

Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of Pakistan Polity

Rafida Nawaz

Ph.D. in International Relations and Assistant Professor at Department of Political Science, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan.

Email: rafida.nawaz@bzu.edu.pk

Syed Hussain Murtaza

Ph.D. Scholar in Department of Political Science at Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan.

Muqarab Akbar

Chairman, Department of Political science at Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan.

Email: muqarrabakbar@bzu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Postcolonial polities are marred with governance dilemma due to plethora of factors from lack of resources to flawed administrative structures; diffused roles and structures with a bend to authoritarianism; corruption to ineffectiveness for provision of welfare services for population; curbing freedoms to military interventions leading to crisis of governance. Michel Foucault theoretical approach of governmentality with its three pillars i.e. who will govern, how will govern and what is meant by governance is an effective tool to provide an insight in structural functional revisionist analysis of working of such polities. The methodological approach of paper is to cluster three important concepts, i.e. governmentality-structural-functional analysis and the concept of good governance encompassing hexagonal study of six important indicators, i.e. voice and accountability, political stability, effective governance, regulatory capability, Rule of Law and Control of Corruption. As different IGO's evaluate countries performance on basis of these indicators, the study will take account of Pakistan performance on good governance indicators and try to find the answer of why questions by a structural functional analysis of governmentality at play in Pakistan. The performance flaws of Pakistani state are direct result of diffused and overlapping governance roles and structures; collaborative rule of non-representative institutions like military and judiciary and their intervention in governance.

Key Words: Governmentality, Good Governance, Structural-Functional Analysis, Pakistan

Introduction

At end of millennium Good Governance emerged as a new buzzword. The Concept of Governance is as old as human civilization. In political thought since the time of Greek the basic thrust of Political philosophy is what is Just Governance?: Rules to demarcate functional boundaries between different organs of state: Relationship of state to society (the state is an end in itself or state is a mean to achieve the end welfare of individual and society). From Plato to Renaissance thinker Machiavelli, to Social Contract theorists (Hobbes, Locke and

Rousseau) to Enlightenment thinkers Kant and Montesquieu to Postmodern Critical Theorists Jurgen Habermas and Michel Foucault each theorist tried to provide the answers to above questions within given societal framework or with a view to change and adapt governance for better. Eurocenter (America + Europe) drawing on these theories adapted their system from time to time. It gave the soft power to Europe to be idealized by the rest of world for the effectiveness, efficiency, efficacy of the governance systems capable of providing their populace social distributive Justice. But in system of states majority of states are postcolonial states attaining their sovereign status in second half of 20th century. In postcolonial period, independence meant for the newly freed states the attainment of ideal of just governance based on social justice and welfare achieved by the previous masters much earlier. The recipe to actualize the dream was given by the old masters in the form of Development and modernization Paradigm. Both the interlocking and overlapping paradigms were prescribed a system of governance in form of democracy with clear cut functional domains of different structures of state. Almost every country of previous colonial world tried to adopt the model.

Very few countries of Latin America and Asia can be regarded as success stories where societal forces in collaboration of political leadership was able to establish democratic norms i.e., dominance of civil over military organ of the state; specification of domain of different pillars of state (Legislative, Executive and Judicial); a system of non-intervention in above set domains and last but not least a system of checks and balances to gain a level of accountability. Dream of independence proved a bitter reality for those who could not discover the independent path and fell prey to neo-colonial strategies. History of Governance in Pakistan reveals the fact that it falls in the second category. Its failure in democratic institution building and establishing democratic norms at societal level accounted for its flawed development. It was not able to deliver the good promised by development and modernization paradigm. A new change in the concept of governance has entered in policy discourses backed by International Governance bodies. Good Governance is not a new paradigm but a shift in paradigm that is going to take place on the previously established foundations of governance. The concept has certain integral components like Rule of Law, transparency, responsiveness, equity/equality, participation, effectiveness, efficiency and accountability. Good Governance is an inclusive concept, or in words of Michel Foucault rationality involved in discourse of governance. It's a governmentality with clearly demarcated structures and assigned functions assuring rule of law and fundamental freedoms and rights; giving a comprehensive view about who, how and what of governance.

Countries are ranked and measured on different scales given by IGOs like World Bank, UNDP and NGOs like Transparency International and other independent organizations like Economist Intelligence Unit. The ranking of country is important because a nation has to operate in an international setting that

Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of Pakistan Polity

is characterized by norms of Economic and Political liberal order. The evaluative indexes of the above mentioned IGOs indicate how affectively the moral values like human rights especially social and political rights and accountability mechanism have been structured through institutionalization and how effective the performance of institutions is. Country's positive/ negative image is directly proportional to ranking of a country on the norm meters. This positive/negative perception has a proportional relation with economic efficiency, and the governing and societal norms are in turn directly affected by deliverance of economic wellbeing of a society. So, a vicious circle is generated.

Perception impacts economic performance of a country because in liberal trade regime countries are interconnected; foreign investment as well as aid by donor agencies having a pivotal role in effective economic policies of a country is attracted or distracted by perception parameters. Effective/Ineffective economic policies in turn have an impact on quality of life and development of a civil society having freedom of expression and other political rights. Negative performance of a country on Quality of life Index, Democracy Index and Corruption Index result in negative perception of a country and this negative perception prevent foreign investment and aid by donor agencies. The resultant is further deterioration of country's performance on different scales and measures defined by the international regime governing bodies (IMF, World Bank, UNDP, USAID etc). The study is divided in three main segments.

1. Reflections on Governance Discourses and Methodological Frame to Evaluate Governance.
2. Evaluation of Pakistan Performance on Governance Indicators issued by IGO's
3. Structural-Functional Analysis of Governmentality in Pakistan

Reflections on Governance Discourses and Methodological Frame to Evaluate Governance

Michel Foucault defines governmentality as "rationality involved in governance" (Foucault, Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978., 2009) For some it is management of people. (Albrow, 2001, p. 151) But governance involves not only people or population it also involves territory of state as well and country internal and external policies. Hence it is the authority exercised to manage or control country's affairs and resources. (Schneider, 1999, p. 7) As postcolonial states opt for aid to meet their development needs the International Governance Organizations and donor agencies like OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) United Nations Development Program (UNDP), governance is a complex concept. It is a complex interactive system

among structures, traditions, functions and processes with three base values, i.e. accountability, transparency, and participation. (USAID, 2013, p. 2) UNDP added suffix good with governance and assigned attributes like rule of law, transparency, participation, responsiveness, equity, efficiency and effectiveness with legitimate exercise of authority in political, economic and administrative spheres. (Policy, 2011, p. 2)



Figure 1 Good Governance Indicators

Government is just one part of concept of good governance. The concept of good governance is like a three legged stool, i.e. the private sector (business), public sector, and civil society, as foundation of sustainable democracy. (Policy, 2011) The concept is considered to be a paradigm shift in development and modernization policy discourses adopted by international governance bodies and multilateral donor agencies in 1950's and 60's to develop postcolonial world. The paradigm of good governance is rooted in social and political thought.

The Ancient Greeks like Plato and Aristotle had a conception of civic life fused with state centered measures of ordering society in polis. Though the concept of state society differentiation was lost in Bodin and Hobbes who believed in holding society together through sovereign powers, the idea of differentiation was rediscovered by Locke in Two Treatises of Government, where he conceives society as voluntary association and contract between equals. Hence state for Locke is an outcome of autonomous uncoerced commitment of individuals. Society is primus for Locke as it is result of first contract. The second contract creates state with a responsibility, as trustee and custodian of society for attainment of objectives that individuals are unable to achieve in voluntary association. Hence state capability of regulation is for a purpose. (Taylor, 2001) Notion of Civil society is validated in Montesquieu thought who is a strong

*Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of
Pakistan Polity*

influence in 1789 US constitution framers. The concept of limited government raised in backdrop of limiting the authority of absolute monarchs, to sustain liberties and virtues of non-monarchical power. (Ellis, 1990) Foucault believes that demand about human rights in age of absolute monarchies were not that “we do not want to be governed” or the concept of governance, rather rights discourses emphasized on “we do not want to be governed by such principles”. Hence the whole discourse of *Rights* was built on the concept of limiting the authority, or imposing checks on arbitrary sovereign powers. (Foucault, *What is Critique*, 2002) The third pillar of good governance emerged on scene with the advent of capitalism. The work of Adam Smith and Karl Marx provides insight in analysis of market or capitalist forces along with state and society. Smith in *An Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations* taken stance that market forces has power to organize society if state power is limited to providing only order. To Smith economic interests can serve as solid base of social organizations. Hegel identified civil society with market relations. He identified a sphere of interaction between society and market forces driven by economic needs and utility. To Hegel civil society means formal recognition of stakeholders (property holders) as basis of *sittlichkeit*, the ethical community. Marx coined the term *bürgerliche Gesellschaft*, the bourgeoisie society. Marx was the first to employ three distinctive institutions, i.e. the market, state and associative as participant of governance activity. The term civil society is used by Marx to identify market relations within bourgeoisie society. (Taylor, 2001) Though, the term civil society is used differently in present day discourses of governance. In Adam Smith, Hegel and Marx accounts market forces are identified influencing and interacting with society, having a two way interactive relation with state, as ordering institution, a carrier of idea or just a part of superstructure. But the identification and distinction of three clear facets i.e. civil society, state and market forces is blurred.

Talcott Parson is the first social theorist to identify civil society as distinct sphere and domain of collective decisions. To Parson civil society when three operational organizations of modern societies differentiated. Money and capital as domain of market, administration and use of coercive power as prerogative of state, and voluntary association comes in play through normative, discursive influences. The three distinctive spheres according to Parsons are in equilibrium in relation to each other; change and transformation in one part leading to adjustments and amendments in other two spheres as well. Hence transformation and change in market forces initiate a reform in state administrative procedures and also a normative change in associative relations of civil society. To Parsons four processes are inevitable in process of change, i.e.

- **Differentiation** leading to increase in complexity of social organizations
- **Adaptive Upgrading** leading to institutional specialization
- **Inclusion** leading to mechanism of inclusion of previously excluded groups on basis of gender, race and class.

- **Value Generalization** as mechanism to evolve new values of toleration and legitimation of a wide range of activities (Parsons, 1937)

Hence the Discourse of **Good Governance** believe in a multi-centered system with increased role and structure differentiation for effectiveness, efficiency, transparency and inclusion of groups in process of decision making. Good Governance do not take state as unitary actor and central to governance activities, rather it is polycentric idea with state as arbiter and regulator in arena of wide range of socio-economic activities.

The concept of multi-centered good governance become more relevant, as states are parts of world system; and rules of international order and trade regime are binding for state actors. Further the commercial pursuits and markets are no more limited to state bounds making interactions with society across state boundaries enhancing the domain of civil society to global level. Jurgen Habermas theory of communicative as a model of governance is important for guiding principles of good governance for mature societies, where all actors participate on basis of understanding, reasoned argument, For sake of value generalization in society compatible to international trade regime an account of postmodern post industrial society given by Jurgen Hebermas is important because it believe in normatively controlled actions. Hebermas theory of Communicative Action as a model of governance is significant in guiding the policy discourse of Good Governance. Communicative Action is the method of mature societies where actors in society seek to reach common understanding and to coordinate actions by reasoned argument, consensus arrived through dialogue, with no privileges attributed to bureaucracy. Habermas call it deregulated liberal trade regime with participation of individuals. Theory of communicative action endorses that state is no more a center as other centers emerge affecting the process of decision making and implementation of decisions. Habermas calls it normatively controlled action as norms of trade liberalization order are internalized by all involved i.e. individual, society, polity, fulfilling generalized expectations of behavior. (Habermas, 1985)

Analytical Scheme of Study

The discourse of good governance believes in interaction of public sector, private sector and civil society interacting at multiple levels of analysis. The public sector or governance structures are considered responsible for allocation of resources as well as values and norms for the society. Michel Foucault is of the view that governance is an intelligible exercise and have three dimensions, i.e. who, how and what of governance. To him idea of reasonable governance emerged in period of absolute monarchs who not only calculated statistical data about population, territory and resources but effectively used the territory to make a milieu where economic activities can be effectively carried out. A good monarch was signified as good shepherd responsible for the wellbeing of flock, owing to religious

***Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of
Pakistan Polity***

tradition of Bible. (Foucault, Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978., 2009)

With Enlightenment came the idea of limited authority but comprehensive state performing tasks of public welfare. Hence limited authority meant distribution of authority in various state institutions and processes that interact to formulate a public policy. In discourses of comparative politics to evaluate and compare the performance of state, term of political system in interactive relation with social and economic environment was coined. The studies included formal and informal actors involved in decision making process of country. As governance activities were divided and distributed among various institutions, concepts of role(s), structure(s) and function(s) were employed for sake of accountability and efficiency in process of governance. Roles are base interacting units of political system. Persons performing political and administrative roles are in terms of what they do? And how they do?

Role is hence a political/administrative activity performed by an individual in formal official capacity. Concept of role has significance in good governance discourses. If power or authority is used for personal gain the countries are ranked as corrupt on governance indicators. Furthermore the term role signify limited defined sphere of role in process of decision making and implementation. There is a delicate boundary between the spheres of different roles. Crossing the line mean stepping in zone of other actor resulting in ineffective performance and authoritarianism. The concept of role is important for accountability as well.

Patterned interactions between basic units (roles) of system are attributed as structure. Structures involve institutions and processes. Structures of political system include formal and informal institutions involved in process of decision making. Legislature, executive, bureaucracy and judiciary are institutions of public sector. But civil society and commercial interests enter in arena of governance as political parties and interest groups influencing the process of governance through legal or anomic means. Civil society and private sector also constitute the environment of political domain.

Function is a signifier of political/administrative activity. Function is a signifier of an activity that is carried out by Political System. Security (external or internal), the generation of wealth, the distribution and redistribution of wealth, the provision of welfare related activities and regulation of societal environment are some common functions performed by every political system. Role and Structure both performs function but level and domain of their activity is different. Sometime the structure overall is not responsible for intervention in the functional domain of other structures but activism of a role lead to subversion of functional activities of other structures. It sows the seed for authoritarian tendencies and abuse of accountability mechanism. The root to authoritarianism can also be taken if roles of different structures make unconstitutional alliance to subdue a

constitutional structure. It affect the transparency and accountability of governance system.

After analyzing Pakistan performance on various international indicators, the study will analyze the how, how and what of governance/ governmentality on basis of Role-Structure-Function triangular analyses of history of Pakistani Political System. The study will take a revisionist look on Pakistan history to address following questions cum hypothesis.

- Roles of Pakistani Political System performed the well-defined constitutional functions in their respective structure or were they performing overlapping functions in domains of other structures?
- Were different structures or sub systems were operating effectively in their defined domains or they were not allowed to perform their functions by the activist tendencies of roles in other systems?
- All the structures had an equal power to perform effectively in constitutionally defined ways or some structure were more powerful creating hindrances and blockades in ways of other structures?
- Some role and structure were successful in making extra constitutional alliances leading to authoritarian tendencies in the political system. It resulted in lack of accountability and transparency mechanism destroying the very concept of good governance.

Pakistan Performance in Comparison to South Asian States on Good Governance Measures

Annual reports on Governance indicators are produced by WGI (Worldwide Governance Indicators) and World Bank for over 200 countries regarding six basic indicators of Governance. World Bank's report Governance Matters 2008, defines Governance as it consists of the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised. This includes the process by which governments are selected, monitored and replaced; the capacity of the government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies; and the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them. The report aggregates for individual governance indicators over the period 1996–2019, for six dimensions of governance:

- Voice and Accountability
- Political Stability and Absence of Violence
- Government Effectiveness
- Regulatory Quality
- Rule of Law
- Control of Corruption

***Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of
Pakistan Polity***

Each indicator can be analyzed individually in comparison of other countries or regions, also can be analyzed for development across time. The data is collected from a large number of surveys produced by governmental/non-governmental organizations, think tanks, educational institutions and public/private survey institutions. Governance score is measured on a scale ranging from (-2.5 and +2.5) as extremes marking zero as the mid-point. In comparison of year 2009 and 2019 Pakistan percentile rank and Governance score on all six indicators are as follows.

Governance Indicator	Year	Number of Score	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Governance Score (-2.5-+2.5)
Voice and Accountability	2009	15	24.17	-0.86
	2019	11	23.15	-0.84
Political Stability and Absence of Violence	2009	7	1.42	-2.64
	2019	7	3.33	-2.25
Government Effectiveness	2009	10	23.44	-0.80
	2019	10	25.96	-0.68
Regulatory Quality	2009	10	30.62	-0.58
	2019	11	27.40	-0.64
Rule of Law	2009	16	21.80	-0.83
	2019	13	26.44	-0.67
Control of Corruption	2009	14	14.83	-1.07
	2019	12	21.15	-0.85

Table 1 Comparison of Pakistan on Governance Indicators (2009-19)¹

The table represents a cross-sectional view of all indicators representing governance in Pakistan. For first indicator of Voice and Accountability the provided data doesn't show any notable changes. As one can say for the period of last 10 years the situation of voice and accountability has not improved or declined. Second indicator also shows the same trajectory as 1st indicator. The table shows a small hike over the year in situation of third & fourth indicator of Govt. effectiveness and Regulatory Quality as both go up and down with time but remains consistent in comparison to 2009 with 2019. The table indicates a slight loss in percentile position of Pakistan for fifth indicator as the country moved from 21.80 to 26.44 likewise sixth indicator in which Pakistan has also losses his position for 6.30 percentile in a decade.

Voice and Accountability (1st Indicator)

¹ <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>

Pakistan performance in year 2019 in Voice and Accountability is better than war affected Afghanistan only in the region.

Indicator	Country	Year	Number of Score	Governance (-2.5 to +2.5)
Voice and Accountability	Afghanistan	2019	10	-0.99
	Pakistan	2019	11	-0.84
	Bangladesh	2019	11	-0.72
	Maldives	2019	4	-0.44
	Nepal	2019	10	-0.13
	Sri Lanka	2019	10	-0.04
	Bhutan	2019	5	0.1
	India	2019	12	0.29

Table 2 Comparison of South Asian States on Voice and Accountability Indicator²

Pakistan score of Voice and Accountability Indicator -0.84 is located on the second position from the bottom while Afghanistan is first among the lowest ordered with score of -0.99. Bottom third position is achieved by Sri Lanka with a score of -0.04. Among the top two of the region are India with a score of 0.29 (only two countries in the South Asian region with positive ranking) and Bhutan with a score 0.10. Nepal and Sri Lanka are on 5th and 6th positions respectively.

Political Stability and Absence of Violence (2nd Indicator)

In second indicator condition of Pakistan is not very much different from the first indicator.

Indicator	Country	Year	Number of Score	Governance (-2.5 to +2.5)
Political Stability and Absence of Violence	Afghanistan	2019	6	-2.65
	Pakistan	2019	7	-2.25
	Bangladesh	2019	17	-0.92
	India	2019	8	-0.7
	Nepal	2019	6	-0.47
	Sri Lanka	2019	7	-0.23
	Maldives	2019	3	0.01
	Bhutan	2019	4	1.09

² <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>

*Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of
Pakistan Polity*

Table 3 Comparison of South Asian States on Political Stability and Absence of Violence Indicator³

Afghanistan’s regional performance on Political Stability and Absence of Violence Indicator is worst with a score of -2.65. On this indicator Pakistan is ranked on number 7 with a score slightly better than Afghanistan i.e., -2.25. Bottom third position is taken by Bangladesh with a score of -0.92. Bhutan with a score of +1.09, Maldives with +0.10 and Sri Lanka with -0.23 are ranked first, Second and third respectively on the top. India with a score of -0.70 and Nepal with a score of -0.47 are the mid countries with 4th and 5th position.

Government Effectiveness (3rd Indicator)

Pakistan performance is slightly better in indicator three as it is below form Afghanistan, Nepal and Bangladesh. As a matter of fact, Pakistan has shown no sign of progress over a decade and maintained its position.

Indicator	Country	Year	Number of Score	Governance (-2.5 to +2.5)
Government Effectiveness	Afghanistan	2019	8	-1.46
	Nepal	2019	9	-1.05
	Bangladesh	2019	10	-0.74
	Pakistan	2019	10	-0.68
	Maldives	2019	4	-0.19
	Sri Lanka	2019	8	-0.11
	India	2019	10	0.17
	Bhutan	2019	5	0.31

Table 4 Comparison of South Asian states on Government Effectiveness⁴

Government effectiveness indicator reveal the fact that Bhutan with a +0.31, India with +0.17 and Sri Lanka with -0.11 score are ranked on First three Positions. Maldives with a score of -0.19 is at No. 4. Pakistan with -0.68 is at No. 5. Bottom three positions are shared by Afghanistan, Nepal and Bangladesh.

Regulatory Quality (4th Indicator)

Comparison of Regulatory Indicator across South Asian region reveals the fact that no country of the region scored on the positive side of the scale. Performance of the whole region is below zero. Countries can be ranked as following

³ <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>

⁴ <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>

Indicator	Country	Year	Number of Score	Governance (-2.5 to +2.5)
Regulatory Quality	Afghanistan	2019	9	-1.12
	Bangladesh	2019	11	-0.93
	Nepal	2019	10	-0.7
	Pakistan	2019	11	-0.64
	Maldives	2019	4	-0.48
	Bhutan	2019	6	-0.33
	Sri Lanka	2019	10	-0.18
	India	2019	11	-0.16

**Table 5 Comparison of South Asian States on Regulatory Quality⁵
Rule of Law (5th Indicator)**

Indicator	Country	Year	Number of Score	Governance (-2.5 to +2.5)
Rule of Law	Afghanistan	2019	11	-1.71
	Pakistan	2019	13	-0.67
	Bangladesh	2019	12	-0.64
	Nepal	2019	12	-0.54
	Maldives	2019	6	-0.41
	India	2019	13	-0.03
	Sri Lanka	2019	11	-0.01
	Bhutan	2019	7	0.59

Table 6 Comparison of South Asian States on Rule of Law⁶

Pakistan is on second position on the bottom ladder of the region with -0.67 better than Afghanistan with a score of -1.71. Even Bangladesh has a better score than Pakistan with -0.64 points. Top three of eight countries are Bhutan (+0.59), Sri Lanka (-0.01) and India (-0.03). Middle range countries are Maldives (-0.41) and Nepal (-0.54).

⁵ <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>

⁶ <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>

*Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of
Pakistan Polity*

Control of Corruption (6th Indicator)

Indicator	Country	Year	Number of Score	Governance (-2.5 to +2.5)
Control of Corruption	Afghanistan	2019	10	-1.4
	Bangladesh	2019	12	-0.99
	Pakistan	2019	12	-0.85
	Nepal	2019	11	-0.67
	Sri Lanka	2019	10	-0.32
	Maldives	2019	5	-0.26
	India	2019	13	-0.23
	Bhutan	2019	6	1.62

Table 7 Comparison of South Asian States on Control of Corruption⁷

Region is considered as worst performer on control of corruption indicator. Only country with a positive ranking is Bhutan (+1.62).

Evaluation of Pakistan by Transparency International on Corruption Perception Index 2007

Corruption Perception Index (CPI) orders countries of the world according to the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among Public officials and Politicians. Index is published by Transparency International. The organization defines corruption as the abuse of entrusted powers for private gains. Scale is 1-100. Top scorers are countries scoring near to 100 like New Zealand and Denmark's score is 88, countries scoring the second-best score of 85 are as follows Finland, Switzerland, Singapore and Sweden and bottom scorers are Somalia and Sudan with a Score of Only 12. For sake of comparison a table is presented here to compare performance of eight South Asian countries from year 2012-2020.

⁷ <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>

Country	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Worldwide Ranking 2020
Afghanistan	3.30	3.30	1.29	3.49	1.74	1.39	1.41	2.55	2.44	165
Bangladesh	4.10	4.10	4.23	4.30	4.13	3.19	2.63	2.62	1.72	146
Pakistan	2.30	3.00	3.24	3.12	2.12	2.11	2.06	2.46	1.80	124
Nepal	2.40	1.40	2.20	2.73	2.33	2.00	1.85	1.76	1.35	117
Sri Lanka	1.30	2.10	2.18	2.09	1.64	1.82	1.85	2.11	1.17	94
India	2.10	2.20	2.27	3.14	2.47	2.16	2.42	1.60	1.14	86
Maldives	-	-	-	-	5.66	1.71	2.24	2.57	7.69	75
Bhutan	3.60	2.60	1.81	2.14	2.12	1.83	2.86	2.76	2.39	24

Table 8 Comparison of South Asian States on CPI⁸

The Report is composed of overall 180 countries around the globe. The worldwide ranking of 2020 on Corruption Index indicates Afghanistan on 165/180, Bangladesh 146/180 and Pakistan 124/180 positions of the overall ranking of the world in Corruption that is worst ranking for South Asian region. Yet Small states like Bhutan and Maldives are on much better state ranking in the report by Transparency International scoring 24 and 75 position respectively.

Evaluation of Pakistan on Economist Intelligence Unit Democracy and Quality of Life Index

The two indexes are grouped together for the reason that both are produced by Economist Intelligence Unit. The previous methodology of comparing countries of South Asia is adopted here too.

Democracy Index

Democracy Index questionnaire is comprised of questions related to respective categories as

1. "Whether National Elections are free and fair";
2. "The security of voters";
3. "The influence of foreign powers on government";
4. "The capability of the Civil Servants to implement policies".

Finally, the democracy index, rounded to one decimal, decides the classification of the country, as quoted:

1. **Functioning democracies**—scores of 8-10.
2. **Flawed democracies**—scores of 6 to 7.9.

⁸ <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2020/index/nzl>

**Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of
Pakistan Polity**

3. **Hybrid regimes**—scores of 4 to 5.9.
4. **Authoritarian regimes**—scores below 4.

	Number of countries	Percentage of countries	Percentage of world population
Functioning Democracies	23	13.8	8.4
Flawed Democracies	52	31.1	41.0
Hybrid Regimes	35	21.0	15.0
Authoritarian Regimes	57	34.1	35.6

Table 9 Categorization of Democracies around the Globe⁹

A total of 167 countries has been classified into four categories mentioned in the table. Countries like Norway (9.81), Iceland (9.37), and Sweden (9.26) are functioning democracies. Bangladesh (5.99) and Pakistan (4.31) belong to the Hybrid regime list that end with Nigeria (4.10).

Comparative ranking of South Asian Countries in 2012-2020 is presented in the following chart.

The following data is taken from the Democracy Index compiled by Economist Intelligence Unit. The south Asian countries are listed in region Asia and Australasia 2020 comprising of 28 countries.

Country	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	Global Ranking 2020	Regional Ranking 2020	Classification
Maldives												
Bhutan	5.71	5.30	5.30	5.08	4.93	4.93	4.87	4.82	4.65	84	18	Hybrid Regime
Afghanistan	2.85	2.85	2.97	2.55	2.55	2.77	2.77	2.48	2.48	139	25	Authoritarian Regime

⁹ eu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2020/

Nepal	5.2 2	5.2 8	5.1 8	5.1 8	4.8 6	4.7 7	4.7 7	4.1 6	4.2 4	92	20	Hybrid Regime
Pakistan	4.3 1	4.2 5	4.1 7	4.2 6	4.3 3	4.4 0	4.6 4	4.6 4	4.5 7	105	21	Hybrid Regime
Bangladesh	5.9 9	5.8 8	5.5 7	5.4 3	5.7 3	5.7 3	5.7 8	5.8 6	5.8 6	76	16	Hybrid Democracy
Sri Lanka	6.1 4	6.2 7	6.1 9	6.4 8	6.4 8	6.4 2	5.6 9	5.6 9	5.7 5	68	12	Flawed Democracy
India	6.6 1	6.9 0	7.2 3	7.2 3	7.8 1	7.7 4	7.9 2	7.6 9	7.5 2	53	8	Flawed Democracy

Table 10 Comparison of South Asian States on Democracy Index by The Economist Intelligence Unit¹⁰

Revisionist View of Pakistan Formative History Through a Structural-Functional Lens

The segment of study is about the root cause of ineffective performance of Pakistan on Governance indicators by casting a revisionist glance on early history of Pakistan. The colonial legacy of diffused structures and overstepping of different roles and institutions continued in postcolonial age. This governmentality set its own norms like doctrine of necessity and involvement of non-representative structures in political sphere.

Colonial Legacy

Governmentality or rational governance in South Asia can be traced back to colonial rule encompassing almost all the eight states except Afghanistan. British introduced administrative state apparatus based on merit recruitments, defined structures and standard operation procedures, and rule of law. With advent of administrative and political reforms, awareness of local elites enhanced, and British faced contestation. The conflict of interest between imperial administration and multiple local elites were resolved through negotiation and dialogue. Hence a civil society conscious about its interests emerged, though the civic space was occupied by indigenous elites who represented commercial interests like landed aristocracy and emerging capitalist class. Masses were excluded from the system. British Rule in South Asia created hegemony of imperial power and local elites. Colonial governmentality was characterized by centralization, elitism, and strong state structure with limited representation. Defining feature of colonial governance

¹⁰ eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2020/

***Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of
Pakistan Polity***

was a developed, modernized administrative structure. It can be regarded as overdeveloped vis a vis weak political institutions. It was a necessary precautionary measure on part of colonial masters to suppress and subdue the political arm of system. (Jalal, 1995)

A strong administrative arm was necessary to extract the revenues for imperial powers. Although infrastructure was build connecting every nook and corner of the country to gain a horizontal legitimacy through coercive means. The power discourse was sustained by a complementary process of developing a rigid social stratification. Hierarchy was headed by imperial might with local elites as subordinate power sharer. Rule of voice of masses in form of participation and accountability to masses that is the basis of good governance was deliberately not introduced by the colonial power.

Government of India Act 1935 introduced a limited version, a faded image of Parliamentary democracy at Provincial level. But no central Parliamentary democracy was working on the dawn of Independence Day. Norms of a working Parliamentary system were still in their infancy in provinces also. Instead of democratic dialogue process politician looked towards hegemonic intervention for gain and sustenance of power. Central government intervened in provincial domains as patron for sake of control and protection of Imperial interest. (Khan H. , 2005)

Horizontal legitimacy sufficed the purpose of colonial rule thus there was no need to gain a mass oriented vertical legitimacy. But challenges of post-colonial governance were different from alien hegemonic rule. Independence should have meant the realization of ideals of indigenous rule according to the will and wishes of people of Pakistan. There must have been a postcolonial discourse to develop governing mechanism to attain a vertical legitimacy.

But power bearers of Pakistan polity turned a deaf ear and independence without participatory mechanism became just a change of masters. The subordinate partners of imperial power (Administration + Politicians) who were previously accountable at least to hegemon became almighty. With no demarcation of structural functional boundaries story of Pakistan Governance in early years is a story of activist roles in Judiciary as well as in bureaucracy crossing the fine lines, penetrating in the working of other structures and making alliances to subvert the effective performance of political institutions. (Hussain A. , 1979) (Hussain H. , 2007)

Another feature with which Pakistan initiated its working was that provinces comprising Pakistan never before shared power with each other. They were accustomed to accountability to Viceroy who was an alien, but more or less they were independent in provincial domains. They used to struggle for Power sharing on provincial front with their fellows having same ethnic background. With the consent of Central authority they maneuver power over their fellow people. In federation of Pakistan they have to share power with different ethnic cults. The

intervention of Central Government that was previously an established norm was now seen as an activity to be subdued by dominant ethnic groups. In this environment of suspicion the observance of colonial legacy proved a catalyst for ethnic hatred. (Ali, 1970) A constitution based on the aspirations of People demarcating the functional boundaries for roles as well as for structures was the only solution. But the process was subverted by the alliance of roles in different structures of Pakistan polity. The following subsection will narrate the tale of this alliance.

Societal Settings of Pakistan

Social system is the grand system that provides a setting to operate in to other systems like Political and Economic. Other systems get their feed back and raw material from the societal environment. Politicians, bureaucracy (Civil and Military) and judiciary all are rooted in societal system and societal tendencies have deep imprints on their cognition. The dispensation of official roles is influenced by this cognition.

Demographic features of eastern and Western wings comprising Pakistani federation till 1971 were essentially different. Bengal was the only province in Pakistani federation who was considered fit for 'self rule' under the diarchic system introduced by the British in 1919. There was few big land lords in Bengal left at the time of partition. It was also the first province where the movement of awakening Muslims started after 1857. Plan for 'Simla Delegation' (1906) to seek safeguards for Muslims was made by Bengali Muslim intelligentsia. Muslim league was also born in Dhaka. (Cohen S. P., *The Idea of Pakistan*, 2005)

Except for East Pakistan which had an urban intelligentsia capable of mastering the complexities of governing a modern state, West Pakistan was ill prepared for such a task. The politicians of West Pakistan were feudal landlords appointed by the British to govern their territories in the name of British Raj. Population of Western wing was rural and it lacked a middle class intelligentsia capable of taking over the political responsibility. Feudal landlords of West Pakistan who previously ruled the country as Unionist were resented and disturbed by the influx of the Muslim refugees, who were altering the established demographics of power. The feudal landlords had nothing to do with the idea of Pakistan that was originally initiated in Muslim minority provinces. The creation of Pakistan was a threat to their own powers and they resisted the idea of Pakistan. Quaid-e-Azam was aware of these tendencies so he opted to control all reigns of power in himself. (Sayeed, 1980)

Alliance of Civil-Military Bureaucracy and Judicial Roles of

Pakistan inherited a judiciary rooted in British traditions, strictly following nonpartisan norms. The first Pakistani Chief Justice Sir Abdul Rasheed refused the invitation from first Prime Minister Khan Liaquat Ali Khan to save judiciary image

***Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of
Pakistan Polity***

from misperception. The Sindh Chief Court led by Sir George Constantine reversed the Governor General's order to dissolve Constituent Assembly. Tradition of Judiciary exercising independent judgment for limiting and defining the authority of different roles was not sustained. Federal Court represented by Chief Justice Muhammed Munir reversed Sindh Chief Court order by limiting and defining the jurisdiction of Sindh Chief Court. Instead a tradition of supremacy of executive over not only the legislative but also judicial organ of the state was well set during the initial years, when some Judicial roles decided to become a member of alliance of non-elected institutions. Judiciary provided the cover to unconstitutional decisions of administrative arms of the state in disfavor of representative bodies. Justice Munir was made Chief Justice of federal court when Senior most judge from East Pakistan A.S. Akram waived his seniority in his favor due to some invisible pressure. Judges of superior judiciary served as acting heads of governments in clear violation of principles of structural functionalism. (Hussain H. , 2007)

Direct Intervention of Military in Politics

The years that witnessed the seven Prime Ministers in Pakistan were able to see only one Indigenous Army Chief General Mohammed Ayub Khan. 1958 Martial Law was not a fresh experience of governance for the Armed forces of Pakistan. Martial Law was first introduced in Punjab during Anti Ahmadi riots in 1953. Moreover General Ayub Khan was holding chair in cabinet as Defense Minister since the time of Ghulam Mohammed. (Khan H. , 2005)

Although responsibility of Martial Law was put on the shoulders of Iskandar Mirza but real power behind this usurpation was General Ayub Khan. "Broad tactical outline" to overthrow civilian rule by civilian president with bureaucratic background Isikandar Mirza was framed by General Ayub Khan. Ayub Khan wrote in his book *Friends Not Masters*, recalling 4th October, 1958, that, the moment so long delayed had finally arrived. (Khan A. , 1967) Khalid bin Sayeed is of the view that Ayub was planning for the day when he visited USA with the first Prime Minister Liaqat Ali Khan and presented his vision of Pakistan future to Pentagon and US state department. (Sayeed, 1980)

The extra constitutional act of imposition of Martial Law was not possible without the collaboration of judiciary. Chief Justice Munir was aiding Mirza-Khan bureaucratic-military rule in legal constitutional matters. Munir not only guided military ruler about the structure of new constitution but also justified and validated the martial law of 1958 by employing the "doctrine of necessity". Though, it was against the structural-functional attributes of political system as well as independence of judiciary as Justice Munir was also the Law Minister of Pakistan in Ayub cabinet. (Hussain H. , 2007)

Conclusion

As we have discussed in the start that good governance is directly related to country's image dynamics. Image and perception of country has become utmost important in the setting of trade liberalization International regime of Globalization. Good Governance is measured on the scale of efficiency, effectivity, rule of law and accountability mechanism. It can be achieved through demarcation of functional boundaries between different role and structures of governance and development of accountability mechanism

Genealogy of governance systems of Pakistan reveals the fact that instead of rule of law, separation of powers, different roles and structures intervened in one another's domain. Supremacy of executive was established at the cost of Supremacy of Parliament with the patronage of some judicial roles. Judiciary is considered as guardian of constitution holding accountable the power hungry roles. Instead of holding accountable the establishment Judiciary acted as partners of establishment.

Some people from Law profession including Chief Justice Muhammed Munir gave their services to military rulers suggestion to legitimize their rule as well as to frame legal frame work orders as well as Provisional Constitutional Orders. (Khan H. , 2005)

Institution of Local bodies that is responsible to provide welfare services to masses at grass root level was used to legitimize military rule. More over the institution also served to curb the autonomy of Provinces. It was used to centralize power for the military rule. Instead of providing efficient rule it was used to give effectiveness to military rule by taking away the freedom of the people and minimizing the chances of any mass movement against military rule. (Hussain A. , 1979)

In an effective democracy parties play the role of political recruitment and political socialization of the people. From the very beginning Muslim League denied its role and instead of honoring the voice of the people it denied them the Voice necessary for democratic rule. To win elections at all costs it made unholy alliances first with the bureaucracy and then by introducing martial law. In early period it slaughtered the rule of provincial autonomy in a culturally and ethnically diverse country. Authoritative discourse was given the place of political discourse. In later party it assumed the role of King's party for military dictators. (Jalal, 1995)

Supremacy of Parliament was never established. Prime Ministers in early period were nominated by the Governor General and then President. These ratio of success of these nominated people from the Parliament was hundred percent. These Prime ministers were never accountable to Parliament. Instead they worked as extended arm of President on his will and till his consent. In Ayub period although Presidential system was introduced but the rule of separation of power that is the soul of Presidential form was ignored. A system by the President and for the President was devised. Even in short lived democracies the Parliament was not fully empowered. The reign of Z.A. Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif are examples of personalized rule instead of democratic institutions. (Cohen S. P., *The Idea of Pakistan*, 2005)

Governmentality and Good Governance: Structural Functional Study of Pakistan Polity

Judicial roles bargained for personal gains from dictators as well as from demagogues. Doctrine of necessity used to curtail constitution from time to time. Judiciary gave some bold decisions to declare martial laws as unconstitutional in some cases like Aasma Jilani case but that after martial law completed its life tenure. (Hussain H. , 2007)

To set an effective efficient democratic governance mechanism in operation all structures of polity must have equal power but Pakistan military might had no other equal. So the recurrence of military take over after each democratic experience has become the unwritten constitution of the land. Military is the guardian of ideological and geographical boundaries of Pakistan and providing security to the citizens of Pakistan.

If Pakistan has to achieve the optimum level of good governance first on the scale of South Asia (of eight countries compared Pakistan is better than only Afghanistan), then on Asian level and afterwards on the world level; onwards its different structures and roles has to opt for the policy of performing the constitutionally defined functions.

References

- Albrow, M. (2001). Society as Social Diversity: Challenges of Governance in Global Age. In OECD, *Governance in the 21st Century* (pp. 149-182). Paris: Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development.
- Ali, T. (1970). *Pakistan: Military Rule or People's Power*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Cohen, S. P. (1998). *The Pakistan Army*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, S. P. (2005). *The Idea of Pakistan*. Lahore: Vanguard Books.
- Cohen, S. P. (2012). Pakistan: Arrival and Departure. In S. P. Cohen, *The Futurof Pakistane* (pp. 1-69). Lahore: Vanguard Books.
- Ellis, H. A. (1990). Montesquieu's comparative politics and the spirit of American constitutionalism. *History of European Ideas*, 687-690.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *What is Critique*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Franz Nuscheler, Veronika Wittmann. (2017). From Governance to Good Governance. In C. K. Michael von Hauff, *Sustainable Development Policy A European Perspective*. London : Routledge.
- Habermas, J. (1985). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Beacon Press.
- Hilali, Z. A. (Spring 2002). Challenges to Pakistan Domestic Security. *Journal of Third World Studies*, 65-100.
- Hussain, A. (1979). *Elite Politics in an Ideological State*. Kentt: Dawson.

- Hussain, H. (2007, November). *Judicial Jitters in Pakistan: A Historical Overview*. Retrieved 05 26, 2021, from Defence Journal Mind is Ultimate Weapon: <http://www.defencejournal.com/2018-8/contents.asp>
- Jalal, A. (1995). *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khan, A. (1967). *Friends Not Masters*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Khan, H. (2005). *Constitutional and Political history of Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford.
- Khan, R. (1998). *Pakistan: A Dream Gone Sore*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Martin Hetherington, Tom Pierre Najem. (2003). *Good Governance in the Middle East Oil Monarchies*. London: Routledge.
- Merquior, J. G. (1985). *Foucault*. London: Fontana Press.
- Parsons, T. (1937). *The Structure of Social Action*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Policy, B. f. (2011). *Governance Principles, Institutional Capacity and Quality*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- Rizvi, H. A. (1974). *Military and Politics in Pakistan*. Progressive Publishers.
- Sayeed, K. B. (1980). *Politics in Pakistan, The Nature and Direction of Change*. New York: Preager.
- Schneider, H. (1999). Participatory governance for poverty reduction. *International Development*, 521-534.
- Shafqat, S. (1997). *Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan From Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto to BeNazir Bhutto*. New York: Routledge.
- smith, S. B. (1989). What Is "Right" In Hegel's Philosophy of Right? *The American Political Science Review*, 3-18.
- Taylor, C. (2001). *Sources of Self The Making of Modren Identity*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Usaid. (2013). *Usaid strategy on democracy human rights and governance*.
- Ziring, L. (1971). *The Ayub Khan Era: Politics in Pakistan 1958-69*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Ziring, L. (1977). *Pakistan: The Long View*. Durham: Duke University Press.
-