

THE MEANING AND EVOLUTION OF DEMOCRACY: THE DEMOCRATIC DEFICIT IN PAKISTAN

Prof. Dr. Tasneem Sultana

This Article is extracted from Ph.D Dissertation

Democracy has become the most widely accepted political system of our age. In ancient times societies were ruled by individuals who possessed wealth, physical strength or some sort of power. While these rulers were autocratic, for the sake of acceptance by the people they too took on board the powerful members of society and consulting them on important issues. Gradually, these powerful elite evolved into councils, estates and parliaments. The idea of consensus-seeking broadened and over the centuries the masses too became part of the system. Thus democracy was born.¹

The word 'democracy' has roots in two Greek words: demos (the people) and Kratos (strength). In simple terms, democracy means that the ultimate source of political power is the whole adult population of a country.² In 1863, US President Abraham Lincoln gave a succinct definition of democracy at Gettysburg, pa... Lincoln described democracy as "government of the people, by the people and for the people"³, and it becomes one of the most famous definitions of the term. In contemporary politics the term democracy is generally taken to mean universal suffrage, free elections and governance with the consent of the people of a country.⁴ In short, in a democracy the people have either a direct or indirect part in governance. However, the term also has another related connotation; it is used to measure the extent of influence of the people wield over their government, or how much freedom they enjoy.⁵ In the general meaning of the word democracy means rule by

¹ *Colliers Encyclopedia* 8 (New York: Macmillan Educational Company, 1986).

² David Robertson, *A Dictionary of Modern Politics* (London: Europa Publications, 1985), 302-3.

³ *Colliers Encyclopedia*, no.8 (New York: Macmillan Educational Company, 1986), 75.

⁴ Barrie Axford, Gary K. Browning, Richard Huggins and Ben Rosemond, *Politics: An Introduction*, 11nd edition (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 159.

⁵ Visit at <http://www.political-information.net/encyclopedia/democracy.htm>.

the people, which can be direct, participatory, or in representative form. In the present day world the term has begun to be used in a very wide sense, to an extent that political systems that have hardly any or no participation by the people, also claim to be democracies.⁶ In a modern democracy the people elect their representatives among candidates from various political parties, who if they get the requisite number of votes, then become members of the legislature. In this manner the people transfer political power to their elected representatives. There are three aspects of democracy e.g. political, social, and economic but there is ample proofs to say that if political democracy prevails over long periods of time in a state, it also result in democracy in the socio-economic realms.⁷ John Dunn opines that democracy has a linkage with liberalism and freedom but with the upholding of human rights and the manifestation of economic prosperity.⁸ George Sorensen holds the view that to measure democracy in a country, one must assess the conditions prevalent in its economy, society and institutions.⁹

Robert Dahl has given an exhaustive list of yard sticks for a successful democracy. These yardsticks include institutions that guarantee sustenance of democracy, allow people's participation; voting equality; an electorate which is fairly educated, and universal adult franchise.¹⁰

The fulfillment of these benchmarks ensures that stable democratic institutions develop that elected officials are answerable to the representative government; that election are frequently held and are free, that citizens are allowed to freely express themselves, that citizens have access to sources of information other than those provided by the state, that there is freedom to form associations and maintain their autonomy and that citizenship is inclusive.¹¹

Including free and fair elections, the modern democracy also emphasizes on freedom of press; the rule of law; freedom of speech and assembly; the right

⁶ Lyman Tower Sargent, *Contemporary Political Ideologies: A Comparative Analysis*, 8th edition (California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1990), 37.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ John Dunn, *Democracy* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2005), 16-20.

⁹ Sorensen, *Democracy and Democratization* (Aarhus: Westview Press, 2008), 3.

¹⁰ Robert Dahl, *On Democracy* (New York: Yale University Press, 1998), 37.

¹¹ Ibid, 85-86.

to take up a job of one's choice and, most importantly to be able to oppose the government if one so chooses.¹² The Western concept of democracy is based on the assumption that the people are capable of knowing what is in their best interests, and must therefore have the freedom to air their opinions.¹³

In the Marxist concept of democracy, on the other hand, it is assumed that only small ruling elite, since they are well versed in Marxist ideology, know the needs of the people and must therefore have the power to make decisions on their behalf.¹⁴

According to Communist beliefs, the basic ingredients of Western democracy, i.e. liberty of speech, press, equality before the law, and other basic civil liberties are superfluous, and real democracy only prevails under the Communist system, when the state takes over the means of production.¹⁵ According to Marx, Democracy does not only mean the people's participation in decision making on governance matters but also involvement in ordinary issues like workplace problems and recreational movements etc.¹⁶

The Islamic and Western concepts of democracy have some parallels. The basic principles of liberal democracy can be gleaned from many of the *Quranic* verses. Islam is considered as a comprehensive code of life. Only credible leaders in an Islamic polity run the government. In Islam, the leaders are supposed to shun self-appreciation and avoid seeking continuation of their rule. Leaders are selected to govern on behalf of the community. The most essential condition of Western democracy i.e. a credible system of elections also has affinity with Islamic norms. For decision on community matters the *Quran* enjoins mutual consultation, or *Shura*. While the Islamic system seems in tune with the Western notion of representative democracy, there is a significant difference: Islam stands for mutual consultation, but not with all and sundry. The *Shura* is supposed to comprise a group of persons

¹² *Colliers Encyclopedia*.

¹³ *Ibid*.

¹⁴ *Ibid*.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, 76.

¹⁶ Geriant Parry and Michael Moran (eds.), *Democracy and Democratization* (London & New York: Routledge, 1994), 4.

who are knowledgeable about the affairs of the community, educated, well-versed in the *Quran* and the *Sunnah*, wise, sincere, and honest.

As in Western democracy, the Islam too provides a meticulous system of public accountability of the leaders. The *Quran* clearly instructs that the government should run through consensus, and not in an arbitrary manner.¹⁷

Equality and freedom, the other essential elements of a democratic polity, are also considered important in Islam. The idea of free will entails freedom. The *Quran* encourages human beings to form social and political groups. But unlike in Western liberal thought, Islam imposes some restrictions in socialization. These restrictions cover morality, ethics and spirituality.¹⁸

Sovereignty of Allah is settled by Islam, which is in consonance with the basic spirit of the concept of oneness of Allah (*Towheed*). There is no space for priesthood or clergy, and no one represent Allah on earth.

The period of the four pious caliphs, the *Khulfa-i-Rashideen*, in Islamic history may be broadly termed 'Islamic' while the eras that came after the four *Khulfa* are 'Muslim' and not 'Islamic'. A completely un-Islamic system of governance emerged, in the post-Caliphate era, i.e. hereditary kingship. In spirit as well as in form it was the anti-thesis of Islam. Islam rejects hereditary leadership and instead emphasizes the consensual selection of leaders of noble qualities. Therefore, the period that spans governance by the Holy Prophet (PBUH) followed by four pious caliphs is relevant, in any debate on Islam-democracy interface or even Islamic democracy, but not the one classified as the Muslim period.

However, virtually all countries across the globe claim that they are democratic. The undemocratic regimes whether civilian or military also insisted that they are actually striving to establish democracy. Thus from the twentieth century onwards, dictators have tried to fool people with some new fanged formulations such as 'guided democracy', 'people's democracy' or even the 'people's democratic dictatorship'.¹⁹

¹⁷ An-Nisa'a 4:59.

¹⁸ Al-Hujrat 49:13.

¹⁹ Ibid ; R. Hanson, 'Democracy', in T. Ball, J. Ferr and R. Hanson (eds.), *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change* (Cambridge University Press, 1989), 68.

The ancient Greeks, who conceived democracy, perceived it as only one amongst several types of political orders. It is considered by Plato and Aristotle as a freakish phenomenon, an anomaly from the standard of good government. The philosophers did not consider it worthy of being equated with popular self government.²⁰ The Greek did not present any clear guidelines for building a democratic state or a democratic system.²¹

Origins and evolution of democracy

In ancient times, untrammled societies were ruled by persons with wealth, physical strength or spiritual power. They enjoyed power over the subjects, but even they had to work for the well-being of those they ruled. The rulers, governed according to their values and precedence. In this regard the influential members of society were consulted. Gradually, the consulted groups evolved into cabinets. Later, the citizen's involved in consensus-seeking and this is how modern democracy came into being.

Democracy's birth place was ancient Greece, particularly Athens. In the Greek city-state, there was direct democratic self-government. The people voted on major issues. Parliaments, cabinets and civil servants were non-existent. Officials were selected by lot, but slaves and women did not have the right to vote.²²

Democracy was not praised by Plato. He held the view that people did not have the intellectual capacity to participate in governance. Plato favored entrusting government to a small elite group of highly trained men, the 'philosopher-kings', who were of superior moral fiber and intellectual capacities.²³

Though Aristotle was more sympathetic towards Democracy than Plato, he believed it a corrupt form of government. While he was convinced that government should be comprised of educated and wealthy people, the majority of the people could not be ignored in the formation of government. Aristotle's emphasis was on the rule of law, rather than the rule of men, for

²⁰ Geriant Parry, *Democracy and Democratization*, 2.

²¹ G. Sartori, *The Theory of Democracy Revisited* (Chatham: Chatham House, 1987), 279.

²² *Colliers Encyclopedia*, 80.

²³ *Ibid.*

he is considered one of the pioneering philosophers of the Western tradition of constitutional government.²⁴

Athens (which led the Delian League of democratic city-states) met with defeat by a rival league, led by Sparta in 404 BC. This league comprised entities that had oligarchic polities. Later, all the oligarchies and democratic city-states became part of the Roman Empire.²⁵

The Romans inspired by Greeks established their first assembly called *comitia curiata*. Later, when Rome had a bigger population, the Romans restructured a much larger assembly, including members from the Army. Most of the decisions on the governance were taken by the assembly called *comitia centuriata*.

The Roman assembly consisted chiefly of the prosperous free male citizens and soldiers. The senate was the main legislative body which passed the laws, and the assembly members were also selected by it. The assembly members elected the consuls. Thus, senate was the most powerful body. The Roman system of governance lacked a credible system of checks and balances among the senate, the assembly and, the consuls.

The early Roman republic was somewhat democratic but the Patricians (the wealthy aristocratic families) and the system of clientalism in which every senate member in Roman republic had some clients, followers, who gave unquestioned loyalty and their vote to the senator, and in return got full protection, greatly weakened the democratic features and they also kept away the number of citizens from governance. The Republic died when Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus Augustus gradually obtained all the powers from the Senate and declare himself Emperor.

Having retraced history in the above, we can safely say that Europe was the birthplace of democracy. When in the thirteenth century, Aristotle's *Politics* translated in Latin then Europe came to know how the government was run in Athens or how Aristotle thought about democracy or when Aristotle began to be read by the educated elite, they came to know that the great philosopher considered democracy as a corrupt form of government.²⁶

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Nathaniel Harris, *Democracy*, 14.

²⁶ Geriant Parry, *Democracy and Democratization*, 24.

The main instruments of change in Europe were Renaissance and enlightenment. In Renaissance the learning of ancient Greece and Rome was revived. The ancient texts were translated in local languages, attracting a wider readership. The knowledge of the middle ages was rediscovered. Europe began to emerge from the Middle Ages, which is also called the dark ages.

The invention of the printing press spread the ancient text at much larger scale which brought changes in Europe. The Protestant Movement which divided the Church also contributed in a direct and indirect manner to the rise of democracy. In Europe, though Martin Luther, who led the Protestant Movement, did not find democracy a viable form of government. He believed in the authority of prince.²⁷ Although after long bloody religious wars both Catholics and Protestants finally learnt to coexist peacefully. With the passage of time, tolerance also adopted as a fundamental norm of politics.

The English Parliament adopted the trail blazing Bill of Rights in 1689, which became the precursor in other countries too. The Bill of Rights stressed upon the citizen's freedom in governmental matters and religion. The parliament also obtained supremacy after the Bill of Rights. But the democratic norms took long time; the immediate outcome was the aristocratic government.²⁸

In April 1775, the armed colonists of America exchanged fire with the imperial British authorities, and after a long struggle the American colonists got independence. The American colonies under George Washington's leadership formed the United States of America. He was the founder who formulated an identity for the US and institutionalize a competitive electoral democracy, and established a republic. John Locke and Montesquieu, the writers of American constitution, proposed a balance of power between the three branches of government – the executive, the legislature and the judiciary.

The French revolution of 1789 radically transformed the social order in France and changed the face of democracy by establishing government for

²⁷ *Colliers Encyclopedia*, 80.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

the first time in Europe by the people.²⁹ Liberty, equality and fraternity the slogans of revolution changed the thinking in France, and also impacted people's thought processes in the whole of Europe. The French Revolution completely abolished feudalism from Europe, a main hindrance in the way democracy. The monarchy persisted but wounded state. Thus, the French revolution spread democratic ideas and popular sovereignty in Europe.

Popular sovereignty is a modern phenomenon, which confers legitimacy on political institutions that did not exist in the Grecian polity. As pointed out earlier, ancient Athenian democracy did not give representation to the masses. Representation of the masses in government began only in the nineteenth century.

The Congress of Vienna (1815) after the Napoleonic wars halted the revolutionary ideals and restored the old order of Europe. The revolutions of 1830 and 1848 again revived the idea of democracy though in its initial form. Another milestone in democracy was the Industrial Revolution which gave birth to the middle class, which gradually pressed for universal suffrage. This middle class also established political parties and different types of unions. Democracies were working well, though slowly, when the First World War engulfed the world.

The war ended with the defeat and collapse of the German, the Austro-Hungarian and the Ottoman empires. In 1919, the Weimar Republic replaced Germany's Kaiser and his supporters – the Junkers (the land owning aristocratic military class). Several new states emerged in Eastern Europe and the Baltic region. All of these were committed to democracy, but in different degrees. Women were enfranchised in most of the old and new states.

Political parties emerged in the European democracies, essentially represented the industrial working class. They adopted names such as the Social Democratic Party, the Socialist Party or the Labour Party. Their aim was to eventually change the economic system, from Capitalism to Socialism, but not through revolution. In this way they differed from the Marxist school of thought.

²⁹ Ibid, 25.

The socialist democrats and the other brand of socialists argued that political democracy was meaningless unless accompanied by economic democracy, which would assure a reasonably comfortable standard of living, adequate education, security against destitution and leisure for citizens.³⁰

The Communist revolution in Russia during the First World War overthrew the Russian monarchy and its appendage the privileged aristocracy, bringing into power the Bolsheviks led by V. I. Lenin. In the inter-war years in Italy, the Fascist party led by Benito Mussolini, seized power. Similar movements arose in some other European countries, particularly Germany and fascism became a scourge which threatened to take over Europe, in fact the world, in its stranglehold.

Fascism was ultra-nationalistic, racist and militaristic, and after the Great Depression found the continental soil fertile for its growth. In 1933, Adolf Hitler riding the wave of nationalism and the spirit of revenge led the Nazi party to power in Germany.

The aggressiveness and expansionism of the fascist regimes led to the Second World War, in which the democratic states of Europe along with the Soviet Union confronted the fascist-ruled countries. The US entered the fray later. Though the fascist era lasted less than a quarter century, it wrought immense havoc on the socio-political and economic structures of Europe. Fascism could only be dislodged through an all out war against the three main fascist powers Germany, Italy, and Japan.

After the war, the parliamentary system was adopted by the West European countries, which had been under fascist regimes or Nazi occupation. Democracy soon became well-entrenched in Western and Nordic Europe.

The Soviet Union, imposed 'people's democracies' on East and Central Europe which it had liberated from fascism. It then became the Soviet Union's aim to spread Communism throughout the world. World affairs were then dominated by two opposing power blocs one led by the Soviet Union and the other by the US. For nearly 45 years, the liberal democratic West and the Communist East confronted each other in what is known as the Cold War. The Cold War ended in 1989-1991 with the collapse of the

³⁰ David Thomson, *Europe Since Napoleon* (London: Penguin, 1990), 130.

Communist regimes in Central and East Europe and the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

Soviet-style Communism enforced one-party rule, strengthened by the KGB, the secret police and made it possible for an individual and his clique to exercise dictatorial powers.³¹

After the dismemberment of Soviet Union the former Communist countries of East and Central Europe and the former states of Soviet Union adopted the Western multi-party political model. The Eastern European states succeeded in completing their transitional phase and several of them have now become members of the European Union and NATO.

The failure of Communism in the last decade of the twentieth century invalidated the totalitarian system and encouraged democratic movements in various parts of the world.

Hindrances to democracy

After the Second World War, circumstances forced Britain, France and other European powers to give independence to their colonies in Asia and Africa. The departing colonial powers, set up parliamentary system of governance in these countries, but few of these thrived. Several reasons can be cited for the failure of democracy in the developing world. Among the most prominent causes was dictatorship, mass poverty, illiteracy, political inexperience, ethnic and regional conflicts and the selfish agendas of the former colonial masters and the bloc politics, which emerged after the Second World War.

Though, most of the newly independent countries abandoned democracy after brief experiments, they preferred to proclaim themselves as democracies to gain respectability in the comity of nations. The regimes in power added some superfluous words with democracy such as 'peoples', 'social', 'Islamic', 'basic', 'guided', 'controlled', etc. This trend became so widespread and the results were so dismal that the Western democracies now make it a point to distinguish themselves from what they perceive (but

³¹ Ibid, 45.

may not say so) as sham democracies. Thus, the Western democracies call themselves 'liberal' democracies.³²

There is an ongoing struggle to establish democracy in many developing countries. Although one-party rule, dictatorships and absolute monarchies still exist, a semblance of multi-party democracy has been introduced in some countries.³³

The case of Pakistan

Pakistan, before the 1947, was part of the British Indian Empire and under direct British rule. It inherited the imperial system in which the governmental system revolved around the crown and the people were deemed its subjects. The modern idea that the government is there to serve the people and not the other way around never took roots in Pakistan. The tribal-feudal culture of this part of sub-continent further promoted the master-servant relationship between the government and the people. The British Raj in India granted lands to their supporters and the land owners formed a new feudal class in British India. The elders of the most powerful *Zamindar*, *Jagirdar* families and the tribal chiefs etc. became the de facto rulers in their respective areas and the rest of the people became their subjects. The 'elder' became wholesale in charge of his area; he was governor, the judge and the bank – all in one.

To ensure the smooth running of government, in urban areas the British imperial government created a class of loyal civil servants, who unquestioningly implemented the vice-regal system. The military was another highly organized group in British India. Their training and discipline on lines of the British army and the gifts of land conferred on them, made them not only loyal to the British Raj, but also powerful.

The British consciously encouraged the class system and the 'Bara Sahib'--Gentry culture. Therefore, mass-elite culture developed in Pakistan which further widened the gap between them -- the elite and the masses. With the decision making powers in public affairs resting in the hands of the elites,

³² John Pinder, *Foundations of Democracy in the European Union* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 1999), 1.

³³ David Thomson, 54.

the masses were gradually completely sidelined from political matters.³⁴ Thus the democratic culture in Pakistani society never took roots. The political elites mobilized the masses only when they needed to attain their political objectives against a rival group.³⁵

The Government of India Act 1935, which was inherited by Pakistan, gave some provincial autonomy but also gave veto power to the governors with which the latter could control all legislation and suspend the elected government itself. At the district level all administrative departments were answerable to the District Commissioner, thus centralizing all bureaucratic power in the hands of a few civil servants.³⁶

Furthermore, a separate Public Service Commission ensured the organizational autonomy of the bureaucracy. Therefore, the political authority had no say in the appointments, promotions, transfers and disciplinary questions of the bureaucracy. The latter institution emerged very strong and influential in the early years of Pakistan and some of the top bureaucrats acquired the most powerful political positions. Thus it was in their interest to encourage the concentration of power in the Executive.³⁷

The 1935 Government of India Act, which was to be a temporary constitution, was kept intact, the feudal class became more powerful in the rural areas and the bureaucracy dominated the urban areas. The two decided that it was in their interest to maintain the status quo in the newly independent country.

Pakistan's political independence coincided with the onset of the Cold War and a bipolar world, where the rival superpowers were competing with each other to win the allegiance and support of the newly independent states and

³⁴ B. K. Nehru, "Western Democracy and the Third World", in A. A. Kadeer and Naveed Ahmad (eds.), *Europe and the Third World* (Karachi: ASCE, 1985), 101.

³⁵ Arshad Syed Karim, "Impact of Political Culture on Foreign Policy Decision Making: A Comparative Study of Pakistan and Europe" in A. A. Kadeer and Naveed Ahmad Tahir (eds.), *Pakistan-Europe Ties: In Contemporary Setting* (Karachi: ASCE, 1988), 124.

³⁶ Zainul Abedin, *Local Administration and Politics in Modernizing Societies: Bangladesh and Pakistan* (Dacca: 1975), 33.

³⁷ Mohammad Waseem, "European colonialism and institutionalization of third world state", in *Europe and the Third World*, 44-45.

were keen to involve them in the geopolitical game. This also diverted the attention of these states from issues of development.³⁸

The imposition of Army rule in Pakistan in 1958, though apparently a domestic issue became part of the great game of the US along with India and the USSR to encircle the emerging Communist giant China. Ideological differences between the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union came out in the open in 1956 and eventually convinced the two superpowers that despite their rivalry it would be better for them to try to coexist in a peaceful manner. It was considered beneficial for the global balance of power in both Moscow and Washington. After a showdown over borders India and China began to strive for the leadership of Asia.

The leadership in Pakistan apparently had no choice but to seek borrowed strength to enhance its defense and economic capability by becoming part of the Cold War.

The elites in Pakistan, comprised of politicians, the military, landowners, businessmen, civil servants and the intelligentsia have always favored the status quo, and instead of mobilizing domestic resources their focus has been on securing loans and grants from the developed world. Those in government have concentrated on superficial development to entice the aid givers, instead of genuine development.³⁹

The radical and revolutionary European ideas of equality, fraternity and liberty attracted small groups of Western educated elites who used these ideas to form local movements for change.

In the least developed countries very few are experiencing democracy and where there is democracy it does not meet the standards of Western liberal democracy. Though each developing country has its own characteristics and peculiarities, they all have one thing in common and that is poverty. Most of the Third World countries fall below the poverty line. Besides several other causes of their inability to overcome poverty and under-development, two other very important reasons are ethnic strife and involvement in border

³⁸ Najmul Saqib Khan, "Non-Economic Factors in Development", in Naveed Ahmad Tahir (ed.), *Relations between the European Union and the Muslim world in the Contemporary Geopolitical and Economic Scenario* (Karachi: ASCE, 2003), 249.

³⁹ B. K. Nehru, "Western Democracy and the Third World", 104.

disputes with neighboring countries which are colonial legacies. This forces them to use the bulk of their resources on security.⁴⁰

In the sub-continent, the Britishers adopted the stratagem of 'divide and rule'. For instance, they supported one ethnic and religious group while marginalizing others. Those groups were favored who demonstrated loyalty to the Raj. Large tracts of state lands were allotted to loyal subjects, these were known as *Jagirs*. Thus a system of hereditary landlordism was firmly established. Interestingly while India got rid of this legacy of British imperialism, in Pakistan it is till strongly entrenched and the feudal class continues to have a strong hold on politics.

After partition the ruling junta in Pakistan neither had the will nor the capability to change or modify injustices which had become endemic in many of its regions. They kept intact much of the colonial system in every realm.

The British also designed an education system for their colonies which created small elite groups which enabled the latter to master the English language and way of thinking, while the vast majority of the subjects only had access to schools which used indigenous languages as medium of instruction. Those who studied from these schools had little chance of getting into the civil service. The poorest of the poor were taught in religious schools. This three tiered system of education created a strongly entrenched class system. Again the so-called leaders continued this class system in Pakistan, which resulted in fragmentation and disharmony in society.

Soon after independence, the powerful lobbies and groups grabbed all power and resources, but were not sincerely interested in making Pakistan a truly independent and progressive country. They deliberately kept out the people from all levels of decision-making.⁴¹ The people's potential was never allowed to blossom. Moreover, with borrowed money and artificial

⁴⁰ Kamal Matinuddin, "Ethnic conflict in Asia and Africa – A legacy of European colonialism", in Naveed Ahmad Tahir (ed.), *The Role of Europe in Conflict Resolution, Conflict Management, Peace Building and Peace Keeping from the Balkans to South East Asia* (Karachi: ASCE, 2006), 242-243.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

prosperity the ruling elite spent lavishly. Resources were mostly used for non-productive and non development sectors.⁴²

In a democratic setup political leadership and bureaucracy are closely linked. The public servant or bureaucrat in the performance of his duties is answerable to the political leaders. Thus, we can say that while the policy parameters are decided by the political forces the implementation is done by the bureaucrats. This arrangement has resulted in enhancement of the interdependence of politics and administration.⁴³ In the Third World, the politicians not only make policies but also taken upon themselves the implementation. In some cases senior bureaucrats possessing the knowledge and the relevant experience even help in formulating policies, for the politicians are incapable and inexperienced. The bureaucrats found the opportunity ripe to meddle in politics and began playing the role of king makers and later even became kings.

Most of the developing countries are a victim of poor governance. This lack of good governance has a direct adverse impact on economic performance. There are losses in government revenues, reduced private and foreign investment, less capital inflow, and lower growth rate. The developing countries can ill-afford to bear such economic losses.

Most developing countries have not been able to come out of the ruler-subject syndrome which is totally outdated in the developed Western countries, the states, which got independence after the Second World War are mired in the worst sort of nepotism and corruption. The principle of accountability has been rendered superfluous.

The vice regal style of governance adopted by the bureaucracy and the politicians has resulted in the alienation of the masses from the political system. Those in power expect unquestioning obedience from their 'subjects' and also expect them to meekly accept whatever treatment they choose to mete out to them. The evolution of a centralized state and the attitude of unquestioning authority has hampered the growth of viable political parties, muzzled the freedom of expression, and made redundant the system of checks and balances.

⁴² Mian Mumtaz Abdullah, "Political Rulership and Bureaucracy in Pakistan: The pattern the British left behind and subsequent developments", in Naveed Ahmad Tahir (ed.), *Ibid.*, 38.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 40.

There are no training schools for those wanting to pursue political career. The leaders are not even qualified as law makers or administrators. So the obvious result is poor decision making and poor governance. There is a need to change the system by allowing only the most capable, to exercise power in the larger interest. For this to happen there is need to discipline and educate the masses, who must be able to differentiate between charlatans and genuine persons and between demagogues and leaders.

Family based politics is one of the main features of the political system in Pakistan as in other developing states. Pakistan has a multi party system, with two major parties and several smaller ones at the national level, but nearly all the political parties have a dynastic character and are run by individuals or by families in an arbitrary style. Democratic culture is thoroughly lacking within the parties. There are no elections for the party cadres and the ordinary party members can never challenge party leader. Thus, parties are run like personal fiefdoms of their leaders. Frustration owing to lack of inner party democracy has resulted in the formation of splinter groups in nearly every major party in Pakistan. Uneven political development in rural and urban areas of Pakistan is a major hindrance in the growth of national level parties, as most of the parties are urban-based. This leaves the rural population at the mercy of the feudal lords. This practice has strengthened the position of the feudal in national politics.

The political parties should first of all practice internal democracy, which would enhance their credibility; political leaders should prepare their party workers to take on major responsibilities. Besides, it is the parties which should convert the masses towards progressive thinking and positive change instead of giving in to reactionary and traditionalist thinking.

The civil society nurtures the political society. The civil society in developing countries often supports the transition from authoritarian to representative government and also helps strengthen democracy by encouraging citizen's participation in the political process. Luckily Pakistan has a vibrant civil society which has steered the country out of difficult situations. Pakistan experienced four martial laws and at least one authoritarian civilian regime. The authoritarian rulers could only be gotten rid of, after some sort of popular mass movement and the civil society, each time, played an important role in these movements.

Corruption – the usurpation of public resources / funds and graft has consistently increased since the last four decades. Though, in the fifties and sixties it existed, it was confined to the high level officialdom and the economic and political elites. The middle class and lower middle class which were largely uninfected by this scourge, have, in recent decades also been drawn toward it. Bribery, embezzlement and other money-related crimes have become common.

Successive governments whether democratic or authoritarian, have been accused of corrupt practices, though also set up commissions or institutions to contain it. However, owing to lack of will, these institutions have not been result oriented.

Pakistan since its inception, developed dependence on foreign assistance, particularly on US aid. Pakistan, like several other newly independent countries, became a victim of neo-colonialism, which meant control of a country without direct occupation. It can be safely said that the US never played a significant role in the socio-economic development of the country, or in the development of its institutions. The US aid was only meant for achieving Washington's own immediate foreign policy objectives or to prolong dictatorial regimes, which could be more easily manipulated.

Conclusion

For a viable and true democracy the elitist and parochial culture, which has been a very important stumbling block in the development of parliamentary democracy should be abolished. The lack of a uniform educational system in the country for instance is perpetuating this culture. On the other hand, tribalism and feudalism have such a strong hold over the Pakistani polity that instead of moving towards progress, Pakistan is being deliberately pulled backwards by such elements. No country with a predominantly tribal-feudal culture can become truly democratic nor can it get rid of poverty and illiteracy. Poverty and illiteracy are hindrances in the development of democracy.

The rule of law should be strictly followed where everyone is considered equal before the law.

A well-entrenched local government system is the need of hour, which will provide not only on job training for Assembly members, but will also produce leadership from below. Moreover, the masses have to be involved in decision making process because participatory governance is a must. There must be genuine inner party democracy in political parties; for a family led party cannot be considered as a democratic party.

The educated class has always viewed politics as a game for the corrupt and the plunderers and not for the virtuous and the straight forward. Until and unless, the professionals and the scholars take part in politics in large numbers, the rules of game will remain the same.