

## Governance Under Parliamentary Regime Of PML-Q (2002-2007): Analyzing The Dynamics Of Controlled Democracy

Muhammad Akmal Hussain<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Mubeen Gohar<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract:

*This research paper examines the governance dynamics under the parliamentary rule of the PML-Q from 2002 to 2007. In Pakistan's political history, this is the first occasion, a parliament has successfully completed its full five-year constitutional term. The regime being analyzed is characterized by the predominance of military dictator Ge<sup>1</sup>neral Pervaiz Musharraf. The military exercises complete domination over all state matters, while the role of parliament is strictly controlled. This system is thus characterized as a controlled democratic regime. The presence of Gen Musharraf in the power corridor had a significant impact on both the parliamentary process and the institutional structure. This research also examined the means by which Gen Musharraf exerted influence over every area of the parliamentary process, including constitutional modifications and political manipulation. The paper analyses the significant events including the military coup in October 1999, the local government election influenced by the military, and the establishment of NAB (National Accountability Bureau) to regulate politicians. In addition, the article examines the establishment of the PML-Q party, which was a pro-military political party, as well as the holding of the 2002 general elections that resulted in the formation of the PML-Q regime. The article concluded by evaluating the impact of controlled democracy on the political landscape of Pakistan.*

**Key-Words:** Parliament, Governance, PML-Q, Controlled Democracy, Influence, Military, Dictator, Amendments, MMA, NSC.

### 1. Introduction:

The political climate in Pakistan has remained turbulent ever since its inception. The political institutions have been undermined as a result of the growing dominance of the bureaucracy and the military. Nevertheless, the political parties and the politicians themselves were the primary individuals who were responsible for the disturbance that occurred in the political situation. Due to the early demise of the leaders (such as Jinnah and Liaquat Ali), Pakistan was on the verge of falling into anarchy and chaos. As a result of the political disturbance, the military is able to locate an appropriate position in which to intervene and fill the gap that was produced by the political forces. The military leaders wasted no time laying out their plans and goals the moment they stepped foot in the power corridor. It is necessary to obtain legal cover from the main pillar of the state, which is most likely the judicial system, in order to accomplish these objectives and agendas. There are several other types of laws, such as PCO and LFO, that offer

---

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer Dept. of Pakistan Studies IUB (RYK Campus)

<sup>2</sup>PhD Scholar Dept. of Pakistan Studies BZU Multan.

the military a legal means of accomplishing these objectives. After achieving these aims, the military will try to seek the assistance of political groups to enter the political arena and endeavour to expand their political control (Hussain & Salyana, 2022).

In a controlled democracy, there is the existence of the political system but is highly influenced or guided by the non-democratic system in order to maintain control over the political process. In the context of Pakistan, the period from 2002-2007 is a period in which PML-Q government was installed with the support of the military establishment. During this period the military played an influential role and this political era is considered as a controlled democratic era. The parliament was fully controlled by the military establishment and it exerted a significant influence over the political process (Fani & Naqvi, 2023). The aim of this paper is to analyze the dynamics of governance during the PML-Q regime (2002-2007), in order to explore the ways in which party's decisions and policies were shaped by the complex interplay between the two institutions: the civilian and the military (Wu & Ali, 2020).

## **2. Origins, Development, and Consolidation of Authoritarianism:**

Following the British departure in 1947, the Muslim League was entrusted with the task of establishing a nation in a country of multiple ethnicities. The Muslim League leadership adopted the Government of India Act 1935 as a temporary constitution, creating a federal parliamentary system with limited powers for the constituent units and a strong central government.

The people of Pakistan have worked together to develop a more efficient system of governance based on democratic principles. Unfortunately, both the military and a democratic administration hindered the advancement of democracy. The civilian populace has directly caused disruptions in the political process. The new state was in a developmental stage, working towards establishing institutions that would devotedly reflect the aspirations and wishes of its citizens. In order to achieve this objective, the political leadership needed to make a significant contribution. However, regrettably, they were motivated by self-interest and prioritized their personal concerns over the welfare of the state. This mode of thinking and approach undermines the efficient functioning of governance for the nation, which has encountered several obstacles.

Pakistan has inherited a highly imbalanced institutional framework with a powerful military and bureaucracy and unorganized political institutions led by self-seeker politicians. The poor political institution and culture caused maximum military involvement in politics. Conversely, political parties' violations of political and democratic values threatened the democratic system, allowing the military, a more sophisticated and structured organization, to intervene in politics. The inclusion of the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces in the cabinet of the civilian administration demonstrated a clear imbalance of political authority<sup>2</sup>. Huntington had argued that the military presence in the civilian institutions is due to the absence of effective political institutions (Huntington S. P., 1968).

President Iskander Mirza proclaimed martial law on October 7, 1958, and designated Ayub Khan as the Chief Martial Law Administrator. On October 27, 1958, General Ayub Khan compelled Iskander Mirza to step down, thereby assuming the presidency of Pakistan. Ayub Khan, driven by his belief that mainstream politicians were the primary reason for Pakistan's

---

<sup>2</sup> Ayub Khan was appointed to the position of Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of Pakistan in 1951. In 1954, he was also assigned to the position of Minister of Defense, and he continued to hold the position of C-in-C of the Armed Forces as well.

political underperformance, sought to damage their reputations. The politicians were disqualified from taking part in politics following allegations of corruption under EBDO (Elected Bodies Disqualification Order) (Ahmed, 2013).

Ayub Khan established a local government system famously known as B.D (Basic Democracies) System. According to Ayub Khan, the method was created to better reflect rural communities. The military government wanted to organize the public, especially in rural areas, for development and active participation in local affairs. The military administration used the B.D. System to attain these goals. While Ayub Khan used BD members as an electoral college for the presidential elections in 1965 and enabled his own election. He skillfully manipulated the political process to consolidate power under his own hands. Ayub Khan strategically employed this maneuver to weaken the fundamental democratic foundations while upholding his dictatorial rule. This was the prime model of controlled democracy.

The first general elections in Pakistan took place in 1970, based on the premise of "One Man One Vote," (Abbas, 2004) with the objective of bolstering the democratic process. Nevertheless, the outcome of this election caused the separation of East Pakistan, since the political and military authorities in Western Pakistan were reluctant to relinquish power to the Awami League, the dominant party in the National Assembly. Later, in the remaining Pakistan the power handed over to the PPP, which secured convincing success in West Pakistan. However, this civilian rule proved short lived in Pakistan from 1971 to 1977. The military take over the control in July 1977, General Zia's army toppled Bhutto in July 1977 after the Pakistan National Alliance (PNA), a coalition of nine opposition parties, accused him of manipulating and rigging the elections. Martial law was implemented by Zia, who also disbanded parliament and put the 1973 Constitution of Pakistan under abeyance. Gen Zia imposed martial law in the country and took the entire control in his hand.

After taking control, General Zia promised to reinstate democracy and conduct elections within the prescribed constitutional period of 90 days. However, he later backed out his promised and postponed the elections for about eight years. In 1984, Zia manipulated a presidential referendum to prolong his term for another five years. After securing his position, he conducted general elections in the country on party-less basis in March 1985. General Zia manipulated the civilian government and built a controlled democracy by installing the controversial 8th Amendment, which gave the president the most power over parliament and could dissolve the national assembly and cabinet. In October of 1985, once General Zia had ensured the safety of his flanks, he formally abolished martial law and turned over power to a civilian administration.<sup>3</sup>

An aeroplane crash that occurred on August 17, 1988, resulted in the death of General Zia, and this event was significant in paving the way for the restoration of civilian democracy in the country. Once the military establishment received assurance that its corporate interests would be enhanced, it was ready to transfer power to the leadership of the PPP. Nevertheless, they ensured the preservation of their institutional autonomy and exclusive jurisdiction over crucial domains of policy, such as foreign and defense affairs. Nevertheless, despite the aforementioned pledges, the government led by Benazir Bhutto under the PPP was unable of fulfilling its constitutional term and was ousted on August 6, 1990, by President Ishaq Khan due to allegations of corruption and inefficiency (Rizvi, 2000). Subsequently, the two consecutive civilian governments, namely the Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz (PML-N) government led by Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif from 1990 to 1993, and the PPP government led by Benazir Bhutto from 1993 to 1996, were both removed on the same pattern, with allegations of corruption and mismanagement for the respective governments. Later in October

---

<sup>3</sup> In May 1988, General Zia used his discretionary power under 8<sup>th</sup> Amendment to dismiss to Prime Minister Muhammad Khan Junejo and his cabinet.

1999, in a military coup, Gen Pervez Musharraf ended the civilian government of Nawaz Sharif.

There is a contention that civilian governments (in 1988, 1990, 1993, 1996, and 1999) were ousted when they violated the boundaries set by the military establishment. An instance of the Sharif government's dismissal occurred in October 1999. After regaining power in 1997, the Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz (PML-N) led by Nawaz Sharif abolished article 58 (2) B, thereby revoking the president's right to dissolve democratically elected governments.

### **3. Musharraf's Military Coup**

General Musharraf overthrew civilian Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif on October 12, 1999, in a bloodless military coup. During that period, Nawaz Sharif's political party, the PML-N, held a two-thirds majority in the parliament. In Pakistan, it has been customary for the military to interfere in the civilian government affairs directly when there is significant political instability or an acute economic crisis. However, the situations of October 1999 were significantly different from previous military coup as the October 1999 coup was more likely a personal between Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and General Pervez Musharraf" (Belokrenitsky & Moskalenko, 2013). Pervez Musharraf became the Chief Executive, rather to be a martial law administrator. In his book, Musharraf expressed his reluctance to assume the office of a martial law administrator and instead aimed to maintain the functionality of the constitution, with the exception of temporarily suspending a few of its sections (Musharraf, 2006).

After assuming the post of Chief Executive of Pakistan, General Musharraf announced emergency in the country with the Provisional Constitutional Order (PCO). This order suspended the constitution and also dissolved the parliament on October 13, 1999 (Mahmood, 2015). On October 17, 1999, he delivered a brief address to the nation outlining his plans for the future, including a return to democracy, a new government structure, strong leadership, an improved economy, insuring greater accountability, and the maintenance of his foreign policy initiatives. To save the country, he added, the constitution is temporarily suspended, and the military will not remain for longer than is absolutely necessary to provide the groundwork for a genuine democracy (The Nation, 1999). In that way Musharraf effectively placed the state of Pakistan under military control.

### **4. Local Government System (Party-less) under Musharraf**

Through the Local Government Ordinance of 2001, Gen. Musharraf established a new Local Government system to decentralize power at the local level and legitimize his rule. Tanveer Naqvi was named Chairman of the National Reconstruction Bureau (NRB), which he established. The NRB devised a "Devolution Plan," according to which local governments elections were held on non-party basis on December 30, 2000, and July 5, 2001, and were formally established on August 14, 2001 (Alam, Bhatti, & Alvi, 2020). According to the Local Government Ordinance 2001, the local bodies were organized into three tiers: District Governments, Tehsil/Town Governments, and Union council Governments. This kind of local governance was widespread in all the provinces, except for the cantonment regions, which were under the control of the armed troops. However, this local government system was not adopted in the Federal Administrated Tribal Areas either.

As elections for local government were held on a non-party basis, it can be stated that the military government has its own agenda and objectives derived from this system. The purpose of this plan was for Musharraf to exercise his authority on the structures of the local government. People had been experiencing a sense of convenience in resolving local issues, while the political leadership was considered it to be a system that marginalizes political

parties. Local bodies were also regarded as being utilized as an instrument in the referendum that took place in 2001 and in the general elections that took place in 2002 in order to assist in the victory of the Pro-Musharraf Party (PML-Q), which was supported by the military government. Previously, the military dictator Gen Ayub Khan exerted control over the local government system by utilizing the Basic Democracies (BD) members as an electoral college for the presidential elections. By employing this strategy, he avoided the direct voting system and implemented an indirect voting mechanism to strengthen his grip on the political apparatus.

## **5. Presidential Referendum**

The Supreme Court has granted the military government a three-year timeframe to accomplish its goals and thereafter conduct national elections. Gen. Musharraf came to the realization that it would be risky to relinquish control to a new administration formed following the October 2002 elections as the three-year period drew to a close. He held non-party elections for local government before holding the general elections. However, Musharraf did not opt the Ayub model, where the members of the local government had served as the Electoral College for the presidential elections, while Musharraf opted to validate his authority as president through presidential election.

General Musharraf wanted to gain political legitimacy, for this purpose he declared that holding the presidential referendum is necessary in order to restore true democracy. For this purpose, chief Election commissioner was appointed, and he given prime responsibility to hold a presidential referendum in the country (The Dawn, 2002). The Chief Election Commissioner scheduled the presidential referendum for April 30, 2002 (The Dawn, 2002). Zia was previously elected as the President of Pakistan by a referendum for a five-year term. He held a position of significant authority as the president before the general election took place. Musharraf followed the pattern of Zia and got himself as the President of Pakistan via referendum before the conduction of 2002 general elections. In August of that year, he issued the Legal Framework Order (LFO) which allows him the ability to remove the elected government, dissolve the national assembly, select armed services heads, and authorize nominations to the supreme judiciary. A National Security Council, which is directed by Musharraf, was established in order to supervise the operation of the civilian administration. This council operates outside of the jurisdiction of the parliament (Hussain & Salyana, 2021).

## **6. Accountability of Politicians via NAB**

Musharraf, like his predecessors, was of the opinion that politicians should be held accountable for their actions. The National Accountability Bureau (NAB) was established under the National Accountability Ordinance (1999), and the government continues to employ it as a tool to suppress political opponents, all under the guise of holding them accountable. According to the ordinance, the accused may be detained for a period of 90 days without being charged (Khan, 2009, p. 495). The NAB exerted pressure on the political opponents to switch allegiances by virtue of its jurisdiction. Corruption charges led to the imprisonment of PML-N and PPP leaders who refused to switch allegiances.

## **7. Dynamics of Controlled Democracy:**

### **7.1 Controlled Election (2002)**

In order to impose his own agenda on the system of government, one of the objectives of a military dictator is to establish an authoritarian rule with the intention of imposing his own agenda. To a large extent, he prohibited the political forces who were in opposition from actively participating in the political process. In a similar manner, a military dictator would

require assistance from other political parties in order to establish a new political party, which is frequently referred to as a pro-military party. Ayub Khan gave his official support to the Muslim League Functional (PML-F), whereas General Zia promoted the Jamat-i-Islami, and General Musharraf backed the PML (Q) Party.

Aqil Shah wrote in his book that ISI, under the Musharraf Regime, formed the PML-Q party, in order to function as a civilian front for the military government (Shah, 2014). The PML (Q) shortly gained a reputation as a dominant political party. The PML-N, which was the ruling party at the time of military coup in 1999, was split into two factions. PML (Q) emerged as a splinter faction that disassociated from Nawaz Sharif during his exile to Saudi Arabia, subsequently pledging allegiance to General Musharraf. Meanwhile, those who stayed loyal to Nawaz Sharif used the name PML (N) for their own faction. The PML (Q) was seen as a pro-Musharraf party. A conference was convened in March 2001, attended by 140 former Members of the National Assembly (MNAs), out of which 108 members were those who were elected in the 1997 General Election. The purpose of the conference was to formally establish the Pakistan Muslim League (Quaid-e-Azam) Party. Mian Azar, the ex-governor of the Punjab Province, was designated as the first president of this political organization (Aziz, 2009). Several ex-MNAs from the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) joined the (PML-Q). It is noteworthy that under the Musharraf regime, politicians with pending cases before the NAB or facing pursuit in the accountability courts were successfully compelled by the military government to join the PML (Q) party, in order to secure protection under the authority of the military government. As a result, their cases were also withdrawn (Naazer, Mahmood, & Ashfaq, 2017).

During a press conference on August 16, 2002, the Chief Election Commissioner declared that October 10, 2002 would be the date for the country's elections. However, the military government prohibited the prominent political leadership likely Nawaz Sharif and Benazir Bhutto to contest the elections. The European Union observers expressed criticism on the legal justification for barring individuals like Nawaz Sharif and Benazir Bhutto from the electoral process based on political reasons, considering it to be "questionable". This can be interpreted as a government tactic to remove influential leaders (Mission, 2002). The systematic exclusion of opposition leaders based on discriminatory use of power is a troubling aspect of the pre-election turmoil. Aside from Nawaz Sharif and Benazir, several other notable politicians, including Begum Kalsum Nawaz and Shahbaz Sharif, were disqualified from participating in the elections. Their candidatures were denied because the Returning Officer could not authenticate their signature on the nomination papers in their absence (Aziz, 2009, pp. 299-300). The exclusion of significant opposition figures from participating in the elections has been interpreted as a deliberate indication by the military government that they desire leadership that aligns with their interests. This serves as a prime example of a guided or controlled democracy.

## 2002 General Election Result

Parties	National	Punjab	Sindh	NWFP/KPK	Baluchistan
PLM-Q	78	128	10	07	10
PPPP	62	63	51	08	02
MMA	45	07	15	51	13
Independent	28	34	05	14	07

PML-N	14	37	—	05	—
MQM	13	—	31	—	—
NA	12	12	10	—	04
PML-F	04	—	04	—	—
ANP	—	—	—	08	—
PPP-Sherpao	02	—	—	09	—
Others	10	06	02	01	11
Total	268	287	128	99	47

**Sources: Elections Commission of Pakistan Report 2002**

The elections result showed that the PML (Q) became the dominant party by winning 78 seats and overall, 118 seats in the National Assembly. The PPP obtained a cumulative of 87 seats, but the MMA acquired a total of 60 seats, which was a surprised element of this election. In contrast, the performance of PML (N) was average. The voter turnout in the 2002 General Elections was 40.69 percent (Khan, 2009, p. 490).

It is noteworthy that the influential independent candidate achieved success in both the national and provincial assemblies, and then joined the predicted ruling parties. A PPP group then agreed to form PPP-Patriot through a strategic political technique. The group joined the PML (Q), received six ministerial positions, and had their NAB cases dropped. In order to legalized this move, the provision of Article 63(A) that prohibited floor crossing was temporarily suspended. However, later, on December 31, 2002, Article 63 (A) of the constitution was restored. In the Prime Minister Election, the PML-Q nominated Mir Zafarullah Jamali was elected as the Prime Minister of Pakistan. He secured 172 votes from the 342 members of the National Assembly. Mir Zafarullah Jamali remained a passive prime minister and his government was fully controlled by the military establishment (Alam, Bhatti, & Alvi, 2020). Despite the establishment of civilian government after the election process in October 2002, General Musharraf was able to secure his dominant position as President in the new political structure. He had a Prime Minister who was willing to carry out his instructions, parliamentarians who followed his program, and an obedient political party that he could easily be controlled.

**7.2 Introduction of 17<sup>th</sup> Amendment**

The coalition parties who were supporting Musharraf, failed to secure the necessary two-thirds majority in parliament. In May 2003, the government engaged in a dialogue with the parliament in response to their strong resistance, however, this dialogue did not produce any outcomes. The coalition’s divergent views on LFO and the president in uniform deepened in the months that followed. Nonetheless, discussions continued, and the parliament was unable to conduct any major activity throughout the year with the exception of the budget session.

On December 24, 2003, the joint package of constitutional reforms was finally signed by the ruling PML-Q and the MMA. It would appear that the establishment of a National Security Council (NSC) in compliance with the Parliament Act was one among the several decisions made by the PML-Q agreement. Article 58 (2) (b) grants the President the authority to dissolve

the National Assembly, whereas Article 112 (2) (b) grants the same authority to the governors of the provinces to dissolve their respective assemblies. Nevertheless, within fifteen days of the assemblies' dissolution, they can refer any actions taken under these powers to the Supreme Court for review. The President will need to consult with the Prime Minister on the appointment of the Armed Forces chiefs, although he is not bound to follow the advice of the Prime Minister. President Musharraf will seek a vote of confidence from both houses of parliament and four provincial assemblies. President Musharraf will cease the office of the Army Chief by December 31, 2004. It would appear that the establishment of a National Security Council (NSC) in compliance with the Parliament Act was one among the several decisions made by the PML-Q and MMA agreement. The President has the authority to dissolve the National Assembly as stated in Article 58 (2) (b). The governor also has the right to dissolve provincial assemblies as stated in Article 112 (2) (b). The Supreme Court can be asked to review these cases within 15 days of their dissolution. Although the president is not bound to follow the Prime Minister's suggestion, the President must consult with him before appointing the heads of the services chief of the military force. President Musharraf was asked to seek the vote of confidence from the two houses of the parliament and from the four provincial assemblies. By December 31, 2004, President Musharraf will step down from the position of Army Chief (Khan, 2009, p. 492).

The Seventeenth Amendment granted Pervez Musharraf the authority to simultaneously hold the job of Army Chief and serve as the President of Pakistan. With the implementation of this amendment, the president obtained supreme authority over the parliament by possessing the discretionary power granted to the president by article 58 (2) (b), which grants him the authority to dissolve both the National Assembly and the current government.

### **7.3 Establishment of National Security Council (NSC)**

When the Seventeenth Amendment bill was introduced in parliament for endorsement, Musharraf wished to institutionalize the NSC as a constitutional entity by integrating it into the Legal Framework Order (LFO). However, the political parties who were backing Musharraf lacked the required majority in parliament. After engaging in negotiations, the ruling party PML-Q and MMA decided to remove article 152-A from the 17<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment. However, both sides agreed that the establishment of the NSC would be attained through the legislative process rather than the constitutional process (Shah, 2014, p. 152).

The members of the parliament passed the 17th Amendment without including Article 152-A<sup>4</sup>, which is associated to NSC. Nevertheless, the parliamentarian started working on the legislator draft for NSC, which was completed in January 2004. Opposition criticized the NSC bill. They claimed that the approval of the NSC bill would limit parliament's power. When parliament debated the NSC bill, opposing parties decided to boycott the session. However, the MMA did not boycott the session but abstained from casting their vote in the favour of the NSC. They didn't speak out against the bill because they were sure that Musharraf would step down as Army Chief by the end of December 2004.

The National Security Council (NSC) Act 2004 was passed by Parliament on April 19, 2004, designating the President as the chairman of the council (NSC). The Prime Minister, the Speaker of the National Assembly, the head of the opposition in the National Assembly, the

---

<sup>4</sup> Article 152-A establishes the National Security Council, which functions as a platform for discussing important matters related to the State's sovereignty, integrity, and security. It also covers topics concerning democracy, governance, and inter-Provincial harmony.

Senate Chairman, and the chief ministers of the four provinces were the other members of the NSC. The three Pakistani military chiefs and the chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Committee were the members of this council (Khan, 2009, p. 496). The National Security Council (NSC) was opposed by the opposition parties, the Pakistan Muslim League (N) and the Pakistan People's Party (PPP), since they believed it was a step against the process of democratization in Pakistan. Because the National Security Council is comprised of four men in uniform, there is no room for uncertainty over who will be in charge of making decisions. The creation of the NSC by the military has formalized the military's involvement in the management of state affairs, particularly in the decision-making process. The NSC insured that the military would maintain a dominant position in the power structure, overshadowing civilian institutions. There was a possibility that the civilian institutions work under the influence of the military establishment. The NSC's structure, which incorporates both civil and military elites, allowed the military to exert significant influence over the government of the state. The basis of NSC guaranteed the potential for controlled democracy.

#### **7.4 Military's Control over State Affairs**

Despite the establishment of a civilian administration in 2002 and Musharraf's transfer of power to an elected government, the country remained under the control of military generals. General Musharraf simultaneously held the positions of president and Army Chief, consolidating all authorities, including control over internal and external state affairs. In most instances, the elected Prime Minister Zafar Ullah Jamali has had a limited role. Despite this, he incurred the loss of trust from both Musharraf and members of the parliament, resulting in his subsequent removal from his job.

Consequently, in 2004, the country had a situation where it had three prime ministers consecutively for a duration of two months. Initially, General Musharraf demanded Jamali to step down from his position. General Musharraf's dissatisfaction with Prime Minister Jamali's behavior on important matters, such the National Security Council (NSC) and Musharraf's potential continuation as Chief of the Army Staff, is becoming more apparent (The New York Times, 2004). In June 2014, Chaudhry Shujaat Hussain was elected as the new prime minister. In a parliamentary system of governance, the prime minister is replaced by the parliament, rather than by the decree of a military leader. Subsequently, Shaukat Aziz was regarded as a loyalist to the king and officially assumed the position of prime minister in August 2004 (Kamran, 2008).

#### **7.5 Issue of Uniform**

As previously indicated, PML-Q and MMA agreed that Musharraf will quit as Army Chief by December 31, 2004. General Musharraf pledged to resign as Chief of Army Staff by December 31, 2004, when he addressed the nation on December 24, 2003. "I have chosen to resign from the position of Army Chief prior to December 31, 2004." However, I can set the timing inside this period. (Khan, 2009, p. 498).

Everything proceeded as per the parliamentarian's plan, which called for Musharraf to resign as Army Chief by the end of 2004. However, Musharraf had other plans. Shaukat Aziz eventually took over as prime minister of Pakistan in August 2004 after a prime ministerial reshuffle that started after the budget was approved by the parliament in June 2004. Soon, there was a feeling that General Musharraf continued to serve his country by staying in uniform. Punjab's Chief Minister, Ch. Pervez Elahi, urges Musharraf to remain in the Army Chief's office. 96% of Pakistanis, according to a statement made by Musharraf himself, "did not want him to take off his uniform." It is noteworthy that Musharraf had the belief that his power resided in the position of the Chief of Army Staff (COAS), rather than the presidency. General

Musharraf expressed his intention to retain his military uniform in order to assure the continuity and implementation of the state's strategy.

Subsequent to the remarks made by the parliamentarian and Musharraf, the members of the Punjab and Sindh assembly expressed their desire for Musharraf to remain in his position as Chief of the Armed Forces. The Ruling party (PML-Q) presented a bill in the National Assembly in October 2004, which granted Musharraf the authority to hold his position as Army Chief as well as to serve the country as the president.

### Conclusion

Since its inception, Pakistan has consistently experienced political instability. Democracy has not yet escaped the need to justify its legitimacy. The years 2002–2007 are symbolic of a controlled democracy since the military elite influenced democratic institutions and legislative procedures. General Pervez Musharraf, following a military takeover in October 1999, has introduced his own democratic proposal. Initially, he implemented the Devolution of Power Plan, which involved conducting non-party local elections in 2001. Furthermore, he legitimized his rule through political means and was elected as the president of Pakistan for the subsequent five years via a presidential referendum in April 2002. Upon consolidating his position, he conducted General Elections in October 2002. Nevertheless, the military controlled the elections procedure by excluding the leadership of the main political parties in Pakistan from participating in the general elections of 2002. Musharraf was able to obtain more power than the parliament after the new parliament was installed. This was accomplished by the implementation of the 17<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment. The formation of the NSC and the replacement of Prime Minister Jamali with his faithful associate Shoukat Aziz served to strengthen this system of controlled democracy. The PML-Q emerged as a party that supported the military and gained the military's favor. The PML-Q government, which was in power from 2002 to 2007, had a significant and enduring influence on Pakistan's political environment. In Pakistan, the legacy of controlled democracy during this period continues to have an impact on the dynamics of the country, which has created an excessive number of obstacles that prevent the democratic institutions from being strengthened in their original form.

### References

- (1999, October 18). *The Nation*.
- (2002, January 15). *The Dawn*.
- (2002, April 20). *The Dawn*.
- (2004, July 25). *The New York Times*.
- Abbas, H. (2004). *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, then Army, and America's War Terror*. New York: Routledge.
- Ahmed, I. (2013). *Pakistan the Garrison State Origins, Evolution, Consequences 1947-2011*. Karachi: Oxford university Press.
- Alam, S., Bhatti, M. N., & Alvi, A. S. (2020, June). Civilianization of Military Rule in Pakistan: A Study of Musharraf Era (1999-2005). *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4(2), 150-163.
- Aziz, S. (2009). *Between Dreams and Realities*. Karachi: Oxford university Press.
- Belokrenitsky, V. Y., & Moskalenko, V. N. (2013). *A Political History of Pakistan 1947-2007*. Karachi: Oxford university Press.
- Fani, I., & Naqvi, B. (2023). Issues of Governance in Pakistan and its Impact on Society. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 6(2), 216-227.
- Hussain, A. M., & Salyana, A. J. (2021). Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan: Quest for Power and the Role of National Security Council. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 207-219.

- Hussain, M. A., & Salyana, J. A. (2022, Jan-March). The Transition of Guided Democracy in Pakistan. A Study of Military Regimes. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, (1), 93-106.
- Kamran, T. (2008). *Democracy and Governance in Pakistan*. Lahore: South Asia Partnership-Pakistan.
- Khan, H. (2009). *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Mahmood, Z. (2015, July-December). Political Turmoil And Military Era of General Musharraf (1988-2007). *Journal of the Punjab University Historical Society*, 28(2), 239-251.
- Mission, E. U. (2002). Pakistan National and Provincial Assembly Election, 10 October 2002.
- Musharraf, P. (2006). *In the Line of fire A Memoir*. London: Pocket Books.
- Naazer, M. A., Mahmood, A., & Ashfaq, S. (2017, January-June). Political Rights Situation during Musharraf Era: 1999-2004. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal*, 1, 20-31.
- Rizvi, H. A. (2000). *Military, state, and society in Pakistan*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publication.
- Shah, A. (2014). *The Army and Democracy: Military Politics in Pakistan*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Wu, X., & Ali, S. (2020). The Novel Changes in Pakistan's Party Politics: Analysis of Causes and Impacts. *Chinese Political Science Review*, 5, 513-533.