in the center and the provinces as well. This time it was being perceived that now Pakistan had been put on the track of democracy as the democratic government was trying to take all democratic matters in its hands (Rizvi, 1998).

The important step Nawaz Sharif took this time was to alienate the president from the powers who had dismissed last three democratic governments. So, he got passed the 13th amendment from the parliament gaining advantage of his majority and repealed 8th amendment. This was the first extraordinary step a democratic leader took to safeguard the elected governments. During this tenure, Nawaz Sharif did not face the pressure of opposition like the previous which encouraged him to take concrete steps to consolidate the democracy in Pakistan (Kukreja, 2007).

After passing 13th and 14th amendments in the constitution, the prime minister became the most powerful head of the parliamentary system. It decreased the powers of president to just a nominal head with little powers as the power of dissolution of government under 58 (2) (b) was diminished. This was the golden period of democracy in the country in terms of constitutional powers. This could only be fruitful if the prime minister had democratic attitude. But in the case of Pakistan, the prime minister started to consider himself all in all and rejected the involvement of the opposition in the political matters (Mahmood, 2000).

After assuming the extreme powers, the next target of Nawaz Sharif was to probe corruption cases against Benazir and her husband which were initiated by the president Laghari. The special accountability cell was established inside the premises of Prime Minister's Secretariat to take revenge of his political rivalry. This practice was against the democratic norms and democracy negates such personal practices (Haqqani, 2005). This time other than Bhutto and Zardari family the pro-PPP businessmen, journalists and other political workers were also targeted. (Haqqani, 2005).

Apart from the other issues, there started a tussle between Nawaz Sharif and president Laghari. The tussle between both further deteriorated on the appointment of the governor Sindh. Nawaz Sharif wanted to appoint a candidate of MQM but president was in the favor to appoint the Lt. General Moeenuddin Haider for the same post (Kamran, 2008). This developed differences between the president and prime minister. This time Nawaz Sharif was in full power so he could take such steps as he did previously. Resultantly, the president resigned on 2nd December, 1997. This portrayed the powers of prime minister restored in Pakistan (Kamran, 2008).

During this tenure another opposition alliance was formed with the collaboration of nine political parties named as GDA in 1999. On the other hand, Nawaz Sharif also confronted with military over the promotion and COAS appointment. At last, Nawaz Sharif's government was ended and Pervaiz Musharraf assumed the control (Indurthy, 2004). This once again halted the political transition and provided a way to military rule.

Conclusion

The democratic period from 1988-1999 witnessed two terms of both Benazir and Nawaz Sharif. None of them completed the full tenure of five years due to their bilateral confrontation and the extreme powers held by the president i.e., 58/2-B. Although Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif tried to decrease the presidential powers and to enhance the powers of the prime minister, he failed during his first tenure. There were two reasons which failed him i.e., on one side, the rival political party PPP did not support and on the other hand president also came to know about the political concerns of Nawaz Sharif. Consequently, President Ghulam Ishaq Khan dissolved the first democratically elected government of Nawaz Sharif (Hashmi, 2018).

After the dismissal of Nawaz Sharif's government, once again the elections were held in the country and this time PPP assumed the control and command of the country. The role of both democratic parties is reciprocally associated to each other. When the Benazir was in power, she adopted arrogant attitude towards the opposition especially to Nawaz Sharif and on the other hand, the similar political policy was adopted by Nawaz Sharif when his party assumed the power (Naqvi, 2010).

Ultimately, Benazir came back into the power after general elections of 1993. She wished to gain the extreme control contrary to democratic practice and tried to nominate eleven judges that were not fulfilling the seniority criteria so that she could take revenge from opposition. Ultimately, this matter was taken before the Supreme Court that declared these appointments null and voids (Hashmi, 2018). Like the earlier rule this time too, the government of Benazir could not complete its tenure and again Nawaz Sharif took over the charge as the strongest prime minister of Pakistan in 1997 (Jaffrelot, 2010). The unique step he took this time was to get pass the thirteenth amendment from both houses. This amendment brought four articles into question i.e., article 58 (2) b, article 101, article 112 (2) and article 243 (9) (2). Another achievement of this government was to get selected Rafique Tarar as the president of Pakistan. This absolute power was not acceptable to military and PPP both and eventually this time again Nawaz Sharif's government was dissolved by the military takeover of Musharraf in 1999 (Jan, 2005).

The whole of the above discussion concluded that democracy faced multiple challenges. Apart from the military and bureaucratic pressures, the political parties also adopted undemocratic way of administration. The decade of 1988-1999 is known as the parliamentary era in Pakistan because this provided an opportunity to democratic political parties to rule the country but contrary to democratic political style, they followed authoritarian government styles and targeted the opposition side during each term. Each of the political leader i.e., Nawaz Sharif and Benazir Bhutto allied president and military establishment during their opposition tenures which halted the development of democracy during 1988-1999 and ultimately the parliamentary period was once again taken over by the military in 1999 which again started another chapter of authoritarian rule in Pakistan.

References

- Abbas, Z. (1993). Enter the Army. *The Herald*, pp. 19-24. July
- Afzal, M. R. (1976) *Political Parties in Pakistan, 1947–1959*. Islamabad: National Commission on Historical and Cultural Research.
- Ahmad, M. (1988). *Government and politics in Pakistan*, Karachi: Royal Book Company
- Ahmed, M. (1987) *Politics of Crisis*. Karachi: Royal Book Company.
- Akhund, I. (2000). *Trial and error: The advent and eclipse of Benazir Bhutto*. Oxford University Press, USA.

- Amin, T. (1994). Pakistan in 1993: Some Dramatic Changes. *Asian Survey*, vol. 34 (No. 2). February
- Bashir, Q.-U.-A. (2015). *Parliamentary Democracy In Pakistan: 1988-1999* [Phd Thesis]. Quaid-I-Azam University Islamabad.
- Bibi, F., Jameel, S., & Syed Jalal, S. U. (2018). What is Democracy? Challenges for Democracy in Pakistan. *Global Political Review (GPR)* Vol. III, No. I (Spring 2018) | Pages: 66 – 75
- Callard, K. (1957) *Pakistan: A Political Study*. London: Allen George and Unwin
- Embree, A. (1997) *Statehood in South Asia*. *Journal of International Affairs*. 51:1, Summer. 10–15, 1–18.
- Gardezi, H. J. R. (ed) (1983) *Pakistan: The Roots of Dictatorship*. London: Zed Press.
- Haqqani, H. (2005). *Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Hashmi, R. S. (2018). Parliamentary Democracy and the Issue of Institutional Jurisdiction in South Asia (The Case of Pakistan). *Journal of Political Studies*, Special Issue, 2018, 133:146
- Hussain, E. (2010, August). *Military Agency, Politics and the State: The Case of Pakistan*. Retrieved from http://archiv.ub.uniheidelberg.de/volltextserver/10947/1/Thesis.Online_P.pdf
- Inayatullah, S. (1997) *The Futures of Democracy in Pakistan—A Liberal Perspective*. *Futures* 29:10 955–970.
- Indurthy, R. (2004, April-June). Musharraf's Regime in Pakistan: The Praetorianism Faces an Uncertain Future. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 65(No. 2), 259-282
- Jaffrelot, C. (2002) 'India and Pakistan: Interpreting the Divergence of Two Political Trajectories', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 15 (2), 251–67.
- Jalal, A. (1995) *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia: A Comparative and Historical Perspective*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications. 9– 25, 48–62.
- Jan, A. U. (2005). *The Musharraf Factor: Leading Pakistan to Inevitable Demise*. Lulu.com.
- Jr, R. L. (1997). Pakistan in 1996: Starting Over Again. *Asian Survey*, vol. 37(no. 2) February
- Kamran, T. (2008). *Politics of Elections and Autocracy in Pakistan: Appraising the Electoral Process during Zia ul-Haq's Regime*. Islamabad: Pildat.
- Kamran, T. (2008). *Democracy and Governance in Pakistan*. Lahore: South Asian Partnership Pakistan.
- Khan, H. (2005). *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan* (Karachi: Oxford University Press)
- Khan, R. A. (1993). Pakistan in 1992: Waiting for Change. *Asian Survey*, 33(2), 129– 140.
- Kukreja, V. (1991). *Politics in Pakistan: Nawaz Sharif...* - Lamb, C. (1991). *Waiting for Allah. Pakistan's Struggle for Democracy*, New Delhi: Viking Penguin Book, 86
- Lodhi, M., & Hussain, Z. (1992). *Power Play in Islamabad*. *Newsline*, Karachi, June, 24–25.
- Mahmood, D. S. (2000). *Pakistan: Political Roots and Development (1947-1999)*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Maluka, Z. K. (1995). *The Myth of Constitutionalism in Pakistan*, Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Mitra, S. K. (1990). *The post-colonial state in Asia: Dialectics of politics and culture*. Teacher Created Materials.
- Naqvi, M. (2010). *Pakistan at Knife's Edge*. Roli Books Private Limited.

- Nasr, S. V. R. (1992). Democracy and the Crisis of Governability in Pakistan. *Asian Survey*, 32(6), 521–537.
- Pardesi, Y. Y. (2012). An Analysis of the Constitutional Crisis in Pakistan (1958-1969). *Dialogue (Pakistan)*, 7(4).
- Raza, R. (2001). *Pakistan in Perspective, 1947-1997*. Oxford University Press
- Rizvi, A. H. (1997) *The Military and Politics in Pakistan 1947–86*. Lahore: Progressive Publishers.
- Rizvi, H. A. (1998). Civil-Military Relations in Contemporary Pakistan. *Survival*, 96-113.
- Rizvi, H. A. (1998). Civil-military relations in contemporary Pakistan. *Survival*, 40(2), 96–113.
- Rizvi, H. A. (1999). Pakistan in 1998: A Polity under Pressure. *Asian Survey*, vol-1, pp.181-182.
- Rizvi, Y. (1988). *Pakistan's Elections 1988*, Lahore: Vanguard Publishers
- Shāh, S. S. 'A. (2001). *Law Courts in a Glass House: An Autobiography*. Oxford University Press.
- Shaikh, M. A. (2000). *Benazir Bhutto: A political biography*. Oriental Books Publishing House.
- Shaikh, M. A. (2000). *Benazir Bhutto: A political biography*. Oriental Books Publishing House.
- Siddique, Q. M. (2002). *Political Culture in Pakistan*. Islamabad: Dost Publication
- Talbot, I. (1998) *Pakistan: A Modern History*. London: Hurst and Company.
- Waseem, M. (1989) *Politics and the State in Pakistan*. Lahore: Progressive Publisher.
- Waseem, M. (1994) *Politics and the State in Pakistan*. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.
- Wilder, R. A. (1995) *Punjab Politics in Pakistan: National Assembly Election Results, 1988–1993*. *Asian Survey* 35:6 377–393.
- Wynbrandt, J. (2009). *A Brief history of Pakistan*. New York.
- Zarrin, A. (2013). Jinnah's Vision of Pakistan as a Modern Islamic State. *Ma'arif Research Journal*, 8.
- Ziring, L. (1991). Pakistan in 1990: The Fall of Benazir Bhutto. *Asian Survey*, 31(2), 113–124.
- Ziring, L. (1997). *Pakistan in the Twentieth Century: A Political History*. Oxford University Press.
- Ziring, L. (2007). *Pakistan in the twentieth century, A Political History*, Karachi: Oxford University Press.