

PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY: PAKISTAN VS INDIA IN 70S

Sadia Parveen^{*1}, Prof. Dr Muhammad Khan²^{*1}PhD Scholar, Department of Politics & IR, International Islamic University Islamabad²Department of Politics & IR, International Islamic University Islamabad^{*1}27sadi@gmail.com^{*1}<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-2463-0845>DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15055132>

Keywords

Article History

Received on 12 February 2025

Accepted on 12 March 2025

Published on 20 March 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Abstract

This study aims to critically examine the Democratic Political Process in Pakistan and India. The focus is to investigate the decline of the parliamentary democratic system in Pakistan and the role of politicians, ulema, judges, and bureaucrats in the development of parliamentary democracy. An effort is made to understand that Democracy flourished in India, and it failed in Pakistan because of the military, feudal, and religious elements. An analysis has been made between both states' democratic systems since 1947. The present information has been collected through the use of secondary sources.

In Pakistan, the political system had become almost an oligarchy under the cover of democracy. Due to selfish and self-interested rulers from 1953 to 1958, various governments changed. Democracy was adjourned between 1958 and 1969 in the Ayub Khan era, 1977-1988, and again in 1998-2008 in the Musharraf regime. Another factor for the collapse of the parliamentary system in Pakistan is its dependence on the military for security against the threats of India. The self-centered leaders, grabbing provincial autonomy and ethnolinguistic issues, restrictions on press and media, and unsatisfactory role of political parties also have weakened the state.

India's democracy has never been flawless. Therefore, the difference between India's and Pakistan's democracy is of degree rather than a difference in kind. Pakistan was ruled by the army and India by the people. The states that had military authoritarianism broke up first. India had insurgency in many places, but it stayed united because of the democratic negotiations.

Indian politicians had become corrupt, and democracy had not flourished as it should have. But Indians identified the progress they had to follow and support democracy. Democracy prospered in India because the leaders who had learned it from Britain exercised it after independence, but it failed in Pakistan because of feudal, military, and religious elements. India remained united despite many internal insurgencies because of democracy, but Pakistan, due to the absence of democracy, disintegrated and had problems.

INTRODUCTION

The political process is associated with all those legal actions according to which public policy could be changed by the residents. The political system and democratization are interrelated. Modern-day Democracy is traced back to the English Parliamentary Structure.

The term 'Democracy' is taken from two Greek words: "demos," which means 'the people' and 'Kratos' which means 'the rule'. Hence, Democracy means the rule of the people. It is also defined as Democracy is the government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Democracy is a system of government in which the people, in standard, uncontrolled, and unbiased voting, select the country's leadership. In a democracy, people have an option between different political parties and candidates who want the authority to govern. People can criticize and replace their representatives if they do not perform well through peaceful means (Bhatti, 2005).

Democracy in Pakistan is passing through a critical phase; people vote for their representatives on the basis of sect, caste, and language and remain unconcerned about the worth of their vote, and few leaders exploit their legitimate position to accumulate public wealth. Due to the selfishness of the individuals in every election, there are some incidents of bloody clashes (Guhar, 1993).

After the formation of Pakistan, the governmental mechanism of Pakistan was believed to be carried on in accordance with socio-cultural and political conditions within the widespread framework of Islamic teachings. The sovereignty of Allah will be the foundation of this political system, not like the sovereignty of people, as understood in a Western sense (Mazhar, 1959). The objective resolution approved by the First Constitution Assembly in 1949 was included in the preamble of the 1956, 1962, and 1973 constitutions. The first constitution remained applied for a period of two years only it was too short a phase to check the practicality of a constitution. During the first eleven years, eight consecutive governments were shaped and soon collapsed (Sarwer, 2002). Unluckily, the unpredictable democratic history continued till 2008, flashing between elected governments and long spells of military dictators since its beginning. Pakistan

has covered a long distance towards its march on the route of democracy. The parliamentary democracy warped four times due to misconduct, unbalanced development of the institutional environment, and the growing political ambitions of the military officers.

With the result of the general elections in 2018, it was the first time that a politically elected government effectively accomplished its term and was changed by another democratically chosen government. Since 1952, India has had 16 seriously contested general elections and plenty of state assembly elections. Since the 1990s, urban and rural local governments have effectively formed panchayats, and local elections have been successfully held.

In comparison, Pakistan did not have its first election till 1970, and Democracy was adjourned in 1958-1969 in the Ayub Khan era, 1977-1988, and again in 1998-2008 in the Musharraf regime. To yield to its original form, Pakistan did not require a new map; it had to delete the track made by the army and return to the Pakistan of the Quaid-i-Azam. Pakistan was ruled by the army and India by the people. The states that had military authoritarianism broke up first. India had insurgency in many places, but it stayed united because of the democratic negotiations.

Religions and political systems have always existed side by side in an atmosphere of stress. The same relates to affairs between democracy and religion (Ayub, 1967). Islamic political system and the Concept of Democracy are not contradictory to each other. Islamic law is based on the consensus of the Muslim people in the same way the American Constitution is based on the approval of the American people.

Significance of the Study

The reader will gain a better understanding of the significance of democratic government from economic, political, and social perspectives. It will provide a guideline to the readers to identify the weakness and causes of the failure of democracy in Pakistan and, on the other hand, reasons for the sustainability of democracy in India.

Objectives of the Study

The following are the main aims and objectives of the research.

1. The research aims to investigate the failure of the parliamentary democratic system in Pakistan and the stable democracy in India.
2. The second objective of the paper is to understand the role of politicians, ulema, and bureaucrats in the establishment of parliamentary democracy in Pakistan.
3. To understand the difference between Indian Democracy and Pakistan Democracy.

Research questions

The following Questions are intended to be answered in this study.

1. Why could Pakistan never become a stable democracy, whereas India today is the world's largest democracy?
2. What were the differences between Indian Democracy and Pakistan Democracy?
3. How did India Institutionalize democracy and Pakistan promote autocracy?
4. Why is it considered that the role of the military and religion in Pakistan is a major obstacle to democracy?

Literature review

In the contemporary world, the democratic system is recognized and preferred. It has the capacity to bring together the demands of public reasoning and participation in the legislative process. Democratization is the process of implementing democracy in a state. Pakistan and India both embraced democracies. Pakistan has gone through a process of nation-building and struggled to create the institutions necessary for a stable democracy (Jan, 2010). The public and politicians in Pakistan and India play a significant role in democratization. Democratic transition requires free and fair elections. The norm of equal citizenship must be practiced by the state, regardless of caste, religion, ethnicity, or geographic origin. Many of the world's civilized states are incapable of carrying out verbal commitments. Democratic mechanisms are employed to prevent state organs from implementing non-democratic agendas. The leaders aren't bothered by the curiosity and prosperity of the general public because they are

too preoccupied with their power struggle. A similar sense of ineffectiveness in politics is reflected in the declining percentage of voters in general elections (Bibi et al., 2018).

An unstable regional environment, problems with the state system, and the larger global system all contribute to conflicts in Pakistan. The privileged migrant elite has characterized Pakistan's state system with problems relating to constitutionally underdeveloped provincial setups, dysfunctional elections for the dominant system, a centralistic power system, and a dominant position in the military. Mostly at the expense of provincial autonomy and a sense of shared community participation in state affairs, the state system has undergone various phases of authoritarianism, populism, Islamization, and constitution reformation by the bureaucratic establishment over the last seven decades (Hussain, 2013).

The denial of the electoral mandate as the ultimate source of legitimacy led to the emergence of ethnic movements in Sindh, Baluchistan, and the Northwest Frontier Province. Similar to this, the influx of refugees from neighboring countries, the trafficking of illegal drugs and weapons, and the transportation of weapons have all contributed to rising levels of political violence and new identity politics (Waseem & Hayat, 1997). Political conflicts among various institutions as a result of the Clash of Interests and Identities have affected the nation's political behavior among groups, communities, classes, ideologies, and institutions (Waseem, 2022). Democratic institutions and values were undermined as a result of a power structure that was ultimately dominated by the military, identity-based mobilization, and the subsequent migration that followed the partition of British India. Pakistan's internal politics are still influenced by the power disparity that emerged from the division of India and Pakistan (Oldenburg, 2010). When India and Pakistan gained independence from British rule in 1947, they shared a historical and geographical region that left them with nearly identical levels of extreme poverty and inequality. Both countries are large, multilingual, and multireligious. Most theories contend that all of those things work against democracy, and in Pakistan, democracy did, in fact, collapse very quickly after independence. Since then, it has only been temporarily reinstated as a front for military-

bureaucratic rule. In contrast, during the 1975–1976 Emergency, India experienced an episode of authoritarian rule following nearly thirty years of democracy. This led some analysts to mistakenly believe that the India exception had been eliminated (Candland, 2007). Instead, over the last thirty years, democracy has grown stronger following a historic election in 1977.

After gaining independence, India took three years to draft a constitution and started the democratic transition. Lal Bahadur Shastri held the position of prime minister until his passing in January 1966, after Jawahar Lal Nehru's term ended in May 1964. The democratic process has proceeded uninterrupted to this day, with India holding the distinction of being the world's largest democracy in operation (Oldenburg, 2010).

On the other hand, political squabbling over provincial autonomy and the decentralization of power prevented Pakistan from drafting a constitution until 1956. The centrists were adamant about East Pakistan being taken away from the majority province in order to equalize it with West Pakistan using a parity formula. The seeds of disintegration were sown when the demand that Bangla be designated as the nation's second language was rejected. Pakistan held its first general election in 1970. But Bangladesh emerged as a result of the regime's unwillingness to recognize the eastern wing of Pakistan's mandate to rule the nation (Jan, 2010). Throughout the 1990s, dictatorial tendencies persisted in unrepresentative power centers, even after Zia's 11-year martial law. Musharraf led the nation through its fourth dictatorial regime. The nation has operated as a quasi-democracy for the past fifteen years since Musharraf was overthrown. PTI supporters have been calling for "haqeeqi azadi" on the roads lately.

The experts looked into the factors that caused these two South Asian neighbors to follow quite different political paths despite finding many similarities between them. A critical year for both nations was 1977. India was on the verge of becoming an authoritarian nation under the emergency declaration, but Indira Gandhi's call for elections in 1977 turned the country's political future back toward democracy. In actuality, after the election, democracy grew significantly stronger as the press

opened up and marginalized classes joined the political mainstream (Ali et al., 2015).

While this was going on, Bhutto in Pakistan in 1977 chose "the path that brought Pakistan to its autocratic path." Two of the biggest barriers to democracy in Pakistan are the military and the role of religion. Pakistan's future success depends on its departure from military rule. Democracy requires the support of all political parties in order to endure. All social groups should benefit from the democratic system. More people in India than anywhere else in South Asia—70% of people—think that democracy is better than other kinds of governance. According to data from Pakistan, 37% of people think democracy is preferable. To evaluate the level of vested interest in each community, political engagement, and demonstrating the rise in Indian voter turnout and election participation over time. The trend in Pakistan is the opposite, with a decline in political participation. She clarified that while there is still a small amount of vested interest in democracy in Pakistan, politics in India serve the interests of the people (Zia, 2022).

Islam is a democratic system in itself, both with regard to political issues and other societal issues. The Quran provides very clear guidance in this area. According to the Quran, believers decide on matters by consulting one another. (42: 38) It implies that Muslims must always use the mutual consultation process when addressing social issues. It's good if they can come to an agreement; if not, the majority will decide the issue. The rule of the majority is also known as democracy, and Islam recognizes this idea (Long et al., 2015). The Islamic prophet used to apply this idea to everything. Whenever he had an issue, he would get people together. He solicited their input, and only after consulting with his friends was the issue resolved. There is evidence that the Prophet occasionally agreed with the majority even when it conflicted with his own viewpoint. During the Battle of Uhud in 2 A.H., there is one such instance. The Prophet believed that during this battle they should remain in Madinah and defend themselves, while his companions believed that they should continue to the outskirts. The majority's viewpoint was accepted by the prophet. The opinions of the people will shape the government of the Islamic state. In other words, the democratic process

will decide who leads the country. A single person cannot form the government; the views of the majority prevail. Islam agrees with the widely recognized democratic tenet, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people."

A state that follows Islam is not a theocracy. Islam rejects the idea that any one religious group should have the exclusive authority to rule. Like a religious dynasty, theocratic rule is similar, but in Islam, there is no place for it, neither in terms of clergy or family (Kamali, 2005). Islam distinguishes between political systems and religious creeds. Islam maintains that all religious creeds are subject to their unchanging precepts and that religious convictions cannot be compromised; nevertheless, in actuality, Islam's political structure is secular rather than religious. If a society is made up of believers, then the government will reflect their beliefs; if the society is not ready to accept religion in politics or is a mixed society, then Islam will adapt to the needs of the people. The life of the Islamic Prophet served as an example of this.

In the city of Makkah, the Prophet of Islam began his mission in 610 A.D. He was prepared to take the throne from the Makkah. However, he declined because the majority of people in Makkah at the time were not believers. As a result, he accepted the current political status quo and refrained from meddling with the city's political structure. Thirteen years after moving to Madina, he succeeded in creating a city-state. Since most of the town had accepted the Prophet's mission, the people of Madina nominated him as head of state, and he accepted the position. The political essence of Islam was exemplified by the Prophet Muhammad.

Theoretical Framework

Critical Theory and its Application

Critical theory in political science is an approach to studying politics that challenges traditional norms and perceptions. Its ultimate objective is to build a society that is more just and equal. According to critical theorists, many injustices and inequalities exist in the current social order. They seek to pinpoint these issues and devise solutions (Devetak, 2013). Critical theories identify the societal assumptions that restrain the masses from taking part in a "true democracy," and they work to analyze

and change society. Critical theory originated in the Frankfurt School, yet it has evolved throughout many different historical periods spanning several generations. The Frankfurt School was established in the 1920s as the Institute for Social Research in the context of growing fascism in Italy and Germany (Horkheimer, 1972). As per the Frankfurt School theorists, a "Critical Theory" is distinct from a "traditional" theory since it aims to achieve a specific practical objective, such as developing a theory of the world that enables human "emancipation from slavery". Horkheimer states that for a theory to be classified as critical, it needs to be normative, practical, and explanatory. According to Horkheimer, a theory must explain why the current social reality is flawed, pinpoint the individuals and actors who have the power to change it, and offer both workable, realistic objectives for social reform and means of critiquing those objectives. Marxism had a major influence on Horkheimer's Critical Theory, which sought to increase cooperation in the contemporary capitalist society (Horkheimer, 1993). He maintained that the only way to change a capitalist society is to make it more democratic, allowing the people who live there to come to an agreement on all social conditions that are under their control (Horkheimer, 1972).

Critical Theory analyzes the idea of a "real democracy" as follows:

Critical Theory's early stages intended to differentiate the theory of "real democracy" from the systems of administration then prevailing in the West. Critical theorists believe True democracy is reasonable as it permits people to have restraint on the social processes that impact them and the decisions they make in life.

The latter stages of Critical Theory focused on anti-democratic forces, such as the advent of fascism in the 1930s. These studies focused on fascist states and dictators (Nickerson, 2022). These anti-democratic trends, together with the reification process, Horkheimer saw as reducing people's ability to control their social surroundings. Reification is a confused concept in which a nonphysical concept, such as pleasure, terror, or evil, is portrayed as a tangible object. According to Critical Theory's early views on authoritarianism, the spread of increasingly

abstract but fascist social notions resulted in more fascist societies on a concrete level.

In the 1940s, reification happened on two levels, according to critical theorists.

- In the beginning, reification took place on a minor level, allowing thinkers to investigate the psychosomatic factors that influence individuals' support for democracy or dictatorship.
- Secondly, it occurred over a longer period of time and on a larger scale. Individuals employed historical narratives to impose their democratic or authoritarian beliefs to explain long-standing societal issues.

The lens of Critical Theory is being utilized in this research to answer all the research questions related to how democracy failed in Pakistan but flourished in India. Pakistani and Indian people had the same political, social, and cultural trends till 1947, but the modes of democracy in the two states changed after they gained independence. The role of politicians, bureaucrats, and establishments in the failure of the parliamentary democratic system in Pakistan will be critically analyzed in this research work.

Research Methodology

In the field of political science, investigators typically adopt one of two primary methodological approaches: the qualitative or quantitative approach (McNabb, 2015). The qualitative approach is used in this study. This research, which is based on historical analysis, aims to explain why democracy flourished in India and failed in Pakistan.

The thesis mostly drew from secondary sources. The current study guide was created after consulting a number of books, newspapers, magazines, and journals, as well as attending seminars and conversations with experts on democracy. The characteristics of this methodological framework are outlined in the research design that follows.

Research Design

To document an important event, this study will employ a historical research design. This method will give a thorough account of the incident for potential use by researchers, policymakers, and the general public (Halperin & Heath, 2020). This kind of study

could stimulate more investigation, and the findings could be applied to assess preexisting theories.

The method of historical research has several benefits. The first advantage of using historical research is the capacity to develop or derive a sound theory through a more thorough analysis of particular behavioral and occurrence cases. The historical approach makes sense of the present by drawing on the past.

The second advantage is that past events can reveal information about future ones. For example, information from past advertising campaigns can be analyzed to aid in the creation of new ones. The basic idea is to use past knowledge to inform the present and future. It takes a great deal of talent. The data needs to be examined in order to spot trends and deviations. The most reasonable theories and concepts must be developed based on the facts and supported by evidence.

The third benefit of the historical research method is that it allows researchers to better understand why something happened and how it affected things by conducting historical studies (Nwolise, 2011). This data can be used by researchers to forecast future events or to comprehend the past more thoroughly.

The fourth advantage of historical research is that it can help with decision-making by providing a more detailed evaluation of an event. It can be used for decision-making in a variety of domains, including business, public policy, education, and law. Making sense of the historical background of the current situation may help us decide how best to respond to it.

The fifth advantage of historical research is the preservation of cultural heritage. Cultural history, including customs and traditions, can be documented and preserved through historical research (Rowlinson, 2005). When one is aware of the historical significance of these cultural aspects, efforts can be made to preserve them for future generations.

Last but not least, learning about the past stimulates curiosity and critical thinking. Examining various historical perspectives and interpretations can help develop a more critical and reflective understanding of history and how it relates to the present.

Data Analysis

Explanatory data analysis will be used to analyze the data in this research paper. Explanatory research is a research method used when there is limited information. It examines why something happens (Buchanan et al., 2013). The term "cause and effect" model can also be used to characterize explanatory research, which examines data for patterns and trends that have not been identified before. For this reason, it is often considered a form of causal research.

The following are some of the most widely used research methodologies:

- Interviews and focus groups
- Observations
- Experiments
- Literature reviews
- Pilot studies

A number of factors, including the question's structure, budget, and timeline, influence the method that is chosen. If there has been prior research on the topic, a literature review is a great place to start. A literature review is an excellent research method to start if there has already been some research on the subject. In this study, explanatory data analysis will be used to analyze the data through the literature review technique, the main factors and reasons at 75, India's world's largest democracy turned into turmoil, and the impact of RSS on policy formulation in India. The focus was on how the policies of Narendra Modi became the cause of deteriorated conditions of democracy in India. Through explanatory analysis, the researcher will attempt to discover the truth about the sector's biggest democracy as claimed by India. There is an influence of Hindu ideology, and they encourage Hindu nationalism and violate the basic rights of minorities, specifically Muslim ideology.

Comparison of India and Pakistan's Democratic System

Evolution of Democracy in Pakistan (1947-2022)

Being the sixth most populous country in the world, Pakistan was created on the basis of the common will of the people in 1947 with the vision to have a liberal, appropriate, and democratic parliamentary federation. Though Pakistan was a postcolonial state, the democratic experience was reinforced by the

bureaucracy and political constancy, and the institutionalized democratic setup remained an illusion (Tudor, 2013). The first Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan was implemented in 1956 and was abolished just after two years by martial law. During the first eleven years, eight consecutive governments were shaped and soon collapsed. The military rulers have always interrupted political growth and party politics and have encouraged religious, traditional, and tribal politics to legalize their governments by fixed referendum (Engineer, 2022).

However, throughout the brief time they were in charge, elected officials engaged in ongoing practices of exploitation, succession politics, favoritism, and money laundering rather than making significant contributions to democracy (Guhar, 1993). Good administration, the fruit of democracy, was still only a pipe dream.

The outcome of the general elections in 2013 was the first time that a politically elected government successfully completed its tenure and was replaced by another democratically elected government. Even now, the people of Pakistan have to go a long way in the search for true democracy, leading to the decisive goal of a good governmental system.

India and Pakistan at 70: Is Democracy in Danger

The 14th/15th of August (2023) resulted in a special birthday. The partition caused millions of emigrants and up to a million deaths. From the ashes of partition, two states appeared, with different majority religions, diverse societies, and increasingly different political systems (Andy, 2017). Since 1952, India has had 16 seriously contested general elections and plenty of state assembly elections. Since the 1990s, urban and rural local governments formed *panchayat*, or local elections were successfully held (Batool, 2021). In comparison, Pakistan did not have its first election till 1970, and Democracy was adjourned in 1958-1969 in the Ayub Khan era, 1977-1988, and again in 1998-2008 in the Musharraf regime (Andy & Swenden, 2017).

In tracking to explain the different pathways of India and Pakistan, there are a number of explanatory factors. Such as the existence of influential civilian leaders in India, particularly Jawaharlal Nehru, enabled the suppression of the army to civil control.

In comparison, internal conflicts on the role of religion and the accommodation of group clashes among the political elite in Pakistan helped to strengthen the importance of the Pakistani army.

Elections must be impartial and open, secured by a set of rights that assure the freedom to stand, freedom of opinion, establish associations and political parties, and see those views expressed and publicized by a non-censored press. Horse trading, media pressure, and judicial intervention—all of which were observed as electoral irregularities in 2018—are institutional aspects of Pakistani politics that expose the country's democracy to manipulation and instability.

India's democracy has never been flawless. Therefore, the difference between India's and Pakistan's democracy is of degree rather than a difference in kind. Pakistan was ruled by the army and India by the people (Tudor, 2013). Since coming into power, the BJP has concentrated not only on economic expansion but also on developing its Hindu nationalist agenda. India's democracy is at risk. Seventy years after Partition, India might start to fail most of its competitive advantage over Pakistan in that most gratified goal: the excellence of its democracy.

Islamic Constitutionalism and the Concept of Democracy

In the dominant secular world of Western democracies, the correct Islamic point of view needs to be elaborated. The paper then evaluates the Islamic system of government in light of two main principles of Western democracies.

1. The principle that the will of the people shall be the foundation of the authority of the government.
2. The principle of separation of powers.

1. People as a foundation of the authority

If one observes the Islamic system of government, the will of the people shall be the source of the power of the government. The Muslim state, irrespective of its particular system of government, is bound to the rule of Islamic law, which is based on the Qur'an and Sunnah. Islamic law is based on the consensus of the Muslims, as the American

Constitution relies on the assent of the American people (Al-Hibri, 1992).

2. Separation of powers

The Prophet had complete authority over all matters of justice, policy, and implementation during his lifetime. During that time, this arrangement made sense because the Prophet was God's Messenger and was tasked with teaching Muslims the fundamental morals of Islam and demonstrating to them how to perform. However, the Prophet took advice from his companions in worldly problems, like those of agriculture or war. So, it is clear that the Islamic Constitution and the Theory of Democracy are not contradictory to each other.

Conclusion

Democracy is not based on DNA, which some people have and others do not. One had to absorb and exercise it every day. The Indians started the exploration of democracy when their British rulers molded a threat to their history and culture after domination. They acknowledge that the Britons were great because of democracy, and from 1857 to 1947, their offspring learned democracy and its complexities. Indian politics had gone unethical, and democracy had not flourished as it should have. But Indians knew that if they needed development, they had to follow and support democracy. If we evaluate democracy between the two states, India has exercised democracy since 1947, while Pakistan has had a non-democratic government for 32 years of its existence. The parliament had passed only 26 budgets here.

Democracy was embedded in India as the British Raj installed industry in its areas. At the time of partition, India was an industrial state with sizeable businesses and a middle class. On the other hand, Pakistan was composed of regions where the British Raj had raised an army and introduced the feudal elite. British India had hired half of its total soldiers for World War II.

Religious leaders who had ideological conflicts joined Pakistan's ruling system after 1947. The religious leaders started the anti-Ahmadis movement in 1953-54, and after that, they penetrated the political system of Pakistan. In the last elections, they won the highest number of seats in parliament,

which was not frightening but worrying. The Quaid-i-Azam desired Pakistan to be a Muslim state, and the religious political parties were trying to make it an Islamic state.

After an assessment of religious extremism in India, it has some drawbacks to democracy, but Pakistan was ruled by the army and India by the people. The states that had military authoritarianism broke up first. India had insurgency in many places, but it stayed united because of the democratic negotiations.

The first martial law was enforced in Pakistan in 1958 by Ayub Khan, and subsequently, the nature of Pakistan was transformed from a welfare state to a national security state, and India was declared an enemy for justification. To yield to its original form, Pakistan did not require a new map; it had to delete the track made by the army and return to the Pakistan of the Quaid-i-Azam.

REFERENCES

- Adeney, K. (2017). London School of Economics and Political Science. Retrieved from <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/southasia/2017/08/15/india-and-pakistan-at-70-is-democracy-in-peril/>
- Adeney, K., & Swenden, W. (2017). India and Pakistan at 70: Is Democracy In Peril? Retrieved from India and Pakistan at 70. Is democracy in peril? - NEW South Asia Network. Retrieved from India and Pakistan at 70. Is democracy in peril? - NEW South Asia Network
- Ali, S., Latif, A., & Kataria, J. R. (2015). Democracy in South Asia: A comparative Analysis of democracy in Pakistan and India. *Journal of Indian Studies*, 1(2), 83-101.
- Azizah Y. al-Hibri, Islamic Constitutionalism and the Concept of Democracy, 24 Case W. Res. J. Int'l L. 1 (1992) Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/jil/vol24/iss1/>
- Batool, F. (2021). India and Pakistan's Democratic Backslide. *South Asian Voices*. Retrieved From <https://southasianvoices.org/india-and-pakistans-democratic-backslide/>
- Bibi, F., Jameel, S., & Jalal, S. U. (2018). What is democracy? Challenges for democracy in Pakistan. *Global Political Review*, 3(1), 66-75.
- Buchanan, G. M., Seligman, M. E. P., & Seligman, M. (2013). Explanatory style. Routledge.
- Candland, C. (2007). Labor, democratization and development in India and Pakistan (Vol. 2). Routledge.
- Devetak, R. (2013). Critical theory. In *Theories of international relations* (pp. 162-186). Springer.
- Engineer, A. (2022). Military Supremacy in Pakistan: A Case of Military Dictators and Eluded Democracy. Retrieved from <https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2918&context=scrippstheses>
- Guhar, A. (1993). Ayub Khan Pakistan's First Military Ruler, Lahore: Sange-Meel Publication, 1993.
- Halperin, S., & Heath, O. (2020). Political research: methods and practical skills. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Horkheimer, M. (1972). Critical theory: Selected essays (Vol. 1). A&C Black.
- Horkheimer, M. (1993). Between Philosophy and Social Science: Selected Early. MIT Press.
- Hussain, E. (2013). Military agency, politics, and the state in Pakistan. Saṁskṛiti.
- Jan, F. (2010). Pakistan: A struggling nation-state. *Democracy and Security*, 6(3), 237-255.
- Kamali, M. H. (2005). The Islamic state: Origins, definition and salient attributes. *Islam in Southeast Asia: Political, Social and Strategic Challenges for the 21st Century*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 278-297.
- Khan H. (2013). Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan Oxford University Press Retrieved from <https://oup.com.pk/academic-generalbooks/law/constitutional-and-political-history-of-pakistan.html>
- Long, R. D., Singh, G., Samad, Y., & Talbot, I. (2015). State and nation-building in Pakistan: Beyond Islam and security. Routledge.
- Mazhar-ul-Haq January 1, 1959 Political Science: Theory and Practice. Retrieved from | Goodreads 656 .Bookland. ISBN: 9789695380000 (ISBN10: 969538000X). Retrieved from Political Science: Theory and Practice by Mazhar-ul-Haq | Goodreads.
- Mohammad, A., K. (1967). Friends, Not Masters,

- (Oxford University Press, London Karachi, 1967). p 189-191.
- McNabb, D. E. (2015). Research methods for political science: Quantitative and qualitative methods. Routledge.
- Nickerson, C. (2022). Understanding critical theory. SimplyPsychology. Retrieved April, 29, 2022.
- Nwolise, O. B. C. (2011). QUALITATIVE RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES.
- Oldenburg, P. (2010). India, Pakistan, and democracy: Solving the puzzle of divergent paths. Routledge.
- Rowlinson, M. (2005). Historical research methods. Research in Organizations: Foundations and Methods of Inquiry, 295-311.
- Sarwar, M. (2002). Comparative Governments, Lahore: Caravan Press, Publisher: Ilmi Kitab Khana.
- Sohail B., M. (2005). Pakistan Affairs, Lahore: Bhatti Sons Publishers. Bhatti Sons Publishers
- Tudor, M. (2013). The promise of power: The origins of democracy in India and autocracy in Pakistan. Cambridge University Press.
- Waseem, M. (2022). Political conflict in Pakistan. Oxford University Press.
- Waseem, M., & Hayat, S. (1997). Political Development and Conflict Resolution in Pakistan [with Comments]. The Pakistan Development Review, 715-742.
- Zia, A. S. (2022). Pious, populist, political masculinities in Pakistan and India. South Asian Popular Culture, 20(2), 181-199.

