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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APCL</td>
<td>All Pakistan Confederation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.C.</td>
<td>Central Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Combined Opposition Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>Communist Party of Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSF</td>
<td>Democratic Student Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKP</td>
<td>Mazdoor Kisan Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>Muslim Student Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>National Awami Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>Pakistan Democratic Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNA</td>
<td>Pakistan National Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Pakistan People’s Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>Pakistan Socialist Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTUF</td>
<td>Pakistan Trade Union Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWP</td>
<td>Pakistan Worker’s Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any fool can solve the problems of Government through Martial Law, but only a fool can regard that is the process of government

(Leo yemum)
Introduction

The political history of Pakistan has absorbed the characteristics of unnecessary delay in constitution making, breakdowns of constitutional order, political instability, military rule and the efforts of the revival of political governments. There is a long history of constitutional development in Pakistan due to civil military oligarchy which not only created hurdles in the formulation of the constitution but also abrogated the constitution of 1956. Later on the military dictators devised his constitution and prolonged the rule as he could. It was astonishing that the first general elections were held in Pakistan in 1970 that injected the confidence in the democratic forces. The politicians gave a new impetus to the state with the formulation of the constitution of 1973. The elected government laid the foundation of nuclear program and made strenuous efforts to unite the Muslim World at one plate form. It is dismal that these strenuous efforts could not create hindrances on the way of Zia coup. Z.A.Bhutto gained roots within the masses due to his popular slogans and deep rooted policies. The fear of Bhutto’s popularity compelled the Zia government to take drastic measures against Z.A.Bhutto. For this purpose the military courts were established and the political workers were detained and trialed in courts. After the assassination of Bhutto, an opposition was developed against Zia and with the passage of time it used to stand on strong footings. The democratic forces always exist in every kind of government and no doubt they have also faced the music. The military government promoted the sectarian and regional feelings in the masses, so that the unity of opposition may be shattered on sectarian and regional bases and for this purposes, the political parties were established on sectarian and regional bases. This policy embroiled the people in minor issues and they remained busy in confrontations on sectarian bases. Zia era exploited the sentiments of the people with the slogan of Islamization in Pakistan and put democracy in the bucket of Islamic reforms. He left no stone
unturned in delaying constitution at maximum level. Even he tried to ban the political activities on the name of accountability. Those religio-political parties who did not have vote bank at the grass root level encouraged the Zia government and supported military regime. Zia used anti-PPP outlook for his advantage and Jamaat-i-Islami due to its ideological differences with PPP stood with Zia. When the democratic forces felt the bad intentions of military dictator, they gathered at the plate form of MRD and demanded the free and fair elections. The pressure of the opposition parties compelled Zia to announce non-party based elections. In these elections, the pro-Zia parties were miserably defeated and could not gain majority in any area of Pakistan. It was the evident that people disliked their tilt towards Zia regime. The members who have been elected in the elections of 1985 formed the parliament and a new kind of opposition was developed within the houses of National and Provincial Assemblies. These assemblies could not work for a long time due to obnoxious designs of Zia. Within this short span of time, the members justified the rule of dictator with the approval of the constitutional amendments.

A lot of books have been written on the period of General Zia-ul-Haq and his policies have been discussed and criticized but on the specific topic of the role opposition has not been discussed. The survey of literature is presented to prove the worth of the pioneering work. The book “Pakistan In Crisis” was written by Ashok Kapur. It highlights the policies of Zia government towards the religious parties and also discusses how Zia exploits the religious emotions for consolidating his rule. It exposed the intentions of Zia in conducting the elections and the reaction of the political parties in the shape of MRD. This book is also related to the soft corner of Jamaat-i-Islami for the policies of dictator. It also makes clear the Army’s pre-eminent position in political and constitutional affairs of Pakistan. But it does not discuss the politics of Bidanda M. Chengapa in his Pakistan, Islamization, Army and Foreign Policy, divided the
politics of Zia in three distinct phases, one is the interim period 1977 to 79 in which JI and PML (Pagaro) retained their utility for the Zia regime and Zia used anti PPP outlook for his advantage. During this interim period, he also exploited the Islamic sentiments. Chengapa declared second period a phase of consolidation in which Zia introduced Islamic type of democracy but on the other hand the majority of the political parties demanded the free and fair elections. The writer also discusses the politics and formation of MRD. During this period, constitutional amendments also strengthened the rule of Zia. The writer declared the third period “Post Martial Law Phase” in which Zia used Islam against democracy. During this period, he introduced Blasphemy law and sharia ordinance. Hamid Khan, Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan, highlights the major events of Zia era like the assassination of Z.A.Bhutto, role of judiciary in strengthening the dictator, delaying dactictics in holding elections, obnoxious role of Jamaat-i-Islami, formation of MRD, constitutional amendments, elections of 1985 and the death of Zia. But this book has also ignored the role of opposition leaders in the National Assembly and the provincial assemblies. The role of MRD for the free and fair elections has not been discussed in detail. It also lacks of critical analysis on the policies of regionalism and provincialism introduced by the Zia government. The writer presents the issues but not in detail. Pakistan Political Roots and Development 1947-1999 by Safdar Mahmood discuss the important role PNA against the rigging the elections of 1977. He elaborates the division of Muslim League into different groups on the issue of cooperation with the military ruler. Pakistan Muslim League worked under the government supervision and an alliance was established by Zia with the help of PML (P) and JI. The formation of the government of Muhammad Khan Junejo in the center and later on its dissolution due to some reasons is the main theme of the writer in the chapter of Political Parties. Though the Zia era takes place in this book only in few chapters but the politics of political
parties has been discussed in a very short manners. The role of the opposition has not been discussed in detail. Abdul Sattar, *Pakistan’s Foreign Policy 1947-2005 A concise history*, elaborates Pakistan’s decision to oppose the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. He also discusses the constraints of Pak-USA relations at the time of Soviet intervention. The writer weighs the pros and cons of the decision of Pakistan against the Soviet in Afghanistan and the future of Pak-USA relation. The book is purely related to the foreign policy of Pakistan, that’s why it does not discuss the role of the opposition on the external issues of Pakistan. The writer only depicts the governmental point of view on the external issues. This book consists of lengthy period from 1947 to 2005 and that’s why it does not take the things in detail. Dr Baz Muhammad, *Constitution Making in Pakistan 1947-1985*, highlights the constitutional history of Pakistan along with a short introduction of the political leaders who played role in the formation of the constitutions. It brings to surface the amendments which were introduced by Zia but what was the role of the leaders of opposition in the assemblies over the introduction of the amendments has not been discussed in detailed. The few sentences of the speeches of few opposition leaders has been given which are in sufficient. Ayesha Jalal, *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia*, discusses the comparative political systems of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. It consists of six chapters which highlight the different governments and their pros and cons. She also makes analysis about the rule of Zia in 3rd chapter but these analysis only cover four pages of the book which are not sufficient. The writer discusses the major issues of Zia era but with lack of sufficient evidences. Like the issue of the caliber of candidates in the elections of 1985, she has the opinion that this election provided the opportunity to such politicians to become the members of national and provincial assemblies who did not have the caliber to become a councilor. But for strengthening her views, she does not quote the names of such candidates and their
constituencies. She also discusses the role of biradris in the election of 1985 but does not mention the names of those biradris who played role in different constituencies. This book give only an idea but idea comes into practical shape when it is proved with solid arguments. Christina Lamb, the author of *Waiting for Allah*, divides her book into fourteen chapters and in these fourteen parts; she discusses the politics within the Pakistan and the foreign policy of Pakistan. She covers the Zia era from it’s up to down but not in detail. She gives full coverage to Zia’s conspiracy against Bhutto and the events of the death of Zia. The author also gives the wonderful comparison of the son of Zia and the daughter of Bhutto but it has failed to give the details of the events which aroused the anti-Zia sentiments. She mentions the role of the opposition within the parliament and outside of the parliament but not covered it with full details. In some events, she also exaggerates also and elaborates the events without citations. Kausar Parveen has discussed the politics of opposition from 1947 to 1958 in her book *The Politics of Pakistan – Role of the Opposition 1947 -1958*. This book is related to the initial days of the creation of Pakistan. It was the first research work on the opposition in Pakistan but only consisted of nine years. My research work on the role of the opposition 1977 - 88 is a continuation of this process.

The present study is a pioneering work on this subject. The effort has been made to understand the causes of the imposition of martial law and the efforts of the democratic forces for the restoration of democracy. In this way, the government – opposition relations have been discussed along with the importance of the democracy. The present study will improve the image of the opposition for tolerating the severe attitude of the dictator and various kinds of sanctions. It is confined to the ten years of dictatorial period. This period is significant as a particular direction which left deep impact on troubled history of Pakistan. The focus of the study is the
political parties and the oppressive polices of the dictator. It not only emphasis the importance of
the opposition’s point of view but also explains the causes of political instability. The present
study raises the following questions and offers the analysis on these lines:

1. What were the determining factors in the emergency, growth and development of
opposition in Zia era?
2. What was the relation between the government and the opposition and to what extent it
affected the political system of Pakistan?
3. What was the reaction of opposition on the constitutional amendments?
4. What was the perception of opposition on key issues in the internal politics of Pakistan as
well as the external issues?
5. What was the role of opposition in parliament and to what extent did it succeed in
moulding government policies in its favor? What was its impact on the political
developments in Pakistan?

The present study consists of six chapters. The first chapter explains rise, Growth and
development of Opposition along with those factors that played role in this regard like
assassination of Z.A Bhutto, Inhuman treatments with political workers, Military Courts,
Postponement of elections (1977 &1979), and Rift within PNA. The second chapter deals with
United front and Movement for Restoration of Democracy. The political parties are classified
along the right – left ideological spectrum. MRD was an alliance of nine political parties. These
were, Pakistan People’s Party, Muslim League (Qasim Group), JUI, National Awami Party,
Pakistan Democratic Party, Pakistan National Party, Kisan Mazdor Party, National Democratic
Party, Quomi Mahaz Azadi. In this chapter, the focus is on the demands of the alliance, its
efforts, and oppressive policies of the government and the causes of its failure. The third chapter
is related to non - Party Based Elections- 1985 in which the critical analysis of the stance of MRD has been presented and the participation of the Pro-Government candidates has been discussed along with the results of the National Assembly and Provincial Assemblies. Chapter fourth, fifth and sixth offers analysis of the working of the opposition inside the National and Provincial Assemblies, particularly its response to important constitutional issues, including PCO 1981, 8th Amendment, Islamic Political Order 1983. The fifth chapter elaborates the contribution of the opposition on troubling internal issues in Pakistan like Process of Islamization, Ojhri arms depot blast, Law and Order (Sindh, Bomb blasts in Frontier). The sixth chapter is related to Foreign Policy of Pakistan and the efforts of the opposition in exposing the feeble stand of government on external issues like Sikh Issue, Cricket Diplomacy, Nuclear Ambitions, Afghan Muddle. The study is concluded with a summary of major findings.

The research is descriptive and analytical in nature. Both quantitative and qualitative techniques have been applied in the study. Statistical data has been used to analyze the facts. Interviews have been conducted of the personalities who were the members of National and Provincial Assemblies in the elections of 1985 and played role as the opposition leaders.
CHAPTER 1
Rise, Growth and Development of Opposition

The experience of Pakistan, however suggests that it might be easy for a disciplined army to take over the reins of the government in a developing country......but the military can not solve all the problems facing a new nation. It may check instability, introduce certain social and economic reforms and accelerate the rate of economic growth but it can not tackle the real problem which leads to a coup d’etat – certain of a viable framework of political action which can function smoothly without the backing of the military commanders........

(Hassan AskariRizvi, 1976)

Introduction

The first General Elections to the National Assembly under the 1973 Constitution were held on 7\textsuperscript{th} March, 1977, while the elections to the Provincial Assemblies were scheduled for 10\textsuperscript{th} March 1977. The opposition political parties of ruling PPP\textsuperscript{1} formed an alliance called as Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) and it fielded its candidates in the elections. But the candidates of PNA could not stall the PPP. In the elections of National Assembly, PPP won thumping majority. Out of two hundred general seats, it won one hundred and fifty five seats, the opposition alliance (PNA) gained only thirty six seats, Pakistan Muslim League secured one seat and the independent candidates won the remaining seven. Even Pakistan Peoples’ Party won the reserved sixteen seats for women and minorities also. On 26\textsuperscript{th} March 1977, the elected members took the oath and elected the speaker and deputy speaker on next day. Z.A.Bhutto\textsuperscript{2} took oath as Prime

\textsuperscript{1}Pakistan People’s Party was established by Z.A.Bhutto in 1967 and participated in the elections of 1970 that were held under the command of military ruler. The majority in West Pakistan provided it a opportunity to form the government after the separation of East Pakistan. From 1971 to 1977 PPP ruled over the country with great achievements for Pakistan. General Muhammad Zia toppled the government of ZAB and made plot for his death. Pakistan People’s Party was in doldrums after the death of ZAB. Nusrat Bhutto took the command of the party and it was a time when the important leaders left the party. SafdarMahmood, Pakistan Political Roots & Development 1947-1999, pp. 140-43

\textsuperscript{2}Born in January 1927, he was the President and then Prime Minister of Pakistan (1971-77). Educated at the university of California, Berkeley, and Oxford University. A Sindhi landlord and lawyer, Bhutto entered national politics as a member of two of Ayub’s cabinets in the 1960s. He left Ayub government in 1968. He was the founder of Pakistan People’s Party and its most prominent leader. He appointed General Zia as chief of the Army Staff in March 1976. Zia removed Bhutto from the office by a coup d’état on July 5, 1977. After a lengthy trial, Zia executed
Minister in his second term day after. The nine party opposition alliance of ruling PPP decided to boycott the elections of the Provincial Assemblies that were going to be held on 11th March, 1977 and refused to take oath as members of the National Assembly with the allegations of rigging in elections⁴ of the National Assembly. The PPP thus swept to power in all four provinces. It secured four hundred and thirty five seats out of total four hundred and sixty five Provincial Assemblies seats. While sixteen seats were won by independent candidates and two by the PML (Q). The opposition blamed that the polling staff and the ruling PPP had indulged in rigging in the elections. This allegation seriously damaged the credibility of the national exercise. The opposition launched countrywide protest against rigging in the elections that often became violent. This protest succeeded in dismantling the ruling PPP and even few members of PPP also decided to resign from the membership of the National Assembly and suggested the Prime Minister to hold fresh elections. About the credibility of the elections of 1977, Mr. Andrew R. Wilder observed that

“The elections had clearly been rigged. The rigging charges began prior to the elections when 19 National Assembly and 66 Provincial Assemblies candidates declared ‘elected unopposed’. In contrast, only one candidate ran unopposed in 1970. The opposition claimed that some of its candidates had been kidnapped and others had been forcibly prevented from filing their nomination papers. Perhaps the most damaging evidence was the unbelievable high voter turnout figures. The official figure was 63 per cent, the same as in the 1970. However, if the 19 uncontested seats and the contests in Baluchistan which the PNA boycotted are discounted, the turnout reached the incredible figure of 80 per cent. In the aftermath of their rout in the National Assembly elections, the PNA


⁴ Rigging in elections has not been something new for Pakistan or for that matter the sub-continent. In Pakistan, it has always been rampant, in one form or another, in local bodies elections, National Assembly elections, Provincial Assemblies elections and senate elections. There was a great uproar on “rigging of elections” by the candidates in the first direct elections held to all the five provincial assemblies during 1951 to 1954. In the simplest and the briefest terms, the term can be defined as “the rival candidates ability to cast bogus votes” with the help of patwarees, police officers, use of money, use of pressure tactics, enticement of voters, providing of transport to voters, use of muscle power of local gangsters to harass opponent’s polling agents, intimidation to keep opponent’s voters away from polling stations, virtual capturing of polling stations, tampering of results at polling stations and then, of course, to get away with all this by winning elections with all the said or more imaginable fraudulent acts. Hasan Muhammad, General Elections in Pakistan, some untold stories & Personal Experiences, PP. 169-70.
decided to boycott the provincial assembly elections schedule for 10 March. Shortly thereafter they launched an anti-PPP agitation movement that grew increasingly violent during the subsequent months.  

National Assembly session was convened on 26th March 1977 but no opposition member attended the session. Only the 153 members elected on PPP ticket and eight members from Federal Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) attended the session. Miraj Khalid was elected the speaker. Speaking on the occasion, Bhutto invited the PNA to come for negotiations. He termed the 7th March elections as a history making event, hence the assemblies so elected could not be dissolved before their tenure. Before the session, all the prominent PNA leaders were arrested. They included Mufti Mahmood, Mian Tufail Ahmed, Malik Mohammad Qasim, Sardar Sherbaz Mazari, Maulana Shah Ahmed Noorani, Prof Shah Faridul Haq, Syed Munawar Hassan, Haji Hanif Tayab, Begum Nasim Wali Khan, Mir Rasool Bakhsh Talpur, Mian Mohammad Shaukat.  

On 28th March 1977, The National Assembly was convened again and Bhutto took oath as Prime Minister. Only 168 members were present and the opposition did not participate. In his speech, Z.A.Bhutto invited the opposition to shun “Politics of vandalism” and invited them for talks. He even offered certain concessions which included

1. The end of emergency
2. Release of all political detainees
3. Decision on all election petitions within three months
4. Bringing all laws into accordance with Islamic teachings  

Inspite of all these concessions, Z.A.Bhutto decided to meet Maulana Moudoodi of Jamaat-i-Islami who was a brain child behind the Nifaz-i-Nizam-i-Mustafa. The meeting took place on April 15, 1977 in Lahore. This was the second meeting between the two leaders, the first being the one before the final approval of the permanent constitution four years ago. The hardliners of the both parties opposed this meeting and some youngsters belonging to Islami Jamiat Talba gathered outside Moudoodi’s house and raised slogans to which the Maulana replied that he had not invited Bhutto but it was against courtesy to turn away a visitor. Bhutto said that he had gone to solicit the advice and good offices of the JI leader. But the last meeting with the both leaders (15th April 1977) lasted for about seventy five minutes and was not fruitful for Bhutto as the

4 Andrew R. Wilder, The Pakistani Voter, Electoral Politics and voting Behaviour in the Punjab, P. 26
5 Shaikh Aziz, A Leaf from History, P. 59.
6 Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan.
Maulana advised him to step down and allow the provincial governments to take over and hold elections to the National Assembly after the restoration of law and order. After meeting Maulana Moudoodi, Bhutto turned to Islamization. At the press meet he announced that in recognition of the demands of Nizam-i-Mustafa all casinos and night clubs would close down and sale of alcoholic drinks and gambling would be banned.\(^7\)

Within PPP, the differences also came to surface. Dr Mubashir Hasan, General Secretary of PPP, wrote a long letter to the party chief, accompanied by his resignation, and demanded that

1. The resignation of the Prime Minister
2. The dissolution of all the assemblies and the governments
3. Fresh elections under the rule of the President\(^8\)
4. To purge the party of feudal lords who had just joined the party to get into the assemblies
5. Remove the bureaucrats around him who have misguided him during the whole election exercise
7. Get rid of the corrupt people related to the ministries and their protégées.

The resignation was accepted by the Party Chief and the proposals were rejected because Bhutto had no answer, especially at a time when he was at cross roads. But on 16\(^{th}\) April 1977, seven other MNAs of PPP supported the demands of Dr Mubashir Hasan and among them were the followings:

1. Sardarshaukat Hayat (NA 42)
2. Malik KarimBakhsh (NA 54)
3. ZakirQureshi (NA 55)
4. Anwar Noon (NA 59)
5. Amir Abdullah Rokhri (NA 61)
6. MianSalahuddin (NA 85)
7. BalakhSherMazari (NA 126)

The opposition alliance demanded the ruling party for fresh elections under the supervision of Judiciary and Army. As the spat of violence in the country increased, the government of PPP

\(^7\)Shaikh Aziz, *A Leaf from History*, P. 69.
\(^8\) The Pakistan Election Compendium, Vol. 1, PP. 347-53.
tried to devise a solution to the political crisis. On 16th April 1977, Yahya Bakhtiar\textsuperscript{9} of the PPP suggested that the government was ready to organize fresh elections to the Provincial Assemblies and that, if the PNA won a majority in these elections to the National Assembly would also be held afresh but the opposition refused to accept the offer of the government. Shaikh Aziz claimed in his book “\textit{A Leaf from History}” that Bhutto had also denied to accept the proposal of Yahya Bakhtiar. When his formula appeared in the press Bhutto denied it initially, saying that the proposal had not been approved by him: however, in the national interest he was prepared to agree to it. PNA rejected the proposal and said that nothing less than acceptance of all demands was the solution to the debacle which had pushed the country into a state of political and economic disaster.\textsuperscript{10}

The government of Pakistan People’s Party then devised the novel idea of holding a referendum to legitimize Bhutto’s premiership. As the opposition directed its campaign against Bhutto, the ruling party considered it reasonable and democratic to obtain verdict from the electorate, but there was no provision in the constitution to support this idea. Since there was no other party in the houses apart from the PPP, it passed the seventh amendment to the constitution on 16th May 1977, providing for a referendum to be held. The parliament was supposed to pass a law dealing with practical details of the referendum, but this did not happen because the idea was soon overtaken by other suggestions for resolving the political crisis.\textsuperscript{11}

At last, the government of PPP decided to start negotiations with the opposition leaders. On 18th May 1977, Bhutto visited Molana Mufti Mehmood in Sihala. It was the place where most opposition leaders had been confined by the government. The two sides formed the negotiating teams to formally engage in talks. The PPP team comprised of the following members

\textsuperscript{9}YahyaBakhtiar was a Quetta-born lawyer. He had been in the news since 1958 when he challenged the imposition of martial law by Ayub Khan. He was a muslim leaguer but he joined the Pakistan People’s Party in 1974 and became an active member of the party in Balochistan. He was appointed Attorney General during the PPP regime and continued to represent state till handling Bhutto’s case in the Supreme Court. He did not involve himself much in the political decisions of the party at the higher level but was respected for his legal weight. In the 1977 controversial elections, he was asked to contest on the party ticket which he obediently did and was declared elected. When the elections became too contentious, he decided to quit. However during the height of the PNA agitation he became a member of the core team that was supposed to find some solution for the fiasco. At a time when some members close to Bhutto were partying ways and some were pressing for fresh elections, YahyaBakhtiar presented a proposal to break the stalemate. He recommended holding fresh elections for the provincial assemblies and if the PNA came out victorious then fresh elections to the National Assembly should also be held. DAWN, 20\textsuperscript{th} Oct. 2013.

\textsuperscript{10}Shaikh Aziz, \textit{A Leaf from History}, PP. 35-65.

\textsuperscript{11}The Pakistan Election Compendium, Vol. 1, PP. 347-53.
1. Z.A. Bhutto
2. Abdul Hafeez Pirzada
3. Kausar Niazi

Followings were the members of the team of the opposition alliance
1. Mufti Mehmood
2. Nawabzada Nasarullah
3. Professor Ghafoor Ahmed

The talks continued for a month and half. At least twelfth rounds of talks were held. The demands of the opposition were as under
1. Fresh elections
2. Caretaker government

After the conclusion of the Eighth Round on 14th June 1977, PPP spokesman Kausar Niazi, in press conference, said that the two sides had agreed to hold fresh elections to the National and Provincial Assemblies. But he did not say something about the second demand of the opposition that had become bone of contention. The opposition pressed for the suspension of the present governments and vast changes in the governments to ensure fair and free polls.12

On 1st July 1977, at the end of the Twelfth session of negotiations, both the parties had abandoned their earlier rigid stance and made concessions. They agreed that
1. Elections would be held afresh under presidential rule
2. Formation of Implementation Council with equal representation from both sides
3. Instituted safeguards to ensure that the legal structure and administrative set up governing the elections would remain impartial

But the PNAs main council did not approve the agreement on next day without additional safeguards that included constitutional cover for the Implementing Council. Once again, the talks encountered an impasse.13

The events of 3rd and 4th July 1977 were a matter of controversy. Some sources argue that Bhutto had acceded to the PNAs’ additional demands and that the final agreement was hours

---

12 Ibid.,
away when the army intervened to exploit the situation. Others contend that both parties were still far from agreement and that martial law was a fait accompli.

Chief of Army Staff General Zia-ul-Haq\textsuperscript{14} imposed Martial Law early on 5\textsuperscript{th} July 1977, holding the constitution in abeyance. He passed the orders to dissolve the National and Provincial Assemblies and the governments were dismissed. Zia-ul-Haq addressed the nation that evening and promised that

1. Fresh elections would be held within ninety days
2. He and his institution had no political ambitions
3. Only purpose of takeover was to break the political deadlock and offer political parties an opportunity to start afresh.

For fulfilling his promises, the government of General Zia-ul-Haq adopted the following measures for ensuring elections in Pakistan

1. The house of parliament and provincial assemblies (Election) Order with supra-constitutional powers became effective from 20\textsuperscript{th} July, and provided the necessary legal cover for the promised elections
2. The Election Commission Order promulgated on 23 July was given effect from 5 July enabling the chief martial law administrator to appoint a new election commissioner.\textsuperscript{15}

After the imposition of Martial Law, Zia regime created polarization among those who supported and those who opposed Mr. Bhutto’s PPP. On the basis of this polarization, Inhuman treatments with political workers were used. The regime’s record on human rights was very poor. The government detained political prisoners without charges or trial and treated them shabbily. Third degree methods were used on the bases of categorization of political prisoners. Political opponents of the regime had periodically been hauled up in pre-emptive swoops by police on the bases or lists prepared by the intelligence agencies. On the whole, there had been an institutional

\textsuperscript{14} He was born in Jullundur, East Punjab on August 12, 1924. An Arain from a lower middle class family, he was educated at St. Stephen’s College in Delhi and joined the British Indian army in 1944. He was commissioned into the Indian cavalry in 1945. He was appointed chief of the army staff in 1976 by Z.A.Bhutto. He assumed the office of President of Pakistan in 1978 but retained his position as chief of the army staff .ShahidJavedBurki& Craig Baxter, Pakistan Under the Military, Eleven Years of Zia-ul-Haq, PP. 184-192

\textsuperscript{15} The Pakistan Election Compendium, Vol. 1, PP. 347-53.
breakdown of the process of constitutional safeguards for civil liberties, topped with virtual castration of the 1973 constitution.\textsuperscript{16}

The major allegations that were being given to the workers of PPP were followings

1. The printing of illegal and revolt based material
2. To create uncertainty within the different sections of military
3. To work against the ideology of Pakistan
4. To support the ideology of Russia
5. To spread uncertainty within the government servants

All these allegations were not included in the charge sheet but verbally these were assigned to the political workers.\textsuperscript{17}

Professor Khurshaid Ahmed had the opinion that these punishments which had been given to the political workers were those which were given after October 1979. Before this, all political parties including PPP were working in Pakistan, the rallies, meetings, processions were being organized.\textsuperscript{18}

Besides of all these things, often the people raise the question why the polls were rigged by Pakistan People’s Party, Aandrew R. Wilder quotes from the government of Pakistan’s White Paper stated as under

“It is still unclear why the polls were rigged so blatantly when the PPP was virtually assured of a victory without resorting to rigging. One explanation is that it was the fault of overly zealous local government officials who feared the consequence of the wrong candidates winning. Another explanation was that Bhutto was feeling constrained by the parliamentary system of government, and wanted a two third majority in the National Assembly so that the constitution could be amended to support a Presidential form of government.”\textsuperscript{19}

**Bhutto’s Assassination**

On 3\textsuperscript{rd} September 1977, Z.A.Bhutto was rearrested by the military administration with the allegation of murder of Nawab Muhammad Ahmed Khan. It was alleged that on the orders of Bhutto, Nawab Muhammad Khan had been murdered in an assault on his car (11 November

\textsuperscript{16}MushahidHussain, *Pakistan’s Politics: The Zia Years*, P. 122.
\textsuperscript{17}NisarHussain, "ZameerKaQadi", P. 131.
An inquiry was conducted by High Court judges, headed by Justice Shafiur-Rehman and exonerated Bhutto from this charge. But Ahmed Raza Qasuri, son of the murdered person, filed again case after the coup. Zia’s administration re-arrested Bhutto and trailed in full bench of Lahore High Court presided by Chief Justice Moulvi Mushtaq. This full bench sentenced Bhutto and four other persons to death in the murder case. The four other persons were Mian Mohammad Abbas, Director Intelligence and Operations of the defunct Federal Security force (FSF), Sufi Ghulam Mustafa, Inspector, Arshad Iqbal, Sub-Inspector, and Rana Iftikhar, Assistant Sub-Inspector of FSF. On March 18th, 1978, the court held that the murder charge against the five accused was proved completely and that all those five accused be hanged by the neck till they were dead. Appeal was filed in the Supreme Court that was rejected. The family of Z.A.Bhutto moved the mercy petition that was also turned down by General Zia-ul-Haq. After all these proceedings, it was decided to hang Bhutto on April 4th, 1979 that was done by the military government. Popular leadership was killed in Pakistan. It was the strange case with strange decision in the history of Pakistan due to following reasons;

1. Approver’s statement is the weakest evidence in the murder case. Bhutto had been hanged on the statement of approver only. In the judicial history, it was unprecedented that capital punishment was awarded and the accused was executed on the basis of approver’s statement. Mr. Masood Mahmood, Ex-director of FSF and Ghulam Hussain were approvers against Z.A.Bhutto in the murder case.

2. It is such a bad case in the eyes of the law that this has never been cited as authority in any murder case in any court of the law in the country. The murder of Z.A.Bhutto not only left soft corner in the hearts of the people of Pakistan but also created hatred against General Zia-ul-Haq. This murder permanently created “Jiala Culture” this has always been the main source of Pakistan People’s Party. General Zia-ul-Haq tried to snub this culture through different ways but all in vain.

---

20 He was the head of the Federal Security force during the period of Z.A.Bhutto. after Bhutto was charged with a murder of a political opponent by the Zia regime, he accepted a “plea bargaining arrangement” with the prosecution and testified against Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in his (Bhutto’s) murder trial. ShahidJavedBurki& Craig Baxter, Pakistan Under the Military, Eleven Years of Zia-ul-Haq, PP. 184-192

21 Hasan Muhammad, General Elections in Pakistan, some untold stories and Personal Experiences, PP. 197-201.
Military Courts

In the period of Zia, there was a three tiers law system in Pakistan i.e. Sharia Laws, Martial Laws and Civil Laws. The civil Courts started issuing stay orders to the detainees who was disliked by the dictator and he decided to establish military courts. Although Zia-ul-Haq maintained that military courts were used only to combat threats to national security, both summary and special military courts were used extensively and without oversight. The premise of these military courts was autonomy. Neither records, reasoned judgments nor representations were maintained to facilitate later scrutiny; the regime did not always respond to habeas corpus petitions and frequently applied death sentences for political acts. In fact, the military courts were established for snubbing the rivals and these courts began to impose harsh punishments, including publishing with greater frequency. The government arrested a large number of political personalities. General Zia-ul-Haq, after take over, replaced civil court judges with military officers acting on their own authority and police and these forces determined independently the tribunals to which detainees were remanded and the laws under which they were tried. The arrested political personalities, teachers of the Punjab and Quaid-i-Azam universities and the lawyers were trailed by the military courts.22 The regime prosecuted citizens in military tribunals. In the beginning, the superior courts used to give limited relief against the judgments of the military courts and this thing irritated the ruling generals. It created rift in the military ruling general and the superior courts. No doubt, the superior courts also gave extra-legal coverage to autocrat, unconstitutional and illegal steps of the military regime. But later on, two developments precipitated the confrontation and led the military regime to strip the superior judiciary of its powers. Asghar Khan filed a petition in the Lahore High Court in early 1980 and challenged the legality of the Zia government.23 The competency of military courts and of the regime generally was upheld in *AH Asghar v. Chairman, Summary Military Court and 2 others*, PLD 1978 Karachi 773; *Nazeer Ahmed v. Lt. Col Abbas AH Khan, President, Special Military Court No. 10 and 2 others*, PLD 1978 Karachi 777; *Saeed Ahmad Malik v. Federation of Pakistan*, PLD 1978 Lahore 1218; and *Rustam AH v. Martial Law Administrator, Zone "C" and 3 others*, PLD 1978 Karachi 736. Additionally, the Quetta High Court distanced the actions of officers from the

---

23 Ibid., P. 253.
This ruled out challenges to the regime on the basis of local actions. *Ghulam Mujtaba Khan v. Martial Law Administrator, Zone "D," Quetta and 5 others*, PLD 1978 Quetta 199.24

The PCO excluded the judiciary from hearing a broad range of cases. Members of the armed forces were made fully immune to civil prosecution. High courts were barred from ruling on preventive detention, providing interim relief to detainees under preventive detention, taking action on any case registered in civil or military courts or tribunals or interfering with cases registered at police stations. Pending cases were immediately suspended. In addition, civil courts were barred from entertaining any proceedings concerned with military courts, their pending cases or their sentencing. The Chief Martial Law Administrator had sole power to "remove difficulties" in these matters.


On 8th August 1977, election cell was established by the military regime under the supervision of General Faiz Ali Cheshiti25. Other members were General Rao Farman Ali, General Jamaal Syed Mian and General Ashan-ul-Haq Malik. Firstly, they decided to meet the politicians and discussed the political matters with them. Muhammad Yousuf Khan Khattak came to see the members of the election cell. He was representing the Muslim League (Qayyum Group). He tried to convey to the members that the position of NDP26 and JUI27 was much

---

25He was Lt. General (retd) of the Pakistani army. He was born in 1927 in Jullundur, East Punjab. An Arain, he was the commander of Operation Fairplay, the military operation that performed the coup against Bhutto in 1977. He was appointed chief of staff to the chief martial law administrator in 1978 and minister of labour and man power, northern areas and Kashmir Affairs, petroleum and natural resources in 1979, and was an important advisor to general Zia during the yearly years of the Zia period. ShahidJavedBurki& Craig Baxter, *Pakistan Under the Military, Eleven Years of Zia-ul-Haq*, PP. 184-192
26It was founded by SardarSherbaz khan Mazari in 1975 after the banning of ANP. The workers of ANP joined NDP. National Democratic Party supported the concept of non-alignment and a democratic system in Pakistan. Bhutto was against NDP and the party also always opposed the policies of ZAB. The leaders of NDP joined the alliance of Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) and participated in the campaign against rigging in the elections of 1977. But it opposed the decision of PNA in favor of Zia regime. NDP claimed to be a true democratic party, that’s why it opposed the rule of dictator and dissociated itself from PNA. SafdarMahmood, *Pakistan Political Roots & Development 1947-1999*, pp. 145-51.
27The roots of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Islam sprang from Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind. It was established in Oct. 1945 to support the demand of Pakistan and it supported Muslim League in the elections of 1945-46. It also helped Muslim League in winning referendum in the NWFP and Sylhet in 1947. The deobandi school of thought dominated the party from its existence. MaulanaShabir Ahmed Usmani, MaulanaIhteshamulHaqThanvi, SyyaidSulemanNadvi, Mufti Mahmood, MaulanaGhulamghousHazarvi, MaulanaFazlurRehman were the renowned leaders of the party. After the creation of Pakistan, the party made efforts for the Islamic constitution. It participated in the 1970 elections and won
strengthened in NWFP and if these parties would decide to participate in elections, Muslim League was not in a position to win even a single seat. In NWFP, National Alliance was also not cooperating with Muslim League. Yousuf Khan Khattak wanted to gain the support of the military regime for winning elections.

The second important personality that came to see the members of election cell was Ghulam Mustafa Khar. He suggested them that it was necessary to compel PPP for boycott of the elections. In this way, the rightest wing of PPP would join them under the leadership of Ghulam Mustafa Khar and Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi. On 25th August 1977, even Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi also came to meet the election cell. Jatoi was of the opinion that it was difficult for them to provide support to the military regime in the presence of Z.A.Bhutto. It was too necessary to “Out” Bhutto. In this way, PPP, NDP, JUI, Muslim League and Tehrik-e-Istiklal would join an alliance and with the help of this alliance, Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi would be the best choice for the post of Prime Minister.

On 23rd August 1977, Prof Abdul Ghafoor Ahmed, S. M. Zafar and Air Martial Asghar Khan also met the election cell and gave them recommendations about the coming elections. These were the followings:

1. It was their opinion that National Alliance was artificial alliance and did not have practical roots. It was effective against Z.A.Bhutto but it could not be continued after him. The leaders of National Alliance had announced the implementation of “Nezam-e-Mustafa” which was very dreadful dream for the educated people of Pakistan because they did not like the government of Mullahs.

---

seven National Assembly seats from the districts of Bannu, Kohat and DeraImail Khan of the NWFP and Baluchistan. Ibid., pp. 157-59.

28 He was Landlord and politician from Punjab, Opponent of General Zia-ul-Haq. He is known as early PPP leader and supporter of Z.A.Bhutto. He also served as governor of Punjab during the Z.A.Bhutto period. He left the PPP when Benazir took charge. He joined with Jatoi in establishing the National Peoples’s Party in 1986. He broke with Jatoi in September 1989 and joined PPP. He was again ousted from the PPP in August 1990. He also served as water and power minister in the caretaker government. ShahidJavedBurki& Craig Baxter, Pakistan Under the Military, Eleven Years of Zia-ul-Haq, PP. 184-192

29 He was landlord and politician from Sindh and opponent of Zia ulHaq. He remained member of Z.A.Bhutto’s cabinet (1971-77). He was founder and leader of the PPP in Sindh and one of the main forces behind the creation of the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy (MRD) in 1981. He was also one of the uncles who broke with the PPP led by Benazir. He joined with Khar in establishing the National People’s Party in 1986. Appointed prime minister of the caretaker government (August 1990 to October 1990) by President GhulamIshaq Khan. ShahidJavedBurki& Craig Baxter, Pakistan Under the Military, Eleven Years of Zia-ul-Haq, PP. 184-192
2. They also criticized the decision of General Zia-ul-Haq to hold elections within ninety days. First you should create such circumstances in which PPP had not option to boycott the elections.

3. Third point was related to Z.A.Bhutto and he declared him a corrupt person. There was dire need to trial him on the charges of murder and dishonesty. The accountability of Z.A.Bhutto should not be left on the disposal of the next government.

While S.M.Zafar also gave opinion against the politicians and recommended that those politicians who had denied to cooperate with Zia regime, must be disqualified under EBDO\(^30\). He also declared that it was not a proper time for elections and under these circumstances; the opposite political parties would win a clear majority in the provinces. He also criticized the National Alliance.

After that, Prof Abdul Ghafoor also gave the same opinion about the elections and criticized the politics of Asghar Khan who was giving tough time to National Alliance and had decided to finalise the candidates against the candidates of National Alliance. Even he presented the problems of the voters of his constituency. \(^31\)

On the issue of the elections, the government was itself confusing due to following questions;

1. Whether elections should be on the bases of proportional representation
2. Whether there should be registration of political parties
3. Whether elections should be on party or non-party basis

---

\(^30\) Elective Bodies (Disqualification) Order, 1959 was popularly known as EBDO. It defined misconduct of a politician as meaning any subversive activity, preaching of any doctrine or committing any act which contributed to political instability, bribery, corruption, or if he had a general or persistent reputation for favoritism, nepotism, willful maladministration, willful misapplication or diversion of public money or any other abuse of power or position. The reach of law was very wide because elective bodies included any assembly, board or committee of which the constituent members were chosen by means of elections and included legislatures, municipal bodies, cantonment boards, district boards, and so on. Each tribunal to be formed for inquiry under this law had to be composed of three members with the presiding officer being n incumbent or retired judge of the Supreme Court, the Federal Court or High Court. A District and Session Judge, who was qualified for appointment as a High Court Judge could also be appointed as presiding officer of such a tribunal. A person could be disqualified for being a member of any elective body until 31\(^{st}\) December 1966. An offer could be made to a politician to voluntarily retire from public life until 31\(^{st}\) December 1966. Hamid Khan, *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan*, P. 130

\(^31\) AzharSohail, *General Zia KaGyaraSaal*, PP. 33-38.
4. Whether President should join an existing party or form his own “King’s Party”.

The Military officer promised the Pakistani politicians and the public that election would be held within ninety days. The projected date for holding fresh elections was 18th October 1977. After the commitment of General Zia-ul-Haq about elections with the nation, The Election Commission Secretariat had started preparatory work for the general elections. The 1973 constitution was effective at that time. The government of Pakistan had enacted the following two laws for holding October, 1977 general elections:

1. The Election Commission Order, 1977 (President’s Order No.4 of 1977)

It provided for the appointment of the Chief Election Commissioner, Acting Chief Election Commissioner, Election Commission, powers of Election Commission, duties of Commissioner, decisions of Commission, etc. In the past, there were the two members of the Election Commission but this law provided for the four members of the Election Commission. Clause (2) or Article 5 of the said law as under:

(2) Election Commission. The Election Commission shall consist of
(a) The Commissioner, who shall be chairman of the Commission
(b) Four members, each of whom shall be a judge of the Supreme Court or of a High Court, appointed by the President after consultation with the Chief Justice of Pakistan and with the Commissioner.”

2. The Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) Order, 1977 (President’s Order No.5 of 1977)

It provided the statutory basis for October, 1977 general elections.

“Elections to the two Houses and the Provincial Assemblies shall be held in the month of October, 1977, on dates to be notified by the Commission under the Representation of the People Act, 1976 (LXXXY of 1976), or, as the case may be, under the Senate (Election) Act 1975, with the prior approval of the President.”

---

32Mushahid Hussain, Pakistan’s Politics: the Zia Years, P. 120
33ECP’s Compendium of Election Laws, P. 4.
The ordinance also defined the allocation of seats of the National Assembly, Senate and Provincial Assemblies. It described the qualification and disqualification for the membership of parliament. It was as under

1. He is a citizen of Pakistan;
2. He is, in the case of the National Assembly, not less than twenty five years of age and is enrolled as a voter in any electoral roll for election to that National Assembly; and
3. He is, in case of the Senate, not less than thirty years of age and is enrolled as a voter in any area in a province or, as the case may be, the federal Capital or the federally Administered Areas, from where he seeks membership;\(^\text{35}\)

Mr. Justice Dorab Patel who was the judge of the Supreme Court, took oath as the Acting CEC on 17\(^{th}\) June, 1977.\(^\text{36}\) It was also remarkable that the voice was being raised that elections should be held under the supervision of military and judiciary. So the Returning Officers had been taken from these two institutions. Ostensibly, all was set for this date, when elections were indefinitely postponed on 1\(^{st}\) Oct. General Zia-ul-Haq addressed the nation and stated the reasons for postponing elections in Pakistan. The stated objectives of postponing elections were as under

1. Organize the process of accountability
2. Purge political parties’ rank
3. File of corruption

But he intentionally created such circumstances in which the elections were not being arranged. Followings were the reasons behind the scene.

1. Actually the fear of the victory of PPP disturbed the planes of the Zia government and that’s why he delayed the elections twice and created mistrust within the government and pro-government political parties.
2. Self-perpetuation in power
3. Missionary zeal (in this case Islam)
4. Protection of corporate interests of the military
5. A certain alignment of social and political forces which necessitate a caretaker’s role for the armed forces in the civilian sector.\(^\text{37}\)

But at the same time, few reforms or changes were introduced in the procedure of the elections by the administration of General Zia-ul-Haq. These were as under

1. Heavy expenses were incurred on procurement of material
2. Large size steel ballot boxes of 12” * 12” * 15” size to replace the smaller ballot boxes of 9” * 7” * 8” size were procured.
3. The ballot boxes were transported to the districts by the Provincial Election Commissioners
4. Steel trunks of 3’ * 1-½ * 1-3/4 with two locks of 2” size were procured
5. Chemical (Potassium permanganate) was procured to augment the quality of the indelible ink used to mark on the finger of voters in order to avoid the possibility of a voter voting again at another polling station.38

In February 1978, the CMLA directed the Election Commissioner to prepare fresh electoral rolls and review the delimitation of constituencies. The rolls were to be prepared on the basis of separate electorates for Muslims and non-Muslim voters. On 25th March 1979, General Zia Ul Haq announced that on 17th November 1979 he would announce the date of the next elections. On that day, he suggested that the politicians should complete their home work for elections and avoid from indulging in futile matters.39 On 2nd August 1979, the Election Commission notified the new list of constituencies and the new rolls were published on 15th September 1979. The general elections were now scheduled for 17th November 1979, to be held simultaneously for the National Assembly and provincial assemblies. But nobody in the political arena was certain that elections would be held. Former Prime Minister Bhutto was hanged on 4th April 1979 following a court verdict in a murder case. The PNA had broken down into its constituent parties, and the right wing parties, especially Jamaat-e-Islami, were carrying favor with the CMLA. The military regime had little reason to share power with the political forces.

On 17th October 1979, Zia-ul-Haq postponed the elections for unlimited period and adopted stern actions towards political parties and newspapers. He even ordered to lock up the offices of the political parties. Censorship was imposed on the newspapers. It was a dire need to raise protest against such steps of a dictator but the politicians did not show concern over such

---

38 Hasan Muhammad, General Elections in Pakistan, some untold stories and Personal Experiences, PP. 183-83.
39 Azhar Sohail, General Zia Ka Gyara Saal, P. 64.
decisions of the government. It was also fact that Zia-ul-Haq made up mind from the first day of his rule that general elections would not be held but made it public in 1979. He gave the reason that it was necessary to complete the introduction of Nizam-e-Islam before the elections. He declared that

“Several prominent political leaders, Ulama, intellectuals and worried citizens expect me not to hold elections in the present circumstances because they might cause harm to the country..........some people have termed the present method of elections totally un-Islamic. their view is that there is no concept of political parties in Islam.............some of the factors which have contributed to this approach are the bitter experience of past elections, the tradition of negative politics in the country and the tendency towards violence and agitation.............I personally feel that these considerations can not be brushed aside national integrity demands that steps should be taken to guard against these dangers before the elections.”

Rift within PNA.

From August 1978 to April 1979, all the parties of PNA had joined the government. PNA had joined the government on specific conditions. After dismissal of the government of PPP, An agreement had been signed between government and PNA on May 1978, party in opposition was inducted in government. PNA forwarded the demand that no serving general would become the part of the cabinet. The government accepted the demand of PNA and kept the generals away from ministries. But when the members of PNA resigned from the ministries, the generals joined the cabinet. PNA was outsmarted by the regime on the issue of elections also. Every leader was expecting elections but Zia regime did not want. PNA took two years to adjust to the reality of ever-evasive elections and after that it used to look for friends amongst the PPP.

---

41 Quoted in “Government and Politics of Pakistan” by P. Sharan, P. 181.
The differences of the leaders of PNA came to surface soon after the death of Z.A. Bhutto. The role of Asghar Khan in this regard was remarkable. Later on Jamat-Islami refused to cooperate with MRD due to secular approach of PPP but most of other parties of PNA were the part and parcel of MRD except PML (P). The Muslim League, led by Pir Pagara, continued to support Zia and his regime. A few political workers and a segment of the population supported the regime of General Zia-ul-Haq either for fear of return of the People’s Party to power or for their narrow personal political objectives. It was also fact that the PNA parties, inspite of differences with Zia regime, did not find it easy to come to terms with the leader of PPP and the PPP leaders also took time to overcome the shock of Bhutto’s execution. But the political forces rose from their slumber and decided to put their differences aside from the time being and faced the military dictatorship by uniting themselves against Zia regime because they thought that the real damage had come from Zia regime not the PPP. There was no option for PPP to put the execution behind and to make alliance with the opponents for waging a collective struggle against General Zia-ul-Haq. The military dictator fully exploited the differences of the politicians and used it for his interests. After many years, the politicians realized the situation and decided to sit together on a table with PPP.

After postponement of elections, General Zia-ul-Haq used to introduce changes in the constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan and imposed restrictions on the powers of the superior judiciary. Such kind of restrictions created resentment among the people and the politicians against the Zia regime. The military government adopted a stance that the Supreme Court gave the CMLA unconditional powers to amend the constitution but the legal circles maintained that he could amend the constitution to the extent it was needed for holding the promised elections.

The Provisional Constitutional Order 1981 empowered Zia regime to establish Majlis-i-Shura and the military regime contacted the politicians through district administrations for participation in the Shura. The traditional politicians showed their willingness to join it but most of the

---

44 Asghar Khan was vocal and very public opponent of Field Marshal Ayub Khan, General Yahya, Z.A.Bhutto and General Zia ulHaq. Leader of the Tehrik-i-Istiqlal, which he founded in 1970. The Tehrik, however, has not emerged as a strong (in terms of popular support) political party and failed to capture a seat in the national assembly election of 1988. ShahidJavedBurki & Craig Baxter, Pakistan Under the Military, Eleven Years of Zia-ul-Haq, PP. 184-192

45 Hamid Khan, Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan, P. 645.

46 Ibid., P. 646.

47 Hasan Askari Rizvi, Military, State and Society in Pakistan, P. 176.
politicians refused to join Shura. Those who refused to accept the ministries in the Shura created a front against the regime of dictator.  

**Local Government Elections 1979**

After postponement of the general elections, Zia-ul-Haq decided to hold the elections of District and Union Councils. In these elections, the majority of the population participated because the local politics often involves the people more enthusiastically as compare to politics at the national level. The population is often divided into different factions and these factions are exploited in the politics of District and Union councils. It was a first time when the candidates of District Councils were directly contacting with people for direct vote. Feudal as well as the middle class candidates came on surface as candidates. After the elections, amongst the elected candidates, few filed their papers for chairmanship of the District Councils. During these elections, it was the direction of the government that nobody could contest elections from the platform of any political party. The candidates of PPP filed their papers with the title of “Awam Dost”. The government with the help of secret agencies identified those candidates who filed their papers of nomination with the title of “Awam Dost” and disqualified them. From District Faisalabad, Makhdom Ali Raza Shah  

49 was elected as Chairman District Council by the members of union councils but the government disqualified him because he had filed his paper with the title of “Awam Dost”. In District Multan, Fakhar Imam and Hamid Raza Gillani were the candidates of the chairmanship of District Multan. Both the candidates secured the equal votes but Mr. Fakhar Imam filed the writ petition in the High Court that the proposer of Mr. Hamid Raza Gillani had won election elections with the title of “Awam Dost”. On the request of Fakhar Imam, the court disqualified the supporter of Hamid Raza Gillani and in this way; Fakhar

---

49 Makhdoom Ali Raza Shah is the son of Makhdoom Nasir Deen Shah. He lives in Nasir Nagar that is situated in Tehsil Pirmahal, T.T.Singh. he contested the elections for the membership of National Assembly in 1985 but after that he always contested elections on the seat of the member of provincial assembly Punjab. He won all elections except 1996 elections. He is considered the real leader of the local people (Jangli). Interview with the author.  
50 He is landlord and politician from south Punjab. He educated himself from the University of California, Davis. He was elected as member and later Chairman of the Multan District Council in 1979. He was appointed federal minister of local government and rural development by General Zia and served in that capacity until 1983. He was elected as independent member in the national assembly (1985-88). He became speaker of the national assembly inspite of the opposition of the Gen. Zia. He was the leading member of the opposition to Prime Minister Junejo’s government (1987-88). ShahidJavedBurki& Craig Baxter, *Pakistan Under the Military, Eleven Years of Zia-ul-Haq*, PP. 184-192
Imam was elected as Chairman Zila Council Multan. Same case was happened with a member in Peshawar also. It was the reaction of the government against the supporters of Pakistan People’s Party and it was also an effort to keep the leaders of PPP away from politics.\footnote{Interview with Abida Hussain, dated 22-07-12.}

**Conclusion**

Overwhelming majority of Pakistan People’s Party in the elections of 1977 made the elections skeptical that led to massive campaign against rigging. The victory of PPP was being expected in the elections but the cohorts of Z.A.Bhutto in bureaucracy derailed the process of elections and made the victory skeptical. Inspite of the rigid stance of PNA, the government of PPP became ready to negotiate with the opposition. It is the characteristic of the democratic government that it deals with different issues with democratic style. But the institution of military dismantled the negotiation process and undermined the elected government. The democratic personalities are not ready to accept the rule of absorbers’. In this way, the opposition of Z.A.Bhutto was changed into the opposition of the rule of General Zia-ul-Haq. He tried to dismantle the opposition through different ways but his actions strengthened the roots of opposition within the hearts of the people. It can be said that the policies of the government gathered the opponents against the Zia regime instead of the initiatives of the opposition because the main leadership of PPP was in exile or in jail. Inhuman treatments with the political workers and delay in holding elections annoyed the politicians also. It enhanced the popularity of PPP and democratic forces. Due to that fear of popularity, the Zia regime postponed the elections till 1985.
CHAPTER 2

MRD (6th Feb 1981)

(Movement for Restoration of Democracy)

“………………do not be frightened of this movement. It is for our people, for our poor, for our children so that they do not live in poverty, hunger and disease. Struggle for your parliament, for your government, for your constitution so that the decisions are taken for the poor people and not for the junta and its stooges…………..” (Benazir Bhutto)

Introduction

The dictators come into power with the announcement of the suspension of existing constitution and political activities. They launch the program of reforms so that the favors of the population may be secured. The political parties are the most organized and institutionalized agents of oppositions in any society. Therefore, the focus of the study is the role of political parties who played role as opposition. It is not possible for one party to challenge the rule of dictator and alliances come into existence for powerful movements against the dictators. The present study not only helps to understand the causes of political instability and the role of opposition parties against the dictatorship of Zia government. It also highlights the efforts of the government in handling the efforts of the opposition alliance and how did it snubbed the voice of people through oppressive military operations? This paper also exposes the weaknesses of the alliances and it makes it clear how the alliances are broken by the leadership of the major political parties and the existing governments. Inspite of the failure of movements, how does it influence the political system of the state?

In the elections\textsuperscript{52} of 1977, PNA was major alliance against Z.A.Bhutto. Unexpected results in the elections prepared a ground for PNA to raise protest against the government of Pakistan People’s Party. Most of the religious parties had joined the alliance due to liberal outlook of Bhutto government. American role in the projection of PNA has also been highlighted by the different writers and Bhutto himself in his book “If I am assassinated”. With the bulk of dollars, the alliance gained momentum and Bhutto felt the need to negotiate with the leaders of PNA. But it was too late and the military government decided to replace PPP government with

\textsuperscript{52} Election is a device for filling an office or post through choices made by designate body of people: the electorate. Elections have different functions in its roots, like as political recruitment, representation, making government and influencing policy. These are bottom up functions. While it has its to down functions which include that it build legitimacy, shape public opinion and help to strengthen elites. Andrew Heywood, Politics, P. 227.
the support of PNA. Due to the interference of the institution of military, the negotiations could not succeed. Gen. Muhammad Zia Ul Haq took over reigns of the government and suspended the constitution of 1973 with the promise of holding elections within 90 days. The PNA leaders not only welcomed the Zia but also decided to support his policies. Bhutto was a very strong and dynamic personality. He had created Bhuttoism in the minds of the middle and lower middle class through his slogans and reforms. Pakistan People’s Party had its vote bank in all provinces of Pakistan and it was too difficult to ignore PPP in the coming elections. It could be predicted that PPP would again win the seats in the coming elections which were going to be held under the supervision of General Zia-ul-Haq. Z.A.Bhutto had become a great threat to the leaders of PNA and General Zia. The history of Bhutto about his rivals was not good. That’s why Zia could not give Bhutto free hand in the elections. It was the same stance of the leaders of PNA. Due to this fear, an alliance was established between the military and PNA. General Zia-ul-Haq wanted the elections without the participation of PPP and it was the same desire of the leaders of PNA. After the assassination of Z.A.Bhutto, the free and fair election was the major demand of all democracy loving parties. General Zia made two times commitments with the nation and parties that elections would be held but he seemed reluctant. Due to bad intentions of Zia government, rift had developed within those parties who were supporting the military regime. Only few parties, like Muslim League led by Pir Pagaro, stood with dictator and the other parties made an alliance in the form of MRD with PPP. Basically it was an alliance but BBC used to call it MRD and this name of the alliance of political parties became popular. Most of the pro-military political parties did not want martial law within the country. These parties only changed the regime of Z.A.Bhutto but did not want to give the sacrifice of the democracy. Pakistan People’s Party was the only opposition party in Pakistan after the takeover of General Zia. But it was passing through a critical phase due to the death of Z.A.Bhutto and the faked cases were being registered on the workers. The political workers were being trialed in the military courts and severe punishments were being proposed. It was not possible for PPP to launch a movement against military regime without the support of the other political parties. The movement of Restoration of Democracy revived Pakistan People’s Party and provided it a chance to challenge the rule of dictator. PPP leadership also realized that they had to put the execution behind and act under the political logic and compulsion of the situation and reach for

53 Asghar Khan, My Political Struggle, P. 251.
erstwhile political opponents for waging a collective struggle against the military dictator.\textsuperscript{54}

MRD started from the Bhutto’s home province and gained roots in the different parts of Pakistan.

### Main Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Leader’s Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi</td>
<td>PPP leader while B.B was in exile. On her return, he demanded from B.B. to hold party elections but she refused. Due to this, he left PPP and established his own party National People’s Party. In 1981 and 1984, Zia had offered him premiership but he refused. It was an effort from Zia side to weaken the PPP. After his exist from PPP, he repent over his refusal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mairaj Mohammad Khan</td>
<td>QMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rasul Bux Palejo</td>
<td>Awami National Party. He even became against of PPP due to her decision of acceptance of those politicians who had rendered in Zia government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mumtaz Bhutto</td>
<td>PPP (Left PPP in 1985 and established Sindh Baluch Pushtoon Front)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Khwaja Khairuddin</td>
<td>PML (Khairuddin). He was also the secretary general of MRD and was repeatedly arrested by the government of Zia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maulana Fazlur Rehman</td>
<td>JUI Fazlur Rehman group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan</td>
<td>Pakistan Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{54} Burki, Shahid Javed, \textit{Pakistan Under the Military – Eleven Years of Zia Ul Haq}, P. 34.
Marriage of convenience

MRD was an alliance of nine political parties. Most of those political parties who had launched movement against Bhutto were the part of the Movement for Restoration of Democracy against General Zia-ul-Haq. Muslim Fundamentalist opposition parties like JUI, Centrist opposition Parties like Muslim League, Nationalist Opposition parties like NAP, Leftist political Parties like Qoumi Mahaz Azadi, Mazdour Kassan Party, PPP. All kinds of parties had joined the alliance. Jamaat-i-Islami had also divided on the issue of the support of Zia regime. Though jamaat-Islami was not the part of the alliance but it was being considered that it was promoting the agenda of MRD due to the criticism of Prof. Ghafoor and Munawaar Hasan on Zia regime.

1. Pakistan People’s Party,

Pakistan People’s Party was established by Z.A.Bhutto in 1967 and participated in the elections of 1970 that were held under the command of military ruler. The majority in West Pakistan provided it a opportunity to form the government after the separation of East Pakistan. From 1971 to 1977 PPP ruled over the country with great achievements for Pakistan. General Muhammad Zia toppled the government of ZAB and made plot for his death. Pakistan People’s Party was in doldrums after the death of ZAB. Nusrat Bhutto took the command of the party and it was a time when the important leaders left the party. Inspite of crisis, the party formed the alliance against Zia rule with the collaboration of few other parties. The alliance formed the shape of Restoration of Democracy in 1981. There were two major demands, holding of elections and restoration of a representative government. With the efforts of PPP, MRD gained

---

55 The political scientists declare the political party – a group of people organized for the purpose of wining government power. Political party displays some measures of ideological cohesion. The principal classification of political parties have distinguished between cadre and mass or, later, catch all parties, parties of representation and parties of integration, constitutional or main stream parties and revolutionary and anti system ones, and left wing parties and right wing parties. Andrew Heywood, *Politics*, P. 249.
momentum but could not dislodge the government. This failure created a sense of demoralization in the party.\textsuperscript{56}

2. Muslim League (Khairuddin),

Muslim league was considered the major party that got credit of the creation of Pakistan but the military dictators always used it for prolonging their rules. Due to the support of Military dictators, it was divided into different branches. Same situation was developed after the imposition of Zia’s Martial Law. Though it was united against Bhutto’s rule and even participated in the movement of PNA but after that it was divided into two groups. One was supporting Zia’s Martial Law under the leadership of Pir of Pagaro while another group with the leadership of Khwaja Khairuddin opposed any cooperation with the military regime. PML (Khairuddin) joined MRD against Zia government and demanded free and fair elections and the removal of Martial Law.\textsuperscript{57}


The roots of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Islam sprang from Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind. It was established in Oct. 1945 to support the demand of Pakistan and it supported Muslim League in the elections of 1945-46. It also helped Muslim League in winning referendum in the NWFP and Sylhet in 1947. The deobandi school of thought dominated the party from its existence. Maulana Shabir Ahmed Usmani, Maulana Ihteshamul Haq Thanvi, Syyaid Suleman Nadvi, Mufti Mahmood, Maulana Ghulam ghous Hazarvi, Maulana Fazlur Rehman were the renowned leaders of the party. After the creation of Pakistan, the party made efforts for the Islamic constitution. It participated in the 1970 elections and won seven National Assembly seats from the districts of Bannu, Kohat and Dera Iamail Khan of the NWFP and Baluchistan. The remarkable thing of this election was the defeat of Bhutto from Mufti Mehmood. It participated in the elections of 1977 with the colliaion of the parties of PNA. It was also a part of PNA in agitation against Bhutto and after the imposition of Martial Law; it was split into two groups. JUI (F) and JUI (S) were the two groups. JUI (Saimullah Group) was supporting Zia regime and JUI Fazlur Rehman group) was against the imposition of Martial Law. JUI (F) joined the MRD against Zia government and made efforts

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., pp. 125-26.
for the restoration of democracy and the constitution of 1973. It boycotted the elections of 1985.\(^58\)

**4. Pakistan Democratic Party,**
In June 1969, PDP came into existence with the merger of four parties, Nizam-i-Islam party, Awami League (NN Group), National Democratic Front, Justice Party. PDP joined the Zia government after the imposition of Martial Law but it could not run for a long time. Soon the party left the federal cabinet of Zia regime and joined the anti-Zia political alliance in the shape of MRD. During the agitation against dictator, Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan was arrested and detained in jail. It is fact that he spent most of his time in opposition. Even during the rule of ZAB, he was very critical to PPP and he also joined PNA movement. His electoral support was always very limited.\(^59\)

**5. National Democratic Party (NDP),**
It was founded by Sardar Sherbaz khan Mazari in 1975 after the banning of ANP. The workers of ANP joined NDP. National Democratic Party supported the concept of non-alignment and a democratic system in Pakistan. Bhutto was against NDP and the party also always opposed the policies of ZAB. The leaders of NDP joined the alliance of Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) and participated in the campaign against rigging in the elections of 1977. But it opposed the decision of PNA in favor of Zia regime. NDP claimed to be a true democratic party, that’s why it opposed the rule of dictator and dissociated itself from PNA. National Democratic Party had the two demands from Martial Law dictator i.e. restoration of the constitution of 1973 and free and fair elections. For the implementation of its demands, it joined the opposition alliance MRD and made efforts for its targets. But the differences of Sardar Sherbaz khan Mazari and Wali Khan affected the integrity of the party and it gradually eased out of the political scene because Wali Khan had debarred from the party and established Awami National Party.\(^60\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Name</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Awami Party</td>
<td>Maulana Abul Hamid Bhashani</td>
<td>25 July 1957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{59}\) Ibid., pp. 131-33.

\(^{60}\) Ibid., pp. 145-51.
6. **Tehrik-i-Istaqlal**

Asghar Khan was the founder of Tehrik-i-Istaqlal in 1970 and opened its offices in the major cities of Pakistan within the party elections. Before the creation of Tehrik-i-Istaqlal, he had laid the foundation of Justice Party on 13 March 1969. After the downfall of Ayub Khan, it merged into Pakistan Democratic Party. After that he felt that he had been sidelined by the leaders of PDP and due to this, he decided to quit politics on 2 December 1969. After the announcement of elections in 1970, he again became active and laid the foundation of Tehrik-i-Istaqlal but it was defeated by the candidate of PPP in the elections of 1970. During Bhutto rule (1971-77), the party remained in opposition and even joined PNA against Bhutto. But the imposition of Martial Law reduced the differences between PPP and Tehrik-i-Istaqlal. Asghar Khan refused to join Zia cabinet and even withdrew from PNA. The party also demanded free and fair elections, withdrawal of Martial Law and restoration of democracy. For this purpose, it joined MRD and fully participated in the agitation against dictator’s rule. Due to his anti-Zia stance, Asghar Khan remained under house arrest for several years. Even the party decided to boycott the elections of 1985 in pursuance of the decision by the MRD.  

---

61 Asghar Khan served in different capacities in the institution of armed forces including Royal Indian Military College, Indian Military Academy at Dera Dun, Chief Flying Officer, Ambala, C-In-C, Pakistan Air force, First Pakistan Air Marshal, Deputy Martial Law Administrator under Ayub, PIA Chief. Through out his career, he held core positions in the military and civilian bureaucracy. His political fortune has seen ups and downs since his entry into politics in November 1968, he has largely been spared allegations of treachery to the nation, experienced by so many of his less fortunate compatriots in politics. He entered politics less than a week after the beginning of the anti-Ayub movement. He constantly talked of a national crisis in terms of Ayub failure to deliver the goods to the nation. He was younger than a majority of the established leaders of that time. First he formed the Justice party, but soon thereafter entered in negotiations for its merger into the PDP, despite opposition of the party’s local convenors. Asghar Khan’s decision to join hands with veterans of Pakistan Politics cost him heavily in the 1970 elections. In sheer frustration, he announced his decision to abandon politics altogether. However, Asghar Khan announced his re-entry into politics by forming Tehrike Istaqlal. Such fluctuations in politics indicated his lack of firmness which was reflected in his political stance over various issues. For example, after the emergence of Bangladesh, he first demanded its recognition from the Bhutto government, but when the latter recognized Bangladesh he started opposing it. Mohammad Waeeem, *Pakistan Under Martial Law 1977-1985*, PP. 114-118.

7. Quomi Mahaz Azadi.
8. Pakistan National Party,
Abdul Hamid Jatoi was the president of Pakistan National party, Sindh.
9. Kisan Mazdor Party,
Most of the parties of MRD faced contradictions owing to trust deficit and later on the meetings of MRD also exposed it. Most of these parties were willing to join the military government with a better status but the government was not willing to do so. That’s why, they had joined the movement.\(^{63}\)

**Manifesto**

1. The Military\(^{64}\) officer promised the Pakistani politicians and the public that election will be held within ninety days but he reluctantly created such circumstances in which the elections were not being arranged. He delayed the elections twice (1977 & 1979) and created mistrust within the pro-government political parties also. The manifesto of MRD was the free and fair elections in Pakistan.\(^{65}\) General Zia-ul-Haq was reluctant in holding elections due to his bad intentions. He wanted to prolong his rule in Pakistan but except few political parties, no one was ready to give him a long tenure of government. General Zia-ul-Haq did not want to give the power to the elected political parties who were not allowing him to rule over the country. General Zia wanted to create such a circle before elections that strengthened its rule after their victory in the elections. When he felt that it was not possible to gain the favors of the political parties, he decided to hold elections on non-party basis.

\(^{64}\) Military is a institution of a very particular kind. It is distinguished due to its monopoly over weapons and coercive power. The institution of military has a high level of internal discipline and strict hierarchy is being observed. A set of values and a culture separates it from those of civilian society. The perception has also developed within society that it embodies the national interest and so is above politics. The purpose of military is to be an instrument of war that can be directed against other political societies. It is also fact that the institution of military also operates as a powerful interest group that influences defence and foreign policy. It also helps the civilians in maintaining domestic order and stability when civilian mechanisms are unable or unwilling to act. This is institution is so much powerful that some times, it displaces civilian government with a form of military rule. Andrew Heywood, *Politics*, PP. 361-371.
\(^{65}\) Hamid Khan, *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan*, P. 356.
2. Democracy and political parties go side by side. Politic parties are the main players of democratic system and they handle the affairs of the government. In the dictatorship, the system and reforms are imposed by those figures who are not the representatives of the people. Such kind of government is least interested in the affairs of people but it is most interested in prolonging rule over the country. Political activities were strictly prohibited so that no party could challenge the dictator’s rule. Inspite of strict measures, the democratic parties made strenuous efforts for the restoration of democracy. In the same way, the demand of restoration of democracy was raised by the leaders of MRD which was not possible without free and fair elections on party bases. General Zia was reluctant in holding elections on party bases.

3. The third major demand was the revival of constitution of 1973. It was the first constitution in the history of Pakistan that had been introduced and approved by the elected government. It was a tremendous achievement of Bhutto government. Under the constitution of 1973, parliamentary form of government was introduced and ZAB ran the affairs of the state under this system which was not perhaps acceptable to any military dictator. Even the Art.6 of the constitution of 1973 closed the chapter of Martial Law with the statement

“All person who abrogates or attempt or conspires to abrogate, subverts or attempts or conspires to subvert the constitution by use of force or show of force or by other unconstitutional means shall be guilty of high treason

Any person aiding or abetting the acts mentioned in clause 1 shall like wise be guilty of high treason.”

The punishment of high treason was death penalty. Under the Article 6, General Zia-ul-Haq deserved committed a high treason. Under such circumstances, he could not restore the original constitution of 1973 which was the main demand of the leaders of MRD. He, like military officers, did not give importance to the constitution. While addressing a press conference in Tehran, Zia said,

“What is the constitution? It is the booklet with ten or twelve pages. I can tear the up and say that from tomorrow we shall live under a different system. Is

there anybody to stop me? Today the people will follow wherever I lead. All the politicians including the once mighty Mr Bhutto will follow me with their tails wagging. *67*

General Zia-ul-Haq, first, wanted to introduce amendments and modification in the constitution so that he might secure his position. He had also the desire to change the system of government from parliamentary to presidential. He raised the slogan of islamization in Pakistan and under this slogan he changed the shape of constitution to the maximum level.

4. MRD was against the newly adopted approach in foreign policy of Pakistan. The leaders of MRD criticized the government’s foreign policy especially the call to sever ties to the United States. They opposed the concept of alignment with USA and protested to establish Pakistan as a non-aligned state. *68*

5. On 11 May 1983, the leaders of MRD announced 31 points program for which the efforts would be made. Among those points, these were the remarkable key demands

(a) Greater provincial autonomy  
(b) An independent judiciary  
(c) Guarantee of fundamental rights  
(d) Lifting of restrictions on the press  
(e) Promotion of trade unions  
(f) An end to discrimination against women  
(g) No discrimination on religious basis.  
(h) Strict accountability of all civil and military personnel  
(i) Reduction in tax burdens on workers with fixed incomes  
(j) Clear demarcation between private industry and public corporations  
(k) Establishment of compulsory military training  
(l) To make Pakistan a non-aligned state  
(m) Questioned the heavy transfer of American weapons to Pakistan  
(n) Urged the government to pursue good relations with all the country’s neighbors

*67* Quoted in *Pakistan – A Dream Gone Sour* by Roedad Khan, PP. 87-88.  
*68* Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan At The Crosscurrent Of History*, P. 183
(o) Good relations with the Third World
(p) Cordial relations with Muslim countries.⁶⁹

6. The major motive of all the parties behind all demands was to unseat General Zia-ul-Haq. PPP was considering him enemy while the other parties had also annoyed with him due to some other reasons. Few leaders of PNA had left General Zia due to none of their shares in the ministries. While the leftist parties had annoyed with Zia-ul-Haq due to the exploitation of religion.⁷⁰

7. In 1986, MRD, headed by the workers of Pakistan People’s Party demanded the mid-term elections but it did not achieve its targets due to the following reasons
   (a) The demand of mid-term election did not gain firm footings within the people as the general elections were held in 1985.
   (b) There was a lack of unity among the parties who had joined MRD. Tehrik-i-Istaqlal did not support the movement and Khan Wali Khan had gone abroad.
   (c) Clashes had developed among the leaders of MRD. That’s why, there was a leadership crisis.⁷¹

Efforts

On 26 March 1981, the parties of MRD met at Lahore and passed a resolution against amendments in the constitution of 1973. The leaders issued the statement that Zia-ul-Haq had abrogated the constitution of 1973 and was therefore a traitor. Same the statement came from Baluchistan. These meetings also congratulated those judges who had refused to take oath.⁷²

MRD started agitation against the Zia regime in various cities of Pakistan. Students, doctors, actors, politicians and lawyers participated in the agitation. The middle and lower middle classes in Punjab showed the solidarity with PPP and tried to achieve the results at the platform of MRD. The persons from all sections of society joined the movement. Taxi driver, shopkeepers, small traders were the prominent workers of MRD. In Faisalabad, the lawyers fully agitated against Zia regime at the platform of MRD. The prominent personalities from

---

⁶⁹ Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan in the Twentieth Century-A Political History*, PP. 460-61.
⁷² Asghar Khan, *My Political Struggle*, P. 257.
Faisalabad were, Ch Talib Hussain, Zaman Khan, Badruddin Ch., Ch. Umer Draz, Shams Ul Islam Naz, Ahmed Saeed Awan, Fazal Hussain Rahi, Ghias uddin Janbaz. The people of Multan also strengthened the movement like Ch Arshad, Mukhtar Ahmed Awan. From Lahore, Atzaz Ahsin, Mahmood Butt were the prominent personalities. The students’ disturbances were started in Dargai, Rawalpindi, Lahore, Multan and Quetta. One student was injured and some were arrested by the police. The students of Karachi created disturbances and also burnt the jeep of Pakistan army on 25th February 1981. Lawyers also observed the day of 2nd March as a protest day against the government. They also protested against the miserable treatment with Yahya Bukhtair by the Quetta jail staff and demanded the dismissal of the jail superintendent. On 19th Oct. 1983, the lawyers again organized “a protest day against the martial law regime”. In Lahore, they tried to take out a procession but police created hurdles through throwing stones and bricks. A clash took place in the premises of Lahore High Court. The role of Talat Yaqub (Lawyer) was very remarkable in Lahore Bar Association. She used to shout at the male dominated Lahore Bar Association, throwing off her glass bangles and waving the Pakistani flag. She raised the slogans of democracy and challenged the clutches of the police. In Karachi, the same case came to surface. Few lawyers were injured and few were arrested by police. The doctors of Rawalpindi started to join the movement and arranged discussions on the demand of MRD on 27 Feb 1981. Near about twenty doctors were arrested by the government. One this action of government, the doctors all over the country decided to go on strike and demanded the release of the arrested doctors. They threatened that the strike would go on until their demand was not met. The students also contributed in the movements through the strikes in the institutions, especially in universities. The students in the Frontier province were the first to take to the streets. The protests also broke out in the institutions of Multan, Sheikupura, Bahawalpur and Quetta. In Lyari, the poorest section of Karachi, PPP and MRD organized rally and the poor people fully joined it. Busses, cars and trucks were burnt by the people and challenged the writ of the government. The police arrested the workers and tried to eliminate the demonstrations.

The poets, writers and scholars also contributed in the Movement for Restoration of Democracy through their writings, speeches and poems. Rehmattullah Manjothi, Naseer Mirza,

---

73 Interview with Amina Zaman, dated 1st August 2011.
75 Benazir Bhutto, *Daughter of the East*, P. 146.
76 Ibid., P. 292.
Tariq Alam, Adal Soomro were the renowned poets. In the rallies of MRD, the poems of the various poets were very chanted by the workers. The poetry of Manzoor Solangi were remark

“Manban, chhapran, ghar ghar mein golioon, fouji police chaway dharial paya golioon.”

The workers of MRD targeted the symbols of state authority – Jails, Police stations, Banks, Government Vehicles, Railway Stations and Judicial Institutions. At few places, they disrupted railway tracks also.

In Feb. 1983, the leaders of the MRD met in Lahore under the tight security from the government side. It was a violation of martial law regulations. The leaders decided to observe a “Political Prisoner’s day”. That meeting was dispersed by the police by force.

In August 1983, MRD led a forceful movement especially in Sindh. The Urban areas of the provinces remained quite but the interior of Sindh broke all expectations of the governments and the agencies. Especially in the districts of Sukkur, Larkana, Jacobabad, Khairpur, thatta, Dadu, Sanghar, the agitation started with a bang and was like a volcanic eruption. Such kind of agitation had never been seen in the interior of Sindh before this move of MRD. It was purely a rural agitation. Cars and buses were stopped from travelling. Police stations were burned. Hundreds of people lost their lives. The Waders of Interior Sindh put the moral, material and political support behind the agitation. It was the first time in the history of interior Sindh that the Waders went against the wishes of the establishment. Secondly they first time participated in the politics of agitation. It was the evident that political awareness had risen unperceived.

Another important factor was that MRD was organized from grass root level and pressure from below pushed the Waders into the movement. Abdul Hamid Jatoi, President of Pakistan National Party Sindh, says that

“The Wadera is basically ‘Buzdil’. He was pushed into this agitation due to pressure from the people, so it is essentially a question of survival for him.”
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But few Sindhi nationalists, like G.M. Sayid, refused to support the objectives of the MRD. He was of the opinion that the first objective of MRD was to save Pakistan while he was not interested in saving Pakistan. The second objective was the restoration of 1973 constitution which was unacceptable for him. Third objective of the agitation was the restoration of democracy and this objective would put the Sindhis in a minority cadre. He even said that

“*We are staying out of this agitation. It is not a popular movement. It is only led by PPP feudals for their lust of power. Like a Dog, the PPP is only seeking crumbs and bones. Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi joined in when he got a pat on the back for it from some American senators he had met.*”\(^83\)

It shows that the anti-Pakistan lobby in Sindh was not the part of MRD and even they refused to accept MRD as a popular movement. While few regional parties in Sindh strengthened the hands of MRD through providing vigorous support. One of them was Sindh Awami Tehrik (SAT)\(^84\) whose workers had courted arrest. Dadu, Tharparkar and Larkana were the districts where the power of the Awami Tehrik existed.\(^85\) In 1983, Zia visited Sindh and during this visit, he faced resistance in Dadu. The Sindhis compelled him to stay in the Rest House of Dadu for hours and the forces helped him to dismantle the pressure of the public. After that, he never visited Interior Sindh.\(^86\)

It is also said that the people of other provinces did not show so much interest as the people of Sindh had showed. They used to be viewed as a Sindhi movement which had been launched for the redressed of Sindhi grievances and removal of their sense of deprivation. Due to Sindhi tag on the movement, it lost its national appeal.\(^87\) Ayesha Jalal has also of the opinion that MRD failed to ignite the majority province of Punjab. The government had exerted influence over the local politics. She has the idea that

\(^83\) Quoted in *Pakistan’s Politics: The Zia Years* by Mushahid Hussain, P. 43
\(^84\) Sindh Awami Tehrik was established by Rasul Bux Paleejo in the early 70s. This organisation emerged as a new potent factor to be reckoned within the context of Sindhi politics. It commanded respect and admiration amongst a broad section of Sindhi. This Tehrik was against the Sindhi Wadera and Sindhi nationalist. It declared them pro-Americans and they did not desire any change in the socio-economic system. As opposed to the Sindhi nationalist slogan of “land should be free”, the Awami Tehrik responded with the line that “People should be free”. Sindhi nationalists spoke of “Sindhu Desh”, while the SAT was very much for a united federal Pakistan, although it did not hold the view that “Pakistan is a multinational state”. Mushahid Hussain, *Pakistan’s Politics: The Zia Years*, PP. 47-51.
\(^85\) Ibid., P. 48.
\(^86\) Azhar Sohail, *General Zia Ka Gyara Saal*, P. 98.
\(^87\) Roedad Khan, *Pakistan – A Dream Gone Sour*, P. 89.
“The regime’s policies of differential patronage and selective mobilization had won over substantial segments of Punjab’s dominant socio-economic strata, landlords and industrialists and, most promisingly, emergent commercial groups.”  

It is fact that the landlords and the industrialists did not play role in igniting the people of Punjab but the real power of PPP has always been middle and lower middle class. The workers and the trade unions of Punjab resented against the rule of dictator. In the major cities of Punjab, Lahore, Faisalabad and Multan, MRD was very successful in gathering the people. The Punjabis faced the cases and remained in jails due to their support of MRD.

In Baluchistan, the people did not actively participate in the campaign of MRD because they did not have any interest in the slogans. The restoration of democracy has never been remained important for the people of Baluchistan due to tribal system and less population than the other provinces of Pakistan. Baluch declared MRD as the part of American conspiracy which had been planned for changing status quo. But on the other hand, Pushtoons joined MRD and even faced jails.

Movement for Restoration of Democracy enlisted the services of labour unions. It was an effort to active the labor class against the autocratic rule of General Zia-ul-Haq. Due to labor reforms of ZAB and the slogan of socialism of PPP had created soft corner in the hearts of labor unions. The Pakistan Railway worker’s union decided to oppose to the government of General Zia-ul-Haq and support the slogans of MRD. On 26th Oct. 1983, factory and railway workers took out the procession in Lahore and shouted anti-martial law slogans. In the procession, near about ten thousands workers took part. Police tried to handle them with iron hand and the leader of workers, Bashir Zafar, was injured. Police tried to confine them to the railway premises. The workers became aggressive and burnt buses, cars and petrol pumps. They also burnt the portraits of Martial Law dictator.

On 8th November, 1981, General Zia-ul-Haq passed a statement that Pakistan was not ready for democracy. MRD condemned Zia’s statement and declared nominated federal advisory
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council as undemocratic and un-Islamic. MRD demanded the restoration of democracy in Pakistan as soon as possible.92

For implementing 31 points programme throughout the country, the leaders of MRD decided to hold a major protest meeting on 14th August 1983. They announced the date of Independence Day because Zia had the intentions to reveal a new political system on the occasion of nation’s independence holiday.93

In the elections of Local Bodies in 1979, few councilors got victory that had close link with PPP. In the movement of MRD against General Zia, these elected councilors agreed to resign from the membership of union councils and called for General Zia’s resignation from the post of chief of the army staff.94

Zia was not in a position to face the music of the political parties and he was also not in a position to win elections in a free atmosphere. For legalizing his position, he decided to hold referendum95. The referendum Order 1984 was passed, putting a complex question to the citizens but, in essence, endorsement of the process initiated by General Zia for Islamization in Pakistan. The referendum was held on 19th December 1984 with a question that

“whether the people of Pakistan endorse the process initiated by Gen. Muhammad Zia-Ul-Haq, the president of Pakistan, for bringing the laws of Pakistan in conformity with the injunctions of Islam as laid down in the Holy Quran and Sunnah of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) and for the preservation of the ideology of Pakistan, for the continuation and consolidation of that process, and for the smooth and orderly transfer of power to the elected representatives of the people.”96
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The leaders of Movement for Restoration of Democracy boycotted the referendum and refused to accept the results which had been announced by the government machinery. The faked results gave five years term to General Zia as President of Pakistan. No doubt, people did not participate fully in the referendum and some analysts put the turn out as low as 2 percent. In spite of this, Zia-ul-Haq took referendum as a vote of confidence on him.\textsuperscript{97} It was very strange that both the parties, General Zia and MRD declared it their victories after the results of referendum. The turnout in the election was as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Turnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>0-5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>5-25 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>35-40 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>10-15 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the Election Commission of Pakistan)

But according to official results, 67 percent of the registered voters voted in the referendum. 97 percent out of 67 percent gave vote in the favor of islamization. It was very interesting that officials on polling stations allowed everyone to vote and where the turn vote was low, they added votes. It was very difficult to differentiate votes cast by officials and not by voters.\textsuperscript{98}

The successful boycott of the 1984 referendum caused the MRD to miscalculate their next step. Being confident of public opinion, MRD boycotted the non-party based 1985 elections.\textsuperscript{99} From 14th to 16th Sept 1984, the meeting of the leaders of MRD held in Lahore and they decided to boycott any elections which were not free, fair and in accordance with the constitution of 1973. They also pledged to form an electoral alliance in any future elections in which the MRD would take part and after the election to stay together in the government. Later on, the central council of MRD was met from 18th to 19th January 1985.\textsuperscript{100} Their main demand was that the elections should not be held under Zia regime and that the 1973 constitution had to be restored before elections could take place. They also demanded that martial law should be lifted before elections and political prisoners should be released. It was also their suggestion that elections should be held on party basis. The leaders agreed that if these conditions were not met, they would not accept any election under martial law. All the political parties that had joined
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Movement for Restoration of Democracy not only refused to participate in the elections which were going to be held under the supervision of military government but also denied to accept the results of the elections. Contrary to the expectations of the leaders of MRD, the voters turned to the polls in large numbers. It was remarkable that few leaders of PPP participated in the elections and violated the party discipline. But Asghar Khan has a different opinion about turn out in the elections of 1985. He mentions the names of those districts in his book “My Political struggle” where the turnout was very low. Among those districts were Abbottabad, Karachi, Lahore, Rawalpindi, Peshawar, Mardan, Quetta, Sahiwal, Faisalabad, Vehari, Multan and Sargodha. The turnout in these areas was near about thirty percent but the Election Commission announced that 52.9 percent votes had been casted in the National Assembly polls. But Sartaj Aziz has refuted the argument of Asghar Khan with the statement that the voter’s turnout was quite impressive. Out of 33 million registered voters, 17.3 million or 53 percent cast votes for National Assembly candidates and 18.5 million or 57 percent for provincial assembly candidates. But later on in the elections of 1988, most of the parties of MRD put their candidates separately and won the seats from the different provinces of Pakistan.

“PPP later admitted that boycott was a mistake, and when Zia-ul-Haq announced elections in 1988, Benazir was quick to announce their participation on whatever basis.”

Sartaj Aziz also declares a wrong decision of PPP and MRD to boycott the elections of 1985 because the boycott left substantial political space for the political coalition which Zia ul Haq was trying to build.

Inspite of the boycott of MRD, the pressure of the opposition was so much on the government that they were very careful in the selection of the candidates. It was expecting that opposition would support anti-establishment candidates. General Fazal-e-Haq, Governor of NWFP passed a statement in the meeting that was organized by Zia-ul-Haq for the selection of the pro-establishment candidates in the coming elections that,
“Do not underestimate the opposition. Despite the boycott, they will support anti-establishment candidates. We have to disqualify some of these candidates otherwise the agitation will become unbearable.”

The female section of MRD was also very active. In Faisalabad, Lahore, Gujranwala, female workers of MRD distributed fruits to the workers in the jails. Amina, Ziae, Shahida Nafis, Ameena Zaman, Nasreen, Ruksana Zahoor, Nafis Siddiqui, Mrs Tahira Mazhar Ali Khan, Mumtaz Noorani, were the prominent personalities. Women’s Action Forum led by Mahnaz Rafi arranged a demonstration in Lahore on 12th February 1983 and two hundred women took part. The police used tear gas and button charges for dispersing the women. Aitzaz Ahsan’s mother and wife were put under house arrest in Lahore. On 24th Sept. 1983, the workers women took out a procession against the martial dictator in Lahore. During this procession, the police arrested fourteen women including Asma Jilani. Even the literary women also contributed in the movement against Zia regime. Atiya Dawood wrote the poetry against the oppression of opposition. Fahmida Riaz showed concern about the atrocities of Zia regime and the military courts in her poetry. Actually Zia government tried to reduce the social status of women through his policies. All the organizations of women protested against dictator and his policies. In these organizations, APWA, Democratic Women Association was remarkable.

Due to strict censorship and restrictions on the press, the journalists organized protest meetings and rallies in the different cities of Pakistan. They raised the voice against the brutal policies of Martial Law regime.

In jails, the prisoners used to boycott the jail administration and refused to take food. They came out of their barracks and agitated against the rule of martial law ruler and his atrocities on political workers. A riot took place in Sukkur jail where about a hundred political prisoners had been lodged. The police used baton charges against them and also fired in the air for creating fear within the prisoners.

PPP workers who fled Pakistan after the coup had settled in London. The city of London had also become the center of political activities. The brothers of Benazir Bhutto were also living
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there. She also settled in London after her exile from Pakistan. She launched a international campaign against General Zia and exposed maltreatment with political prisoners who were living their lives in jails. The workers of PPP launched a magazine “Amal” in which articles were issued regarding the cruel treatments with the prisoners.\footnote{Benazir Bhutto, 
_Daughter of the East_, P. 218, 229.}

On 14\textsuperscript{th} August 1988, MRD organized a public meeting in Rawalpindi against the rule of General Zia-ul-Haq. The gathering used to chant against dictator, while the leaders also challenged the dictator and his policies. They were informing the people that the time of the departure of dictator had come. Malik Qasim mentioned the departure of Zia in his speech and Tikka Khan, General Secretary of PPP, spoke against the “Jalandhri Group”. They also made it clear that they were not against the institution of army but against those who were defaming the institution through wrong policies.\footnote{Azhar sohail, 
_From Sindhri to Ojhri Camp_, P. 147.}

The workers of MRD who faced the atrocities of the dictator filed their petitions in the various courts. The remarkable were as under,

1. Affidavit of Bhai Khan of Village Ahmed Khan Brihmani,
2. Taluka; Mohammad Khan v. Abdul Sami, Petition to Additional Sessions Judge, Dadu, P.E. No. 31 of 1986, and Mohammad Khan v. Abdul Sami and 14 others, Court of Civil Judge and First Class Magistrate,
3. Dadu; Abdul Moula Shah v. Province of Sind and 2 others, Court of Senior Civil Judge,
4. Tando Mohammad Khan; The State v. Abdul Rehman Bhatti, Sub-divisional Magistrate, Tando Mohammad Khan’, Allah Dino v. Muhammad Malook and 7 others, Civil Court petition.\footnote{Quoted in Paula R. Newberg, 
Judging the state, _Courts and constitutional politics in Pakistan_, P. 192}

**Oppressive Policies of the government**

Zia government was in trouble due to agitation in the various cities of Pakistan. It set up a Joint Security Committee under the chairmanship of Roedad Ahmed Khan\footnote{Roedad Khan was a civil servant of Pakistan. He joined the civil services of Pakistan in 1949. He rendered his services on servaal important appointments, including those of Chief Secretary Sindh, secretary ministry of Interior,}. The committee
consisted of all Home Secretaries, all heads of special branches, the Director Intelligence Bureau and the Director General ISI. The major task of the committee was to review and monitor the law and order situation. It was also the duty of the Committee to anticipate events to make intelligence forecasts and take preventive actions.\textsuperscript{116}

The instructions were issued to the provincial governments to ensure the condition of law and order. The governors of the provinces were as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor’s Name</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant General Fazle Haq</td>
<td>NWFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant General Abbasi,</td>
<td>Sindh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahimuddin,</td>
<td>Balochistan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The governors ensured the Martial Law administration that peace would be maintained at every cost. Restrictions were imposed on traveling of the opposition leaders and tried to dismantle the public meetings. B.B. has also mentioned in her book “Daughter of the East” the order of the Governor of Punjab regarding her entry in the Punjab. It was the following order:

“.........your entry in the Punjab as deemed as prejudicial to public safety and maintenance of public order as well as public interest.”\textsuperscript{117}

From 28\textsuperscript{th} to 31\textsuperscript{st} December 1985, all governors had been changed. Inspite of all strenuous efforts, the previous governors had failed in satisfying the martial law regime. The new names of the governors were as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor’s Name</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Musa</td>
<td>Balochistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghafoor Hoti</td>
<td>NWFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawab Sajjad Qureshi</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant General Jehandad</td>
<td>Sindh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reactionary activities were started by the government against the opposition leaders. The leaders of MRD were arrested by the officers of Police on the directions of Martial Law dictator.
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Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan, leader of Pakistan Democratic Party, was sent to jail, Asghar Khan was on house arrest, and the main leadership of PPP was deported. Khwaja Khairuddin, Secretary General of the MRD was repeatedly arrested. The workers were arrested by the police and sent to jail. General Tikka Khan was placed under house arrest on 23rd February 1981 in Abbottabad. Nasirullah Khan Babar, Aftab Sherpao, Samd Khan were arrested in Peshawar on the same day. On 8th February 1985, Wali Khan, his wife, Syed Munir Shah, Syed Mukhtiar Bacha was arrested in Peshawar. In Multan, Khalilur Rehman was sentenced to one year imprisonment. In Punjab, the jails of Lahore, Faisalabad, Sahiwal and Multan were used for keeping the leaders of MRD. The government kept detains the leaders for at least two to four months. In these months, they were sent from one jail to other jail. B.B. had been brought to Karachi jail from Sukkur. Rafi Butt and Fazaly Bhaty were sent to Gujarwanwala jail from Rawalpindi. Mian Mahmud Ali Kasuri had been shifted from Kot Lakhpat to Sahiwal jail. Aitzaz Ahsan from Multan to Lahore and Qayyum Pahat from Lahore to Multan. Asaf Vardag had been sent to Bahawalpur jail from Faisalabad. Omer Kasuri and Khurshid Kasuri were moved to Kot Lakhpat from camp jail Lahore. Mahnaz Rafi was moved to Kot Lakhpat jail from Lahore. In Faisalabad, few leaders of PPP were law abiding gentlemen who went into custody of the police with grace while few went to underground. In Faisalabad district, the workers were arrested by Police. Ch. Umer Daraz, syed Zulifkar Bukhari, Zaman Khan went into the police custody and faced the jails. In those days, Major Arif was DIG (Prison) and he was the friend of Zaman Khan (Due to this relation, the wife of Zaman Khan could easily manage the breakfast, lunch and dinner in the jail. She appreciates the system of jails of those days). Due to the fear of the government, few leaders of MRD disappeared from the scene for time being so that the police could not arrest them. Ch Talib Hussain, Cap. Nisar Akbar, Ahmed Saeed Awan, Faisal Saleh Hyat, Badar ud Din, Rana Aftab Ahmed Khan and Ch. Zaheer-ud-Din were among those leaders who disappeared from the scene and went to underground. Ghulam Mustafa Khar was also arrested and sent to the central jail of Faisalabad where he remained for four months. The directions of the home secretary regarding Khar were very strict and orders were passed to
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keep him in isolation. The agents of the special branches were deputed in the jails for vigilance of the visitors who came to see the detainees. Despite all these measures, the Divisional Administration adopted a mild attitude towards him because the Divisional Commissioner had been a secretary of Mustafa Khar when he was governor of Punjab.\textsuperscript{121} In Lahore, Kaswar Gardezi, Malik Qasim, and two sons of Mohammad Ali Qasuri were arrested by the Lahore police. Mian Mahmood Ali Qasuri was also sent to Kot Lakhpat jail. Khurshid and Omar Kasur were in camp jail in Lahore. The police of Sindh also captured the political workers. Over fifty persons had been arrested in Karachi. While Mardan was also the city where the workers were not safe from the atrocities of police department. Kaneez Fatima, a labor leader was also arrested in Mardan on 23\textsuperscript{rd} March 1981.\textsuperscript{122} Fazil Rahu, MRD leader, was axed to death in his home village. Bashir Riaz, former editor of Amal in London, received the threatening calls.\textsuperscript{123}

The workers were being arrested without any investigation and their relatives were not allowed to see them in jails. Under these circumstances, the person had not the right to appeal to the High Court against the decisions of military courts and Martial Law Orders. The government restricted the people to get relief from judiciary through Ordinance in 1980. The Ordinance was as under;

\textquote{Amended the article 199 of the constitution barring high courts from reviewing Martial Law Orders or challenging the judgments of military courts. Any person could now be detained without being told the charges against him.}\textsuperscript{124}

The arrested workers faced the military courts which were established by Zia regime. The military courts awarded lashes and imprisonment to citizens for participation in the protest rallies against the military regime. The most of the workers of PPP bore the lashes and imprisonment which was announced by military courts. The example of Hala Town can be quoted here. In 1983, more than fifty persons were awarded lashes and imprisonment by the military courts in the Hala town.\textsuperscript{125} Eighteen political prisoners were about to be tried by a military court in Rawalpindi.\textsuperscript{126}
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Flogging sentences were also granted to the workers by the military courts. The sentences of flogging were displayed on the public places so that terror and harassments might be spread in the whole country. It was an effort to stop the movement against Zia regime.\(^{127}\)

Punjab government tackled the movement very carefully and therefore it petered out sooner than expected.\(^{128}\) The Chief Minister of Punjab, Mian Nawaz Sharif\(^{129}\), adopted a very strict poster towards the bureaucracy and warned them that if the Movement became succeeded, the existing officers would be replaced with competent officers who were waiting for their postings. He even convened the meeting of the Commissioners and suggested them to eliminate the movement at every cost. The Chief Minister called the meeting of his cabinet on the issue of MRD. The ministers and the MPAs, like Ghulam Haider Wyne, Sardarzada Zafar Abbas from Chiniot suggested that the movement be crushed with an iron hand. A decision was taken to pick up all leaders of the opposition.\(^{130}\) The major confrontation between MRD and the Punjab government developed on 14\(^{th}\) August 1985, when the police attempted to arrest the MRD’s leaders when they were holding a public meeting in Lahore, four people were killed in this clash. This time, The Punjab witnessed more agitation.\(^{131}\)

The government sent army in the rural Sindh for crushing the campaign of MRD. 20,000 people were arrested by the military officers and made strenuous efforts for snubbing the workers. Severe operation was launched in the districts of Sukkur, Larkana, Jacobabad and Khaipure. The governor Sindh admitted that in the opening three weeks of the struggle, 1999 were arrested, 189 killed and 126 injured.\(^{132}\) It is said that most of military officers who were working in the operation were Punjabis and they misused the powers through raped with women, burned houses and cattle stolen.\(^{133}\) Such kind of exaggeration cannot be accepted because the


\(^{129}\) Industrialist and politician from Punjab. He became Chief Minister of Punjab in 1985 after the partyless elections. He was part of the new political leadership cultivated by both General Zia and Junejo. He served as the caretaker chief minister of Punjab during the period between the dismissal of the assemblies (May 1988) and the November 1988 elections. After the 1988 elections, he was one of the few Pakistan Muslim League leaders to continue in power. He was a leader of the nine party Islami Jamhoori Ittehad group established to challenge the PPP in the national and provincial elections. Shahid Javed Burki & Craig Baxter, *Pakistan Under the Military, Eleven Years of Zia Regime*, PP. 188-191.

\(^{130}\) Aminullah Chaudry, *Political Administrators*, P. 204.

\(^{131}\) Hamid Khan, *constitutional and Political History of Pakistan*, P. 678.

\(^{132}\) Ian Talbot, *Pakistan-A Modern History*, P. 253.
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movement was equally powerful in Punjab. The Punjabi workers faced the jails and cases due to their participation in MRD.

The Special Branch prepared the lists of the problem creators of MRD and PPP. The list was designed police station wise. These lists served as guidelines for the police officers and all the pinpointed persons was picked up and sent to jail. These lists were very inaccurate and imprecise. Directions were issued by the Home secretaries to DIGs, SPs and DCs to follow the lists and arrest the persons at every cost. The intelligence agents used to hijack the houses of the workers. The telephones were being recorded or disconnected. The telephones of the house of Malik Haider Sultan were disconnected on 21st March 1981. The agents of agencies ordered the linesmen not to connect the connections of telephone. It has always been the policy of the dictators to use the agencies against the opponents. On the reports of the agencies, the actions are taken. Agencies adopted the different ways for getting information. They engage such kind of people who look like ordinary persons of the society. People cannot expect from them that they will provide any kind of information. Secondly, the servants of the agencies visited the houses of the political workers and sought information about their business, their family etc. sometimes they embarrassed the innocent people. The reports are very good if proper and lavish treatment is given to them during their visit. Sometimes, the information was also full of personal grievances.

The government tried to splinter the opposition through different incentives. Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi was offered the Prime Ministership. The party workers of PPP were being offered rupees for leaving the party. B.B. has quoted the name of Dhoki, the son of the poor PPP leader, who was offered rupees.

The alliance was defamed with the allegations on the leaders of MRD that they had also a programme of sabotaging the state through strikes, demonstration, social boycott and civil disobedience. Ian Talbot also mentions the anti-state activities of MRD especially in Sindh. General lawlessness was prevailing over the whole province in which dacoits robbed the houses of the people.

Censorship and restrictions were imposed on the press and electronic media by the government of Martial Law dictator. The media was used against the opposition parties. Most of
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the television news was telecasted against the opposition. The statements of those opposition leaders, who had been purchased by the government, were being telecasted. On 21st March 1981, in the evening news, Radio Pakistan gave news about the press conference of Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan of Azad Kashmir as chairman of MRD for the month of March. This news conveyed the message to the workers of MRD that all the parties of MRD would suspend all activities. The media disclosed that A.Q.Khan had convinced that Pakistan People’s Party was involved in hijacking affair. On the other hand, the newspapers which were being issued by the workers of MRD had been banned with different allegations. The newspaper, *Haider*, was being issued by Rafi Butt from Azad Kashmir. The government banned it with the allegation that it was propagating pro-Israel and pro-Mascow views.  

In Sindh, those newspapers which were published in Sindhi Language came under cloud. Such newspapers were banned by the government. That’s why; there were fewer chances for the scholars and thinkers to write in the newspapers. Under these conditions, they had to publish their writings from India. Due to Indian enmity, they were immediately declared the traitors. Few newspapers faced restrictions due to Zia’s personal grievances also. Even “The Sun’, an English newspaper was banned by Zia due to personal grievances.

The government even tried to utilize the mosques against the opposition. In Friday congregations, the Imam Masjids condemned the opposition of the government and declared them Kafir (Non-Muslims). It was the real exploitation of the slogan of Islamization.

The workers were tortured by the Zia regime. In the torture cells, they were given very tough time through severe punishments. Baldia Centre, Division 555 in Karachi (555 was notorious, the headquarters of the Central Intelligence Agency in Karachi), Lahore Fort, Birdwood Barracks in Lahore, Mach jail and Khalli camp were the renowned torture centers where the supporters of MRD and PPP were kept. PPP lawyer of Peshawar, Kanwar Abbas, was tortured by the police and he had to admit in hospital for treatment. Former Attorney General, Yahya Bukhtair was beaten up in Quetta by the jail staff. The same case came to surface in Faisalabad jail also. Syed Moin Shah was being kept in a condemned prisoner’s cell without fan and light. Due to unpleasant atmosphere and stress of the jail staff, he suffered a
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heart attack on 14th May 1981 and was taken to district hospital for treatment. Sherbaz Mazari was arrested in forest rest house in Multan district and during his arrest, he met heart attack. Haji Yusaf Lacewala died in Karachi jail on 5th sept 1983. Imdad Chandio was beaten in Larkana police station. Few even met their death in the torture cells, like Nazir Abbasi, Hameed Baloch, Annayat Maseh, Gul sher Khan, Lala Asad, whose dead body was taken from military torture cell.

Students had also participated in the movement very forcefully. They even launched protests in the universities and colleges. The Zia government closed down all universities of Pakistan for few days so that the pressure of MRD might be maximized. The cases were registered against the students of universities. Student unions were banned by the government.

The government also restricted the activities of the workers to their provinces and districts. Amina’s entry into Sindh was banned. Under Martial Law Order 48, she was not allowed to enter in Sindh. Mian Mahmud Ali Qasuri was also banned from entering into Sindh. Ghaus Bux Bizenjo was expelled from Sindh, Punjab and NWFP. He was confined to Balochistan. Syed Munir Shah was externed from Punjab due to his speech at Gujranwala Bar Association. Sherbaz Mazari was externed from Sindh for ninety days.

For crushing the opposition, the dictator issued different Ordinances in different years which curtailed the efforts of anti-Zia lobby. The remarkable Ordinances in this regard were as under

- Martial Law Order No. 5
  
  “Any one organizing or attending a meeting of trade union, students union or political party without permission from the Martial Law Administrator will receive up to ten lashes and five years’ imprisonment.”

- Martial Law Order No. 13
  
  “Criticizing the army in speech or writing will be punished by ten lashes and five years’ imprisonment.”

- Martial Law Order No. 16
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“Seducing a member of the army from his duty to the Chief Martial Administrator, General Zia ul-Haq, was punishable by death.”

- On 27th September 1982, Zia regime passed a Martial Law Order which provided the chance to the dictator to crush the opposition. That Order gave the power to the government to give the sentence of death that damaged government property or created insecurity or frightened people. This Order was implemented from 5th July 1977. The Order could not be challenged in a court of law. The accused was presumed guilty unless he proves himself to be innocent. Under the Order, the accused was to be tried by a Martial Law court, which would deal with the case on the basis of police evidence or opinion.

- Ordinance, 12th August 1983

“If any employee of the government found involved in the politics, he would be punished fourteen years.”

On 5th June 1984, the government withdrew its orders against the landlords of Sindh and ordered a review of the implementation of the 1959 and 1972 land reforms. It was time when MRD was its height due to help of landlords of Sindh. Through these orders, the Zia regime put pressure on the feudal elements in the Pakistan People’s Party who were playing a leading role. The government used tactics to get the favors of the landlords.

The government made its policies as per schedule of the MRD. Whenever and wherever, the meetings of the coalition were announced, the government sealed off the roads of that city where the meeting was going to be held. The activities of the leaders were being monitored.

Government tried to impose new labor policy which was stridently opposed by most workers unions. Due to the pressure of the worker’s unions, it was not implemented despite repeated demands by industrialists.

The incident of the highjacking of a plan of Pakistan International Airline opened a new chapter of oppressive activities against the MRD and PPP workers. In different cities, police...
arrested the people and sent them to jail. In Kot Lakhpat jail, fifty four persons were charged with criminal conspiracy and sedition for their alleged involvement with Al-Zulfikar. All of them were sentenced to life imprisonment along with forty others in absentia, including Mir Murtaza and Shah Nawaz. Jehangir Badar (Additional Secretary General of the PPP Punjab), Shaukat Mahmood (General Secretary), Nazim Shah (Finance Secretary), Mukhtar Awan (a former minister) and Faisal Hayat (Landowner) were arrested by the police and tried to establish their links with the incident. Multan, the warrants were issued of the few persons like Dr. Anwar Hussain, Anees Advocate, Mr. Rauf. The police arrested most of the Anwars of Multan in a suspicion. The workers went underground due to the fear of arrest. Anwar Hussain took shelter in the house of his pupil, Mehdhi Abbasi Khan. Mohsin Naqvi also remained in that house for many days. In Sindh, Lala Assad (Later on, he was shot dead by police), the vice president of the student’s wing in Sindh, and Naseer Baloach who was the representative of Pakistan People’s Party in the gigantic Karachi steels Mills, was also arrested by the police. Lala Assad was being sought as a leader of Al-Zulfikar. Pervaz Ali Shah, a leading member of Sindh PPP was also arrested at that time when he was playing cricket with his son. Qazi Sultan Mahmood, General Secretary of the PPP in Rawalpindi city, was arrested again and taken first to Rawalpindi jail, then Gujranwala jail and then to the Lahore Fort. The government agencies even did not spare the women and arrested them. Nasira Rana (her husband was the member of MRD and the police wanted to arrest him who was in Karachi at that time. She was arrested from Lahore and kept in Lahore fort), Begum Arif Bhutti (her husband had been a provincial minister
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156 Dr. Anwar Hussain was born in 11 July 1947. His family settled in Multan and he got his early education from the institutions of Multan. He passed Matric from Muslim High School. He did master in Urdu from Punjab University Lahore and PhD from the same institution. In 1971, Anwar Hussain started his career as a lecturer from government college Quetta. In 1984, he came in BZU Multan and retired from his service on 10th June 2007. After his retirement, he engaged himself in GC University Faisalabad and brought changes in the Urdu department. He launched PhD program in Urdu. He had a close liason with then vice chancellor, Dr Arif Ali Zaidi. On the resignation of the vice chancellor, he also decided to leave Faisalabad. The writer contested the election of General secretary in the elections of Academic staff Association. Dr Anwar Hussain played the role in the success of myself and my group. He left Faisalabad in 2009 and went to Osaka university Japan. He is the writer of six books. Now a days, he is serving as a chairman Maqdadra Qoumi Zaban, Islamabad. *Daily Express*, August 17, 2011.
158 Nasser Baloach was being tried in the military court for charges for complicity in the hijacking. It was charge which could result in a sentence of death. After his arrest, he remained in jail for two years but the military regime could not bring before a military court within two years. When he was presented in the military court, it was being expected that death penalty would be awarded to him as the time proved. The magazine “Amal” issued the articles about Baloach’s unfair and cruel treatment. But on 5 November, 1984, the military court, in its final verdict, announced the death penalty for him. Nasser Baloach was sentenced to ‘hang by the neck until dead. on 5th March, he was hanged. Benazir Bhutto, *Daughter of the East*, P. 229.
as well as revenue minister for the Punjab. The police wanted to arrest her husband but he was not at home at that time. That’s why police arrested and interrogated her), Farkhanda Bukhari and Mrs Safooran became the political prisoners and spent few days of their lives in torture cells due to their loyalties with MRD and PPP.\textsuperscript{159}

It is also said that the issue of high jacking was planned by Zia regime for gaining multiple purposes. One, he tried to divide the members of MRD on the issue of high jacking and secondly he put the responsibility on the shoulders of Murtaza Bhutto. Thirdly, he used to crush the political leaders.\textsuperscript{160}

The assassination of Ch. Zahur Elahi provided the opportunity to the government to suppress political opposition. The warrants of the hundreds workers were issued and arrested. Near about 103 young men were in Haripur jail alone. Electric shocks were being given during interrogations. The workers were also pressurized to give evidence against Ms.Bhutto.\textsuperscript{161}

The family of Z.A.Bhutto had come under fire due to two factors; one was Bhutto-Zia rivalry and second was the key role of PPP in MRD. B.B. was deported to London and conspiracy was designed to punish the sons of Bhutto. During their stay in Kabul, Zia managed the mujahedeen against them. The mujahedeen hired one of the servants of Mir Murtaza to give poison to the both brothers but the secret could not get success and the servant confessed to the crime.\textsuperscript{162}

Even General Zia-ul-Haq tried to highjack the movement of MRD through inducting such personalities which would ultimately run the movement according to the directions of the government.\textsuperscript{163}

General Zia Constructed alliances between the military, paramilitary forces, police and feudal landlords to break the MRD and the PPP in Sindh. Individuals were detained for raising party flags in their villages or for living in villages with PPP supporters. Political demonstrations were not banned; instead, law enforcement agencies attacked processions in progress. Entire villages were assaulted and burned.\textsuperscript{164}

\textsuperscript{159} Benazir Bhutto, \textit{Daughter of the East}, P. 158, 165.
\textsuperscript{161} Benazir Bhutto, \textit{Daughter of the East}, P. 189.
\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., P. 248.
\textsuperscript{163} Azhar Sohail, \textit{Gen Zia Ka Gyara Saal}, P. 98.
\textsuperscript{164} Paula R. Newberg, \textit{Judging the state, Courts and constitutional politics in Pakistan}, P. 192
Causes of Failure

Suddenly an incident occurred that not only changed the direction of people but also created resentment against PPP. A plane of Pakistan International Airline was high jacked by a terrorist organization, named Al-Zulifkar\(^{165}\). This organization was working under the supervision of Bhutto’s son Ghulam Murtaza who was the General Secretary. The kidnappers went to Kabal with Pakistani plane and then Damascus. Murtaza Bhutto met the hijackers in Kabul. The main demand of the hijackers was the release of the political workers. They also gave the ultimatum to the Pakistani government. On 10\(^{th}\) March 1981, the hijackers gave the list of fifty five prisoners whom they wanted release. The names of Kamaal Warsi, Shabir Shar, Sohail Sangi, Jaam Saqi, Prof. Jamaal Naqvi were also included in the list. At that time, they were in different jails and were being trialed in military courts. These personalities were committed communists and wanted to fight for their cause with the Zia regime. When the hijackers gave the list of prisoners, the govt tried to take their pictures for passport purpose because the highjackers had also demanded to free them and sent to them to Kabal. The above mentioned names refused to give their pictures and also denied to leave their country because they wanted to fight within the state. Even Jamaal Saqi locked the barrack of the jail from inside so that the jail staff could not take his picture. They were so much brave that they even challenged the military courts in the presence of those military judges who were presiding over the court. In the courts, the leaders of PPP came for giving evidence in their favor. Among those were Benazir Bhutto, Shaikh Rashid, Miraj Muhammad Khan, Fateh Yab Ali Khan. The leaders of the other parties also supported them in the courts, like Wali Khan, Ghaus Baksh Bazanjo. Few prisoners met their deaths in the torture cells.\(^{166}\) But Benazir Bhutto admits in her book “Daughter of the East” that she had never met Jaam Saqi before the evidence in court. Jaam Saqi had opposed Z.A.Bhattu during his rule. Now B.B. commented in his book that

\(^{165}\) Al-Zulfikar was established by two sons of Z.a.Bhutto, basing their operations in Libya. It was a terrorist organization. The sons of ZAB were tried in absentia for the murder of a Pakistani diplomat and it did not take a great deal of imagination to link them with the army plotters. Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan At The Crosscurrent Of History*, P. 189.

\(^{166}\) Nisar Hussain (ed), *Zamir Ka Qaidi*, P. 5-10.
“Jaam Saqi had called upon a number of prominent politicians to define the issues to determine whether the charges against him were valid or not. I was more than willing to discuss the illegality of Martial Law."\textsuperscript{167}

This incident of highjacking provided an opportunity to the military dictator to arrest the workers of MRD. The blame was given to the workers of PPP and they faced the jails.\textsuperscript{168} On 4\textsuperscript{th} March 1981, the hijackers released eighteen women and nine children but all the release persons did not have any relation with PPP. But on the other hand, the hijackers killed the son of Major General Qazi Rehman on 5\textsuperscript{th} March 1981. The death of the son military officer provided the chance to government to use it for its benefit. The Pakistan media tried to establish its link with PPP. The leadership of the party was house arrested.\textsuperscript{169}

After the incident of highjacking, the media used to ignore the efforts of MRD and decided to highlight the incident. The different newspapers issued the different news. Few were declaring that Mir Murtaza took the responsibility of the highjacking while few newspapers were denying from such kind of responsibility. The media also tried to establish link with PPP and Al-Zulifkar. It was declared that Al-Zulifkar was the armed wing of Pakistan People’s Party. The whole coverage was being given to Al-Zulifkar, PPP and Mir Murtaza. The interviews of Mir Murtaza were being published in different newspapers. He even denied from any kind of links with PPP. But inspite of this, the role of media remained very bleak during the whole movement. Media plays important role in developing the thinking of the people.\textsuperscript{170}

The family of Z.A.Bhutto had divided on different approaches towards Zia regime. Mir Murtaza Bhutto believed that ‘only violence can answer violence’. But B.B. disagreed from this approach and believed that ‘violence only breads violence’. She insisted that any permanent change must come peacefully and politically through elections. She believed on the strength of the people not on violence.\textsuperscript{171} There is no blinking fact that these different approaches not only harmed the movement but also provided the opportunity to arrest the political workers.

The second major event was the murder of Ch. Zahuur Elahi, one of the ministers in Zia’s military cabinet. On 25\textsuperscript{th} Sept.1981, he was ambushed in Lahore and shot dead. He was the person who had accepted Zia’s pen as a gift after General Zia signed Z.A.Bhutto’s death warrant.

\textsuperscript{168} Hamid Khan, \textit{Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan}, PP. 356-57
\textsuperscript{169} Asghar Khan, \textit{My Political Struggle}, P. 251, 251.
\textsuperscript{171} Ibid., P. 244.
Again, the name of Al-Zulfikar was highlighted by the government and declared it the real responsible of the murder of Zahur Elahi. Mir Murtza in his interview to BBC took the credit of the assassination. Government used to find out the supporters of Al-Zulfikar from the workers of PPP and MRD. In this way, the series of arrests began. The opposition parties showed lack of unity due to ideological differences, mutual jealousies, and clash of leadership. Maulana Fazlur Rehman who was arrested on 24th February 1981 passed the statement that he joined the movement and signed its declaration in his individual capacity and as the representative of JUI. It was the reason that the workers of JUI were not arrested. The leadership of Tehrik-i-Istiqlal had some doubts about the leadership of NDP. On 2nd Sept. 1981, Sardar Shaukat Hayat moved a suggestion of the meeting of all political parties of MRD on 11 Sept 1981 at Karachi. Asghar Khan opposed this idea with the allegation that half of these parties had soft corners for government. Even the parties of MRD had some suspicions about Khawaja Khairuddin who was the president of Qasim Muslim League. On 14th May 1981, the Nawa-i-Waqt broke news after his release from jail that Khawaja had decided to join Pagara-JUI alliance and left the politics of opposition. Even the role of Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi was being taken with doubts. He was not arrested by the government during the whole scenario. He was also known for his pro-government leanings. He was ready to accept General Zia as the head of state. In his meeting with Pagara, Ch. Arshad and Maulana Noorani on 2nd March 1982, it was decided that Zia-ul-Haq should form a national government with himself as the head and this national government should hold election. The leaders of MRD did not like such kind of his meetings with pro-Zia political parties. Nasrullah Khan was very critical about the role of Tehrik-e-Istaklal. Some prominent personalities of TI had joined the federal council of General Zia. Among them were Fakhruz Zaman Khan, Begum Sahiba Shakil, Ch. Mumtaz Tarar, Qurban Ali Chauhan, Ayub Khan of Elahi and Chakar Khan Domki. Even TI had also refused to support the 31 points programme of MRD and declared that it would only support four point agenda of MRD only. The workers of TI had also divided into two groups, one group, J.A.Rahim, Mushir Pesh Immam, Munir Shah, Shahida Jameel, Zahoor Butt, etc was insisting on leaving the alliance and the second group, Rana Arshad, Khurshid Kasuri, Aitzaz Ahsan, Mahnaz Rafi, Azhar Hussain, etc was stressing on the cooperation with the parties of MRD. The leadership of PPP was also not clear about the politics of TI. Rao Rashid accused Asghar Khan of
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172 Benazir Bhutto, Daughter of the East, P. 188.
being in league with the US, and the TI and Asghar Khan in believing in coming to power through intrigue and the army’s help. Even in a public meeting of MRD at Mochi Gate on 29th January 1986, PPP workers refused to listen the speech of Asghar Khan and clashes had started among the leaders of PPP and TI. Due to these differences, TI decided to withdraw from MRD. 173 Few member parties of MRD were afraid of Pakistan People’s Party’s electoral strength. Even the workers of PPP were hesitating in joining the movement due to Jatoi’s meetings with American officials and army officers. But with the intervention of Benazir Bhutto, they decided to unite against Zia regime.174 JUI chief objected to Benazir’s candidature for MRD convener ship on the plea that she was a woman. But on the interference of Wali Khan, he was convinced.175

MRD suffered from the weakness as it failed to get any support from the Muslim League, Jamaat-i-Islami and Jamiat-e-Ulema-i-Pakistan.

The landlords of Sindh adopted a mild attitude towards the Zia government due to his policies regarding land reforms. Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi and Abid Zuberi used to stress on the negotiations with government. Abid Zuberi wrote a letter to Malik Qasim who was the acting Secretary General of MRD. In his letter, he stated that

“A continuance of the movement would endanger the feudal socio-economic order and the present social order should maintain.”

Ayesha Jalal has of the opinion that

“The attraction of gaining access to state power and patronage were far more tempting than the magnetism of individuals and parties.”177

The government used to give rewards to the politicians for collaboration with the state and this strategy weakened the disciplines of the political parties. Even the workers of PPP welcomed Zia-ul-Haq in Sindh during his first tour to Sindh after the assassination of Z.A.Bhutto. Few councilors of PPP who had been elected in the elections of local bodies in 1979 met General Zia in Sindh. Even the son of Sindh PPP chief was also one of them. Benazir Bhutto who was house arrest at that time tried to convey message to the leadership of PPP that they should issue the direction to the councilors that they should not meet General Zia but all her efforts went into

175 Prof. Khalid Mahmood, Pakistan’s Political Scene 1984-1992, P. 90.
176 Asghar Khan, My Political Struggle, P. 329.
177 Ayesha Jalal, Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia, p. 106.
dustbin. The rewards of the government compelled the councilors to violate the principles of party.178

Asghar Khan comments on the failure of MRD with the words

“I feel that perhaps the most important reason for it being unable to mobilize public opinion is its failure to put up a clear alternative to Zia-ul-Haq’s regime. The people did not accept the MRD as an alternative as they rightly felt that MRD could not run the country in the event of martial law ending and political power being handed over to it.”179

Lack of coordination with the leaders of MRD and PPP. Benazir Bhutto wanted to boycott the elections of National and provincial assemblies while the other leadership of MRD wanted to contest elections. B.B had also admitted in his autobiography that

“I did not know what to do, nor did I know what the members of MRD in Pakistan were planning to do.”180

Later on, she was convinced that her party and the alliance should boycott the elections. Even she recorded tape in Urdu and sindhi calling for the masses to boycott the elections. Inspite of this, the candidates who had claimed association with Pakistan Peoples Party contested the elections. Fifty two such kinds of candidates appeared during the polls and among them, fifty won the elections.181

On August 14 demonstrations as announced by MRD, B.B. did not want the demonstrations directly and only built pressure on the government. While the leaders of MRD had planed to launch demonstrations in the whole country. About Such kind of difference with leadership, She has mentioned in “Daughter of the East”,

“I was caught on the horns of dilemma. Either the coalition between the MRD and the PPP would be severed or I had to acquiesce. The consensus was that we should participate in the demonstrations. I was the only dissenting vote out of nine.”182

178 Benazir Bhutto, Daughter of the East, P. 205.
179 Asghar Khan, My Political struggle, P. 296, 304.
180 Benazir Bhutto, Daughter of the East, P. 235.
181 Ibid., P. 237.
182 Ibid., P. 289.
After the elections of 1985, Muhammad Khan Junejo formed the federal government and the MRD adopted two track approaches towards the Junejo government, accusing it of being an extension of martial law, while negotiating within when necessary.

B.B., after her arrival in Pakistan (10th April 1986), had become cynical about Pakistan’s politicians. Her autocratic style in party decisions and with the party workers annoyed those people who had struggled against Zia regime under MRD. In the coming elections, she was eager for her party not campaign on MRD tickets. She wanted to contest elections without the support of MRD. She wanted to convince the leaders of MRD that they were nothing without Pakistan People’s Party and on the other hand she assured the party leaders that they owed their political existence to her. While the leaders of MRD wanted the insurance that each component of MRD would get a share in the spoils of victory.

On the other hand, she did not have faith on those party leaders who were associates of her father and were secretly hobnobbing with the generals. She had convinced that she was the only inheritor of the charisma of Z.A.Bhutto and could easily manage the masses and party singlehandedly. It was also remarkable that petty rivalries had also developed among the PPP leaders. 183

B.B. decided to accept those politicians who had rendered in the government of General Zia and among them were Rana Naeem (Defence Minister), Tariq Rahim (Member of Majlis Shoora), Yusuf Raza Gillani (Provincial minister) 184 and Zafar Ali shah (Federal minister) prominent personalities. MRD leaders were openly critical of her policy of accepting new comers rather than those with whom they had suffered lashings during martial law. 185 During the

183 Prof. Khalid Mahmud, Pakistan’s Political Scene, P. 58.
184 His father, syed AlmDar Hussain Shah, was very active in the politics of Multan. But in the movement of PNA, the family of Gillani did not participate and isolate itself from the politics. After the imposition of Martial Law in 1977, it again became active and fully participated in the elections of local bodies. The major rival family of the gillanis was Qureshi. Both the families always tried to establish hegemony over each other. Yousuf Raza Gillani, first time, became the chairman of District council Faisalabad. He and his family made efforts for the success of referendum. He also became the member of Majlis a Shoora. In the election of 1985, the Gillani family gained victory over its opponents. The division within the Qureshi family played role in the victory of Gillani family. Saajad Hussain Qureshi, Pir Shujat Hussanian Qureshi and Riaz Qureshi made alliance with the family of Gillani during the elections of 1985. After the elections, Yousuf Raza Gillani became the federal minister in the government of Muhammad Khan Junejo. After that, the differences had developed within the Gillani family. His uncle, Hamid Raza Gillani, became his opponent. On the other hand, Yousuf Raza did not have the cordial relations with Nawaz Sharif due to close relationship with the Pervaz Elahi. When Zia dismissed the government of Muhammad Khan Junejo and dissolved the assemblies, he decided to join Pakistan People’s Party while his uncle Hamid Raza joined National People’s Party and then Muslim League. In the mid-term election of 1990, Yousuf Raza gillani contested against his uncle Hamid raza but defeated him. Vakeel Anjum, Siast Ka Faroon, PP. 201-213.
185 Christina Lamb, Waiting for Allah, PP. 53-54.
movement, Benazir Bhutto compromised with the enemies of Bhutto and PPP for twice. First, at
the time of the formation of MRD, B.B. decided to reconcile with those who had invited the
General Zia to topple the government of Z.A.Bhutto. These were the leaders of PNA and on 6th
Feb. 1981, they also joined MRD against Zia. Second time, when the few ex-ministers of Zia’s
government decided to join PPP and B.B. welcomed them. B.B. declared it a part of politics.186

On 3rd June 1988, Zia announced the elections in the country. B.B. at once decided to
participate in the elections without the consultation of the leaders of MRD or the political parties
of MRD. It was mistrust on the leaders of MRD that not only weakened the alliance but also
eliminated it in the elections of 1988.187

The death of President Zia-ul-Haq in August 1988 removed the last veneer of unity. No
doubt, the MRD had outlived its purpose and was soon in disarray. It suffered its clinical death
when the parties of MRD disagreed on the issue of the distribution of tickets for November 1988.
Even some leaders of PPP used to say it an unnatural alliance.188

Impacts.

The PPP’s reputation was adversely affected due to plane high jacking incident. The
military leadership compelled the PPP’s leadership to leave the country and both the women left
the country and did not return till 10th April 1986.

The stand of MRD on the amendments in the constitution created a pro-movement circle
in the judiciary. The judges who had refused to take oath felt relief in the resolutions of MRD
against Zia’s constitution. Even, the former chief justice Anwar-ul-Haq held the press conference
and criticized the constitutional measures of Zia-ul-Haq.189

Due to the pressure of political parties, Zia-ul-Haq decided to hold free and fair elections
but on non-party bases. After the elections of 1985, General Zia chose Muhammad Khan Junejo
the Prime Minister of Pakistan. He belonged to the province of Sindh. The movement for
Restoration of democracy had got momentum in Sindh and proved that ZAB and his party had a
large number of supporters in Sindh. Junejo’s selection was aimed at gaining support of the

186 Benazir Bhutto, Daughter of the East, PP. 143-146.
187 Christina Lamb, Waiting for Allah, PP. 53-54.
188 Khalid Mahmud Arif, Working with Zia, P. 223.
189 Asghar Khan, My Political Struggle, P. 257.
people of Sindh. The appointment was also meant to win supporters from among the Pakistan People’s Party. General Zia’s government was expecting that Junejo would help in reducing Sindhi bitterness and dampen PPP’s campaign against the President. But the expectation of Zia did not fulfill.¹⁹⁰

The agitational politics of MRD brought forth new forces like Sindh Awami Tehrik¹⁹¹ on the political horizon.¹⁹²

The brutal military operation against the MRD workers compelled the youngsters to seek shelter in the forests. The army killed the people and created fear in their hearts. The soldiers raped with women, burnt their houses and stole their cattle. There was no one to help them; their only recourse was to flee into the jungle, where they were branded criminals. A campaign was started against the criminals in the jungles also. It was the effort of Zia government to push up the PPP into taking up the nationalist cry of their supporters so that PPP lost the support of Punjab and if it refused to then it would lose support of Sindh and the other provinces.¹⁹³

The decision of the dictator of military operation in Sindh for crushing the MRD movement and the so called criminals in different jungles prepared a ground of the permanent presence of military in Sindh. It established army cantonments in upper Sindh and created army check posts on all the roads. Army units were stationed in every district. Such kind of policy became the cause of hatred against the Punjabi dominated military and the center. In 1983, no Sindhi was in the senior officers neither of army nor among bureaucrats. This thing ignited the sense of deprivation among the Sindhis and a confrontation was started between the Sindhis and non-Sindhis.¹⁹⁴

The poets of Sindh also felt the effects of the atrocities of military in Sindh and delivered it their poems. The movement left its impact on the literature of Sindh. The poem of Niaz Hamayooni’s “Love for HomeLand” can be quoted here

“the Makli graveyard is shedding tears

The battlefield of Miyani is crying:

¹⁹⁰ Lawrence Ziring, Pakistan At The Crosscurrent Of History, P. 190.
¹⁹¹ Sindh Awami Tehrik was formed by Rasul Bux Paleejo. He was an eminent intellectual in the early 1970s. during the agitation of MRD, over 1200 activists of SAT have courted arrest including over 400 from Badin, over 200 from Thatta, over 75 from Khairpur, 75 from Tharparkar, Dadu and Larkana. Mushahid Hussain, Pakistan’s Politics: The Zia Years, P. 48.
¹⁹² Mushahid Hussain, Pakistan’s Politics: The Zia Years, P. 51.
¹⁹³ Christina Lamb, Waiting for Allah, PP. 126-127.
¹⁹⁴ Ibid., P. 84.
Will anyone rid us of these sympathizers?
We have decided
Not to retreat
Against any impediment
We are armed with slogan of Hooshoo:
We may die but not give up Sindh
Love for the homeland
Is our only creed.
We will pronounce it even on the gallows
None dare teach us any other lesson
O, Sindh, I swear upon Samoi
To fight those
Who hurt the hearts
Of my countrymen
Either we will die
Or the aliens will perish.
Truth will triumph
Against the falsehood of the day.195

(It has been translated from Sindhi by Anwar Pirzada)
Among the renowned poets who challenged the rule of martial dictator, Fehmida Riaz was prominent. Even few writers described the military operations in their short stories. The remarkable stories are as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer's Name</th>
<th>Short stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afzal Tauseef</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badar Abro</td>
<td>Furnace Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siraj</td>
<td>The Eighth Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashid Hasan Rana</td>
<td>Faceless people (Poem)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(These are all available in H. Rahman, *resistance Literature*)

Sindh was the center of the all activities of MRD. Zia-ul-Haq decided to divide the opposition on the basis of ethnicity. MQM emerged in 1984 (Mahajirs), Punjabi-Pushtun Ittehad,

Sindhis etc. The tussle had started among the ethnic groups which divided the people of Sindh who were busy in anti-Zia regime. A new topic of discussion replaced the topic of the conversation.\footnote{Ian Talbot, *Pakistan-A Modern History*, PP. 264-65.}

MRD proved an instrumental in providing PPP the cover it needed to defuse the onslaught against the party. PPP used the movement for arousing the broadest masses for political agitation. MRD also helped the PPP in softening the hostility of that section of society who had viewed PPP’s come back in politics as a danger signal. PPP had become persona non grata in the politics of Pakistan but MRD gave it a new impetus.\footnote{Prof. Khalid Mahmud, *Pakistan’s Political Scene 1984-1992*, P. 72, 102.}

The politicians compelled General Zia to withdraw the Martial Law and restore the constitution which he did. Though it was late but the efforts of MRD brought fruits at last.

The attitude of the leadership of PPP became the cause of the break-up of the MRD. The break-up of MRD was causing problems for the Pakistan People’s Party in the Peshawar and ANP gave it a strong challenge.\footnote{Christina Lamb, *Waiting for Allah*, P. 66.} Even Benazir Bhutto entered into a compromise with the establishment. After that she was allowed to go out of the country in Jan. 1984. And even with the help of the establishment, she came back on 10th April 1986.\footnote{Sardar Shoukat Ali, *Pakistan Issues of Government And Politics*, P. 98.}

The role of the military courts against the opposition deepened the feelings of nationalism in the minds of the victims. In Sindh, most of the heads of the military courts were non-Sindhis. It was exploited by the leaders of Sindh that the presence of non-Sindhis in military courts was the major cause behind tyranny and autocratic decisions. It was said that the government had intentionally done so. It was the effort of the government that Punjabis should kill the Sindhis.\footnote{Benazir Bhutto, *The Way Out*, P. 129.} It could also be seen when the cases against Jaam Saqi and his cohorts were being heard in the military courts and in the presence of military officers in the court, they challenged their validity and made it status obnoxious through the allegation that these Punjabi officers could not feel the emotions of the people of Sindh.\footnote{Nisar Hussain (ed), *Zamir Ka Qaidi*, PP. 20-45.}

During the whole movement, MRD could not develop itself into a dynamic political force. It even could not pose any serious challenge to the civilian successors of Martial Law regime. Prof Khalid Mahmud has the opinion that
MRD and Senate

On 12th December 1985, Maulana Kousar Niazi moved an Adjournment Motion regarding the politicians not permitted to participate in a meeting at Karachi. The three adjournment motions on the same subject No. 47, 48 and 49 had been moved by the different members. The government banned the entry of Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan, Abdul Wali Khan, Ghous Bakhsh Bazenjo, Asghar Khan and Maulana Fazal ur Rehman in Sindh. He declared it against the norms of democracy and said that such sanctions would disturb the condition of Law and Order that would dismantle the efforts of the restoration of democracy in Pakistan. Pakistan was a federation and in it there were the different provinces not the countries, so the citizens of Pakistan would not have to get passport for travelling from one province to other province. The government was negating the concept of federation through such kind of sanctions of the leaders of political parties that would be fatal for the country. Maulana Kousar Niazi requested that the government had announced to lift Martial Law again and again, now it should not impose such kind of restrictions on the political leaders. He said that it was a matter of national importance and it must be discussed in the House.203

On 16th December 1985, Maulana Kousar Niazi presented the adjournment motion regarding breach of right of freedom of movement. The government imposed restrictions on the leaders of MRD from visiting Karachi for a period of three months. The said ban had been imposed on Ghousbuksh Bizenjo, Abdul Wali Khan, Aftab Ahmed Sherpao, Ghulam Ahmed Bilour, Abdul Khaliq Khan. Such restrictions had caused serious public resentment and were detrimental to the integrity and solidarity of the Federal structure of Pakistan, which it was the duty of the Federal government to protect. The Interior Minister declared it a provincial matter but Maulana Kousar Niazi, Ahmed Mian Soomro and Mir Yousuf Ali Khan negated this concept and declared it the matter of the Federal government. But Chairman Senate ruled it out.204

Conclusion

The history is evident of itself that alliances are always formed among the political parties but these alliances sometime look very active and sometime in a very low capacity. The meetings are organized regularly and in the meetings, the leaders of the various parties try to prove that they are the symbol of unity among the parties and due to their efforts; all parties have come to one platform. Though behind every alliance, one major party is playing key role but in the meetings, time is given to the leaders of smaller parties to express their views. In the start of the alliance, the leadership of the major party invests and tried to unite the democratic parties but the leadership is not so much aggressive. The ordinary workers of the parties are used for filling the jails. While the major leadership is house arrested and is confined to one province only. It is time for the alliances to start demonstrations in various cities. Police try to stop it through different ways. It also arrests the workers and some time the lathe charge is also done. Due to the attitude of police or administration, the workers are aggressive and these emotions are exploited by the leaders through their speeches. At this time, the leadership of the major party come at the forefront and highjack all the movement. Those leaders who speak in the meetings are not given free hand. The major party has already vote bank in the population and dictator’s anti vote bank increase the popularity of the party. The chanting slogans of the leadership boost up the morale and sometime, the leadership does not care of the minor parties and adopt rude attitude due to the massive support of the people.

The dictators always try to create disharmony among the leaders of the alliance different ways. First, the slogan of ideology is used and the parties of right wing are attracted for support. This factor divides the democratic forces into two groups. Second, few parties cannot afford opposition and they always try to remain in power. Such parties exist in the form of various pressure groups. The dictators use such kind of groups for strengthening their rules. Third factor, power is the weakness of the politicians. The dictators try to trap the politicians with the incentive of ministry in the coming government. Few politicians change their loyalties due to incentives. Forth, the corruption of the politicians is highlighted by the dictator and raises the
slogan of accountability. On the name of the accountability, politicians are arrested and tortured in jails. During their stay in jail, they are forced to change their loyalties. Few politicians, due to pressure, decide to support the dictator and get rid of his atrocities. For implementing all these plans, the secret agencies help the military dictators and provide information or pros and cons of every politician.

After that, the different cards are played for eliminating the opposition. These cards are religion, provincialism, ethnicity, biradrism, regionalism etc. On the bases of these cards, the opposition is divided and the alliances cannot achieve their desired results. Zia divided the province of Sindh in Sindhis, Mahajirs, Pathans and drugs mafia. They used to quarrel over the issue of Sindh. The administration was used against the Sindhis and tried to compel PPP to raise the slogan of Jia Sindh so that the hatred might be developed in the province of Punjab against PPP.

Few parties always do the politics of opposition under every government. Such kind of parties are not in a position to form government or win elections with thumping majorities but their leadership consider themselves the candidate of Prime Ministership or President of Pakistan. The people listen their speeches and participate in their procession but do not cast vote to their parties. That’s why; they win few seats in the elections and always sit on the benches of the opposition. Such kind of parties is the part of each alliance which is established against the existing government. The example of TI can be given here; it was the part of PNA against Bhutto and MRD against Zia.
CHAPTER 3


Introduction

This chapter deals with the developments of the politics of opposition during and after the general elections in Pakistan in 1985. How did the opposition to the Zia regime in the masses as well as in the political circles turned into the parliamentary opposition is main focus of the discussion in the chapter. Besides main question of the chapter the supplementary questions regarding the causes of holding of non-party elections and the circumstances leading to the lifting of martial law will also be observed. Due to the pressure of political parties, General Zia-ul-Haq regime decided to hold elections on non-party basis in the last week of February 1985. On 12th January 1985, the President announced that the elections to the National Assembly would be held on 25 February 1985 and for the provincial assemblies on 28th February. He also laid down the main features of the elections in his address, which are as follows:

1. Elections would be held on a nonparty basis – no political party could take part; only individuals would contest the polls as independent candidates
2. Elections would be based on separate electorates, implying that Muslim voters would vote for Muslim candidates and non-Muslim voters would elect non-Muslim candidates
3. The number of seats reserved for non-Muslims would be raised from six to ten, and these seats would be filled by direct vote by non-Muslim voters (and not by indirect election by an electoral college comprising elected assembly members as was practiced earlier)\(^\text{205}\)

On 28th July 1977, General Zia-ul-Haq promulgated the Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Election) Order (No. 5) 1977. The order had supra-constitutional powers and elections held under it were deemed held under the constitution. The general elections in 1985 were held under the same constitutional instrument. However, the seven years between the promulgation of this order and the elections had changed a number of things. The order was thus

amended thoroughly to accommodate the General’s new electoral themes such as nonparty elections and separate electorates. The corresponding set of electoral laws and rules (Electoral Rolls Act 1974, Delimitation of constituencies Act 174, and Representation of People Act 1976) also underwent considerable changes, some of which included the followings:

1. The Election Commission Order was promulgated on 23rd July, 1977 and was given effect from 5th July 1977. The order enabled the President to appoint a new Election Commission to provide for the statutory basis for holding elections. The Election Commission (Reconstitution) Order 1980 provided that the commission would comprise a CEC as chairperson and four judges of the high courts of the four provinces instead of two as provided in the constitution.

2. The separate electorate system made it necessary to include a declaration of faith in the application for voter registration. The new form for Muslims was later further amended, adding a declaration in the belief of finality of the Prophethood of Muhammad (PBUH). This was done to verify the registration of Qadianis/Ahmedis/Lahoris as Muslim voters. Qadianis, who had been declared as non-Muslims by a constitutional amendment in 1974, continued to consider themselves Muslims and refused to register as non-Muslims. The new law and the community’s resistance resulted in their complete disenfranchisement.

3. A new section (10 A) in the Delimitation of Constituencies Act 1974 empowered the commission to change the delimitation of any constituency at any time of its own accord. These sweeping powers effectively dispensed with the entire process of delimitation, which the commission had to follow under the law. Being answerable to the public was now a moral rather than legal obligation. In its notification on new delimitations dated 6th January 1985, the commission wrote that:

   “Though not required under the law, the constitution gave public hearing to the applicant, their agents and advocates.”

4. Seven more general seats were added to the 200 provided by the constitution, four of which were awarded to certain areas in Baluchistan and three to Sindh. Zia was specific about which area would be awarded the additional seats, no legal delimitation exercise was deemed necessary. He amended the delimitation act and notified delimitation in the form of a new schedule appended to the act. The commission
included the delimitation of these seats in its notification of all the delimited constituencies.

5. The number of non-Muslim seats in the National Assembly was raised from six to ten. The non-Muslim seats were further allocated among different religious communities; four each were granted to Christians and Hindus/Scheduled Castes; one jointly to Sikhs, Buddhists, Parsis and other non-Muslims; and one to Qadianis. The entire country formed one multi member constituency for all non-Muslims. Members were to be elected directly by the non-Muslim electorate and not through indirect election as provided in the previous constitution.

6. The number of seats reserved for women was doubled: 12 in Punjab, four in Sindh and each two in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Balochistan. The elected members of the National Assembly from a particular province formed the Electoral College for election to the seats allocated to their province.206

The political parties who had joined MRD refused to participate in the elections and boycotted it. Because the political parties were demanding elections on party basis. It was too difficult for Zia to hold elections on party basis. In the elections of local bodies, the results showed that the PPP had still its roots in the masses.207 After the elections of the Local Bodies, it was not an easy task to hold elections on party bases. The voter strength was as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>47,292,441</td>
<td>21,125,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>19,028,666</td>
<td>7,652,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>11,061,328</td>
<td>4,173,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>4,323,376</td>
<td>1,409,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>340,286</td>
<td>149,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA</td>
<td>2,198,547</td>
<td>30,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Politics without Parties (Report) PP 22.)

---

Zia-ul-Haq wanted to create such a populist political party that could politically challenge the appeal of the Pakistan People’s Party. And secondly such kind of party did not have any conflict with the institution of army.

**Electoral Rolls**

In February 1978, the CMLA directed the Election Commission to prepare fresh electoral rolls on the basis of separate electorates (Muslims and non-Muslims). Another important change effected through an amendment to the constitution related to the age limit for voters. The general elections in 1970 had been held with a voter age limit of 21 years, but the new constitution prescribed an age limit of 18 and above, which was to take effect from the second elections scheduled under the constitution. The age limit had remained 21 years for the general elections in 1977. Since the general elections in 1985 would have been the second elections under the 1973 constitution, the age limit should have been lowered to 18 years, but the CMLA amended the constitution and set the age limit at 21 years with no time bar. The commission planned a country wide door to door voter enumeration exercise that commenced on 21st October 1978. The exercise halted midway on 5th November when the government decided to change the text of the oath prescribed in the enrollment form for the Muslims. Although the Qadianis had been declared as non-Muslims through a constitutional amendment in 1974, they contended that they were a sect of Islam and refused to register themselves as non-Muslims. As they wanted to separate themselves from the bulk of the Muslims, the government put the requirement for the Muslim voters to declare their belief in the finality of the Prophethood of Muhammad (PBUH) as part of the voter enrollment application.

The revised campaign with a new text for the oath was resumed on 1st January 1979. With the help of 261 registration officers, 876 assistant registration officers, 237 revising authorities, 9207 supervisors and 27455 enumerators, the Election Commission published the final electoral rolls on 15th September.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/ Province</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Non-Muslim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khyber Pakhtunkhwa</td>
<td>4,103,325</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>4,114,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA</td>
<td>26,953</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the chances of general elections being held faded with time, the commission did not bother to undertake any large scale annual exercise to update the rolls. Instead, it relied on Section 18 of the Electoral Rolls Act 1974, which provided for the routine day to day updating of the rolls.

However, with elections looming in 1982, the preparation of new rolls became imperative. The commission decided against another countrywide enumeration campaign instead of launching a comprehensive program to update the rolls and make the necessary additions, deletions and corrections. This was commenced on 10th September 1982 and scheduled to conclude by 24th October 1982. Two extensions of 15 and 10 days extended the date for filling claims/objections to the second half of November. The commission extended the date further to 31st January, 1983 on the cabinet’s request. During these four months, the commission received 1,037,543 applications, of which 860,586 were applications for addition, 145,770 were for deletion and 31,187 for correction. The additional list of additions, deletions and corrections along with the existing electoral rolls was published on 31st March, 1983. The updated list recorded 33,560,565 voters including Muslims and non-Muslims. The commission continued with routine updating under section 18 of the Electoral rolls Act 1974, and by the time of the general elections in 1985, it had prepared the following rolls:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/ Province</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Non- Muslim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khyber Pakhtunkhwa</td>
<td>4,181,078</td>
<td>11,543</td>
<td>4,192,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA</td>
<td>31,261</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>142,695</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>145,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>20,512,805</td>
<td>435,202</td>
<td>20,948,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>7,125,539</td>
<td>522,896</td>
<td>7,648,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the office of Chief Election Commission)
The total number of polling stations set up for the election of 1985 was 25,447 and these stations contained 80,239 polling booths. There were separate polling booths for male and female. The House of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Election) Order (23 July 1977) was amended on 12th January 1985. The amendment in Article 10 (1) added the following to the list of qualifications for elections:

1. He was of good character and was not commonly known as one who violated Islamic injunctions
2. He had adequate knowledge of Islamic teachings and practiced obligatory duties prescribed by Islam as well abstained from major sins;
3. He was sagacious, righteous and not profligate and honest and amen.
4. He had not been convicted for a crime of moral turpitude or for giving false evidence
5. He had not, after the establishment of Pakistan, worked against the integrity of the country or opposed the ideology of Pakistan.
6. The minimum age for a candidate to the National Assembly was twenty five years and for the Senate thirty years.
7. In addition a candidate was required to be a registered voter of Pakistan.

But it was dismal that the relevant laws and rules did not provide for any methods or instruments that returning officers could use to ascertain whether a candidate met above mentioned qualifications. It is also remarkable that the returning officers did not take the conditions seriously and did not apply them on the candidates. But the record of the election commission shows that many contestants tried to exploit these criteria and filed appeals against acceptance of nominations on the basis of above mentioned grounds. It is interesting that one contestant filed an appeal against the acceptance of another candidate who was clean shaven, on the grounds that this violated Islamic injunctions. But the appeal was rejected. In another case, the appellate judge accepted the rejection of a candidates’ nomination on the grounds that the latter had been removed from membership of district council because of “bad character”. Under the

---

disqualification sections, the new law provided that an office bearer of a “dissolved” political party was disqualified from taking part in an election for five years from the date of dissolution. Subsequently amendments raised the period to 12 years, those members of federal and provincial councils (Majlis-e-Shura) and ministers were exempted from this clause who had served the government after the imposition of martial law on 5 July 1979. This clearly indicated that everyone who had deserted his/her party and joined the regime was welcome to contest, while those who had not barred from doing so.

It was also necessary for the political parties and the members not involve in the opposition of the creation of Pakistan but the only political party not dissolved by the regime was the Jamaat-e-Islami. In caluse (h) of the above mentioned conditions, the words “after the establishment of Pakistan” were ostensibly inserted to save candidates of the party, which was commonly accused of having opposed the cause of Pakistan and its founder during the country’s formation.

Returning officers were given a list of politicians who had been disqualified by a disqualification tribunal. They also rejected nominations in cases where they had been provided evidence of a candidate’s involvement in politics. Appellate judges upheld the rejection of such candidates at least in one case where the candidate had been removed from the membership of district council on account of political activities.

The 1979 order had barred the spouses and dependent children of “person holding any office of profit in service of Pakistan” from taking part in elections. This was amended in 1985, allowing some to contest on condition that they were able to satisfy the election commissioner that the election results were not materially influenced by their position in service.

The Representation of People Act 1976 required one elector of a constituency to propose and another to second the name of a duly qualified person as a candidate from that constituency. It was amended to provide that 50 electors from a constituency nominate a person as a candidate.

Why Elections?

General Zia-ul-Haq was intentionally delaying the elections. The question arises what were the factors that compelled him to announce the elections.
1. The pressure of General Zia-ul-Haq to restore democratic process mounted from inside the country and abroad due to lack of legitimacy. In Afghanistan war, he was being considered indispensable. That is why it was necessary to justify his legitimacy through elections.

2. The credibility gap had developed between General Zia-ul-Haq regime and the masses and it had become a liability for him. He had already announced elections again and again. This time postponement of election would cost it heavily.

3. MRD was demanding for elections again and again and even it called for a mass movement from 14th August, 1983. The government was expecting strong agitation from MRD in the event of a further postponement of elections beyond March 1985.

4. Further delay in elections would have followed much greater cynicism among the general populace as well as the non-MRD parties which were still far from active.\(^{210}\)

5. It was also necessary for Zia regime that it neutralized the impending PPP threat through muster popular support.

6. Western pressure on Zia for democratizing the political structure became a major cause of holding elections.\(^ {211}\)

**Issues During Election Campaigns**

1. Biraderi and tribal considerations always played an important role in the politics of the sub-continent. There is no doubt that Zia regime gave special significance to the old personalized networks of Biraderi or clan based ties. The announcement of the non-party based elections compelled the individual candidates to focus on the local politics that emerged from Biraderi and tribe system.\(^ {212}\) Ian Talbot also admits in his book “Pakistan: A Modern History” that the partyless elections of 1985 further encouraged ethnic and Biraderi loyalties. Even the Mohajirs felt the need to create unity and claimed that they should be recognized as a fifth nationality.\(^ {213}\)

---


\(^{211}\) Nadeem Qadir, *Pakistan Studies*, P.121.


\(^{213}\) Ian Talbot, *Pakistan-A Modern History*, P. 265.
2. Due to the boycott of the elections from the side of the original politicians, such a newly created politicians came to surface that may have been more appropriate as municipal councilors than members of the National and Provincial assemblies.214

3. Zia, first, won the hearts of religious groups through the slogan of Islamization and then gained the support of commercial and trading groups.215 The alliance of religious-commercial and trading groups could be seen in the elections of 1985.

4. The expenditure limit in the elections of the National Assembly was Rs. 40,000 but the candidates violated the fixed limit and spent as much as Rs. 4,000,000 or even more.216

5. The candidates avoided from the domestic and external issues. They focused on local problems and issues. Even the candidates did not mention the issues of foreign policy, freedom of speech and expression in their leaflets which were distributed to the supporters.217 Only local issues surfaced such as sanitation, roads, water supply etc.

6. The religious parties raised the slogan of Islamization in Pakistan and on the basis of this slogan; they requested the people for vote. Syed Munawar Hassan of the Tehrik-e-Islami contested the election from NA 193 constituency and he proudly said during his campaign that he was not interested in merely winning an election, but promulgating Islam.218 But the slogan of religion failed to become a decisive factor in the election

7. The government launched a move against those politicians who had denied to cooperate with the military regime and they were arrested from their houses before the elections. A S Ghazali writes in his e-book in chapter VIII:

   “More than eight hundred prominent politicians were arrested in a pre-election crackdown; campaigning was forbidden by a ban on political parties, processions, rallies and even loud speakers………..”219

8. In the elections, candidates were prohibited from using the platform of any political party during the election campaign.

9. The two Local Bodies elections of 1979 and 1983 had generated a new leadership which was visible during the General Elections of 1985.

214 Ayesha Jalal, Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia, P. 106.
215 Ibid., P. 105.
216 M.Asghar Khan, My Political Struggle, P. 358.
217 Tahir Kamaran, Election Commission of Pakistan, Role in Politics, P. 144.
218 Politics without Parties (Report) P.22.
219 Quoted in Judges & Generals in Pakistan by Inam R Sehri, P. 88.
Restrictions or Ban

1. There was complete ban on political processions
2. Political meetings in the open places were prohibited
3. The use of loud speakers for any public meeting, public gathering as for canvassing was not permitted.
4. The candidates were not allowed to show any association with a political party or present a joint manifesto.220

Candidates in Election

The different candidates filed their papers for contesting elections as showed by the record of the Election Commission of Pakistan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Nominations Files</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Rejection overturned on Appeal</th>
<th>Acceptance overturned on Appeal</th>
<th>Validly nominated</th>
<th>withdrawn</th>
<th>Contesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakhtunkhwa</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Capital</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official record of the Election Commission of Pakistan)

1. MRD raised protest against the Martial Law regime with two major slogans. One was the restoration of democracy and second was the revival of the constitution of 1973.

The low turnout in the referendum compelled General Zia-ul-Haq to invite MRD

---

politicians to participate in the party less elections.\textsuperscript{221} But with the announcement of the elections, MRD decided to boycott due to following reasons i.e.

- that their demand of party based elections was not met
- Their demand for the restoration of the 1973 constitution in toto was not met.\textsuperscript{222}

The MRD rejected Zia’s declaration of August 1983, to oppose the non-party basis of the proposed elections. It was the effort of the Zia regime to sideline the opposition through non-party based elections. The decision of boycott by the MRD left the other parties to file open and as well as those candidates who were willing to abandon their party loyalty in exchange for membership of the assembly in order to maintain their local political leadership and to gain beneficial success to authority to sustain their position in their constituencies. \textsuperscript{223}

Inspite of the decision of MRD, the members of various political parties took part in the 1985 elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>NWFP</th>
<th>Punjab</th>
<th>Sindh</th>
<th>Balochistan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PML</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive PP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inqillabi Mahaz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PML (ZS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{222} Hamid Khan, \textit{Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan}, P. 365.
The decision of MRD provided a free hand to government to win elections without any hindrance. It is said that the decision of boycott had been taken with the consultation of government. In October 1984, a secret meeting was held between General Zia-ul-Haq and Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi. After that, the meeting of the leaders of MRD was arranged at the house of Asghar Khan (Abbottabad) in which the decision of boycott was taken (It was alleged that Zia facilitated meeting of the MRD’s executive council at Abbott Abad to deliberate on the issue of election boycott). Gen. Fazal Haq also admitted in his meeting with his friend that most of the leaders of MRD were under the influence of secret agencies of government. Due to this influence, the Zia government took the decision in its own favor.\(^{224}\) Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi, a prominent leader of the PPP of the view that

\[\text{“If the 1973 constitution is alive as the government claims it is and is being held in abeyance only, then there is no need of any political framework and the government can straightway hold elections under the constitution.”}\(^{225}\)

But the critics of MRD also maintained that the parties in MRD were unable to find candidates with chances of success.\(^{226}\)

\(^{224}\) Azhar Sohail, *Gen Zia Ka Gyara Saal*, P. 81.

\(^{225}\) Quoted in “*The Politics Economy of Pakistan 1947-1985*” by Omar Numan, P. 127.
2. Pro-Government candidates. Most of the pro-government candidates did not get their seats. Six cabinet ministers, a presidential advisor, two provincial ministers and three city mayors were miserably defeated by their rival candidates. Even over half of the members of the nominated Majlis-i-Shura were not returned to the new house. Even Jamaat-i-Islami failed to get required seats due to the support of Zia government. The main leadership of Jamaat was wiped out. Only eight out of sixty three contested candidates won their seats. Karachi had been the stronghold of Jamaat-i-Islami but the elections of 1985 turned down the claim of the religious party.\textsuperscript{227}

President, General Zia-ul-Haq, passed the orders to the Governors about the support to the various candidates in the elections. He wanted to see few candidates in the assembly at every cost, like Sartaj Aziz. All the Governors of the provinces assured the President that his desired candidates would win the elections but Governor of NWFP, Left General Fazla Haq, objected the nomination of Sartaj Aziz and stressed that people would object if the support was provided to him.\textsuperscript{228}

The intelligence agencies were also working for the pro-government candidates. As Shaikh Rasheed Ahmed pointed out in his interview that when he decided to contest elections to the Punjab Assembly from his constituency, the intelligence agencies used to watch every step he took. Therefore, he had to pose that he was not serious about the elections. He even mentioned that

\textit{\"I was also apprehensive that I might be picked up by some people so I asked Sufi Latif to go with the papers to the court five hours before the closing time and Choudhry Ishaq was to go there two hours earlier.\"}\textsuperscript{229}

General Zia-ul-Haq had deputed few persons on the clearance of the candidates so that pro-government candidates would be sponsored for winning elections. Shaikh Ishrat Ali who was an advisor to General Zia-ul-Haq was pressuring the candidates to withdraw their nomination papers in favor of the government supported candidates. Even few candidates approached General

\textsuperscript{226} Zakia Batool, \textit{The Role of Opposition During General Zia-ul-Ha\textquotesingle s Era}, P. 47.
\textsuperscript{227} Inam R Sehri, \textit{Judges & Generals in Pakistan}, P. 88.
\textsuperscript{228} Azhar Sohail, \textit{General Zia Ka Gyara Saal}, P. 84.
\textsuperscript{229} Author's interview with Shakih Rasheed.
Akhtar Abdul Rehman to minimize the enmity of Gen. Zia or to seek the support of the government.\textsuperscript{230}

Eighty five of the candidates in the elections were contesting elections for the first time and majority of them did not have any previous political background. The Zia government used different methods to keep the opposite candidates out from the elections. Cases were registered against them. Leaflets were distributed against them in their constituencies. As Shaikh Rasheed pointed out that

“\textit{One day I came out of the Shalimar hotel at dawn I noticed a Cessna plane dropping leaflets. One leaflet fell near my car. When I read that I was flabbergasted as it read that Shaikh Rasheed had withdrawn from the elections. I rushed towards College Road where a crowd had gathered and was reading the morning papers that had announced that I had taken money to withdraw from the elections.}”\textsuperscript{231}

The special courts formed under the ordinance of 25\textsuperscript{th} November 1977 disqualified sixteen former MNA’s and thirty three MPA’s of Sindh who had been associated with the PPP government. About one hundred people were disqualified from the Punjab, and forty from the NWFP and Balochistan.\textsuperscript{232}

It was fact that the candidates wanted to seek the blessings of the team of General Zia-ul-Haq but they did not want to leave such kind of impression in the public that they were the sponsored candidates of the martial law dictator. Such kind of candidates wanted to use the both tools to win the elections. Shaikh Rasheed Ahmed won the elections of National Assembly by a margin of 14000 votes when he was convincing the people that General Zia-ul-Haq did not like him and he had lost the election of Deputy Myer due to his opposition. On the other hand, he was trying to use General Akhtar Abdul Rehman for gaining the support of General Zia-ul-Haq. After the elections of National Assembly, a statement appeared in \textit{Jang} (Newspaper) that Shakih Rasheed was eyeing the Chief Minister of Punjab. This statement left adverse effects on the elections of provincial assembly. The entire government machinery went into full gear to stop him from winning. He admits that

\textsuperscript{230} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{231} Ibid.,
“The victory of three days ago changed into defeat. Then I realized how important a role police play in elections in our country.”

3. Former Army Officers. Twenty five former army officers took part in the elections and out of twenty nine, only few won the elections. Among them retired Captain Gohar Ayub Khan (Abbottabad), retired Air Marshal Nur Khan (Attock), Retired Lt. General Abdul Majeed Khan (Jhelum), retired Brigadier Iftikhar Bashir (Gujranwala), retired Major Nadir Parvez (Faisalabad), and retired Major Ata Mohammad Khan (Shikarpur) were remarkable who won the seats of National Assembly.

4. Thirteen women contested elections for general Muslim seats of the National Assembly and eighteen women in the provinces. Among thirteen candidates in the National Assembly, only Abida Hussain of Jhang won the election and became the member of National Assembly.

5. In the elections, 75% candidates were pirs, sajada nashines, and old feudal families. Most of them won the elections.

**National Assembly**

The elections of the National Assembly were held on 25th February 1985. The distribution of the seats was as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Area</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Chirstian</th>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>Buddhist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochista</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

233 Writer’s Interview with Shaikh Rasheed.
234 *Jung*, February 27, 1985.
235 Interview with Abida Hussain, July 22, 2012.
Due to boycott of the elections from the side of the major parties and restrictions on political mobilizations created a pleasant atmosphere for feudals and tribal chiefs in the elections. The background of the members of National Assembly was as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Lords and Tribal Leaders</th>
<th>157</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Professionals</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Leaders</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The elected members of the National Assembly who had been elected on non-party bases were soon divided into two groups. An Independent Parliamentary Group (IPG), consisting of about forty members, and an Official Parliamentary Group (OPG), which included the supporters of the government. Zia regime was feeling pleasure over the elections which had been organized on non-party basis. But with the passage of time, it was proved that it was not a rubberstamp. The first step towards the independence of Parliament was the election of the speaker of National Assembly.237

**Nomination of the Prime Minister**

Pir of Paghara had developed close relations with President and even influenced the decisions of General Zia-ul-Haq. On the issue of the nomination of Prime Minister, Pir of Paghara took a stand and stressed that if the Prime Minister was not taken from Sindh, he would not raise any objection. Otherwise, his sponsored candidate would become Prime Minister from Sindh. He presented the name of Muhammad Khan Junejo and was approved by the President of Pakistan. Elahi Baksh Soomro was also a candidate for Prime Ministership and even President had also assured him for the said post. But at the last moment, the President advised him to consult with Pir of Paghara but it was too late.238

On 24th March 1985, Prince Mohyuddin Baloch presented the resolution in the National Assembly,

---

238 Azhar Sohail, *General Zia Ka Gyara Saal*, P. 84.
“that this Assembly expresses full confidence in Mr. Muhammad Khan Junejo, as Prime Minister of Pakistan”

All the members expressed full confidence in the nominated Prime Minister and declared it a right decision in right direction. Syed Nusrat Ali Shah said,

“I would now endorse my friend, Mr. Mohyuddin’s resolution and I feel that is indeed a step in the right direction. We have to support Junejo for the establishment of parliamentary democracy in Pakistan. ………………..we should strive for a process where there is no more possibility of any other martial law and we should also strive for the establishment of parliamentary institutions so that martial law is lifted from Pakistan at the earliest possible time…………..it is also the responsibility of the nominated Prime Minister that we should work together for a system that, at the end of the five years, again elected representatives of the people should come in this house and there should not be any further possibility of Martial Law.”

Mian Muhammad Zaman, in his speech, supported Muhammad Khan Junejo not due his nomination from the President. He put the confidence on him because all the members of the house wanted to put this country on the track of democracy. He also highlighted the wish of the people that they wanted no more martial law in Pakistan and it was the time to make efforts for lifting Martial Law.

Muhammad Aslam Khatak, during his speech, mentioned his relation with nominated Prime Minister and declared him gentleman, honest and a sincere person. He also condemned any kind regionalism or provincialism and stressed on nationalism. He passed the remarks that

“…………..we are representing the people of Pakistan in this house and should eliminate regional feelings. We should think that we are Pakistanis. We should absolutely think that we are Pathan, Punjabi, Sindhi or Balochi…………….”

Liaquat Baloch expressed his confidence on the Prime Minister due to his loyalty with Islam and he hoped that the Prime Minister would work sincerely for the implementation of Islamic system in Pakistan. He also focused on lifting Martial Law, protection of the fundamental rights, justice and elimination of sanctions on the Press.

---
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Khan Muhammad Arif Khan criticized the role of bureaucracy in Pakistan and suggested the Prime Minister to control it. It was his opinion that this institution always tried to trap every Prime Minister and formulated policies according to their own wishes. So the Prime Minister should resolve the problems of the people through controlling the administration.

After the speeches of the few members, the speaker invited the nominated Prime to have few words. He highlighted the following points in his speech

1. I am thankful to God who has provided me the opportunity to serve Pakistan as a Prime Minister.
2. He appreciated the efforts of the speaker and paid a special tribute to him.
3. It was his view that Pakistan is passing through transitory phase. Elections after the eight years of Martial Law and the participation of the people in these elections justify the presence of these elected people in this house. You are the true representatives of the masses of Pakistan.
4. I have requested the President of Pakistan that two things cannot be maintained at the same time i.e. Martial Law and Civil government. We should try to cover up the transitory phase and lift Martial Law as soon as possible.
5. I appreciate the process of Islamization which has been started by the President of Pakistan.
6. I assure the common man of Pakistan that I will provide them relief through providing justice, elimination of personal grievances and rule of Law.
7. I will try to decrease poverty.
8. Inflation will be controlled.
9. I have served as minister in the cabinet of Ayub Khan so I realize the problems of the people of Pakistan. I am not stranger from the areas of Pakistan.
10. Your vote of confidence has injected a new spirit in my life. After your encouragement and support, I can move ahead with new vision.
11. Most of the population of Pakistan lives in villages and most of the villages are backward. Water logging and solidity is rampant in these areas. We will try to eliminate such kinds of evils so that the farmers could earn more.
12. In cities, population is facing a lot of problems. It’s a time to eradicate these problems.
13. Our education standard is very poor. Our institutions are not playing any effective role in producing better generation. Rich people send their children in foreign institutions. The poor cannot send their children in those institutions and it is dire need to introduce reforms in our own institutions.

14. The students should focus in their education and after the completion, they should come into politics.

15. We are also facing external threats for a super power that has adopted the expansionist policy and is suggesting us to avoid from supporting Afghanistan.

16. China has always supported Pakistan against any external threat and hope that she will provide us assistance against any aggression in future also.

17. We should love Pakistan without any regional feelings. I am first Pakistani, then Sindhi, Punjabi or Balochi.

18. During the period of Martial Law, the level of corruption has upgraded at the lower level. You people should put them on right path. There is no place for such a person in Pakistan who will do embezzlement.

19. I am also thankful to the President who has nominated me as a Prime Minister and also to you that you have expressed vote of confidence on me.\(^24\)

**Election of the Speaker**

After the elections of National and Provincial Assemblies, Zia regime was feeling very comfortable due to non-party affiliations of the elected members. But he and his king makers felt first threat when Fakhar Imam decided to contest the election for speaker of the national assembly against the pro-Zia candidate, namely Khawaja Muhammad Safdar. He served as the chairman of Zia’s Shoora before elections. Khawaja Safdar belonged to Sialkot and had developed rivelry with Anwar Aziz Chaudhury. When the military regime announced the candidate for speaker, Anwar Aziz tried to convince Mian Muhammad Yasin Khan Watto from Okara for contesting election against the Zia sponsored candidate. He was succeeded in nominating Mian Yasin Watto but the pressure of the government compelled Watto to withdraw. It was a great threat to those members who did not like to cast vote to the military sponsored candidate. After the withdrawal of Mian Muhammad Yasin, twenty six members of National

Assembly assembled in the State Bank building that belonged to the different areas of Pakistan. Among them, few wanted to nominate Abida Hussain but the opposition of religious minded people who did not like the rule of woman created hurdles on the way of Abida Hussain. After detailed discussions, it was decided that Fakhar Imam would contest the election. At this occasion, Chaudhoury Muhammad Iqbal delivered a speech

“................for truth and right, we people raise slogans in private meetings but practically no step is taken. If any action is taken, the members will not stand with determination. After the experiment of Mian Yasin Watto, we will have to take decision with great care. Fikar Imam is our friend and Ala Rasool. Its time, he should think over this decision with cool minded. After the decision, he will have no option to withdraw because in this way the integrity of the group will be at stake.”242

All the members in their speeches stressed on the firm stand of Fakhar Imam and urged him to contest without any fear of the government. At last, Fakhar Imam addressed the participants in these words

“I am thankful to all of you people that you have nominated me for the election of speaker. I assure you that I will contest election at every cost.”243

The session of the National Assembly was held on 21st March, 1985 and Chief Election Commission, Justice S.A.Nusrat, presided over the session. He took oath from the elected members. After that, he announced the election of the speaker of the National Assembly. Three candidates filed their papers i.e. Fakhar Imam, Khawaja Muhammad Safdar and Ch. Shamim Haider. Thirty seven MNAs nominated Khawaja Safdar for the election of speaker, fifty three MNAs seconded Fakhar Imam and Rana Tanvir Hussain proposed the name of Ch. Shamim Haider but on 22nd March 1985 he withdrew his papers from the competition. On 22nd March 1985, the election of the speaker was held under the Presiding Officer (Justice S.A.Nusrat).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Secured Votes</th>
<th>Casting Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Syed Fakhar Imam</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Khawaja Muhammad Safdar</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

242 Quoted in “From Sindhri To Ojhri Camp” by Azhar Sohail, P. 20.
243 Ibid.,
The presiding officer invited Syed Fakhar Imam to have a chair of Speaker of National Assembly. The members congratulated him on becoming the speaker. Few members like Mian Muhammad Yasin Watto, Mir Nawaz Khan Marwat, Liaquat Baloch, Hanif Ansari, Hanif Tayyub, in their speeches, opposed the Martial Law and demanded to eliminate it immediately. After the speeches of the few members, Fakhar Imam as a speaker addressed the members of National Assembly. In his speech, he highlighted the following points

1. The election of the National and Provincial Assemblies was the first step of the democratic process and the election of the speaker was the continuation of that process.

2. The political institutions could be strengthened only through continuation of the democratic process. In this democratic process, one wins and other faces defeat.

3. Though I am younger than the most of the other members but I assure you that I would utilize your experience and age for maintaining the sanctity of this prestigious house.

4. I pay vote of special thanks to Justice Nusrat (Presiding Officer) and Khawaja Muhammad Safdar.

5. All members are equal in my eyes and I would like to treat them without any discrimination. All Rulings will be introduced according to the constitution.

6. At the last, I am thankful to all of you that you have bestowed me this responsibility and pray to God that He will help me in fulfilling this task.

After the election of speaker, the election of Deputy Speaker was held on the same day. Sardar Wazir Ahmed Joogzai was proposed by Mir Zafar Ullah Jamali. No other member filed paper and in this way, Sardar Wazir Ahmed Joogzai was elected unopposed under the Rule 9 (2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the National Assembly.\footnote{The National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, Official Report, Vol. 1. 1985.}

**Motions Against Martial Law (26 May 1985)**

Three members of the house tried to present the motions against the Martial Law and stressed that after the elections, there was no need of further continuation of Martial Law. On 26th May 1985, Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar presented two motions and one of them was related to Martial Law. He presented his point of view in his speech during discussion on the motion that
“In country, the process of National and Provincial Assemblies election has completed and the elected parliament has come to existence and even civil democratic government has been established. Most of the part of the constitution of 1973 has been restored. In existence of elected parliament, there is no justification of continuation of Martial Law. Notice should be taken immediately............... Even the Prime Minister has announced after taking oath that Martial Law and Civil Government cannot be maintained side by side...............at this time, two parallel law making bodies are working in the country. Martial Law is working as a law making body and on the other hand, this prestigious house has been elected for that purpose. There is a conflict, contradiction and tussle between these two institutions. Two laws cannot be implemented at the same time. One is the law of Martial Law and the other is the constitution of 1973. The provisions of the constitution of 1973 should be exercised freely. Martial Law should be lifted...............”

Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar exposed the system of the dictator which was being run on the name of democracy and opposed the further continuation of Martial Law. He even tried to convince the members of the house that their importance was not being recognized due to the parallel laws of the Martial Law regime. He threatened that if the house failed in resolving the problems of the people, then the decisions would be taken in the streets. In a democratic process, the elected members work freely without any interference of any other institution. But in the presence of Martial Law they were not free and the sword was hanging on their heads which could weaken them or abrupt them any time. After the speech of the Prime Minister against Martial Law (At the time of vote of confidence), Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar was the first politician who demanded to lift Martial Law and instigated the elected members to raise protest against it.

Second Motion was moved by Haji Muhammad Saif Ullah Khan and he discussed the Martial Law in a historical context. He highlighted the previous Martial Laws and their importance. But he seconded the point of Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar that after the elections, there was no justification of Martial Law in Pakistan. It was against the privilege and rights of the House to continue Martial Law further. Parliament is supreme in democratic countries. It cannot maintain its supremacy in the presence of Martial Law. If Martial Law exists, the parliament will

be dissolved. He shattered the notion that without Martial Law, the crises could not be handled. The people had elected their representatives for resolving their issues, so the opportunity should be given to them. He declared that Martial Law is no law. We were facing all internal and external problems due to the existence of Martial Law. After 10\textsuperscript{th} March 1985, the constitution of Pakistan had been restored, after that the President would not have the right to issue any order contrary to constitution. Zafar Ali Shah, Industrial Minister, raised the issue of admissibility of these motions. But the speaker invited the third personality who criticized the continuation Martial Law for speech.

Maulana Ghour Rehman criticized Martial Law and declared it against Shariat Muhammadi. It was also against the dignity of parliament. Under Martial, the law of military is supreme and it cannot be challenged in any court, even not in Federal Shairat Court. So it was against the teachings of Quran and Sunnah and even contrary to the constitution of Pakistan. Second argument he floated that the people had elected this house and the President for lifting Martial Law. So it was our legal, religious and moral duty to make efforts for lifting Martial Law. Third argument was that the continuation of Martial Law was against the determined principles of democracy and Islamic system. The government cannot be run without advice. So the system of the country could not be streamlined under the orders of the Martial law, military courts. Fourth point, in case of continuation of Martial Law, the House would lose the trust of the people. In this way, the government faced difficulties in its working. Fifth, in the presence of Martial Law, few decisions would be taken by the civilian government and few by the military government. In this way, the institution of military will be involved in politics that would weaken our defence. Due to these reasons, the Martial Law should be lifted immediately.

Iqbal Ahmed Khan, Minister for Law and Parliamentary Affairs, opposed the motions and gave justifications that these motions could not be moved in this house because it had no legal justifications. He pleaded that the events which had been quoted in motion occurred before the existence of house. So these motions should be moved in the first session of the house. While the second session was going on. He also argued that these motions were related to the personal conduct of the President and that’s why it cannot be moved in this house.

After the remarks of Law Minister, Mr M.P.Bhandara stood and defended the motions with these words,
“……………the overwhelming sense of this house, as expressed in the motions, resolutions as well as these privilege motions should be considered. And if these are not considered, the perhaps it would not be budget debate……………….”

As the official record shows that the elected members did not show much interest in these motions and only a few raised and favored the motions. The ministers tried to turn it down, while few members raised the issue of Islamization and declared Martial Law compulsory for that purpose. At last, the mover Hajji Muhammed Saifullah Khan requested the speaker that

“that the motions be referred to a Special Committee to be constituted today from this house, and be referred to that Committee, and report to come within a week.”

Ruling against Martial Law (26 May 1985)

Second major step was the demand of the members of National Assembly in the form of resolution to the government to remove the Martial Law. Even the Prime Minister announced on 14th August 1985 that the Martial Law would be lifted on the last day of 1985. On 26th May 1985, three motions were presented by three different members of National Assembly regarding lifting martial law. Gohar Rehman, Mumtaz Tarar and Haji Saifullah forwarded their motions to the speaker and focused that after the elections, there was no justification of Martial Law. It should be eliminated practically. There was no moral and legal justification of Martial Law and the civilian government should not take relief under the banner of dictator. They even quoted the example of the martial law of Ayub Khan which had been lifted after the session of the elected body. Haji Saifullah delivered a speech in favor of the motions that:

“Martial Law and the democratic government cannot go side by side. When the martial law is imposed, the parliament will come to an end. Now the parliament has come into existence, that’s why, the martial law should be eliminated. If Mr. Bhutto in his initial days prolonged martial law, we would deprive of most of the part of West Pakistan along with East Pakistan. The referendum which was held under the Zia regime was unconstitutional. But

247 Ibid.,
people accepted it at the cost of transformation of power to the elected people. So it’s a time to transfer power to the elected people and there is no justification of martial law.”  

Fakhar Imam gave the rolling on the motions  

“I would not like to state on the privilege motion itself, but it has been a well-known historical practice for directly elected houses of parliament all over the world, which deal with and control the financial aspects of the state, that is the basic and fundamental privilege of a parliamentary legislature where it is elected on an adult franchise basis. The modern practice in respect of financial privileges is based on a resolution in the House of Commons, passed in 1671, that, in all aids given to the king by the commons, the rate of tax ought not to be altered by the Lords. This was way back in 1671.

A similar resolution was passed subsequent to that by the commons that all aids and supplies and aids to His Majesty and parliament are the sole gift of the parliament to direct, limit and appoint, in such ways, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants which ought not to be changed or altered by the house of lords. These resolutions have been restated and amplified in resolutions 1909-1910 and stand to this day.

Thus stated generally, the commons claimed privilege in respect of national taxation and expenditure. In short, any interference by the lords in matters in respect of which privilege is claimed is treated by the commons as a breach of privilege.

Today honorable members, we are debating the finance bill and applying the same principles. Monies which are to be debated on by the national assembly are to be spent for the objectives and purposes approved by this assembly. As this house is already debating the finance bill, which includes expenditures on Martial Law, and as these expenditures on Martial Law, whose objectives are not approved and, therefore, this constitutes a breach of privilege of both the members of the house and the house itself. I, therefore, hold the privilege motion in order.”

After lifting the Martial Law, parliamentary system used to operate and for the success of this system, political parties were very important because political parties form an integral part of

---
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the parliamentary system. The Prime Minister of Pakistan, Muhammad Khan Junejo, decided to become the President of Muslim League. With the support of Pir Pagara, he became successful in achieving his target. A large numbers of the members of Official Parliamentary Group joined Muslim League. On the other hand, the provincial chief ministers became the provincial presidents of Muslim League. It was an effort to organize the party at the national level. Even the Prime Minister and his ministers pressurized the members of the parliament and the provincial assemblies to join Muslim League before its registration with the Election Commission, as required by law, which rendered them liable to disqualification as they had joined an unregistered party. Independent members in the house raised the issue and the speaker referred it to the Election Commission for adjudication.

Reference Against Prime Minister

“National Assembly of Pakistan
Subject: Reference under article 63(2) of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan

1. Haji Mohammad Saifullah Khan, member of the National Assembly of Pakistan raised a question on the floor of the house on 04-02-1986 and also submitted a written petition on 13-02-1986 alleging that forty nine members of the parliament became members of Pakistan Muslim League before its registration as a political party under the political parties act, 1962 and thus became disqualified from being members of the parliament under para (P) of article 63(1) of the constitution read with section 3 B(6) of the political parties act, 1962, and section 10(2) (b) (7a) of the houses of parliament and provincial assemblies (Elections) order, 1977. He requested that question should be referred to the Chief Election Commissioner under article 63 (2) of the constitution.

2. Dr Sher afghan Khan Niazi, a member of the National Assembly, also made a petition on 03-04-1986, alleging that Messrs Mohammad Khan Junejo and Abdus Sattar

---

251 Muhammad Khan Junejo was a Sindhi Landlord from Sanghar district. The political experience of Muhammad Khan Junejo was witnessed by 1960s. he served as railway minister in Ayub Regime. His main qualification for the post of Prime Minister was that he was a Sindhi. The members of the National Assembly nominated Ilahi Buksh Soomro for the post Prime Minister but with the support of Pir of Pagaro, he succeeded in achieving the support of Zia. Arif, Working with Zia, P. 234.
Laleka, members of the National Assembly, have become disqualified from being members of the national assembly by acquiring membership of the Pakistan Muslim League before its registration as a political party under the above provisions of law.

3. Haji Mohammad Saifullah Khan presented documents consisting of extracts from Jang dated 10-2-1986 and Pakistan Times dated 19th and 20th January, 1986, Nawai Waqt dated 19th and 20th January 1986 and the Muslim dated 19th and 20th January 1986, which according to him indicated that two persons namely Messrs Mohammad Khan Junejo and Abdus Sattar Laleka had become members/office bearers of the Pakistan Muslim League.

4. Discussion between parties were held in my chamber on 05-03-1986, 11-03-1986, 12-03-1986, 25-03-1986, 02-04-1986 and 05-05-1986 in my presence along with the secretary and staff of the national assembly.

5. Haji Mohammad Saifullah Khan admitted on 05-05-86 that he had no proof on that day about 47 out of 49 persons mentioned in his petition but he produced evidence regarding two members namely Messrs Mohammad Khan Junejo and Abdus Sattar Laleka as stated above.

6. According to article 63 (2) of the constitution when a question is raised whether a member has been disqualified under article 63 (1) of the constitution, the speaker shall refer the question to the Chief Election Commissioner. This is the constitutional obligation of the speaker. It may be pointed out that earlier in a similar case the chairman of the senate Mr. Ghulam Ishaq Khan referred a petition dated 06-07-1985 to the Chief Election Commissioner. Accordingly I hereby refer under clause (2) of article 63 of the constitution, question of membership of Muhammad Khan Junejo and Abdus Sattar Laleka as stated in the petitions of Haji Mohammad Saifullah Khan and Dr Sher Afghan Khan Niazi to the chief election commissioner.”

Syed Fakhar Immam
Speaker

The Prime Minister got annoyed from this action of the speaker and he managed to help the President for this matter. The president issued an ordinance setting it aside with retrospective
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effect. The Prime Minister and his cabinet retaliated by arranging a vote of no-confidence against Fakhar Imam. After the removal of Fakhar Imam from the seat of speaker, the real but small opposition was formed.

On 23rd March 1986, Dr Mahbub ul Haq announced the budget in the National Assembly. 13.13 percent inflation factor has been applied to the defence bill; increase on defence was the largest increase so far, 10 percent tax on petroleum products, WAPDA and rail fares. The annual development budget had been combined with the revenue budget thus showing defence as 24 percent of the budget instead of the 47 percent of the revenue budget that it was last year.

**Dissolution**

On 29th May 1988, Zia dissolved the National Assembly and removed the Prime Minister under article 58(2)(B) of the amended constitution. He made the following allegations against Junejo government:

1. The law and order in the country had broken down to an alarming extent resulting in tragic loss of human lives.
2. The life, property, honor, safety and security of the citizens of Pakistan were rendered totally unsafe.
3. The integrity and ideology of Pakistan have been seriously endangered and doubts generated in this regard.
4. The president’s conscience always pricked that he had not fulfilled his promises regarding the enforcement of Islam made to the people in the referendum of 1984.
5. The public morality had deteriorated to an unprecedented level.
6. A situation had arisen in which the government of the federation cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the constitution necessitating an appeal to the election.

But these allegations were baseless and did not have any footings. While the differences of General Zia-ul-Haq and Muhammad Khan Junejo had started due to the following reasons.

1. The Prime Minister tried to develop his group in the institution of armed forces. General K.M.Arif, a close associate of the President, used to speak about the appointment of a new professional chief of Army Staff. The relations of

---

General K.M. Arif and the Prime Minister put the President in doldrums. President decided to relieve K.M. Arif from the institution on army but the Prime Minister did not like so.

2. In 1986, Prime Minister visited USA and warmly reception was received. During the whole visit, the American government ignored the President of Pakistan completely. It was a clear message that the civilian government would rule over Pakistan for five years. It was another cause of the differences of President and Prime Minister.

3. The appointment of the Vice Chief of army staff added fuel to fire and created rift. General Zia-ul-Haq wanted to replace K.M. Arif with General Zahid Ali Akbar, while the Prime Minister was against this decision. At last, he announced that the most senior would become the Vice Chief of army staff. In this way, Mirza Aslam Baig became the VCAS without any political affiliations.²⁵⁶

6. Senate

Qazi Hussain Ahmed moved the Privilege Motion on 6th July 1985 for lifting Martial Law. After the formation of the National Assembly, Senate and Provincial Assemblies, there was no justification of the Martial Law. Therefore, the House suggested that for the supremacy of Allah, Quran and Sunnah, it was necessary to lift Martial Law from Pakistan and the rights should be given to the people of Pakistan. The supremacy of Martial Law was the negation of the supremacy of Allah. Qazi Hussain Ahmed said that the military was invited for maintaining peace and this practice was exercised in different countries of the world but the civil institutions invited it and after maintaining peace, it went back to their real task not it used to take the price of it services which it provided. Muhammad Khan Junejo, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, also supported the privilege motion of Qazi Hussain Ahmed and informed the House about the history of Martial Laws in Pakistan. He pledged that they all had been elected for making efforts against the impositions of Martial Law. He suggested that a committee should be formed that would be consisted of the members of the Senate and it would present recommendations for lifting Martial Law. Both the Houses would collectively devise the policy against Martial Law. But he also focused that before lifting Martial Law it was necessary to pass the law about the revival of the political parties because it was necessary for lifting Martial Law. So he said that Qazi Hussain Ahmed should reconsider his privilege motion and gave the time to the members to

²⁵⁶ Azhar Sohail, General Zia Ka Gyara Saal, P 88.
think over it. Qazi Hussain Ahmed said that now they could not wait further and the Prime Minister should make commitment with House that in the month of July the Martial Law would remain no more. The Prime Minister said that the members should do their business with patience and focused on the Bill of the Political Parties. On the assurances of Prime Minister, Qazi Hussain Ahmed did not press the motion.\(^{257}\)

7. **Provincial Assemblies**

The elections of the Provincial Assemblies were held on 28\(^{th}\) February, 1985. The distribution of seats in the provincial assemblies was as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Area</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochista</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>460</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A large number of candidates filed their nominations for the elections of provincial assemblies. In the Punjab 2156 candidates filed papers for the 240 Muslim seats. Among 2156, two candidates were elected unopposed and election commission declared 1745 candidates eligible for contesting elections. In Sindh, 1141 candidates submitted their papers against the 100 seats. Four candidates were elected unopposed and after the scrutiny of the nomination papers 881 candidates were declared eligible for contesting elections.\(^{258}\) In Baluchistan 442 candidates filed papers and among them five were elected unopposed. In NWFP, 889 people filed papers. On the reserved seats of minorities, in Punjab, 78 candidates contested on the 8 seats. In Sindh, eighty five candidates contested on the nine seats and in Balochistan, twenty eight candidates contested on three seats. In NWFP, five candidates appeared on the three seats of the minorities.\(^{259}\)

It was also fact that certain number of seats had been reserved for women in the elections of 1985 in the National and Provincial assemblies. Thirteen women contested elections for general

\(^{258}\) The Muslims, January 24, 1985.  
\(^{259}\) The Muslims, January 24, 1985.
Muslim seats of the National Assembly and eighteen women in the provinces. The breakup was as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sind</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the Election Commission of Pakistan)

The President, after the elections, nominated the following persons as chief ministers of the various provinces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Chief Minister</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arbab Muhammad Jahngir Khan</td>
<td>NWFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ghous Ali Shah</td>
<td>Sindh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jaam Mir Ghulam Qadir Khan</td>
<td>Balochistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nawaz Sharif</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the Election Commission of Pakistan)

The provincial assemblies of Sindh, NWFP, and Punjab also passed the resolutions against the impositions of Martial Law and demanded the government of its removal.

The members of the provincial assemblies had become so powerful that they exerted pressure on the decisions of the federal government. On the issue of the water of Chashma Right bank Canal, the members of the provincial assemblies of Punjab and NWFP protested in the lobbies of the National Assemblies. The provincial ministers used to manage the members of the National Assemblies against their own prime minister and party. The MPAs from Punjab and NWFP gave tough time to the Prime Minister during his visit to the provinces. All the members and the chief ministers were doing all these things due to the support of the President, General Zia-ul-Haq. The Chief Ministers and Governors were more powerful than the Prime Minister. The Federal government issued the funds to the members of the National Assemblies but the implementations of the Developmental Works were being done through the provincial governments. The Federal government only completed the paper work without practical task. The Prime Minister sought
the support of the members of the National Assembly through managing the members of provincial assemblies. 260

**Election Turnout**

It was being expected that there would be a low turnout in the elections due to the boycott of the elections of MRD. Inspite of the alliance of political parties, the turnout remained 50 percent due to the support of the local politicians. 261 The expectations of the leaders of MRD could not be fulfilled and the unexpected turn out put them in isolation.

National Assembly 262

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provinces</th>
<th>Turnout %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>44.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>40.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>37.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>60.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Record of the Election Commission of Pakistan)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provinces</th>
<th>Turnout %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>62.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>50.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>48.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>46.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Record of the Election Commission of Pakistan)

**Judiciary and Non-Party Based Elections**

Zia dissolved the National Assembly and the cabinet of Junejo. He did not want to hold the elections on party basis again. But before the elections, he met his death. The Supreme Court

---

262 Report on the General Elections 1985, Volume II, Published by the Election Commission of Pakistan, Islamabad, P. 73
263 Ibid., P. 205.
delivered a judgment on non-party elections after the death of Gen. Zia-ul-Haq and declared the non-party based elections as against the spirit of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the 1973 constitution.\textsuperscript{264}

**Impact of the Election**

1. It served as a bridge between martial law and the restoration of parliamentary democracy.
2. A new leadership came to the forefront whose only prior political experience had been in the local body politics.
3. It enabled the social groups and politicians opposed to the PPP, to gain legitimacy and a political base which they were able to consolidate after coming into power.\textsuperscript{265}
4. MRD’s election to boycott elections disappointed the following sections of the society
   - Most of the politically-minded rural elite
   - Constituency-level political workers
   - The so called “pragmatic” elements among the intelligentsia who favored a break-through in the political stalemate.\textsuperscript{266}

**Conclusion**

The fever of the popularity of PPP was still prevailing in 1985 and Zia-ul-Haq decided to hold elections on non-party basis. Due to this decision, PPP decided to boycott the elections. The boycott of the elections from the political parties provided space to the new leadership to emerge.

MRD and its components did not participate in the elections. The Zia regime also utilized the resources to keep the major leadership away from the process of elections and it got success to some extent. But the leadership that emerged after the elections of 1985 also disliked the imposition of martial law further. The first speech of the Prime Minister Muhammad Khan Junejo in the National Assembly after becoming Prime Minister was against martial law and he demanded the President to lift martial law and restore democracy fully. In this way, the second opposition was emerged that was against the rule of dictator. It was the opposition within house of the National Assembly. The election of the speaker also strengthened the roots of opposition.

\textsuperscript{266} Andrew R. Wilder, *The Pakistani Voters: Electoral Politics and Voting Behaviour in the Punjab*, P. 33
and opposition came to surface. Later on, this opposition used to criticize the government policies on different issues.
CHAPTER 4

Internal Issues of Pakistan and Opposition

Introduction

Crises are the part of life. Every nation either poor or rich has to pass through the crisis, some crisis are the result of exogenous forces while others are man’s own making. After the death of elected government, Pakistan was passing through these kinds of crisis. Political activities along with political parties had been suspended, the condition of law and order was bleak, the whole edifice was bound to crumble and disintegrate. In this chapter, the problems of the government of Pakistan will be discussed and the critical analysis of the response of opposition on these issues will be highlighted. It is a descriptive and analytical study.

Official Political Party

Soon after the non-party based elections (25th Feb. 1985), the government tried to introduce a new political party with the support and influence of the governors, military officers and bureaucrats. Under the Martial Law regulations, the political parties had been banned and their political activities were restricted. The elections of the National Assembly had been held on non-party basis. The government functionaries had tried to compel the members to join the newly revived Muslim League. On 18th August 1985, LaiqauatBaloch presented the adjournment motion on the formation of Muslim League on the official expenses. He said that till the approval of the political parties’ amendment bill, all such political actions were against the regulations of Martial Law. Such efforts of the government in his view would prolong the Martial Law in Pakistan which was not acceptable to the members of the National Assembly. Haji Saifullah Khan also moved another adjournment motion on the same day and criticized the government that it was violating the rules which had been imposed by the Martial Law government and the formation of any political party was considered illegal. He said that it was not fair that the
sanctions had been imposed on the other political parties but the government was making effort to form its own political party under the supervision of the governors and military officers. He even said that the members were being detained in different cells for taking their signatures. The Minister for Law refuted such allegations but Haji Saifullah Khan recited the verses of the Holy Quran (Lanatullah Ha AlalKazi Bean). Shaikh Rashid Ahmed also referred to the statement of Dr Shar Afghan Niazi that he could not sleep for three days after his signatures. The district bureaucracy was playing role in compelling the members to join Muslim League. Hafiz Salman told the House about those members of Peshawar who firstly refused to join Muslim League inspite of the insistence of Prime Minister but later on they joined due to the involvement of the military officers and governor. He even said that in Lahore, Assistant Commissioners and Deputy Commissioners asked few members of the National Assembly not to attend the meeting of the members in the governor house that was presided over by the Prime Minister. Dr Shar Afghan Niazi seconded the statement of the members of the House and told the story when he was called by the Commissioner Sargodha and compelled him to join the official political party in the presence of the few military officers. All the members of the Jamat-i-Islami opposed the formation of Muslim League under the supervision of the government. But the speaker, after the debate and criticism on the formation of political party under the government supervision by the members of the House, ruled the motion out of order.267

Report of the Special Committee on the Future Political Structure

The special committee was established by the government for giving recommendations on the future political structure in the country. Initially, it consisted of nine members but the Prime Minister increased the strength of its members and it reached to twenty nine members. The Prime Minister announced that the committee would lead the House and the nation towards lifting offthe

Martial Law. Interior Minister, Aslam Khattak, became the chairman of that committee. From the first day, the committee used delaying tactics that created differences among the members of the committee. Even few members wanted to resign but on the insistence of the other members they continued. The members were not allowed to discuss the Martial Law in the meetings. Javed Hashmi criticized the report of the committee and declared that the government was not sincere in changing the system but it was only making efforts to delay the lifting of Martial Law. Though, Javed Hashmi was the member of the committee but he did not sign on the recommendations of the committee. He gave the statement in the House on 18th August 1985 that it was a conspiracy against the unity of the members of the House and through such recommendations it wanted to create a rift so that the divided members could be used for its own interests turn by turn. He said that in the meetings of the committee it was told that the Martial Law would not be discussed in the meetings of the committee but the Prime Minister correlated it with Martial Law. Gohar Rehman, Raja Afsar, also opposed the recommendations of the committee.268

Ch. Nisar Ali criticized those members who were opposing the committee. He alleged that the leaders of the opposition had remained in the government of General Zia-ul-Haq as ministers and they strengthened the Martial Law. Such people, he alleged, had also joined MRD and these people were agitating because they had not taken their share in the government.269

---
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Process of Islamization

The religious parties had gathered against Z.A.Bhutto due to his secular outlook and they wanted to implement Islamic system in Pakistan after his down fall. Zia-ul-Haq in an effort to take advantage of the situation and gain the support of opposition parties raised the slogan of Islamization in Pakistan. According to Talbot, he focused on five things for achieving his target

1. Judicial Reforms
2. The Islamic Penal Code
3. The economy
4. Educational Reforms
5. Women, the Minorities and Islamization\(^{270}\)

From these slogans, Zia-ul-Haq gained the following objectives

- The religious parties stood with him for the implementation of Islamization. A circle of pro-Zia people was developed in the shape of religious groups.
- Zia-ul-Haq used Islam as a legitimization strategy for the consolidation of his autocratic military rule. He exploited religion to evoke an emotional response in support of his regime.\(^ {271}\)

- Zia ignored the democratic forces under the banner of Islamization in Pakistan.
- He stressed the role of ideology while choosing to skip over real issues.

\(^{270}\) Talbot, *Pakistan a modern history*, PP. 270-279.
The election of 1985 was contested by the leaders of religious parties on the commitment of Islamization in Pakistan. Few of them also won the elections and became the part of National Assembly.\textsuperscript{272}

**Steps of Zia Regime**

- From 1979 to onward, the Zia government adopted a stance and took a decision against the Christians to expropriate the properties under the nationalized institutions in the garb of the provisions contained in Martial Law Regulation (MLR) 118. The properties under such Institutions were ordered to be transferred to the Government in the Revenue Records and Christian occupants of these properties were served notices to vacate such properties. The Supreme Court took the notice and rescued Christians with the decision that MLR 118 neither intended nor had the effect of making the government owner of the properties under such Institutions.\textsuperscript{273}

- Presidential Order 3 of 1979 established Sharia Benches of the four provincial High courts with the power to strike down any law which was repugnant to the teachings of Islam and such law would be invalid from the date set by the court. But soon these benches were replaced with Federal Sharia Court and it was working full time with the appointment of ulama as judges.

- In 1981, he introduced Ramadan Ordinance which declared drinking, eating, smoking in public a crime and suggested Rs.500 fine or two months imprisonment.

- In August 1984, through Presidential directive he introduced the system of appointment of prayer wardens to persuade and inspire persons to perform Namaz five times a day.\textsuperscript{274}

\textsuperscript{273} Tahir Kamran, *Election Commission of Pakistan, Role in Politics*, P. 141.
\textsuperscript{274} Talbot, *Pakistan a modern history*, PP. 272-273.
• Ordinance XXpf 1984 126 prohibited Ahmadis from using epithets, descriptions and titles reserved for holy personages or places of the Muslims and same was made a punishable offence.

Assertion By Sardar Shoukat Hayat Khan about Islam in Pakistan

Sardar Shoukat Hayat Khan, on the occasion of the Freedom Day (14th August), gave statement about Islam and Pakistan. He briefed the media spokespersons that Islam should not be enforced in Pakistan and the slogan of Islamization of Zia-ul-Haq was not correct. On the statement of a member of the Muslim League, Haji Saifullah Khan moved the privilege motion and condemned the statement with the arguments that the statement was the negation of the constitution. Mr. Hamza declared that the matter required the intervention of the assembly. Shaikh Rashid Ahmed also condemned the statement and suggested that such statements should not be given much importance because it would give projection to the anti-Pakistan and anti-Islam lobby. This statement of the former Muslim League leader about Islamization in Pakistan divided the opposition on that issue. Few said that it was the statement of one person and the House should not take it so seriously.275

Qazi Courts

The government repeatedly announced that the Qazi courts would be established in Pakistan. The purpose of these courts was to provide speedy justice. President of Pakistan even gave the dates for the establishment of Qazi courts in different divisions. During his visit to Sawat, he announced that the Qazi courts were going to work within few days in Malakand division but the government was not serious in fulfilling the promises of the President. On 10th June 1985, Haji Muhammad Unis Elahi, Rana Tanvir Hussain, Raja ShahidZafar, Mian Muhammad Zaman

stressed on the establishment of the Qazi courts and asked the minister for Justice and Parliamentary Affairs (Iqbal Ahmed Khan) to describe the reasons for not establishing Qazi courts so far, despite repeated announcements, and dates by which he said the courts will be established? The concerned minister did not have the sufficient reasons to describe and he requested the speaker to give him time for answering the question of the members.\textsuperscript{276}

\textbf{Council of Islamic Ideology}

The council made 641 recommendations to the government on laws and issues. Most of these recommendations were related to Arkaan-e-Deen, educational system, legal and judicial system, economic system, social system, Mass communication media etc. A number of major recommendations of the Council were implemented by the government while others were under active consideration of the government. The sum of Rs. 3,413,942/35 had been incurred on the Council of Islamic Ideology during the period from 1\textsuperscript{st} June, 1984 to 30\textsuperscript{th} June, 1985 by the government. The expenditure had been incurred on the establishment of the office of the Council which had been busy with the preparation of research material relating to provincial laws under the guidance of whole time member of the Council. The government did not appoint its proper chairman and day to day administration and routine functions of the Council were looked after by the senior whole time member of the Council and the financial matters were referred to the Ministry of Religious Affairs for disposal. But the government had not fully briefed the House about the changes which had been introduced for the time being. On 20\textsuperscript{th} August 1985, Ch. Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar asked the Minister for Religious Affairs and Minorities Affairs to state whether it was fact that Council of Islamic Ideology had not been set up after 31\textsuperscript{st} May, 1984 nor had its chairman been appointed and secondly the amount of money spent on the Council during

this period and the justification therefore; of the person responsible for running the administration of the Council in the absence of the Chairman.²⁷⁷

**Report of the Council of Islamic Ideology for the Year (1977-78)**

On 13th Feb. 1986, in the discussion on the report of the Council of Islamic Ideology for the year 1977-78, Haji Saifullah Khan described the motives of the formation of the Council of Islamic Ideology and the motives of those reports which were being presented in the House by the Council. The real motive in the report was to establish Pakistan as an Islamic welfare state which would provide the due rights of the people without any discrimination. It was an effort to provide opportunity to the people to live their lives according to the teachings of Islam. But in thirty eight years, no such serious efforts had been made in Pakistan. In previous eight years, the government prolonged its rule on the name of Islamization but without practical steps. He stressed that no body was feeling comfortable in Pakistan after the imposition of Martial Law. The condition of law and order was feeble; there was no protection of life and property. Under such circumstances, Pakistan could not be declared an Islamic welfare state. The labor class was facing deprivation, society had been divided into rich and poor people, no concept of equality prevailed over the society, the governmental policies were not giving relief to the poor people, courts had failed in doing justice according to the teachings of Islam, no proper arrangements for health and education, the farmers were not getting the proper prices of their products.

The Council had in its recommendations stated that there was no justification of the formation of political parties. Perhaps due to the report of the Council, the elections had been held on non-party basis but now the government was establishing a party which would strengthen its rule. For this purpose, the political parties amendment bill was introduced which

imposed defection clauses on the members and snatched their freedom. After one year of the elections, the House had failed to implement the recommendations of the reports of the Council of Islamic Ideology. The reports had become a joke for the government and the political parties were being established in the House inspite of rejection of the concept of Political parties by the Council of Islamic Ideology. Haji Saifullah Khan took more than one hour to deliver his views in the House and at last the speaker intervened.  

Malik Haji Khial Shah declared it a good step that the report of the Council of Islamic Ideology was being forwarded to the members of the House for consideration but he felt sorrow over the attitude of the government towards the implementation of Islamic principles in Pakistan. He said that all the members should forward their requests to the government to implement the report of the Council practically and its effect should also be seen. Orders of Usher, Zakat, Namaz had been issued but the positive impact of these orders could not be seen due to non-serious attitude of the government. 

Professor Muhammad Ahmed, after giving details of the process of the Islamization and its implementation in the light of the history of Pakistan, criticized the report of the Council of Islamic Ideology and declared it a fraud with the nation and the country. He suggested that the suggestions of Maulana Muhammad Taqi should be implemented, and then the society could be Islamized. Even he gave his own recommendations for islamization in Pakistan.  

Muhammad Nawaz Bossal declared the recommendations of the Council bogus and fraud. It was his opinion that the things were being made complicated and the ordinary people were unable to understand these complications. Islam is a simple religion and it should be implemented in a simple way. Islam was not the name of Zakat only. The government was

---

279 Ibid.,
280 Ibid.,
focusing on Zakat only which was not proper Islamization. Bureaucrats prepared the reports and these reports were forwarded to the House without any suggestions or recommendations. The government was using the name of Islam only but there were no proper arrangements for its implementation.\textsuperscript{281}

**Shariah Bill**

On 28\textsuperscript{th} November 1985, the meeting of the Federal Cabinet was held and the finance minister, Dr Mahboobul Haq, informed the ministers that according to the report of the standing committee on Shariah Bill, the Federal Sharia Court had the right to review the matters related to financial matter. Due to this authority, it would be impossible for the government to collect taxes properly. The finance minister and few other ministers showed concerns on the Sharia Bill. Maulana Sami ul Haq moved the privilege motion about undue apprehensions of the finance and other ministers about Sharia Bill. Maulana Kousar Niazi supported the point of Maulana Sami ul Haq and told that the cabinet had the right to implement the decisions of the House not to influence the decisions. Maulana Sami criticized the so called double standard of the government in implementing Islamic provisions in Pakistan. The government had announced that it had eliminated interest system in banking which was against the Islamic system and the whole economic system had been changed according to the system of Sharia and on the other hand the opposition of the Sharia Bill in the meeting of the Federal Cabinet was a matter of deep concern for the members of the Senate and the people of Pakistan.\textsuperscript{282}

**Implementation of Zakat and Reaction of the Shiite Community**

\textsuperscript{281} Ibid.,
Zakat is the share of the less fortunate members of the community from the wealth of the rich people. Pursuant to his zakat ordinance, monies derived by the government were to be divided into three parts

1. A local account
2. A provincial account
3. A central account

Such funds were earmarked for community use and were intended to spark development schemes from the village upwards.\textsuperscript{283} For zakat collections, a hierarchy of control boards was created. For the implementation of the supervision, administrator general was appointed by the President himself and he was directly answerable to Gen. Zia ul Haq. The scheme of the system of Zakat created opposition that sparked the religious differences among Shia and Sunni communities. In Pakistan, majority of the Shia community belongs to Ithna Ashari division, which is the state religion in Iran, while the minority of the Shia community belongs to Ismaili branch. The Shia community always dislikes the collection of Zakat at the official level and the decision of Zia regime to collect Zakat at the official level created controversy. At the height of the controversy, the Shia community had staged a protest in Islamabad against the decision of the government on the grounds that by no means and in no case would they accept the system. Pakistan People’s Party supported the Shia community regardless of its sectarian affiliation. The protest of the Shia community compelled Zia regime to bow down and accepted the demands of Shia community.\textsuperscript{284}

**Women Protest against the Hadood Ordinance**

\textsuperscript{283} Muhammad Munir, *From Jinnah to Zia*, P. 139.
\textsuperscript{284} Syed MujawarHussain, *Religion and Politics in Pakistan 1972-88*, P. 249.
The government passed the Hadood Ordinance in 1979 and it covered adultery, fornication, rape, prostitution, and false testimony, theft, drinking and gambling. Women’s groups had been especially critical of many of the Islamic injunctions. For example, charges of rape could not be supported. In some cases, the woman who appears under secular law to have been raped, instead found herself guilty of fornication or adultery, a situation that at times was found to the satisfaction of the sharia judge when it was apparent the woman was pregnant. Another Ordinance of 1984 became the cause of resentment among the women’s groups due to the rules of evidence under which, in matters of financial dispute, the evidence of two women was considered equivalent to that of one man. Some other orders of Gen. Zia-ul-Haq also took the opposition of the women of Pakistan. The orders declared that

1. women should stay at home and not work at public places  
2. women must not be involved in sports or drama when men might be in the audience  
3. women must wear “Islamic dress” when in government offices or other public places  

Women Action Forum (WAF) protested against the government’s policy of segregating women because it thought that it would throw women away from the arena of public life and put them back into the narrow and static world of domestic life. WAF also showed concern on the Hadood Ordinance and its leaders were also apprehensive about the repeal of President Ayub’s Family Laws Ordinance of 1961 which had been opposed by most of the rightest wing parties and ulama. Another group of the women who had educated themselves from liberal institutions also showed apprehensions on President Zia’s campaign for Islamization. 

---
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Ojhri Arms Depot Blast (10 April 1988)

Mumtaz Tarar, a member of the National Assembly, tabled an adjournment motion in the Assembly before this tragedy that Ammunition Dumps should be shifted from Rawalpindi and Lahore. But unfortunately, his motion did not receive any response from the members of the house and they did not show interest in this important issue. Well informed and active members of the assembly could be counted on the figure tips. Among them five or six were from the opposition benches.  

Ojhri Camp was an ammunition dump unknown to the civilian society. It was situated between Rawalpindi and Islamabad. This ammunition camp was suddenly exploded and had left hundreds of citizens died and a large number of injured people were admitted in hospitals. Asghar Khan has reported in his book that the eighty people met their death and eight hundred people were injured. Missiles, rockets and bombs went off and flew in all directions. Houses were destroyed. Fear had developed among the people of Rawalpindi and Islamabad. A missile also hit MNA, Khaqan Abbasi and his son, and he was killed. This incident exposed the weaknesses of the institution of military and it also created resentment against the army. Rallies and demonstrations demanded the government for accountability of the officers responsible for this tragic event. Along with this demand, it was being stressed that there should be reduction in defence expenditure.

Shaikh Rasheed also presented the picture of those events in his interview with the author and described the miserable conditions of the people. He said that

“………….Near Chandni Chowkn a shell whizzed by. I stopped there, go out of the car and started sending the children and outlookers under the shad of

---
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nearby houses and shops. As I was doing that a sheel fell on a little girl Shazia who was standing nearby. Her body was torn into pieces. I was the first person to reach Ojhri Camp. Behind me many other people arrived there for rescue work.”

Uproar could be heard in the country against this explosion. It also created few questions in the minds of the people. Why was the ammunition dump allowed to exist in a heavily populated area? Was it a convenient location for arms supply to Afghan fighters? Why did it explode?

The Prime Minister announced an inquiry of the event and said that the culprits would be brought to justice. He declared that the responsible military officers for an explosion at ammunitions dump at Ojhri in Rawalpindi would be removed from their offices. The open and straightforward stance of the Prime Minister embittered the relations of President of Pakistan with the Prime Minister because an investigation into the Ojhri Camp explosion threatened to embarrass the ISI.

Two committees were formed by the government for investigating the matter. First was the military committee headed by a serving General, Lt Gen Imranullah Khan. Within one week, the committee presented its report and recommended the removal of Gen Zia’s right hand man, Gen Akhtar Abdul Rehman, along with other senior military officials. It even suggested court martial for the culprits. But the recommendations of this committee were not implemented due to non-cooperation of president’s secretariat.

---
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Another committee was set up by the Prime Minister in consultation with the cabinet and his close colleagues. It consisted of five members, a cabinet minister and four federal ministers. Rana Naeem Muhammad Khan told the members of the Senate on 12th April 1988 that

“…………….the order in which we planned to proceed is that after the inquiry is completed for which 7 to 10 days have been given a sub committee of the cabinet (comprising of five ministers, Kazi Abid Sahib, Mr. Baloch from the Senate, Khattak sahib, Nasim Aheer Sahib and myself) will be supervising the working of the committee. We would also put up recommendations within one week of the completion of the report to the cabinet and indeed at the same time we will be taking into confidence the Defence Committee of this House as well as the National Assembly on the procedure and proceedings of the committee.........”

The members could not present the final findings but Aslam Khattak, the head of the committee, concluded with these words that

“No one was responsible; it was an act of Allah”

Shaikh Rasheed Ahmed declared the nomination of Aslam Khattak as a blunder because his whole family humbly followed the dictates of the agencies. It is said that the family of Aslam Khattak never acted according to conscience

Later on, the defence minister, Rana Naeem Mehmood, prepared a white paper with the signature of three members of political committee and declared Gen. Akhtar Abdul Rehman the responsible of the event. But its recommendations were also not implemented.

---
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Actually, Ojhri Camp depot was being used to store supplies for Afghan guerrillas. At that day, the trucks were being loaded with missiles but suddenly the explosion took place at 10.00 am.\textsuperscript{297} Zia-ul-Haq was in Kuwait at the time of the incident.

The government decided to give compensations to the aggrieved people and even the people soon forgot their dear and near ones and started filling their claims for compensations. Even few people got more than their actual price of property. The example of an advocate Majeed Abbasi can be quoted. Few persons submitted claims although they had not suffered any loss or damage.\textsuperscript{298}

On 12\textsuperscript{th} April 1988, in Senate, Muhammad Mohsin Siddique, Professor Khurshaid Ahmed, Dr Noor Jehan Panezai, Qazi Abdul Latif and Maulana Sami ul Haq moved the motions on the incidence of blasts, Ojhri camp Rawalpindi. They requested the chairman to take notice of the delay in investigations and the permission should be granted to the members to discuss the issue. The chairman granted the leave. Mohsin Siddique suggested during his speech that an open Judicial Inquiry presided over by a Chief Justice of a Provincial High Court or a Judge of the Supreme Court should be held. Maulana Sami ul Haq told the House that same depots existed in Pshawar, Hyeatabad, Kohat and Banu and the precautionary measures should be taken so that in future such incidents might be avoided. Professor Khurshaid Ahmed discussed it with the reference of historical events and quoted the incident of 1970 (Herbanuspura, Lahore). At that time the government promised that precautionary would be taken but all in vain. Now the government should formulate the national policy on this issue and ammunition depots should be shifted away from the settlements of the population. He criticized the administration with the allegations that no civil administration of Islamabad and Pindi did not take the incident seriously.

\textsuperscript{297}M. Asghar Khan, \textit{My Political Struggle}, P. 383.  
\textsuperscript{298}Author’s interview with Shaikh Rasheed.
People were in the condition of fear but no one was there to provide them relief. Even the servants of Civil Defence ignored the people and did not provide proper services to the injured people. He also suggested that an open Judicial Inquiry presided over by a Chief Justice of a Provincial High Court or a Judge of the Supreme Court with the members of the parliament as a part of the tribunal should be held. The events must be investigated and the report of that commission should be presented before the people of Pakistan. No doubt, such incidents had occurred in America and Russia also but precautionary measures must be taken. Dr Noor Jehan Panezai said that it was shameful for the government that due to the incident four thousands boys and girls were being found absent from their houses.  

Mr. Hasan A. Shaikh declared it the failure of the government and demanded that

“……………….Fresh enquiry may be held. High superior judicial officers or Superior Court Judges should be associated with it and then we should try to fathom the depth of the cause of this disaster.”

Ejaz Ali Khan Jatoi demanded the resignation of the defence minister due to the incident which engulfed the two important cities of Pakistan. He quoted the examples of different countries like USA where the President stepped down after Watergate scandal, in India the minister for Railway resigned after an accident of the trains. He presented the report of the Red Cross which showed the one thousand deaths and five thousand people were injured in the incident. The amount which government paid was not sufficient for the treatment of the injured people. He objected on the investigation through Army personals because the destroyed depot was under the custody of Army. The fair and transparent inquiry was not possible through Army officers because it was thought that few Army officers were involved in the incident. All the members
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stressed on the participation of the MNAs and Senators as members in the enquiry committees. Nawabzada Jahngir Shah said that it was the after effect of Martial Law because the Martial Laws often leave such kind of incidents for the nation. It was the failure of the institution of Army and it had failed in delivering goods to the people. He pointed out the ammunition depots in Queta near the offices of PIA and Civil Aviation and considered dangerous and demanded that these depots should be shifted from these places; otherwise the destruction at the vast level could be expected. General (Rtd) Jamaal Syed Mian raised few questions on the government regarding the issue and requested the commission (established by the Prime Minister) to answer these questions in the report. The questions were:

1. Was it a regular depot or temporary arrangement?
2. If it was a regular depot, then what precautionary measures had been taken?
3. Was it the result of negligence or sabotaging?  

It was a very unfortunate tragedy and a national catastrophe that had befallen Pakistan. Enquires had been set up. But the results of those enquires had not been placed before the public. But such enquires were not conducted in a manner in which public confidence could be gained. Most of the members demanded that enquires had no other objectives except that we should know the causes of that disaster. At the same time, people should be satisfied that everything had been done to find out the cause of the disaster and steps to be taken for the purpose that such disasters would not take place in future. Even some members suggested that such stores should have been kept outside the populated area of the capital. It was very unfortunate that forty years had passed, but cantonments still existed in busy cities of Pakistan. Therefore, they should be placed outside the city limits to make the people safe.

---

It was dismal that in Senate, only one day (12\textsuperscript{th} April 1988) was given to the members of the House to discuss the incident of explosions at Faizabad or Ojhri Camp. All the speakers spoke against the government, Army, police and executive. They demanded from the government to enquire the issue as soon as possible.
Law and Order (Conditions in Sindh and NWFP)

In Karachi, the major communities were Punjabi, Pakhtoon, Mahajirs and religious parties. Punjabi-Mahajir differences, Pakhtoon-Mahajir differences, Jamaat and Mahajir differences embroiled the situation in Karachi and eliminated the peaceful atmosphere. The major cause of dispute within these groups was to have hegemony over Karachi. The Pakhtoon leader Khan Abdul Wali Khan came to Karachi for a visit in 1986 but the government refused to allow him to enter in the vicinity of Karachi. The Jamaati-i-Islami had remained a part of the Zia government but now the game of cat and mouse was being played between MQM and Jamaat. The Zia’s policies had divided the forces on basis of regionalism and language and sowed the seeds of hatred and agony which can be even seen in 2011. The events of bombings, firings, attacks on transport, deaths tolls are the constant features of the cities of Karachi and Hyderabad.

The Afghan war also left long sighted impact on the politics of Karachi. Massive supply of sophisticated weapons to the Afghan Mujahideen led to the proliferation of arms in the country from Peshawar to Karachi and produced the Kalashnikov culture. Another result of the ten year long Afghan war was the drug smuggling as the principal conduit by which weapons reached the Afghan rebels in the North became one of the main organized routes of heroin for Karachi, Europe and USA. The mafia which was created by Afghan war used to exert its influence over Karachi which was not acceptable to the Mahajirs and tussle was started between these factions.

Though, the condition of law and order was feeble in 1985 also and the members of the Senate felt it. On 6th July 1985, QaziHussain Ahmed moved an Adjournment motion regarding

---
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Law and Order situation in Karachi. The chairman Senate declared it provincial subject but Qazi Hussain Ahmed told the importance of the city of Karachi and Sindh. He stressed that the poor conditions of Law and Order would leave bad effect on the other provinces also.\textsuperscript{304} The year of 1986 was very important in the politics of Sindh. First time Sindhi-Mahajir conflict had started. Few personalities of PPP and Mumtaz Bhutto with the collaboration of Hafeez Pirzada made an effort to instigate the Sindhis against Mahajirs. In Karachi, the conflicts had started among the Mahajirs, Pathan and Afghans. The transport of Karachi was under the control of Afghans and Pathans, that’s why the Mahajirs used to attack on the transport and burnt the buses in the Karachi. In the same year, conflicts came to surface between the Pathans and Mahajirs in Karachi and Hyderabad.\textsuperscript{305}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Major Events In 1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pathan – Mahajirs Conflict in Karachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 December 1986, MQM declared it a Black Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Attack on Orangi Town, 75 Mahajirs met their death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 December 1986, the events of Aligarah and Qasbah colonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Altaf Hussain was arrested by Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sahrab Goth, Firing on the caravan of MQM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>attacks on the Mahajirs in Shah Faisal colony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{304} The Senate of Pakistan Debates, Official Report, Vol. IV, 1985  
\textsuperscript{305} Muneer Ahmed, \textit{Altaf Hussain}, pp. 103-107
**Riots In Karachi and Hyderabad**

The parliament felt sorrow over the killings in the different cities of Sindh. It was very painful occasion for the people of Sindh. The members of Senate put up the issue in the house and demanded the government to brief the House. Maulana Kousar Niazi raised the issue and put the following questions regarding the issue:

(a) The number of persons killed and injured during the recent riots in Karachi and Hyderabad indicating also the number belonging to law enforcing agencies

(b) The question and details of loss caused to the public as well as private property?

Mr. Muhammad Aslam Khan Khattak (Interior Minister) gave the following details to the house about the massacre in Sindh and Hyderabad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Killed Injured</th>
<th>Karachi</th>
<th>Hyderabad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>849</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Law Enforcing Agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Govt Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Railway stations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>No. of Attack</td>
<td>No. of Injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attack on Police Stations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Petrol Pumps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>……</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Garment Factory</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Post Offices</td>
<td>…….</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cinemas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>…….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>College Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>…….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Carts</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fire Wood Depots</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Timber Market</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(National Assembly Debates)

**Bomb Explosion in Karachi**

On 9th Feb. 1985, a bomb explosion took place in the building of ShaikhZaid Bin Sultan Trust and it not only damaged the building but also created fear among the people of Karachi. But the media did not give coverage to the explosion at the national level. In the explosion, many persons were injured, the furniture was damaged, and window panes were broken. Muzafar
Ahmed Hasmi, on 13th Feb. 1986, criticized the treasury benches that the bureaucracy and the media tried to black out the event.\textsuperscript{306}

**Failure of the Government to Stop the Riots and Massacre in Karachi**

On the failure of the government in handling the massacre, few members not only criticized the policies of the government but also demanded the house to play its role. Among them were Mr. Javed Jabbar, Ahmed Mian Soomro, Prof. Khurshid Ahmed. Javed Jabbar put up the motion in the Senate stating:

"Thank you Mr Chairman. I ask for leave to move that the privilege of this House as the supreme custodian of the rights of all the people of Pakistan has been breached by the unparalleled break down of governmental authority and inexcusable in competence both at the Federal and provincial levels as a result of which hundreds of innocent human beings including men, women, children were massacred in Karachi between December 12 and December 21, 1986. The use of the armed forces of Pakistan both during the operation clean up of Sohrab Goth which commenced on December 12th 1986 and after the massacre had begun on December 14, 1986 conclusively proves that the Federal government is closely concerned with this entire catastrophe, thus giving this tragedy the very highest priority for immediate consideration by the Senate which is the highest legislative body of the country."\textsuperscript{307}

The chairman Senate tried to stop the motion in the discussion of admissibility but Mr. Javed Jabbar gave his convincing arguments on the admissibility. It was his opinion that


\textsuperscript{307} Senate Debates, 6th January, 1987.
“…………..the institution of state consists of three institutions. The legislature, Executive and Judiciary. Where one of these three institutions fails on so great and colossal a scale, the privilege of the third institution or any one of the other two which is in this case Parliament is automatically and directly breached because the credibility of the parliament is immediately open to question. The dignity of parliament is open to question by the people who suffer the atrocities perpetrated through inaction by the competent authorities. Sir, in this case there is an inexplicable and so far un-explained six hour scandal. A six hour scandal of silence that pervaded the whole of Karachi while massages had already been passed to the authorities both Federal and Provincial that a massacre was taking place. There was no action taken to ensure that the necessary troops, the necessary forces are sent to the places where action had already commenced. Most surprising sir, even after the imposition of curfew on that first tragic day the second day resulted in casualties even higher than the first day which conclusively proves that if at all there is any doubt on the competence or failure of the Federal and Provincial governments on the first day then what happened on the second day, is even more indubitable evidence of the failure of the entire law enforcement system in this country. Sir, when one has witnessed oneself directly the consequences of this massacre as perhaps I being the first member of Parliament who reached the hospital within four hours of that massacre having begun no one here is perhaps better qualified than me to tell you how the people of this country in the system that runs this country at the total lack of governmental presence anywhere insight even after the curfew had been
imposed there was no sign of governmental authority at the hospital level when everyone knew days in advance.................."

Haji Akram Sultan showed resentment over the motion of the member and tried to ridicule his statement. He quoted the Prime Minister who personally visited Sindh after massacre and he invited all IPG, OPG, Jamat-i-Islami, and every respected Senator, MNA from Karachi and elsewhere to give their points of view. He also refuted the statement of Javed Jabbar about his visit of the places where the massacres had occurred.

While, Mr Ahmed Mian Soomr supported Javed Jabbar’s version and condemned the statement of the Interior Minister. He pleaded that

“I think Javed Jabbar is fully justified in bringing this privilege motion. If this house does not deem it a breach of privilege of one of its main functions and responsibilities what else could it do because government is responsible to Parliament and Parliament cannot afford to close its eyes to a massacre in its country. I call it a massacre because hundreds of lives have been lost, hundreds of men, women and children injured. It was really carnage where for six hours they were as if allowed to let loose. Not only had that, as you rightly pointed out the next day when the administration had moved in, the same thing happened. It is not reasonable to make just the Governor the scapegoat of that. We should take into account the person who is really responsible for this, so I would request you and appeal to you not to reject this privilege motion on mere technicalities.

But I hope that it will not be like the previous law and order issue debate where several suggestions were made and accepted by him (Interior Minister) but nothing has come out of that. I hope he will not follow the same thing in this

---
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debate because this is something very serious and I hope that he would certainly give this debate the importance that is due to it.”

Both the members stressed that large scale riots taking place in any part of the country can be construed to amount to a breach of privilege of the parliament and the government had failed in its responsibilities. But the Interior Minister stated that the question of breach of privilege did not seem to be relevant. He highlighted that there is a chapter on privileges in our rules of procedure and conduct of business and like the rulings of the High Court on what constitutes and what does not constitute privilege or breach of privilege of a house. Due to cold response of the government, JavedJabbar walked out from the House as a protest.

**Bomb Explosions in Peshawar Television Station**

On 16th October 1985, at about 13.00 hours, explosion did take place in the Technical section of Pakistan Television Center, causing damage to furniture, window panes and equipment, fortunately no loss of life took place as the staff was out for lunch at that time. A gun carton slab of the size of 1 kg exploded, Rai Ahmed Nawaz moved the motion in the National Assembly that the discussion should be started on the bomb explosions in Peshawar television station. Due to this event, the machines of the technical section had completely been destroyed and it had also damaged the building of the station. The initial inquiry showed that it was a subversive activity. It was matter of deep concern that strict system had been devised for the investigation of the visitors at the main gates of the station. Inspite of this, the terrorists had reached at the center of the station. Such kind of events had become a matter of routine and the government had fully failed in managing it. So the House should take notice of it. ShaikhRasheed Ahmed seconded the motion and demanded that it must be discussed in the House. Rai Ahmed Nawaz demanded from

---
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the Minister that he should inform the House about the progress of the investigation. He felt sorrow over the assurances which were given to the members of the House after every incident. What measures had been taken by the government? He demanded that the government should not spare those people who were involved in such kind of activities.311

**Abductions**

On 13th Feb. 1986, Shah Baleeghuddin asked the Interior Minister to state the number of adult males and females abducted during the year 1984 and 1985, in the country, province wise? Muhammad Aslam Khan Khattak gave the figures of the abducted males and females in Punjab, Sindh, NWFP and Balochistan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punjab</th>
<th>Sind</th>
<th>NWFP</th>
<th>Balochistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>2734</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3715</td>
<td>3357</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

The honorable member showed unsatisfaction over the figures which were presented by the Interior Minister. Then he also asked the minister to give the figure how much had been recovered among them in eleven months? M. Hamza criticized the Interior Minister that he did not have exact information about the national issue which was directly related to the lives of the people. It was the department of Interior Minister and he did not know about the performance of his department. Noor Hussan declared it the failure of the police department and even he alleged that the few officers of the police department (SSP level) were providing protection to the culprits and under these circumstances how the abduction could be stopped? Shah Baleeghuddin

---

told the minister that he had given the figures of the month of November but the figures of the month of December had not been given. It showed that in the month of December, the ratio of abduction had increased and that’s why the minister was hesitating to give the exact figures of the month of December.  

**Religious Differences and Sectarianism**

Zia’s religious policies created the rifts among the religious sects. Muslims murdered their Muslim brothers due to religious differences. Shia had taken weapon against Sunni; Sunni had taken weapons against Deobandi. Such differences had never been seen in the history of Pakistan. Zia ulHaq ignored the Shia community and even no Shia judges were appointed to the Federal Shariat Court. Such conditions compelled the Shia community to refuse to accept the decisions of the Federal Shariat Court which led to further differences between the different religious communities.

On 17th June 1987, Mr. Hamza criticized the polices of the government especially Interior Ministry with the reference to the bleak conditions of law and order in different provinces of Pakistan. He even said that the murders of ex-chief minister and governor Baluchistan were a question mark on the performance of the provincial as well as the central governments. Police, FIA and bureaucracy had failed in maintaining the conditions of law and order in the provinces and the Tribal areas of Pakistan. He even suggested the treasury benches to resign if it had failed in delivering the people in effective manners. He quoted the cyclo styled statement of the President and the Prime Minister that both the personalities gave their statement after every tragic event and said if the government machinery had operated properly and it was not possible

---
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for the culprits to save themselves from the law and the government agencies. Such kind of statement had failed in controlling the ratio of crimes.\textsuperscript{315}

**Holding of Office of Profit By the President**

On 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 1985, Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan moved the privilege motion on the issue of holding of office of profit by the president. He stated that under the article of 43 of the constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan 1973, the President could not hold the office of profit. So he should leave the job of Chief of Army staff because after taking the oath as a President he was bound to do so. But he had not resigned from the post of Chief of Army staff which was clear negation of the articles of constitution of Pakistan. He quoted the article 41 (7) which was as under

\textit{``Notwithstanding anything contained in this article or article 43 or any other article of the constitution or any other law, Gen Mohammad Zia ulHaq in consequence of the result of the referendum held on the 19\textsuperscript{th} day of December 1984 shall become...........''}

He mentioned article 43 and according to this article General Zia-ul-Haq could not become the candidate for the post of President and even not contest the elections. Inspite of this, he had assumed the office of President on 23 March 1985 and from that date the article 43 had applied.

\textit{``The President shall not hold any office of profit in the service of Pakistan or occupy any other position carrying the right to remuneration for rendering of the services.''}

Haji Saifullh Khan said that it was the clear violation of the constitution of 1973 and the privilege of the House had been threatened. The House was the custodian of the constitution and it could not ignore the violation of the constitution of Pakistan.

DrShar Afghan Niazi seconded the privilege motion of Haji Saifullah Khan and requested the speaker that it must be admitted for discussion. He mentioned that the President should resign from the Chief of Army staff after taking the oath of President. He could not hold two offices at the same time.\textsuperscript{316}

Press Restrictions

On 13th Feb. 1986, Shah Baleeghuddin demanded the government to brief the National Assembly about the restrictions which had been imposed on the press. Ch. Shujaat Hussain quoted the article 19 of the constitution of Pakistan and refused to have any kind of restriction on the press. Liaquat Baloch refuted the statement of the minister and said that no doubt, the article 19 had given the freedom to press but not in the presence of Press and Publication Ordinance. He informed the minister and House that the government had the right to issue quota of papers to newspapers and magazines and under these circumstances how the freedom of press could be ensured? The government had so many powers due to the Press and Publication Ordinance, quota for Papers and division of the quota of advertisement. He said that the treasury benches always promised to ensure the freedom of Press but no practical steps had been taken yet. 317

Military Officers in District Management Group and Police Service of Pakistan.

On 13th Feb. 1986, Liaquat Baloch, MNA, asked the Minister Incharge of the Establishment Division to state the names, ranks, present designation, and educational qualification of the military officers and dates of their transfers in the District Management Group or Police service of Pakistan? The treasury benches provided the list of those military officers who had been inducted in Police and DMG. Liaquat Baloch critically evaluated the list and informed the House that since 1960, 142 military officers had been inducted in these departments. Among them, forty two had been inducted before the Martial Law and one hundred military officers joined Police and DMG after the imposition of Martial Law. He again showed concerns on the induction and asked the minister to tell the House either it had been inducted according to fixed quota or not? Raja Shahid Zafar also pointed out the criteria of the induction and said that the sons, son-in-law, nephews of the senior military officers were inducted in the civilian departments and there was no strict rules and regulations in this regard. M. Hamza also disliked the induction process and made it clear that the original police service did not like such kind of inductions and the officers of the Police Service considered these inductions a hurdle on

their promotions. He highlighted a difference between police service and military service and demanded from the government that special training programmes should be launched for the military officers before their induction. Liqaut Baloch considered it a political corruption and major cause of deprivation of the rights of the people of Pakistan. He demanded that it must be abolished and these seats should be advertised in the national newspapers for recruitment on open merit. Syed Nusrat Ali Shah also objected on the induction of military officers in civilian institutions. He said that

“…………….that Police Service, like the military service, is also a specialty, and I find here that some of the important positions and posts in the Police Service are occupied by those people who had basic training as military officers…………….one of the reasons for the deterioration of the Police in Pakistan has been that so many military people, without proper training, have been inducted in the police force of Pakistan.”

Judicial System of the Country

Haji Safi ullah Khan moved the motion under Rule 220 in the House on 28th January 1986 and the House took it for consideration. Ch. Ameer Husain gave a lengthy speech on the importance of the judicial system of any country and stressed that the business of the state could not be run smoothly without the effective judicial system. Mrs Rafia Tariq, Malik Abdul Rauf, Dr Sher Afghan Niazi interrupted and pointed out the quorum. But the speaker continued the session. Maulana Ghoar Rehman gave the suggestion of Islamic Judicial System in Pakistan according to the teachings of Quran and Sunnah.

Collection of Zakat and Usher

On 6th July 1986, Sardar Rais Shabbir Ahmed put the question to the Minister for Finance and Economic Affairs to state as to how much collection of Zakat and Usher had been made from the date of commencement of the system in the country and as how much collection of Zakat pertained to the Bahawalpur division? He asked how much Usher had been distributed to charitable and other institutions and individual families, year wise?

---

YasinWatto gave the figures of the amount of Zakat uptoShahban 1406 AH whichwereRs. 6186.4 million and the amount of Usher collected from the Rabi 1982-83 uptoKharif 1985 was Rs. 728.34 million. The Minister told the House that the deduction of Zakat was effected through Banks and other financial institutions which reported figures of collection of Zakat on countrywide basis. But it was dismal that no record was maintained in respect of collections relating separately to each province or division or district. Usher was collected fiscal wise which is as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rabi 1982-83</td>
<td>33.49</td>
<td>33.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharif 1983</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>21.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabi 1983-84</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>19.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharif 1984</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>22.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabi 1984-85</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Report of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

Rai Ahmed Nawaz took the statement of the Minister that “the deduction of Zakat was effected through the banks and other financial institutions” and he said if the deduction was effected through banks on those amounts which were deposited in banks and said it was another kind of interest that was being collected on the name of Zakat? Ch. Nisar Ahmed, Parliamentary Secretary could not give the satisfying answer to the member. Shaikh Rashid Ahmed gave a secondary question that after the deduction, how much amount remained in the government account till the handing over to the needy people. During this period, the banks paid interest on the said amount. Would the treasury bench like to tell where that amount was spent? The parliamentary secretary told that the amount of profit of the Zakat amount was also included in the Zakat amount. Malik Muhammad AslamKhachila criticized the statement of the Minister that “no record was maintained in respect of collections relating separately to each province or division or district” and said that the government should maintain the record of Zakat and Usher at district level also. Khan Arif Khan raised the point about the satisfaction of the people on the proper delivery of Zakat. Was it being given to the real needy people? Were people getting easily that amount?320

---

On 6th July 1986, Javed Hashmi, MNA, took the notice of the deduction of Zakat from the holders of PLS/Saving Banks Accounts in case the balance at their credit was Rs. 3,000 or more on the first of Ramzanul Mubarik. He asked the Minister for Finance and Economic Affairs that was it a fact that in certain cases Zakat was being deducted from government employees on the cheques issued to them by A.G.P.R. for Housing Building advance, Motor car/ Cycle advance and General Provident Fund advance? He also asked whether it was a fact that Zakat was also being recovered from such employees at the time of final/part payment of their GP fund? Mian Muhammad Yasin Watto refused to accept all baseless allegations. 321

The official zakat system was not being operated properly due to fake zakat committees and even embezzlement in the distribution of Zakat. Talbot also recognized this fact in his book ‘Pakistan a modern history’ 322 but the opposition minded people in the Houses of Senate and National Assembly did not highlight as they should.

Non-Association of Members with the Preparation of Annual Development Programmes

The member of the National Assembly, Fazal Razaq, presented a motion that the representatives of the people were not involved in the preparation of the Annual Development Programmes (ADP). It was their right to be involved the schemes which were devised for the welfare of the people of Pakistan. He said that bureaucracy was not the ruler but the servants of the state and they had to do work under the elected representatives. There were the two kinds of Democracy, one political democracy and second economic democracy. Both were necessary and without economic democracy the concept of political democracy would not be meaningful. The members of House made efforts for political democracy and raised voices against Martial Law but no serious efforts had been made for economic democracy because it had been hijacked by the bureaucracy. No doubt, fifty lacs had been allocated to each member of this House but it was useless if the members were not involved in the preparation of ADP by the bureaucracy. He gave the suggestion that at the Divisional level committees should be established which consisted of those elected members who belonged to that Division. Ch. Muhammad Bashir Randhawa gave

322 Talbot, Pakistan a modern history, P. 272.
the indications of corruption in the Development Programmes and alleged that bureaucracy is involved in corruption. The House, he said, was consisted of doctors, engineers, lawyers, ulama and all these people should play role in eliminating the corruption.

AbidaHussain criticized the government that it had created an impression that the members of the National Assembly got 50 lakhs rupees in their individual capacities. She made it clear that the members were not recipient of any charity and had not pocketed these funds. It must be cleared that these funds were not given to the MNAs individually or separately; they were the part of the procedural development programme. It was not charity for any individual or any institution; it was the right of the public representatives because it was the public representatives in whose name all governments stand constituted.323

SardarAseff Ahmed Ali submitted his submissions that

“.......total programme represents less than five percent of the National Budget whereas ninety five percent of the Budget has been beyond the purview of the members of the National Assembly.......five percent is meant to be an opiate for the people of Pakistan whereas 95 percent decisions are taken by the bureaucracy in Islamabad and have nothing to do with National Assembly whatsoever.”324

JavedHasmi and LiaquatBaloch exposed the flaws in the policies of government regarding ADP and stressed on the formation of the committees at the district level and the government should send different teams in the districts for inspection. They also stressed the importance of the members of National and Provincial Assemblies in the formulation of the schemes of ADP. JavedHashmi repeated the point of AbidaHussain that 50 lakhs had not been given to the members individually because the view had been promoted that the government had given the price of each member to him. The government should eliminate such kind of impressions which the media was spreading among the people.325

Unemployment

Unemployment as an issue of great importance and urgency attracted the attention of the members of the House of National Assembly and on 28th Nov. 1985, Ch. Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar,

321 Interview with AbidaHussain
323 Ibid.,
Shaikh Rashid Ahmed moved the motion on this issue. They told the House that a large number of the people were facing unemployment and the unemployed people were putting pressure on the elected members to adjust them in various departments of the government. Ch. Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar asked the Minister Incharge of the Planning and Development Division to state whether it was a fact that unemployment rate had increased to 35% in the country. Shaikh Rashid Ahmed showed his worry over the increasing ratio of unemployed people. They compelled the treasury benches to inform the House about the policy paper on the subject of unemployment and how the Planning Commission was making efforts to create more opportunities for educated and uneducated unemployed people.\footnote{The National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, Official Reprot, Vol. III, 1985.}

**Drugs Addiction**

The Interior Minister (Aslam Khan Khattak) gave the figures of the addicted people in the National Assembly and even mentioned the quantity of the drugs seized by the government. It was as under,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Name of Drugs</th>
<th>Quantity Sized</th>
<th>Persons Arrested</th>
<th>Persons Prosecuted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>22,337.521 Kgs</td>
<td>10901</td>
<td>10520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>34,807.000</td>
<td>15608</td>
<td>6653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>27,994.955</td>
<td>4820</td>
<td>3383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>31,737.154</td>
<td>11623</td>
<td>10489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>431.689</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>53,173.482</td>
<td>12108</td>
<td>11418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>2,392.801</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>49,764.305</td>
<td>4176</td>
<td>4142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>3,376.704</td>
<td>3913</td>
<td>2801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>31,566.499</td>
<td>12303</td>
<td>11387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>1984 Quantity</td>
<td>1985 Quantity</td>
<td>N.A. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,223.412</td>
<td>2,428.821</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,311.744</td>
<td>56,389.935</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

The members of the National Assembly took these figures critically and showed their doubts on it. They said that the government had not caught the culprits and taken no effective measures to stop the spread of this social evil. That meant that the government did not bother to collect the names of addicted people. Dr Muhammad Shaifque declared it a failure of the government and rejected the false figures which were presented by the government in the House.\(^\text{327}\) In Senate, Professor Khurshid Ahmed declared Bara Markets as the centers of promoting narcotics and smuggled goods. Due to the promotion of narcotics, it seemed that there was no government in Pakistan or it did not have control on the promoters. But the government was refusing to accept such figures and not willing to take any action.\(^\text{328}\)

---


President and Prime Minister Differences

Though the President had immense powers along with the nomination of the Prime Minister but his own nominated Prime Minister soon developed differences with him. Due to these differences a new opposition had emerged who was against the continuation of Martial Law after the elections of 1985 and was in favor of strong Prime Minister instead of President that was the team of Muhammad Khan Junejo and he himself. Even Muhammad Khan Junejo refused to accommodate those ministers who were recommended by Zia ul Haq. A lot of factors played role in these differences

- Afghan war created rift within the both personalities because both had different approaches on that issue. The Prime Minister put the question of Afghan war to the National Assembly where the MNAs were mostly opposed to the continuation of Pakistan’s involvement in Afghanistan’s struggle and considered it dangerous for Pakistan’s security. Muhammad Khan Junejo publicized this opinion of the members of National Assembly in public meetings but President, Zia-ul-Haq, had different views. ^329

- The incident of Ojhri Camp blast was another cause which added fuel to fire. At the time of incident, the President was in Kuwait for attending the Summit of OIC Science Group. Muhammad Khan Junejo had the opinion that General Akhtar Abdur Rehman who had been the main pivot of training facilities for the Afghans and supply of equipment to them was the real responsible of the incident. While General Akhtar Abdur Rehman was the close associate of the President. Both the personalities established separate commissions for inquiry. ^330

- Muhammad Khan Junejo worked against Zia’s philosophy of non-party based politics and involved Pakistan People’s Party leadership in his government’s diplomacy on Afghan issue. Secondly, the Prime Minister called meeting in the President House Rawalpindi and both the personalities addressed the gathering about the feasibility of party based politics. The most of the present members supported the stance of Prime Minister. It was a serious below to Zia-ul-Haq on

^330 Ibid. P. 280.
the issue of party system in Pakistan because he wanted to have a non-party system.

- A few ministers had been taken in the cabinet by the Prime Minister on the recommendations of the President but soon after they were replaced. The Prime Minister replaced General Yaqub Khan with a civilian foreign minister ZainNoorani. He ignored pro-Zia ministers in awarding development schemes.

- It was also perception that USA did not further want to work with Zia-ul-Haq and it boosted the Prime Minister against President. Muhammad Khan Junejo, after the visit of USA, used to openly criticize the policies of Zia-ul-Haq on Afghan war. General Zia-ul-Haq wanted to work with Mujahideen and their leadership in Afghanistan and on the other hand the government of USA had decided not to support the Mujahidin further.\textsuperscript{331}

- The Prime Minister Junejo, after becoming the Prime Minister, had adopted an independent line and even refused to accept the small requests of the President. He replaced his ministers first and decided to attend all international conferences himself instead of President (Bangalore SAARC Summit).

- In the Budget 1986-87, the Prime Minister included a new proposal known as Defence Surcharge which was not received well in the military and his announcement that an army officer would not be entitled to any car other than the Suzuki also created a gulf between the government and the military.\textsuperscript{332}

- The Prime Minister wanted ceremonial splendor but the President did not want to give him all these on the occasions of National Day.\textsuperscript{333}

- Muhammad Khan Junejo assumed the portfolio of Prime Minister along with Defence. The COAS was answerable to defence minister and at that time Zia ul-Haq was serving as COAS. At the same time, Muhammad Khan Junejo as a Prime Minister was responsible to Zia-ul-Haq, because he was serving as the President at the same time. Such kind of clumsy arrangements created the circumstance that led to the dismissal of Junejo government.\textsuperscript{334}

\textsuperscript{331} Syed Shabir Hussain, Ayub, Bhutto and Zia, How they fell victim to their own plans, P. 278.
\textsuperscript{332} Ibid. P. 277.
\textsuperscript{333} Ibid., P. 275.
\textsuperscript{334} Shahid Javed Burki & Craig Baxter, Pakistan Under the Military – Eleven Years of Zia-ul-Haq, P. 16.
These factors placed Muhammad Khan Junejo in the opposite camp of Gen. Zia-ul-Haq who had his own plans to continue his rule under the slogan of islamization. It was difficult for any government to run the affairs of the state with the opposition of the President. It is dismal fact that in Pakistan the foreign policy has mainly been designed by the armed forces and it does not matter either they are directly governing the country or not. Since its establishment, Pakistan is facing such problems and whenever the elected governments raised objections on this issue, they faced the hostile response from the army including dissolutions.

**Conclusion**

The government did not face resistance so much from outside of the house of National Assembly on so much important issues as the members of the opposition within house provided. It was the time when the country was passing through critical phase and a lot of problems had engulfed the whole state. The drug culture along with weapon culture, bomb blasts, corruption was prevailing all over the state. The differences of the President and the Prime Minister had developed. It seemed that the Prime Minister and his team was the major opposition of the President. In this way, two oppositions came at the front. Prime Minister and his team was the opposition of the President. Second opposition consisted of those members who were opposing the policies of the government of Muhammad Khan Junejo. The confrontation between these two oppositions remained till the dissolution of the assemblies.
CHAPTER 5

Foreign Policy of Pakistan and Opposition

Introduction

Foreign policy is composed of the goals sought, values set, decisions made and actions taken by states, and national governments acting on their behalf, in the context of the external relations of national societies. It constitutes an attempt to design, manage and control the foreign relations of national societies. This chapter deals with the international issues and the direction of the Pakistani government on these issues. It also discusses the reactions of the opposition on the policies of the government on the external issues. This chapter throws light on Zia’s and Junejo’s foreign policy and the reaction of the opposition. It also discusses the Pakistan’s relations with USA, India and Afghanistan. The military rulers often dictate the foreign relations of their countries according to their interests and long term ambitions. History itself is the evidence of the facts that they pursue their special targets on external and internal issues. They denounce the policies of the politicians and declared them responsible for all the evils. General Zia-ul-Haq kept the foreign policy of Pakistan under his control and command. He did not bother about the suggestions of the politicians. The politicians had mainly indulged in the efforts for restoration of democracy and that’s why no remarkable criticism came on foreign policy from the opposition. After the elections of 1985, the members of National and Provincial Assemblies tried to exert pressure on the external policies of the government but the government used to delay the discussion on the foreign policy of Pakistan in the National Assembly. The members presented the motions for discussions on the vital issues like Afghanistan issue, Pak-USA relations, Indian threat etc. They not only criticized the policy of the government but also demanded that the House must be informed about the latest developments in the foreign relations
of Pakistan. Shaikh Rasheed Ahmed, Mian Muhammad Zaman, Muhammad Abdullah Ghazi were the important members who stressed upon the government to inform the House about the issues in foreign policy. They were of the view that enough time had not been given to the issues of foreign policy. So it was need of the hour to give the attention on it.\textsuperscript{335} This chapter throws light on Zia’s and Junejo’s foreign policy and the reaction of the opposition. It also discusses the Pakistan’s relations with USA, India and Afghanistan.

**Indo-Pak Relations**

Despite of problems with India and Soviet Union, Zia regime managed to keep open the lines of communication both with Moscow and New Delhi.\textsuperscript{336} In the initial days of his rule, he stressed on normal relations with India but in the latter period of his rule, relations with Pakistan and India were deteriorated. Both the countries attempted to lay the blame for internal disturbances on each other. Inspite of all these allegations, both the countries tried to avoid bringing the relations too close to the dangerous line. Contacts and dialogues were held on various issues. Even in 1983, a joint committee for economic, scientific and technical cooperation was held. The President of Pakistan also visited India in 1984 and participated in Indira Gandhi’s funeral ceremony.\textsuperscript{337} Inspite of all these efforts, the following issues engulfed the Pak-India relations in Zia era.

### a. Sikh Issue

The major internal issue of India was the acute problem of the Sikhs which tried to create distance between the both states. The Indian Foreign Minister, while addressing a meeting at the Indian High Commission in London on June 23\textsuperscript{rd} said that

\textsuperscript{335}The National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, Vol. 1. 1985  
\textsuperscript{336}Mushahid Hussain, Pakistan’s Politics: The Zia Years, P. 112.  
\textsuperscript{337}Vyacheslav Y. Belokrenitsky and Vladimir N. Moskalenko, A Political History of Pakistan 1947-2007, PP.299-308.
“We have documentary evidence to establish that what was being done in Punjab was at the behest of some neighbors and other external powers.”

The Indian newspapers also alleged that Pakistan was supplying arms to the Sikh agitators and even mentioned those Sikh leaders who were receiving the arms. It blamed that Mr. Gernail Singh’s relatives received the weapons from the Pakistani government which were being used against the Indian government. It was also mentioned that training centers were working in Pakistan where the youth of Sikh community was being given training. Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar, member of the National Assembly, moved the adjournment motion on the statement of the Indian newspaper and foreign minister. Shaikh Rashid also presented the same motion in the House that Indian officials from time to time had been making direct statements that they had proof of providing assistance to the Sikh extremists by the Pakistani government. But the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs opposed the adjournment motion and told the House that the Indian so called proof was based entirely on confessions extracted from alleged terrorists under duress in police detention. The minister refused to accept any involvement of Pakistan in the resistance of Sikhs against Indian government.

The President of India, Vanikit Raman in his speech in the joint session of the parliament on 4th March 1988 said that India could create dangerous circumstances in the troubled areas of Pakistan. He blamed Pakistan that it was providing support to Sikh terrorists. The opposition in the Senate took it seriously and raised the issue of speech of the President of India.

---

338 Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan.
340 Venkataraman was born in Rajamadam village in Tanjore district, Madras Presidency. He studied law and practised in the Madras High Court and the Supreme Court of India. In his young age, he was an activist of the Indian independence movement and participated in the Quit India Movement. He was appointed member of the Constituent Assembly and the provisional cabinet. He was elected to LokSabha four times and served as Union Finance Minister and Defence Minister. In 1984, he was elected the seventh Vice-President of India and in 1987, he became the 8th President of India and served from 1987 to 1992. He also served as a State minister under K. Kamaraj and M. Bhaktavatsalam. DAWN, 24th March 1986.
Maulana Kousar Niazi linked it with ambitious and aggressive designs of India. He declared that India wanted to further divide Pakistan into different parts through her involvement in the troubled areas of Pakistan.

b. Nuclear Ambitions

Indian government was worried about the nuclear programme of Pakistan and it had launched a sustained campaign against it. The Indian Minister for External Affairs made a number of statements on the nuclear issue of Pakistan in the Indian Parliament on 7th and 8th August 1985. He alleged that Pakistan was pursuing a weapons programme. He said that

“…………….that India was continuing to do “all that was necessary”, that “its capacity should not be under estimated” and it was confident of its preparedness. ………..while Indian leaders had declared in the past that India would not produce nuclear weapons. India’s options were open and “with change of times and change of conditions, nobody can say what is going to happen”, with reference to a reported claim that Pakistani scientists were ahead of India, they will come to their senses when there is some opportunity arising.”

341 KausarNiazi, commonly known as MaulanaKausarNiazi (1934-1994), was a Pakistani politician and a religious leader in Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP). Niazi, in Bhutto's premiership cabinet, was a most powerful federal minister in Pakistan during 1974 till 1977. Niazi was among one of the close aid and trusted confident of Bhutto who remained loyal to Bhutto until his death. He was born in Musa Khel district, Mianwali. He was a religious scholar and orator, who made a name for himself in politics, and was a member in Bhutto's the Federal Cabinet. He served as a minister and assisted Bhutto for 6 years. He was also a member of the Pakistan Peoples Party. He served as the minister of Religious & Minorities Affairs till 1976 and was later appointed the Federal Information Minister. Maulana KausarNiazi said that Zia-ul-Haq had deposed and ultimately destroyed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. He later visited India as the goodwill emissary of the acting Prime Minister Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi. In his later years, Maulana KausarNiazi was rewarded for his loyalty to the Bhutto clan by being nominated to serve as the Chairman of the Islamic Ideology Council during Ms Benazir Bhutto's second government.Nawa-i-Waqt, 8th March 1994.

MianZaman also moved a motion against the statements of Indian Minister and declared it a challenge to the security of Pakistan.

The Indian Prime Minister, Rajavi Gandhi$^{344}$, met the President of USA, Reagin$^{345}$, and showed concern about the nuclear weapons of Pakistan. Later on the Prime Minister issued a statement that he and the President of USA had agreed to stop Pakistan for further enhancing the nuclear weapons. That statement was quoted by Pakistani newspaper “Nawa-i-Waqit” on 26th Oct. 1985.

Raja ShahidSaeed Khan moved a motion against the statement of the Indian Prime Minister and declared it a conspiracy of Hindu and Jewish lobby against the nuclear programme of Pakistan. He stated that Pakistan had repeatedly clarified its position with the justification that she had developed her programme only for peaceful purposes. The statement of Rajvi Gandhi was direct threat to the integrity of Pakistan. Though, the spokesman of American government tried to distance itself from such kind of statements but Raja ShahidSaeed Khan used to convince the speaker that time must be allocated for a thorough discussion on that topic.

---

$^{344}$Rajiv Gandhi was the eldest son of Indira and Feroze Gandhi. He went to study at Trinit College, Cambridge, and later at Imperial College London, but did not complete a degree at either. At Cambridge he met the Italian-born Antonia AlbinaMaino, then a waitress in a restaurant, whom he later married. After dropping out of university, he became a professional pilot for Indian Airlines. He remained aloof from politics, despite his family's political prominence. Following the death of his younger brother Sanjay Gandhi in 1980 Rajiv entered politics. Following the assassination of his mother in 1984 after Operation Blue Star, the Indian National Congress party leaders nominated him to be Prime Minister. Rajiv Gandhi led the Congress to a major election victory in 1984 soon after, amassing the largest majority ever seen in the Indian Parliament, the Congress party winning 411 seats out of 542. He began dismantling the License Raj – government quotas, tariffs and permit regulations on economic activity – modernized the telecommunications industry, the education system, expanded science and technology initiatives and improved relations with the United States.

$^{345}$During his Presidency (1981-89), Reagan pursued policies that reflected his personal belief in individual freedom, brought changes domestically, both to the U.S. economy and expanded military, and contributed to the end of the Cold War. Termed the Reagan Revolution, his presidency would reinvigorate American morale and reduce the people's reliance upon government. As president, Reagan kept a series of diaries in which he commented on daily occurrences of his presidency and his views on the issues of the day. The diaries were published in May 2007 in the bestselling book, *The Reagan Diaries*. Reagan, Ronald (2007). *The Reagan Diaries*, P. 45.
The Minister of state for Foreign Affairs told the House that the news was based on a misunderstanding and misreporting because the Indian government, Pakistani government and USA all had clarified the issue and removed the doubts. He said that what the American President actually meant was:

“if India had any fears about its nuclear programme it should directly approach it and sort it out with it because this was a regional question”\textsuperscript{346}

c. Siachin Glacier

The problem of Siachin Glacier arose in April 1984 when the Indian troops intruded into the Siachin Glacier area and finding the area uninhabited, occupied some mountain passes there. The Pakistani government claimed that Siachin Glacier was a part of the Northern Areas of Pakistan. It is situated to the north of the terminus of the line of control in Jammu & Kashmir. The government of Pakistan protested to the government of India for its violation of this area and on more than one occasions, it reiterated the position in official communications to the government of India. MaulanaKousarNiazi moved adjournment motion on a statement reportedly made by the Indian Prime Minister asserting that,  

“Siachin area is part of India and our position is very clear on this issue. There will be no compromise on the Indian stance on the Siachin Glacier area.”

MaulanaKousarNiazi pointed out in the Senate that the Prime Minister of India declared Siachin Glacier as the integral part of India and no compromise would be made with Pakistan on this issue. He asserted that the Prime Minister also blamed Pakistan for increasing the strength of

\textsuperscript{346}Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan.
her forces and the Indian forces should be ready for that. Such kind of statements of the Indian Prime Minister showed the aggressive designs of India. Maulana Kousar Niazi criticized the foreign policy of the government and informed the house that after the statement of the Indian Prime Minister, no significant protest had been launched from the government side on national or international forum. It was not a matter of ordinary nature and the government should not take it for granted. According to him, it was a joke with the defence of Pakistan. Professor Khurshid Ahmed also criticized the statement of the Indian Prime Minister about Siachin Glacier and requested the chairman to suspend the routine matters and to have more focus on this issue. According to him, the issue of Siachin Glacier was politically and strategically very important. The visit of the Indian Prime Minister (Rajavi Gandhi) of Siachin Glacier should be a matter of deep concern for the government of Pakistan and people of Pakistan. He focused on the Indo-Soviet alliance against Pakistan. He blamed the Soviet government that she was providing weapons to the Indian government for taking revenge. Muhammad Tariq Choudhary also discussed the Indian aggressive designs and exposed that the order had been passed to the Indian forces to be ready for war with Pakistan on this issue. He was of the view that Russia wanted to use India against Pakistan and considered it a direct threat to the integrity of Pakistan. He suggested that the government should take notice of such activities but the silence of the government was creating problems for the institutions and the masses of Pakistan. To him, it was a time to launch protest at the international level.\textsuperscript{347}

Lt. Gen. (Retd) Saeed Qadir also showed concern over the silence of the government. It was his view that

``It was the Indian Defence Minister who has also made a similar statement and there has been no response from our ministry of defence or foreign office to that``

statement also. So I would request the Minister of State for Defence to take note of that statement which already exists and if no protest has been launched, at least protest at government level should go to the Indian government; and if the public opinion is required to be built up then certainly we are around for that very purpose. So, the government should take serious note of such statements which are being made right down to the defence minister level now.”

On June 8th, 1985, Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar presented the adjournment motion in the National Assembly on the statement of Indian government about the Indian claim of the Siachin Glacier area but the government did not show concern seriously.

Incorrect Information About Siachin Glacier

On December 2nd, 1985, ShaikhRasheed Ahmed presented the privilege motion in the House of National Assembly that he had moved the adjournment motion concerning Siachin Glacier but the government disregarded it. Foreign minister opposed the admissibility of the motion on different grounds. ShaikhRasheed Ahmed blamed foreign minister for provided false information to the House regarding the issue that the Indian troops entered only in few areas of Pakistan. While the boot was in other leg and the Indian troops had occupied over the complete Siachin glacier. Near about sixty four miles had come under the control of the Indian troops. So this issue must be referred to the committee because the privilege of the House had been threatened.

He told the importance of the area and also mentioned that the areas had been shown in the custody of Pakistan in all maps of the world. The Indian troops had occupied our territory and the government did not launch any protest at any platform. Any country of the world even did not condemn the aggression of the Indian forces. The government wanted to put dust on the issue and that’s why it did not take this House into confidence and also did not make any contact

\[348\] Ibid.,
with the UNO. He even challenged the statement of the foreign minister and alleged that he had misrepresented the facts to the House. Foreign Minister in turn denied the allegations and challenged his statement. Sh. Rasheed accepted his challenge and stated emphatically that total Glacier was under the control of India.\textsuperscript{349}

The six other members of National Assembly also moved six motions on this issue but the government responded coldly.

\textbf{D. Firing By Indian Army across the Border of Azad Kashmir}

The Indian forces often resorted to unprovoked firing with small arms on Pakistani posts and on Pakistani civilians living or working in the vicinity of the Line of Control. Total number of 192 violations took place across the Jammu and Kashmir during the year of 1986. Pakistan always made it point to lodge complaints with the United Nations Military Observer Group about these violations of the Line of Control. On September 21\textsuperscript{st}, 1986, Liaquat Baloch moved the motion on the statement of the Prime Minister of Azad Kashmir regarding the violations of the Indian forces. In the statement which was published by the daily newspaper \textit{"Jang"}, the Prime Minister requested Pakistan for help against the Indian violations. Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar also seconded the motion and requested the speaker to give great importance to the statement of the Prime Minister of Azad Kahmir.\textsuperscript{350} Indian forces carried out unprovoked firing on troops and civilians in Ali Abad area; district Bagh on 19\textsuperscript{th}, 22\textsuperscript{nd} and 24\textsuperscript{th} of Feb. 1988. On March 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1988, Maulana Kousar Niazi pointed out the activities of the Indian forces in Azad Kashmir. They were firing on the people of Azad Kashmir for the last three days and the local people were migrating from that area. He also stated that the Indian forces had gathered at the border of Azad Kashmir that was showing their aggressive designs. He stressed that the discussion should be launched in

the House (Senate) but the government opposed it. The deputy chairman Senate who was presiding that session asked Maulana to discuss it in detail. Maulana Kousar Niazi criticized the leadership of India and their aggressive designs towards Pakistan. He declared that there was contradiction in their words and actions. Aggressive statements of the Indian leadership were creating a new phase in Pak-India relations. The firing of the Indian forces in the area of Bagh (Azad Kashmir) was dismal and matter of deep concern for the people of Pakistan. He demanded the government that the reasons behind such events should be informed to the House and the members also should view the developments seriously.

Professor Khurshaid Ahmed also seconded the arguments of Maulana Kousar Niazi and told the House that India was building pressure on the Pakistani government through different means. Sometimes it interfered in Azad Kashmir, another time in Siachin and Rajahistan sector. Pakistan should take notice of these developments. The subversive activities of India in Pakistan must be informed to the people of Pakistan and they should be ready to counter the designs of India. So it was the time to adopt the resolution and the issue should be dealt seriously.

Mr. Abdul Rahim also supported the resolution of Mulana Kousar Niazi and discussed the importance of Azad Kashmir for Pakistan. He said that it was the duty of the Pakistani government to protect the land of Pakistan and give security to the people of Pakistan. He showed doubts on the silence of the government over the issue and declared it fatal for the integrity of Pakistan.

Rana Naeem Muhammad Khan (Minister) confirmed the incidents of firing in the area of Azad Kashmir but he said that no unusual concentration of Indian troops on the Azad Kashmir border had been noticed. Maulana Kousar Niazi criticized the double standards of the government on the issue. He said that on the one hand the minister admitted that the incidents of firing had occurred
and on the other hand it was refusing to accept the concentration of Indian troops on the Azad Kashmir border. He demanded that the defence policy should be discussed in the House because the firing of Indian forces was not a matter of ordinary nature. He requested the government to nominate full-fledged defence minister for running the affairs. At last the government, on the pressure of the members, agreed that in consultation with the secretariat, it would soon fix a date for debate on this sensitive issue.\footnote{351}

E. **Stoppage of Water of Rivers Ravi and Chenab by India**

On 7\textsuperscript{th} August 1985, the daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* gave a headline that the Treaty of 1960 had been violated. Under the provisions of the Indus Water Treaty\footnote{352}, the water of river Ravi and its tributaries had been allocated for the exclusive use of India and the construction of irrigation schemes on river Ravi and its tributaries did not violate any provision of the treaty. In the same treaty, India had also been allowed to use some of the water of Chenab River and its tributaries for agricultural purposes. Inspite of this, Haji Saifullah Khan moved a motion on the headline of the *Nawa-i-Waqt* and said that the government had not shown any resentment on the actions of the Indian government on violating the provisions of Indus Water Treaty and due to its sluggish attitude, the people of Pakistan were under stress. The minister for Water and Power, Mir Zafarullah Jamali refused to accept the statement of the newspaper and stated that there was no justification for the acceptance of motion.\footnote{353}

\footnote{351}{The Senate of Pakistan Debates, Official Record, Vol. II, 1988.}

\footnote{352}{It is a water-sharing treaty between the Republic of India and Islamic Republic of Pakistan, brokered by the World Bank (then the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development). The treaty was signed in Karachi on September 19, 1960 by Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and President of Pakistan Mohammad Ayub Khan. The treaty was a result of Pakistani fear that since the source rivers of the Indus basin were in India, it could potentially create droughts and famines in Pakistan, especially at times of war. However, India did not revoke the treaty during any of three later Indo-Pakistani Wars. Abdul Sattar, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy 1947-2005 A concise history*, P. 75.}

\footnote{353}{The National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, Official Record, Vol. III, 1985.}
Pakistan and Afghan Muddle

The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in December 1979 provided Zia-ul-Haq with two opportunities; one was to strengthen his rule through raising a new issue among the people of Pakistan, secondly to establish cordial relations with USA. He tried to assure the people of Pakistan by repeatedly saying that it was in the interest of Pakistan to help the Afghan’s resistance movement against the Soviet intervention. He adopted four inter-related policies on the Afghan issue,

1. To resist Soviet Military intervention
2. To build and sustain a strong and highly visible international commitment to its stand against Soviet intervention
3. To keep Pakistan’s own engagement in the war indirect\textsuperscript{354}.
4. To maintain relations with the Afghan government

Pakistan-Afghanistan relations can be analyzed in the value and volume (in Metric Tones) of goods of other countries imported and exported by the Republic of Afghanistan through Pakistani ports during three financial years. It was as under

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Year & Export & Import \\
\hline
1981-82 & 186,790 & 875,536 \\
1982-83 & 210,185 & 769,069 \\
1983-84 & 213,372 & 374,220 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

(Official Record of the National Assembly)

Zia government tried to ensure the world that he had adopted well laid principles of the United Nations and by the Islamic countries. He also refuted the notion that Pakistan’s Afghan policy was being dictated or formulated by any other country like USA. Pakistan’s position on Afghanistan adversely affected its relations with Soviet Union and even it declared USSR and Afghanistan a menace for its integrity. Official statements of the Pakistani government against Soviet Union came to surface which deteriorated the relations with both countries.\textsuperscript{355}

While, the rightest political parties used to support his mission and in this way, a pro-Zia lobby was created in Pakistan. In Pakistan, the political parties were divided into two groups, leftist parties not only condemned the decision of Zia regime to fight against Soviet Union but also supported the government of BabralKarmal\textsuperscript{356}. Begum Bhutto of PPP defended the Soviet take over in Afghanistan and accused Zia’s government of exaggerating the number of refugees in Pakistan and stated that her party, if came to power, would recognize the BabralKarmal government in Kabal.\textsuperscript{357} While the different kinds of parties irrespective of their ideologies formed alliance, MRD, against the military government and denounced its foreign policy. Few rightest parties like Jamat-i-Islami hailed Zia’s policy over the Afghan issue. Muslim League (Pagara group) and JUI supported Zia’s mission.\textsuperscript{358} After the elections of 1985, the

\textsuperscript{355}Vyacheslav Y. Belokrenitsky and Vladimir N. Moskalenko, A Political History of Pakistan 1947-2007, PP.299-308.

\textsuperscript{356}Babrak Karmal was an Afghan politician and statesman during the Cold War. Karmal was born in Kamari and educated at Kabul University, after which he started his career as a bureaucrat. Before, during and after his career as a bureaucrat Karmal was a leading member of the Afghan movement. He was introduced to Marxism by Mir Akbar Khyber during his imprisonment for activities deemed too radical by the government. When the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) was formed, Karmal became one of its leading members, and eventually became the leader of the Parcham faction. When the PDPA split in 1967, the Parcham-faction established a Parcham PDPA, while their ideological nemesis, the Khalqs, established a Khalqist PDPA. Under Karmal's leadership, the Parchamite PDPA participated in Mohammad Daoud Khan's rise to power, and his subsequent regime. While relations were good at the beginning, Daoud began a major purge of leftist influence in the mid-1970s. This in turn led to the refoundation of the PDPA in 1977. The PDPA took power in the 1978 Saur Revolution.

\textsuperscript{357}Craig Baxter, Zia's Pakistan: Politics and stability in Frontline state, P. 81.

\textsuperscript{358}Pooja Joshi, Jamaat-i-Islami: The catalyst of Islamization in Pakistan, P. 130.
elected members of the National Assembly were divided into two groups; one was the Independent Parliamentary Group and second was the Official Parliamentary Group. The members of the Independent Parliamentary Group played the role of opposition and exercised a check on the policies of the government. Unfortunately, in Senate and National Assembly, all the members supported the cause of the freedom fighters in Afghanistan and appreciated the role of Pakistan in providing support to them. Though, they showed their concerns on the longevity of the war and its influence on Pakistan but supported the policies of government. It was also fact that the President and the Prime Minister had different policies on Afghan issue. The foreign minister, ZainNoorni, was presenting the stance of the Prime Minister and Gen. HameedGul was the spokesman of the President. HameedGul was playing more active role than the foreign minister because the foreign policy was controlled by the army not the politicians. This reality was also indicated by Muhammad Tariq Chaudhry in Senate on 14th April 1988 and mentioned the differences with the Prime Minister and President on the Afghan issue.

a. **Indirect Negotiations On Afghan Issue**

Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar took the issue in the National Assembly on 28th May 1985 and demanded few clarifications from the government. On 28th May 1985, He said,

“The minister for foreign affairs be pleased to state whether it is a fact that indirect negotiations upon the Afghanistan issue have produced no solid results; if so, the steps that government intend to take to resolve the said issue?”

He also put the question on the minister

---

“Will the minister agree with me that the issue of Afghanistan can be settled through direct negotiations and there is dire need to start direct negotiations with the Afghanistan government?”

Mr Tarar also showed concern on the American role in the settlement of Afghanistan issue and enquired from the minister that

“Will the minister for foreign affairs be pleased to state that the indirect negotiations have failed due to American role and is the American government suggest Pakistani government to adopt stern attitude towards Afghan government?”

Raja Shahid Zafar also exposed the weaknesses of the foreign policy of Pakistan and raised objection on the Pakistani policy towards Russia with the question on the minister that

“In March 1983, Russia offered that she was ready to withdraw her forces from Afghanistan and even offered to settle the refugees. What was the reason that such kind of offers was not accepted by the Pakistani government?”

Sahabzada Yaqub Khan (Replied by the Zain Noorani) presented the government version about the Afghan issue

“The indirect talks have shown considerable progress. I would refer the Hon. Member’s attention to a recent interview of the secretary general special representative, Mr Cordovez which was published in the Muslim on May 16 in which he clearly states that progress on a number of issues has been registered. This is not to minimize the importance of the outstanding issues and the difficulties in making further progress. But the problem is not, has the Hon.
Member appears to suggest, the indirect form of negotiations. The problem is basically that a mutually acceptable negotiated solution that is based on the principles enunciated by the several UN resolutions on Afghanistan requires both sides to be sincere in their approach to the negotiations. So far the other side has been more interested in utilizing the forum of negotiations to progressively erode our principled position, to obtain recognition, for an illegitimate and unacceptable regime and to present the Afghan people and a world with a fait accompli brought about by the external use of force. It has shown little interest in negotiating a solution acceptable to the Afghan people. The government of Pakistan believes that neither will a stable solution be found nor will our own security be enhanced by legitimizing a situation brought about by force. We are, moreover, bound by the OIC resolution not to recognize the Kabul regime as long as foreign troops continue to stay in Afghanistan.

The government will, however, continue to seek a negotiated political solution that is acceptable to the Afghan people in the conviction that there can be no military solution, and in the conviction that sooner or the later the other side will have to acknowledge that the people of Pakistan can not be bullied into adopting an unprincipled policy towards Afghanistan which would only undermine their own long term security. This may take time, and may well involve certain burdens and sacrifices. But it is the only path that will lead to an acceptable and principled settlement of the problem of Afghanistan.

Sir, I must emphatically contradict this assertion of the member. Pakistan-Afghanistan policy is its own and it is not dictated by any other foreign power.
The main issue is not merely of holding direct negotiations or recognizing a government, but legitimising it which under then present circumstances is not in the interest of Pakistan or the Afghans who have sought shelter in Pakistan.

Sir, a number of ambassadors belonging to a number of other countries have been making statements which normally they aught not to make. It is not a question of pinpointing one ambassador only. If we go into the list, it would be others also who have gone beyond the scope of their duties.363

b. Air Violations By Afghanistan

The Afghan Aircrafts started committing violation of the Pakistani territory from 29th December 1979. Their year wise breakdown is as tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

The members of the National Assembly felt insult over repeated air violations from Afghan side and they put questions on the foreign minister. Among them were Ch. Nisar Ali Khan, ShaikhRasheed Ahmed, Raja ShahidZafar and BalakhSher Khan Mazari. On 28th May 1985, Ch. Nisar Ali Khan raised that

“Will the Foreign Minister be pleased to state:

i. The measures adopted against the frequent violation of air space by Afghanistan; and

ii. The steps taken to ensure that the said violations may not occur in future?

Shaikh Rasheed Ahmed criticised the attacks and declared objection of Government as “Psycholo Styled Agitation”. He said that it was a joke with the nation that “Psycholo Styled Agitation” was submitted in the foreign office but the government did not take it as a serious matter.

Raja Shahid Zafar demanded the clarification from the foreign minister that either the response of the violations would be only verbal or any practical step would be taken.

Sahabzada Yaqub Khan (Replied by the Zain Noorani) presented the government version on the issue:

“The government of Pakistan will defend every inch of Pakistani territory, let there never be the slightest doubt about that. At the same time we have so far restrained our reaction to the Kabal regime’s provocations along our border out of a desire to avoid a further escalation of military tension and to minimise the suffering of our people and of our Afghan brethren. Our restrained approach is proof positive of the sincerity with which we seek a peaceful negotiated solution to the problem of Afghanistan.

We have, however, made it clear that our forbearance should not be mistaken for weakness nor is our patience without limit. We have both the
capability and the determination to administer a fitting rebuff to such provocations if our protest to Kabul regime continue to go unheeded." 364

Mir Balaksher Khan Mazari also demanded from the foreign minister to update him about protest notes which had been handed over to the Afghan representatives after the violations of the territory of Pakistan.

c. Afghan Refugees

The number of registered Afghan Refugees up to 30-4-1985 was 26,00660. All these refugees were being kept in RTVs (Refugees Tentage Villages) scattered through out the FATA, Balochistan and in the Isa Khel Tehsil of Mianwali District in the Punjab. The breakup was as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>19,84,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baluchistan</td>
<td>5,12,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>1,03,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,00,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

Till 31th July 1985, the number of Afghan refugees settled in the agencies in FATA was as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bajaur</td>
<td>1,76,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kurram</td>
<td>3,31,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mohmand</td>
<td>9,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Waziristan</td>
<td>1,57,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Orakzai</td>
<td>13,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total estimated population of Afghan Refugees in the country up to 31-3-1987 was 33,34,894. The breakup of registered and un-registered refugees was as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Un-registered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NWFP/FATA</td>
<td>21,39,306</td>
<td>2,00,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>6,18,393</td>
<td>1,94,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>1,55,171</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sind</td>
<td>18,441</td>
<td>4,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azad Kashmir</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Territory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,31,311</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,03,583</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These Afghan refugees purchased the moveable and immoveable properties in the different cities of Pakistan. They even occupied the government lands in different areas.  

The members of the National Assembly showed concern over the government Refugee Policy and they put questions to the minister with great suspicion. Among them were Haji Muhammad YounisElahi, RanaTanveerHussain, Mian Muhammad Zaman, SyedaAbidaHussain. AbidaHussain expressed concern on the purchase of the houses by the Afghan refugees in the cities like Peshawar, Islamabad, Lahore, Karachi. She enquired that had all these purchases been done with the support of the Pakistani government. Mian Muhammad Zaman informed the house...
that it had come into his notice that Pakistani government was going to issue ID cards to the Afghan Refugees.\footnote{The National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, Official Report, Vol. 1. 1985.}

On 3\textsuperscript{rd} December 1985, Haji Muhammad UnisElahi requested the Minister for State and Frontier Regions to inform the National Assembly about the total number of Afghan refugees in the country upto 30-09-1985. Syed Qasim Shah told about the strength of the Afghan refugees in Pakistan. He briefed that the total number of Afghan Refugees in the country up to 30\textsuperscript{th} September 1985 was 30,30,335. Out of these 26,67,982 were registered refugees and 3, 62,353 were un-registered refugees. The breakup of registered refugees was as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>20,35,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baluchistan</td>
<td>5,29,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>1,02,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,67,982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

The breakup of the unregistered refugees was as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>2,00,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baluchistan</td>
<td>1,30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>4,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>22,606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan)
Haji Muhammad UnisElahi criticized the figures which were presented by the Minister and tried to expose the weaknesses of the government in Afghan policy. He said that the government was issuing ID cards to those refugees who entered in the jurisdiction of Pakistan illegally. Then why government was giving the figures of unregistered refugees? Dr Shar Afghan Niazi also declared the figures incorrect and said that the Minister was misleading the House. Another honorable member FazalRazaq put the question why unregistered refugees were not being registered? Few other members showed concern on the entrance of KGB agents in the shape of Afghan refugees in the land of Pakistan. Few also declared it a burden on the economy of Pakistan and asked who would bear the expenses of their food, houses etc? 

**Afghan Refugee’s Business Activities**

The Afghan refugees not only had settled in the various cities of Pakistan but also had engaged in the various businesses within Pakistan. They had engaged themselves in the business of construction, transport, wood, smuggling, etc. it was matter of deep concern for the people of Pakistan because the refugees had become burden on the economy of Pakistan. Few members of the National Assembly like Rai Ahmed Nawaz, Dr Shar Afghan Niazi, raised objections on this issue and registered their protest to the concerned minister. Syed Qasim Shah, Minister for Refugees, tried to address their criticism through arguments. He declared that it was their right to do any business for living but they could not start business at vast level.

**Smuggling of Heroin & Charas**

With the arrival of Afghan Refugees, the heroin addiction rate increased in Pakistan. In different places like Rose and Jasmine Garden, the heroin was sold under the protection of the local administration.

---

368 Ibid.,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Name of Drugs</th>
<th>Quantity Sized</th>
<th>Persons Arrested</th>
<th>Persons Prosecuted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>22,337.521 Kgs</td>
<td>10901</td>
<td>10520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>34,807.000</td>
<td>15608</td>
<td>6653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>27,994.955</td>
<td>4820</td>
<td>3383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>31,737.154</td>
<td>11623</td>
<td>10489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>431.689</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>53,173.482</td>
<td>12108</td>
<td>11418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>2,392.801</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>49,764.305</td>
<td>4176</td>
<td>4142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>3,376.704</td>
<td>3913</td>
<td>2801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>31,566.499</td>
<td>12303</td>
<td>11387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>2,223.412</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>43,311.744</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Herion</td>
<td>2,428.821</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charas</td>
<td>56,389.935</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The members of the National Assembly took notice of the governmental failures and demanded that they should be informed about the addiction ratio and the smuggled heroin from Afghanistan. ShaikhRasheed Ahmed referred the British newspaper publishing an article accusing Pakistan and some departments of the government in smuggling heroin. He enquired that whether the Government lodged protest or instituted a suit of damages against a British newspaper for publishing an article. The foreign minister could not satisfy the member on the said question. MrMumtaz Ahmed Tarar asked the Interior Minister to please state:

(a) The number of persons addicted to heroin in the country in present:

(b) Whether, it is fact that number of the said persons has increased to 25,000,00; if so, the steps taken or being taken to prevent the use of heroin?

(c) Is it reality that with the arrival of Afghan Refugees, the use of heroin has increased?

QamarZaman Shah Khagha also showed concern over the arrival of the Afghan refugees in Pakistan. He enquired that the Afghan trucks that were being used for transportation between Peshawar and Karachi brought the heroin. He showed doubts that this was possible without the support of the local police?

The few members of the National Assembly diverted the attention of the house through discussions on the issue of plants protection, seeds, fruits etc. But Mir BlakhSher Khan Mazari stated that some of those pesticides, which had been banned in Europe and America, were being used in Pakistan.369

On 13th Feb 1986, Shah Baleeghuddin showed concern over the growing addiction ratio among the people of Pakistan having 15 to 35 years of age. Herion addiction was increasing rapidly in Pakistan. The Honorable members requested the Minister to give the details of the addicted persons and annual estimated consumption of heroin in the country and also total

The quantity of heroin seized in the country during 1985 province-wise? Aslam Khan Khattak gave the figures as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>No of Addict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sind</td>
<td>1,00,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,00,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Report of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

The minister also told the members that total consumption annually was 54.5 tonnes of 50% purity. He gave the figure of seized heroine during 1985 that was as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Quantity seized during 1985 (Kgs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sind</td>
<td>576.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>2466.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluchistan</td>
<td>120.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>1744.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4907.955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Report of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

d. **Pakistan’s Involvement in Afghanistan’s Internal Affairs**

Babrak Karmal made statement during his address to the workers of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan about the involvement of Pakistan in the internal issues of Afghanistan and declared it responsible for any attacks inside Afghanistan. Karmal regime attributed this resistance to external forces, particularly to Pakistan and Iran. The statement of Babrak Karmal
was published in newspapers on the 8th of July, 1985. No doubt, Karmal regime had, however, from the start, sought to attribute this resistance to external forces. On 20th August 1985, Ch. Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar moved the adjournment motion on the statement of Babrak Karmal and declared it a direct threat to the security of Pakistan. But the foreign minister said these allegations were baseless and Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar also did not stress upon his motion because the statement of the minister satisfied him.370

**e. Geneva Talks**

Different rounds of dialogues were held on the Afghan issue between the Pakistan and Russia after every round of discussions, the opposition leaders in the National Assembly compelled the treasury benches to update the members of the House about the latest developments. On the pressure of the members, the government gave details of the negotiations in the House. On 18th August 1985, Mian Muhammad Zaman, Mir Balakh Sher Khan Mazari, Liaquat Baloch, Sahikh Rashid Ahmed asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs to inform about the progress in the solution of Afghan problem in Geneva Talks and whether there was any possibility of finding a solution of the issue in the near future? Mian Muhammad Zaman pointed out the briefing of the Minister on the Afghan issue and his statement about the Russian government that it had agreed to with draw its troops from Afghanistan. Liaquat Baloch referred to the issue of Afghan refugees in NWFP and Balochistan. He stressed that the government should take into confidence about any change in its policy about Afghan refugees after the success of the dialogues. Shaikh Rashid Ahmed raised the issue about the future strategy of the Pakistani government on Afghan issue and after the success of negotiations, would the government of Pakistan hold direct negotiations with the existing government? The foreign minister, Sahabzada Yaqub Khan, explained at some

---

length the details of the negotiations. He highlighted the four elements that were to constitute the eventual settlement of the Afghan problem

1. Withdrawal of foreign troops within an agreed time frame
2. Non-interference and non-intervention
3. Safe and voluntary return of the Afghan refugees to their homeland
4. International guarantees

On 2nd December 1985, Mian Muhammad Zamaan raised the point of participants of Geneva Conference and asked the government why did it consist of only bureaucrats. He suggested that the politicians should be sent in Geneva Talks instead of only bureaucrats. He laid the importance of the members of National Assembly and demanded that they should be included in the delegation so that the representatives of the people should play their role. Sardar Asif Ahmed Ali also expressed his views on the foreign policy of Pakistan and asked to the treasury benches whether the foreign policy was only a preserve and exclusive jurisdiction of the foreign office? What was the role of the people of Pakistan in the foreign policy of Pakistan? Raja Shahid Zafar criticized the Geneva Talks and stressed that due to these talks, we had taken up these aspects of Afghanistan issue which were not related to Pakistan.

f. Russian Stance

The Russian deputy foreign minister, Mr. Kapitsa, gave a statement on 11th Oct 1985 in the Daily “Muslim” that Pakistan was creating problems for India in the Indian Punjab which would be very dangerous for the both states. He said that Pakistan was in the condition of war against Russia and Afghanistan. The twelve Russian soldiers were murdered in the areas of Pakistan (Mattani). In future, in the conflicts of Pakistan and India, Russia would support India. He also

---

threatened that Pakistan should not play role against India in the Punjab. He made it clear that Pakistan was involved in the internal affairs of other countries. No doubt, such accusations were made by Moscow as part of its efforts to invent excuses for its continuing aggression against Afghanistan. On the statement of Russian deputy foreign minister, Mr Kapitsa was also reported to have said that, if Afghanistan and Pakistan reached an agreement directly, the Soviet troops would start their withdrawal within weeks. He further said to have alleged that the Pakistani side had agreed to hold direct talks with the Karmal regime, but had later gone back on its word. On 3rd December 1985, ShaikhRasheed Ahmed moved the adjournment motion and declared it a matter of great importance because it was related to the integrity of Pakistan. Malik Abdul Rauf, member of the House, seconded it. Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, ZainNoorani, declared it only a statement of the Russian Deputy Foreign Minister but ShaikhRasheed Ahmed stressed on the motion that it was not an ordinary statement because different allegations had been leveled on Pakistan. Russians had the feelings that Pakistan was working against their interests and India. The people of Pakistan were facing such problems in its foreign relations due to the fact that the foreign relations were not being discussed in the National Assembly. In parliament, Time was not being allocated for discussion on the burning issues in the foreign policy of Pakistan. 373

g. Smuggling of Russian Missiles From Afghanistan

On 13th Feb. 1986, ShaikhRasheed Ahmed moved the adjournment motion that eight Russian missiles had been taken into custody from the Kurram Agency. The police failed to arrest those persons who were doing the business of weapon smuggling. The saboteurs ran away in the darkness, leaving behind mules loaded eight rockets along with fuses and batteries. The rockets were taken into custody by the administration. These heavy weapons were being brought in 373 The National Assembly of Pakistan Debates, Vol.I, 1985.
Pakistan for sabotage activities. Malik Muhammad Aslam quoted the news of *Nawa-i-Waqt* about the smuggling of Russian weapons from Afghanistan to Pakistan and moved the motion on this issue. Shaikh Rasheed Ahmed declared it a matter of national integrity and direct threat to the integrity of Pakistan. The foreigners were playing role in creating uncertainty in Pakistan through such weapons. Due to the smuggled weapons, the terrorism had increased in Pakistan and the population was not secure. The members of the house should take the matter seriously and it must be admitted for discussion.  

After the statement of the minister on the issue, the speaker gave a rolling that

“In view of the statement made by the minister, I do not feel that this particular motion should be dealt with and taken up in the House. So I rule it out of order.”

---
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Pak-USA Relations

Immediately after the establishment of the military regime, the United States did not show much interest in Pakistan. Its main support base in South West Asia and in the whole of the Middle East, was the Shah’s regime in Iran. As far as South Asia was concerned, USA was focusing on establishing cordial relations with India. In 1979, President Jimmy Carter’s administration suspended military and economic support to Pakistan. On the overthrow of the Iran’s Shah, Iranian-US relations came to an end. Another development was the arrival of the Russian forces in Afghanistan. Both the events urged USA to increase its military presence in South West Asia. On the other hand, USA declared Middle East and Persian Gulf regions of its special and vital interests. The government of USA decided to establish United States Central Command with its area of responsibility extending from North Africa and the Near East, through the Persian Gulf region to cover Pakistan, Iran and Afghanistan. USA decided to open a new chapter of relations with Pakistan and started to make large scale deliveries of military equipment, sophisticated arms and financial resources for countering the Soviet military presence in Afghanistan.\(^{376}\)

a. Foreign Minister’s Visit To USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 1980</th>
<th>Official visit to USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>August 1980</td>
<td>To attend the 22nd session of the committee on the elimination of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>September 1980</td>
<td>To attend the meeting of Board of Trustees of UNITAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Novembr 1980</td>
<td>Visit to the USA in connection with UN General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>April 1981</td>
<td>Official visit to USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>May 1981</td>
<td>To attend the meeting of UN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>July 1981</td>
<td>To attend International Conference on Kampuchea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>August 1981</td>
<td>To attend the meeting of the committee on Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>September 1981</td>
<td>To attend the meeting of Board of Trustees of UNITAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>November 1981</td>
<td>To attend UN General Assembly Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>June 1982</td>
<td>For the United Nations Conference on disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>September 1982</td>
<td>For the 37th session of the United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>September 1983</td>
<td>For the 37th session of the United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>May 1983</td>
<td>Official visit to USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>November 1984</td>
<td>For the debate on the issue of Afghanistan in the United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

b. **American Policy of Supply Arms to Pakistan: Effect of Indian Premier’s Visit to USA.**

Indian Prime Minister visited USA on 16th August 1985 and expressed concerns about the American assistance to Pakistan and tried to convince them that the assistance was being used against India. He also highlighted the involvement of Pakistan in the internal issues of India. It was an effort that was being made to create rift in Pak-USA relations. The Indian media tried to build up the image of their own Prime Minister during his visit to USA. The opposition leaders took the notice of the effort of the Indian government and inquired from the treasury benches about the success of the efforts of Indian Prime Minister. On 18th August 1985, Mian Muhammad Zaman and Shaikh Rashid Ahmed put their questions to the minister for Foreign Affairs whether it was fact that, as result of the Indian Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi’s visit to the USA, the American policy of supply of arms to Pakistan had been affected; if so, the measures adopted to counter it.? The government refused to accept the idea of adverse effects of the Indian Prime Minister’s visit to USA on Pak-USA relations.377

c. **American Kidnapping of Plane Carrying Palestinian Hijackers**

---

On 1st December 1985, Dr Muhammad Shaifque Choudhary presented a motion in the National Assembly against the acts of terrorism and airpiracy of USA. It concerned to an Egyptian aircraft, intercepted by American jetplanes, carrying Palestinian hijackers destined for Tunisia. It was a matter with which everyone in Pakistan was involved and disturbed. Pakistan had always been committed to a policy of unwavering support for the just cause of the Palestinian and the Arab world. She always urged the international community and all peace loving people to denounce Israeli aggression. Pakistan always called on all countries to restrain it from pursuing its dangerous policies which jeopardized world peace and stability.

Dr Muhammad Shafique Choudhary focused on the issue and highlighted Pak-USA relations. His stand was that Pakistan was supporting the cause of Palestinians while USA was opposing it. There was a hell of difference in the policies of the both countries. Under these circumstances, how this friendship could be maintained. He also demanded from the foreign minister that he should inform the House that any kind of protest had been launched to the government of USA on this act of terrorism. What role the Pakistani government had played in this regard.

Shaikh Rasheed Ahmed also took the American policies critically. He said that the Americans should play the role of arbitrator instead of being a party. He alleged that America was helping Israel in suppressing the Palestinians. But the speaker of the National Assembly declared that

“This is a matter which is primarily not the concern of the government or within its control. Therefore, the motion is ruled out of the order.”

### d. Alleged Presence of American Advisers to Train Afghan Resistance Fighters in Pakistan

Radio Moscow aired the news with reference to Indian newspaper that one thousand and five hundred Americans were giving military training to Afghan resistance fighters on Pakistan territory. It also alleged that most of the trainers belonged to CIA. They are providing training of using chemical weapons. Ch. Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar presented the adjournment motion on the

---
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issue and demanded the government to clarify its position because the Russian government was repeatedly involving the Pakistani government in the sabotage activities in Afghanistan and blamed that the condition of law and order was not improving in Afghanistan due to the involvement of Pakistan. The Minister of state for Foreign Affairs, ZainNoorani, opposed it on technical grounds and expressed his views on these allegations with these words;

"............The Soviet technique of planting such baseless reports in the Indian media, particularly in the pro-Soviet newspapers, and then quoting its own planted stories in the Soviet media is too well known. It is supposed to be one of the techniques of modern propaganda designed to convince the audience that the story comes from an objective third source instead of the interested party. But no one, I am sure, will be confused by the stories."\(^{380}\)

e. US Military and Economic Aid

Sh. Rashid Ahmed put the question to the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs on the amount of military and economic aid extended by USA to Pakistan during last two years. Mian Muhammad Yasin Khan Watto gave the figures of the aid which was provided by USA in the years of (July, 1984 to June, 1986). It was as under

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military assistance</td>
<td>$ 637 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Assistance</td>
<td>$593 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 1230 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the National Assembly of Pakistan)

Fakhar Imam raised the point that the Minister for Foreign Affairs should tell the House about the terms and conditions on which the amount had been negotiated, subject to the approval by the US Congress. Sh. Rashid Ahmed put the question about the interest rate on military and economic aid. Was it equal on both aids? Fakhar Imam again asked the foreign minister that

"............the economic aid that is coming to Pakistan is tied or is it on a comparative basis as far as procurement of goods and services are

concerned?.................that whenever we get tied aid, there is a higher rate that accrues to the country."  

Ch. Nisar Ali declared it tied aid. No further discussions and queries came to surface after that.

**f. Statement of MrSolarz, Chairman US House Sub-Committee on National Affairs**

According to a front page report in the daily "Muslim" of June 24th, 1986, the chairman of the US House Sub-committee on National Affairs, Mr. Solar stated in the course of an interview to the newspaper 'India Abroad'

"He does not expect India to stand idly by and do nothing if Pakistan indulges in actions to destabilize Punjab. If India genuinely believes, which it apparently does, that Pakistan was training Sikh generals and sending them to Punjab, then India should organize political and economic pressure against Pakistan..............they Indians are helpful to me.................they are becoming increasingly influential and I am told they are the most affluent ethnic community in the US. "

The statement of the American official alarmed the bells of danger for Pakistan and the members of the National Assembly felt the need to reject the propaganda that Pakistan was supporting Sikh community in India to weaken the Indian government. Secondly, it was time when Pak-USA friendship was going on very well and Pakistan was playing role as a front line state against the expansionist policy of USSR. M.P.Bhandara moved the adjournment motion on the statement of Mr. Solarz and demanded from the government of Pakistan that Foreign Office should issue a demarche to the US government suggesting that such like remarks were likely to destabilize the relationships between Pakistan and United States. He also suggested that the American Sub-committee on National Affairs would be welcomed if it visited Pakistan to check the facts for themselves or to expose the propaganda campaign made by the Indian government.

---
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M.P.Bhandara also suggested to the government of Pakistan that it should improve its PR as did India, in the lobbies of the US Congress. He also recommended that the other members of the House should travel to USA at their own expenses and explain Pakistan’s point of view. He mentioned the lobbies in USA which were being cultivated by India. There was dire need to put across Pakistan’s case more effectively so that these lies were exposed. Another member, Turabul Haq, argued in favor of the motion of M.P.Bhandara. Sheikh Rashid Ahmed also showed concern over the statement of Mr. Solaraz and requested the Prime Minister to clarify the position of Pakistan on the following points during his tour which was going to be started from July 1986

1. Nuclear Programme of Pakistan
2. Afghan issue
3. Problem of Sikh community in East Punjab
4. Terrorism in Pakistan\(^\text{384}\)

**Conclusion**

In Pakistan, two governments were working at the same time. The government of General Zia-ul-Haq was trying to keep the foreign policy under the influence of military. He designed different plans for establishing relations with different states. At that time, Pak-US alliance had developed against the Russian aggression in Afghanistan. Zia-ul-Haq was managing different meetings and dialogues with different officials of USA at the national and international level. It was not being liked by the elected government. Muhammad Khan Junejo was supporting the policies of Zia-ul-Haq but not openly. While the military regime was not taking the elected government into the confidence and it strengthened the differences of the President and the Prime Minister. The team of the Prime Minister often showed that they were not being well informed about the foreign policy of Pakistan. On the other hand, MRD had failed to counter the Pakistan-US Nexus against Russia in Afghanistan. Due to leadership crisis, MRD was not in a position to give resistance against the decisions of the government at international level.

Chapter 6

Opposition and the Constitutional Amendments.

Introduction

In the history of Pakistan, most of the dictators abrogated the constitutions and introduced PCO, RCO, LFO for running the affairs of the state for the time being. Contrary to the other dictators, General Zia-ul-Haq did not abrogate the constitution of Pakistan but suspended it. He also introduced PCO and RCO for strengthening his roots in the system of Pakistan. Earlier in 1980, the President & CMLA issued a Provisional Constitutional Order under which the judges of the Supreme Court and the High Courts were required to take fresh oath and those, who did not take oath, were deemed as having been removed from their positions. General used the PCO to get rid of those judges, who believed in the constitution and democracy. He also used PCO to remove those judges who were either not liked by him or had served their ‘assigned’ purpose, i.e. outlived their utility for him. After the elections of 1985, these PCO and RCO were presented in the National Assembly for approval. In this chapter, the main characteristics of the PCO and RCO have been discussed along with the reaction of the opposition on these constitutional packages. How did the opposition try to force the government not to include these constitutional packages in the constitution as regular part?

PCO 1981

Most effective, and consequently most destructive to the civilian state, was the 1981 Provisional Constitution Order (PCO). The 1981 Order abrogated the 1973 Constitution effectively. It was offered as a substitute national constitution but not ratified. It gave all powers in the hands of the executive, extended extensive emergency provisions to military rule and gave the President and Chief Martial Law Administrator powers to amend the constitution. All orders and actions taken by the regime were considered to have been validly made, and "notwithstanding any judgment of any Court" could not be called into question "in any Court on any ground whatsoever." Were political parties revived they were to conform to registration standards determined by an Election Commission subordinate to the CMLA. In February 1985, the elections were held on non-party bases. General Zia-ul-Haq wanted to amend the constitution comprehensively before the session
of the assemblies. For implementing his dreams, he amended the constitution of 1973 through a President’s Order, known as RCO, on 2\textsuperscript{nd} March 1985, before the session of parliament that was going to be held on 23\textsuperscript{rd} March 1985. RCO changed the whole shape of the constitution. As many as sixty five articles were amended/substituted/added/modified/varied/deleted/omitted. For making understanding about the 8\textsuperscript{th} amendment, it is necessary to understand the importance of the Revival of the Constitution of 1973 Order.

\textbf{RCO (2\textsuperscript{nd} March 1985)}

1. Article 2-A was inserted, making the Objective Resolution of 1949 a substantive and effective part of the constitution. The Resolution with some modifications had already been adopted as a preamble to the constitutions of 1956, 1962 and 1973. Now the resolution was reproduced as an annex and made an operative part, with a significant change. The sixth paragraph of the Objectives Resolution in its original form read as follows:

\begin{quote}
Wherein adequate provision shall be made for the minorities freely to profess and practice their religions and develop their culture.
\end{quote}

While reproducing the above paragraph in the Annex, the word freely was omitted.

2. The electoral college for election to the office of the President was modified so as to comprise both houses of parliament and all four provincial assemblies (with equal weightage given in terms of votes to each provincial assembly).

3. The President was supposed to act on the advice of the cabinet, the Prime Minister, or the appropriate minister, but he could require the cabinet to reconsider such advice.

4. The President was empowered to dissolve the National Assembly at his discretion where, in his opinion, appeal to the electorate was necessary. On such dissolution, elections were to be called within a hundred days.

5. On the dissolution of the National Assembly, the President could ask the prime minister to continue in office until his successor entered the office of prime minister. This apparently applied to the prime minister in the event of either his resignation from the office or where the national assembly was dissolved on his advice. Where the National Assembly was dissolved at the discretion of the President, a caretaker cabinet would be
appointed till such time that the election of the Prime Minister had taken place on the reconstitution of National Assembly after general elections.

6. The seats reserved for women in the National Assembly were increased from ten to twenty. These special seats for women were only available until the holding of third general elections to the National Assembly under the constitution.

7. The number of members in Senate was raised from sixty three to eighty seven, with five seats from each province reserved for technocrats, ulama or professionals. The number of seats for Federally Administered Tribal Areas was increased from five to eight. Seats for Federal Capital were increased from two to three.

8. The period of time provided for the President to give assent to the bills passed by the parliament was increased from seven to forty five days. The president could return a bill within forty five days for reconsideration. This gave the President a power to veto a bill, but this could be overridden by passing a same bill again by a majority of the members, present and voting, of both houses of parliament in a joint session.

9. The president could, at his discretion, appoint any member of the National Assembly as Prime Minister who, in his opinion, could command the confidence of a majority of the members of the National Assembly. However, a prime minister so appointed had to obtain a vote of confidence from the national assembly within sixty days. The prime minister as to hold office during the pleasure of the president, but the president could not remove him unless he was satisfied that the prime minister did not command the confidence of the majority of the members of national assembly.

10. Federal ministers and the ministers of state were to be appointed by the president on the advice of the prime minister.

11. Procedure for passing the motion of vote of no-confidence against the prime minister was altered and the requirement of giving the name of an alternative candidate in such a motion was omitted.

12. The provision for amendment to the constitution was modified and under the new provision, an amendment to the constitution could only be passed by a majority of two thirds of the total members in the national assembly and the senate and by an absolute majority in all four provincial assemblies. The procedure for amendment to the constitution was further modified under President’s Order 20 of 1985, and the
requirement of laying the amendment bill before the provincial assemblies was dispensed with except where such amendment had the effect of altering the limits of a province. In such a case, the provincial assembly of the concerned province had to pass the amendment by two thirds of its total membership.

13. The governor was supposed to act on the advice of the cabinet or the chief minister, or appropriate minister, but he could require the cabinet to reconsider such advice.

14. The period of time provided for the governor to give assent to the bills passed by the provincial assembly was increased from seven to forty five days. The governor could return a bill within forty five days for reconsideration. This gave the governor power to veto a bill but it could be overridden by passing the same bill again by votes of the majority of the total membership of the provincial assembly.

15. The governor could appoint a member of the provincial assembly as chief minister who, in his opinion, could command the confidence of the majority of the members of the provincial assembly. However, a chief minister so appointed had to obtain a vote of confidence from the provincial assembly within sixty days. The chief minister was to hold office during the pleasure of the governor but the governor could not remove him unless he was satisfied that the chief minister did not command the confidence of the majority of the members of the provincial assembly.

16. Provincial ministers were to be appointed by the governor from amongst the members of the provincial assembly on advice of the chief minister.

17. Procedure for passing the motion of vote of no-confidence against a chief minister was altered and the requirement of giving the name of an alternative candidate was omitted.

18. The number of general constituencies (for Muslims) of the national assembly was raised from 200 to 207. In addition to that, ten seats for minorities were reserved.

19. The seats in the provincial assemblies of Baluchistan, the NWFP, the Punjab, and Sindh for minorities three, three, eight and nine, respectively. These members were to be elected, simultaneously with members from general constituencies, on the basis of separate electorate.

20. Separate electorates for minorities were given constitutional recognition for the first time in Pakistan.
21. The qualification added under article 62 require a candidate for the parliament to be some one:

   (a) Of good character and not commonly known as one who violates Islamic Injunctions

   (b) With adequate knowledge of Islamic teachings and practices and obligatory duties prescribed by Islam as well as abstaining from major sins.

   (c) Sagacious, righteous, non-profligate, honest and amen

   (d) With no criminal conviction involving moral turpitude or for giving false evidence

   (e) After the establishment of Pakistan, never to have worked against the integrity of the country or opposed the ideology of Pakistan.

   The disqualifications added under article 63 require a candidate for the parliament not to:

   (a) Be propagating any opinion, or acting in any manner prejudicial to the ideology of Pakistan, or the sovereignty, integrity, or security of Pakistan, or the maintenance of public order, or the integrity or the independence of the judiciary of Pakistan, or which defames or brings into ridicule the judiciary or the armed forces of Pakistan; or

   (b) Have been, on conviction for any offence which in the opinion of the chief election commissioner involves moral turpitude, sentenced to imprisonment for a term of not less than two years, unless a period of five years has elapsed since his release; or

   (c) Have been dismissed from the service of Pakistan on the ground of misconduct, unless a period of five years has elapsed since his dismissal; or

   (d) Have been removed or been compulsorily retired from the service of Pakistan on the ground of misconduct unless a period of three years has elapsed since his removal or compulsorily retirement; or

   (e) Have been in the service of Pakistan or of any statutory body or anybody which is owned or controlled by the government or in which the government has a controlling share or interest, unless a period of two years has elapsed since he ceased to be in such service; or
(f) Have been found guilty of a corrupt or illegal practice under any law for the
time being in force, unless a period of five years has elapsed from the date on
which that order takes effect.

(g) Have been convicted under section 7 of the political parties act, 1962, unless a
period of five years has elapsed from the date of such conviction; or

(h) Have, whether by himself or by any person or body of persons in trust for him
or for his benefit or on his account or as a member of Hindu undivided family,
any share or interest in a contract, not being a contract between a cooperative
society and government, for the supply of goods to, or for the execution of any
contract or for the performance of any service undertaken by government.

22. It also introduced the office of the Advisor to the prime minister. The President could
appoint up to five advisors to the prime minister, on advice of the prime minister.
However, these advisors could not participate in the proceedings of either house of the
parliament

23. The executive authority of the federation would vest in the President which should be
exercised by him, either directly or through officers subordinate to him, in accordance
with the constitution.

24. The Supreme Court was empowered to transfer any case pending before any High Court
to any other High Court.

25. It was provided that the president could request one of the judges of the Supreme Court to
act as chief justice of a High Court.

26. The president was conferred with the discretionary power to appoint the Chairman, Joint
Chiefs of Staff Committee, and chiefs of army, Naval and Air staff.

27. All martial law regulations, martial law orders, laws framed during the martial law
regime, and acts, and orders made thereunder were validated under article 270-A.

28. Appointment of the governor of a province was left to the discretion of the President.

29. A national security council was to be constituted under article 152-A which was to
include the President, the prime minister, chairman of the Senate, the chairman of the
Joint Chiefs of Staff committee, and the chiefs of the three armed forces.

Critical analysis
1. RCO shifted the balance of power in favor of the President and the office of the prime minister was relegated to a subservient and subordinate position. 
2. Later on, the basic changes through RCO in the structure of the constitution created constitutional and political crisis in the country. 
3. The introduction of RCO was a clear departure from the original constitution of 1973 which provided that the executive authority of the federation should be exercised in the name of the President by the federal government consisting of the prime minister and the federal ministers which should act through the prime minister who was the chief executive of the federation. After the implementation of RCO, president was the chief executive of the federation. 
4. RCO caused great harm to the independence of the judiciary. The power of the president to ask one of the judges of the Supreme Court to act as chief justice of a High court tarnished the image of the judiciary and gave it in a subordinate position. At least five judges of the Supreme Court, in various times, were asked to be acting chief justices of the Lahore High court and Sindh High Court for extending periods of time running into several years. 

**Role of the Opposition**

Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar, member of the national assembly, raised a protest on the constitutional amendments which has been introduced by the dictator. He raised the point that after the elections of 985, the house has come into existence. The nation has given trust to the members of the house. But after the existence of house, few important and basic amendments in the constitution of 1973 had been introduced by the President. The house had only the right to amend the constitution. In this way, the introduction of the amendments outside the house deprived it from its basic right. So the house should take the notice of this action of the President. It did not matter either these amendments were good or bad. If these amendments were indispensable, it should be introduced in the house. The members of this house were wise, patriotic and could not go against the interests of the nation. If they felt these amendments indispensable, they would definitely cast vote in its favor. It was another option that these reforms should be introduced before the elections of the house so that the members were fully aware that under what kind of system they were going to work. The President should conduct referendum for these reforms.
He also mentioned that the Supreme Court gave the right to the President under the doctrine of necessity to amend only those articles of the constitution which were only necessary for running the smooth working of the government and maintaining the condition of law and order. So in my opinion, the right of the house had been challenged and the house should take notice of it.

Minister for justice and the matters of parliament opposed the resolution and declared that

“The question reflects on the personal conduct of the President”

Under Order 1977, this right had been given to the President to amend the constitution. So the President did under that right and the assembly could not discuss it. He requested to the speaker that the resolution was against the rules and conduct of business. It was maintainable and it should be declared rule out.

Haji Muhammad SaifUllah Khan stood on Point of Order and tried to refute the statement of the Minister. He requested the speaker that he wanted a Ruling on this issue that the action which the President took in capacity of the executive authority of the Federation would come in the list of Official Functions or the Personal Conduct?. The personal was only which was related to his own personality or caste. The difference between the Official and Personal Functions is necessary.

The speaker gave the Ruling that

They can be amended by this house and this house is competent to take up these amendments afresh and amend them, this house is competent by law to reamend, if it wants to, or amend any other clause or article of this constitution, therefore I rule this privilege motion out of order.  

8th Amendment

The Martial Law dictator had the desire from the National Assembly and the civilian government to accept his constitutional package of RCO while the civilian government had promised the nation that it would lift martial law and restore the constitution of 1973. That’s why, the approval of the 8th amendment was necessary for lifting the martial law from the country. The members of the National Assembly introduced the 8th amendment and gave the approval of the changes brought about by Gen. Zia-ul-Haq in the constitution. But parliament secured some changes in the original draft. For example, the proposed National Security Council which was meant to
give representation to the military in policy making was scraped. Even the National Assembly reduced the powers of the President and gave power to the members of National Assembly to elect a prime minister from March 1990 and the provincial assemblies could elect their chief ministers from March 1988. It was also made compulsory for the President of Pakistan to appoint the provincial governors in consultation with the Prime Minister.\footnote{SafdarMahmood, \textit{Pakistan Political Roots \& Development 1947-1999}, PP. 375-76.} In fact, the Eighth Amendment was piece of ‘constitutional engineering’ to provide a bridge for transition from military rule to democracy.

**Main Provisions**

1. The President was required to act on advice of the Prime Minister or cabinet. The President could, however, require the Prime Minister or the cabinet to reconsider such advice.

2. The period for giving assent by the President to the bills passed by the parliament, was reduced from forty five to thirty days, but rest of the provisions of RCO remained the same.

3. The President retained the power to dissolve the National Assembly at his discretion, but this power was conditional. He could dissolve the National Assembly provided that, in his opinion, the government could not be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the constitution and an appeal to the electorate became necessary. The period for holding elections after the dissolution of the National Assembly was reduced from 100 to 90 days.

4. The President retained the power to appoint, at his discretion, Chiefs of Armed Forces and Chief election Commissioner.

5. The power of the President to appoint the Prime Minister was limited to a period of five years, that is, until 20 March 1990 after which date, the President was required to invite that member of the National Assembly that commanded the confidence of the majority of its members, as ascertained in a session of an assembly summoned for the purpose, to assume the office of the Prime Minister.

6. The President retained the power to appoint, at his discretion, governors of the provinces but in consultation with the Prime Minister.
7. The power of the governor to appoint the Chief Minister was limited to three years, that is, until 20 March 1988 after which date, the Governor was required to invite that member of the provincial assembly to be the chief minister who commanded the confidence of the majority of the members of the provincial assembly as ascertained in a session of assembly summoned for the purpose.

8. The Governor could also dissolve the provincial assembly at his discretion, but subject to the previous approval of the President where in his opinion:

   (a) A vote of no-confidence having been passed against the chief minister, no other member of the provincial assembly is likely to command the confidence of the majority of the members of the provincial assembly in accordance with the provisions of the constitution, as ascertained in a session of the provincial assembly summoned for the purpose or

   (b) A situation has arisen in which the government of the province can not be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the constitution and an appeal to the electorate is necessary.

9. Article 152-A, regarding the constitution and establishment of the National Security Council, was omitted.

10. Article 270-A, regarding validation of the laws, acts, and orders of Martial Law Regime was extended to cover more cases. The word validation was substituted by the word affirmation. In addition to President’s order, Ordinances, martial law regulations, martial law orders, Referendum Order 1984, the RCO and other constitutional amendments by Zia from time to time were affirmed and validated. 387

Results

1. The amendment was the result of the compromise between the civilian government and the Martial Law dictator.

2. Zia-u-Haq ensured his prominent position as the strongest President of Pakistan by reserving unto himself the power to dissolve the National Assembly at his discretion and to appoint a caretaker government.

3. The 8th amendment reduced the status of the Prime Minister and made Prime Minister subservient to the desires of the President.

---

4. It retained elements of both parliamentary and the Presidential forms of government but tilted the balance of power in the latter’s favor.

5. Removing excessive powers of the Prime Minister in the original 1973 constitution, the 8th amendment grafted presidential discretion without the protection of a system of checks and balances. 388

6. After the implementation of 8th amendment, Zia-ul-Haq lifted the Martial Law on 30 December 1985. 389

Role of Opposition
The bill of the 8th amendment in the National Assembly ignited a heated debate between the opposition and the pro-government group. Independent parliamentary group played the role of opposition and criticized the 8th amendment. Haji Saifullah Khan was an opposition leader and he delivered a lengthy debate over the bill. He said

“The bill consisted of amendments to those articles which had not been enforced then”

He further said,

“Until article 270 A is revised the Assembly cannot consider the bill.” 390

Shaikh Rashid said,

“Repeated amendments in the constitution tantamount to playing with the destiny of the nation and should be avoided.” 391

Javed Hashmi demanded that

“Amendments should be made in a well-considered fashion and not haphazardly. The bill should be referred to the standing committee.”

Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar added that

“If the present bill was passed it would mean, making the assembly powerless.” 392

Inspite of all these speeches on the bill, on 16th October 1985, the Prime Minister of Pakistan made it clear on the members of the National Assembly that an agreement had reached between

---

the opposition and the government on all important issues relating to the constitution. This agreement left a shadow of doubts on the role of the opposition in the National Assembly.

**Salient Features of the Accord.**

1. Clause 2 of the eighth amendment bill providing discretionary powers of the president whose validity cannot be called in question will be deleted.

2. Discretionary powers of the President in respect of dissolution of the National Assembly as provided in clause of the bill seeking to amend article 58 of the constitution would be limited and the National Assembly will be given more powers.

3. Article 90 A of the constitution will be amended to provide greater provincial autonomy and further limiting the executive authority of the president.

4. The powers of the President for dismissal of the Prime Minister will be drastically curtailed under article 91 (5) of the constitution and the clause of the present bill which sought wide powers for the President in this connection would be deleted.

5. The clause of the bill regarding the appointment of a person as governor who is not domiciled of that province will be deleted.

6. The Governor’s power for dismissal of chief minister and dissolution of provincial assemblies will be curtailed.

7. The National Assembly will be given power to elect its own prime minister from 1990, and the provincial assemblies will have powers to elect their own chief minister from March, 20th 1988.

8. Discretionary power of the President for appointment of governors will be curtailed.

9. Women will be given two terms of their indirect election to the National and Provincial Assemblies

---
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10. The election of the senators will be by rotation of three years instead of two years and their term of office will be for six years.

11. The clause amending article 150 A which authorized the government to invite armed forces to discuss the political affairs of the country will be deleted.

12. The clause amending article 270 A which gave powers to the President that without its approval no Martial Law regulation or order could challenge will be deleted.

13. The Political Parties’ Act which has been given protection under constitution will be excluded from the first schedule of the constitution.

14. Article 203-B (C) of the constitution which curtails the power of the Federal Shariat Court will be amended.

15. A high powered commission will be appointed to suggest ways and means for accelerating the pace of Islamization.

According to the provisions of the agreement between Independent Parliamentary Group and Official Parliamentary Group, the 8th amendment was approved in the National Assembly on 16th October 1985.

The only opposition on the bill of 8th amendment in the National Assembly came from three members, i.e. Mumtaz Tarar, Nur Khan and Shahid Zafar of Rawalpindi. 394 At the time of the voting in favor of 8th amendment, eight members did not attend the session on that day. Abida Hussain was also one of them. Though, the treasury benches tried to contact with the absentee members telephonically but the eight members did not like to cast vote in the favor of the 8th amendment and decided not to attend the session. 395

Failure of the Special Committee set up by the Prime Minister to submit its recommendations regarding amendments to be made in the Constitution

In the Senate, on 10th March 1988 Prof. Khurshaid Ahmed begged to seek leave of the House to move the following privilege motion

---

395 Interview with Abida Hussain, dated 22-07-12, Shah Jewana Jhang.
“On the occasion of the debate on the constitutional (Eight Amendment) Bill, the Prime Minister in response to an agreement between him and 11 senators promised that a committee of senators would be formed to report within six months on the followings:

(I) Identification of further amendments needed in the constitution to bring it in conformity with the inclusion of the Objectives Resolution in the operative part of the constitution and the adoption of the principle contained in the constitutional (Ninth Amendment) Bill that Quran and Sunnah would be the supreme law of the land and chief source for legislation and policy making.

(II) To suggest changes in the constitution to make it obligatory that Prime Minister shall be Muslim

(III) To suggest changes ensuring that provincial autonomy as contained in the original constitution of 1973 be restored

(IV) To suggest ways and means for redressing the grievances of people subjected to punishment under different Martial Law Ordinances and Regulations

The report of the committee as presented by the Minister for Justice and Parliamentary Affairs to the Senate on 28th Feb. 1988, totally failed to cover the first three points and was extremely inadequate in respect of the fourth point. The committee took over two years to produce this mole out of the mountain. The committee seemed to have neglected its terms of reference and had failed to fulfill the responsibilities assigned to it in response to the will of the House. This constituted a violation of the trust reposed in it. This failure of the committee constituted a violation of the privilege of the House some of whose members had voted in favor of the amendment in view of the undertaking that the issues assigned to the committee would be amicably resolved. This issue was discussed in the Senate and also referred to the privileges committee for appropriate action.”

(v) **Political Parties (Amendment) Act 1962**

The military government changed the ground rules for the polls which caused and raised new doubts about the military government’s intentions to hold the elections on that date which had been announced by the military ruler. The president then announced the following amendments to the Political Parties’ Act of 1962:

---

1. All parties must register with the election commission.
2. A party’s registration might be cancelled “if it acts in any manner harmful to the ideology of Pakistan, the maintenance of public order, integrity or independent of the judiciary………;
3. Every party must hold annual elections at all level.
4. All parties must submit their accounts for audit to the Election Commission.\(397\)

With the approval of the parliament, the Zia government enforced the Political Parties (amendment) Act. It was related to the registration of the political parties, defection clauses and the powers of the Election Commission of Pakistan. It was necessary for the political parties to register themselves in the election commission. Unregistered parties were not allowed to contest election.\(398\)

Later, the Supreme Court declared the registration of political parties as unconstitutional and in this way; it abolished the distinction between registered and non-registered parties.\(399\)

On 1\(^{st}\) December 1985, Iqbal Ahmed Khan moved the Political Parties Amendment bill in the house with the permission of the speaker.

“\textit{That the bill further to amend the political parties act 1962, the political parties (Amendment) Bill, 1985, as reported by the standing committee, be taken into consideration at once.}”\(400\)

As soon as the member moved the bill from the treasury benches, the several members not only opposed it but also criticized it in their speeches on the bill. Most of the members of the House of National Assembly showed their concerns and that’s why this bill took many days of the House. Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan, Dr Sher Afghan Khan Niazi, Sh. Rasheed Ahmed, Wasi Mazhar, Shah Baleeghudeen gave the proposal on the bill that it should first forward for public opinion. Without the support of the public, it should not be considered in the House. It was their opinion that the bill had great importance and would definitely leave impact on the lives of the people. So the people opinion must be sought on the bill.

\(397\) Hamid Khan, \textit{Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan}, P. 632.
\(399\) Ibid., P. 384
\(400\) Official Record of the National Assembly.
Haji Saifullah said that internationally the parliaments made laws and these were also implemented. The people took the effects of these laws. But few laws were of such kinds that every citizen of the state indented to give his opinion on the issue because it was directly related to his life. If the legislation was made after the consultation of the masses, that legislation would be of great importance as compare to ordinary legislation. The people would follow that law without any fear because it was introduced with their opinion. So the Political Parties (Amendment) Bill had of great importance and it should be directly related to the lives of the people. Haji Saifullah also described the history of the Political Parties Act 1962 and discussed how the amendments were introduced in the different periods. He said that in 1978, 1979, 1985 such kinds of things had been included in it which curtailed the jurisdiction of the people and tried to snatch their political freedom. He felt sorrow over it that again same kind of effort was being made through the elected representatives and the political freedom of the people was further being curtailed. This bill would be the death of Political Democratic Institutions and the political parties would no longer survive. Haji Saifullah highlighted the importance of the people and their rights. According to him, the political rights should be given to them. Parliament would further strengthen if it succeeded in maintaining the trust of the people. He delivered a lengthy speech on Political Parties amendment Bill and fully opposed it with the justification that it would destroy the political democratic institutions in Pakistan.401

The treasury benches declared that the speech of Haji Saifullah was the repetition of the words. He always gave the same speech and the members of the House had already heard the same speech on different occasions. So it was only emotional speech, nothing else. But Shah Baleighudeen negated such kind of concept and declared it a democratic and political speech and it must be considered seriously.

Haji Saifullah again started his speech and mentioned the elections of 1985. A lot of people casted votes in the elections inspite of the opposition of political parties. The people of Pakistan rejected the request of the political parties. Even the turn out in the local bodies’ elections was so high that the people would like the democratic institutions. He said that the political parties faced sanctions in different periods and the dictators fully tried to weaken them. The ruling party strengthened its roots within the masses through defaming the other parties. That’s why, the parties could not leave good impressions in the minds of the people. He

highlighted the role of Muslim League in Pakistan and declared it the party of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah but he felt sorrow over its role after the death of Jinnah. He mentioned that any political party which disconnected itself from the people, always lost its image and down to trodden. He said that Jinnah left the president ship of Muslim League when he became Governor General. So the ruler should be neutral and not partisan.402

On 2nd December 1985, the law minister told the house that the books on political parties’ amendment bill were printed in a few days. But WasiMazharNadvi negated the statement of the minister and informed the house that 1983, 1984 printed year had been given on the books which showed that these books had been printed even before the elections. This thing showed the bad intentions of the government that it had planned before the elections what it was going to do. So the minister should not misguide the House.403

On 2nd December, Haji Saifullah Khan again tried to convince the House that the Bill should be referred to the people for consideration and an opportunity might be given to the political parties to restore their images in the masses. The political parties should convince the people and the people must create liaison between themselves and the parties. Though, people had lost confidence on the political parties but it was a time to rebuild that image. It was necessary because the democratic set up could not be run without the political parties. Haji Saifullah made it clear that he was not opposing the political parties. Political parties are the blood of the democratic set up. Without it, the democratic set up cannot survive.

He highlighted the controversy over the bill with the allegations that the President did not like the political parties while the Prime Minister liked the political parties. He also mentioned the differences of the members of the House on the bill. Few members declared that the political parties were not legal according to the teachings of Islam, while few declared it legal. Such kind of debate made the bill controversial and that’s why it should be referred to the people for consideration. Without the opinion of the people, no bill could be passed in the house. He also criticized the politics of Muslim League and declared it responsible for all the problems in the political and democratic set up. He said that Muslim League always remained the party of rulers and did not attract the masses. 404
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In his speech, Haji SaifUllah gave the historical background of the Assemblies and also mentioned the formation of the political parties under the supervision of the governments. He told the history of Republication party, Convention Muslim League and how the governments were involved in the formation of these parties. He stressed that the political parties were related to people or parliament but those political parties which were established under the governmental supervision did not have any roots within the people. Such kind of parties could not survive after the demise of that government who formed it for its own designs. Equal status should be given to all political parties. It has been the tradition of the political culture of Pakistan that ruling political party tried to crush the other political parties which derailed the political system of Pakistan. The Martial Law dictators imposed illegal sanctions on those parties which refused to cooperate with him but the dictators could not depart the people from those parties. Even the elected members of banned parties were arrested and detained in prisons without any solid reasons. Such policies played role in the disintegration of Pakistan. So the House should not pass such kind of black laws which snatched the freedom of the political parties as well as the people of Pakistan. He declared that the political party’s amendment bill 1985 was a black law and it must be referred to the masses for consideration. He also raised the point that those political leaders who had come to the House on non-party basis elections, did not have the right to pass the laws about the political parties. If they wanted to support this bill, first they should go to the masses and contest elections on the party basis. The law of political parties of 1975 should be introduced as such. He informed the House that Bill which was going to be introduced by the government was against the articles of the constitution of Pakistan. He quoted those articles (article 8, 17, 225, 66, 260) in his speech also. He criticized the election commissioner who had taken the oath according to law. Haji Saifullah said that present Election Commissioner had not taken oath under the constitution of Pakistan so he did not have the right to continue.

ShaikhRasheed Ahmed supported the points of Haji Saifullah and gave few hints from the history of Pakistan. He quoted the government of Muhammad AliBogra and the politicians. He said that the politicians should not change their loyalties because such actions weakened the democracy and democratic institutions. He opposed the political party’s amendment bill and demanded that it should be referred to the masses for consideration first and then the members of House would take up.  

---

Dr Shar Afghan Niazi mentioned the report of the standing committee regarding the Political Parties Amendment Bill and informed the House that the Minister was misleading the worthy members. He read the wording of the report of the standing committee, “There was full consensus among the members of the committee to the effect that the bill as received may be passed.”

Iqbal Ahmed Khan was the chairman of the standing committee. Dr Shar Afghan refuted the report of Iqbal Ahmed Khan who did not mention the dissenting notes of the members in his report. He mentioned the dissenting note of Maulana Gohar Rehman about the Political Parties Amendment bill. Note of dissent was as under

“On the basis of following reasons, the Political Parties Act, 1962 is not acceptable to me. I submit that certain clauses of the Act of 1962 and the amendment bill are contrary to justice and democratic values. It was proper to remove the lacunas in the amendment bill. But, instead of improvement, not only the past lacunas has been left as there were, the new ones have also been added. Therefore, in my opinion, the amendment bill 1985, is incomplete; and to make it acceptable, my following proposal may be submitted.”

This dissenting note showed that the members of the standing committee did not pass the bill with full consensus. The honorable members had declared it undemocratic and against the justice. Under these circumstances how the Minister gave the statement that the standing committee had passed the bill with full consensus?

Abida Hussain also gave her comments on the Political Parties Amendment Bill and expressed the motives of the bill. She said that the government wanted to make such political party a majority party which did not have its majority in the House that was elected by the people on non-party basis elections. In her speech, she quoted the speech of Haji Saifullah and appreciated his comments on the history of Pakistan. She remembered the era of Ayub Khan who established Convention Muslim League and after that Muslim League was known with different names. First time, Muslim League faced Mamdoot and Doltana tussle and then it was divided into Convention and Council Muslim League. But the Convention Muslim League also faced the same fate and lost its popularity with the end of the rule of its founders. It was further divided into different groups, like Qaum League, Qasim League and then Pagara League.

---

After discussing the history of Muslim League, she told the house about the Political Parties Amendment Bill and repeated the demand of the treasury benches that after lifting the Martial Law, a vacuum would be developed. The revival of the political parties with few amendments in the Political Parties Act 1962 was necessary for filling that vacuum. She said that the Political Parties Amendment Bill consisted of two aspects, one was related to the registration of the political parties and the second was related to the defection clause. About the first aspect of the bill, she declared it against the freedom of association, freedom of speech which were basic rights recognized by the constitution of Pakistan. So not even a single wise member of the House would like to support it. There was no need of sections about the revival of the political parties. It did not matter what was the name of the political party. People would play the role of judge. She said that it was not suitable for the people of Pakistan that the official institution, election commission, was going to decide whose party was eligible or not. The political parties could reformise itself through the continuing process of democracy. No House had the right to bind the political parties without the support of the people. After that, she discussed the second aspect of the bill which was related to defection. She made it clear that she and her group had contested elections without the support of any political party but the minister and the leader of the House had their affiliations with a political party. Through this bill, an effort was being made to compel the members to join the party of the ruling people which was totally illegal. She criticized the Prime Minister with the allegation that he was trying to maintain his majority through such a political party who did not have any firm roots within the masses. Defection clause was being considered in such a House which had been elected on non-party basis. If the members of this prestigious House had been elected on party basis, then it was their moral obligation to support the defection clause. The members of this House should do trust on each other because the Bill was leading towards distrust among the members. We, all members, had given three times vote of confidence to the Prime Minister collectively, then why mistrust was being created among the members. People elected us on non-party basis and now how we could join political party without their consent. Even the people were not ensured about the lifting of the Martial Law and they were in suspicion. Under these circumstances, why a sword was being hanged on our heads through the defection clause that the members would lose his seat if he or she changed loyalties from one party to other.
At the end of her speech, she described the reasons behind the creation of Pakistan. Fair play, freedom and fraternity were the basic principles that compelled the people to migrate from India to Pakistan. This House should also adopt these principles for its survival.407

Malik Noor Khan not only opposed the Political Parties Amendment Bill but also suggested the members to unite themselves against the autocratic rules and regulations which were being imposed on the people of Pakistan through those members who had been elected on non-party based elections. He said that

"...............the members of this house are not committed to any political party but are today deciding the rules by which we will be able to operate. The only way we can go about this business is to whole heartedly embrace the democratic political system and have no restriction whatsoever. The whole country, infact, demanding that why must we have any system of reservations or restrictions on crossing the floor. Only through our experience, after we have put it into operation, can we genuinely say that this system is working or not working. Every government that has come into power has used it, in the past to put in more and more restriction...............if you are going to impose restrictions, then I think they affect each and every body’s life in this country. Even one amendment will affect the bill as a whole, the spirit of the bill........if you today want to save Pakistan and you want to put it on political system, then, please, you have got to come out with liberal reforms, not only in every other sphere of life but also in the way the political parties operate. And the only way they can operate it total freedom and total ability to do exactly what they want to do. "408

On 3rd December 1985, SardarAseff Ahmed Ali divided the bill into three aspects. One was related to registration, second defection clause and third powers of the Election Commission. He tried to expose the real purposes behind the introduction of the bill. The purposes appeared to him to be far more sinister than to impose restrictions over the House of National Assembly. According to him, if the registration clause went through as proposed in the bill, perhaps it was felt that some of the larger national parties would refuse to get themselves
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registered under act, and, therefore, a certain political party, which had tried to grab power in this country through the Governor Houses of the four provinces, would then have a filed day. It could hold elections one or one and a half year. Even the government wanted to hold election within one month; he pledged that he would be the first man to declare his candidature. He said that he was not afraid of election but there were certain rules. Aseff Ahmed Ali declared injustice to the unity of Pakistan if the government was going to force certain parties out of political field. The banned political parties would indulge in subversion because the government would have closed the door of normal political activities on them. He rejected the registration clause completely. Then he took the defection clause and said that anywhere in the world such restrictions were not imposed on members of a party. He opposed and condemned the effort of government who was trying to hijack National Assembly and its sovereignty. On the powers of the Election Commission regarding the registration of the parties, to form rules and regulations, he declared it deplorable method and condemned it. Overall, he opposed the bill completely.\textsuperscript{409}

Dr Shar Afghan Niazi, Dr Muhammad Shafique Ch. And Javed Hashmi also gave their lengthy speeches on the Political Parties Amendment Bill. Javed Hashmi said that with revival of only one party, the confusion would prevail. We would see the polarization and in this way the existing assembly would lose its importance. Under these circumstances, opportunity would be provided another dictator to occupy the affairs of the state. The people gave the mandate of progress and growth in the elections and we had promised them that we would make strenuous efforts for the development of the state. They had not given the mandate to restore the political parties. The President imposed the Martial Law with the justification that the political parties had failed in delivering their services to the people of Pakistan. Again the political parties were being introduced with the help of the government. He criticized the policy of the government with the allegations that the signatures had already been taken from the members and name of the party was being finalized after the taking of signatures. He even disliked the floor crossing and declared it “Mockery of Democracy”.\textsuperscript{410} Near about thirty members spoke on the bill with their lengthy speeches. But the speaker realized the situation that the members were repeating the things and they were wasting the time of the House. The speaker gave a Ruling on 4\textsuperscript{th} December 1985 as under

\textsuperscript{410}Ibid.,
“...................seeing the speed of the debate, the length of the speeches and the time consumed by the honorable members, so many honorable members in the list still appear to speak. If we keep this further by this stage, I think, the Bill in question has been thrashed out by the honorable members sufficiently. The mover has said that it will be the abuse of the rules and infringement of the right of the reasonable debate and it has been protracted and there is no further scope of any reasonable other discussion or now no point yet left has been to be further clarified. So, I hold the motion in order and I will be put thing the question.”

Few members of the House showed resentment on the Ruling of the speaker and walked out from the House as a protest. The main demand of those members was that time had not been allocated to them for speech. Remarkable among them were Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan (he adopted the stance that freedom of speech had been snatched through Ruling), Muzafar Ahmed Hashmi, Mir Ahmed Nawaz Khan and few other members.

Few members of the House of National Assembly were opposing the Bill with the justification that there was no justification of political parties in Islam and that’s why, political parties should not be allowed to work within the state. After the Ruling of the speaker, WasiMazharNadvi, Haji Muhammad Asghar, MoinudeenLakhvi, Shah Baleghudeen, Raja Muhammad Afsar, moved the motion that the Bill should be referred to the Islamic Ideology Council. Final decision should be taken according to the opinion of the members of Islamic Ideology Council. After the debates on the motion, the speaker asked the members to stand on their seats who support the motion. Two fifth of the total members were required for passing the motion. But the motion could not get the required strength of the members. So the motion was not carried.

On 5th December 1985, the speaker said that the Bill would be discussed clause by clause. First he presented the clause 2 for consideration. Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan opposed clause 2 and moved a new motion. That was as under

“That for clause 2 of the Bill, as reported by the standing committee, the following be substituted, namely:

\[\text{[citation text]}\]

\[\text{[citation text]}\]

After the discussion on the amendment from the both sides, the speaker gave Ruling that the motion was negative.\textsuperscript{413}

The Bill was passes by the House of National Assembly and it was referred to the Senate for consideration. On 14\textsuperscript{th} December 1985, the treasury benches moved the Bill in the Senate but Prof. Khurshid Ahmed moved the motion that

“\textit{That the Political Parties (Amendment) Bill, 1985, as passed by the National Assembly, referred to the standing committee, concerned, for report within 4 days.}”\textsuperscript{414}

The Law Minister opposed it. Prof. Khurshid Ahmed gave arguments in the favor of his point that

1. There were few flaws in the Bill and it was necessary for eliminating those flaws to refer the Bill to standing committee.

2. The Bill did not have any link with the lifting of Martial Law as said by the President himself. So the Bill must not link with the Martial Law and it should be referred to the standing committee for consideration.

JavedJabbar gave his remarks against the Bill and declared that

“\textit{…………………this Bill directly seeks to contradict at least seven articles of the Constitution of Pakistan………we are being presented with a Bill which directly subverts the very constitution that we are supposed to hold………………}”\textsuperscript{415}

Abdul Rahim Mir DaadKhail, MaulanaKousarNiazi, NawabzadaJahngir Shah, Yousuf Ali Khan Magsi, QaziHussain Ahmed, Ahmed MianSoomro supported the motion and gave valid arguments in its favor but the law minister and his coherts opposed the motion and declared that it was only wastage of time.

In Senate, the government was in the favor that the Bill must be passed immediately so that the Martial Law could not prevail over the heads of the people of Pakistan further. While the
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opposition was denying such kind of claims and adopted that such bills did not have any link with the lifting of Martial Law.

Ahmed MianSoomro commented on the Bill and declared it against the freedom of the people. He made it clear that the elections by which all of the senators had come into the House; had come about in a system of non-party basis but the Bill showed the realization that the elections should have been on party basis. Holding elections on non-party basis and again bringing an amendment about defection in the case of persons who had not been elected on any party basis who had not been elected as nominees of any party to tie them, down.⁴¹⁶

Prof. Khursahid Ahmed, MualanaKousarNiazi, Ahmed MianSoomro moved the motions on the Bill and these were as under

“*That in clause 4 of the Bill, as passed by the National Assembly, in the proposed section 12, for the words “Federal Government” occurring in the first line, the words “Senate of Pakistan” be substituted.*”⁴¹⁷

The chairman rejected all the motions which were presented by the opposition in the Senate. At the end of the discussions, the chairman Senate again put the question before the House that

“*That the Bill further amends the Political Parties Act 1962, (Political Parties (Amendment Bill 1985) as passed by the National Assembly, be passed.*”

Ahmed MianSoomro claimed a division and suggested by standing counting. The chairman announced that those in favor of the Bill might stand up. The results were as under

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstention</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Official Record of the Senate of Pakistan)

The chairman announced that the Bill stood passed.

⁴¹⁷Official Record of the Senate of Pakistan.
The establishment of the Office of WafaqiMohtasibs (Ombudsman) Order (Amendment Bill, 1986)

On 1st July 1986, M.P.Bhandara begged to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Establishment of the Office of WafaqiMohtasib Order, 1983, (The establishment of the Office of WafaqiMohtasibs (Ombudsman) Order (Amendment Bill, 1986). The minister for Justice and Parliamentary Affairs (Iqbal Ahmed Khan) opposed it. But the honorable member, M.P.Bhandara elaborated it with the justification that he wanted to give the ombudsman the same status as he had in other countries. Under article 28 (2) of the Ombudsman Order, his powers could be withdrawn by the head of the state at his pleasure. The honorable member informed the House that the Bill would attempt rationalizes the Ombudsman office. After passing the bill, it would be impossible for one person to withdraw the powers of the Ombudsman. He criticized the treasury benches and said if I proposed that the Ombudsman should be responsible to the parliament, how did it affect them? Dr Muhammad Shafique Ch. Supported the bill of Bhandara and Syed Fakhar Imam gave his arguments in the favor of the bill and said that a simple proposition in the bill was that the Ombudsman should be made accountable to the members of the parliament and not to one particular person, even though he might be the head of the state. He said that the treasury benches should not oppose due to this that it had been presented from the opposition benches. LiaquatBaloch also supported the Bill and demanded that it must be discussed in the House. After the speeches of the honorable members, the speaker passed the comments

“This is not really point or order and, under normal circumstances, you would be the first one to point it out to this house. I think that you have already made your point. I would now like to put this to the House; they are the final authority to decide this.”

Count was taken but the quorum bells rang. The House was adjourned by the speaker.

---

The House of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) (Amendment) Bill, 1986

Iqbal Ahmed Khan moved the Bill in the House on 6th July 1986:

“That the Bill further to amend the Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) Order, 1977 (The Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) (Amendment) Bill, 1986, as reported by the standing committee, be taken into consideration at one”419

The speaker read the Bill loudly in the House because it was necessary for the speaker to read after the mover. Several members opposed the bill and Ch. Mumtaz Tarar moved that

“That the Bill further to amend the Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) Order, 1977 (The Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) (Amendment) Bill, 1986, as reported by the standing committee, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by 30th July 1986.”420

The speaker read the motion in the House and Iqbal Ahmed Khan opposed it. But Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan moved another motion that was

“That the Bill further to amend the Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) Order, 1977 (The Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) (Amendment) Bill, 1986, as reported by the standing committee, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by 31st July 1986.”421

Mr. Iqbal Ahmed Khan opposed this motion also. A lot of other members also move the motions. Among them were Syed Fakhar Imam, Dr. Shafique Ch., Dr. Sher Afghan Niazi, Sardar Aseef Ahmed Ali, Malik Noor Khan, Syeda Abida Hussain, Javed Hashmi, Raja Shahid Zafar, Khan Muhammad Arif Khan etc. Abida Hussain demanded the speaker that all those who had moved the motions would like to speak because it was their right. The speaker asked that the members would have to restrict themselves for only five minutes. Syed Fakhar Imam requested the speaker that Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan, who had prepared in great detail about that particular Bill, if you would kindly indulge and allow him full freedom of speech, we will be
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very grateful. On the request of Syed Fakhar Imam, the speaker gave extra time to Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan for expressing his views on the Bill. Saifullah highlighted the Bill in detail but as usual he included irrelevant things in his speech. On all important issues, he delivered lengthy speeches but the repetition was frequently seen. He criticized the Ordinance of the President which was going to be taken the shape of law. The laws which were passed in hustle and bustle without the support of the people would not leave impact on the masses. The Bill was not only related to the members of the National Assembly, it was directly related to the fundamental rights of the people. So it should be referred to the people for consideration. The same opinion, Haji Saifullah gave in the Political Parties (Amendment) Bill, 1986. He again as usual stressed on the supremacy of the House and warned the members that they should take the Bill seriously; otherwise the people would not forgive them.

Syed Fakhar Imam also took the shelter of history of Pakistan in his speech and said that democracy, institutions of elected representatives, rule of law, for the major part of the history of Pakistan, had been missing from our policy. He said about the Bill that

“...........it was a very small test, it was a small challenge, that an Ordinance which has been brought in and we are told that Article 48 do not exist, we are told that, no, it was not at the behest of the cabinet, it was not at the behest of the Prime Minister, we are told, but we are told that one individual bailed out this government. I am surprised and I said once before that nobody wishes to retract from such statements and nobody wants to make any kind of statement to counter such statements...........why do not the Treasury Benches wish to take the people of Pakistan into confidence.”

MumtazTarar critically evaluated the Bill and stressed that it should not be passed due to the fact that it was against the fundamental rights. Its defection clauses would deprive the people from their basic rights. If the Bill was approved, the freedom of speech would be lost. During his speech, Iqbal Ahmed interrupted and said that the honorable member had quoted the Political Parties Amendment Bill and he was unable to understand that the House was discussing a different issue. But MumtazTarar made it clear that he was not discussing Political Parties Amendment Bill but he was opposing the Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) (Amendment) Bill, 1986. He mentioned that the government had taken the shelter of

---

Ordinance for this legislation. There was no need of issuing Ordinance because within few days the session of the National Assembly was going to be held. The government should not strengthen itself through Ordinances but it should focus on the power of the people. Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar always showed maturity in his speeches at all occasions and took the matters of national importance with keen consideration. He also avoided the repetition in his speeches and lengthy speeches.

Dr Muhammad Shafique Ch. declared the Bill a conspiracy against the parliament and the motive behind it was to turn the people against this House. So this Bill must be referred to the people for consideration because after the 8th Amendment it was of great importance Bill. He said that the under discussion Bill devised due to fact that an competent speaker sent a Reference to the Chief Election Commission against the Prime Minister of Pakistan. That Reference not only compelled the President House to crumble but the whole cabinet and due to this, the under discussion Bill was introduced by the government. He said that the Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) (Amendment) Bill, 1986 was against the constitution and the Parliament had not the right to make laws against the provisions of the constitution.423

On 7th July 1986, Shaikh Rashid Ahmed also condemned the action of government regarding the Bill of Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) (Amendment) Bill, 1986. He said that in the history of Pakistan the majority parties often passed such kind of bills which did not have any kind of support of the people of Pakistan. So that tradition was being repeated again which was not good. After that Aseff Ahmed Ali submitted his submissions that the in trying to cover up the Ordinance, the Treasury Benches was in a great haste and wanted to suspend or bypass the normal processes of legislation. He hoped that that the House would send the Bill to elicit public opinion so that the Bill came after due process of law and due deliberations. Raja ShahidZafar declared the Bill as “Bail out Ordinance” and highlighted the importance of the Bill and the House. He also suggested that the Bill should not be passed in haste and it must be referred to the people for consideration. Khan Muhammad Arif Khan said that though the majority parties always tried to bring the laws under their control and the government was considering that the people were unable to understand the Bill which was not suitable. Without the support of the people, no government could survive for a long time and the

power of the people was the real power of the government. So the population of Pakistan must not be ignored and the Bill should be referred for their consideration.\textsuperscript{424}

Abid Hussain also supported the points of the previous members and demanded that the Bill must be sent out for eliciting public opinion. He asserted that

“………..\textit{this is an excellent opportunity that has offered itself to the Treasury Benches in particular, and to the National Assembly of Pakistan in general, to invoke public opinion, to obtain and elicit public opinion and to establish that this parliament enjoys public support and that the public is interested in the affairs of this parliament and in all processes of law-making, that we undertake so as to strengthen institutions in the country and we do not seek the individualistic tendencies to extend sufferings upon our people in the future}………..” \textsuperscript{425}

After discussions on the motion, the speaker rejected the following motion that was moved by Haji Saifullah Khan

"\textit{That the Bill further to amend the Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) Order, 1977 (The Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) (Amendment) Bill, 1986, as reported by the standing committee, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by 31st July 1986.}”\textsuperscript{426}

The speaker was considering that the debates had been completed on the both motions but Haji Saifullah Khan said that general discussion must be taken place on the following motion

"\textit{That the Bill further to amend the Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) Order, 1977 (The Houses of Parliament and Provincial Assemblies (Elections) (Amendment) Bill, 1986, as reported by the standing committee, be taken into consideration at one}”\textsuperscript{427}

The speaker decided to give the member’s limited time for general discussion. Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan, as usual, gave lengthy speech with full of repetition of words and ideas. It seemed that he only wanted to delay the process and had the desire to engage the House in futile
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arguments. This was the technique of the opposition to engage the House and proved its worth through emotional speeches. All the members of the opposition preferred Haji Saifullah Khan to express his views due to his lengthy speeches which was not tolerable for the Treasury Benches. Fakhar Imam and Abida Hussain mostly argued in English language and with solid comments. Both proved themselves great orators and never felt afraid of the policies of dictator. Dr Sher Afghan Niazi was fully aware of the Rules and Regulations of the House and with the provisions of the constitution. He tried to justify his arguments with the articles of the constitution, its clauses and sub clauses. During the whole tenure of the Assembly, he used more articles in his speeches that any other person who was sitting on Opposition Benches. Shaikh Rashid Ahmed also proved his worth and fully supported those leaders who were considered the opposition party in the House but he was supporting the Prime Minister also and even he praised Muhammad Khan Junejo in his interview with the author. Liaquat Baloch also strengthened the stance of the opposition in the Assembly and opposed all those steps which the government tried to implement or introduce through the parliament. Fakhar Imam and Abida Hussain were two liberal personalities but Liaquat Baloch accompanied them and did not use his ideology in his speeches. It was the opposition which consisted of liberals as well as the conservatives.

Twenty four members expressed their views on the motion and further the few members were requesting the speaker for expressing views but the speaker gave the Ruling on 7th July 1986 that the motion was adopted. The speaker and the members of the Treasury Benches only amused from the speeches of the opposition benches but did not consider their recommendations. It has always been the problem of weak opposition. The speaker announced after the Ruling that

“We take up the clause by clause reading. We take clause 2 of the Bill”

Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan, Syed Fakhar Imam, Dr Muhammad Shafique Choudhary, Dr Sher Afghan Niazi, Sardar Aseff Ahmed Ali jointly moved:

“The clause of the Bill, as reported by the Standing Committee, be deleted.” “That for clause 2 of the Bill, as reported by the standing Committee, the following be substituted:

2. Amendment of article 10, P (P.P.) O. No. 5 of 1977. In the Houses of Parliament and Provincial assemblies (elections) Order, 1977 (P.P.) O. No. 5 of
Mr. Iqbal from the treasury benches opposed the motion. But Haji Saifullah Khan, Fakhar Imam, Dr. Shar Afghan Niazi, Syeda Abida Hussain, Sardar Aseff Ahmed Ali, Raja Shahid Zafar, Javed Hashmi and Shaikh Rashid Ahmed gave their arguments in the favor of the particular amendment and demanded that the amendment should be accepted by the honorable members of the House.

It was the technique of the opposition that on every bill, Haji Muhammad Saifullah Khan took the initiative of opposing or supporting any Bill and later on few members supported him through their speeches. Fakhar Imam, Abida Hussain and Aseff Ahmed Ali used the English language during the whole period of the Assembly and Dr. Shar Afghan Niazi, Dr. Shafique Choudhary, Shaikh Rashid Ahmed and Raja Shahid Zafar delivered their speeches in Urdu. On this amendment, the same technique was applied by the opposition. Haji Saif Saifullah Khan supported the amendment with full criticism on the Political Parties (Amendment) Act, 1986. Syed Fakhar Imam said that institution should be greater than any one individual and the members of the House had come for institutionalization rather than reinforcing individual’s personality. Dr. Shar Afghan Khan Niazi took the shelter of history and gave the example of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah. When M.A. Jinnah became Governor General of Pakistan, he refused to accept the Presidentship of Muslim League while Liaquat Ali continued the both and that’s why Muslim League could not promote or strengthen its roots with the people. So the amendment did not allow any member to have two posts at a same time. Sardar Aseff Ahmed Ali supported the amendment moved by his colleagues and said that they were trying to cover the bad law which was passed six or seven months ago and due to that law, the government of Muhammad Khan Junejo and the Parliament had been time and again put into very untenable legal and constitutional situation which had finally resulted in the vote of no confidence against an elected speaker of the National Assembly and thereby had lowered the prestige and sovereignty of the National Assembly of Pakistan. He said that
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head of the party. President Ronald Reagan is not the head of the Republican Party in USA. Mrs. Thatcher is not the head of the conservative party in the United Kingdom..........

Mrs Rafia Tariq, who came on the surface for the first time in the House, said few but impressive words against the President, Prime Minister and the Bill. He quoted the Ruling of the Supreme Court which hanged the former Prime Minister but the law was not changed for him. She asked how it was that; comparatively on such a small issue, a law had been changed for another. She warned the members that they should not play as rubber stamps in making Ordinances into Bills and if they would like to condemn themselves, they would make the nation feel that we were not fit for democracy.

Raja Shahid Zafar quoted the statement of the President which was published in magazine that the President bailed the Prime Minister out. He said that the statement of the President about Prime Minister, who had got the vote of confidence from the House at three times, had tarnished the image of the members of the National Assembly and they should resign from their seats and would go to public for new elections.

After the speeches of the opposition leaders, the speaker announced about the amendment that “The motion was negative.” It was strange that during the whole day, the opposition commented on the amendment but even not a single member from the treasury benches stood and refuted the statements of the opposition benches. In the start, only Iqbal Ahmed Khan opposed it but later on treasury benches remained silent.

\[430\] Ibid.,
Conclusion

“History does nothing, possesses no enormous wealth, fights no battles. It is rather man, the real, living man, who does everything, possesses, fights. It is not “History”, as if she were a person apart, who uses men as means to work out her purposes, but history itself is nothing but activity of men pursuing their purposes.” (Karl Marx)

The history is evident of itself that alliances are always formed among the political parties but these alliances sometime look very active and sometime in a very low capacity. The meetings are organized regularly and in the meetings, the leaders of the various parties try to prove that they are the symbol of unity among the parties and due to their efforts; all parties have come to one platform. Though behind every alliance, one major party is playing key role but in the meetings, time is given to the leaders of smaller parties to express their views. In the start of the alliance, the leadership of the major party invests and tries to unite the democratic parties but the leadership is not so much aggressive. The ordinary workers of the parties are used for filling the jails. While the major leadership is house arrested and is confined to one province only. It is time for the alliances to start demonstrations in various cities. Police try to stop it through different ways. It also arrests the workers and some time the lathe charge is also done. Due to the attitude of police or administration, the workers are become aggressive and these emotions are exploited by the leaders through their speeches. At this time, the leadership of the major party come at the forefront and highjack all the movement. Those leaders who speak in the meetings are not given free hand. The major party has already vote bank in the population and dictator’s anti vote bank increase the popularity of the party. The chanting slogans of the leadership boost up the morale and sometime, the leadership does not care of the minor parties and adopt rude attitude due to the massive support of the people. All these facts have been observed in the movement for restoration of democracy from the meetings of the leaders.

The dictators always try to create disharmony among the leaders of the alliance through different ways. First, the slogan of ideology is used and the parties of right wing are attracted for support. This factor divides the democratic forces into two groups. Second, few parties cannot afford opposition and they always try to remain in power. Such parties exist in the form of various pressure groups. The dictators use such kind of groups for strengthening their rules. Third factor, power is the weakness of the politicians. The dictators try to trap the politicians
with the incentive of ministry in the coming government. Few politicians change their loyalties due to incentives. Forth, the corruption of the politicians is highlighted by the dictator and raises the slogan of accountability. On the name of the accountability, politicians are arrested and tortured in jails. During their stay in jail, they are forced to change their loyalties. Few politicians, due to pressure, decide to support the dictator and get rid of his atrocities. For implementing all these plans, the secret agencies help the military dictators and provide information or pros and cons of every politician. All these factors played role in Zia era in dismantling the unity of the politicians.

After that, the different cards are played for eliminating the opposition. These cards are religion, provincialism, ethnicity, biradrism, regionalism etc. On the bases of these cards, the opposition is divided and the alliances cannot achieve their desired results. General Zia-ul-Haq divided the province of Sindh in Sindhis, Mahajirs, Pathans and drugs mafia. They used to quarrel over the issue of Sindh. The administration was used against the Sindhis and tried to compel PPP to raise the slogan of Jia Sindh so that the hatred might be developed in the province of Punjab against PPP. From that period, the agony and hatred has developed among the people of both provinces and with the passage of time, it has gained roots. Now the people of Punjab always dislike the politicians of Sindh and the Sindhis also propagate against Punjab.

Few parties always do the politics of opposition under every government. Such kind of parties are not in a position to form government or win elections with thumping majorities but their leadership consider themselves the candidate of Prime Ministership or President of Pakistan. The people listen their speeches and participate in their procession but do not cast vote to their parties. That’s why; they win few seats in the elections and always sit on the benches of the opposition. Such kinds of parties are the part of each alliance which is established against the existing government. The example of TI can be given here; it was the part of PNA against Bhutto and MRD against Zia-ul-Haq. Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan also spent always most of his time in establishing oppositions against different regimes.

It is fact that nobody openly dare to defend the Martial Law or support it. The politicians can support the programmes of the dictator but not his martial law because the people of Pakistan do not like the dictators. The whole society is the opposition of the Martial Law. That’s why, the dictators give their agenda which consist of three major points, and one is related to religion,
second related to economy and third is about the defense. These three factors provide opportunity to the few people to support the dictators. While the other active people are arrested and through administration their support is taken. General Zia-ul-Haq promised with the nation that he would introduce islamization in Pakistan. Its promise attracted the religious parties to stand with dictator. The leaders of these parties became ministers in the government but they could not succeed in increasing their vote bank. When the dictators feel that the religious parties have failed in creating pro-dictator circle among the masses, they use to think on alternatives. It is fact that the religious scholars or Maulanas cannot remain in power for a long time due to their personal differences or personal cult. The people give them the respect and protocol in daily life but not trust to give them vote. Due to the protocol and respect, they consider themselves superior and a superior personality cannot work in the subordinate position. Most of the religious parties left the government of General Zia-ul-Haq in 1979 and used to demand the free and fair elections. But it is dismal that the dictators do not announce the elections of National and Provincial Assemblies until they are succeeded in organizing the elections of Local Bodies. During this whole process, the major political parties remain out of context. In the elections of Local Bodies, the persons of ordinary nature come in the elections but they are often in search of such a personality who will help them in becoming the pro-government candidates. This personality may be a military officer, chiefs of the secret agencies, retired bureaucrat or any politician. At first, the dictator try to avoid the politician at the maximum level but later on he is ready to accept those councilors who have been elected in Local Bodies Elections. Now they are in a position to announce elections because they have developed their own team. Most of councilors are ready to contest the elections of National and Provincial Assemblies. The chiefs of the secret agencies are also in search of those personalities who have the level of councilor. They call them for interviews and issue them the tickets. The government machinery is given the task to help them in elections. Cases are registered, the supporters are arrested, tactics are used to demoralize the opposite candidates, and even funds are provided to the pro-government candidates. Under these circumstances, sometime the major parties do the blunder and boycott the elections. If the parties decide to contest the election, they will nominate their candidates but not with spirit. If they boycott the elections, the pro-government candidates will easily win the election. Most of the people of Pakistan cast the vote in every election. Majority of the people live in villages and there are two different groups in every village. They cast the vote to the
different candidates. In this way, the group of the pro-government candidates is developed with the influence of Patwari, Assistant Commissioners and Police Inspectors. These three government servants have great influence on the Head of the village. It is easy for the government to manage the Head of the village and his vote bank is used for winning the pro-government candidate. In this way, the councilors are succeeded in reaching in the National and Provincial Assemblies. In the House, they face two difficulties, one lack of confidence and second ignorance from rules and regulations. The feudal system is very strong in Pakistan and in every election their role is very important. The feudal are divided into two groups, one consist of those who support the policies of dictator and second group of those feudal who contest the elections inspite of the opposition of the dictator. These two groups are succeeded in winning their elections and enter in the provincial and national assemblies with two different things, one with full confidence and second fully aware with the rules and regulations (they have won the elections many times). The councilors who enter in the provincial and national assemblies for the first time observe the feudal of the both groups. Few of them join the feudal of pro-government and few of them sit in the opposition with those feudal who has come in the House without the opposition of the dictator. Those who decide to sit on the treasury benches are succeeded in becoming the minister. With the company of feudal, the desire is developed in their hearts to become millionaire. For this purpose, they indulge in corruption and accumulate the wealth. While those councilors who decide sit in opposition with opposition feudal give the tough time to the treasury benches through their futile speeches. The feudal observe the rules and regulations of the Houses while the councilors seconded their points or resolutions. They also show that they are more sincere and committed with the state and the masses.

General Zia-ul-Haq announced Islamization in Pakistan and most of the scholars have highlighted the steps of General Zia-ul-Haq and his team for achieving that target. But the members of National Assembly who were sitting on the Treasury Benches were claiming to be the part of the process of Islamization. The reports of the Council of Islamic Ideology were being considered in the House for implementation but the members were not fully sincere with the cause. The report of Islamic Ideology Council declared the political parties un-Islamic and it was announced by the members of treasury. But the Prime Minister and his team used to convince the members of the National Assembly and politicians that they should join the Muslim League and for that purpose the Political Parties (Amendment) Act 1986 was introduced which left no option
for the members to join any political party. After the vote of no-confidence against Fakhar Imam, the speaker said in his speech that the majority party had the right to elect its own speaker. It was exposing the double standard of the policies of government that was considering the recommendations of the Council of Islamic Ideology and on the other hand it was violating its own recommendations. The opposition leaders exposed the flaws of the government in the process of Islamization in Pakistan but this opposition consisted of those politicians who claimed to be a secular leadership and demanded the modern democratic state instead of Islamic republic of Pakistan.

Though, there was no organized opposition in the National Assembly of Pakistan but few members of the House adopted the shape of opposition with their actions and conducts. Fakhar Imam, Abida Hussain, Haji Saif ullah Khan, Raja Shahid Zafar, M. Hamza, Javed Hashmi, Sardar Aseff Ahmed Ali, Saikh Rashid Ahmed, Liaquat Baloch were the prominent personalities who were considered opposition. In the vote of no-confidence against the elected speaker Fakhar Imam, seventy two members went in his favor inspite of the opposition of General Zia-ul-Haq and the government machinery. Even on 21th of September 1986, Fakhar Imam moved the question to the speaker that

“............we an Opposition Group of 21 honorable members had applied to the speaker for sitting separately. The speaker had stated that by the start of this session, a separate allocation of seats would be made for the group.............” (National Assembly Debates)

In the matters of legislations, the opposition made strenuous efforts to create hurdles on the ways of those Bills which were being introduced for strengthening the dictator and were weakening the democratic institutions. The one thing which treasury benches fully utilized was the Martial Law. No member of the House wanted to see prolonging Martial Law. The Opposition and the treasury benches had agreed on this principle that Martial Law should be lifted as soon as possible. The government exploited the sentiments of the members and compelled them to vote for justifying the acts of dictator if they wanted to see no further Martial Law. Inspite of this, the opposition delayed the process of passing the Bills of the treasury benches through their lengthy arguments. But it was also fact that the government did not take so much pressure of the speeches of the opposition leaders because the controlled media was not
giving due coverage to the speeches of the opposition leaders in the House and the support of the general masses was not with the elected members against the dictator and his policies. Because, the general masses had divided on this subject, few of them considered the opposition as agents of General Zia-ul-Haq because they were giving tough time to Junejo government not Zia regime, others considered them greedy persons who were opposing the government only for seeking ministries, the leaders of MRD did not have close liaison with them. That’s why their credibility always remained dubious.

On the issues which were related to the foreign policy of Pakistan, the opposition leaders moved the motions or put the questions and demanded the government to clarify its position but all these motions were not pressed by the opposition leaders. They mostly relied on the news of the newspapers which were published in International or National newspapers. In early days of the National Assembly, no proper time was allocated for the issues of the foreign policy and even the treasury benches did not bother to up-date the members about the development which had occurred in foreign relations. The speeches of the members of opposition were, no doubt, a check on the government and the minister had to clarify the position of the government which were directly related to the sovereignty and integrity of Pakistan. As far as Pak-India relations were concerned, the allegations were given to Pakistan for its support to the Sikh freedom fighters. The opposition leaders never asked the government why it was supporting to Sikh community but they raised the points that the government was not launching any kind of protest against the Indian allegations. The most debated issue was Pak-Afghan Relations because it was directly related to the economy and law and order in Pakistan. The government was not even in a position to clarify its own policy because foreign relations were controlled by the dictator himself not the elected Prime Minister and this factor also created rift among the both personalities which came to end with dismissal of the Prime Minister.

In Internal issues, the opposition took the matters seriously and put the questions on the Interior Minister. The internal issues like use of Drugs, terrorism, Afghan Refugees, restoration of the democracy, political prisoners, economic democracy, attracted the attention of the opposition benches. As I have already said that the speeches of the opposition created problems for treasury benches and the government had to answer those questions which were put for the opposition side. But it was dismal that not any change came in the policies of the government
due to the reaction of the opposition because the opposition was not in so much strength that it
could develop pressure outside the House. Nor opposition did collectively walk-out from the
House on any bill which was passed by the government against their wishes. It was only verbal
protest which never took the shape of demonstrations and strikes.

Without the street power, no opposition can play any significant role against the policies
of the government. The major failure of the opposition in National Assembly was that it could
not develop relations with the leaders of MRD who were fighting in the streets. MRD had
boycotted the elections and did not recognize the Assembly as a result of free and fair elections.
It was the major cause of the difference of the leaders of MRD and the opposition leaders in the
House. The dictator was crushing the workers of PPP and its allies, while the treasury benches in
the House were ignoring the suggestions and recommendations of the leaders of opposition.

It was also fact that the opposition in the National Assembly and Senate did issue based
politics. They highlighted the issues and commented on them with solid arguments. The caliber
of the most of the leaders of opposition was tremendous and remarkable. The treasury benches
felt hesitated in answering the questions of the opposition. Few of them were out spoken like
Shaikh Rashid Ahmed, Haji Saif ullah Khan, Javed Hashmi and Abida Hussain. Few
personalities were very sober and well-mannered like Fakhar Imam, Mumtaz Ahmed Tarar,
Aseff Ahmed Ali. But all of them showed their trust on the Prime Minister of Pakistan,
Muhammad Khan Junejo and gave him the vote of confidence for three times without any
considerations. It was strange decision of those leaders who claimed to be the opposition because
they took the decision to favor such a Prime Minister who had been nominated by the dictator.
Such actions made the opposition unreliable and unpredictable.

The role of Jamaat-i-Islami remained very different during the whole period of General
Zia-ul-Haq as President of Pakistan. In his initial days, the party joined government and took the
responsibilities in different ministries. The party of Islam supported Zia-ul-Haq in the period
from 1977 to 1979 and to some extent it accepted the decision to postpone the elections. Even it
supported Referendum that was opposed by the most of the political parties. It was a time when
Mian Muhammad Tufail was leading the party and he belonged to Arian family who had
migrated from Jullundur. It was a first occasion in the history of Pakistan when the party joined
any government. After Mian Muhammad Tufail, Qazi Hussain Ahmed became the Amir
(Leader) of the party and after that Jamaat-i-Islami used to oppose the policies of Zia regime. Even after the elections of 1985, the leaders of the Jamaat-i-Islami moved the motions against Martial Law in the Senate and the National Assembly. They fully supported that group which was being considered the opposite group of General Zia-ul-Haq (Independent Parliamentary Group) but on the other hand they were fully supporting the Afghan Jihad which was launched by Zia-ul-Haq. The members of Jamat-i-Islami in Senate and National Assembly always appreciated the Afghan policy of General Zia-ul-Haq and declared it best in the strategic interest of Pakistan. The main beneficiary of Afghan jihad was the Jamaati-i-Islami also. But on the other hand, In Senate, Prof. Khurshid Ahmed admitted on 14th April 1988 that he did not have interest in Muhammad Khan Junejo and Zia-ul-Haq because he belonged to opposition. Due to be the member of opposition, he showed his differences with the President and the Prime Minister. These were two different faces of Jamaat-i-Islami which defamed it in the eyes of the writers. Now most of the leaders of this religious party try to satisfy the people that they were against the policies of General Zia-ul-Haq and their party played the role of real opposition at that time. As the history of Pakistan shows that the most of the rightest parties adopt the double standards and always remain active in such kind of politics which lead them to power. These parties are more interested in power than the interests of the people. Different businesses have been started for collection of funds that are used for political motives. But it is said that these businesses are only for the welfare of the people. This hypocritical style has left no place for them in the politics of Pakistan. That’s why, they try to hijack the educational institutions so that the young generation may be used for their obnoxious designs. But this strategy has also been exposed by different leftist parties who have promoted the study circles instead of gun culture.

It was a notion that the opposition in the Houses of National Assembly and Senate had been created by General Zia-ul-Haq himself. Few people of the society do not consider real opposition because the leaders of the opposition had served as different ministers in the first phase of Martial Law. But after the elections of 1985, they became the leaders of opposition and gave their lengthy speeches against Martial Law and the policies of the treasury benches. It is also considered that those speeches were fruitless because it was only crocodile tears. It cannot be denied from this fact that the opposition played its constitutional role in the Senate and National Assembly but they avoided from agitational politics. In constitutional politics, the
leaders tried to prefer negotiations and dialogues. The rights are demanded through constitutional reforms.

The members who were being supposed as opposition benches did have cordial relations with each other. The feudal did not like those politicians who had come in the House for first time. They considered them “third class leaders” and declared them the real responsible of the corruption. Abida Hussain did not like Shaikh Rashid Ahmed and his politics due to the influence of military. She was also against the politics of Javed Hashmi and Mumtaz Tarar also. She did not like the involvement of the military in the politics but also appreciated the developmental works of the dictator era. She has the opinion that more roads, hospitals, schools had been opened in the era of Zia as compare to other periods of politicians. But she also disliked his government due to religious extremism etc. while Javed Hasmi and Shaikh Rashid also did not like the politics of Abida Hussain and his husband. Under these circumstances, it was not possible for such kind of leaders to unite or demonstrate at one platform against dictator.

It was very strange that there were two oppositions at the same time. One had developed in the shape of MRD and the second emerged in Parliament. One was opposing the military dictator, General Zia-ul-Haq and the second was not against the dictator but opposing the government of Muhammad Khan Junejo. The opposition in the Houses of National, Provincial Assemblies and the Senate did not have cordial relations with the movement of MRD. It was their justification that they were playing role through legislation and did not like the agitational politics. They could play proper role within the Houses as compare to on the roads or in the streets. They wanted the development not the destruction. They utilized their developmental budgets for the betterment of the people. Those members who were opposing the Junejo government openly claim that they were not against Zia-ul-Haq but they were criticizing the policies of the government. Abida Huasain is one of them who were very active in the parliament accepted in her interview with the author that their group was not the opposition of Zia-ul-Haq. But she also admitted that she did not like the involvement of the institution of military in politics. This factor has developed in her personality due to her personal grievances with General Zia-ul-Haq due to his enmity or hatred towards Shia community. Zia-ul-Haq did not like the Shia community and he promoted Wahabism. General Zia-ul-Haq was the son of Imam Masjid in Jalandhar and very active in promoting the ideas of Wahabis. Abida Hussain told the author on
22-07-12 that America pressurized Zia-ul-Haq to lift sanction on the entrance of Benazir Bhutto in Pakistan. Due to this pressure, Zia-ul-Haq gave task to General Hamid Gul to build a parallel leadership of B.B. After collecting reports from the various agencies, Hamid Gul presented the names of Fakhar Imam (Abida Hussain also) and Nawaz Sharif for the future leadership who would give tough time to the newly leadership of Pakistan People’s Party. Zia-ul-Haq inquired about the sects of the both families and Hamid Gul informed that Fakhar Imam belonged to Shia community. General Zia said that he would not like to give leadership in the hands of Shia community and he decided to promote Nawaz Sharif as a parallel leadership of Benazir Bhutto. It was a first time in the history of Pakistan that the military decided the leadership of Pakistan for future and still continue. Due to Wahabi ideas of Zia-ul-Haq, Abida Hussain and Fakhar Imam did not like him. Both the personalities announced the name of Nawaz Sharif with full hatred and called him “Lohar Da Bata” (son of ironman). Abida Hussain said that her grandmother once told that “Raj does not come in the first generation”, so the Nawaz family is passing from the first generation. She even considers them corrupt. It shows that a lot of factors contributed in the creation of the opposition in the parliament but the important were as under

1. Religious differences
2. The desire of power
3. Fear of the people (hatred against Martial Law)

But inspite of all these factors, the opposition leaders in the parliament appreciated the development works of the dictator era.

Pakistan People’s Party played important role against Zia regime and offered great resistance to the military dictatorship. Due to the pressure of Pakistan People’s Party, General Zia reintroduced democracy in the country and changed the dictatorial nature of his government. Though a lot of factors played role in this regard but the efforts of Pakistan People’s Party was remarkable against the dictator and was the key element in opposition against it. Benazir Bhutto, newly leadership of Pakistan People’s Party after the death of Z.A.Bhutto, managed international community against Zia-ul-Haq and delivered lecture on the importance of democracy in Pakistan. Due to her strenuous efforts, General Zia-ul-Haq allowed her to return Pakistan after exile.
General Zia’s rule strengthened the institutions of military and bureaucracy but weakened the political parties. Inspite of strict attitude towards civil and religious freedoms, the military could not suppress the democratic aspirations among the people. Zia-ul-Haq tried to snub these aspirations through encouraging and expanding the base of religious groups, trade merchants and other right wing groups. He even permitted its civilian supporters to use violence to break the opposition rallies. He empowered the governors and Chief Ministers of the provinces to snub the opposition moves and crush it with iron hands. Even after the declaration of real martial law, he not only sidelined the political parties but also refused to hold the general elections.

Zia-ul-Haq was an astute, enigmatic and shrewder head of state. He created such circumstances in the provinces that embroiled the people into different issues instead of uniting against the dictator in the shape of powerful opposition. The issues were as under

1. In the year of 1985, inter-provinces tension came to surface due to the wrong policies of Zia regime. The Martial Law dictator raised the issue of the construction of the Kalabagh Dam project for power generation. This issue divided the provinces and shattered the unity of the people of Pakistan. Punjab favored its construction while the government of the North West Frontier Province rejected it. In the start, the province Sindh remained silent but later on, it also joined the NWFP government in opposing the project. 431
2. Zia-ul-Haq handled the problem of unrest in Baluchistan more successfully than Z.A.Butto. He used various schemes of economic developments to assuage the Baloch and was successful to a high degree.
3. The North West Frontier Province, alarmed at the presence of Soviet troops next door after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979, remained relatively quiet.
4. The long festering division between Sindhis and non-Sindhis exploded violence in Sindh.
5. The growth of the illicit drug industry also added to the ethnic problem.

General Zia's regime fell into constitutional and non-constitutional periods. Instruments of the state - particularly the army and police - were viewed as enemies of popular sovereignty rather than vehicles to restore it. The longer the regime stayed in power, the greater the opportunity for citizens to suffer at the hand of increasingly corrupt law-enforcing bodies. Those officers were appointed who had strict attitude against Pakistan People’s Party due to its ideology.

---
The associations or unions play an important role against the dictators. The workers of the trade unions or the bar councils are very important in any movement. Zia regime first of all tried to crush these forces. The legal profession came under fire with restrictions. The freedom of attorneys and bar associations was sharply curtailed in 1982 by the regime. The 1973 Legal Practitioners and Bar Councils Act was amended to remove peer review from licensing, giving the councils less power than had been granted in the 1926 Indian Bar Councils Act. Further amendments in 1985 gave regime-appointed judges, rather than bar groups, power to suspend the right to practice before the courts, granted the regime greater latitude in judicial appointments and strictly banned members of bar councils from politics. The amendments were retribution for the national council's expulsion of lawyers who joined the Federal Advisory Council after the PCO was promulgated; a similar expulsion had taken place against PPP members after the 1977 coup d'état. Subsequent to the amendments, the regime transferred judges indiscriminately or as punishment for anti-regime judgments, and refused to confirm some judicial appointments; Presidential Order No. 24 of 1985 required judges to accept transfer or be summarily retired.

Local government elections were held three times in Zia era. The dictator and the Junejo government considered it a major achievement. But these elections were influenced by the Assistant Commissioners, Magistrates, Tehsildars, Patwaris. The candidates used their wealth to influence the voters and the rigging was also done by the government agencies. Professor Khurshid Ahmed presented the glimpse of these elections in the Senate on 14th April 1988 with different allegations and felt shame on becoming the member of Senate.

The problem of Nefaza Sharia was not resolved by the government due to the difference of the ulama because they had divided themselves in different sects. One sect did not agree with other sect and it was not possible for ulama to forward any common proposal. Even they could not perform Namaz collectively. It was a major hurdle in the implementation of Nefaza Sharia which was highlighted by the members of Senate. The government also used delaying tactics in its implementation. But there was no remarkable hue and cry on the sluggishness of the government.

The role of media has always been remained very important in every era. The different news in the newspapers provides guidelines for the government as well as the opposition. Though restrictions are often imposed on the media in the periods of dictators and media passes through
critical phase. Same situation was prevailing in the period of General Zia-ul-Haq but inspite of this few newspapers published news against the policies of the government. This practice was being seen after the elections of 1985 and the opposition members of the National Assembly and Senate opposed the policies of government that were based on the facts of newspapers. Even the cuttings of the news were attached with the adjournment motions. The government always tried to refute the figures which were given in media against the treasury benches.

The treasury benches did not take the motions of the members of National Assembly seriously and took the decisions as they liked. Due to this attitude of the government, the members became least interested in the affairs of the House and even they did not like to attend the sessions. That’s why; it was not possible for the speaker of the House to start the session in time. The sessions of 1987s and 88s can be quoted as examples. Even in the session of 17th June 1987, only ten members were present but later on few others also joined it.

The most of the members of the House of National and Provincial Assemblies did not oppose the policies of the government due to the incentives that were given to them by the government. In the city of Islamabad, plots were given to the members of National Assembly and they constructed their houses on allotted plots with the looted wealth. Few of the opposition members also purchased their Houses in Islamabad with their own wealth (Like Fakhar Imam and Abida Hussain). On 17th June 1987, Mr. Hamza exposed the incentives of the government in shape of plots for the members and suggested them to avoid it because it was also corruption.

The feeble condition of law and order provided the opportunity to the opposition minded people in National Assembly and Senate to criticize the government. After every sabotaging activity, the Prime Minister and the President gave the statement that the government machinery had been operated and it would not be possible for the culprits to save themselves from law and the government agencies. It was a recorded statement that was given to the media after every event. The opposition minded members ridiculed such kind of statement in the House of National Assembly and declared it a failure of the government to provide relief to the people of Pakistan.

It was remarkable that not only few members of the National Assembly and Senate opposed the policies of the government and General Zia-ul-Haq but the civil society also
appeared as opposition. The implementation of Islamic punishments through the process of Islamization launched by Zia-ul-Haq was opposed by the Human rights activists and doctors. Even Talbot has quoted the Executive Committee of the Karachi Branch of the Pakistan Medical Association who called on the government not to involve the medical profession in the process of flogging and even requested the government to stop such punishments on humanitarian and medical grounds. On the other hand, the Women Action Forum declared the enforcement of an Islamic code with respect to sexual crimes as brutal and degrading. While few bankers also opposed the Islamic banking system and questioned how the practices of early Islam could fit a complex modern economy.

Though the President had immense powers along with the nomination of the Prime Minister but his own nominated Prime Minister soon created differences with him. A lot of factors played role in it. Due to these differences, the three oppositions came to surface, one was opposing the dictator outside the parliament that was MRD and even it refused to accept the elections of 1985. Second had developed who was against further Martial Law after the elections of 1985 and was in favor of strong Prime Minister instead of President that was the team of Muhammad Khan Junejo and he himself. Even Muhammad Khan Junejo refused to accommodate those ministers who were recommended by Zia-ul-Haq. Third kind of opposition consisted of those members of National Assembly who were opposing the policies of the government of Muhammad Khan Junejo and his cohorts. Fakhar Imam, Abida Hussain, Javed Hashmi, Mumtaz Tarar, Shaikh Rashid Ahmed, Haji Saif ullah Khan etc were the prominent members of third opposition. It is common perception that the third opposition opposed the policies of Muhammad Khan Junejo due to the support of Zia-ul-Haq but this notion has been rejected by Abida Hussain in his interview with the author.

It is said that the government nominated its own persons as opposition leaders and deputy opposition leaders in the provincial assemblies instead of original opposition. Mian Muhammad Rafique (MPA from Toba Tek Singh) also seconded this concept in his interview with the author and alleged that the government nominated Afzal Hyat as opposition leader in Punjab Assembly. In fact, Afzal Hyat was not the actual leader of opposition in the House. While the Deputy Opposition leader (Syed Tahir Hussain Shah from Faisalabad) was also pro-government leader and was not the part and parcel of the opposition. While Riaz Hasmat Jinjeo, Fazal Hussain Rahi
and Mian Muhammad Rafique were the prominent opposition members in Punjab Assembly but the government did not assign them the title of Opposition leader or Deputy Opposition leader. These three personalities always showed strict reaction on the policies of the government and opposed the dictator openly. Even the speaker of the Punjab Assembly restricted the entry of Fazal Hussain Rahi (MPA from Faisalabad) and Mian Muhammad Rafique in the House. It shows the intentions of the government about the real opposition members in the provinces. Sometimes, these three persons were physically thrown out of the House on the orders of the speaker.

Zia-ul-Haq proved lucky enough that the circumstances helped him in pro-lon- ing his rule. In 1979, the hijacking incident of plane by Al-Zulfikar defamed the opposition and created soft corner in the hearts of the people for Zia-ul-Haq. Secondly, the statement of Indira Gandhi in the summer of 1983 that India sympathized with the pro-democracy movement launched by the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy put the anti-lobby of India under the banner of Zia-ul-Haq. These two major events proved very helpful for the military ruler to not only postpone the elections but also crush the opponents. The supporters of General Zia-ul-Haq still claim that India was sponsoring anti-Zia lobby in Pakistan and that lobby was playing role in destabilizing Pakistan. But it is also fact that MRD did not project a clear-cut anti-Indian stance.

MRD tried only three times to launch street agitation against Zia-ul-Haq, first occasion was in 1981 when the agitation was launched but soon petered out, secondly in 1983 the leaders of the alliance tried to force General Zia-ul-Haq to leave the government but found it difficult to sustain the movement, the third protest was started in summer 1985 when Benazir Bhutto challenged the Zia-Junejo government by calling a public meeting in Lahore to demonstrate the people’s unhappiness with the slowness of the pace towards the restoration of full democracy. The response of the people towards these efforts was very poor due to the fear of the military dictator. The middle and lower middle class is always afraid of the institutions of police and military. But it is also fact that the movement failed to organize a nation-wide hartal in support of its demand because the movement was largely concentrated in Sind but in other provinces, the participation was much less vocal.
I agree with writer Mohammad Waseem that Dubai factor also played role in strengthening the rule of General Zia-ul-Haq and problems for MRD. As Mohammad Waseem has pointed out in his book “Pakistan Under Martial Law”

“People generally respond to immediate economic causes........safeguarding individual interests in land, education, jobs and commerce are the dominant values which defeat the possibility of a mass movement”

The opposition failed in creating such kind of pressure. The Zia regime opened ways of Gulf for labour which promoted a rapid inflow of money from there. This economic factor also cornered the PPP government before the advent of Martial law. The Bhutto’s nationalization policies stopped the private investment which lowered the rate of economic growth. It badly affected the interests of economic groups and classes which later on played role against the Bhutto regime. The economic groups and classes did not support to the opposition of General Zia-ul-Haq because it protected the interests of these classes and issued licenses to the newly established industrialists to establish new industries. In this way, a new class entered among the industrialists. Industry got boom and labor class was consumed in it. Free hand was given to the industrialists to crush the labor unions which were fighting against the exploitation of the labor class. The alliance of military, police, judiciary and industrialists opened a new chapter of the history of Pakistan. After that, the leadership of Pakistan has shifted from feudal to industrialists. When the feudal felt its defeat, then it also used to try to enter in this circle. They used to give support to the policies of the Zia regime. The government of General Zia-ul-Haq also accepted them with the passage of time. Now the alliance adopted a new shape with the advent of feudal. After that, it consisted of military, police, judiciary, industrialists and feudal. This alliance crushed the opposition in Zia regime and after the death of Zia-ul-Haq, they became the champion of democracy in Pakistan. Judiciary fully supported General Zia-ul-Haq and provided opportunities to pro-long his tenure. The decision of the Supreme Court in Nusrat Bhutto petition against the proclamation of Martial Law is clear evidence that exposed the mentality of judges. The Supreme Court ruled that the martial law regime could perform all such acts and promulgate legislative measures, which fell within the scope of the law of necessity, including the power to amend the constitution. It was the support of the military regime but few judges
refused to accept the new rules of Zia regime regarding judiciary and these few judges always remained opponent of military regime.

Bureaucracy always tries to curtail the constitutional powers of the legislatures. This institution does not like the power sharing with any other institution. It faces a constant threat from a public seeking participation in the national decision making process through their elected representatives. They even exert their full influence in keeping the election option out of our political system. In the days of Martial Laws, they fully cooperate with the dictators and lose no opportunity to degrade the politicians. It is divided into three levels, district, provincial and central administration. The Zia regime specified quota for military in the bureaucracy. Secondly, serving generals were appointed the heads of Federal Public Service Commission (an institution for the recruitment of the bureaucrats). For example admiral Sharif was recruited as the boss of the FPSC. He gave focus during the interviews on religion alone. He asked questions like ‘do you know dua-e-qanoot’. Thirdly, the relatives of those politicians and industrialists who had decided to support the dictator regime were given key posts of bureaucracy. In this way, military and civilian bureaucracy became the tools of General Zia-ul-Haq that eliminated every hurdle from the way of military regime. This alliance arrested the opposition leaders and workers from every corner of cities and villages.

It is recognized fact that the Zia regime faced opposition on the basis of ideology. During Z.A.Bhutto regime, people got opportunity to firm their ideologies. But with the advent of Zia-ul-Haq, the whole focus was done on one specific ideology and other all opposite ideologies were crushed. The efforts were made to promote only Islamic ideology. Syllabus was redesigned and teachers were recruited on specific terms and conditions. K.K.Aziz admits in his book “Murder of History”

“...........textbooks distorted the facts and twisted the ideas. Muslim invasions and conquerors received positive emphasis while Hindus and Hindu religion were denigrated. Great emphasis was laid on glorifying the Pakistani military. It was asserted that, in the 1965 war, India was on the verge of being beaten by Pakistan and begged the United Nations to arrange a cease fire.........”
Dialogues and discussions were banned. Those scholars who tried to promote secular approaches in the institutions were suspended or expelled. Even the leftist or secular persons were not promoted due to their ideologies. Ishtiaq Ahmed has also quoted in his book “Pakistan The Garrison State” an event that expose the mentality of the ruling party

“Admiral Sharif (head of FPSC) pronounced a top level candidate, Zafar Bukhari’ as unfit for all key administrative positions and fit only for the postal service. The reason was that he had written in his exam that the leftist Faiz Ahmed Faiz was his favorite poet.”

All such kind of scholars, teachers and bureacurates played the role of opposition in Zia era. They faced jails and courts. Due to such kinds of policies, such generations were produced by the institutions which are still confused. That’s why, mostly Pakistanis are confused nation.K.K.Aziz in his book “Murder of History” comments,

“The goal, it seems, is to produce a generation wit a following traits: docility, inability to ask questions, capacity to indulge in pleasurable illusions, pride in wearing blinkers, willingness to accept guidance from above, alacrity to like and dislike things by order, tendency to ignore gaps in one’s knowledge, enjoyment of make-belief, faith in the high value of pretenses”

General Zia-ul-Haq adopted anti-liberal, anti-democratic, anti-minorities and anti-women agenda. That’s why, liberals, democratic lovers, minorities and progressive women opposed his policies. In 1979, Zia-ul-Haq imposed the Hudood Ordinance and highly educated liberal sections of society protested against it with the collaboration of different NGOs. In 1984, a new law of evidence was adopted which reduced the evidence of a female witness to half, in worth, of a male witness. Under the Zina Ordinance, neither the evidence of the victim nor that of any other woman was admissible. Some of the educated women of the large cities of Lahore, Karachi and Islamabad brought out demonstrations demanding a stop to the anti-women campaign. Asma Jahangir, Hina Jilani and many others opposed the laws and refused to accept the rule of General Zia-ul-Haq. There is no blinking the fact that Pakistan has intrinsically patriarchal structure (where men have control over everything) and patrilineal lineage (where lineage continues through men) where men enjoys great importance and a permanent place in the household. In
contrast, a woman has a secondary position within the household; she is considered a guest in her parent’s house and her final and permanent place is her husband’s house. General Zia-ul-Haq strengthened this structure through his policies. In 1982, General Zia-ul-Haq introduced the blasphemy law which annoyed the minorities. Human Rights organizations and NGOs protested against it. He even overruled the promotions of the minorities’ officers in military. Ishtiaq Ahmed has quoted the example of Cecil Chaudhry in his book “Pakistan The Garrison state”. He was a Christian leader and decorated 1965 war hero of the Pakistan Air Force. He has mentioned his disappointment over such anti-minority laws in an article “Remembering Our Heroes” published in the Defence Journal of June 2001:

“.........In Pakistan our political order is based on religious apartheid through the separate electorate system.....the separate electorate system, thrust upon the nation by Zia-ul-Haq in 1985, divides the entire nation into five religious groups and does not allow any political interaction between any two of the groups. The seats of the National and the provincial Assemblies are so divided that Muslims, Christians, Hindus, Ahmadis and other religious minorities can only contest for and vote within their own group. This system has completely broken down social harmony thus paving the way for sectarianism strife..............a political system so deeply rooted in religion when allowed to perpetuate will most definitely cause dissensions within each group and give rise to religious extremism, even to the extent of spreading terrorism in the name of religion..........the non-Muslim citizens have proved that they donot want the separate electorates by very effectively boycotting the first two phases of the on-going Union Council elections........having said this let me state that in India the extremist Hindu is targeting the Christians mainly............”

General Zia-ul-Haq supported the Deobandi school of thought which annoyed the Shia community especially. Abida Hussain also showed his resentment against his decision to the author. The Shias refused to pay Zakat to the government of General Zia-ul-Haq as the government was Sunni in its orientation and, therefore, could not claim Zakat from them. The Shias started agitation which threatened to paralyse the government and march to Islamabad in their thousands. The determined resistance forced the government to change its policy and exempted Shias from paying Zakat. Inspite of this, the Shia community always opposed the government of General Zia-ul-Haq and its policies.
It is fact that Zia regime started the process of the decline and degeneration of the society. One can detect the elements which cause this downfall.

1. The first sign was the increased emphasis on self-interest. National interest became redundant and people, in order to survive, followed the path of self-interest. At that stage it became easy to betray the nation and collaborate with foreign powers, as well as domestic enemies of the state.

2. The second was the preference for wearing your religion on your sleeve. People began to show their religious devotion outwardly without having any real faith in religious teachings. The manifestation of this preference for form over function was an increase in ‘showy’ religious processions, celebrations, sermons and distributions of religious tract and pamphlets. The corollary was that the actual teachings of the creed were neglected.

3. The third sign was the weakness of the state power which allowed people to indulge in all sorts of criminal activities without any fear of punishment. The business of drugs trapped the whole society. The judiciary failed to maintained justice; the army and police became powerless to enforce law and order. The result was that who were powerful formed mafias and militias, illegal organizations which dominated society and forced the relatively weak (through terror and coercion) to obey them rather to look to state for protection.

4. Fourth sign was the loss of creativity. Artists, intellectuals, musicians, architects, sculptors and scientists were not able to invent or contribute anything new. They survived on imitation alone, leading society towards backwardness and degeneration. During Zia era, music as a whole became an unpalatable commodity not in sync with the state’s definition of faith. Most of our great musicians passed away during the eleven year rule of Gen. Zia-ul-Haq and most of them died penniless and unsung. What was more tragic, they did not teach or encourage their offspring to make music their profession. But music, like water, finds its own course. It flows serenely where the terrain is smooth and tranquil; where it passes through rocky and uneven terrain it
becomes aggressive and noisy. In such an evolutionary process, priceless traditions and heritage are likely to be lost.

5. The fifth sign was that society became so shallow that it failed to produce any people of substance. The giants vanished and pygmies ruled over all.

The present society of Pakistan clearly gives the glimpse of degeneration and decline. It is ruled by pygmies. Intellectuals are shallow and artists are little vision. Architects, instead of building the future, are disfiguring cities with meaningless monuments and borrowed buildings. Worst of all, the people themselves are disillusioned and hopeless, watching helplessly as the decline continues.
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## Appendix

### Chief Election Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Justice Dorab Patel</td>
<td>17-06-1977</td>
<td>17-07-1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr. Justice Mushtaq Hussain</td>
<td>17-07-1977</td>
<td>26-05-1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr. Justice Karam Elahee Chauhan</td>
<td>27-05-1980</td>
<td>04-02-1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr. Justice S.A. Nusrat</td>
<td>01-03-1982</td>
<td>30-04-1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix

### Secretaries, Election Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr. A.Z. Faruqui, CSP</td>
<td>04-06-1974</td>
<td>30-06-1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr. Muhammad Amin, T.PK</td>
<td>01-07-1981</td>
<td>17-08-1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr. Haider Muhammad Chauhan</td>
<td>18-08-1982</td>
<td>07-10-1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr. M.M. Kazim</td>
<td>08-10-1984</td>
<td>20-03-1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## March 1977 Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Seats won</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pakistan People’s Party</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pakistan National Alliance</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PML (Qayyum)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix

### Referendum Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total number of Registered Voters</td>
<td>34,992,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total number of votes cast in favor of “Yes”</td>
<td>21,253,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total number of votes cast in favor of “No”</td>
<td>316,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total number of votes declared invalid</td>
<td>180,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total number of votes cast in the referendum</td>
<td>21,750,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Percentage of “Yes” votes</td>
<td>97.71 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix

### Composition of Parliament and Assemblies 1985

#### National Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>Province/Area</th>
<th>Muslim Seats</th>
<th>Women Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baluchistan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Federal Capital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FATA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Provincial Assemblies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial/Area</th>
<th>Muslim Seats</th>
<th>Non-Muslim Seats</th>
<th>Women Seats</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluchistan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix

1985 Elections

**Turnout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Turnout</th>
<th>Registered Votes</th>
<th>Polled Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>53.7 %</td>
<td>32,528,996</td>
<td>17,468,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>60.1 %</td>
<td>20,505,805</td>
<td>12,335,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>44.4 %</td>
<td>6,536,830</td>
<td>2,900,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khyber Pakhtunkhwa</td>
<td>40.6 %</td>
<td>4,181,078</td>
<td>1,698,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>37.4 %</td>
<td>1,132,464</td>
<td>423,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>