

CHAPTER 5

Styles of Governance

INTRODUCTION

Individual Style and State Structure

The personal proclivities of individuals in positions of power within the state structure not only found increasingly free play as the civil institutional structure weakened, but in turn, individual leaders, unrestrained by institutional accountability were able to further undermine the state institutions themselves. This dialectic between individuals and history perhaps comes out more sharply when we examine the peculiar style of governance of Pakistan's rulers. How their modes of operating state institutions were rooted in their psychological makeup on the one hand, and their relationship with the people on the other. For example, Sandhurst trained General Ayub Khan with his thinly veiled condescension for the people felt that they were still not ready for full-fledged democracy. He, therefore, chose the indirect system of "Basic Democracy" which, in his paternalism be thought was more in consonance with the rudimentary stage of political consciousness of the people he wished to rule. Whenever the reality of a hi developed political consciousness of people manifested it. Ayub Khan came down with the iron hand of a military disciplinarian. It was in this context that he chose to throttle freedom of speech through the Press and Publications Ordinance, and under mined the universities by crushing dissent. These steps combined with the BD political system which prevented the emergence of political parties with national programmes, constrained the emergence of a democratic political culture. Similarly, Ayub Khan's emphasis on uniformity and inability to grasp the diversity of Pakistan's regional cultures led to his decision for the "One Unit"

system under whose deceptively placid surface, the passions of provincialism were ignited, and erupted ultimately in the Bangladesh war of independence in 1971.¹

Bhutto's decision to cut the nascent links of the PPP from its mass base soon after coming into power in 1971 and to hold back internal democracy within the PPP organization by his autocratic establishment of a personality cult was an important factor in constraining the growth of a healthy political culture. Tragically, seven years later when he needed the PPP to mobilize popular support to prevent his hanging, the necessary organizational structure did not exist. Similarly, Mr. Bhutto's reliance on state institutions on the basis of a personalized chain of command for exercising power not only undermined the institutional coherence of the bureaucracy, but also turned large sections of the bureaucracy against him. This led to a planned effort by the state apparatus between 1977 and 1979, to launch a campaign of character assassination while he was in jail and later to eliminate him physically.²

General Zia-ul-Haq's carefully calibrated dictatorship combined the selective use of terror with various political and financial inducements to some of his political opponents and the formation of a new political organization on the basis of ethnicity in an attempt to undermine the political forces against him.³ These features of Zia's policy contributed to the fragmentation of parties, further corruption among politicians and a violent polarization of civil society along ethnic, communal and regional lines.

The ensuing analysis of the styles of governance of some of the key leaders in Pakistan's history attempts to show how the personal traits of these leaders and their operation of state institutions on the one hand, and the development of civil society on the other.

AYUB KHAN

Ayub Khan was the last of a particular type of leader in the Third World whose authoritarian paternalism was combined with an idea of progress, to produce a ruler removed from his people and

the realities of the country that he was leading. Western political scientists and economists (e.g., Samuel Huntington and Gustav Papanek) looked upon such a leader with much favour. He was eulogized as an “Asian de Gaulle”, that is, a military leader who could also be a statesman with vision.

The problem with such a leader is that he feels he has all the solutions and only he is in a position to tell what is right for the illiterate masses”. Ayub’s view on this count was formed well before he launched his coup in October 1958,⁴ a view which was probably reaffirmed by the subsequent shenanigans of the country’s politicians who, lacking a political base, sought props either from the power structure or patronage of the Americans. The biggest problem for such an “instant” politician with “instant solutions” for the country is that he starts believing in his own propaganda, with a wall of deception that surrounds authority ensuring a distance from the “real” world. Ayub Khan, for instance, started calling his coup a “Revolution”, assumed that his rank of Field Marshal (a self conferred designation) was well-deserved and that his view of “reality” matched the situation on the ground. His paternalism made him see Pakistan as a country that was “not. fit for democracy”, hence the need to erect a system of grassroots local bodies knit together by clans, and a strong bureaucracy. The Basic Democracy system, which was another way of providing local influential with institutional legitimacy, never got off the ground. Central to this structure was a determination to declare politicians as either “incompetent” or “unpatriotic”. With a single executive order — The Elective Bodies Disqualification Order (EBDO) — an entire generation of politicians and political workers was made redundant.⁵

That Ayub Khan was remote from reality was best exemplified by his simplistic view of the Bengalis, when he talked of their “complexes” and “character traits” as a colonial administrator would have classified his subjects. An equally naive view premised Ayub’s method of quelling political dissent among students. He made physical training compulsory in schools and colleges on the basis of the view that “it will take the devil out of them” by presumably channelizing their “extra” energies. After having

promulgated the most repressive press laws in Pakistan's history. Ayub Khan's ghostwritten "political" autobiography, *Friends not Masters* in 1967 had this observation "there has never been so much freedom in the country as there is today". Repression was institutionalized not simply by laws that regulated political life but also through a policy that banned political parties, student unions and trade unions.

If politically the system was regressive, socially Ayub's vision saw a secular, progressive Pakistan. In 1963, his government initiated the Family Laws Ordinance, the same year he banned the Jamaat-e-Islami and made family planning, one of the major planks of his "reforms". While the cleavage between East and West Pakistan grew, a popular joke aptly summing up the reality:

"Only three things unite East and West Pakistan — Islam, English and PIA." Ayub's simplistic recipe for this problem was "national integration". Bengalis in West Pakistan were encouraged to learn Urdu and West Pakistanis in East Pakistan, Bengali. An Inter-wing students exchange programme was initiated and Dacca was proclaimed the "second capital", as if such moves were sufficient to assuage the alienation felt by the Bengalis from Islamabad

Ayub's own relationship with his colleagues was marked by a cordiality that lacked intimacy. With the notable exception of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Ayub's cabinet lacked spark and substance. After removing the popular Lt General Azam Khan as Governor of East Pakistan and the powerful Nawab of Kalabagh as Governor of West Pakistan (both were seen as threats by him), he had them replaced by flunkies like Monem Khan in the East and General Musa Khan in the West. While a certain amount of nepotism flourished with Ayub Khan's sons benefiting financially from their father's position, he ensured that such factors did not influence his decision-making in the power structure. For instance Lt. General Habibullah Khan Khattak, who was father-in-law of Ayub's eldest son, was Chief of Staff in the Pakistan Army and a leading contender for the Army's top slot, passed over by Ayub in favour of Muss. This was because the latter was perceived to be more "reliable" in terms of loyalty. Ayub's insecurity vis-a-vis colleagues in the power structure also

stemmed from inability to come to grips with a somewhat modest family background. He was ill-at-ease while discussing his father, a junior commissioned officer (JCO). During a 1966 visit to L at a party in his honour, some Pakistanis distributed an anti-Ayub pamphlet to the guest entitled "From a Bugler's son to a millionaire", referring to the popular perception as to how Ayub and his family L enriched them after his taking office.⁷

However, Ayub's leader when put to the rest in times of crisis, never quite measured up. After presiding over all decisions that preceded the 1965 War with India, Ayub backtracked under the pressure of war and blamed his Foreign Minister for embroiling him in a conflict with India. The retreat was complete, at Tashkent. In 1968, Ayub initiated the Agartala Conspiracy Case against Sheikh Mujib, the Awami League leader, but, with his back to the wall in 1969 after the prolonged street agitation, he not only withdrew the charges of treason leveled earlier against Mujib but invited him to participate in the deliberations of the Round Table Conference that he was carrying on with opposition politicians. At the end of it all, Ayub violated his own Constitution when instead of following it by transferring power to the National Assembly's Speaker, he meekly handed it over to the Army Chief who promptly proclaimed Martial Law. The country was put back to square one, with Ayub leaving precisely where he had begun, that is, with a Martial Law.

ZULFIQAR ALI BHUTTO

Mr. Bhutto's style of governance was a combination of some of the cultural attributes of populism, liberal democracy and feudal despotism. He had reached out to the people like a messiah of the poor racked by an inner pain. His ability to communicate to the people, his emotional experience of their misery as well as their great potential, enabled him to achieve a special chemistry with the downtrodden. He had a powerful rhetoric whose images were drawn from the contemporary nationalist struggles in the Third World, the ideology of liberal democracy, socialism and the folklore of the Indus Valley Civilization. Some of the institutions

whose formal structure he attempted to construct (like the Constitution of 1973, a number of universities, autonomous industrial corporations anti progressive labour laws) were all indicative of his modernist and liberal democratic dimension. Yet, at the same time, a despotic streak was manifested in his restructuring of some institutions like the civil services and the paramilitary Federal Security Force in an attempt to create within them a personalized chain of command based on fear of and loyalty to him. He was a leader with a potent political vision and, at the same time, a sharp eye for detail. He saw some current events in the context of the grand sweep of history, yet he sometimes reveled in trivia. He could be, in turn, arrogant and generous with his colleagues, and looked upon criticism from within his party or from senior administrative personal with intolerance and occasionally even hostility.

The apparently conflicting dimensions of Mr. Bhutto's magnetic personality may have been rooted in the powerfully polarized experiences of his early childhood. He admired and looked up to his father Mr. Shahnawaz Bhutto whose feudal mould was reinforced by a flair for politics during the Raj. Mr. Bhutto's penchant for an aristocratic life style perhaps came from an internalization of the image of his father. He introduced gold braided uniforms for his senior party colleagues, reveled in the imperial horse-drawn carriage and other symbols of the pomp and panoply of power. At the same time, Mr. Bhutto was deeply attached to his mother who came from a humble background and, in the feudal household of the Bhutto, was not only treated with condescension but was psychologically persecuted by members of the Bhutto clan. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, in his childhood years, experienced through the immonial link with his mother, the pain, oppression and sense of injustice of the downtrodden. Perhaps the resonant images of the aristocratic mien of his father and the memories of injustice against his mother contributed to moulding his mercurial and brilliant mind. Bhutto writes in one of his books how pleased he was 'when he received a gift on his birthday from his father which was a set of biographical books on Napoleon and, at the same time, he received a gift of Karl Marx's *The Commu-*

nist Manifesto. He wrote about the intellectual impact of these books on him: “from one (Napoleon) I learnt the politics of power and from the other (Marx), I learnt the politics of power” His academic training was at the University of California, Berkeley, and later at Oxford where he got an exposure to the nineteenth century philosophical traditions of liberal democracy, the intellectual intoxication of socialist ideas propounded by Marx, Lenin, and Mao Zedong and the expression of Third World nationalism articulated by such magnificent personalities as Gamal Abdel Nasser, Ho Chi Minh and Nkruma. Bhutto saw himself in the mould of these Third World nationalists, including leaders like Indonesia’s Soekarno.¹⁰

His favourite historical figure was Napoleon. (Biographies and books about Napoleon formed a substantial chunk of Mr. Bhutto’s personal library.)” Perhaps Napoleon’s imperial personality, the scale of his military endeavors and the dramatic fluctuations of his fortunes caught Mr. Bhutto’s imagination, who regarded himself to be a man of destiny, placed in a position of unquestioned power at a conjunctural moment in the history of Pakistan. “I was born to make a nation, to serve a people, to overcome an impending doom... I was born to bring emancipation to the people and honour them with a self-respecting destiny. Sooner or later for every people there comes a day to storm the Bastille.... The people of Pakistan are bound to have their day of Bastille if not in 1978 in 1989. The day is coming and nobody has yet been born to stop its advent I am the only person to reverse the march towards self-annihilation. I have the confidence of the people...”

Mr. Bhutto was perhaps the only charismatic leader of Pakistan after Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad All Jinnah. His charisma was derived from the image of efficacy in actualizing the dream of the poor for a society where they could have dignity, equality and where they could be part of the decisions that affect their economic and social life. While Mr. Bhutto stood apart in splendid isolation from his colleagues he was able to achieve a visceral contact with the masses.

He developed a unique grammar of style, gesture and language

that he employed during mass rallies.¹² For example. The dress, bearing and the design of the stage in sub-continental Jalsas had traditionally been a device of psychologically distancing the audience from the speaker. The speaker normally gave a spruce look, dressed in stiff ackhan or in a western suit, speaking in “Nastaleek” Urdu or Oxbridge English. The stage was usually a raised platform with a stylized setting (flowers in a vase and water in a glass jug). The speaker stood immobile behind the rostrum. Each of the elements of a highly structural stage design and the formal bearing of the speaker emphasized the distance from an audience that was unkempt and chaotic. Mr. Bhutto undermined this psychological distance by means of a number of symbolic gestures such as:

(1) During his speech he took off his coat, then progressively loosened his tie and unbuttoned his shin sleeves. By means of these gestures he was demolishing the image of the conventional speaker and symbolically acquiring the unkempt appearance of the audience. He often wreaked havoc on the tidy stage. On one occasion, during his speech at Ichhra, in Lahore, he picked up the flower vase and threw it at his audience, smashing a symbol that served to separate him from them.¹³

(2) His language did not have the streamlined sophistication of the traditional politician, but was often grammatically incorrect, in fragmented, laced with earthy epithets from the local dialect. As he built up to an emotional crescendo, his voice often cracked and halted in mid-sentence. Through these devices Mr. Bhutto was reaching out to his audience. He was sending the coded message that he was not delivering a speech but rather participating in a collective emotion; he was suggesting that contact with the audience was cracking his emotional defences: that at a psychosomatic level he was one with the crowd.

(3) He achieved 21 participation through rhetorical questions and rhythm. For example, he often posed a question and let the audience answer it in a single joyous roar. Perhaps the most important gesture that brought the speaker and audience into visceral contact, was breaking into the dance rhythm of *Dama Dam Mast Kalandar*,¹⁵ the ancient rhythm through which the

Individual could momentarily transcend his separateness and experience the intoxication of collective being.

The intimate contact that Mr. Bhutto was able to achieve with the people enabled him to unleash such mass emotion that drove other politicians into a sense of inadequacy and members of the establishment into a sense of fear. That is why Mr. Bhutto induced such extremes of love and hate.

In his relationship with his senior colleagues Mr. Bhutto sometimes displayed a feudal hostility when his authority was questioned, or a paternal generosity when they begged forgiveness. For example, on one occasion, Mr. J.A. Rahim was waiting asking with other dinner guests in the Prime Minister's house for Mr. Bhutto to arrive. After waiting for over two hours he verbally expressed his impatience at the delay and then left the party. Mr. Bhutto was informed of Mr. Rahim's decision to leave in a huff. The same evening he ordered the Federal Security Force "to teach Rahim a lesson". Operatives of the paramilitary Federal Security Force stormed J.A. Rahim's house a few hours later, woke him from his sleep and beat him up along with his son Mr. Sikandar Rahim who 'was living in the same house. The FSF assault was led by the Prime Minister's Chief Security Officer Saeed Anwar Khan. He was accompanied by gun-toting goons of this proto fascist organization, and one of them hit J.A. Rahim with a rifle butt. Rahim suffered multiple fractures and had to be removed to a hospital. He was also immediately dismissed from all his official and party positions. Thus, by May 1974 when the Rahim episode took place Bhutto had started using the slate apparatus which he had restructured and partly personalized. It manifested the autocratic part of his personality that would ultimately be a key reason for his subsequent downfall.¹⁶ Another aspect of Bhutto was the manner of forgiveness of his past political enemies. Altaf Gauhar, for instance, who had been a close associate of Ayub Khan as a civil servant at a time when Bhutto was serving in the Ayub Cabinet, later fell out with Bhutto and when Bhutto took office in December 1971 Gauhar became editor of *The Dawn* which he quickly transformed into an opposition. Bhutto arrested him on trivial charges like "smuggling of foreign

currency” and humiliated Gauhar. He personally dictated a 50 page note to his intelligence chief Mian Anwar Ali, on how to interrogate Ai Gauhar. This showed the extent to which Bhutto was prepared to expend his energies on harassing a relatively unimportant political critic. Bhutto “forgave” him by appointing Gauhar’s brother as Ambassador to Malaysia and awarded a lucrative turnkey contract, the Rou Plain, to Gauhar’s son, Humayun Gauhar.

In spite of mercurial personality traits that led him to move quickly from vindictiveness to forgiveness, Bhutto nevertheless was a competent ruler. He had a depth of understanding of political issues, thoroughness in policy formulation, and an eye for detail that was without precedence in Pakistani rulers. He was known for giving detailed comments on notes that were put up to him, and for preparing long drafts which were sometimes brilliant in their formulation. He used to work long hours, frequently putting in 16 hours into a work schedule that may have been helped by a chronic insomnia.¹⁷

During the PNA movement against him Mr. Bhutto suspected fairly early that the American CIA was supporting the agitation against him because he had defied Henry Kissinger during his visit to Pakistan. Mr. Bhutto, drawing upon his sense of history, his courage and commitment to Pakistan, had refused to give in under this pressure. During the early days of the PNA Movement (April 19th, Mr. Bhutto held an impromptu public meeting in Raja Bazar, Rawalpindi and declared that the Americans were ret against him for taking a stand on Pakistan’s Nuclear Programme. He stood up in his open jeep and read out a letter front Cyrus Vance.’ He was dearly under pressure and responded initially by attempting to mobilize the people in his favour. However, his earlier failure to establish the Peoples Party as a political organization which could institutionalize public support and bring it to bear in a moment of crisis now became a factor in the inability of his supporters to come out to face the PNA agitation. As the anti-Bhutto demonstrations began to get out of control and his political position became untenable, Mr. Bhutto switched from a populist to an authoritarian mode. Having unsuc-

cessfully tried to mobilize political support in his favour, he d that he could not be removed, became the 'seat of the Prime Minister is a strong one.¹⁹ Mr. Bhutto's effort to assert the authority of the Prime Minister was a lost cause in a cim2tion where the sneer agitation was swinging the pendulum of power once again towards the military.

Through his charismatic personality and populist rhetoric, Mr. Bhutto had in his early years galvanized mass consciousness and unleashed powerful popular forces. His failure to institutionalize these essentially spontaneous forces within a grass roots party and the associated failure to subordinate the military and bureaucratic elks to the political system, led to his tragic downfall. Yet, the style and content of Mr. Bhutto's political message left a lasting legacy in popular consciousness: That the poor have the right and the ability to be freed of the shackles of oppression; that they too can dream of threatening the citadels of power.

For all his failures and negative personality traits, Mr. Bhutto's ordeal in the death cell, and his lonely defiance of dictatorship, has left the image of a martyred hero in the minds of a large proportion of the dispossessed population in Pakistan. In the popular psyche, his pain and incarceration began to represent the suffering of the people under Zia's Martial Law.

His period in the death cell created the image of a Prince sacrificing his body in slow degrees for the people: The broken wire mesh of his bare bed drawing blood from his back; the slow loss of body weight due to an untended stomach ailment.

His body shorn of its flesh, was held only by a fierce spirit of defiance: He continued to smoke his customary cigar and sip his coffee as his life ebbed away. Before the curtain went up, l body, shorn of its flesh as much as of its sins, stood in stark silhouette on the horizon of public consciousness. For many, a flawed politician by the form of his death, had passed into folk myth as a Faqir.

GENERAL ZIA-UL-HAQ

With his sudden death on 17 August General ha left Pakistan in the same state of uncertainty and fear of the future that existed eleven years earlier, when he seized power in a military coup. He had come a long way since 1977, wt he was initially seen as a “reluctant” coup-maker. By 1988, Pakistan’s longest-ever ruler was perceived as a shrewd, calculating politician who always managed to outsmart us opponents

Perhaps deliberately, General Zia allowed himself to be under estimated, both by friends and foes alike. The result was that there were frequent miscalculations about General Zia. Writing in her memoirs, the Shah of Iran’s elder sister who was a good friend of Mr. Bhutto, Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, talks of her visit to Pakistan in May 1977 during the height of the PNA agitation. They discussed the Pakistani political situation during the banquet given by Mr. Bhutto. She expressed her concern about the role of the Mullahs” during the agitation and also worried aloud about possible repercussions in the Army. Bhutto replied with characteristic confidence: “As far as the Army is concerned, you know that man (pointing to General ha who was sitting at a distance), he heads the Army. He is in my pocket”.²⁰ the always assured and supremely confident Bhutto, General ha, at least in his early years in power, gave the impression of being unsure of himself. Those present on the afternoon of 4 July 1977 at the National Day reception at the American Embassy saw a uniformed man of medium height, nervously chain-smoking his Dunhill cigarettes while standing alone in a corner.²¹ The same night when he told his commanders to move against the government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, he was said to be worried until the Corps Commander of Rawalpindi and then) is closest confidant, Lt. Gen. Chishti, came and told him “Murshed, (a term of deference used by disciples when referring to their spiritual leader), we have got all of them”.²² Knowing that the PPP high command had been hauled up. General his managed a smile and then seemed to relax.

In many ways, he was an enigmatic, authoritarian military leader who could not easily be slotted in the category of classic

Third World tin pot despots or military dictators. He presided over Pakistan's longest period of military rule, but then himself lifted Martial Law to begin a unique power-sharing experience with handpicked civilian politician. His rule saw one of Pakistan's worst periods of human rights abuses, which included for the first time in the country's history the whipping of journalists. But he also tolerated a press more lively and free than (the Ayub regime. He had his predecessor. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, hanged, but did go ahead to appoint as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court one of the three judges who had sought Bhutto's acquittal. During his rule he continued to lead and strengthen Pakistan's only organized institution — the Army — but, at the same time he ensured the weakening of many other institutions — the judiciary, the political parties and, of course, the Constitution. He loved to be in the limelight and call the shots, but at the same time, consciously avoided a personality cult, unlike his predecessors. Despite his abiding pro Americanism, he defied Washington on the nuclear issue and built a working rapport with Iran.

If one word can describe his rule, it would be “ad hocism”. There were no long term, well thought out policies for specific sectors such as industry, agriculture, education or health. He followed a cautious, moment to moment reactive, one-step-at-a-time approach that was guided more by his instincts for political survival than a well-defined vision of Pakistan.

However, he was clear on the basics as he saw them. For instance soon after overthrowing Bhutto, there was little doubt about what General Zia had in mind about the fate of Bhutto's predecessor. A month after the coup, in August 1977 General Zia-ul-Haq went to Multan to address Army Officers, where he was asked about Mr. Bhutto. Till then, no charge had been pressed against the former Prime Minister and he was not under arrest on the charges of having conspired to murder one of his political opponents. General Zia responded to this question with a wide grin and looked at two of his Staff Officers, Brigadier Mian Afzaal and Brigadier Ilyas, who were standing close by: “Why should I kill Afzaal myself when I can make Ilyas do it”.²³ The long-drawn judicial process, which began in September 1977 with the arrest

of Mr. Bhutto ended in April 1979, eighteen months later, with his execution under a split Supreme Court verdict. Some time later, in July 1978, when General Zia was told that the Supreme Court might acquit Bhutto (then two judges of the Supreme Court, allegedly sympathetic to Mr. Bhutto, had not retired), General Zia responded: "If the Supreme Court releases him, I will have the bastard tried by a military court and hung (sic)".²⁴

The fact was that General Zia perceived All Bhutto and his family as his main political adversaries and the Court came in handy in that regard. After all, General Zia was well aware that successive Pakistani government had used official instruments as a tool for political assassination. For instance, during the days of Ayub Khan; the Field Marshal personally ordered Major General Riaz Hussain, the then Director General, Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) to "bump off" Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan, who was active in mobilizing the public against Ayub. The D.C., ISI, instructed his juniors to "do the needful", but after a thorough investigation led ISI to the conclusion that since Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan had no personal enmities, there could be no plausible motive for any individual to kill him. It, therefore, advised Ayub against this move since the suspicion would "point at the government". Ayub reluctantly dropped the idea.²⁵ Later, during the 1971 military action in East Pakistan, political assassinations were undertaken on the basis of prepared lists.

If General Zia was clear on the future of Bhutto, he was equally clear on the question of his own relationship with power, which was more like a "Catholic marriage", in which there could be no divorce. He wanted to rule to the exclusion of political parties or politicians of stature; real, genuine power-sharing was out as the 29 May 1988 dismissal of Junejo exemplified. He wanted to maintain the status quo as far as possible. Finally, all through this, he knew that the army was his primary constituency.

Throughout his rule, General Zia, as if like Macbeth, seemed to be haunted by "Banquo's ghost". During an October 1980 visit to New York to address the United Nations General Assembly, General Zia went to visit the Pakistan Consulate General. When

he entered the library, he picked a book at random and opened it. A coloured portrait of Zulfiqar Au Bhutto stared General Zia in the face. Immediately, as if instinctively, General Zia flung the book across the room and shouted, "Don't you have better books" and angrily walked out of the library.²⁶ In April 1981, Lt General Ejaz Azeem, also of the Armoured Corps was one of General Zia's close confidants and favourite Corps Commanders, posted at Mangla. Since he happened to be a family friend, General Zia was in the habit of visiting the aging father of General Ejaz Azeem, Sardar Mohammad Azeem, who lived in Jhelum. Hanging in the drawing room of Sardar Azeem was a photograph of his grand children presenting a bouquet of flowers to Mr. Bhutto. Whenever General Zia used to visit Sardar Azeem, a visit normally announced beforehand, the photograph used to be taken down. Once, General Zia came unannounced to the residence of Sardar Azeem and walked into the drawing room where he saw the photo of Mr. Bhutto prominently displayed. General Zia said nothing, and showed no reaction upon seeing the photograph and left after exchanging the usual pleasantries with Sardar Azeem. A couple of weeks later, Lt General Ejaz Azeem, during the peak of his military career, was retired and sent off as Ambassador to the United States. In the end when General Zia was pursuing his Afghan policy after the signing of the Geneva Accords with great zeal and tenacity, it was as if he wanted to prove he had "gained" territory, while Bhutto had "lost territory". Even his falling out with Junejo occurred because, increasingly in the view of General Zia, Junejo reminded him of Mr. Bhutto. During a private dinner at Army House on 23 May 1988 just six days before he knocked out Junejo and the National Assembly, General Zia remarked to his dinner guests: "Have you noticed how arrogant Junejo has become. He even walks and behaves like Bhutto".²⁷

General Zia's emphasis on Islam stemmed from a combination of factors which included a conviction arising out of personal piety as well as the perception that Islam could be an effective political plank given the popular identification with Islam as a religion and way of life. It also helped General Zia to create a constituency based on support of the Islamic ethos among Paki-

stan's clergy, sections of the middle-class and other conservative other conservative segments of society.

It is important to differentiate between Zia the person and Zia the politician. Pakistan's first genuinely "native" ruler, General Zia can be credited with introducing a new style in politics with his now legendary manner of greeting all and sundry with his double handshake, triple embrace, wide grin and hand on his heart. His superb public relations won him many admirers, particularly among the international community. Even in Pakistan a country known for the arrogance of its rulers, General Zia's hallmark was humility that was reinforced by a remarkable memory and an eye for detail. In his own way, he tried to inculcate pride in a national dress (shailwar-kameez), language (Urdu), religion (Islam) and the state of Pakistan particularly through popular celebrations on national days.

Zia built no political institution that could outlast him. Neither was the old constitution properly preserved nor anything new put in place. Even when he spawned a new political order through non-party polls in 1985, he himself demolished it three years later. His rule turned out to be a running battle between General Zia and the political forces, with him usually holding the initiative. He, alternately, tried to use the political forces, repress them, confuse them and confront them, combining the military techniques of surprise and deception. Towards the end of his rule, they were all getting together against him. They were always suspicious of him as if waiting to be "ambushed by his next move. For his part, he defied predictions about his "fall" particularly in crisis situations such as in 1979 (after Bhutto's hanging) 1981 (PIA hijacking), 1983 (MRD agitation), 1984 (failed Referendum), and 1986 (Benazir's return).

On a more positive note, General Zia will be remembered for his deft handling of Pakistan's difficult regional position. His foreign policy successes included a cool handling of India, continuing Pakistan's nuclear programme despite US opposition, using the Soviet blunder in Afghanistan to Pakistan's advantage and strengthening Pakistan's regional position, particularly in ties with Iran, Bangladesh, China, Sri Lanka, Nepal and the Gulf.

states. He was the one Pakistani leader who had a South-Asia policy a somehow, diplomatically he was always able to put the Indian government on the defensive, even when Mrs. Gandhi was in power. He came under tremendous pressure from the United States on the nuclear issue and in 1981, President Reagan sent his Special Envoy, General Vernon Walters, on three different occasions to pressurize General Zia on this issue. While General Zia would assure his American visitors that Pakistan would “never embarrass” the Reagan Administration on this issue, he would end in his inimitable style: “We can hardly make a bicycle, how can we think of making a bomb”.²⁸

General Zia was basically his own Foreign Minister, like his predecessors. But the country had to pay a heavy price for General Zia’s Afghan policy with the “culture of Kalashnikovs”, destabilizing Pakistani society plus the spread of drug abuse, sectarian tension and ethnic animosities.. Ironically, General Zia personally remained above ethnic and sectarian considerations, despite the divisions in Pakistani society on these counts. This is best reflected in the present power structure in Pakistan, which has a healthy combination of people from different parts of the country.

During his eleven years in power, General Zia managed to develop quite a long reach to different sections of Pakistani society. Despite being a military autocrat, General Zia was never aloof, arrogant or inaccessible. Having only a modest academic background General Zia was in rather than cerebral with sharp survival instincts, and remained a careful reader of newspapers and intelligence reports. He had an abiding contempt for politicians and the press, both of whom he felt could be easily used and manipulated. In the end, he became a lonely figure, particularly after 29 May 1988 he was increasingly a prisoner of his own fantasies and saw his salvation through the liberation of Afghanistan. When his death came, he had shed all political allies and it was “back to the bunker” for him.

The Army remained his primary power base and it was this institution, which he headed for over twelve years, the longest in the history of Pakistan. Three characteristics made General Zia both as Chief of Army Staff and President somewhat different

from the other leaders of Pakistan. One was his relationship with his "Rufaqa" (colleagues) which was defined by a close camaraderie and a relaxed bonhomie. The other was the degree of trust and delegation of authority to his de facto number two, General Arif, for a relatively long period (almost 7 years). In Pakistan, given the suspicions that exist at that level, such a concept of a trusted number two had hardly ever existed. Another important difference compared to his military predecessors was that he was probably the first representative of a new generation of "native" Generals, with an indigenous ethos. He was unlike the Sandhurst trained, trained, stiff upper-lipped Anglicized types. Deep religiosity apart, he was also the first of his type who spoke Urdu without an English accent.

However, his mist in his army colleagues was never absolute. The same General Arif who was once his misted confidant was later seen by General Zia to be moving "too close to Junejo" and he was given his marching orders at five days' notice. This was despite the fact that General Zia had told General Arif three months earlier that he would be given an extension and General Arif had accordingly planned a visit to China beginning 29 March 1987. Similarly, in October 1983, General Zia flew into Peshawar to inform the NWFP governor, Lt. General Fazle Haq that he would be superseded by AM who would take over as Vice Chief of Army Staff the following March. However, he promised the somewhat disappointed Fazle Haq that when Arif would be promoted to a four-star General, Fazle Haq would also get a similar promotion. After his elevation, Fazle Haq had to wait in vain for an announcement of his promotion which never came and he ended retiring as a three-star General.³⁰ In the summer of 1986, there were rumors in Rawalpindi that the Corps Commander of that area, Lt. General Zahid Ali Akbar Khan, who was also related by marriage to the President, would be the next Vice Chief of Army Staff. When asked to comment on this, one of the President's close confidants remarked: "The President knows Zahid is an ambitious man".³¹ In such sensitive power-play at the top, relative or no relative, General Zia was not going to take any chance.

BENAZIR BHUTTO

Benazir Bhutto unlike her father was at outsider to both the political system and, at the same time, uninitiated in the exercise of state power. Her father had almost ten years experience as Minister in Ayub Khan's cabinet before he launched his campaign to seek the highest office Benazir, while she was steeled as a politician by her suffering during the incarceration and subsequent hanging of her father had no experience of building a party organization, conducting a political struggle or running the institutions of the state. Although she was educated in the elite western institutions at Harvard and Oxford she did not have the same depth of understanding of politics and history, which her father had. On the positive side, she was not burdened with the psychological conflicts of her father and by virtue of having had a more psychologically stable childhood, and being much more socialized in Western culture she was less prone to despotic tendencies than Mr. Bhutto. She entered Pakistan's politics with the inheritance of her father's mantle as a leader of Pakistan's dispossessed masses. She was in a position to rapidly make alliances with pro-democratic political forces (manifested during the MRD agitation) and being fresh to the Pakistani political scene was likely to receive the benefit of the doubt from her potential allies. At the level of devising the alchemy of charisma she had two vital ingredients available to her:

(1) She was a Bhutto daughter who had undergone the anguish of Bhutto's last days more intimately than any member of the public. She embodied for many people the pain they themselves suffered as distant observers. She had thus a mystique arising from closeness to Bhutto who had achieved the status of a martyred folk hero through the form of his death.

(2) Being a woman represented the archetypal image of both pain and the struggle to regenerate a community, in the folk tradition of Pakistan. As a woman she also represented the synthesizing forces in popular consciousness and a countervailing factor to the banality and manipulateness that had degenerated contemporary politics at the time that Benazir Bhutto entered the

stage of history.

Politically, Pakistan's only woman prime minister was driven by three broad influences. First, there is her love and adulation of her father, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and she is very conscious of the fact that she represents his f surname. Second, there is her hatred for General Zia, her father's hangman and executioner and the principal tormentor of her family for eleven years. Third, there is her infatuation with things American in politics (John F. Kennedy), in education (Harvard) and in foreign affairs (a desire to seek US goodwill). This approach is quite marked since she spent her formative years in the West, particularly the United States.

These three broad influences were also reflected in her maiden address to the nation as Prime Minister.³² She invoked her father's name at least three times, quoted him and even raised the slogan of her party activists *Zinda hai Bhutto* during her speech. She castigated the Zia years for l policies in various areas, including "a myopic foreign policy without once naming the man who had become her major political adversary. She named the United States as the first among the countries with which "relations will be strengthened" and she ended her speech by quoting from the John F. Kennedy inauguration speech of 20 January 1961: "Ask what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

Benazir Bhutto's political life can be seen in three main phases. From 1977-1984, soon after the July 1977 military coup, she was politically growing facing detention and pressure from the military government. During 1984-1986, she was in exile in I t taking charge of the PIP and developing skills in public relations, particularly with d Western media, which stood her in good stead later on. From 1986-1988, when she returned to Pakistan, she was battling General Zia with single-minded determination and exploiting the openings provided in Pakistan owing to the lifting of Martial law. All through this period, she showed tremendous political tenacity and unwavering courage despite the heavy odds.

Benazir Bhutto on her assumption of the prime minister's office in 1988, was in a politically weak position in comparison

with her father when he took over the same office in 1971. At least domestically, her father was the unchallenged leader but in foreign policy his problems were more serious due to the Bangladesh war and the suiting out of various problems with India.

Benazir Bhutto, despite her education at some of the best seats of learning in the West, has few serious works to her credit. In 1978 she wrote *Foreign Policy in Perspective*, a brief collection of her short articles in various newspapers and journals. But she also wrote two more detailed articles in *Musawwat* on 20 and 21 September 1978, on *Quitting CENTO*. Her recently published autobiography, *Daughter of the East* is more a personalized account of her ordeal during the execution of her father than a clear exposition of her views on economic or political issues. In this respect, unlike her father she cannot claim to be an intellectual. Her most challenging task was to make the transition from being the head of an opposition party for eleven years to being prime minister of Pakistan.

In spite of the charisma with which she entered Pakistan's politics, Benazir Bhutto was unable to sustain it because of her failure to articulate a credible alternative to the status quo let alone take effective steps to actualize it. Benazir's style was populist but she attempted to use mass mobilization with a restrained militancy in order to achieve her objective of finding a niche in the existing power structure and to make herself acceptable to its major elements, namely, the military, civil bureaucracy and the US Government. The PPP which during the late sixties had fired the imagination of the masses using the slogans of anti-nationalism, anti-imperialism, and socialism, was converted by Benazir Bhutto into a centrist party that instead of appearing as a party of change began to project an image of a status quo party. (This was with respect to both her market orientated pro-entrepreneurial economic policy and a greater subservience to the US than even Zia-ul-Haq was able to boast of.) Benazir Bhutto gave the impression that she was a politician for whom America's blessings take precedence over the concerns of her own party and the public opinion of Pakistan. As a senior American officer remarked, "Benazir Bhutto's stand is a bonus

for us because we did not expect it.³⁴ During April 1986, when she returned to Lahore to a triumphant homecoming enthusiastic activists raised slogans against the US and burned the American flag. She publicly admonished them and told them not to bum the American flag. This was before she came to power and she continued this attitude towards the US during her 20-month stay in office and after her dismissal during the Gulf War at a time when the Pakistani people, including her party were demonstrating g the US, she was busy touring America and placating the US with such statements as “President Bush went the extra mile for peace and the US is in Persian Gulf to defend the principle of opposing aggression”.

Benazir Bhutto entered the office of Prime Minister within a very narrow political space that was granted to her by the establishment. As a condition for being allowed into the office of Prime Minister she had acquiesced to a set of light parameters within which she was to exercise her power. Pakistan’s Afghan policy would remain unchanged and continue to be run by the ISI as before; to ensure an overall foreign policy orientation consistent with US interests, Sahibzada Yaqub Khan, who was Foreign Minister in the Zia government would continue in office un changed; and finally, economic policy would continue within the framework of the agreement signed by the previous “caretaker” Government. To ensure adherence to this latter stipulation s was obliged to appoint Mr. V.A. Jaffery (whom she had never met before) as Adviser on Finance, (with rank of Minister), after he had been ‘interviewed’ by the US Ambassador. These parameters were imposed by the US on the one hand, and the military and senior bureaucrats on the other. Prime Minister, Benazir Bhutto entered the inner sanctums of the state apparatus, but was dismissed by the major elements of the power structure consisting of the President, bureaucracy and the army. This distrust was based partly on the fact that she was the daughter of a man whom the establishment had hanged, her finger was on the trigger of mass emotion, and being a y woman, the male dominated establishment suspected that she may not be able to perform her tasks competently.

Her style of governance which in any case was cramped by the limited space made available to her was marred by certain features which merely deepened the suspicions of the Establishment about her ability to rule effectively.

Her excessive reliance on cronies such as Happy Minwalla and friends of her husband gave the impression that she was ruling through a cabal of self and incompetent individuals. She had three sets of advisors, some of whom were genuinely men of ability and integrity:

(1) Her father's favourites (Ran Rashid, Chief of Air Staff Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Nasirullah Babur, Iqbal Akhund and Khalid Ahmad Kharal);

(2) Benazir Bhutto's own political friends and colleagues (Aitzaz Ahsan, Itfikhhar Gillani and Tariq Rahim);

(3) Her husband's cronies (such as Fauzi Ali Kazmi, Askari and Kamal Majeedullah).

In the end, Benazir Bhutto's downfall was hastened on two accounts quite similar to the beginning of the end of the first PPP regime of her father. Like her father she turned many potential allies into adversaries with the result that a broad spectrum of political forces began developing against the government. Her allies like MQM and ANP were off-loaded, almost in a casual manner as if they were no longer needed. And long-standing in the MRD was simply ignored, particularly democrats like Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan. Secondly, Benazir made the mistake of endeavoring to use the army to tackle her problem in Sind, similar to the manner in which her father had deployed the military in Baluchistan. In both cases, from an instrument of government policy, the army was quickly converted into an arbitrator in what became a growing dispute between the government and its political opponents.³⁵ The result was the political weakening and the eventual collapse of the PPP government.

COMPARATIVE STYLES

1. Ayub and Zia

Given that the military has ruled Pakistan for twenty-four of its

fortyfour years, a comparison of the rust military ruler, Ayub Khan, with the longest-serving one, Zia-ul-Haq, is apt. Although Zia-ul-Haq often eulogized the Ayub decade as a “golden era” in Pakistan’s history, no two leaders could be more different in their ethos, worldview and the way they went about tackling Pakistan’s problems. Ayub was a “pucca sahib” in the British military tradition, trained at Sandhurst; tall, fair and handsome, epitomizing the classic colonial view of the “martial races” from the north. Conversely, Zia, of medium height, belonging to the Arain caste, a most “non-martial” background, a refugee from East Punjab who joined the Army in the twilight of British colonialism in the subcontinent. An essential difference between them was also ‘cultural’, conditioned by the different historical time frames of their functioning Ayub, commissioned in 1928, was a Reader’s Digest reading, “ general while Zia, commissioned in 1945, represented those seen as being ‘nativised’ via the *Urdu Digest* using the national language as their main medium of communication. Even in the Army, Ayub was an acknowledged leader, a Commander-in-Chief who, as the first Pakistani to occupy this slot, had seven years experience before assuming the Presidency after his coup in 1958. Zia was hardly the first among equals even within the Army having had a 16-month stint as Q of Army Staff before leading the coup in 1977. And he happened to be the junior most Corps Commander who was promoted to the Army’s top slot in March 1976.

The manner of their ascendancy to the power structure also determined their initial moves. Ayub, by his own admission had been seriously thinking about Pakistan’s political problems for at least four sears prior to his takeover, while Zia had actually been pushed into removing Bhutto after months of popular upheaval. While Zia took halting the hailing steps towards a political opening, indicative of his unsure and uncertain position. Ayub was clear from day one regarding the steps he would take. He didn’t have to go through the charade of “90 days” that was Zia’s policy to gain time before moving on to the phase of consolidation. Ayub took a series of 1 thought measures in various areas, promulgated his Presidential Constitution which concentrated all power in his

person—and lifted Martial Law, thereby formally delinking the Army from administering the country. He also quickly appointed a trusted loyalist — Musa Khan — as Army Chief. Zia lifted material law after seven-and-a-half years and remained COAS throughout his eleven years in power.

Ayub's power base was the northern-based bureaucracy and Army, similar to Zia's although his regime had an interesting tripod of East Punjabi Army officers, Urdu-speaking bureaucrats and Pakhtoon military and civil officers. Both represented contrasting worldviews. Ayub was a modernist with an essentially secular vision (his initial draft of the 1962 Constitution deleted "Islamic" referring to the country simply as "Republic of Pakistan"). However, he was averse to a long-drawn political bade or to taking risks. He was to regret the only risk he took, launching the "Gibraltar Force" in occupied Kashmir which sparked the September 1965 War, and he later pinned the blame on what he called were "the childish antics of the Foreign Minister' (Z.A Bhutto). Zia was an Islamist with the zeal of a believer. He was capable of taking calculated risks (hanging Bhutto, cancelling elections, confronting the Soviets and dismissing Junejo). He was thick-skinned with an ability to engage in protracted political combat. Zia was more in the mould of Najib, Saddam or Hafez al Assad, who can fight to the bitter end; while Ayub can be compared to leaders like Marcos and the Shah of Iran, who take the first flight out when they faced serious trouble. Ayub's vision of Pakistan saw a modern society underlined by political conservatism, certainly less ideological than ha whose worldview, however, had a pragmatic streak that relied on ad hocism and status quo for survival.

However, it was apparent that being a military successor to Ayub, Zia did see him as a model of sorts whose strength was perceived in such adjectives as "stability", (a long term unchallenged by a strong opposition save for Miss Fatima Jinnah's challenges or the final wrap-up initiated by Bhutto), "prestige" (international image and impact) and "progress" (economic development under free market conditions).

While ha was willing to share power, Ayub was not, although

both were willing to delegate to their colleagues and subordinates and allowed their provincial governors to act as virtual warlords. Both apparently also reposed faith and trust in the civil bureaucracy. Ayub's period was intellectual suffocation and stagnation while, under Zia, Martial Law notwithstanding, a "culture of resistance" spawned intellectual vibrancy and ferment in the media, drama, and fine arts (e.g., television dramas became popular with an audience that stretched into India as well).

In foreign policy, both developed an interest and expertise that saw them seeking major initiatives: Ayub on China and Zia on Afghanistan, Iran and India. Both started off as friends of America but, at the end of the day, both were distrusted by Washington. Zia, it seemed, had learnt one basic lesson from his two military predecessors — Ayub and Yahya — not to fight on "two fronts", namely, on the frontiers and at home.

Zia certainly had more lasting impact. He died with his "boots on" and was given a hero's funeral. Ayub left in disgrace, much-maligned, he died unsung with Bhutto not even bothering to attend his funeral. Ayub had tried but failed to create a political constituency and the 1970 elections were won by an absence of any reference to his person or politics. Conversely, Zia developed a political constituency and the 1988 elections were fought by the IJI using his name in a manner similar to the PPP using the Bhutto name. However, the domestic enduring legacies of both were political misuses. Ayub was remembered for the "22 families" who had caused the "problem" of East Pakistan, while Zia's legacy was the "Culture of Kalashnikovs" whose worst manifestation was the problem of Sind.

2. Bhutto and Zia

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and General Zia-ul-Haq will probably rank as among the most important personalities in Pakistani history. Their impact is certainly felt beyond their tenure of office. They were a certain mixture of opposites, with some similarities but sharp contrasts both in their style of politics and in the way they pursued the politics of power.

It would be interesting to compare and analyze Zulfikar Ali

Bhutto and Zia-ul-Haq, in terms of the political context of their roles, their personalities and their politics. After all, the two, between the were responsible for running Pakistan for seventeen years since 1971, after the “parting of the ways” between the two wings of the country.

Bhutto was cast in the mould of a certain kind of ‘Third World leader. He was nationalist, populist, and incorruptible but authoritarian like Ben Bella, Nasser and Soekarno. All were fiery orators. all were fl and they all had a special rapport with the m Zia-ul-Haq represented those Third World leaders, in the tradition of Suharto and Ne Win, who were self-effacing, and low-keyed. Their distinctive hallmark was continuity in office, they were instinctual in their approach and their political trait was conservatism. They did not believe in rocking the boat.

When Bhutto came to power, he had long years of experience in high level of government and he came to office with a reputation both at home and abroad. Since Bhutto was perceived as ‘ambitious’, a number of politicians in the country felt threatened by him. Conversely, General ha was seen as unassuming, and a ‘reluctant coup-maker’, although he too had no desire, like Bhutto, of parting with power. Consequently, General Zia was constantly underestimated, both by his friends and his foes.

When he came to power; Bhutto faced serious difficulties in restoring the confidence and morale of a demoralized nation. In this respect, his problems were certainly greater than those of General Zia in his earlier years. In fact, Bhutto banded that phase. The first two years of his rule, with statesmanlike skills both in domestic and foreign policy. General Zia had fewer problems in us earlier years and most people saw him as a temporary and transitional figure. There were fewer expectations attached to him, unlike Bhutto who had come to power through the electoral process where he knew his performance would be compared to his ability to delivery on his promises. The earlier years allowed General ha to grow in office, because that period was notable for LIE exclusive attention that was devoted to the Bhutto trial.

In terms of their personality. Bhutto and ha were strikingly different. Bhutto was a unique combination of affluence. Brill-

liance and good looks. He was easy to read, his reactions were never hidden and at times, he could be volatile, impulsive and unpredictable. He was also decisive in most policy matters. For his part, General Zia was extremely patient and never in a hurry. In fact he was slow to the extent that for him indecision, by design or by default, was almost an instrument of policy, probably in the belief that if a problem was allowed to drag on interminably, it would eventually go away.

In analyzing their personalities, it would be instructive to compare their treatment of their colleagues as well as their political opponents. Bhutto inspired awe and fear in his colleagues who were never sure of their position vis-a-vis him. He was quite insecure vis-a-vis his colleagues and few, if any, of his colleagues had a graceful exit. His relationship with his closest colleagues is best summed up, by an anecdote during an election meeting in Lahore in February 1977. Bhutto was addressing a mammoth crowd, who were listening to him with rapt attention. Standing on the sidelines, slightly to the rear left of Bhutto were Dr. Mubashir Hasan, Mumtaz Ali Bhutto and Rafi Raza. A couple of times they noticed that Bhutto, while speaking, had glanced at the three of them huddled together. At that point Mumtaz Ali Bhutto remarked: "Bhutto seems to be watching us. Let's stand separately, otherwise he may think that we are up to something" Zia had a far more relaxed and stable relationship with his colleagues. He was probably the first Pakistani ruler to have informally incorporated the role of a de facto number two, General Arif, for a very long time, almost seven years. Normally, most of his colleagues parted with General Zia with a "golden hand-shake". However, it should be clear that both had a streak of ruthlessness in them the only difference being that while Bhutto deployed the steel-fist, General Zia used the velvet-glove nothing exemplified more than the manner of ouster of their respective close colleagues, J.A. Rahim and K.M. Arif.³⁸

There was an important difference in the way the two treated their political opponents. Bhutto would often drive his opponents up the wall or seek a humiliating rapprochement with them. There was an excess of use of force: Where knuckles could be rapped,

Bhutto went for the big blow. Conversely, Zia was careful in most cases not to personalize his political enmities. Like Bhutto, he too had a very good memory, but was content to give a blow or two to his opponents at a time of his own convenience. There was no obsessive quest to go “for the kill”.

In terms of their class background, General Zia was genuinely “native”, from the middle class, speaking in chaste Urdu. He was no intellectual by any standards. In fact, his “heavy reading” was confined to rigorous perusal of newspapers, Pakistani and foreign, and intelligence reports. Conversely, Bhutto was an upper class feudal, urbane, westernized and modern. He was genuinely intellectual, well-read and well-versed in writings of history, political and foreign affairs. Their style of work also differed. Bhutto was partially a workaholic as far as spending time on office files went; Zia had mostly relied on subordinates for routing file work.

In human relations, three essential differences need also to be noted. Bhutto proved to be a poor judge of people. He mistook rogues who should not have been touched by a pair of tongs. Although both gave precedence to the loyalty factor, on the whole, Zia proved to be a better judge of people. Secondly while Bhutto was definitely arrogant at times and with some people, (in this way, his attitude was similar to that of Mr. Gandhi), Zia’s hallmark was humility. His double handshake, triple embrace style I greeting was typical of him, together with his routine opening of car doors for his visitors and waiting in the driveway till the visitor departed. An anecdote in the White House aptly sums up this aspect of General Zia. When he was planning to visit Washington in December 1982 a number of Senators egged on by Pakistani opposition leaders, urged President Reagan to put pressure on General Zia for freedom in Pakistan since “he was a military dictator.” After General Zia had made his Washington visit, the Senators asked President Reagan whether he had discussed democracy and its restoration in Pakistan with General Zia. R replied: “He’s no dictator. He was a nice guy. He was the oily foreign leader I have seen visiting the White House, who even took hands with the marine guards, with the waiters and with practically everyone in sight. If he was so good to people, he

can't be all that bad!"³⁹ Finally, their style of decision making differed a lot Zia was cooler, careful, sure-footed, he believed in moving forward step-by-step. Bhutto used to take giant strides do things in one grand sweep. Since both can be noted for their proclivity for being avid cricket fans, perhaps their styles can be better understood in cricketing parlance. Zia liked to play with a straight bat and did not go for the big hit except in the case of Bhutto's hanging. He preferred to score in singles and two and p to consolidate his innings through light strokes. Initially, the impact was minimum but over time, the presence was felt as the innings become more established.

Zia has had one distinct advantage over Bhutto: He was definitely the luckier of the two. Whether it was the timing of the Islamic revolution, which led to the ouster of one of Mr. Bhutto's closest supporters, the Shah, just before his hanging or the fact that the Bhutto hanging was followed three days later by the ha of former Iranian Prime Minister, Hoveida, which mitigated the international impact of the act in Pakistan. These favoured General Zia. So also did the Soviet military intervention which aroused Western interest in a country that was practically at international pariah; or the NA hijacking which effectively scuttled the newly formed MRD's proposed agitation; or even the t of Mrs. Gandhi's assassination, just when she was apparently planning a milit2ry strike against Pakistan. All these developments provided a political advantage to General Zia.

Both Bhutto and Zia as political leaders cannot be termed as "soft", like, say, Ayub, the Shah or Marcos. Basically tenacious fighters they had the capacity to take pressure by not cracking up in a crisis nor taking the first flight out.

In terms of their politics, there were interesting differences b Bhutto and Zia. While Bhutto was perceived to be on the Left and Zia on the Right, both could not really be slotted on an ideological basis. Zia was certainly the more pragmatic of the two, a fact reflected in his choice of such diverse friends as the communists of China, the capitalists of America, the Marxists of Zimbabwe, the secularists of Turkey and the theocrats of Saudi Arabia. While Bhutto had a worldview of how he wanted the

country to look in certain specific areas, General Zia had no worldview. He essentially improvised as he went alone. He had institutionalized ad hocism as a policy and he was certainly not a problem-solver. That could also be a plus in certain situations where General Zia backed down and was prone to compromise during crises (as he did during the 1980 Shia agitation or the 1981 PIA hijacking). Conversely, Bhutto relied on brinkmanship, where crises were allowed to reach a pitch before he would 'solve' them. (The 1973 military action in Baluchistan which he tried to reverse in 1976 through a package deal with Sardar Daud and the 1977 PNA agitation which he first quelled through force, including Mama! Law, and then subsequently tried to settle through negotiations.)

Both had a penchant for foreign affairs, a domain used by both Bhutto and Zia for increasing personal prestige. Neither could be faulted for either interest or expertise in economics. Both also were their own best PR men, whom foreign correspondents generally found to be "charming".

While Bhutto had a strange kind of impersonal rapport with the masses, General Zia relied more on a personal one-to-one contact.

Ironically, history will probably be harsh with both Bhutto and Zia for failure to build political institutions in the country. Both also failed to heal the wounds in the country's body politic. While General Zia muffled the political process by presiding over and prolonging the longest Martial Law in Pakistan's history, Bhutto began wrecking his own Constitution and politics process through the military action in Baluchistan in 1973, which followed the dismissal of an opposition majority government in that province followed by the exit of the other in the Front. History will, however, credit Bhutto on at least three counts: For being the architect of a new kind of politics in Pakistan which generated mass consciousness about people's rights, for restoring morale to the country in the first couple of years of his rule which culminated in the Islamic summit in 1974, and finally for initiating the nuclear programme. Similarly, histories will probably see as definite pluses two successes of General Zia during his long tenure at

the helm of affairs. First, in continuing with Pakistan's nuclear programme, which was inseparable from Pakistan's quest to establish itself as an independent country in the community of nations, and in his deft handling with India, which he managed to outsmart politically, even during a period when one wrong move on his part could have resulted in a state of war with a militarily larger, more powerful neighbour.

3. Bhutto's: Father and Daughter

Twenty-four years after its emergence, the Bhutto legacy looks a politically diminished phenomenon, with its earlier vitality buried under the blunders of the second PPP regime. Yet what has surprised most observers is its ability to endure the chequered nature of the country's politics.

When the PPP had its founding convention in November 1967 on the front lawns of the residence of an obscure Lahore engineer, few gave it any chance of success against the Ayub dictatorship. When it came to power four years later, few thought its rule would be so short-lived. When it was ousted from power following the July 1979 coup, few thought that it would survive the rigours of repression. In 1986 when Benazir returned to a triumphant homecoming, few thought she could be stopped. Later, few were willing to bet that the Pakistan Peoples Party would be in power in 1988. And fewer would have believed that the PPP's second tenure would be so short-lived as to last only twenty months. The zigs and zags of the PPP political fortunes reflect the hazard and uncertainties of politics in most Third World countries, amongst which Pakistan is no exception.

The PPP has experienced a generational "changing of the guard" from Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who was forty three in 1971, to Benazir Bhutto, who was thirty five in 1987. It would be interesting to compare the politics of the father and the daughter. Their political context, their political line and their political style.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was a product of the Establishment, when he joined Pakistan's first Martial Law Cabinet at the age of thirty. In a regime of sycophants and mediocre time-servers, he stood out as a dynamic young nationalist. He soon became the

“whiz kid” of the Ayub regime, whose affluence was backed up by ability and appeal. A product of the post-World War II, anti-imperialist Third World tradition, Bhutto was probably the first major Third World leader who had an intimate exposure to American society — as a student Eight years in the Ayub cabinet gave him considerable experience. He learnt the ropes of ‘the system’ well and knew how it worked. Basically, he got to know personally the 500 or so individuals who mattered in the Pakistan Establishment Linked together by ties of blood, money and mutual interest, these 500 or so individuals were in the army, bureaucracy, police, business, media or were scions of feudal families.

Unlike her father, Benazir Bhutto was an “outsider”. She was neither part nor product of “the system”. She had no experience in government of the kind that Bhutto had, the only similarity being her exposure the West, initially as a student and later as an exile. She was keen to enter “the system”, and to be accepted by the Establishment. Her path to power was by force of circumstance more uphill and more rocky. Her major minus was a lack of understanding of the inner workings of “the system” that she wanted to run. There was also a “cultural problem”: Her knowledge of the 500 or so individuals “who matter?” was extremely limited. She did not live in Pakistan in her formative years, and was later denied the opportunity of interaction with people owing to crises (Bhutto trial and execution) and incarceration.

Bhutto had also managed to put together a team, which proved to be a winning combination in 1970. This team was an assortment of diverse people which essentially defined the PPP’s mass movement character rather than that of an organized, well-knit political force. There were retired bureaucrats, old Leftists, young Leftists, lawyers, traditional feudals, technocrats and representatives of the urban middle class. In fact, the PPP itself was a sort of Grand United Front representing the popular coalition that had ousted Ayub Khan. More than anything else, Bhutto’s stand on issues, being clear and bold, had endeared him to the masses and earned him the respect of the intelligentsia.

Benazir Bhutto had popular support, but little respect among

the intelligentsia despite her apparently impeccable academic credentials. She failed to evolve a method of governance through a well-knit team, with each member given specific tasks for providing expert inputs into important decisions. She had some bright experts contributing policy papers but she failed to consult them on a systematic basis, nor did she wield them into a team. Consequently, her government failed to establish itself as one that could guide the destiny of Pakistan in the 1990s.

It is important to understand the difficulties faced by Benazir Bhutto as compared to her father. There were three major differences in Pakistan that separated the period preceding Bhutto's ascension to power from that of Benazir. The army was neutral when Bhutto was campaigning for office. In fact, he had good contacts in the GHQ who kept him posted on major decisions and developments. Bhutto was thus able to anticipate and even preempt events given his inside knowledge into 'the system'. In Benazir Bhutto's case, the army was certainly not neutral. She had to face the hostility and bear the brunt of the state apparatus of Pakistan's Third Martial Law regime. However, as always, the army remained a political factor. Benazir's theory of three political forces in Pakistan's politics — army, America and PPP was a variation of Bhutto's own theory of the three political forces in 1970 — army, Awami League and PPP.

When Bhutto was campaigning for office in 1970, he was not carrying any "extra baggage". He was untried and untested as a national leader and represented freshness and change. Given the fact that Pakistan became a polarized polity, Bhuttoism was a divisive legacy. It worked both ways for Benazir. Since it was her main claim to fame, it was also her strength, but it also weakened her as a sizeable section of the Pakistani electorate feared Bhuttoism, given the PPP track record in power. Such "extra baggage" was absent in the case of Miss Fatima Jinnah, Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Mrs. Cory Aquino, but was very similar to the predicament of Sheikh Mujib's daughter, Hasina Wajid.

The geo-politics of the region had radically altered since the 1970s. The region was more unstable and more susceptible to outside interference. Owing to the increased superpower conten-

tion for influence, strategically placed countries like Pakistan also had more room to maneuver and more freedom to pursue their objectives of balancing one superpower against the other. In the 1980s there was an American political presence in Pakistan and Soviet military presence in Afghanistan, and resistance to both from the people in these countries. In fact, Iran by changing the rules of the game and telling both superpowers 'to go to hell' at the same time, had charted a new course in diplomacy. Bhutto was also aware of the American factor, but he used it effectively and subtly. For example, soon after he won the 1971 elections, he told *The Times* (London) in an interview: "I have done more to stop communism in this part of the world than all the millions of dollars that the US had spent in Vietnam". The message was clear: Basically Bhutto was telling Washington that he was no America-baiting Leftist, only a Third World nationalist. In 1963, responding to his pro-China image, Bhutto had told *The Washington Post*. "Actually our relationship with China was similar to your wartime collaboration with the Soviets". In other words, he was suggesting that Pakistan knows that China was an ideological adversary but it was mutual interests that have brought the two together. Similarly, on the eve of his return to Pakistan to take over in December 1971, Bhutto made sure that he met President Nixon at the White House.⁴⁰

During the period prior to becoming Prime Minister of Pakistan, Bhutto's contradictions and political minuses were apparent. Her sense of timing had faltered badly. She first insisted on elections by Fall 1986 and when the agitation failed, she was willing to sit it out. In December 1986, when Karachi was burning, she was dining with Western Ambassadors in Islamabad. In April 1987, when Karachi was again gripped by political upheaval, she was dining with the parliamentary opposition in Rawalpindi. In July 1987, when the bomb blasts in Karachi resulted in the biggest death toll of terrorism in Pakistan's history, she merely telephoned her condemnation and concern from London, and failed to rush home. While Benazir Bhutto rejected the Parliament for not being representative, she accepted to dine with the parliamentary opposition and allowed her party to participate

in a Punjab bye-election. While attacking the government's foreign policy, she refrained from pointing at the root of its failure: the degree of dependence on the United States. Although lacking in political acumen in certain cases, Benazir showed courage and perseverance during adverse circumstances.

As Prime Minister, Benazir Bhutto failed to learn the fundamental lessons from three failures of her father: (i) Her father was the first genuinely popular mass leader in Pakistan's history, yet by 1977 he alienated the majority of politicians to the extent that they welcomed the military coup and eagerly concurred in his hanging. (ii) Bhutto's intolerance of dissent and reliance on the state apparatus as opposed to the political forces proved to be his nemesis. (iii) Then there was the organizational failure of the PPP which could not politically counter the PNA in 1977 and which became a helpless spectator to the hanging of its leader. Like her father she failed to convert the PPP from a movement into a political organization: she similarly isolated herself by alienating her potential political allies, and finally began to increasingly rely on the very bureaucracy whose hostility she had earlier incurred. Thus despite the massive month-long mobilization by Benazir Bhutto in April-May, 1986, the PPP failed to take off in the agitation of August 1986. Similarly, it failed to respond to the situation after Benazir's dismissal and defeat in the polls. Basically, her team could not be made into a winning combination. Organizational weakness and intellectual fuzziness reinforced this failure.

Both the Bhutto's failed to politically govern the country in a manner that would strengthen political institutions. Both relied on personalized control as the basis for seeking administrative compliance. Yet they had contrasting attitudes towards the United States. While Zulfikar All Bhutto felt that the US was crucial in the destabilization of his government, Benazir Bhutto drew sustenance from her unqualified faith in American support.

NOTES

1. In this article in "Pakistan: The Long View", Khalid Bin Sayyed refers

- to Ayub Khan never having “a feel for what urban aspirations or frustrations were all about. He tended to dismiss the intellectuals as impractical bookworms and the urban politicians as either selfish or irresponsible: and then goes on to cite some of Ayub’s thoughts in this regards as published in his book *Friends not Masters*, PP.245-255.
2. *White Papers on the performance of Bhutto regime*, published by the Government of Pakistan, August 1978.
 3. MQM’s formation is generally attributed to the Zia regime.
 4. Ayub, for instance, had prepared as working paper on the outlines of his “solution” to Pakistan’s problems as far back as October 1954, *Supra*, 1.
 5. Lawrence Ziring, *Ayub Khan Era: Politics in Pakistan, 1958-1969*, Syracuse University, 1971.
 6. Mohammad Ayub Khan, *Friends not Masters*, Oxford University Press, 1967. pp. 217-218.
 7. Narrated by a person who was personally present in London on that occasion to Mushahid Hussain.
 8. The cover of Shahid Javed Burki’s study *Pakistan under Bhutto 1971-77*, Macmillan, 1980, on the Bhutto regime has a portrait of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto being driven in colonial pageantry.
 9. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, *If I am assassinated*, Vikas, 1979.
 10. Eqbal Ahmad “Signposts to a Police State”, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, November 1974.
 11. “Napoleon was a giant. There was no man more complete than him. His military brilliancy was only one facet of his many-sided genius. His Nap Code remains the basic law of many countries. Napoleon was an outstanding administrator, a scholar and a romanticist. In my opinion his prose was superior to that of Charles de Gaulle. “See Z.A., Bhutto, *If I am assassinated*, op. cit.
 12. The analysis in this section is based on Akmal Hussain. “Charismatic Leadership in Pakistan’s Politics”. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Bombay. 21 January 1989.
 13. Speech at election rally in Ichhra, Lahore, March 1970. A similar scene was evidenced at the Lahore Airport in June 1972, when Bhutto returned from India after signing the Simla Agreement. He was jubilant over the fact that he had returned not as an empty handed leader of a vanquished country but one who had managed to extract substantial concessions for his country. It was at his moment of emotional contact, when leaving a crowd that was keen to touch him, Bhutto tool off his coat and just threw it out in the air. Many hands seized it from several directions and tore it apart.
 14. Bhutto was a very good mimic and put this talent to full inc during his major elections rallies. For instance, during his maiden election rally at

the Mochi Gate which kicked off the campaign for 1977 elections in March Bhutto spoke for 1 hour and 20 minutes in a speech that was vintage Bhutto. During speech he poked fun at his political and related political history by mimicking such personalities as Ayub Khan, Musa Khan and Nawabzada Sher Ali Khan along with audience participation. Often, he would refer to somebody sitting in the audience and sometimes he would involve the entire audience by making them raise their hands to endorse a particular policy. Bhutto's public rallies reflected, new styles of Pakistan's politics and his public meetings invariably were transformed into carnivals, with lessons in political history laced with some sort of entertainment.

15. The rhythmic beating of drums to the music of Dama Dam Mast Kalander, in Bhutto's meetings was essentially a recognition of the fact that the mystic poet Shahbaz Kalander had a deep influence on the masses which Bhutto used to add special flavor to his rallies. For instance, during a November 1971 meeting in Lahore after a visit to China and just three weeks before the beginning of the 1st war-over Bangladesh, he remarked that 'according to my assessment of the international situation there will be no war and India will not attack Pakistan. However, if India does attack Pakistan then these will, and there will be Dama Dam Mast Kalander.
16. Zamir Niazi in his landmark *The Press in Chains*, (Royal Bock Company, 1986), refers to J.A. Rahim's "humiliation and physical torture". p. 146.
17. Conversation with Dr. Mubashir Hasan, who served as Bhutto's Finance Minister.
18. On 28 April 1977, Bhutto accused the United States of destabilizing his government in a speech before the National Assembly and the next day he showed up in a crowded bazaar in Rawalpindi waving the letter that he had received from the American Secretary of State.
19. Soon after the election process was over, and the opposition, refused to accept the election results citing massive rigging. On 12 March 1977 Bhutto made a strong speech on television confidentially proclaiming, while pointing to his seat that "This is a strong seat".
20. Ashraf Pahlavi, *Memoirs*.
21. Ambassador of Philippines Angara narrated this to Mush Hussain.
22. Narrated to Mushahid Hussain by Brig. T.H. Siddiqui who was then Director, Inter Services Public Relations (ISPR).
23. Mushahid Hussain. *Paki Politics The Zia Years*. Konark, Delhi, p. 265.
24. Op. cit.
25. Mushahid Hussain, "The Invisible Government. *The Nation*, 5 February 1989.

26. Narrated to Mushahid Hussain by Brig. T.H. Siddiqui, Director ISPR who was eye-witness to this incident.
27. Mushahid Hussain, "General Zia Versus Mr. Junejo", *The Nation*, 4 June 1988.
28. Narrated to Mushahid Hussain by a high level source.
29. Narrated to Mushahid Hussain by General K.M. Arif.
30. Narrated to Mushahid Hussain by Lt. Gen. Fazle Haq.
31. Narrated to Mushahid Hussain by high-level source.
32. Mushahid Hussain, "Benazir Bhutto: A political profile", *The Frontier Post*, 3 December 1988; Benazir Bhutto, "Story of an arranged marriage", *New Woman*, August 1989; Richard Weintraub, "The symbols of Benazir Bhutto", *The Washington Post*, 31 May 1989.
33. However, according to informed PPP source, the 1978 collection and the article on CENTO in *Mussawat* were actually written by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, but published under Benazir Bhutto's name.
34. Conversation with Mushahid Hussain.
35. A catalogue of Benazir Bhutto's mistakes can be found in Mushahid Hussain, "Failure to evolve new rules of the game". *The Frontier Post*, 26 August 1989, and by the same writer in "How US views Ms. Bhutto", *the Frontier Post*, 26 April 1990; John Burns, "Bhutto survives nearly a year in office, but a new era still proves elusive", *The New York Times*, 8 November 1989; Christina Lamb, "Ghosts hunting Benazir Bhutto", *The Financial Times*, 18 August 1989.
36. Ayub Khan's speech in Rawalpindi public meeting. March 1966.
37. Narrated by Dr. Mubashir Hassan.
38. The details of manner of their ouster can be found in earlier pages of his draft.
39. Narrated to Mushahid Hussain by Dr. Eqbal Ahmed.
40. This was a brief meeting of about half an hour or less, although, according to one account, given by Dr. Eqbal Ahmed, Bhutto flew specially to meet Nixon at his retreat in Florida and not at the White House.