

## **Analysis of Leadership Crisis and Political Instability in Pakistan During 1988 To 1990**

Najeeb Ali Shah\*, Nazim Rahim†, Farhad Ali‡

### **Abstract**

*The progress of a country is dependent upon visionary leadership. No country can achieve the desired milestones without genuine leadership. This quality was lacking in the leadership of Pakistan during 1988 to 1990. The objectives of the study were finding out the causes of leadership crisis as well as political instability in Pakistan during 1988 to 1990. The study was qualitative in nature and content analysis methodology was used in order to probe the research questions. Data was collected from the recorded interviews of political leaders, political analysts and books. For data analysis, descriptive analytical technique was used by the researcher. After the death of Jinnah, leadership vacuum further intensified. The study found out that political leader during 1988 to 1990, both Nawaz as well as Benazir regimes failed to maintain political stability in the country. They were interested to grab more powers; so, they could not develop effective political institutions and political parties which are necessary for democratic culture. The study also found out that the political leaders failed to maintain the civilian supremacy over the non-political forces like military and judiciary. Political leaders were involved in power politics and promoted feudalism and regionalism in the country. It was concluded, that during 1988 to 1993, there was no visionary and sincere political leadership in Pakistan, which could maintain political stability in the country. During this period, the Benazir government has not succeeded in completing its tenure. Recommendations were made for further research regarding other aspects of this political duration (1988-90).*

**Keywords:** political instability, political leadership

### **Introduction**

Leadership and political stability go hand in hand. It is true that no country can make progress without a genuine and visionary leadership. Political stability is very essential for true democracy which is impossible without the vibrant leadership. USA has multiethnic and multicultural society but is more united and work for the interest of its country. In Pakistan, the case is opposite. Political leaders failed to unite the fragmented society because they lacked true leadership (Memon, 2011).

Since her inception in 1947, Pakistan faced serious challenges like refuge, administrative, security, constitutional and political crisis. In order to deal with these issues, it needed a competent leadership, but,

---

\* Lecturer at Oxford Education Academy Batkhela, Malakand

† Assistant Professor, University of Chitral.

‡ PhD, Principal at Elementary and Secondary Education Department KPK

unfortunately Pakistan political leaders failed to deal with these crises. Even though constitution is very important to run the business of the country and unite the fragmented society, but it took nine years to formulate constitution for the country and it could not run more than two and half years and was abrogated by General Ayub Khan. (Chaudary, 1955). The political leaders failed to stop the non-democratic force to interfere in the field of politics and thus political instability prevailed throughout the country.

Pakistan political history has been mainly dominated by the three elites, religious, political and military. They were involved to grab more powers and thus way these elites were continuously engaged in power politics (Kapur, 1990). Now, it was the duty of the political leaders to maintain civilian supremacy and counter the non-political forces to intervene in politics. But they failed to do so and did not strengthen the political institution and democratic culture in the country. The dream of true democracy could not flourish in a country where political instability prevailed (Shah A. , 2004). Lack of competent and visionary leaders of a country is just like fish living without the water. Muslim League could take the credit of the creation of the country, but it was failed to produce 1<sup>st</sup> as well as 2<sup>nd</sup> line of the leadership which could benefit the masses of the country (Junejo, 2010). It is not true that in Pakistan, there was a shortage of political leaders, but actually they were busy to protect their vested interests. They were never worked for national interests as well as benefit the masses (Javid, 2017).

After the creation of Pakistan, some members dominated the key positions of the government, although they had no political background. For instance, Governor General Ghulam Muhammad was a civil servant, similarly Muhammad Ali Bogra was also a civil servant, and both had no political background. All of this indicates that Pakistani political institutions were dominated by the non-political forces (Yusif, 1999).

Ayub Khan formulated the 1962 constitution and presented presidential form of government through Basic Democrat (BD). The political leaders failed to stop Ayub Khan to imposed Martial law. He widens the role of non-political forces in the field of politics. He argued that people of Pakistan are uneducated and, therefore, they suited controlled democracy. It was assumed that due to economic disparity, policies of General Ayub Khan led the foundation of creation of East Pakistan. Ayub Khan resigned on March 25, 1969 and handed over powers to General Yahya Khan, due to strong agitation throughout the country from the side of the people. General Yahya Khan handed over the powers to Zulfikar Ali Bhutto after the war of 1971. The political leaders failed to

unite the people of East Pakistan. They also failed to stop the non-political forces to intervene in the politics.

When Bhutto assumed powers, he attempted various efforts in order to reduce the role of non-political forces in the field of politics, but he failed to do so, because he was mainly depended on non-democratic force in order to get his vested interests. The political leaders failed to resolve the issues which emerged in 1977 election. The opposition's parties blamed the PPP government that they were involved to rag the general elections. They failed to resolve the crisis and once again they provided a vacuum for the non-democratic forces to interfere in the business of politics and once again General Zia imposed Martial Law in the country. General Zia ruled until 17 august 1988, when he died in air-crash during august 1988.

#### *Political Instability from 1988 to 1990*

The era of 1988 to 1990 was an era of political instability as well as democratic crisis in the country. Actually, leadership of Pakistan failed to strengthen the political institutions which could maintain political stability in the country. They failed to stop the non-democratic forces to intervene in the business of the politics. They had promoted politics of hatred in the country. As, difference of the opinions is the beauty of the democracy, but, the political leaders failed to adopt this quality and promoted politics of confrontation and intolerance culture in the country. Therefore, both the PPP as well as Nawaz did not complete their tenures and thus way political instability prevailed throughout the country. The political leaders were involved to promote power politics and interested to grab more powers at every cost even though with the behalf of the non-democratic forces. The political leaders lacked the main qualities which the leaders must be possessed.

#### *Statement of the Problem*

This paper highlights the sensitive relationship between the leadership crises and political instability during 1988 to 1990. There is vast literature available on political instability and leadership crisis, but this study is unique because it interlinked leadership crisis with political instability. The study explains that leadership crisis is the primary cause of political instability in Pakistan during 1988 to 1990. This study finds out the core causes of leadership crisis as well as political instability in Pakistan during 1988 to 1990.

*Research Questions*

- What are the elements that lead to the political instability in Pakistan from 1988 to 1990?
- How leadership crisis played a vibrant role in the political instability in Pakistan from 1988 to 1990?

*Objectives of the Study*

- ❖ To find out the causes of leadership crises in Pakistan from 1988 to 1990.
- ❖ To find out the causes of Political instability in Pakistan from 1988 to 1990.

*Significance of the Study*

This study would be a rich and innovative inclusion in the existing literature on this particular issue because of its new direction about political instability in Pakistan.

**Literature Review**

In Pakistan during 1988 to 99, Parliamentary democracy could not flourish in a true sense. Four governments were dissolved during 1988 to 99 and no government had enabled to complete its tenures. There are various factors involved due to which democratic culture could not prevail in Pakistan. The political institutions remained weak and fragile and the political leadership could not stop the non-democratic force to intervene in the politics (Bashir, 2015). There was a democracy crisis in Pakistan during the period of 1988 to 1999. There were various factors responsible due to which democracy could not flourish in Pakistan in a true sense (Khan M. A., 2019). Political stability is the key factor for the socioeconomic prosperity of any country. Political instability is prevailing in the underdeveloped or third world countries due to which they could not move forward. Weak political party system, fragile political institutions and unsound government are various factors due to which political instability prevailed in the underdeveloped states (Memon, 2011). In Pakistan, alliance politics had played a significant role in the decision-making process. Political parties in Pakistan had formulated on the basis of ethnicity. Therefore, no national political party was emerged which represent the entire country (Malik, 2014). In Pakistan, there was weak political party system. No political party has well organized and disciplined and. they were enabled to make free and fair intra party election among the political parties. Therefore, democratic culture could not flourish in the country (Taj, 2019). In Pakistan, the political party failed to deliver good services and benefited the masses. But actually, they

benefited those people whose could help them to win the elections. The political party has not well organized and there is high level of fragmentation, polarization and fictionalization among the political parties (Hussain Z. , 2008). In order to promote democratic culture and ensure country progress, this is the job of the political leadership only, and not the job of the non-democratic forces (Aziz S. , 2009).

In the political system, only political parties should work and dominated making of any policy. But, in Pakistan, the non-political actors are dominated the business of the country, this is due to the infectiveness of political system of the country (Ahmad M. , 2009). Leadership of Pakistan failed to strengthen political institutions which could promote democratic culture in the country. Leadership of Pakistan failed to maintain civilian supremacy and was unable to stop the non-democratic force to interfere in the field of politics (Cohn S. , 2011). There are various factors involved due to which political instability prevail in any country; legitimacy crisis, identity crisis, penetration crisis, distribution crisis, participation crisis (Lucian, 1971). In Pakistan, there are various factors due to which the military had dominated the business of the politics, such as lack of prominent political institutions, lack of visionary leadership (Veena K. , 1986).

#### *Research Gap*

After the literature review, the researcher found that there is a myriad literature available which discussed both the leadership crisis and political instability in Pakistan. But a gap was noted that during 1988-1990, the link between political instability and leadership crisis has not been studied. In this study, the scholar interlinked both leadership crisis and political instability in Pakistan during 1988 to 1990.

#### *Theoretical Framework*

The researcher has used 5 levels of leadership, 17 and 21 laws of leadership as well as 21 qualities of a leader written by John C Maxwell as theoretical framework in order to investigate the research questions.

#### **Research Methodology**

The researcher has used the Qualitative research methodology in order to probe the research questions. The researcher used content analysis technique in order to analyze and interpret the data. Two variables were used. One is independent variable; Leadership crisis and the other is dependent variable which is political instability in Pakistan during 1988 to 1990. The discussion is an analytical and descriptive style.

*Sources of Data*

The scholar has used mainly secondary sources like proceeding of the cabinets, diaries, international newspapers, articles, journals, periodicals, domestic newspapers, etc.; in order to probe the research questions. Along with this the scholar has also used recorded interviews of the political analyst, political leaders, and constitutional analysts in order to investigate the research questions. Besides, the researcher has utilized the domestic as well as international books to examine the research problems.

*Data Collection Technique*

The researcher used document analysis in which the data was collected through international journals, articles, books, domestic newspapers and books in order to investigate the research questions. The scholar has also used the reordered interviews of senior politicians, Political analysts, and legal constitutional analysts in order to collect the primary data.

*Data Analysis Technique*

A descriptive analytical technique has used by the researcher in order to analyze the data to addresses the questions.

*Benazir Bhutto 1<sup>st</sup> Government (1988-1990)*

Zia died in a plane crash on August 17, 1988, and, after his death there were two main political opponents Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Shareef, both having possessed different political ideology; Benazir had used the trump card of her father while Nawaz supported the legacy of General Zia (Oldenburg, 2010). Pakistan People party had decided to take part in the General election behalf on itself while on the other side a political alliance was made which consisted mainly nine political parties called the IJI (Islami Jamhori Ittehad) which main aim was to defeat the PPP at every cost (Rias, 1988). It was believed and assumed that there was key role of the military in the formation of Islami Jamhori Ittehad; it was claimed that General Hamid Gul was the creator of the IJI which main purpose was to curtail and defeat the PPP at every cost (Shaikh, 2000). It is, therefore, clear that political leadership of Pakistan was involved to take support from the non-democratic forces in order to remain in powers at every cost.

IJI had exploited the “Punjabi card” for their political interest, as the Punjabi province has the largest province of the country; therefore, the IJI badly utilized this card for their vested interest (Mahmood, 2000). The IJI had utilized the religious card during the course of election campaign

in order to get more seats in the NA and to curtail the PPP, even though they motivated and influenced the general masses that in Islam it is a sin or forbidden to caste vote to the women with the help of the Molvis (Shaikh). The core quality of a political leader is that, he must be selfless and honest, but unfortunately leadership of Pakistan used regional as well as religion for their political vested interest. The formation of the IJI by the non-political forces indicated that how political leadership was involved to take help from them.

In the general election of 1988, no political party had unable to secure more seats in the National Assembly. The PPP secured more seats in the NA and emerged as the largest party, but they failed in the center to form its government. They formed a collation government in the center with the help of MQM. Pakistan People Party had formed government in the Sindh, but in the NWFP, they formed a coalition government with the help of ANP (Dawn, 1988). In Punjab, the IJI formed government with CM Nawaz Sharif. In Punjab and Baluchistan, a PPP against government was installed which did not allow political stability in the country and consequently during this period political instability prevailed (Noman, 1990). Formation of coalition's government in the NA as well as in the PAs clearly indicated that in Pakistan, the political party system was weakened.

It was assumed that, the United State of America had played a key role in the formation of regime in the center. US ambassador Oakley, meet with the COAS, President and with political leaders of various parties, the main motif behind this was to bring the PPP and military closer in order to make government in the center. US Ambassador visited to Pakistan after the result of general election and met with Benazir and presented future forthcoming plan to Benazir which she had been accepted without any reluctance (Kumar S. , 1988). It was also believed that in Benazir cabinet ministers were taken on the consent of the President, army and USA (Sherpo).

The President and the military established was not in a position to transfer powers to the PPP that time without the President and support of the army the powers transfer was not possible. In the opinion of Javid Ashraf there was made a deal between the military and PPP. In the deal it was decided that the PPP would not take revenge from military; no intervention in the foreign policy of Afghanistan as well as in Kashmir, and the military would have powers in order to formulate foreign policy for the country. The PPP had accepted all these proposals and made compromise with the military in order to make a coalition government in the center (Ashraf, 2011). It was also decided that Shaib Zada Yaqoob would be given the ministry of foreign affairs and Ghulam Ishaq would be

nominated for President Ship (Sherpo, 2001). The role of the foreign country to form government in the center clearly showed that how the foreign country interfered in the politics of the country. It is true that with the support of the military the PPP would not make government in the center and, therefore, they made compromise with the military. In such a dismal condition, how political leadership can control the military?

*Law and Order Situation*

The PPP government failed to maintain political stability and law and order situation in the country. The ruling party particularly in Sindh failed to stabilize the law-and-order situation and ethnic violence broke out in the province of Sindh. The situation was further worsened when difference arose between the MQM and PPP in tackling the law-and-order condition in the province. Both the military as well as the ruling party had wanted to handle the situation but both did not trust on one another (Bahadur). The Benazir regime had started the cleanup operation in the Pucca Qilla in Hyderabad on May, 26, 1990. There were many people injured and killed during the operation. The security forces which many comprised upon Sindhis and Pushtoon and the majority of the people who were been killed were Mohijir. The mohjiris started agitation and attacked on neighborhood Sindhi with huge machine guns (Kennedy, 1991).

The military had intervened in the operation on its own without the consent of the civilian government and confronted with Sindh administration as well as police. The armed forces blamed that the ruling party had been involved to crush Mohijar while the PPP blamed the military that they supported those whose did not follow and obey the curfew enforced by the Sindh administration (Shaikh, 1990). The ruling party had interested to take help from the military under Article 147 but the military stressed that the ruling party should acquire help from us under Article 245. But the government was not in a position to give extensive powers to the military because the ruling party feared that if under Article 245 powers were given to the military then it is like the marital law and many of their ministers would be arrested (Maleeha, 1990). In the NA, the oppositions parties had blamed the ruling party that they had been failed to maintain the law-and-order circumstance in the Sindh (Official, 1989). In similar fashion the law-and-order situation in another province like NWFP and Baluchistan was also not good. In Baluchistan the ethnic violence broke out among Baloch and Pashtoon. In Punjab the Saraiki movement was started (Official, 1989). It was claimed that the government of Punjab was involved to the backing of unlawful activities with the help of the police (Abbas, 1990).



*Media in Benazir Regime*

In the modern world, Media is the most powerful weapon in order to bring progressive transformation in the society. Free and independent media is very necessary for the true democracy. It is the media which highlighted the good or bad policies of the government and bring awareness in the public to take part in the democracy. But, unluckily in Pakistan the media was not free and independent to work freely. During Benazir regime the media was not neutral. The government media like radio and television was totally controlled by the government and they only supported the views of the government. Some of the opposition's leaders like Wali Khan, Ghulam Mustafa, and Omer Farooq had condemned the negative attitude of electronic media towards the opposition's leaders (Qureshi). As open mindedness, tolerance, accountability is the key qualities of any political leaders. But actually, these qualities had been missing in the political leadership of Pakistan. Whenever the media highlighted the corrupt practice of the political leadership then they were controlled and banned by the government.

*Relationship between the Ruling party and Oppositions*

During the 1<sup>st</sup> tenure of Benazir, the relationship between center and province especially in the Punjab was not good and workable. The political leadership either in government or in oppositions promoted politics of confrontation in the country as a result political instability prevailed in the country and even though the Benazir regime did not complete her tenure and her government was dissolved by the president. Actually, the political leadership of Pakistan promoted destructive politics instead of constructive politics. According to John C Maxwell, A leader is not a leader to empower itself but he must be the potential to empower other. But in Pakistan, there was a power politics where every political leader was involved to grab more powers.

During Benazir government, the relation between the center and Punjab province was not ideal. Even though, the government of Punjab had rejected to present an official protocol to Benazir, when she visited to Punjab (Ziring, 1990). The relation further worsened when Nawaz opposed the People's program led by the central government and he asked the president to stop the program immediately (Haq I. , 1989). Both the ruling party as well as the government of Punjab blamed each other for worsening the situation (Altaf, 1989). The relationship between the center and Punjab province was further intensified when Nawaz became the President of the III on Feb 11, 1989. Due to this attitude of the government of Punjab compelled the PPP government to present a no confidence vote

in the Punjab assembly in order to oust Nawaz government. But with the intervention of the President as well as the military the issue was resolved. Benazir stated that we are not ambitious to bring her member as the CM of Punjab but it was the bad attitude of Nawaz to compel us to do so (Ahmad).

The relation between PPP and Nawaz further intensified when Nawaz announced Punjab Bank and initiation of television network in Punjab. The main aim of these steps was to make Punjab autonomous. For this purpose, Nawaz crossed all the limitations of the constitution in order to make Punjab autonomous (Asghar S. , 2001). Nawaz warned the federal officials in Punjab to not support with the federal government, and if they supported the federal government in Punjab then they could not be tolerable to work in Punjab (Shad). The ruling party had also used the state machinery against the Nawaz government and there were corruption cases filed against the MPs of Nawaz and they were compelled to support the federal government (Mehmood). The relation had been so intensified that Nawaz rejected the transfer of the Chief Secretary from the side of the central government (Waseem). The issue had been resolved when the President intervened and supported Punjab government and PPP was compelled to withdraw from the transfer (Abbas, 1990). If the central government had not intervened in Nawaz government in Punjabi and allowed him to exercise his powers through constitutionally and on the other side the Nawaz collaborated with the center, then the political stability could be maintained in the country which would be very useful for the democratic culture in the country. But unfortunately, this not happened and Benazir motivated and influenced Nawaz to use the Punjabi Nationalism for his political interests rather to think for the country interests (Bakhtiar, 2019).

In Punjab, when the government offered an additional budget, the MPAs of the Pakistan people party strongly opposed this, consequently this created financial difficulties for the Punjab government. The federal government also opposed this budget and called the meeting Council of Common Interest in order to address the economic problems. As a result, the Punjab government disallowed all the program of the federal government and Nawaz made a parallel government of his own, he declared himself as the protector of the Punjab. In this way regional politics dominated in the country (Kali, 2001).

The opposition parties had formed a political alliance called combined oppositions parties led by Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi. The main purpose of this alliance was to undermine the ruling party (Qureshi). On January 26, 1990, the COP had planned a big rally in the city of Karachi to show strength against the ruling party. One of the key leaders of the

COP openly predicated that the next Prime Minister would be Nawaz Sharif, and it has become true after the 14 months. Some of the political leaders used un-parliamentary language against the ruling party (Zafar, 1990). In order to undermine the ruling party, the COP had used the Kashmir card. They blamed the PPP that they failed to formulate foreign policy in order to undermine the India. They pressurized the ruling party even though the ruling party had adopted a strong opposition to India on Kashmir issue. But the COP failed to oust the PPP on Kashmir issue, one of the key leaders of COP said that, "We planned a strategy against PPP government, but I must declare that we failed and failed horribly" (Ihteshamul, 1990).

During Benazir government, the COP was formed. Benazir failed to make compromise with the opposition's parties. It may be the failure of the Benazir to do so or the negative role of the opposites which did not allow the ruling party to complete its tenure. But actually, both the PPP as well as the opposition's parties were involved in politics of confrontation and were busy to dislodge their rivals. Due to immature attitude of the political leadership as well as political intolerance created political instability and overwhelmed the political scene completely (Ahmad, 1989).

#### *Civil Military Relationship during Benazir Regime*

It is true that in Pakistan the politics is controlled by the military. The political leadership failed to maintain civilian supremacy over the non-democratic forces. Both India and Pakistan inherited the British trained army; the leadership of India were successfully to maintain the civilian supremacy and formulated the constitution earlier after the partition from the British, but the leadership of Pakistan failed to maintain the civilian supremacy, because they never strengthened the political institutions and that is the reason that political instability prevailed in the country (Rizwi H. A., 1998). The Muslim League which could take credit to create Pakistan was also failed to produce first as well as second line of leadership which could run the country on the path of progress (Junejo, 2010). The government of Benazir was also failed to maintain the civilian supremacy and the foreign policies were totally controlled by the military.

On 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 1989, the Medal for Democracy for the armed forces was announced by the PPP government (Zafar U. , 2004). The main motive behind this was to appease the military, she had realized that without the collaboration of the armed forces her government would not be completed her tenure, she knew that without the help of the army no government in the country would be unable to complete its tenure (Iqbal). This argument of Benazir was undemocratic that without the support of

the military no government would complete its tenure, why not with the support of the oppositions they failed to formulate such constitutional measures in which the military would not dare to intervene in the politics. This is the job of the political leadership to maintain the civilian supremacy over the non-democratic forces. In India after her independence there was no military intervention and the military had not intervened in the domain of politics. The main reason behind this was the genuine and true political leadership of the India which could maintain civilian supremacy over the democratic forces.

The foreign policies especially the dispute of Kashmir and Afghan policies was totally controlled by the armed forces and ISI. The ISI had frequently told to foreign ministers that these policies were decided by the armed forces (Shahid). On March 6, 1989, the ISI with the help of Afghan Mujahideen attacked Jalalabad. The attack was planned by the ISI and even though the Benazir government was not informed about the operation. The electronic media had criticized the attack of ISI and wrote critical articles against the role of ISI in Afghanistan (Babar, 1989).

The Benazir wanted to curtail the role of ISI in the politics. For this purpose, she replaced General Hamid Gul with Lt. General Shamas Rehman Kullo on May, 1989. But in the same year she failed to substitute another military officer which was backed by the President as well as the military (Iram, 2021). In the constitution, Zia introduced the controversial amendment called 8<sup>th</sup> amendments; under this amendment the President exercised vast powers. This action of Benazir was criticized from the side of the military, they declared that these actions are the interventions in the internal affairs of the military and President had the powers to exercise these powers. Benazir was unable to confront with the armed forces and she always tried to keep the armed forces on her side (Ali N. M., 1997). This indicated the lack of genuine leadership in the country. Here a question arises that why they did not annul the 8<sup>th</sup> amendment. These powers of the President were undemocratic and the political leaders failed to annul this amendment which was introduced in the constitution by the military dictator. Benazir government wanted to amend this, but the oppositions did not support here. Overall, the political leadership failed to maintain the civilian supremacy and thus way the military intervened in the politics and this badly affected the political stability of the country.

In the NA, the COP members presented a no confidence motion in order to dissolve the PPP government on October 1989 (Dawn, 1988). The MQM also supported the no confidence motion in the NA, it was assumed the COAS was involved to motivate the member of the MQM in order to defeat the PPP in the NA and later on this was recognized by the one of the key leaders of PML Chodary Nisar as well as the members of

the MQM (Shiekh). The Benazir regime as well as the oppositions parties were involved in the horse trading because in the NA there were more independents members (Patel). The IJI had utilized state machinery during a no confidence motion because in Punjab and Baluchistan IJI government was there (Abbas B. ). Some members of the PPP were arrested by the government of Punjab before vote a no confidence motion. The IJI had also motivated the members of the FATA in order to support in no confidence motion and they agreed (Shaikh). The IJI had also approached to the members of the PPP and they were motivated to support us in the motion. The Intelligence Bureau (IB) had tapped the voices of the conferences which was later on leaked in which the members of the IJI had involved to influence the members of the PPP. In the recorded cassette, it was assumed that the top leadership of the armed forces had involved in toppling the PPP government (Munir, 1995). In the NA, the PPP government had defeated the opposition and won by 12 votes to curtail the no confidence motion. But unluckily the Benazir was unable to build consensus and harmony for all the political parties in the NA. She failed to promote politics of tolerance in the NA and did not strengthen the political institutions as well as failed to make negotiations with her rivals for the sake of democracy and political stability (Malik, 2008).

#### *Dismissal of Benazir Government*

General Zia introduced 8<sup>th</sup> amendment in the constitution in order to make the president most authoritative. This amendment empowered the president to dissolve the assemblies, to appoint judges in the higher courts and to appoint chief of the armed forces. Benazir wanted to annul this amendment. As a result, a tug of war started between the PM and the President (Zahid, 1989). The PPP government failed to annul the 8<sup>th</sup> amendment because they lacked 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority in the NA. The tension between the President and the PM increased when the President wanted extension to Admiral Sirohi. She stated that he had completed his tenure and a new chief must be nominated. But the President stressed that according to 8<sup>th</sup> amendment appointment and extension powers could be exercised by the President and, therefore, he ordered that Sirohi could continue his job (Yusuf, 1999). The tension between the President and the PM become further intensified when the Benazir cancelled all the appointment of the Judges which had hired by the President Ishaq Khan during caretaker government. Benazir stressed that in parliamentary form of the government, the president is bound to act on the advice of the PM. On the other side, the President stressed that according to 8<sup>th</sup> amendment the powers could be exercised by the President and therefore the PM

should notify permanent orders of the judges of the superior courts (Shaikh, 2000).

On August 6, 1990, the President Ishaq Khan dissolved the NA as well as the provincial assemblies of the country by exercising the power of 58(2)(b) prescribed by the constitution (Lodhi, 1990). The PPP had filed a petition in the HC as well as in the SC in order to null and void the act of the President, but the courts decided in favor of the dissolution (Dawood, 1994).

The political leaders failed to abolish the 8<sup>th</sup> amendment and provided an opportunity to the President to dissolve the NA. If all the political leaders both in government and oppositions would unite and abolish this controversial amendment then the President would not dare to derail the democracy. After the death of the Zia, it was believed that the country would run on the path of democracy, but, unluckily, it did not happen and once again the democratic setup was ruined and political instability remained in the country. All of this indicated in Pakistan no genuine leadership would develop whose could maintain political stability in the country.

The PPP regime could not perform the legislation function very well because they lacked 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority in the NA and they formed a coalition government with the MQM and they were involved to spend more energies to intact the coalition for getting more rewards. Therefore, the PPP government could not formulate reformative policies for economic development which could change the life of the common person (Rizvi, 1998).

Democracy and political stability could not strengthen if there is a lack of visionary leadership. Leadership of Pakistan did not promoted politics of tolerance and had not strengthened the political institutions which could maintain political stability in the country. Both the leaders either in government or in oppositions has played a significant role in democracy, but, unluckily, both of them were never in a position to exercise their constitutional powers, that is the main reason that political instability prevailed in the era of Benazir Bhutto (Christina, 1991).

### **Conclusion**

The main reason behind the political instability in the Benazir era was a lack of visionary leadership. They were involved in power politics and they never promoted a constructive politics which is very necessary for the country. The political leaders failed to have the true qualities of a leader which is necessary for any political leaders. Other reasons were the coalition government, weak party system, weak political institutions, role of the non-democratic forces like the President and the armed forces. The

political leaders failed to abolish the 8<sup>th</sup> amendment which derailed the country democracy as well as political stability. 8<sup>th</sup> amendment was another factor which promoted political instability in the country. Feudalism also contributed political instability in the country and did not allow developing the true leadership in the country.

### References

- Abbas, N. (1990, April). Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan: The Herald.
- Abbas, N. (1990, February). Law and Disorders, The Herald. Karachi.
- Ahmad. (1989, January 5). Proper Stance for the Opposition. Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan: Dawn.
- Ahmad, M. (2009). Relationship between Political Parties and Non-Political Powers: An Analysis with eference to Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science*, 107-115.
- Ali, N. M. (1997). Pakistan: Islamic Nation in Crisis. Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan: Vanguard Pvt Ltd, 72.
- Altaf, K. (1989, May). Battle Stations; The Herald. Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan.
- Asghar, S. (2001). *benazir Bhutto: Pakistan Aur Jamhooriat (Urdu)*. Rawalpindi, Punjab, Pakistan: Sana ublishers.
- Ashraf, J. (2011, September 16). Pakistan Muslims League(PML) (Quaid-e-Azam), Personal Interview. Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Aziz, S. (2009). *Between Dreams and Realities: Some Milestones in Pakistan's History*. Oxford University Press.
- Babar, A. (1989, June). "Benazir: Five Months On", Economic and Political Weekly : .
- Bakhtiar, K. (2019). The Crisis of Governance in Pakistan: A Critical Analysis of Benazir Bhutto. *Global Political Review*, 14.
- Bakhtiar, K. (2019). The Crisis of Governance in Pakistan: A Critical Analysis of Benazir Bhutto. *Global Political Review (GPR)*, 16.
- Bashir, U.-A. Q. (2015). Parlimentary Democracy in Pakistan: 1988-99. Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Chaudary, G. W. (1955). Constitution making dilemmas in Pakistan. *Journal Home, Browose Journal*, 8(4), 589-600.
- Chaudary, G. W. (1955). Constitution making dilemmas in Pakistan. 8(4), 589-600.
- Chaudary, G. W. (1955). Constitution Making Dilemmas in Pakistan. *Pakistan Horizon*, 589-600.
- Christina, L. (1991). *Waiting for Allah, Pakistan's struggle for Democracy*. London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd.
- Cohn, S. (2011). *The Future of Pakistan*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

- Dawn. (1988, October 24). Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan: Dawn.
- Dawood. (1994). . *The role of superior judiciary in the politics of Pakistan*. Royal Book Publisher.
- Haq, I. (1989, May). The meeting Session; the Herald. Karachi.
- Hussain, Z. (2008). The Politics of Service Delivery in Pakistan: Political Parties and Incentive for Patronage: 1988-99. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 129-151.
- Ihteshamul, H. (1990, February). Taking Charge. Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan: The Herald.
- Iram, K. (2021). Power Sharing in Pakistan: A Failed Experience from 1988-1999. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 221.
- Javid, H. (2017, May 17). Leadership: The Bane Of Pakistan. Islamabad, Capital, Pakistan.
- Javid, U. (2017). Historical Analysis of Successive Governments in Pakistan: A History of First Six Decades, 1947-2007. *Pakistan Vision 18(1)*, 214-227.
- Javid, U. (2017). Historical Analysis of Successive Governments In Pakistan: A History Of First Six Decades, 1947-2007. *Pakistan Vision Vol. 18 No. 1*, 214-219.
- Junejo, J. H. (12-12-2010). Why Democracy Failed In Pakistan. *Indus Asia Online Journal*.
- Junejo, J. H. (2010). Why Democracy Failed In Pakistan. *Indus Asia Online Journal*.
- Junejo, J. H. (2010). Why Democratic System Is Weak In Pakistan (Causes And Solutions). *Indus Asia Online Journal*, 1-15.
- Kali. (2001). *Pakistan: From the Rhetoric of Democracy to the Rise of Militancy*. London: Rutledge.
- Kapur, A. (1990). *Pakistan In Crisis*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Khan, M. A. (2019). Crisis of Democracy in Pakistan: Role of Leadership and Systemic Factors (1988-1999). Doctoral dissertation, International Islamic University, Islamabad.).
- Kumar, S. (1988). *The Post Colonial State in Asia: Dialectics of politics and Culture*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel publishers.
- Lucian, P. (1971). *The Identity And Political Culture*. In Leonard Binder (Eds). *Crises and Consequences In Political Development*. New Jersey : Princeton University Press.
- Mahmood, S. (2000). *Political Roots and Development: 1947-99*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Maleeha, L. (1990, August). Beg Bhutto: Collision Course? Karachi.
- Malik. (2008). *The History of Pakistan*. . London: Green Wood Press, p. 178.



- Malik, R. Z. (2014). Politics of Alliances: A case study of Islami Jamoohori Ittehad (JI). Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Memon, A. P. (2011). Political Instability: A Case Study Of Pakistan. *Journal of Political Studies*, 31-43.
- Munir, A. (1995). *Ghadar Kon? (Urdu)*. Lahore: Gora Publishers.
- Noman, O. (1990). *A Political and Economic History of Pakistan Since 1947*. Kegan Paul International.
- Official, R. (1989, March 25). The National Assembly of Pakistan Debate. Vol 2.
- Oldenburg. (2010). *India, Pakistan and Democracy: Solving the Puzzle of Divergent Paths*. London: Routledge.
- Rias. (1988). Pakistan in 1988: From Command to Conciliation politics. *Asian Surveys*, 199-206.
- Rizwi, H. A. (1998). Civil Military Relations In Contemporary Pakistan. *Journal For International Institute For Strategic Studies*, 96-113.
- Rizwi, H. A. (1998). Civil Military Relations In Contemporary Pakistan. *Journal For International Institute For Strategic Studies*.
- Shah, A. (2004). The Transition to Guided Democracy in Pakistan. *The Asia Pacific: A Region in Transition*, 207-218.
- Shah, A. (2004). The Transition to Guided Democracy in Pakistan. *The Asia Pacific: A Region in Transition*, 207-218.
- Shah, A. (2004). The Transition to Guided Democracy in Pakistan. *The Asia Pacific: A Region in Transition*, 207-218.
- Shaikh. (1990, May 27). A Political Biography. Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan: Dawn.
- Shaikh. (2000). *A Political Biography*, 128. Oriental Books Publishing.
- Sherpo, A. A. (2001). Personal Interview. Maroof Raza ed., Generals and Governments in India and Pakistan. New Dehli: Har-Anand Publications Pvt Ltd.
- Taj, S. (2019). Role of Political Parties in Pakistan and Perverted Form of Democracy. *Dialogue*, 1-14.
- Talbot, I. (2015). *Pakistan: A New History*. Hurst.
- Veena, K. (1986). *Military Intervention In Pakistan*. New Dheli: NBO Publisher Distributor.
- Veena, K. (1986). *Military Intervention In Pakistan*. New Dheli: NBO Publisher Distributor.
- Veena, K. (1986). *Military Intervention In Pakistan*, 51. New Dheli: NBO Publisher Distributor.
- Yusaf. (1999). Op.Cit.
- Yusaf, H. (1999). Pakistan: A Study Of Political Development 1947-97. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publication.

- Yusif, H. (1999). *Pakistan: A Study Of Poitical Development 1947-97*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publication.
- Yusuf. (1999). *Pakistan, a Study of Political Developments 1947-97*. Sang-e-Meel Publishers.
- Yusuf. (n.d.). Pakistan in Search of Democracy, 232.
- Yusuf, H. (1999). *A Study Of Political Development*. Lahore: Sange Meel Publications. P.67.
- Yusuf, H. (1999). *A Study Of Political Development*. Lahore: Sange Meel Publications.
- Yusuf, H. (1999). *Pakistan: A Study Of Political Developments 1947-1997*. Lahore: Sang-E-Meel Publications.
- Zafar, A. (1990, December). "The Day of the Mandarin", , 33. Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan: The Herald.
- Zafar, A. (1990, Febuary). A show of Strength. Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan: The herald Karachi.
- Zafar, U. (2004). *Political Parties in Pakistan; Disabled byDesign*. Islamabad: (Islamabad: Freedom Publishers,.
- Zahid, H. (1989, Febuary). "Making Amends", . Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan: The Herald.
- Zahid, H. (1989, Febuary). "Making Amends", 18-19. Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan: The Herald.
- Ziring. (1990). Pakistan in 1989: The Politics of Stalemate. *Asian Survey*, 126-135.