



International Research Journal of Interdisciplinary & Multidisciplinary Studies (IRJIMS)

A Peer-Reviewed Monthly Research Journal

ISSN: 2394-7969 (Online), ISSN: 2394-7950 (Print)

Volume-I, Issue-VIII, September 2015, Page No. 34-44

Published by: Scholar Publications, Karimganj, Assam, India, 788711

Website: <http://www.irjims.com>

Civil-Military Relations: A Comparative Study of Pakistan: From barracks to corporate culture

(Paths toward Re-democratization: Theoretical and Comparative Considerations)

Dr. Arshad Javed Rizvi

Associate Professor, Sir Syed University of Engineering and Technology, Pakistan

Abstract

*This research report, mainly focus on the supremacy and evolution of military in Pakistan, giving out lines of short back ground of Pakistan's political history before and offer independence. Scholarly focus on civil and military relations since 1947, military interventions in to the political domain and its withdrawals. Pakistan has seen four military coup, how and why these military **regimes** have ended, the conditions that led to end the Military Regimes in 1968, 1971, 1988 and 2008, causes were based upon the divergence of interests between the leaders of the military regime, who wanted to keep their strong ship on political power and the active leaders of the armed forces they seek to protect, promote and advance the corporate interests of military. Given Pakistan's volatile relationship with India, centered on the decades-long conflict for control of Kashmir, Pakistan has always been a 'security state', and the national military has historically been a key player in the geopolitical arena. However, information on Pakistan's armed forces is very limited, and interaction with Western civilian and military institutions is heavily controlled. The climate of secrecy within the Pakistan military and its associated security services directly and indirectly affects civil–military coordination and presents humanitarian actors with a highly complicated operational environment.*

Key Words: independent state, corporate, military intervention, regime, secrecy, military-civil relationship, geopolitical.

Introduction

In the history of Pakistan military has been seen holding significant role, encompasses and passing through immense Conflicts and struggles across areas constituting modern Pakistan and in South Asia for more than two thousand years. The history of military in Pakistan begins from post – 1947 after becoming an independent state.

As a Pakistan Armed Forces, Military has played vital role and shaping the country since 1947. Pakistan was supposed to be run through democratic system of government after getting independence from British, Throughout Pakistan's history military has remained the most powerful institution and over thrown on the bases of mismanagement and corruption democratically elected

civilian governments without justification, since its inception Pakistan has been four military coups none of them had justified motive. All the successive political government showed the responsibility to consult military to before take key decisions, specially matters regarding Kashmir, issue and foreign policies. Every time through coup, military entered into the arena of political domain, and established military dictator ships again and again.

In 1947 the military of Pakistan was created by division of British Indian Army and units were formed, who had a long and cherished history during the British India as the “Khyber Rifles”, who participated and seen and gave services in “World war One” and “World war Two”, Many of the military officers of that time had fought in both the world wars.

The military draws on aspiration from the rich combat history that was fought within the present area of Pakistani soil and was examples of sacrifice and perseverance to the troops.

Up till now Pakistan has fought three major wars and one war on limited conflict of “Kargil” with India. Our Armed forces are a legacy from the British Army that at the time of independence in 1947 inherited upon the nation. This was the time when military was instilled or strict with a tradition of civilian supremacy from the colonial administration. Indecisive Indo- Pakistan war in 1947 to 1948 was due to violent separation from India and the conflict and dispute over Kashmir region, this becomes the first test for the Pakistan’s Army to enter into the arena of Political ambit. In Pakistan early years of post independence, politics was run by the Muslim league leaders by Mohammad Ali Jinnah as a Governor General and Liaquat Ali Khan as a prime minster. For the Muslim minority in British India, Muslim league had served as a plat form and had been a potent and strong force within the political environments of that time. Muslim League leaders had full commitment to democracy and used to believed that they were entitled to run the country they had forged, but at the same time they come to discover, once the nation was established slogan of religion was no longer rallying point society of Pakistan was fragmented based having intense cleavages within provincial, Ethnic, Tribal socio economic and sectarian lines, above all geographically Pakistan has two parts west and east thousands miles apart, in between was hostile Indian territory. The cream of the Muslim league were holding upper – echelons dominated by Muhajirs and Punjabis of the west wing of Pakistan, other political parties, the officers corps and civilian bureaucracy. Democratic system of government demands equality of rights a mange the citizens but on the other hand when the time come the Muhajir and Punjabis felt reluctant to initiate democratic processes they were afraid that democratic system would guarantee the shift of political power permanently to the numerically superior Bengalis of East Pakistan and west Pakistan would lose the dominant political position in the fair electoral contest, became the matter of political power grabbing. This was the main reason that for over a decade after getting independence from British Raj, Nations political development remained stalled. Final decision and agreement could not be reached among the politician to give nation a written constitution and other electoral arrangements. Fragmentation and opposition were witnessed in the Muslim League and political parties should instability in their behavior causing rapid changing in Leadership. Before the military coup occurred in 1958, regime of seven prime ministers were rapidly turnover within the period of 1951 – 1957 formal army involvement in the civilian arena begun critical role of politician governing Pakistan force from martial law in Lahore in 1953 then from 1958 army ruled the country from 1958 to 1969 Field Marshal Law Ayub is has ruled, from 1969 to 1971 General Yahya Khan ruled, 1977 to 1989 General Zia ul Haq and 1999 to 2008 General Pervez Musharraf ruled the country.

Statement of Problem

Pakistan since its creation has faced institutional imbalances because its roots go back to British. To rule in India and inherited administrative, legal and political legacies of British Raj. Talking about administrative and political point of view inherited highly imbalanced institutions having characteristics of strong and organized civil and military bureaucracies. Main reason for the institution imbalance is our weak political institution and non-democratic political parties which could not bring strong dynamic and sustainable political institutions, they were not strong enough to organized regular elections based on universal standard therefore failed to build trust and confidence among the masses about democracy, political democratic process could not be saved against the constitutional transgression, a conducive environment could not be provided for the politically elected democratic government to flourish to fulfill the desires and aspirations of the masses.

Muslim League the creator of Pakistan, its movement was not well planned and deep rooted politically mature that could offer post partition programme counter the power of the army and bureaucracy and to fulfill the desires and aspirations of masses immediately after independence.

It could not produced pure democratic leadership having love for democratic norms values and democratic culture. In the absence of elections on the base of universal standard, administrative supremacy facilitated bureaucracy to run the country from 1947 to 1958, this period was stamped as dummy parliaments, dissolution of assemblies were not democratic, inefficient, quarrelling, political intrigues, bickering and abrupt fast changing regimes.

Failure of political administration and bureaucratic regimes caused to create space for army into the political domain which was more organized, strong and disciplined, during the history of Pakistan four military regimes ruled and imposed martial law, political activities and parties were banned, censorship on media was imposed, assemblies were dissolved and constitution was suspended and abrogated. Military interference destroyed the political institutions.

Hypothesis

“Dishonest, inefficient and corrupt political governments create space for the military establishment to step into the arena of political governing system”

Methodology

This research will mainly be based on qualitative method. For this purpose, different methods will be adopted. Descriptive methods will be used to describe characteristics of Pakistani population, it's social cultural conditions to analyze the existing situation. This study will be based upon interviews, surveys interrogation; secondly through exploratory method effort will be made to understand the causes of the situation. Third, the approach will be explanatory method to explain and analyze the research problem.

Military regimes in Pakistan

The Ayub Khan Regime; the counter coup

In 1958 after seizing power, chief of Army staff Ayub Khan, he promoted himself to Field Marshal and Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces and General Mohammad Musa became the new Chief of Army Staff and he was witnessed as a compliant political officer. Compared to other military rules Ayub Kept the army at distance to run the day to day affairs of the country, and administration was largely handled by the bureaucracy he used to rely on, this was the reason many

senior officers did join military regime of Ayub and became ministers governors, Ayub by introducing “Basic Democracy” and the constitution 1962 replaced the parliamentary government. Basic Democracies bestowed legitimacy on Ayub rule and elected him as a president in 1960 to 1965, with the time, Ayub started relying more on civilians for the formulation of public policies, instead of his staff and corps commanders.

Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto was foreign minister during Ayub’s resigm, who became has closest confidents. On the other hand he gave the military significant high degree of autonomy with large increases in defense expenditures and for the modernization secured enormous U.S Military aid packages.

In 1964–65 first visible splits were seen between Ayub and the military. For the favorable path on Kashmir. Ayub, Bhutto and other started plotting a military solution. But military as an institution showed reluctance so the planning for operation was delegated to the joint civilian military cell by Ayub. This cell was influenced and dominated by Bhutto’s men from foreign officer and some intelligence officers. This cell undercut the military command and challenged its autonomy, power and unity. The regime’s plan had two phases the first was infiltration across the line of control (LOC) in to Indian held Kashmir through 30,000 guerrillas, and instigate an uprising. Second phase of the plan was, Army would cross the LOC and would captured strategic areas before the Indian Army could take action, having reservation about high risk of escalation. COAS Musa Khan and senior Army officer raised the objection to Ayub Khan about the plan’s success, which he dismissed. The army was confident in case of Indian army loses fight in Kashmir vale, they would counter attack on Punjab border and the army knew it was unlikely to win. According to military high command shirked in supporting planning for the war, and to General Malik’s divisional headquarters were delegated responsibility for the Kashmir operation’s planning and execution solely by general head quarters. And made no effort to notify its combat commanders or prepare the army and other services for war. Kashmir war 1965 ended with Pakistan’s bitter defeat but achieved some success in Kashmir. Indian counter attach into Punjab at that time Islamabad’s forces there, entirely unprepared, the military as an institution was already not in the favour of this planning got disappointed and became disenchanted with Ayub & Bhutto’s mishandling of the war. The poor generalship showed by the GHQ, totally disappointed senior combat commanders and mid level officers. In place of COAS Musa Khan, General Yahya Khan as a COAS was appointed, Breach rapidly diverged after the war between Ayub’s regime and military, furthermore political support also declined, resulted rise of political parties. Bhutto separated from Ayub Khan and established his own Pakistan people’s party (PPP) IN 1967 and larger popularity in Punjab west Pakistan and Awami League (AL) had a separatist agenda was on rise became threatening for the military regime. Popular opposition parties started demanding parliamentary democracy and soon Ayub’s Basic Democracy **collapsed** seek imposing marshal law, tried to suppress the violent mass protests. Army Chief Yahya Khan with the consensus of the Army was not willing to impose martial law on behalf of Ayub and instead staged counter coup. Ayub Khan had already lost the support of the Army active leaders finally resigned and handed over powers to Yahya Khan.

The General’s Revolt

The Yahya Khan Regime

In 1969 March Yahya Khan assumed the presidency from Ayub Khan. He gave entirely new shape “Military – as – Government” by promoting his close associates General Abdul Hamid Khan as Chief of Army Staff. General Yahya Khan himself wanted to address the underlying political

domestic issues of Pakistan, could not be solved since independence in order to extradite the military from direct power.

He announced free elections for National Assembly within 1970 and abrogated the constitution 1962 given by Ayub and proportional representation to East Pakistan compared to West Pakistan was guaranteed for the first time in Pakistan. Military on the other hand, had reservations to transfer political power to civilians because they had engaged in long term corporate business and did not want to put into risk and especially enfranchising the Bengalis, split between the various political parties showed throughout the each wing of country. There wasn't constitution in the country and the regime used to believe it could act as an arbiter among the divided parties and it could also protect the military corporate long term interest.

Election results totally derailed the military regime's plan, to withdraw in East Pakistan the Awami League got an outright majority except two seats. Bhutto in West Pakistan could win two thirds of the seats. Sweeping majority in East Pakistan by Awami League, issued six demands having regional autonomy based and East Pakistan's own Military. On the other hand Bhutto did not want to make a government with Awami League. negotiations were made between the parties and the regime, in March 1971 but failed, and indefinite delay of National Assembly was delivered. Awami League delivered East Pakistan as an independent state as Bangladesh and descended into open revolt. Excluding Bengal regiments, Yahya with the support of Army called a brutal military Creak down in the East wing. This situation turned into full scale civil war, during the course of nine months thousand of civilian were killed. Due to the massive flow of Bengali refugees into India, Indian Army in 1971 invaded East Pakistan to support Bangladeshi rebels. In early December 1971, Pakistan launched an invasion from West Pakistan into India in retaliation. India fought successfully along two fronts and captured a third of the Pakistan Army trapped in East Pakistan and forced Yahya to surrender, whole of the West Pakistan went into the core of grief. Yahya and his cadre wanted to remain in power but many of the Army Commanders and senior head quarters officers blamed Yahya's regime a complete disaster both for the country and the military prestige and morale to hit rock-bottom. Chief of General Staff (CGS) Lt Gen. Gul Hassan on the demands of many lower commanders, sent a threat to the regime, that tanks would roll into the capital and remove them from the seat if by next day Yahya and military-as-government would not resigned. Sub ordinate of Yahya COAS Gen. Hamid Khan represented himself as an acceptable replacement by senior officer corps but they rejected him. Yahya and Gen, Hamid had to resigned by late December 1971. Once the top leadership of the regime was removed, Gen. Gul Hassan was honored to be COAS and arrangement were made to transfer the power to Bhutto and the people's party and returned the military to the barracks after the down fall of East wing of Pakistan.

General Zia-ul-Haq Regime

In 1977, Bhutto rigged parliamentary elections in order to suppress opposition protests, attempted to have the military impose martial law but Zia-ul-Haq and the Army sized power, He wanted to have military-as- institution a stakeholder in his regime and did lots of efforts in the beginning of his regime. Zia was not expecting that he would be the head of the Army before the coup and respectfulness of the senior officer corps and used to solicit their policy view.

As Rizvi claims, "the key to the invulnerability of Zia-ul-Haq was the support he enjoyed from the senior army commanders".

Zia showed lots of favors in the form of incentives to the military in terms of personal pay, increased defense expenditures, residences, and huge tracts of agricultural land, bank loans and other side perks.

In 1980. Beginning military showed favor, for free elections to return to democracy. It wanted to go along with Zia's efforts as long as military's self interests were not threaten in 1984 referendum gave Zia president ship for five years term. Zia wanted to hold general election on non party basis in the coming year, and picked a civilian politician Muhammad Khan Junejo on his Prime Minister and the martial law was lifted. Zia had misperception about Junejo and legislature that they would fulfill the wishes of Zia but they proved to be more dynamic instead of being anticipated and refused to be act like rubber stamp. These differences in relationship brought political divisions within the military-as-government, where as for the opposition political parties, were a fuel for revival. Biggest Political Party that time PPP started demanding end of military rule to bring parliamentary democracy.

Between Zia and Junejo relations, military's corporate interests become tangled, disagreements arose over cabinet appointments, military spending, promotions, perks and Zia's dual hated role,

The military showed resentment about Junejo's Attitude, like an attack into its autonomy and Zia's inability to protect the military's corporate interests also interference into it's internal affairs, to save his own civilian government. Due to Zia's meddling and Junejo's forays caused an end of the military as government and the military-as-institution period of collaboration.

To save his civilian government, Zia civilianized his rule and kept himself distanced from the military as institution. Zia had to face disregard, for the rigid promotion system and interference in the Army's hierarchy showed blatant nepotism and an under mined the chain of command, Zia preferred to be surrounded himself with civilians and loyal officers, even he build Kinship alliances by marrying his children with some of those senior officers. Untrustworthy officers were denied promotions to key postings. Many active and retired officers were appointed, running the civilian bureaucracies so that they could not have command.

During his tenure Zia rotated there Vice Chief of Army Staff (V COAS) the last one was Gen. Mirza Aslam Beg appointed in 1987. Due to turn over of seniors at the top, Zia had to promote Junior officers on the senior posts, and stop taking political inputs and meeting with senior officers and with corps commanders and top-brass became infrequent Zia started preferring to meet with younger corps Commanders and Junior officers in private. By the summer 1988, too much political tension was within regime and between the regime and the military. An ISI munitions dump used to arm the Afghan mujahedeen, exploded in the populated military capital of Rawalpindi killed hundreds of civilians. To stop public outrage, Junejo demanded head of the ISI to regime and the directorate's former head who was the Zia's closest. In return Zia dismissed Junejo and dissolved the legislature without the consultation of VCOAS or corps commanders and ordered to seize key buildings and arrested civilian leaders of his government. Ignoring political setbacks and unrest, Zia planned for new elections to stay in power. In August 1988, Zia shortly after departing from a tank demonstration, along with most of his closest military aides and the U.S Ambassador to Islamabad, were killed in C-130 Crash. Soon after Zia's death, leadership was passed to VCOAS General Beg, within hours Beg, the Corps commanders and GHQ Staff made a unanimous decision to return to the barracks. A civilian caretaker government was appointed to hold free elections in November 1988, in which Benazir Bhutto regained the power to run the democratic parliamentary government of Pakistan.

The Musharraf Regime

In 1999 October, Chief of Army Staff General Pervez Musharraf, after seizing the power of civilian government under Nawaz Sharif, brought Pakistan's fourth military regime. Nawaz Sharif attempted to fire Musharraf amid rising civil military tension due to many reasons, Sharif's overtures of peace, to promote friendship and environments of good relationship to India and Military's provocation on the defeat in the Kargil war. Formative years of Musharraf regime in relations with military were preceded quite similar to Zia's early years of regime, defence budget was increased, other side benefits to the officer Corps. Musharraf showed full concern to keep intact with military's corporate interests, he was deferential toward his corps commanders, After anointed himself president of Pakistan and hold genuine elections for parliament with his own political party the Pakistan Muslim League Quide- Azim (PMLQ) and defeated PPP and PML Nawaz.

In 2006 was a crucial time for Pakistan because Army was engaged with the war against Pakistan Taliban and rural tribes aligned with al-Qaeda. Amid the backdrop of the escalating extremist violence, in 2007 the regime began to plan Musharraf's presidential election and parliamentary elections, military was not in the favour for support government, legality of the military regime was challenged by the supreme court, due to unconstitutional Musharraf dual role of as president and Chief of Army staff (COAS). Its ignited roits arose across the country due to suspending the highly respected Supreme Court in March, and lasted till his successful reelection in October. Protests gripped the major cities, demanding a return to democracy in Pakistan. Musharraf had no choice, due to domestic and U.S pressure he had to allow, the two major political parties PPP and PML-N to Contest the 2008, parliamentarian elections.

Due to his position as COAS, Supreme Court was totally against and threatened to invalid has reelection because of holding position as COAS also. Musharraf took sharp move and declared a national emergency, suspended the court again, abrogated the constitution and Army was ordered to quell the unrest.

Military it became against Musharraf's moves and the divisions grew between him and military within the period of two months emergency. It was extremely unrealistic to force the Army to step in to protect his political government due to which senior officers were extremely unhappy. Under such environments Musharraf had to resign from the post as COAS and retired from the army after country several weeks into the emergency Musharraf had to relinquish the title of COAS and leave the military while in office. This position was designated to General Ashfaq Pervez Kayani and tried to restore the prestige and unity in the military further Army would no longer jeopardize its corporate interests for Musharraf. All the active Army officers who were working at civilian posts were asked to resign and back to military service. A ban imposed on commanders and officers to have meetings with Musharraf or to play political role. Musharraf's survival into the political arena became on his own laurels. In the result Musharraf's resignation was demanded by hundreds of senior retired military officers, lost the support of military. He had support of his political regime but Army no more wanted to be military as government and returning back to the barracks. In January 2008 there were parliamentary elections between Musharraf's PML Q and all other opposition parties. There were strict orders for military and intelligence agencies be refrain from interference or rig the polls, from Kayani.

In the parliamentarian election, PPP and PML-N got the victory and Musharraf's party PML-Q was trounced. Due to newly formed hostile parliament and likely criminal charges from the Supreme Court, Musharraf had to face impeachment charges. At this difficult moment he got thought to

remove Kayani and dissolve the legislature, but he could not do so, due to back of army support within army.

Instead of fighting for impeachment charges, Kayani reportedly informed Musharraf to resign from the Chief executive post, and in return Army would secure him from prosecution. Then there self-nothing for Musharraf to stand on, he resigned from the presidency and Asif Ali Zardari leader of PPP became the president. Army went back to the barracks, contented and confident that its corporate interests were best served.

Directorate for Inter-Services Intelligence

It is Pakistan's intelligence agency that consolidated Military's power in Pakistan, it was established in 1948, between the three branches of the Armed forces it works independently to strengthen the sharing of Military intelligence, it has three wings.

- **Joint Intelligence Bureau**
- **Joint Signal Intelligence Bureau**
- **Joint Counter Intelligence Bureau**

The military keep an eye and maintains firm track of domestic and international conspiracies and happenings while launching secret operations against enemies, Joint Intelligence North (JIN) is another ISI branch which deals exclusively with India, to carry out operations in Jammu and Kashmir and Afghanistan as a primary responsibility.

National Security Council

In 2004 by General Pervez Mushraf during his presidency, chaired by president and Prime Minister of Pakistan. It is a consultative body, It's main function is to advise, assist the president and Prime Minister on foreign policies and national security matters through the National Security Council (NSC) Pakistan Army Chiefs have a permanent and legal political role. The NSC is established due to the efforts of military commanders.

Their legitimize role is not only to the extend of Pakistan's Security and defense affairs but also in governance, economy and society.

With the Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Committee as the Military Advisor and ISI Chief as the intelligence Advisor, the NSC has virtually made the Prime Minister and the Federal Cabinet Subordinate to its policies, in February 2009, Prime Minister Gillani tried to abolish the NSC but the proposal was rejected in the parliament and through presidential ordinance, its office was moved to president official residence Aiwan-e-Sadar. Now it is chaired by the president of Pakistan and has 21 members.

Pakistan's Military

Beside, Pakistan Military is extremely politicized has been a highly professional organization, having significant level of internal discipline and cohesion. In Pakistan the most powerful political and military position belongs to the Chief of Army Staff (COAS) General Raheel Sharif has currently filled this.

Analysis

Pakistan achieved independence from British rule in 1947, and has been four military coups and military rule for thirty years since then. The Pakistan Military is without any doubt indisputably the

most powerful political actor and one of the 'largest political party of Pakistan'. This is all due to the instability in the nation's political regimes, violent internal behavior and with more powerful neighbor. Amongst Pakistan politicians, there is a tendency to run to Army Generals or seek questionable constitutional options to destabilize ruling regimes, this promotes the role of Army as an arbiter in domestic politics, there are other factors as well Army does not accept democratic authority, inability of Judiciary not to question Army and Islamic preachers are against democratic politics. Corrupt civil administration creates the environment for a military takeover in Pakistan, During Zardari and Gilani administration, level of corruption attained new heights, among several other badly corrupt nations, according to Transparency International Report for the year 2010. According to the World Bank (WB) and Asian Development Bank (ADB) had contribution to the preparation of the report, revealed during the last 12 months, level of corruption in Pakistan had massively increased. This continues corruption promote disaffection towards the political government and provides just grounds for the military to be the only reliable and efficient institution to run the country and repeatedly overthrown weak Civilian governments For U.S policy makers, Pakistan has been a critically important state, due to its strategic regional power and geographical location, possesses nuclear weapons. During the "Cold War" Pakistan has served as a frontline state and again reemerged as front line state in the "War on Terror", as a hot-bed of Islamist groups including al-Qaeda, the United States has always favored the army over the politicians. In search of a strong leader, who could deliver what it wants from Pakistan. These are the main reasons Army's gradual and abrupt evolution into the domain of Pakistan's political system to destabilize the democratic process.

Conclusions

The two dependent variables, military intervention in and disengagement from the politics have two sides of the some theoretical problem, that are similarly rooted in the basic issues of civil-military intervention and disengagement. Military is an institutions, not the government to run the country but to safeguard, militaries are created by the societies for their protection while doing so endow them so much power that they in return become threatening for their creator societies. The elected civilian democratic government must exercise their control over military that has become the crux of the issue, that military should not have that kind of strength to usurp political authority. This is the time civilian government must work sincerely to regain, full Civilian institutional Control after being kicked to the curb by their militaries. Many scholars including Huntington between 1957 to 1968, Fiver in 1962, Norlinger in 1977, Thompson in 1975 Welch in 1976 and Luttwak in 1979 have addressed the causes frequency of military coups and typologies they came to have indentified many casual factors behind military coups, these factors separated into opportunities and motives. Under the opportunities factors coup arise, due to weakening of civilian regime, due to the act of corruption has lost its legitimacy, whether due to electoral fraud or political mischief's or it has ineptitude at governing.

Other coup opportunities can also be fashioned e.g floundering political process, external threats of security, internal threats of unrest or economic crises. Factors of motivation behind military coups are always committed on behalf of the national interest but actually having their own interests behind, sometimes military motivated to stage a coup to defend or advance a particular socioeconomic class or sectional group in society. Personal interests of the military leadership has another motivation regarding seeking greater political power, happiness or riches after seizing power, but one of the strongest motivation behind the coups, is to safeguard and preserve the

military's corporate self interest, based on hierarchical discipline or positions, military's autonomy organizational prestige, internal unity, privileges, access to resources and other aspects.

References

- 1) Larry J. Diamond, "Is Pakistan the (Reverse) Wave of the Future?" *Journal of Democracy* 11, no. 3 (July 2000).
- 2) Ayesha Siddiqa-Agha, *Military Inc.: Inside Pakistan's Military Economy* (London: Pluto Press, 2007), 60-61.
- 3) C. Christine Fair, "Why the Pakistan Army Is Here to Stay," *International Affairs* 87, no. 3 (2011): 583.
- 4) Mark J. Roberts, "Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence Directorate: A State within a State?" *Joint Force Quarterly*, 48, no. 1 (1st Quarter 2008).
- 5) Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 194-195.
- 6) Stepan, *Rethinking Military Politics*, 76
- 7) Nordlinger, *Soldiers in Politics*, 60.
- 8) -Paul Staniland, "The Poisoned Chalice: Military Culture, Contentious Politics, and Cycles of Regime Change in Pakistan." MIT Working Paper, 2009, 5-8.
- 9) - *Ibid.*, 8.
- 10) Mazhar Aziz, *Military Control in Pakistan: The Parallel State* (London: Routledge, 2008).
- 11) See Barbara Geddes, *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 73.
- 12) Stephen P. Cohen, *The Idea of Pakistan* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2004), 47-48.
- 13) Akbar Zaidi, "State, Military and Social Transition: Improbable Future of Democracy in Pakistan," *Economic and Political Weekly* 40, no. 49 (December 2005): 5173.
- 14) Shafqat, *Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan*, 58-66.
- 15) Stepan, "Paths toward Redemocratization," 76-77.
- 16) Sumit Ganguly, *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions since 1947* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 57-61.
- 17) Ganguly, *Conflict Unending*, 61.
- 18) Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, 73. Shafqat, *Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan*, 79.
- 19) Brian Cloughley, *War, Coups, and Terror: Pakistan's Army in Years of Turmoil* (New York: Skyhorse, 2008), 48.
- 20) Cloughley, *War, Coups, and Terror*, 48-52
- 21) Tim Johnson, "Pakistan military retreats from Musharraf's influence," *McClatchy*, January 18, 2008.

- 22) Carlotta Gall, "Military Retirees Demand Musharraf's Resignation, The New York Times, February 8, 2008.
- 23) Alfred Stepan, "Paths toward Redemocratization: Theoretical and Comparative Considerations," in *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy*, ed. Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, vol. 3 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 76-77.
- 24) One major exception to this was the military's ruthless crackdown in East Pakistan in 1971. Yet from the perspective that the possible breakup of Pakistan was a major threat to the military's corporate interests—defending the state's territorial integrity being its primary mission—can at least partly explain its willingness to engage in outright butchery on behalf of the Yahya regime. Shafqat, *Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan*, 61.