

Democracy in Pakistan: A Critical Review Through the Lens of Dr. Israr Ahmed and Western Philosophers

Zoaib Mirza

Abstract—Pakistan is an Islamic country that got its partition from India in 1947 so that the people could practice the religion of Islam. The political slogan to strive for independence was “What does Pakistan mean? There is no God but Allah”. The ideology of Pakistan was based on the notion that sovereignty only belonged to God Almighty (in Arabic, God means “Allah”), and Muslims will live in accordance with Islam principles. The Quran (Holy Book) and Sunnah (authentic practices of Prophet Mohammad, Peace Be Upon Him, that explains the application of the Quran) are foundations of the Islamic principles. It has been over 75 years, but unfortunately, Pakistan, due to its own political, social, and economic mistakes, is responsible for not being able to become a true Islamic nation to justify its partition from India. The rationale for writing this paper is to analyze the factors that led to changes in the democratic movements impacting the country's political, social, and economic growth. The methodology to examine the historical and political context of Pakistan's history is by referencing the scholarly work of Israr Ahmed. He focused on Islamic theology, philosophy, and studies, offering insights into the historical and political context of the country. While from a Western perspective, Karl Marx, Mar Weber, Hannah Arendt, Sheldon Wolin, Paulo Freire, and Jacques Ranciere's philosophies specific to totalitarianism, politics, military rule, religion, capitalism, and superpower are used as the framework to analyze Pakistan's democracy. The study's findings conclude that Pakistan's democracy is unstable and has been impacted by military and civilian governance, which led to political, social, and economic downfall. To improve the current situation, the citizens of Pakistan have to realize that the success of a nation is only dependent on the level of consciousness of the leader and not the political system. Therefore, it is the responsibility of every citizen to be conscious of how they select their leader and take responsibility for the current situation in Pakistan.

Keywords—Pakistan, Islam, democracy, totalitarianism, military, religion, capitalism.

I. BACKGROUND

UNDERSTANDING the current democratic conditions in Pakistan requires a deep dive into the historical context of how Pakistan emerged as a sovereign nation in 1947. The journey to independence was marked by various historical events and political developments, reflecting the complexities of a diverse society striving for self-determination.

For over a thousand years, the Indian subcontinent was under the rule of various Muslim dynasties, with the Mughals being the last significant empire to govern India from 1526 until 1857. This legacy of Muslim rule played a crucial role in shaping the religious and cultural landscape of the region [25]. The fall of the Mughal Empire as explained by [31] in 1857 paved the way for British colonial rule in India. What began as a quest for trade eventually turned into a full-fledged colonization. During their

dominion, the British Empire appeared to favor Hindus in various aspects of life. This preference fueled tensions between Hindus and Muslims, as Muslims increasingly perceived themselves as a marginalized and disadvantaged group [26].

Allama Iqbal, often referred to as the "Spiritual Father of Pakistan," was a polymath and visionary figure. Reference [27] explained that he introduced a compelling vision to the Muslim population, urging them to aspire to an independent Islamic nation as a counterforce to Arab imperialism. Iqbal's concerns were twofold: he feared that secularism in India would erode the spiritual foundations of Islam and the cultural heritage of Muslims. Moreover, he believed that the Hindu-majority population posed a threat to Muslim culture, political influence, and heritage.

World War II as defined by [28] was a turning point that exacerbated political differences between the Indian National Congress (commonly known as the Indian Congress) and the Muslim League. The Indian Congress, led by figures like Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, demanded immediate independence as a precondition for supporting the British war effort. In contrast, the Muslim League, under the leadership of Mohammad Ali Jinnah, extended its support to the British during the war. These divergent stances highlighted the growing divide between the two major political entities. During the 1940s, the Muslim League initiated the Tehrik-e-Pakistan campaign, a religious and political movement aimed at achieving a Muslim-majority nation where the practice of Islam could flourish. Under the astute leadership of Mohammad Ali Jinnah, a prominent politician and lawyer, the Muslim League pursued the cause of an independent Muslim state with remarkable determination [29].

In the pivotal 1946 elections, the Muslim League secured the majority of Muslim votes and reserved Muslim seats in both central and provincial assemblies. This electoral success was achieved against opposition from various quarters, including the British, Hindu leaders such as Gandhi and Nehru, and even some Muslim leaders like Abul Kalam Azad.

The relentless efforts led by Mohammad Ali Jinnah culminated in the creation of Pakistan in 1947, earning him the revered title of the "Founder of Pakistan" [1]. This marked a historic moment when a new nation emerged from the struggles and aspirations of its people.

II. POST PARTITION

After achieving independence in 1947, Pakistan embarked on a journey of nation-building. Liaquat Ali Khan took on the role

Zoaib Mirza is with DePaul University, USA (e-mail: zmirza@depaul.edu).

of the first prime minister, while Mohammad Ali Jinnah served as the first Governor General. This early period in Pakistan's history was marked by significant political and ideological developments.

In March 1949, the Constitution Assembly of Pakistan, under the leadership of Liaquat Ali Khan, adopted the Objective Resolution. This resolution laid out a set of principles, emphasizing the sovereignty of God Almighty as the ultimate authority. It outlined a commitment to implementing democratic values, freedom, equality, tolerance, and social justice, all in accordance with the teachings of the Quran (the Holy Book) and the Sunnah (authentic practices of Prophet Mohammed, Peace Be Upon Him). The Objective Resolution also guaranteed religious freedom for minorities, allowing them to freely profess and practice their faiths [2].

According to [1], the Objective Resolution represented the last significant initiative aimed at upholding the fundamental purpose behind the creation of an independent Muslim nation. It encapsulated the aspirations of the people of Pakistan, emphasizing the fusion of Islamic principles with democratic governance.

In the post-independence era, Pakistan has experienced fluctuations between civilian and military rule. The challenges of governance, particularly in managing both East and West Pakistan (now Bangladesh and Pakistan, respectively), created difficulties for the early leaders. This eventually led to the first imposition of martial law, which spanned from 1958 to 1971.

Pakistan's political history has been characterized by a series of democratic and military periods. The second democratic era emerged from 1972 to 1977, followed by the second military period from 1978 to 1988. The third democratic era took place from 1988 to 1998, with the third military period lasting from 1999 to 2007. The fourth democratic period, from 2008 to 2013, marked a significant milestone as the Pakistan People's Party-led coalition government became the first democratically elected civilian-led government to complete a full five-year term in office [3].

Despite the lofty ideals enshrined in the Objective Resolution, the full implementation of Islamic principles in Pakistan has faced numerous challenges. Reference [1] highlights several key factors contributing to the deterioration of the social, political, and economic systems in Pakistan:

- **Usury (Interest on Loans):** The practice of charging interest on loans has led to economic disparities and social inequality.
- **Feudal System:** The persistence of the feudal system has hindered land reforms and rural development.
- **Role of Media:** The media's influence in promoting Western and Hindu cultures has led to cultural shifts.
- **Caste and Class Divisions:** The division of society into various castes and classes has exacerbated social inequalities.
- **Political and Civilian Corruption:** Corruption among politicians and civilians has eroded trust in governance.
- **Non-Islamic Practices:** The prevalence of non-Islamic practices has challenged the realization of Islamic ideals.
- **Judicial Separation:** The separation from Islamic judicial

systems has impacted the legal and justice framework.

- **American Influence:** External influences, such as American policies, have played a role in Pakistan's political and social dynamics.

These challenges have contributed to the current socio-political landscape in Pakistan, emphasizing the complexity of achieving the goals set out in the Objective Resolution and the ongoing struggle to reconcile Islamic principles with contemporary governance.

The historical journey of Pakistan, from its inception in 1947 to the present day, reflects the intricate relationship between its religious and political identity, the ebb and flow of democratic and military rule, and the enduring quest to harmonize Islamic principles with the evolving demands of a modern nation [30].

III. WESTERN PERSPECTIVE

A. Totalitarianism

Totalitarianism is a political system characterized by centralized control, often exerted by an authoritarian government, which seeks to regulate and control every aspect of public and private life [24]. To understand the concept of totalitarianism and its historical context, it is essential to examine the experiences of different empires, including the Mughal Empire and the British Empire, and how their imperialistic ambitions intersect with the development of totalitarian tendencies.

In [4], the author draws a compelling parallel between the imperialistic ambitions of empires. Reference [23] identifies the warning signs of democratic decay. It further explains that democracies do not die in sudden coups or revolutions, but in gradual erosion of norms and institutions by elected leaders who abuse their power. Democracies can succumb to authoritarianism or collapse into civil war.

Both forms are applied to the Mughals and the British and the evolution of totalitarianism. The Mughal Empire, which ruled India for over three centuries, and the British Empire, which came to dominate the Indian subcontinent in the 19th century, both sought to expand their territorial holdings and influence. These empires encouraged their citizens to participate in democratic initiatives, creating a sense of national identity.

In the case of the Mughal Empire, the centralization of power in the hands of the emperors was a precursor to totalitarian tendencies. The Mughal rulers exerted control over various aspects of their subjects' lives, including religion, culture, and governance. However, the empire's eventual decline can be attributed to its imperial overreach, akin to a form of totalitarianism, as it ruthlessly conquered other territories, leading to social and economic challenges.

The British Empire, on the other hand, represented a modern form of imperialism. The British promoted democratic ideals and institutions in India, such as legislative councils and the rule of law. Yet, their imperialistic rule can also be seen as a form of totalitarianism, where the interests of the imperial power took precedence over those of the local population. The colonization of India led to the suppression of local cultures,

economic exploitation, and political subjugation.

Therefore, according to [4] how Athenian democracy had the hunger to expand their empire is similar to how Mughal and British ruled India. In Ancient Athens, the practice of a *demos*, free male citizens of all backgrounds who were politically engaged and had *kratia*, power, eventually became corrupted through the transformation to an imperial identity by ruthlessly conquering other territories. Mughal and British empires in India – the “Superpowers” after invasions, encouraged their citizenry to participate in democratic initiatives but their empires fell due to their greed of imperialism.

Arendt, in her work [5], delves into the essence of totalitarianism as a system of total control over individuals and societies. She examines how totalitarian regimes, particularly in the 20th century, employed tactics such as surveillance, propaganda, and the elimination of opposition to assert their dominance. While her analysis primarily focuses on Europe, there are clear parallels to how imperial powers like the British and the Mughals exercised control.

Arendt's insights into the terrifying nature of totalitarianism shed light on how the ambitions of imperial powers evolved over time. Initially, empires fostered democratic participation and governance, mirroring the Athenian model [4]. However, as their power solidified and expanded, they adopted characteristics of totalitarianism by suppressing dissent, promoting their interests, and maintaining a stranglehold on the regions they controlled. The consequences of these imperialistic and totalitarian tendencies were profound. In the case of the Mughal Empire, its imperial expansion contributed to internal strife, economic decline, and ultimately, its disintegration. The British Empire's imperial rule left a lasting impact on India, including socio-cultural transformations, economic exploitation, and the erosion of traditional governance structures.

As [5] suggests, totalitarianism and imperialism share a common goal: the elimination of the sovereignty of the human spirit. Both systems seek to exert control over individuals and societies, curtailing freedom and autonomy. However, Arendt also provides a glimmer of hope by emphasizing the potential for political action and the birth of new generations to challenge and transcend the horrors of totalitarianism.

However, [5] does not use examples of Mughals and British to explain imperialism and totalitarianism, but her explanations fit their profile. She highlights the beginning of totalitarian success in Europe from the 19th century by analyzing antisemitism and imperialism in light of totalitarianism. Like imperialism, totalitarianism is a terror, and its purpose is to eliminate the sovereignty of the human spirit. She is optimistic that humanity might be able to astounded such horror through the impulsiveness of political action contained in the birth of a new generation [5].

Arendt was correct that political actions can make a change, but in this context, it was not a positive change. After the fall of the Mughal empire, the British came and ruled India. Both initially started with classic totalitarianism in which masses existed to support the dominant powers, and all forms of opposition were eliminated. When they both had firm grounds

as a superpower, they projected inverted totalitarianism where the minority ruled. During British empire, viceroys from England were assigned to sustain totalitarianism and served the agenda of the superpowers. Eventually, constant greed to expand and conquer finally became the reason for both empires to fall.

B. Politics

The aftermath of World War II was a turning point in global politics, with the emergence of the United States as a superpower. As [4] elucidates, the U.S. bolstered its superpower status by framing Joseph Stalin and the USSR as formidable adversaries in a geopolitical struggle, thus creating a “political imaginary.” This construct helped disseminate the propaganda that communism was the ultimate enemy, influencing not only international relations but also the way Americans perceived domestic issues and social reforms.

The Cold War as explained by [21] marked the end of the historical struggle between different forms of government and ideology. Reference [21] argues that liberal democracy, combined with free-market capitalism, has proven to be the most successful and universal system of human governance, and that there are no viable alternatives or challenges to it.

In stark contrast to the American experience, [33] explains that the British Empire, despite being victorious in World War II, encountered significant challenges. The British could not capitalize on a political imaginary as effectively as the United States did. The burdens of post-war recovery, coupled with growing demands for independence from their colonies, compelled the British to rethink their imperial ambitions. Ultimately, they decided to relinquish much of their empire, culminating in their withdrawal from India.

After World War II, the political landscape in the Indian subcontinent underwent a profound transformation. The Muslim League, led by Mohammad Ali Jinnah, and the Pakistan freedom party gained prominence. In 1946, they secured a critical victory by winning the elections and garnering the Muslim majority votes needed to establish a separate nation [34].

Aristotle's concept of “Politics,” as explored by [6], can aptly be applied to Mohammad Ali Jinnah. Jinnah possessed innate political acumen, distinguishing him as a political “animal” by nature, particularly owing to his exceptional oratory skills. As a lawyer, Jinnah's prowess in speechcraft aligned seamlessly with the essence of politics, setting him apart from the ordinary “animals” or citizenry who merely possessed a voice. In Aristotle's view, politics revolves around communication that is both useful and just, thereby defining the dynamics of a household and a state. This alignment, according to [35] between Jinnah's abilities and the tenets of political philosophy, became a catalyst for the creation of Pakistan. It was not solely a political separation but a profound shift in the very cultural and religious landscape of the Indian subcontinent. His persuasive skills allowed him to communicate the usefulness and justice of this separation, presenting it as an idea grounded in principles that went beyond personal gain.

However, it is important to note that these political changes

were not without consequences. The partition of India and Pakistan, based on the principles of Thrasymachus – where one's profit translates to another's loss – resulted in a deeply emotional and poignant division. Hindus, who referred to India as "Bharat Mata," symbolizing the country as a "living mother" [7], strongly resisted the idea of partition. They envisioned a united India, and the political movement led by Mohammad Ali Jinnah, while delivering Pakistan to the Muslim community, marked a profound loss for the Hindus.

Following the creation of Pakistan, [36] the Objective Resolution was established to lay the foundation for a nation that upheld social, political, and cultural norms in accordance with the Quran and the Sunnah. However, the passage of over 70 years has witnessed a multitude of political shifts, alternating between civilian and military governments.

Reference [1] expresses dissatisfaction with the current state of Pakistan. Despite being founded on the ideals envisioned by Allama Iqbal, the "Spiritual Father of Pakistan," and brought into reality by Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the nation has struggled to fully realize these aspirations. Challenges such as political instability, economic disparities, cultural shifts, and external influences have hampered the realization of the Islamic nation as envisaged by its founders.

The genesis of Pakistan and its subsequent political journey post-World War II reflect the interplay of global dynamics, the astute leadership of figures like Mohammad Ali Jinnah, and the enduring quest to translate a political imaginary into a tangible reality, while simultaneously grappling with the complexities of partition, identity, and the pursuit of an ideal nation.

C. Military

The historical dynamics of democracy and military intervention in Pakistan have indeed been complex and marked by a recurring pattern. The failure of civilian governments in Pakistan often paved the way for military takeovers. While the military often cited its intention to restore order and democracy, the reality was that the military's version of democracy tended to be more authoritarian. This situation aligns with the assertion that democracy is not merely a fixed form of government, as highlighted in [8] which states, "The term democracy, then, does not strictly speaking designate either a form of society or a form of government" [8. p.52].

Notably, the last military government in Pakistan, which ruled from 2001 to 2008, did bring about some positive economic changes in the country. During this period, Pakistan experienced substantial economic growth, becoming the third-fastest growing economy in Asia, following only China and India in 2006. The country's economy, which was valued at \$75 billion in 1999, grew to \$160 billion by 2007. Additionally, there was an 80% growth in small-scale manufacturing in 2005, and the Information Technology industry saw significant expansion, reaching a value of around \$2.8 billion. Exports also increased substantially, rising from \$7.5 billion in 1999 to \$18 billion in the financial year 2007-2008 [9].

This period of military intervention, in some ways, echoes the sentiments of Alexis de Tocqueville, who, in 1853, expressed a belief in democratic institutions while admitting to

an instinctive wariness of the "crowd." He valued liberty and rights but was not necessarily a proponent of democracy [10]. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that despite the short-term economic improvements during this military rule, it could not bring about lasting change for Pakistan. As history has shown, simply liberating a country from oppressive rulers does not automatically lead to public freedom. This lesson can be drawn from the broader international context as well, particularly the example of the United States and its allies' military intervention in Iraq. The false belief that toppling Saddam Hussein's oppressive regime would automatically lead to democratic public freedom in the Middle East was proven to be a dangerous illusion [11].

In essence, the complexities of governance in Pakistan, as well as broader geopolitical interventions, underscore the need for a nuanced understanding of democracy, governance, and the often unpredictable consequences of military interventions.

According to [32] Pakistan's history is marred by a series of military coups and transitions between civilian and military rule. This cycle of instability has had profound implications for the country's political, social, and economic development.

The recurring theme of military interventions in Pakistan based on [37] stems from a lack of faith in civilian governments, which have often been perceived as corrupt and ineffective. The military, in these instances, has presented itself as a savior of the nation, promising to restore order and good governance. However, as mentioned earlier, the military's version of democracy tends to be characterized by authoritarianism, restrictions on civil liberties, and curtailment of press freedom.

The economic gains achieved during the 2001-2008 military rule, while impressive, were not sustainable [38]. Pakistan's economic progress during this period was driven by a combination of factors, including remittances from overseas Pakistanis, increased foreign aid, and investments in key sectors. These gains masked deeper issues, such as income inequality, political instability, and a lack of structural reforms. When the military rule ended, Pakistan faced challenges that could not be overcome solely through economic growth.

Furthermore, [39] shared that the experience of Iraq serves as a sobering example of how military intervention does not necessarily lead to the establishment of stable and democratic governments. The Iraq War, justified in part by the goal of liberating the Iraqi people from Saddam Hussein's oppressive regime, resulted in long-term instability, sectarian violence, and political fragmentation. It illustrated the complexity of nation-building and the need for careful planning beyond the initial phase of liberation [11].

In summary, the interplay between democracy and military intervention in Pakistan is a multifaceted issue. While military governments have, at times, achieved short-term economic growth, they have struggled to establish lasting stability and democratic institutions. The lessons learned from Pakistan's history, as well as from international interventions like the Iraq War, underscore the importance of comprehensive and well-thought-out approaches to governance and nation-building. Only through a nuanced understanding of these complexities can we hope to promote genuine democracy and long-term

public freedom.

D. Religion

Pakistan's Constitution prominently states that all laws should be Islamic-based, drawing inspiration from the Quran and Sunnah [40]. Additionally, the Constitution established key institutions like the Shariat Court and the Council of Islamic Ideology to interpret and apply Islamic principles. Regrettably, this commitment to Islamic law often remains more theoretical than practical, with limited implementation, primarily in specific regions rather than serving as an overarching initiative embraced by both civilian politicians and military rulers.

The intersection of politics, governance, and religion in Pakistan has implications that can be analyzed through the lenses of prominent social theorists like Karl Marx and Max Weber, particularly regarding capitalism and religion. As [12] noted, religious institutions can lay the foundation for a capitalist society. This assertion can be partially understood in the context of Pakistan's complex socio-political landscape. According to Weber's analysis, capitalism in Northern Europe advanced significantly when Protestant movements, particularly Calvinism, influenced individuals to engage in secular activities such as establishing businesses, trade, and the accumulation of wealth for investment. Weber's main thesis posits that certain religious doctrines, like those of the Protestants, played a role in creating the "spirit of capitalism" that encourages a productive life [13].

On the flip side, there's a contrasting perspective rooted in the ideas of Karl Marx. He argued that capitalism had alienated individuals from the true meaning of life, with religion often serving as an escape. Marx contended that religion can distract individuals from the harsh reality of life and the absence of an afterlife. He believed that society uses religion as a coping mechanism. In a world without an afterlife, confirming death as the ultimate end, individuals might be overwhelmed by despair, feeling like they are "beings worth nothing to speak of" [14, p.75].

Within this context, it is interesting to consider Pakistan's political landscape. While the majority of Muslims are in Pakistan, Muslim religious political parties have struggled to win significant elections and form governments, achieving only a few seats in the assembly. This suggests that Muslims in Pakistan do not prefer to have religious political parties take majority in the country.

One notable example in Pakistan's religious and political landscape is Israr Ahmed [41], a Pakistani scholar who was initially associated with a religious political party. However, due to differences in its practices, he departed from the political sphere and initiated a non-political movement aimed at bringing people closer to the teachings of Islam. This case underscores the complex relationship between religion and politics in Pakistan and the diverse ways individuals and groups navigate these dynamics.

In summary, the coexistence of Islamic principles in Pakistan's Constitution and the country's political landscape reveals a multifaceted relationship between religion, governance, and economic philosophies. This relationship can

be interpreted through the lenses of social theorists like Marx and Weber, shedding light on the intricate interplay between religion, politics, and the individual's search for meaning and purpose in a complex society.

E. Capitalism

Like Max Weber, [4] believed that capitalism was associated with the elites and destructive to society, posing a threat to the autonomy and political order of the economy. In Pakistan, the power dynamics were influenced by feudal lords and religious groups, who often played the roles of elites and puppets serving both internal and external superpowers, thereby reinforcing a form of classical totalitarianism. This form of feudal capitalism contributed to a growing economic disparity, where the poor became poorer, and the rich became richer. Such inequalities discouraged people from active political participation and hindered the realization of Pakistan's vision as an Islamic nation, as envisioned by its founders.

Neoliberal policies and practices exploit crises and disasters to advance corporate interests and undermine democracy. Reference [22] argues that neoliberalism is a form of economic shock therapy that uses shocks such as wars, coups, natural disasters, and pandemics to create conditions for radical free-market reforms that benefit the elites and harm the majority. It increased inequality, violence, corruption, and environmental degradation. This political landscape in Pakistan mirrors [4]'s explanation of how the United States favored the elite, with the educated and property-owning classes assuming the mantle of ruling and managing democracy, while the masses were preoccupied with making a living, leaving them with little time or capacity to participate in politics.

On a broader scale, the influence of feudal lords has had adverse effects on politics in Pakistan. However, in the northern region of Pakistan, particularly in the province of Baluchistan, an alternative democratic model has emerged that aligns with Hannah Arendt's vision of democracy as a "polis." This form of democracy is practiced by the Pukhtoon (Pathans and Afghans) and is rooted in the concept of the "jirga," which means "circle" in Pakistan. The "jirga" embodies the characteristics of council democracy, represented by spontaneous, local organizations and associations where every citizen can freely and equally participate [15].

The "jirga" system is an integral part of the Pukhtoon social structure, and although formal state institutions have replaced it to some extent, its vitality remains. While [15] may not entirely concur with Arendt's explanation of council democracy, this system has been successfully incorporated into the state institutions of Pakistan. Over time, some negative trends such as conservatism, male chauvinism, political and factional biases, and corruption have seeped into the institution. However, its merits, including rapid problem resolution, addressing community-wide issues, preventing tribal clashes, and ensuring justice equally accessible to all castes and classes, have contributed to the continued existence of the "jirga" system [16].

In summary, Pakistan's political landscape reflects the influence of capitalist elites and feudal lords. While this has had

adverse effects on the broader political environment, certain regions, such as Baluchistan, have maintained a more democratic model through the "jirga" system, allowing for the participation of all citizens and resolution of community issues.

F. Superpowers

The "jirga" system in Pakistan persists as a tool for promoting participatory democracy, although its influence primarily extends to a minority group within the country. However, Pakistan's overall political landscape aligns with [4]'s definition of a superpower, with a notable distinction. In Pakistan, the superpowers are not dependent on corporate funds and resources, in contrast to the Democrats in the United States. This contrast is highlighted by the financial status of politicians in Pakistan, who are among the wealthiest individuals in the country, unlike most U.S. presidents. The unwritten constitution of a superpower, as defined by [4], is focused on power, whose scope and influence derive from available resources, opportunities, and ambitions, rather than legal limits. This constitution is designed for "increase" rather than constraint [4, p.132].

In Pakistan, both civilian and military governments have employed autocratic systems to amass power. Both are seen as oppressors, in line with [12]'s description of oppressors who seek to dehumanize people through an unfair social order. Interestingly, both civilian and military governments tend to portray themselves as champions of the well-being of humanity and advocates for participatory democracy. However, when oppressors claim to be helping oppressed individuals, Freire argues that they create an artificial form of generosity that relies on oppression to function. According to Freire, oppressed individuals often conform to behavioral standards imposed upon them by their oppressors. This adherence to internalized standards and behaviors can lead to a fear of freedom, as it requires discarding these deeply ingrained norms. Yet, the pursuit of freedom remains a fundamental aspiration for all people, allowing them to feel complete and whole [17].

In essence, the political landscape in Pakistan reflects a complex interplay of power dynamics, where the "jirga" system serves as a grassroots form of participatory democracy for a minority, while superpowers, not reliant on corporate resources, wield significant influence. Both civilian and military governments have exhibited autocratic tendencies, and their claims of promoting participatory democracy can be seen through the lens of Freire's critique of oppressors and the concept of achieving true freedom.

IV. CONCLUSION

Before the partition of Pakistan, Hindus were first ruled by the Mughals for over 800 years, and then by the British for almost 400 years. Finally, after World War II, when the British decided to leave India. When Muslims demanded a separate nation due to growing racial and social tensions between Hindus and Muslims, it was very difficult for Hindus to accept it. They considered India as their motherland, which created an emotional connection with India. It was not possible for them to see their motherland split. Also, it was an opportunity for

Hindus to have Muslims as a minority. British supported the Hindu agenda, and influential Hindu leaders, including Mahatma Gandhi (leader of the Indian independence movement against British rule), were so much against it that they said that Pakistan would get its separate state "over their dead bodies." All odds were against Muslims to get what they wanted. Reference [1] believes that based on the problems that Pakistan had to face during the time of independence, it was only through "divine intervention" that Pakistan became a sovereign state. The political slogan for independence was "What does Pakistan mean? There is no God but Allah."

Finally, Pakistan became a sovereign nation with the goal of freely living and practicing Islam and following the teachings of the Quran (the Holy Book) and the Sunnah (the authentic practices of Prophet Mohammed, Peace Be Upon Him). It has been over 71 years, with failing governments, both civilian and military, and Pakistan did not create a society that practices the true teachings of Islam. Reference [1], with great disappointment, agrees with the criticism towards Pakistan, suggesting that it has not justified its separation from India. Both the government and the people are responsible, and according to [1], Pakistan had betrayed God as the Jews did during the time of Moses when God saved them from the Pharaoh.

Reference [1] suggests that Pakistan should seek forgiveness from God, and through peaceful, nonviolent protest, every citizen should take time from their personal lives to associate themselves with organizations that are working towards the common goal of improving society. Reference [17] suggests that for oppressed people to overcome oppression, they must find the root cause to improve their conditions to create a new society. However, simultaneously, people must address their internalized beliefs and ideas that hinder their freedom. Reference [4] recommends that people should be politically aware and involved to make a change. The fast pace of life, economic conditions, modern technology, and the influence of media have all led to a society where people do not have time to deliberate and ponder what is happening around them, which is necessary to have true democracy.

To change the fate of the nation, it is important that people come out and vote. Voting is not common in Pakistan due to constant disappointments by failing and corrupt governments. History has shown that democracy, socialism, and communism political systems have failed. Reference [18] explains that the success of a nation is only dependent on the level of consciousness of the leader and not the political system. Reference [18] explains that there are four levels of consciousness: egocentric (societies looking for themselves), ethnocentric (people with a common vision supporting each other based on religion, culture, skin color), worldcentric (people who consider everyone in the world, including their and other countries), and cosmocentric (people who think about all sentient beings across the entire universe, thinking multiple generations ahead). Therefore, voters should only focus on the leader, not the political system. The leader's level of consciousness will create a political system well-suited for the country and its impact locally and internationally.

Despite all the research and ways to improve society, leaders who are "God conscious," regardless of any social, economic, and political structure, will be able to create a society of peace and tranquility, as was done by Prophet Mohammed, Hazrat Umer, Hazrat Usman, and Hazrat Ali (Peace Be Upon Them). Their only focus was the well-being of the people, including minorities. Being the most powerful people in the world, they knew that they were accountable to God. Reference [19] ranked Prophet Mohammed (Peace Be Upon Them) as the most influential person in the world. Hart said: "My choice of Muhammad to lead the list of the world's most influential persons may surprise some readers and may be questioned by others, but he was the only man in history who was supremely successful on both the religious and secular levels" [19, p.5]. In recent times, the legendary boxer Mohammad Ali, in an interview, explained the meaning of life by saying, "this life is a test" and "the best thing I can do? Get ready to meet God" [20].

REFERENCES

- [1] Ahmed, I. (2011, April 25). Quaid e Azam, Allama Iqbal aur Nazriya e Pakistan. (Z. Saeed, Interviewer)
- [2] Islamic Research Institute. (2009). The Objectives Resolution. *Islamic Studies*, 89, 91-118.
- [3] Hashim, A. (2013, April 30). *Pakistan: a political timeline*. Retrieved from Aljazeera: <https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/interactive/2012/01/20121181235768904.html>
- [4] Wolin, S. S. (2008). *Democracy incorporated: Managed democracy and the specter of inverted totalitarianism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [5] Arendt, H. (1958). *Human condition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [6] Rancière, J. (1999). *Disagreement: Politics and philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- [7] Daniyal, S. (2016, May 17). *History lesson: How 'Bharat Mata' became the code word for a theocratic Hindu state*. Retrieved from Scroll: <http://scroll.in/article/805247/history-lessons-how-bharat-mata-became-the-code-word-for-a-theocratic-hindu-state>
- [8] Ranciere, J. (2006). *Hatred of Democracy*. New York: Verso
- [9] Baig, A. (2013, March 1). *President Musharraf's Vision and Achievements of his tenure*. Retrieved from President Musharraf: <https://presidentmusharraf.wordpress.com/2013/03/01/musharraf-vision-achievements-2013/>
- [10] Bensaid, Daniel. (2011). *Permanent Scandal. In Democracies in What State?* (16-43). New York: Columbia University Press.
- [11] Bernstein, R. J. (2011). *Hannah arendt's reflections on violence and power*. *Iris*, 3(5), 3-30. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.depaul.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1013797517?accountid=10477>
- [12] Weber, M. (2001). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism of 1930*. London: Routledge Classics.
- [13] Roberts, R. H. (1995). *Religion and The Transformation of Capitalism: Comparative Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- [14] Marx, K., & Engels, F., (1975) *Collected Works Volume I Marx 1936-1843*. London: Progress Publishers
- [15] Bokinić, M. (2011). Is Polis the Answer? Hannah Arendt on Democracy. *Santalka: Filosofija, Komunikacija*, 76-82.
- [16] Fakhr-ul-Islam, K. F. (2013). Jirga: A Conflict Resolution Institutions in Pukhtoon. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 87-95.
- [17] Freire, Paulo. (2000) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- [18] Brown, B. C. (2006, April 3). *An Overview of Developmental Stages of Consciousness*. Retrieved from Integral Without Borders: <https://integralwithoutborders.net/sites/default/files/resources/Overview%20of%20Developmental%20Levels.pdf>
- [19] Hart, M. H. (1978). *The 100: A ranking of the most influential persons in history*. New York: Hart Pub. Co.
- [20] Mizoguchi, K. (2016, June 4). *Muhammad Ali's Moving Speech on the Meaning of Life: 'Get Ready to Meet God'*. Retrieved from People: <https://people.com/sports/muhammad-alis-moving-speech-on-the-meaning-of-life/>
- [21] Fukuyama, F. (2006). *The End of History and the Last Man*. Free Press.
- [22] Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt.
- [23] Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How Democracies Die*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- [24] Burrowes, R. (1969). Totalitarianism: The Revised Standard Version. *World Politics*, 21(2), 272-294. doi:10.2307/2009823
- [25] Anjum, T. (2007). The Emergence of Muslim Rule in India: Some Historical Disconnects and Missing Links. *Islamic Studies*, 46(2), 217-240. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20839068>
- [26] Pearson, M. N. (1976). Shivaji and the Decline of the Mughal Empire. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 35(2), 221-235. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2053980>
- [27] Tatlah, I. (2011). A Review of Educational Values of the Modern Muslim Thinker: Dr. Allama Muhammad Iqbal (R.A). *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1843263.
- [28] Pandey, D. (1978). Congress-Muslim League Relations 1937-39: "The Parting of the Ways." *Modern Asian Studies*, 12(4), 629-654. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/312372>
- [29] Akhtar, S., Saleem, B., & Sirwar, A. M. (2021). Political Role of Muslims Students and Women During Pakistan Moment 1936-1947. *Al Khadim Research Journal of Islamic Culture and Civilization*, 2(2), 21-31.
- [30] Chiriyankandath, J. (1992). 'Democracy' under the Raj: Elections and separate representation in British India. *The Journal of Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 30(1), 39-63. doi:10.1080/14662049208447624.
- [31] Qayoom, O., & Parihar, S. S. (2021). Decline of the Mughal Empire: Theoretical Evidences of Collapse. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Engineering Development*, 4(2), 35-42. URL: <http://www.ijrsred.com/volume4/issue2/IJSRED-V4I2P35.pdf>
- [32] Wolf, S. O. (2013). Civilian Control and Democratic Transition: Pakistan's Unequal Equation. *Pakistan Security Research Unit (PSRU), Research Report No. 2*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2839458>
- [33] Wolf Ferguson, N. (2008). *Empire: The rise and demise of the British world order and the lessons for global power*. Basic Books.
- [34] Tahiliani, S. (2009). *Unity or division? Mohammad Ali Jinnah's evolving motivations throughout India's struggle for independence & the Pakistan movement*. California State University, Dominguez Hills.
- [35] Niaz, I. (2017). Review of the book *The Charismatic Leader: Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah and the Creation of Pakistan*, by S. Hayat. *Journal of Research Society of Pakistan*, 54(1), 250-252.
- [36] Qadeer, M. (2006). *Pakistan-social and cultural transformations in a Muslim Nation*. Routledge.
- [37] Aziz, M. (2007). *Military control in Pakistan: The parallel state*. Routledge.
- [38] Gregory, S., & Revill, J. (2008). The role of the military in the cohesion and stability of Pakistan. *Contemporary South Asia*, 16(1), 39-61.
- [39] Ismael, T. Y., & Ismael, J. S. (2015). *Iraq in the twenty-first century: Regime change and the making of a failed state*. Routledge.
- [40] Mehdi, R. (2013). *The Islamization of the law in Pakistan (RLE Politics of Islam)*. Routledge.
- [41] Ahmad, S. (1993). Dr. Isrāh Ahmad's political thought and activities.