

© 2021 Faisal & Ahmad. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons-Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike License 4.0 International (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly attributed, not used for commercial purposes, and, if transformed, the resulting work is redistributed under the same or similar license to this one.

**Journal of Politics and International Studies**

*Vol. 7, No. 1, January–June 2021, pp.47–61*

## **A study of Institutional Federalism in Pakistan (2008-2013)**

**Dr. Muhammad Faisal**

PhD Scholar,  
Department of Political Science,  
University of the Punjab, Lahore.

**Rana Eijaz Ahmad**

Professor,  
Department of Political Science,  
University of the Punjab, Lahore.

**Correspondence:** [ranaeijaz.polsc@pu.edu.pk](mailto:ranaeijaz.polsc@pu.edu.pk)

### **ABSTRACT**

*History of federalism in Pakistan experienced many ups and downs. It travelled a journey from political centralization to deep tendency of regionalism and towards the emancipation of institutional design of federalism during 2008-2013. The present study deals with the trend and development of federalism in an institutional way. The formative touchstone of the study reveals the tendency of institutionalism in the structure of federalism in Pakistan during previous five years. The structure of governance resolves the issues between the centre and the provinces and provided a political platform for political parties and leadership in dealing with the challenges of governance in Pakistan. The study finds that the institutional principles of federalism in Pakistan are required to resolve the problems of governance.*

**Keywords:** *Federalism, Institutional design, coalition Politics, centre-province politics*

### **Introduction**

The fundamental characteristic of PPP – led regime during the last five years was the acceptance of electoral mandate of political parties both in the centre and in all the provinces. The unique credibility of regime was that, the coalitional regimes were established in the centre and in all the provinces. It was an inimitable development of federalism since the partition period in of 1947. Thus, in establishing the institutional arena of federalism in Pakistan during 2008-2013 was an incredible work of political leadership. The elementary root of this institutionalism was the adaptation of charter of democracy dating back to 2006. The two main stream political parties such as Pakistan People’s Party, Pakistan Muslim League (N) and other political parties at equal footing played a vital role in establishing the institutional federalism in Pakistan.

The present study is restricted to the institutional circle of federalism and finds a narrow tendency of federalism while adopting the institutional theory. The approach espouses the study of those events and tendencies that strengthened the basis for systemic institutional federalism in Pakistan. The approach is derived on the two main critical concepts; the first is the institutionalism while the second is the culture of political governance. By correlating the two concepts; the essential features of

federalism have been studied. The study reviews the general trends of democracy, transitional nature of federalism and the changing patterns of political institutions and their impacts on governance. At the end, the study also finds some general collaborative forces such as; the deep structure of political parties, the implementation of third tier of government (local government system) and complete provincial autonomy for all provinces to increase the level of institutional federalism in Pakistan.

### **Federalism and Governance: An Institutional Approach**

Federalism is a systemic process of governance in a state having multi – ethnic trends. The working of political institutions is directly related to the acceptance of constitutional performance, procedural working of political forces (parties) and the level of expansion of governance in delivering the services to the citizens. The level of governance in a federal state depends upon the degree of cohesiveness and parity of the various political institutions and the margin of socio – political cooperation among the political leadership. The prolonged context of cohesion and political consensus is a path for more stable and institutionalized federalism in a state with minimum socio – political challenges.

In a state, the federal governance is similar to “boiled mineral” which adopts multiple faces depending upon their working in the line of institutionalism (Faisal, 2010, p. 31). The role of democratization become most important in a scenario of decentralized governance and the consensual position of political parties contribute a greater part in delivering basic services to their citizens. According to Kavaljit Singh; “the observable fact of governance directly emphasizes on the implementation of decisions” (Singh, 2005, p. 131) on institutional lines. The principle is adopted in developed federal states like USA, Canada, Australia and Switzerland. The degree of governability in developing federal states like Nigeria, Philippine, India, Indonesia and Pakistan is at the lower ebb due to the existence of overt authoritarianism, hybrid political regimes with unstable governments in the centre and in the federating units, non – organized political parties with personality dominance in decision making, economic insecurity for the federating units and the one – dimensional institutionalization (Singh, 2005, p. 110).

George Anderson adopts an institutional approach while studying the working of federalism in a state. He emphasizes that, the constitutional performance and rule of law play a significance site in expanding the institutionalized exertion of federalism (Anderson, 2008, p. 5). Another approach is bargaining loom by political leadership in arriving at mutual consensus in matters of politics and governance (Sills, 1968, p. 354). Usually a pre – determined position is derived in such matters. Arther B. Gunlick accentuates the coalitional discussion (Gunlick, 1987, p. 34) while reaching at the final decisions that are related to the governance, where the level of participation increased from few to multiple political entities. At all these levels, the institutional cooperation in policy – making (Park, 1967, p. 5) enhance the degree of mutual consensus, institutional sharing in cooperation and pave the process of governance on phased lines.

Despite the above explanations and theories, the institutional working of federalism in a state contributes in increasing the process of decentralization (Faisal, 2010, p. 26), fiscal independence of federating units (Birch, 1972, p. 19) increase the rank of autonomy and governance (Kuper and Jessica, 1980, p. 292), produce political and

constitutional equilibrium among various government institutions (Mushtaq, 1993, p. 25) and the last but not least is the rationalizing role of political parties for a phased transformation in a state regime.

S.P Huntington describes that; “[the] local politics is the politics of ethnicity..... [where the] state government lose their power through devolution to substate, regional, provincial and local political entities” (Huntington, 1996, pp. 28-35). The writer emphasizes on the rising trends of institutionalization as the level of intensity of ethnicity is increasing in federally plural (Burgess, 1993, p. 6) states since the end of cold war. During this period, the political scientists changed their scope of studies to ‘institutionalization’. Like other fields of social sciences; the institutional study in the field of federalism also finds a new multiple trends especially in the governance of developing countries. Since then, institutionalism is a common feature in the study of federalism.

### **History of Institutional Federalism in Pakistan**

The historical evolution of federalism in Pakistan is derived from the India Act of 1935 which was centralized in its tendency having restricted political participation in decision making process. It was a colonial legacy that, the role of constitutional institutionalism in Pakistan was derived this very dropped tendency, which instead of increasing the role and working of political institutions in the centre and in provinces derived a centralized administrative tendency. The lineage is still exited due to the role of colonial bequest (Jalal, 1994, p. 1) which derived their role from civil bureaucratic system. The federal government appointed its three administrators from bureaucratic background in the early period in the province of Punjab, NWFP (Renamed into Khyber Pakhtunkhwa in 2010) and East Bengal. Furthermore, the process was carried on either by declaring the governor rule or dismissing the provincial ministries in the three provinces by the federal government. The formative constitution of 1956 also coined in the same provision while the 1962 constitutional package was fully derived on the tendency of quasi-institutional and centrality theme.

The enactment of 1973 constitution recognized the process of institutional federalism in Pakistan as this constitution was the result of unanimous decision by political parties like NAP, JUI and PPP. But the process was remained incomplete as the martial law was deposed in the state in 1977 and the country was drowned into another tendency of centralization. The 1988-99 period, was thrived into the instability of politics of federalism as the political forces did not in a position to promulgate their consensus in the political process. Although Pervez Musharraf stepped into the realm of politics in 1999 and he declared an institutional plan for the development of federalism but he considered the process on their lineage of personal hierarchy. He tried to unite all institutions under direct control of the centre but failed to cope their administration to complete the process of institutionalism.

There are various tendencies behind the underdeveloped structure of institutional federalism in Pakistan in pre-2008 electoral political scenario. The first reason was the quest of a centralized structure of political power (Mushtaq and Muhammad, 2011, pp. 230-31) rather than the process of democratization in Pakistan. Due to this pictorial process, the scale of democracy had fluctuated in the past as well. Even though, despite the existence of federalism in state, it relatively supported to authoritative governance (Adeney, 2007, p. 111). The second flaw was the alienated

role of political elites on the tendency of narrow political perspectives. They either indulged into personal rifts or did not in a ratified position on institutional challenges. The third cause was that, the federal government did not find an institutional pace for provinces to accommodate their political and financial interests and tendered a period of centralization. The last but not least was that the organized and unanimous role of political parties was either remained absent or at the lower ebb in evolving the trends of institutionalism.

### **Opening the pace: Charter of Democracy**

The charter of democracy is hallmark for the beginning of institutional federalism that was signed between Mian Nawaz Sharif from PML (N) and late Benazir Bhutto; the two veteran and exiled political leaders in London in May 2006. It was a politico – legal document which contained the obligation for democratic rule of federalism on the basis of institutional trends by the two national political parties after they joined Pakistani nation against Pervez Musharraf’s oligarchic rule in 2007. The primary exploration in CoD was to restore the constitution on the parliamentary provisions (Faisal, 2010, pp. 110-113).

Although, Pervez Musharraf tried to dislodge the process of this political reconciliation by joining hands with Benazir Bhutto but the parties were united at the cause of restoration of democracy in the state. The political parties under article 22 of charter clearly defined that process of democratic transition from the state will not be derailed and they will not support any overt rule by military in the future and will try to engage with each other and with the other political forces to enhance the process of institutionalism in Pakistan. The other clauses of the charter were the elimination of concurrent list to enhance the process of provincial autonomy, the strong role of judicial system, the institutional tendency of political government towards military and the democratic transition in the state (Charter of Democracy, May 16, 2006, Friday Times).

The charter of democracy united all political parties at a single cause of restoration of democracy in Pakistan against the Pervez Musharraf’s politics of centralization. There were two reasons behind these steps by the two main stream political parties. First was the rise of citizen’s consciousness about their political rights as it was the strongest wave of mass participation after Anti- Ayub movement that was raised in 1969 under the platform of National Democratic Forum which was being exploited in a successful way by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto under the platform of PPP (Ziring, 2003, p. 111). The participation of people in the political process since the declaration of policy of centralization by Pervez Musharraf since 2005 staged the public at the new millennium of ripen role of their participation.

The second reason was the decline of institutional working of various state institutions in the ambit of constitutional provision limited the role of rational decision making process in the public interests as the whole system was centralized under the kinship of a single institution of presidential office. In Pakistan, the history reveals that whenever this kind of centralization took place it ended with a new role of political parties and their elites being derived on an oscillatory principles of federalism (Milam, 2009, p. 137). This gap was being filled by another wave of institutionalism being started under the streamer of populous wave of democratization. The political elites realized their position and addressed the people about their grievances against the wave of authoritarianism and promised with the

## A study of Institutional Federalism in Pakistan (2008-2013)

nation that the restoration of democracy is very important to address the issues of governance. They regarded to consolidate the political system on the principles of institutional federalism (Boquerat, 2009, p. 2). The citizens supported these voices. They voted to change the previous political system with the new system of federal institutionalism in Pakistan. This position of political parties in 2008 elections was as under:

### General Elections of 2008

<b>Political Party</b>	<b>National Assembly</b>	<b>Punjab Assembly</b>	<b>Sindh Assembly</b>	<b>KPK Assembly</b>	<b>Balochistan Assembly</b>
<i>PPP</i>	122	107	93	30	12
<i>PML (N)</i>	91	170	00	09	01
<i>PML (Q)</i>	54	84	09	06	18
<i>MQM</i>	25	00	51	00	00
<i>ANP</i>	13	00	02	48	04
<i>MMA</i>	07	02	00	14	10
<i>PML (F)</i>	05	03	08	00	00
<i>PPP (S)</i>	01	00	00	06	00
<i>Others</i>	20	04	03	11	20

Source (Mushtaq et. al, 2011, p. 259)

### **Coalitional Governments and Institutionalism**

The election results of 2008 paved the progress of federalism on institutional line by promulgating coalitional governments in the centre and in all the provinces. This process reflected the new beginning of institutional federalism. The political parties and the elites promised to support one another in the centre and in federating units to cope with the challenges of governance against the Pervez Musharraf authoritarianism. Although, the coalitional government in the centre was weakened at political fronts as the mainstream political party which was also a signatory of charter of democracy; quitted the coalitional cabinet after six weak of their formulation at the first stage (Rizvi, 2008) and then formally relinquished the coalition in August 2008 on the issue of restoration of judiciary (Dawn, August 26, 2008). The chart of the coalitional regime in centre and in the provinces is as following:

### **Coalitional Regimes in the Centre and in the Provinces after 2008 elections**

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Punjab</b>	<b>Sindh</b>	<b>KPK</b>	<b>Balochistan</b>
PPP, PML (N)*, ANP, JUI (F)**	PML (N), PPP	PPP, MQM	ANP, PPP	PPP, JUI (F), PML (Q)

\*The party quitted the coalition in August 2008 and the vacuum was being filled by MQM in September 2008 and later PML (Q) joined the federal coalition in May 2012. \*\*The party quitted the coalition in 2012 after the issue of memogate being forged by United States of America after Abbottabad operation.

In the centre, there existed a grand coalition (Mushtaq et. al, 2011, p. 259) of mainstream political parties and the parties from Sindh, KPK and Balochistan dominant regions in the respective provincial assemblies. In Punjab, Sindh, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa two party alliances proclaimed their provincial ministries while in Balochistan tri-partite regional government was installed. The central and the provincial elites were united at the single cause to reform the system of governance on the institutional principles (Haider, 2008, pp. 9-36).

It also illustrated the future perspective of institutional cooperation between opposition and the coalitional political parties both in the federating units and in the centre. This evolving trend was indicating the forthcoming bargaining federal scenario of political elites in the system of governance. The role of their participation was remained on the unique tendency of institutionalism as neither side did try to expel itself from the ambit of democratic process. These elites also tried their best to support the allied regime in all provinces to unite the process of governance on the principle of loose federalism (Bukhari and Kamran, 2013, p. 1195).

### **Politics of federalism and Institutional Governance**

In the past, the system of governance in Pakistan did not take their roots. It also failed in dealing with the matters of public governance. The systematic changes that were introduced in the constitution of 1973 dating back to Pervez Mushrraf under the pedigree of 17<sup>th</sup> amendment promulgated the neo-regime of quasi-institutionalism and the process of politics of federalism was derailed on the normative tendencies. The fundamental reason behind the creation of that political scenario was non-existence of political leadership in Pakistan and the relative weakness of the organized structure of political parties. In these conditions, the mainstream leadership from PPP and PML (N) began to expand their political cooperation with each other which provided a clear road map (Rabbani, 2011, pp. 131-136) in the form of charter of democracy under the political will.

It was lucid boulevard map for the evolution of institution trends of federalism in Pakistan in post 2008 political transition. The quest for governance was increased in the milieu of changing role of the government and opposition and the bargaining position of various other regional political parties. The determining trends of political parties and the political elites digested the political traditions to make smooth transition for federalism unlike the old art of political immaturity (Alvi, 2002, p. 251) during 1980s and 1990s. Although, the position of the establishment was dominated (Cohen, 2012, p. 33) in various political and diplomatic issues but despite the existence of these irrational forces, the evolving maturity in political

leadership codified their potential for democracy, stratification for institutionalism, to make transparency in the governance and setting a meaningful role of opposition is relatively palpable. The following brief description will point out the trends of institutionalism in the politics of federalism and governance in Pakistan.

### **Democratic Transition**

President Pervez Musharraf ruled the state for nine years until August 2008. The repeated political pressure against his tenure did not gain prestige unless the movement for restoration of democracy was started after November 2007 declined his political fame. The political parties especially the two mainstream parties PPP and PML (N) showed their unanimity over the issue of restoration of system of governance on the principles of parliamentary institutionalism by changing its previous nature of quasi presidential (Rabbani, 2011, p. 138). The other regional political parties such as PkMAP, ANP and BNP-M also provided their democratic participation in this concern.

The event of the resignation of Pervez Musharraf from presidential post in 2008 was the transitional event in the evolution of civilian led process of federalism in Pakistan. Their acquiescence completely illustrated that political elites were united to oust him from the democratic politics and he had also become isolated in the new regime of governance (Talbot, 2009, p. 437). This outbreak also changed the political circumstances as PML (N) which was an ingredient part of the coalitional government in the centre in pre-Musharraf period turned their voices as the main opposition party in the parliament. However, one significant quest was remained at the agenda for political elites to strengthen the role of parliament, institutionalism and governability by avoiding the regime from any instability in the political process. It is a consensus among political elites which successfully derived Pakistan on the conduit of good governance.

### **Constitutional consensus**

The restoration of constitution of 1973 at the parliamentary privileges was the fundamental quest of the parliamentary political parties. The process of implementation of this provision was handed over to Special Parliamentary Committee on Constitutional Reforms in 2009. The significant challenge and issue which had to be resolved at this platform was the condition for cooperative federalism in Pakistan. The political parties were blended with one another to mingle the consensus points in constitutional reforms. The process was smoothly run by the committee at the principle of unanimous consensus on the margin to find a quest for parliamentary supremacy. This was a beginning of elite consensus to the new trends in Pakistan.

The decision making procedure was evolved on principle which is pronounced by Lijphart as consociational engineering of the parliamentary political parties in the constitutional evaluation by adjoining the segmented groups as well (Lijphart, 1977, p. 224) to adopt the consensus on constitutional reforms. The 18<sup>th</sup> amendment is variously defined as the new constitutional division in the history of federalism in Pakistan. According to Zafarullah Khan; “the promulgation of 18<sup>th</sup> amendment is a paradigm shift with its reflection in the forthcoming 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> amendments. This evolution has renewed the role of three state institutions legislature, executive and judiciary and also enrooted the developments of Council of Common Interests and

National Economic Council to the new elevation of institutionalism” (Khan, 2013, p. 7). The described view point of parliamentary political parties on constitutional reforms is described in their institutional approach in the following chart:

**Political Parties and their constitutional stands and Agendas**

Political Party	Constitutional Stand and Agenda
PPP	The restoration of parliamentary system, decentralized system of governance, independent working of various government institutions with supremacy of parliament, abolition of concurrent list.
PML (N)	Restoration of parliamentary system, centre-provinces institutional parity, decentralized system of governance and independent role of judiciary and election commission, abolition of concurrent list.
ANP	Provincial autonomy, decentralized structure of finance, independent working of the provincial governments, institutional role of election commission and judiciary, abolition of concurrent list.
MQM	Decentralized governance with independent institutionalism.
PML (Q)	Decentralized political system with an administrative/political role for election commission.
JUI (F)	Independent working of the institutions in Pakistan.
PkMAP	Provincial autonomy, independent financial commission, equal political voice for senate in finance decisions.

The table is compiled by the researchers

The parliamentary committee unanimously adopted the draft of 18<sup>th</sup> amendment. The forthcoming 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> amendments were the result of the institutional disparity in the system of federalism in Pakistan. During all its pace of time, the unconditional consensus was observed among the parliamentary political parties. This blow will further encourage the process of institutionalism in the politics on the political *modus operandi* of winners-thy-all. The collectivism in the inner circles of political parties on the issue of constitutional amendments was created on the motive of institutional bargaining by the party elites. The following table describes the nature of constitutional amendments and their promulgation time to understand the literal quest of institutional- cum-constitutional federalism;



### Constitutional Amendments and their nature

Amendment	Nature	Date of Adaptation
<i>18th Amendment</i>	Reformation of whole constitution on the principle of devolution of political and economic governance and provincial autonomy.	April 19, 2010
<i>19th Amendment</i>		
<i>20th Amendment</i>	To find an institutional consensus on judicial appointment	January 1, 2011
	To approach an independent institutional role of election commission.	February 2012

The Table is based on based on extensive research

### National Finance Commission Award Distribution

The distribution of economic resources under the aegis of national finance commission award was remained on the ebb-regional path dominated under the constraints of the federal government in the past. The diversion of economic resources was disseminated among the federating units on the single provision of population ratio which dismantled the institutional economic structure in the state as the bigger share was promulgated in the hands of Punjab due to its large size of population. This tendency exploited the economic interests of smaller provinces without possessing their voices in the implementation of previous finance awards. The PPP-led coalitional regime of the federal government in 2009 changed this old patter with the new avenues of distribution of economic resources. In other explanations, the adaptation of 7<sup>th</sup> NFC award is hailed a wider consensus of provinces with the federal government.

The centre-province relations are now evolving on the new realm of institutionalism. At the expense and political voice of smaller provinces, the federal government with the consensus of Punjab derived a multi-pronged economic formula in the new finance commission award. The present economic recipe included two horizontal provisions; population and poverty and two vertical segments; revenue and inverse population density. The ratio for each subject is as below;

### Horizontal and vertical % in 7th NFC Award

Horizontal Ratio	%	Vertical Ratio	%
Population	82%	Revenue	5%
Poverty	10.3%	Inverse Population Density	2.7%

Source: (Waseem, 2010, p. 13)

In the following table, a comparison of the 7thNFC award with the previous awards has been described:

**The Ratio of Central government and the Provinces under 7th NFC Award**

Award	Ratio for Federal-provinces		Ratio divided among Provinces from divisible Pool			
	Centre	Provinces	Punjab	Sindh	KPK	Baluchistan
4 <sup>th</sup>	20 %	80 %	57.87%	23.29%	13.54%	5.30%
6 <sup>th</sup>	45 %	55 %	56.87%	25.67%	13.14%	5.13%
7 <sup>th</sup>	44 %	56 %	51.74%	24.55%	14.62%	9.09%
7 <sup>th</sup>	42.5%	57.5 %	51.74%	24.55%	14.62%	9.09%

Source: (Mustafa, 2011, p. 9)

The revised finance award increased the share of provinces in the horizontal way. The federal government declined their economic share from 52.5 per cent to 44 per cent in 2010 and further decreased to 42.5 from 2011 for next four years. Under the 7<sup>th</sup> NFC award, the ratio of economic resources of the smaller provinces has significantly increased.

**The Role of Opposition**

The role of opposition is considered an explanation for institutionalism in a parliamentary political system. Unfortunately, the case of opposition trend had been revolving a force of establishment in Pakistan in the past. This happened due to the overt centralized politics of federal government as the establishment wanted such kind of political environment. According to Owen Bennett Jones; the civil democracy politics did not provide a chance to work with the capacity of institutionalism in Pakistan which ultimately resulted into the decline of mature political and parliamentary norms of opposition politics. This authority was utilized under the punches of military and bureaucratic establishment (Jones, 2009, pp. 323-324).

The coalitional government in the centre provides a chance to include the voice of opposition political parties in decision making process. The major influx in this concern was an important decision by the government to hand over the supervision of Parliamentary Audit Accounts Committee under the chairmanship of leader of opposition. The same provision was promulgated in all provinces in the same mode. The role of opposition was also being counted in the adaptation of constitutional amendments. The process of decision making on the issues related to internal and external security and the challenges on rule of law were discussed in coinciding with the consent of opposition. At each and every step of important and ordinary matters even in adopting the finance budget for the government was also taken by adjoining the suggestions of the opposition. The process of governance was derived on the principle of accommodation in the centre and in all the provinces in accordance with the words of Guelke that; the territorial and institutional approach put pressure on

the government for a unification and segmented political participation of opposition in adopting the strong and implementable policy (Guelke, 2012, p. 128).

From this discussion, two important points are emerged. The first is the relative accommodation of opposition by government in the centre and in the regional politics and second is the arguably political atmosphere in the state for this institution. On various positions such as on the drift of civil-military relations, the opposition did not align their role in the capacity of democracy but despite these interrupted scenarios, this institution was relatively strong from its earlier political regimes. Thus it is a significant process of institutional federalism that the institution of opposition played their position as an accommodative gadget in centre and in the provinces by supporting the amplifying institutionalism in the level of democracy in Pakistan.

### **Civil-military Relations**

The pursuit for security against the external and internal threats provided a chance to military in Pakistan to pave the way to control the political administration either in an indirect mode during 1947-58, 1988-99 and in the direct mode under the governance of Ayub Khan, Yehya Khan, Zia-ul-Haq and Pervez Musharraf. During the transition towards democracy in 2008, there was an extreme political pressure on political parties to revive the line of democracy in the country on previously defined policies and arena. But the political leadership declined this pressure in the interest of public mandate. The military leadership also stressed on the relativity of institutionalism and increasing the brace for democratic governance in Pakistan.

The initial period for the federal coalition was very sturdy as the civil government had a straight compression from the presidency which was under the quite control of a retired chief of army staff but the prime minister expressed their voice for the adaptation of a policy of reconciliation with the institution of military in resolving the confrontation between two sides (Dawn, March 25, 2008). The new military chief welcomed the step of civil government and promised to provide their support to the process of democratic federalism in Pakistan. The progression of equilibrium was raised during 2008-2013 in the domain of civil military relations. The government provided a chance to parliament to supervise the defense committee which was under the control of National Security Council during the tenure of Pervez Musharraf. It showed a change in the evolution of the role of civilian government. However, the process was remained instable at various occasions as the misperceptions were grown at the two sides over the issues of internal and external security and integrity and the role of the two sides in decision making process. The issues upon which the two sides were confronted on institutional levels with each other are described as under:

### **Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan 2008-2013**

---

<b>Year</b>	<b>Incident</b>
2008	The quasi-presidential role of President Pervez Musharraf to counter the civil democratic transition in the state.
2009	Swat operation which was being controlled by the federal government had some institutional reservations for top military leadership.
2010	On 18th amendment, the military had reservations with the federal government which was handled by prime minister Syed Yousaf Raza Gilani in a meaningful way.
2011	Abbottabad operation destabilized the relations at the lowest ebb as there was observed a direct confrontation between COAS and PM in the public domain.
2012	The alleged memogate conundrum voiced the influx of institutional non-equilibrium in civil-military relations.

---

Despite the inequalities and disturbances, the civil-military relation was grown on the accepted potency of institutional role in the political and public domain (Dr. Noor ul Haq, 2012, p. 116). The two sides approached a tendency of internal process of bargaining capacity on reaching the unanimous decisions. This process expressed the mature role of political and military leadership and the strong role of political parties in creating the position and atmosphere of accommodation and inclusion of the smaller political groups in the public issues which declined the role of military establishment in controlling the civil administrative institutions. However, still there is a need to strengthen the capacity of institutional relationship between the civil government and the military hierarchy to create a mature level of democratic participation and decision making process which will further evolve the pace for good governance in Pakistan.

### **Conclusion**

The institutional design of present federal system in Pakistan during 2008-2013 was based on bargaining mode of political elites. The fundamental conception of this notion is the implementation of decision on the win-win-rule having an approach of multiple interests of political partners. The second relativity is the static position of political parties on the policies and issues that are needed to be re-evaluated. The explicit solution of this issue requires a socio – economic changes and a continual check on the governability of the elites. The people also make their political demands and must include themselves in decision making process. It is a long term political process and demands a phased process of institutionalism. The third is the trend of organizational weakening of political parties at the grass root level. It is a formidable challenge in most developing states having federal structure of governance. The last but not least is the over ruling of institutions in Pakistan. There is a need to implement a principle of separation of powers in this concern. This requires a complete uniqueness and institutional foundations without a personification in decisions.

In Pakistan, the post 2008 PPP led coalitional government travelled on the path of institutional federalism. It was the first ever successful lineage for transitional federalism, as one government transforms the governance to another civilian leadership after 2013 general elections despite the pressure of institutional

### A study of Institutional Federalism in Pakistan (2008-2013)

oppressiveness from military and bureaucratic elites. The federal tendency observed on institutional line despite the dominant role of political elites in decision making process. The regional political parties unlike their previous tendency of non-participation find their institutional position under the process of federal bargaining track. The pace is very important to develop the structure of institutionalism to make a sense of maturity in the federalism without their interference in the provincial governments. The role of political parties and the principle of proportionality in the federal cabinet on the basis of regional representation and the electoral shares of coalitional political parties is an accumulative part in this concern. The responsibility of the federal government is very vital to make a sense of institutional federal governance in future.

**References**

- [1] Adeney, K. 2007. *Federalism and Ethnic Conflict Regulation in India and Pakistan*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [2] Alvi, H. 2002. *Pakistan: State and their Crisis* [in Urdu], Lahore: Fiction Hose.
- [3] Ahmad, M. 1993. *Pakistan at the Crossroads*, Karachi: Royal Book Company.
- [4] Bukhari , Dr. Syed Mussawar Hussein, Kamran, Muhammad Faisal. 2013.18th Amendment: A Journey from Strong federalism to Loose federalism in Pakistan,*Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 4, No. 12.
- [5] Boquerat, G. 2009. *The Democratic Transition in Pakistan is under stress*, Paris and Brussels: IFRI Research Centre.
- [6] Burgess, M. 2006. *Comparative Federalism: Theory and Practice*, London and New York: Routledge Press.
- [7] Cohen, S. 2012. *The Future of Law and Order: Six Possible Scenarios*, in Luis Peral, *Pakistan: The End of Exceptionalism?*, Paris: EU Institute of Security Studies, Report No. 12.
- [8] Dawn, March 25, 2008, Lahore.
- [9] Faisal, M. 2010. *Federalism: A Transitional Dilemma in Pakistan 1988-2010*, [UnPublished M.A Thesis], The Islamia University Bahawalpur.
- [10] Guelke, A. 2012. *Politics in Deeply Divided Societies*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [11] Gunlick, A.B. 1986. *Local Government in the German Federal System*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- [12] Haider, S.K. 2008. *Pakistan's General Elections 2008*, Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre, The University of Punjab.
- [13] Huntington, S.P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- [14] Jones, O.B. 2009. *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- [15] Jalal, A. 1994. *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia: A Comparative and Historical Perspective*, Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications.

A study of Institutional Federalism in Pakistan (2008-2013)

- [16] Khan, Z. 2013. *Post 18th Amendment of the Constitution of Pakistan: A Critical Appraisal*, SPO Discussion Paper Series Islamabad: Strengthening Participatory Organization.
- [17] Kuper, A., Kuper, J. eds. 1980. *The Social Science Encyclopedia*, London: Routledge Publishers.
- [18] Lijphart, A. 1977. *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- [19] Mustafa, U. 2011. *Fiscal Federalism in Pakistan: The 7<sup>th</sup> National Finance Commission Award and Its Implications*, Islamabad: Pakistan Institute of Development Economics.
- [20] Mushtaq et. al. 2011. Politics of Power sharing in Post-1971 Pakistan, *Journal of Politics and Law*, Vol. 4, No. 1.
- [21] Mushtaq, M and Muhammad, Dr. A. 2011. Non-Consociational Federalism and Ethnic Strife in Pakistan, *Asian Social Science*, vol. 7, No. 7.
- [22] Milam, W.B. 2009. *Bangladesh and Pakistan: Flirting with Failure in South Asia*, London: Hurst & Company.
- [23] Noor ul Haq 2012. Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan, *IPRI Journal*, XII, No. 2.
- [24] Park, R.L. 1967. *India's Political System*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- [25] Rabbani, M. R. 2011. *A Biography of Pakistani Federalism: Unity in Diversity*, Islamabad: Leo Books.
- [26] Rizvi, H.S. 2008. Coalition Politics, Daily Times, April 6, 2008.
- [27] Singh, K. 2005. *Questioning Globalization*, Delhi: Madhyam Books.
- [28] Sills, David L. ed. 1968. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York: The Macmillan Company & The Free Press, Vol. 1.
- [29] Talbot, I. (2009). *Pakistan: A Modern History*, London: C Hurst & Co. (Publishers) Ltd.
- [30] Waseem, M. 2010. *Federalism in Pakistan*, Lahore: Lahore University of Management Sciences.
- [31] Ziring, L. 2003. *Pakistan: The Crosscurrent of History*, London: Oxford University Press.