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PAPER INFO

This study is a pragmatic effort to explore the effect of civil military relations on foreign policy of Pakistan. One of the essential customs for a democratic system is strong civil-military relations but in history there are certain states in which military take over the civilian government. While observing Pakistan’s history, it was evident that the absence of democratic values in our political culture has permitted the military to effortlessly infiltrate all parts of the legislative framework. Knock down over democratic institutes by Military Dictators started soon after independence. There were many difficulties which provoked uncertainty towards a stable governmental framework in Pakistan. In this research both analytical and descriptive methods will be utilized. The analytical method helps to understand the existing literature in perspective of Pakistan’s foreign policy and its role in international domain. This paper also recommends some possibilities and comprehensive techniques to opt for better democratic setup
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Introduction

Military is always in impacting and influencing mood even US military (Pentagon) also impacting US foreign policy. From the beginning, many countries have experienced their military’s involvement in their government system. Few have evolved into civilian governments and others have experienced a regular military intervention. Pakistan is one of those countries which experienced the nonstop increasing impact of military into governmental issues. In its early sixty-two years since independence, the Pakistan military has had either direct or indirect control of government. It has had massive effect on the instructions that
Pakistan has taken. The ongoing absence of stability in Pakistan is actually due to miss-managed civil-military relations. A healthy civil-military connection allows military to stand in the background and civilian on front to enhance their institutions. Samuel P Huntington is famous for his work on civil-military relations projected the different levels of relationship between army and civilians. (Huntington, 1957) He holds that interference of army in civilian matters must be prohibited on any cost. Many others analysts agreed with his account.

Pakistan’s military played a vital role especially in politics while the military’s role pervades throughout the political system, while there have been decades of challenges to this role (Ahmed, 2013). In ongoing years, especially after the War on Terror was taking on by President Musharraf; the military is questioned by many groups. The army of Pakistan has ruled Pakistan by a direct route for more than half of the country’s history. The remainder history of Pakistan is also governed by military in an indirect way. The army manipulates civilian departments and political parties in many ways. The unwillingness of Army institutes to transfer power to political system is also a major reason behind failure of civilian government (Rizvi, 1988). Self-belief of newly elected governments after Military Coups was never so high. Military always tried to ensure a strong share for themselves even when they are not in power.

Theories of Civil Military Relations

There are number of scholars working on civil military relations and they proposed different theories as per their own criteria and experience. The most popular theory about CMR is given by Samuel P Huntington. Few of them are as under:

- The Institutional Theory by Samuel P. Huntington
- The Convergence Theory by Morrirz Janowits
- The Concordance Theory by Rebecca L Schiff

The Institutional Theory by Samuel P. Huntington

This first theory is among one of the popular theories given by Samuel P. Huntington (1927-2008); who was influential political scientist. He was most popular for his theory of “Clash of civilization” in 1993. Samuel p. Huntington; in his original book on CMR 1957 “Soldier and State”, Huntington described differences between two worlds e.g. Civil authorities and Military authorities. He considers that military values and norms are mostly conservative and norms by civilian authorities are mostly liberals. Both worlds are consisted of their own unique norms and values. The military functions are totally different from civilians. He focused on “Military professionalism”. Huntington claims that civilian leadership would decide the object for military and then leave it on military to achieve objects or goals. Huntington describes two problems:
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I. Too much control over military could result in disaster on the battleground.

II. Less control mechanism over military would generate the opportunity of an overthrow (i.e.) disappointment of civilian administration. To solve these two problems Huntington’s answer is “Objective Civilian Control”.

i. Directions would be more intrusive and detailed to put it simply “The more objective civilian control, the more military security”.

ii. Huntington identified two shaping forces for civilian control.

The first force is functional and the second one is societal. He broke societal force into two categories; Ideology and Structure. By ideology it means world view and by structure it means legal constitutional framework that guided political affairs generally and military affairs specially. (Huntington, Soldier and State, 1957)(Feaver) He strongly considers that effective civil military relations should be in objective civilian control over their armed forces. This control is indicated by following factors:

i. The military’s adoption of professional ethos.
ii. Effective subordination of military to civilian political leaders.
iii. All approvals and recognitions from political leaders.
iv. Minimal intervention of army in politics and politicians in military affairs.

The Convergence Theory by Morriz Janowits

The second is theory of convergence in which Janowitz claims that there is insufficient study in developing countries about relationship of civilian institutions with military. The key difficulty the equilibrium between uphold military force sufficient to protect as well as tolerate democratic ethics of the political culture and government control to be sufficient to evade any intervention from military in civilian institutions. He agreed with the Samuel P Huntington that separate civilian and military worlds happened but he disagree with unmatched solution for ending threat for democratic government. He presented a convergence theory claiming that army in spite of the highly sluggish the bound of revolution was in reality altering even in absence of external control. This theory assumed that there should be militarization of military or civilianization of military. (Horowitz, 1963) He assumed that army would recollect the various important dissimilarities from the government which would actually continue noticeably. (Janowitz, 1973) He also holds the account of Huntington that due to basic alterations army and government clatter with each other on certain issues which would actually reduce the effective civilian control of the army.

In sum, Janowitz claims that despite all this, military would be holds on some differences from civilian institutions just because of its identification as military in nature. (Janowitz, 1977) Apart from Huntington and Janowitz there are many other academics who are working on CMR there are two more models to
understand the civil military relations as; concordance theory and institutional and occupational theory. The last one is actually a hypothesis of Charles Mosko that means accordance with institutional model military is much far from civilian department and according to occupational hypothesis military is much more concur or rally on civilian department. According to Mosko military is not entirely separate from society (Mosko, 1977).

**The Concordance Theory by Rebeeca L. Schiff**

Another theory is concordance theory in which Rebecca L. Schiff provides a different kind of theory because all other theories of CMR mostly really on separation of military and political world. (Schiff) Schiff holds that military and civilian world must detached both in the terms of physical and in ideological term. (Schiff, 2009) In simple words Schiff’s focus is only on effective cooperation between these two. She suggests that this kind of cooperation should occur between three classes of state as:

- The Military
- The Political elite
- The citizens of the state

According to Schiff these three classes must aim for cooperation on four conditions:

- Community Arrangements of the Officers
- The Process of Civilian Decision making
- The Process of Appointment of military
- The Grace of Army

Schiff hold that there is less chances of intervention of military in domestic politics if agreement occurs in these three classes on the basis of four unique indicators.

The Foreign policy making in Pakistan is affected by multi units and somehow directly or indirectly country’s military also affects the foreign policy making. The National Security Committee and Defense Committee of the Cabinet show the catastrophe to institute a collective and effective apparatus for foreign policy making. The main theme to build the National Security policy was to hold the direct influence the security policy and foreign policy.
The National Security Policy was established in 1969 under the supervision of Yahya khan just to legalize the military intervention in foreign policy but remained only a paper work, in 1993 dissolved by Benazir Bhutto and gain emerged in 1998 under Nawaz Sharif. The NSC was essentially formed to institutionalize the military in decision making process. The Defense Committee of the Cabinet established in 1976 under the leadership of Z.A Bhutto to influence the defense policy.

**Role of Military in Making Foreign Policy**

Fundamental aim of Foreign Policy is to secure National Interest of Country and to promote economic stability and ideological basis. On the other hand, a strong army is a strong reflection of a country’s existence in world, where power seeking is a legitimate goal of superpowers. The major connection between both the State and Military is very important,(M.Amin, 2003) State design foreign policy for seeking of national interest and the military is only for protection of those interests. Sometimes through military the state is eligible to acquire national interests. Those countries have strategic position in world always depended on military for their interests. In this situation, military take keen interest in making of foreign policy and in decision making process, for instance, in Pakistan military take interest in law-making body. And such involvement shows in the result of Military coup in country. For many times military took over power on political institutions.

Military coup of General Yahya Khan, General Ayub Khan, General Zia-ul-Haq and General Pervez Musharraf of the example of such excessive involvement in government and in decision making process. Actually the role of military is to protect the country from external control not to decide the relations with other countries. It is also the perspective of Quaid-i-Azam, that military should protect the citizens and not to interfere in government decision making process.
The formation of Pakistan Defense Council was established to legitimize the role of military externally and eternally. The basic purpose to such Defense council is to protect country externally and eternally. But the excessiveness in rights made military’s involvement into government to military coup. Another reason of such involvement was the lack of accountability and passive approach of civilian leaders.

On particular level General Ayub Khan was the first leader, who wanted to control over foreign policy through military insight. According to his demand after his military coup, the ties should strong between Pakistan and United State of America and make military as well as strong economic alliances.

During his regime military successfully control over the civilian institutions and foreign policy decisions also after his regime foreign policy particularly fully under the control of military influence. Because he handed over power to next General rather than civilian control which decision is more strengthen this practice. Although during Ayub’s regime Z. A. Bhutto was the foreign minister, so the foreign ministry was under the control of civilians but under the dominance of military.

After the Yahya Khan’s regime, Z. A. Bhutto totally separated the foreign office from the military influence and under the supervision of civil ministry. Apparently, Z.A. Bhutto controlling the civilian institutions but when the country faced the political instability and control political aggression, Z. A. Bhutto allowed the military to control the dis-obedience situation from country. This permanent link of military with the civilian institution for political stabilization provoked the military to control over country through Martial Law. So Zia-ul-haq imposed Martial Law and became administrator of country.

Once again foreign policy was under the control of military from 1977-88. In result of such dominance Pakistan faced Afghan war and its consequences. It was due to the centralized policies, during the military coup, the whole government or policies always under the supervision of one man, without the consultation on any minister or cabinet.

After General Zia-ul-Haq regime, the Pakistan People’s Party (PPP) again won the general elections and became the ruling party in country. Foreign ministers in her cabinet were influenced by the military indirectly, so most of the policies regarding the relations with India, Afghanistan were under dominance of military.

After the PPP’s government Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif became Prime Minister of Pakistan. He wanted to stabilize the institutions but under the supervision for major consultation he formed National Security Council.
During the regime of Nawaz Sharif, General Pervaz Musharraf, he became the chief of Army staff. Due to the military’s dominance in foreign affairs the outbreak of Kargil war 1999, was one of the other major example of ministry’s dominance in country.

After his regime, history repeats itself in form of Martial Law by General Pervaz Musharraf. Although he wanted to run the country on the civilian basis apparently, in modern manner, but actually his policies were not so much different from previous military dictators. Due to the military’s centralized tradition he announced himself the dominant leader of the chief of Army Staff, chief of ISI and chief of MI and foreign policy. Major institutions were in his under control. Due to his policies country faced major atmosphere of terrorism and instability in civilian institutions and a bad image of Pakistan in foreign countries.

**Role of NSC and DCC in making of Foreign Policy of Pakistan**

**NSC**

The major purpose of National Security Council (NSC) is that to protect the citizens. It has basically two major functions. One is externally and internally. According to the eternally function to protect the citizens from instability in peace and according to second externally function to protect the country from external control.

But it plays major role in cabinet in the shape of opinion in foreign affairs. It was originally worked since Yahya Khan’s period on various matters. Some regimes it remains inactive and in some regimes it worked very actively. It gives its opinion regarding defense, national security matters and converting strategies in foreign policy matters with other states. NSC hold meeting mostly in which Prime Minister, defense minister, Chief of Army Staff and Chief of Arm Committee participate and enlighten the cabinet regarding defense or security matters. And also took important decisions regarding foreign relations mostly strategically and suitable recommendations of Army help the ministers to take such decisions.

So Army directly or indirectly influence on country also in making foreign policy, the National Security council is a link of Civil Military Relations with the dominance of military. In initial stage it mostly focused on military operations or military relations while uncovering the civilian foreign relations. National Security Council was not much popular in public spheres.

Benazir Bhutto dissolved NSC during her government while during Nawaz Sharif’s government he hold meetings regarding security policy, nuclear tests, Kargil was particularly in the relations with India.

General Pervez Musharraf again active the role of NSC, after the fall of his regime the charter of democracy was signed between Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz
Sharif in which selected the reduction of NSC, and after the formation of Nawaz Sharif’s government the NSC was active in 2013 and remain active till now.

Sometimes the policies were very beneficial for country’s strategic position, but it is due to directly the involvement of military in politic. Because did not focus only on the suggestions but factually it is a kind of journey that could be started from recommendations to implementations of their policies.

DCC

Defense Committee of Cabinet (DCC) was formed with the purpose to give the opinion regarding matters of national security, nuclear security, weaponization policy, political and strategically spheres. And it is the way of advisors to political leaders and set up a constructive dimension towards political behavior with other states.

Basically defense committee formed by Z.A, Bhutto in 1976 for the assistance of Prime Minister in the matters of war, nuclear policy and strategically foreign relations. It is also the reflection of national Security Council and with the passage of time these were merged with each other because the purposes of both were same.

Its meeting most probably depended upon border matters, Mumbai attacks, nuclear tests and nuclear policies and in relations and deals with other countries. Regarding these policies military always played very dominant role in strategically behavior.

Both committees were very beneficial for the making the foreign policy of Pakistan because both countries have some purpose of assisting Prime Minister and defense minister regarding geo-political position in the world. But when they played illegitimate it could be harmful for country.

Foreign Image of Pakistan’s Military

International community taking Pakistan’s image as in the four aspects; conflicts/Wars, Religious perspective, expansion in nuclear weapons and terrorism, the military intervention in politics matters are due to the leak of political leadership corruption and ungoverned tactics or performs provided the ways to military authority and changed in constitution to foreign matters.

After the independence of Pakistan in 1947, the institutions of Pakistan were very weak, with the passage of time, all these institutions strong itself. Continues wars with India had a great impact of Pakistan’s military in world. (Lieven, 2011) The global community visualized Pakistan into different phases, which shaped up the military’s impact on world.
First of all, weak political institutions making Pakistan’s military influence into civilian’s matters since independence. Conflicts with India are connected with the birth of Pakistan, which always engage Pakistan’s military in to Indian boarders. In which the Kashmir issue is most important conflict and war of 1948 is also very important example of the beginning of conflict with India. (Macdonald, 2016) LOC’s issues and military strikes on boarders since independence always established a conflict and un-rest position in Pakistan’s military and it shows great impact on International community. During the Ayub Khan’s period, the war of 1965 is also a conflict situation with both countries. Another factor in this regard was, the practical leadership was also under the military supervision. This factor was particularly shaped up Pakistan’s image in International level.

After the transformation of power to General Yahya Khan, the great and darkest tragedy in the History of Pakistan was Fall of Dacca and was with India in this regard. Pakistan was considered as un-peaceful country on Earth. Unfortunately, the leadership was again under the control of Military coup and somehow became the reason of this failure.

After this on the International perspective, there was started up the religion impact on Pakistan’s political system. In other words, the regime of Zia-ul-haq another military dictatorship, his regime also called Islamization of Zial-ul-haq. Imposition of Islamic laws into the constitution and mostly the Islamic system was established the system into domestic and national affairs. But strictly banned the political freedom from country and also banned all political parties, which could not show the good impact in International system (Riedel, 2011).

Although at that time the ties between Pakistan and United States of America was very much strong, because America wanted to attack on Afghanistan to stop the Russia’s involvement in country. So Pakistan was providing military assistance as well as public assistance to US. While opening up the boarders and settling migrants into Pakistan’s land. In the image of international community Pakistan was considered totally biased and shown up pro-American Approach. Slowly but in reality terrorism became the constant problem for regionally and for globally.

After this phase Pakistan was entered into a different phase the nuclear phase and continues expansion in this phase became challenging for Pakistan. The non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) imposed great influence on Pakistan to reduce the nuclear weapons. But Pakistan was never oppressed by such influence and always in the progress of nuclear deals and promotes the nuclear weapons. With this expansion Pakistan was in list of 10 countries, which most have nuclear weapons in world. These expansions break the ties of Pakistan and United States in the shape of economic and military sanctions. Which affected the country in very serious perspectives then Pakistan was entered into globally the phase of terrorism the incident of 9/11, which totally changed the world view and started war on terror. Pakistan was also the part of such war and helped to eradicate the terrorist group for the reduction of terrorism in country.
War on Terror (WOT) affected Pakistan in very worst conditions, the Drone attacks and American influence into domestic politics shaped up Pakistan image into international community. Many international scholars like Myra Macdonald claimed that nuclear of Pakistan is only to counter India (Macdonald, 2016) but she also claimed that Indian nuclear is again a counter to China. During this phase continues bomb blasting in various cities of Pakistan and killings created tensions and un-rest in Pakistan. When Pakistan was facing such incidents the political leadership was also under the military coup. In the four major phases of Pakistan, the three were in the phase of military leadership. That was enough for making opinion regarding military role in country and policy making.

Military intervention in making of Foreign Policy: Beneficial or Not

According to the tradition of Pakistan, it is generally observing that the military is the only solution of all instabilities in country. And it is general social perspective that if military coup imposed in society, all the social problems will be better and progressive. On the other hand, from the global or constitutional level it could not be consider too much involvement of military into politics. In general view, it has two major perspectives, which are considered as beneficial or non-beneficial for the country.

Beneficial

- Military intervention into politics could set the disputes among various ethnic groups and instability in country.
- In the peaceful domestic affairs in the civilian form of government, military always working behind scene for the protection of the citizens eternally and externally. So, military never stop working, no matter what is the style of governance.
- NSC and DCC gave the permanent platform to military in the decision-making into foreign strategically interests which, could accommodate their diverse opinion and reduce the role of military intervention or martial law in country.
- Role of the military enhance the geo-political and geo-strategically position of country into world community.
- Disciplined nature of military policies and institutions is always strengthening the image of country.

Non-Beneficial:

- It is general perspective that after the military coup, it is considered that, it could it could be beneficial for country, but in some context, the military leadership fulfill its own purpose which taking the leadership. And most of the policies are centralized. For example, the wars of 1948, 1965 and 1971.
• Excessive role of leadership in the foreign affairs, always weaken the political system and demolish the legitimacy of political leaders in the country. And mostly the politicians fulfill their interests rather than the productive policies of citizens.
• Military strategies regarding foreign policy are more violent and oppressive rather than productive, peaceful or constructive.
• Constitution is the basic factor for running of policy of state. Mostly the policies, domestic, however, international community always centralized and the dictator never consult with other regarding policies. The aftermaths of such policies were worst that Pakistan was ever faced.
• The NSC and DCC gave the permanent involvement of military into government. In which they could interpret the policies (Defense) according to their wants and fulfill their interests in foreign relations.

It could be beneficial and non-beneficial that the involvement of military in making foreign policy. If military always give priority to their primarily objectives, the direct involvement could never happen and the democratic institutions always run by politicians instead of military.

Conclusion

It is the general perception of military, that the foreign policy could be stabilize with the involvement of military. Without the military the geo-political and geo-strategically position could not clearly into the international community.

In the historical perspective, the role of military is very dominant in Pakistan’s history of civilian and all the major geo-political and strategically decisions occurred in the regimes of military rather than civilians. After the establishment of NSC and DCC, were legalized the role of military in making of foreign policy through assisting or directing the position of Pakistan to Prime Minister and defense minister of Pakistan.

International community visualized Pakistan’s military as the dominant factor of Pakistan’s institutions. Somehow, its dominance is due to the weak leadership of civilian government and a tussle of power among political leaders, corruption, nepotism, feudalism and wants to remain power and lack of accountability.

Military and civilian have major impact to shape-up a society. But if both involve in their own sphere, it could be more beneficial because involvement always creates conflict in other groups. A civilian leader could never be strong as Military leader and a military leader could never be as civilian leader.

Recommendations

i. Institutional integrity is utmost necessary in Pakistan for the sake of all ills.
ii. Pakistan needs more comprehensive techniques that unite military and civilian departments.

iii. Creation of mutual cooperation is much needed.

iv. A sense of harmony must be established for all the required tasks.

v. Pakistan should pay greater attention to Civilian supremacy but besides that experts of foreign policy handling matter also needed.

vi. Pakistan needs to grow its economy and for that it needs a proper suitable strategy. Strong economy leads to strong foreign policies.

vii. The Prime minister as head of state should show leadership in policy matter but for PM must be a man of caliber that would show his/her capabilities in policy matters.

viii. Policy makers should consult think tanks.

ix. Military and Civilians should start a mutual program to enhance their understandings.
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