

THE BROOKINGS PROJECT ON  
U.S. RELATIONS WITH THE ISLAMIC WORLD



WORKING PAPER  
Number 5, January 2011

# PATTERNS OF CONFLICT IN PAKISTAN: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY



*at* BROOKINGS

Mohammad Waseem

THE BROOKINGS PROJECT ON  
U.S. RELATIONS WITH THE ISLAMIC WORLD



WORKING PAPER  
Number 5, January 2011

# PATTERNS OF CONFLICT IN PAKISTAN: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY



*at* BROOKINGS

Mohammad Waseem

**PROJECT ON U.S. RELATIONS WITH THE ISLAMIC WORLD (IWR)** Working Papers present preliminary conclusions or work-in-progress based on research by IWR scholars. Working papers are meant to stimulate debate and discussion on difficult policy questions. As with all Brookings papers, Working Papers do not necessarily reflect the views of the Saban Center, the Brookings Institution, or the Institution's board of trustees.

All IWR Working Papers are available online at [www.brookings.edu/sabancenter](http://www.brookings.edu/sabancenter), and comments are welcome. Other IWR Working Papers include:

- *The Conquest of Muslim Hearts and Minds? Perspectives on U.S. Reform and Public Diplomacy Strategies* by Abdelwahab el-Affendi
- *Arab and American Think Tanks: New Possibilities for Cooperation? New Engines for Reform?* by Ezzat Ibrahim
- *The Interplay Between U.S. Foreign Policy And Political Islam In Post-Soeharto Indonesia* by M. Syafi'i Anwar
- *Reformist Islam versus Radical Islam in Iran* by Mehrangiz Kar



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . .	<a href="#">iv</a>
ABOUT THE AUTHOR . . . . .	<a href="#">v</a>
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	<a href="#">1</a>
PAKISTAN: AN ESTABLISHMENT IN CRISIS . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
Partition: Re-sizing the State . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
A Migrant State . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
A Post-Military State . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
Potential for Democracy . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
ISLAMIC DISCOURSE AND MILITANCY . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
Contours of Militant Discourse . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
Talibanization . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
Islamic Organizations and the State . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
REGIONAL FACTORS AND THE U.S.-PAKISTAN RELATIONSHIP . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
Regional Factors . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
“Disenchanted Allies”: The U.S. and Pakistan . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	<a href="#">16</a>
ACRONYMS . . . . .	<a href="#">20</a>
GLOSSARY . . . . .	<a href="#">21</a>



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pakistan's political instability today is in large measure due to the struggle between three major actors—the civilian wing of the state, the military, and the Islamists. Partition from British India and the migration that followed led to mobilization based on identity, a power structure that was eventually dominated by the military, and the weakening of democratic institutions and principles. Partition also led to an imbalance of power between Pakistan and India, which continues to shape internal Pakistani politics. Other regional developments, such as the Kashmir dispute with India, further partitioning of the state in 1971, the wars in Afghanistan, and the recent U.S.-led war on terror, have also affected Pakistan's internal dynamics. The military constrained the authority of the constitutional state by assuming an informal but substantive role as the supreme political agent and influencing state policies and strategy. The state's authority has also been threatened by the Islamic establishment which has, since the founding of the state, pressured the state to establish *sharia*, or Islamic law. Islamic militant discourse and strategy emerged during the wars in Afghanistan in the 1980s and 1990s and has since intensified.

Despite military rule, regional instability, and Islamist discourse and militancy, Pakistan continues to be a constitutional state with a legal and institutional framework similar to its eastern neighbor India. The state establishment has shown remarkable capacity to reinvent itself and at least partially accommodate pressure from forces contending for power and privilege, within an institutional-constitutional framework. This framework, however, is still threatened by the internal conflicts outlined in this paper, and therefore policymakers must work to strengthen the civilian framework of constitutional authority, enable the state to control policy, and stabilize the political order in the country. Economic development, a better education system, an empowered civil society, and a more stable region are important goals that must be accompanied by the most crucial variable: political modernization. Political modernization entails integrating unadministered regions of the country into the main legal and political system, strengthening democratic institutions and the rule of law, using a policing rather than a military approach to combat militants, and properly federalizing the state to ensure all provinces are equal stakeholders in the political system.



## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

**MOHAMMAD WASEEM** is professor of Political Science in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences at Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS). He was Chairman of the International Relations Department at Quaid-i-Azam University in Islamabad and has taught at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London. He has been a visiting professor at Sciences Po in Paris, a Fulbright Fellow in the New Century Scholars Program at the Brookings Institution, a Ford Foundation Fellow at Oxford, a DAAD Fellow at the University of Heidelberg, a Fulbright Fellow at Columbia University, a Fellow of the Indian

Historical Research Council in New Delhi, a British Council Fellow in London, and an American Political Science Association Fellow in Washington, DC. Most recently, he was a Ford Foundation Fellow at the Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World at the Brookings Institution, where he conducted the research for this working paper. He is the author of numerous articles and his books include *Democratization in Pakistan: A Study of the 2002 Elections*, *The 1993 Elections in Pakistan*, and *Politics and the State in Pakistan*. He also co-authored *Strengthening Democracy in Pakistan* and edited *Electoral Reform in Pakistan*.





## INTRODUCTION

---

In Pakistan today, three actors—the civilian wing of the state, the military, and Islamic parties and groups—vie for influence and power. Over time, the military establishment has emerged as “the parallel state”<sup>1</sup> because of its influence over the state’s policies and priorities. This institutional imbalance between the civilian and military wings of the state has led the former to capitulate to the latter in matters of policy and strategy, including Pakistan’s involvement in the war on terror. Additionally, the Indo-Pakistan conflict has increased the security apparatus’s dominance over the civilian administration. Islamic parties and groups have also become important political actors by seeking to define the national agenda, set moral standards for the political elite, and influence the state to establish *sharia*, or Islamic law. From partition onwards, the *ulema*, or Islamic theologians, increasingly appropriated public space and, over the course of half a century, assumed the role of an Islamic establishment. This establishment—and the militancy that has become associated with it—now challenges the legitimacy and authority of the state.

This internal struggle in Pakistan has its roots in the power play among contending forces that emerged on the political stage after independence. Partition led to political developments that favored ideological mobilization, the militarization of the power

structure and a national vision based on security. The initially dominant migrant leadership of the state shied away from a pluralist framework of authority. While Islamic ideology had been operative before partition, Islamic militancy only emerged during the wars in Afghanistan in the 1980s and 1990s. Sectarian conflict was fueled by the proxy war between Iran and Saudi Arabia after the Khomeini Revolution in 1979. In addition to these factors, the militarization of politics is partly due to the imbalance of power between Pakistan and India, and partly to U.S. influence, especially during the three periods (1950s/60s, 1980s and 2000s) when the U.S.-Pakistan strategic alliance was strong.

Whereas many analysts explain the situation in Pakistan in simple terms—with a focus on the state of Pakistan—and depict a doomsday scenario, this paper attempts to analyze the institutional and constitutional edifice of the state in Pakistan, the civilian-military and modernist-Islamist tensions that have arisen in the country, and Pakistan’s role in its relationship with the U.S. and as a regional actor. In the end, it is the nature of the state, its relationship with society, and whether it can adjust itself to the changing preferences and priorities of regional and global players that will determine the future path of the country.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Mazhar Aziz, *Military Control in Pakistan: The Parallel State* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

<sup>2</sup> See Stephen Philip Cohen, *The Idea of Pakistan* (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 2005), 269-288.

The first part of this study focuses on the state in Pakistan and how certain factors—partition, migration, and military rule—have affected the country’s internal conflicts. In particular, this section examines the nature and character of the military establishment in the context of its conflict with the state establishment, and the manner in which this internal conflict affects the potential long-term political instability in the country.

The second part of the report examines Islamism’s ground realities, a brief history of jihadi influence in the country, and the state’s relationship with Islamist groups and parties. This section focuses on the institutionalization of Islamic influence through *madrasahs*, Islamic parties and jihadi organizations that together represent an amorphous but powerful Islamic establishment. An analysis of the Islamic project in Pakistan is presented to explain

the sources of both a strident militancy and a resilient political presence.

The final part of the report looks at the overlap of global, regional, and national factors that shape the emerging patterns of conflict in the Afghanistan/Pakistan territory and, in particular, on what that means for U.S.-Pakistani relations. Given Islamabad’s cold relations with India and Afghanistan, its difficulties with Iran, India’s emerging presence in Afghanistan, the ethnic movement in Balochistan, and the Pakhtun-based Islamic resurgence,<sup>3</sup> this part analyzes how an unstable regional setting—determined in part by Pakistan’s geo-strategic position as a result of its partition from India and present-day Bangladesh—shapes Islamabad’s priorities and its multilateral and bilateral relations, including its relationship with the United States.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Juan Cole, “Pakistan and Afghanistan: Beyond the Taliban,” *Political Science Quarterly* 124, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 229; see also Michael Hughes, “Balkanizing Pakistan: A Collective National Security Strategy,” *The Huffington Post*, July 6, 2010, <[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-hughes/balkanizing-pakistan-a-co\\_b\\_635950.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-hughes/balkanizing-pakistan-a-co_b_635950.html)>.



# PAKISTAN: AN ESTABLISHMENT IN CRISIS

---

## PARTITION: RE-SIZING THE STATE<sup>4</sup>

After partition, India became a successor state of British India while Pakistan became a seceding state. Despite the ostensible separation, their intermingled histories, cultures, and demographics—not to mention the geographic dispute over Kashmir—have prolonged an intractable conflict. The geographic partition of the sub-continent led to a persistent Pakistani emphasis on partitioning itself further from India in social, cultural, and religious terms. Pakistan's state-building project was dominated by a determination to demonstrate that the newly-founded country was decidedly *not* India. While Indian nationalism was rooted in the idea of India, Muslim nationalism in Pakistan and elsewhere was rooted in the “two-nation theory”—based on the notion that religion, rather than territory or ethnicity, determined identity.

Partition created several anomalies for Pakistan:

- The new state comprised two non-contiguous areas. Fifty-five percent of the population of the new state, East Bengal, dominated the 45 percent remaining in the four provinces of West Pakistan, creating a “one-province-
- dominates-all syndrome.” This led to enormous difficulties in constitution-making for the federation in subsequent years.<sup>5</sup> Further partition of the state in 1971 did not solve the one-province-dominates-all situation, because even within the new Pakistan, Punjab alone accounted for 58 percent of the population. This made administrating the federation even more unwieldy.
- Partition of British India meant the partition of the two most populous provinces of Bengal and Punjab, whereby the two communities were divided down the middle along religious lines. India shunned religion as a political organizing principle and carried out the reorganization of provinces along linguistic lines. Whereas public policy decisions were (and are) made in India based on linguistic rather than religious considerations, the opposite is true in Pakistan.
- Partition changed the position of Muslims from a minority in India to a majority in Pakistan, making Sunnis an absolute majority (approximately 80 percent) of the Pakistani population. The new state soon found itself

---

<sup>4</sup> Gurharpal Singh, “Resizing and Reshaping the State: India from Partition to the Present,” in *Right-sizing the State: The Politics of Moving Borders*, ed. Brendan O’Leary, Ian S. Lustick and Thomas Callaghy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

<sup>5</sup> Mohammad Waseem, “Constitutionalism in Pakistan: The Changing Patterns of Dyarchy,” *Diogenes* 53, no. 4 (November 2006): 104-7.

dominated by a Sunni majoritarian nationalism, eventually leading to sectarian strife. There were incessant calls to declare other communities—including Ahmadis, Shias, Ismailis, and Zikris—as outsiders to Islam.

- Partition also helped militarize Pakistan. Two-thirds of Punjab province, which had accounted for half of the army in British India,<sup>6</sup> and Rawalpindi division (an administrative unit between the provincial and district levels) that was the hub of military recruitment inside the province, became part of Pakistan. Because of its capacity as a military province, Punjab became the center of the new state as the supreme power broker.
- Partition created a permanent imbalance of power between India and Pakistan that only worsened after 1971. Not surprisingly, Pakistan cultivated an “equalizer” in the U.S., a regional balancer in China, an anchor in the Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC), and a doctrine of strategic depth in Afghanistan and Central Asia.

## A MIGRANT STATE

Various internal dynamics in Pakistan—including the ever-increasing importance of religion, the army’s intervention in politics, the rise of ethnic movements, and the weakening of democracy—can be attributed to the phenomenon of migration. At the time of partition, both India and Pakistan received migrants from across the border: 4.4 million and 7.2 million, respectively. However, the political impact of migration on the two countries was substantially different. In post-independence India, migrants accounted for 1 percent of the population,

coming from peripheral areas of British India now included in Pakistan. However, those of migrant stock represent 20 percent of the population in Pakistan today. Every fifth household in Pakistan, every fourth in Punjab and Sindh provinces, and more than half in Karachi are “migrant.” A new ethnic hierarchy emerged with Urdu-speaking migrants, or the *mohajirs*, on top followed by Punjabis—both migrants and locals—with Bengalis, Pakhtuns, Sindhis, and the Baloch at the bottom. Overrepresented in cities and in the professional and commercial middle classes in Punjab and Sindh, migrants exercised a disproportionately high level of influence on the developing state and society. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the first governor-general (1947-1948), and Liaquat Ali Khan, the first prime minister (1947-1951), were both migrants.

The migrant leadership, with its constituency back in India, soon realized that elections would be disruptive for the new ruling set-up. This new elite created a bureaucratic polity that emphasized the rule of law rather than the rule of public representatives, a phenomenon that persisted through the time of the military rulers. Stemming from the tradition of the viceroys in British India, power gravitated in Pakistan into the hands of the governor-general and then the president.<sup>7</sup> Constitutionalism was tempered by institutionalism and undercut by the doctrine of “state necessity.”<sup>8</sup> A power struggle emerged between the state apparatus, represented by the middle class, and the landed and tribal elite, which came to constitute the “political class.”

The migrant-led and military leadership privileged the middle class at the expense of the political class. Composed mostly of Punjabis and the *mohajirs*, the middle class represents the educated, professional, and commercial interests in the modern

<sup>6</sup> Tan Tai Yong, “Punjab and the Making of Pakistan: The Roots of a Civil-Military State,” in “North India: Partition and Independence,” supplement, *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 18, no. S1 (1995): 178.

<sup>7</sup> K.B. Sayeed, *The Political System of Pakistan* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967), 62-63.

<sup>8</sup> Paula R. Newberg, “Balancing Act: Prudence, Impunity and Pakistan’s Jurisprudence,” in *Routledge Handbook of South Asian Politics: India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal*, ed. Paul R. Brass (New York: Routledge, 2010), 182-83.

sector and is at the heart of the permanent institutions of the state represented by the officer cadre of the army and civil bureaucracy. Although socially progressive, the middle class is politically conservative; in fact, it abhors the idea of parliamentary rule, finding it akin to dispersion and dilution of state authority. Military rulers drew on the support of the middle class to “presidentialize” the parliamentary system of the country.<sup>9</sup>

The political class is more inclusive and representative of the nation because it represents Sindhis, Pakhtuns, and the Baloch and the non-elite sections of the population in Punjab and urban Sindh. Nonetheless, the political class in Pakistan is inherently weak. It is socially and culturally conservative and less educated. In the postcolonial state of Pakistan, the only way to political power available to this class is through elections. The political class upholds the constitutional source of legitimacy in principle—and seeks to operate through the parliament and political parties—but essentially functions as a broker between the largely illiterate, inchoate, and inarticulate masses and the remote, impersonal, and English-based state for articulation of the former’s interests.

## A POST-MILITARY STATE

The civil-military conflict has incrementally worsened the institutional imbalance in Pakistan. The top brass ruled the country for thirty-three years (1958-1971, 1977-1988, and 1999-2008) and put a dent in the authority and authenticity of the constitutional state by assuming an informal but substantive role as the supreme political agency. The

army dissolved the National Assembly four times (1958, 1969, 1977, and 1999). General Ayub Khan (1958-1969) reduced parliament to a weak and ineffective institution by curtailing its powers of legislation, and General Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq (1977-1988) renamed the parliament the *Majlis Shura* (Advisory Committee), lowering its status to a consultative body to serve the president.<sup>10</sup> Amendments to the Constitution subjected the legislature to the presidential powers of dissolution.<sup>11</sup> Although an amendment later repealed this power, the parliament is still perceived as having a secondary position in the political system.

Military rule also institutionalized electoral fraud. Although both civilian and military rulers committed electoral malpractices, the latter rigged elections by changing the “rules of the game,” using referendum for presidential elections<sup>12</sup> and placing partisan electoral teams in charge of the polls and changing the results after the voting.<sup>13</sup> Further, military governments typically emasculated the judiciary. Zia-ul-Haq sacked Chief Justice Yaqub Ali in 1977, sent a score of judges home and forced others to take their oaths of office under the Provisional Constitutional Order (PCO) of 1981 (an extra-constitutional order). Pervez Musharraf (1999-2008) also made judges take oaths under PCOs. Iftikhar Choudhary, the current chief justice, was suspended by Musharraf in March 2007, later restored by the remaining members of the Supreme Court, to be again sacked along with scores of other judges under Musharraf’s emergency rule in November of that year. The Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld the dissolution of the National Assembly.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See for example, the 1962 Constitution, the 8<sup>th</sup> Amendment passed under Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq and the 17<sup>th</sup> Amendment passed under Pervez Musharraf.

<sup>10</sup> Hamid Khan, *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2001), 867.

<sup>11</sup> These amendments (8<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>) were passed in 1985 and 2003, respectively.

<sup>12</sup> These referendums were used by Ayub Khan in 1962, Zia-ul-Haq in 1984, and Musharraf in 2002.

<sup>13</sup> See Mohammad Waseem, *Democratization in Pakistan: A Study of the 2002 Elections* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 194-95.

<sup>14</sup> The Supreme Court upheld the dissolution of the National Assembly in 1958, 1977, 1988, 1990, 1996, and 1999.

## POTENTIAL FOR DEMOCRACY

Despite their hold on power and their weakening of the state's constitutional authority, Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan (1969-1971), Zia-ul-Haq, and Musharraf all faced strong opposition, for a number of reasons:

- Advocates of upholding the Constitution—lawyers, political leaders, party workers, liberal intelligentsia, students, trade unions, and media, as well as the landed and tribal elite—could not tolerate the generals any longer and pushed back.
- Political parties proved to be resilient even after long years of suspension from political activity. A hundred-year-long process of party politics, campaigning for issues and identities, and delivering and casting of votes kept people's attention fixed on electoral politics. Military rule was consequently disliked by those who favored party politics.
- The military governments tried to hold local elections on numerous occasions as a rival source of legitimacy and to undercut constituency-level party organization.<sup>15</sup> This strategy had limited success, since the political leadership never considered it a legitimate system of public representation.
- The prevalence of military personnel in civilian positions initially inspired awe, but eventually provoked alienation and finally open criticism.

The state establishment has shown remarkable capacity to reinvent itself and at least partially accommodate pressure from forces contending for power

and privilege, within an institutional-constitutional framework. While Jinnah insisted on Urdu as the national language, his successors accommodated Bengali as the second national language. The merging of the four provinces of West Pakistan into a mega-province alienated various ethnic communities. This was overturned in 1970. After Bangladesh's independence, Punjab had a larger population than all other provinces combined. Thus, the 1973 Constitution provided for a bicameral legislature, featuring a majority-constraining system of federalism. All four provinces—with Balochistan's population as little as 4.5 percent of the total—received equal representation in the Senate, the upper house. Under-representation of various linguistic communities in jobs and services has been a persistently destabilizing factor due to unequal educational and professional qualifications in communities, with mohajirs and Punjabis on top and Sindhis and the Baloch at the bottom. Thus, policies of positive discrimination in favor of the rural-based Sindhis, over the urban-based mohajirs in Sindh, have been in place for nearly four decades.<sup>16</sup> And while Zia-ul-Haq introduced a system of separate electorates for Muslims and various religious minorities in 1979, pressure from the liberal intelligentsia at home and abroad led to a policy reversal prior to the 2002 elections.

Several political parties in Pakistan are considered liberal, if not exactly secular. However, there is a disconnect between the parties and their constituencies regarding religious matters. Benazir Bhutto's liberal credentials pushed Washington to sponsor rapprochement between her and Musharraf. Bhutto's husband, Asif Zardari, inherited the liberal profile of his spouse after her death. Religious and sectarian minorities typically support the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) because of its relatively secular orientation. Muttahida Qaumi Movement's (MQM) leadership vows by secularism when it

<sup>15</sup> Local elections were held in 1959, 1964, 1979, 1983, 1987, 2001, and 2005.

<sup>16</sup> Mohammad Waseem, "Mohajirs in Pakistan: A Case of Nativisation of Migrants," in *Community, Empire and Migration: South Asians in Diaspora*, ed. Crispin Bates (Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 245-60.

meets Western scholars and journalists—in a bid to seek Washington’s attention and patronage—and refrained from voting in favor of the peace agreement with the Taliban in 2009. But its constituency consists of the lower middle class section of the mohajir community in urban Sindh that supported the Islamic parties, Jamaat-e-Islami (JI) and Jamiat Ulema-e-Pakistan (JUP), for decades. While MQM’s self-image as a secular party is due to its rivalry with JUP, its social vision is characterized by crass moralism. Similarly, Awami National Party’s (ANP) historically liberal and progressive credentials notwithstanding, the party’s Pakhtun constituency exceeds other communities in Pakistan in the performance of religious rituals and the segregation of women. In the 2008 elections, ANP entered into an agreement with its opponents to disallow women from casting votes.

As for the military, top officials who interact with the American strategic and diplomatic community claim a secular role for the army to allay Washington’s apprehensions about the known religious fervor of many Pakistani soldiers. The civil bureaucracy has a modern, if not necessarily secular, veneer and a conservative, if not necessarily religious, core. The judiciary has incrementally grown socially, morally, and religiously conservative in recent decades. Although theoretically delivering justice based on the rule of law, judges in Pakistan try to position themselves as guardians of the public and private virtue. Much of the secular thinking and practice comes, in fact, from the party cadres and intellectuals on the left of the political spectrum, as well as the liberal intelligentsia, including a small minority of lawyers, professors, journalists, and the NGO community, together identified as civil society.

# ISLAMIC DISCOURSE AND MILITANCY

---

## CONTOURS OF MILITANT DISCOURSE

The rise of Islamic parties and groups, and the increase in militancy have affected the internal power struggle in Pakistan. The first generation of Islamic intellectuals in the country seriously took up the task of defining, conceptualizing, and operationalizing Islamic agency, seeking to crystallize the classic notions of statehood as operative in the early days of Islam. Led by the celebrated Islamic scholar Syed Abul A'ala Maudoodi, Islamic models of public life increasingly shaped an alternative discourse from the 1950s onward. The religious lobby sought influence through the ballot in the 1970s and the bullet in the 1980s against the backdrop of the Afghanistan jihad. While Maudoodi and his party Jamaat-e-Islami (JI) did not succeed at the ballot box, his ideas acquired widespread currency.<sup>17</sup> Education became a major vehicle of the new Islamism, much as in Egypt under the influence of Syed Qutb, Maudoodi's Arab counterpart. Both called for jihad and initiated a cultural civil war through modern educational institutions.<sup>18</sup> The proliferation of madrasahs, or Islamic seminaries, was most common in the Pakhtun areas,

representing "a massive experiment in social engineering in northern Pakistan,"<sup>19</sup> and spread to Punjab and Karachi. The estimated sixteen thousand madrasahs (with approximately 1.5 million students) provide, for many, an alternative to the perceived Western-dominated educational system of Pakistan.

Analysts have speculated about the potential of madrasahs to radicalize politics in Pakistan. A recent study has argued that no strong link exists between madrasah education and increased militancy.<sup>20</sup> It posits that the number of madrasah students is too small to have a major impact on militancy at a larger scale and that madrasah students come from a higher economic stratum than public school students and join madrasahs not out of necessity (poverty) but out of preference for religious education, which has been in increasing demand. However, the reality is that a large number of madrasah students come from the lowest stratum of society, religious philanthropists open madrasahs and provide free food and accommodation, and madrasahs indoctrinate a dichotomous worldview, stoke sectarian conflict and attempt to govern gender relations,

---

<sup>17</sup> See Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, *The Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution: the Jama'at-i Islami of Pakistan* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1994), 220-22.

<sup>18</sup> Mamoun Fandy, "Enriched Islam: The Muslim Crisis of Education," *Survival* 49, no. 2 (June 2007): 81.

<sup>19</sup> Thomas H. Johnson and M. Chris Mason, "No Sign until the Burst of Fire: Understanding the Pakistan-Afghanistan Frontier," *International Security* 32, no. 4 (Spring 2008): 70.

<sup>20</sup> Rebecca Winthrop and Corinne Graff, "Beyond Madrasahs: Assessing the Links between Education and Militancy in Pakistan" (Working Paper 2, Center for Universal Education at Brookings, Washington, DC, June 2010), 27, <[http://www.brookings.edu/-/media/Files/rc/papers/2010/06\\_pakistan\\_education\\_winthrop/06\\_pakistan\\_education\\_winthrop.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/-/media/Files/rc/papers/2010/06_pakistan_education_winthrop/06_pakistan_education_winthrop.pdf)>.



producing a combative mind among students. As noted in a United States Institute of Peace survey on Pakistan, recruitment to jihadi organizations comes from religious gatherings in and outside the mosque (44 percent), social network of family and friends (42 percent), and madrasahs and schools (26 percent).<sup>21</sup> Jihadi training goes beyond carrying out jihad, suicide bombing or attacks on rival sects; it also includes wider proselytizing efforts to promote jihadism.<sup>22</sup>

The militarization of madrasahs is a worrying trend, especially in areas bordering Afghanistan. Demands for the de-militarization of madrasahs led to attempted government reforms focused on the importance of teaching modern education courses such as science, computer technology, and English. The Musharraf government took up a similar reform project by seeking the registration of madrasahs, regulating their curricula and de-politicizing their institutional life. Further, the U.S. introduced a five-year plan worth \$1 billion to introduce “secular subjects.”<sup>23</sup> Some advocates of madrasah reform even suggest that the ulema should be offered “high-level seats within the government” as a way of addressing curriculum reform.<sup>24</sup> This form of “modernization,” however, places the reform agenda upside down, simply empowering the protagonists of traditional ideals by enabling them to spread their message more forcefully across a larger audience, readership, and viewership. Madrasahs, with their own social service systems, extreme insularity, and sense of a transcendental mission, operate as parallel institutions and potential platforms for mobilization against the state.<sup>25</sup>

## TALIBANIZATION

The prevalence of this Islamic discourse points to a slow progression in the country toward living with

Taliban-like militant activity. One can outline three stages of Talibanization:

1. The first stage was characterized by the Pakistan Army’s support of the Taliban as a pro-Pakistan group in Afghanistan, and the army’s use of the militant group to dismantle the post-Mohammad Najibullah presidency (1987-1992) in Kabul during the mid-1990s. The rise of the Taliban—and their rule in Afghanistan from 1996 until 2001—was the product of Pakistani backing, support from Afghanistan’s Pakhtun community, and the war-induced displacement, anarchy, and militancy that became a way of life. Islamic parties, conservative sections of the middle class, and some politicians, including the Oxford-educated Imran Khan, viewed the rule of the Taliban in Kabul as a symbol of Islamic justice, political stability and the realization of the vision to establish sharia.
2. In the second phase of Talibanization (2001 until 2007), fugitives from the U.S.-led NATO operations in Afghanistan entered the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and the Swat Valley in Pakistan. Islamabad indirectly ruled FATA, leaving a large space of public life un-administered. FATA’s political and administrative system based on the Frontier Crimes Regulation (FCR) is quite different from the mainstream Westminster model found in the rest of Pakistan. Whereas the latter has an elaborate court system with a built in appellate mechanism, a “rational-legal bureaucracy,” and writ and constitutional provisions for equal protection of the law, FATA’s system has a *jirga* (council of tribal leaders with no

<sup>21</sup> C. Christine Fair, “Who are Pakistan’s Militants and Their Families?” *Terrorism and Political Violence* 20, no. 1 (January 2008): 59.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>23</sup> Moniza Khokhar, “Reforming Militant Madaris in Pakistan,” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 30, no. 4 (April 2007): 360.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Zahid Shahab Ahmed, “Battling against Religious Extremism: The State of Madrassah Reforms in Pakistan,” *Peace and Conflict Monitor*, December 4, 2007, <[http://www.monitor.upeace.org/innerpg.cfm?id\\_article=459](http://www.monitor.upeace.org/innerpg.cfm?id_article=459)>.

appellate body), a mini-ruler, and no human rights protection.<sup>26</sup> The feudal administration of justice in Swat Valley was replaced in 1969 by FCR—the brutal wing of the legal edifice of British India mentioned above—but was again replaced in 1988 by the mainstream legal-institutional system of administration. However, in Swat, unlike areas formerly under direct colonial rule, this system did not have a long enough gestation period. The reaction to incomplete assimilation into the modern, constitutional system of Pakistan led to a desire in the valley to return to feudal administration. Tanzim Nifaz Shariat Mohammadi (TNSM) of Sufi Mohammad started a “Shariatization” movement in the early 1990s that continued to simmer into the 2000s.<sup>27</sup> Not surprisingly, the Pakhtuns of both FATA and Swat provided cultural, geographical, and political space to the incoming Taliban, leading to demands for implementation of the pre-colonial *Nizam-e-Adl* (system of justice).

3. The third phase of Talibanization began after the 2007 military action against the radical elements operating from within Jamia Hafsa, a madrasah for female students housed in the Red Mosque in Islamabad. A new wave of bomb attacks started at the hands of proto-Taliban jihadi groups, who had already been active for more than a decade. These proto-Taliban groups include:

- Haqqani group: Based in North Waziristan, along with outfits of Mullah

Maulvi Nazir and Hafiz Gul Bahadur, the Haqqani group mainly attacks NATO targets in Afghanistan.

- Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), Jaish-e-Mohammad (JM), Harkatul Jihad, and Harkatul Mujahideen: These groups have focused on Indian targets since the days of the 1990 Kashmir jihad. LeT was implicated in the 2008 Mumbai attacks.
- Tehrik Taliban Pakistan (TTP): Based in FATA, TTP is a string of loosely tied jihadi groups that operates all over the country and attacks Pakistani targets.
- Sipah-e-Sahaba Pakistan (SSP) and Lashkar-e-Jhangvi (LJ): Headquartered in Jhang in South Punjab, SSP is a major sectarian militant outfit. Both SSP and LJ tend to carry out attacks against Shias.

Islamic militancy was once only a Pakhtun phenomenon, but this is no longer the case. South Punjab has emerged as a new hub of militant Islam in terms of recruitment to jihadi organizations such as JM and the proliferation of madrasahs and proselytizing campaigns.<sup>28</sup> Similar to Swat, the legal-administrative edifice of Bahawalpur—the heart of South Punjab—was underdeveloped in comparison with mainstream Punjab. This underdevelopment constrained Islamabad’s outreach and allowed for an Islamic resurgence to occur. These new developments in South Punjab—the center of gravity of the so-called Punjabi Taliban—threaten the state’s hold on power.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>26</sup> International Crisis Group, “Pakistan: Countering Militancy in FATA” (Asia Report No 178, October 21, 2009), 2-4, <[http://www.crisisgroup.org/-/media/Files/asia/south-asia/pakistan/178\\_pakistan\\_countering\\_militancy\\_in\\_fata.ashx](http://www.crisisgroup.org/-/media/Files/asia/south-asia/pakistan/178_pakistan_countering_militancy_in_fata.ashx)>.

<sup>27</sup> Hassan Abbas, “The Black-Turbaned Brigade: The Rise of TNSM in Pakistan,” in *Pakistan’s Troubled Frontier*, ed. Hassan Abbas (Washington, DC: The Jamestown Foundation, 2009), 227-28.

<sup>28</sup> Ayesha Siddiqi, “Jihadism in Pakistan: The Expanding Frontier,” *Journal of International Affairs* 63, no. 1 (Fall/Winter 2009): 4-6.

<sup>29</sup> K. Alan Kronstadt, “Pakistan: Key Current Issues and Developments” (CRS Report for Congress, Congressional Research Service, Washington DC, June 2010), 15-16, <<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41307.pdf>>.

In Karachi, militant activity manifests itself in multiple ways. There is ethnic violence between the mohajirs and the Pakhtuns led by the Muttahida Qaumi Movement (MQM) and the Awami National Party (ANP), respectively, and religio-sectarian violence between Shias and Sunnis and between the two Sunni sub-sects, Deobandis and Barelvīs. Criminal violence in the city includes the trafficking of guns, narcotics, women, and children.<sup>30</sup> Further, several Taliban fugitives, as well as members of the Iranian militant group Jundullah, have been apprehended in Karachi. One study describes the presence of more than five thousand militants from various jihadi organizations in the city. Police have routinely arrested foreign residents of Afghan and Central Asian origin, with links to terrorist networks. Taliban activists have been fleeing FATA under the deadly impact of U.S. drone attacks, and Karachi is emerging as a safe haven for them.<sup>31</sup>

## ISLAMIC ORGANIZATIONS AND THE STATE

Why has the Pakistan Army been unable to control militancy on its own soil? Apart from the operational constraints, the answer lies in the lack of clarity about the Taliban. In fact, the army has cultivated, mobilized, and mainstreamed Islamic forces in the country. Although Ayub Khan found the ulema a relic of the past and a hindrance to the nation's progress, his successor, Yahya Khan, faced the rise of Bengali nationalism and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's populist movement on the eve of the 1970 elections. The army, since then, has sought to cultivate Islamic parties as a bulwark against the groundswell of popular feelings towards the ruling elite. The army and Islamic parties cooperated with each other in the military operation in East Pakistan in 1971, the Islamization program under Zia-ul-Haq, the

Afghanistan jihad (1980s), the victory of Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal (MMA)—an alliance of Islamic parties—in the 2002 elections in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, and the passage of the 17th amendment, which subjected the parliament to dissolution.<sup>32</sup>

Pakistan's Islamic laws emerged not from public demand sponsored and championed by the mainstream parties in the parliament, but from martial law. Zia-ul-Haq made the 1949 Objectives Resolution a substantive part of the 1973 Constitution, obligating the state to incorporate Islamic provisions into law. After cases accusing women of adultery and the killing of several members of minority groups for allegedly desecrating the prophet and his companions, several governments have tried to reform the Hudood Ordinance (a sharia-enforcing law enacted by Zia-ul-Haq) and the controversial Blasphemy Law. The Islamic establishment has fiercely opposed any change in these laws, and thus gradually assumed political agency in its own right.

The state's general ambiguity toward Islamic organizations has had negative effects. Keeping jihadi organizations alive has destabilized the country, and the perception that they are strategic assets against India is unsubstantiated. Various governments from Zia-ul-Haq onwards have been remarkably tolerant of jihadi mosques and madrasahs and the radicalism associated with them. Consequently, the government has been unable to control militant discourse and activity, with the sole exception of the 2007 Red Mosque incident.<sup>33</sup> Further complicating the government's calculus in dealing with and rooting out jihadi organizations has been the fact that both militants and proponents of counterterrorism operations perceive India as a regional hegemon and the U.S. as an imperial power.

<sup>30</sup> C. Christine Fair and Peter Chalk, "United States Internal Security Assistance to Pakistan," *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 17, no. 3 (September 2006): 335-36.

<sup>31</sup> Imtiaz Ali, "Karachi Becoming a Taliban Safe Haven?" *CTC Sentinel*, January 2010, 13-15.

<sup>32</sup> For a comprehensive view, see Husain Haqqani, *Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military* (Lahore: Vanguard, 2005), chaps. 4, 5 and 8.

<sup>33</sup> John R. Schmidt, "The Unravelling of Pakistan," *Survival* 51, no. 3 (June 2009): 47.

Further, the effort to halt the financing of terrorism has been a dismal failure. Pakistan has frozen the accounts of terrorism suspects and curbed money laundering, but the informal *hawala* system of money transfer continues.<sup>34</sup> The Taliban continue to get their funding from donations, extortion, narcotics trafficking, kidnapping for ransom, and gem and antiquity smuggling.<sup>35</sup> Running almost a parallel government in FATA, the Taliban levy taxes, get protection money, collect revenue based on a “tax schedule,” extort commission from contractors engaged in local projects, and impose heavy fines for crimes such as robbery. The Taliban have also been engaged in bank robberies outside their areas of “governance,” especially in Karachi.

The state’s inability to control militant discourse and activity underscores the importance of political modernization as a key component of any reform effort in Pakistan. The difference between Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province (previously referred to as the North-West Frontier Province) and FATA illustrates this point. The two adjacent regions share ethnic, linguistic, and cultural characteristics, yet their political systems have developed in opposite directions. Whereas political participation in FATA was based on violence and intimidation, it revolved around the ballot box in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In 2002, MMA—the coalition of

Islamic parties—won a majority of seats in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa’s provincial elections, in the wake of the U.S. campaign against the Taliban and allegedly with the indirect support of the Musharraf government (because the latter wanted to keep contending mainstream and ethnic parties out of power).<sup>36</sup> The government maintained that co-opting the *mullahs* was better than having them on the outside. Nonetheless, MMA Islamized the public education system, suppressed women’s rights (including the denial of access to male doctors) and passed the “Hisba Bill,” an attempt at enacting sharia.<sup>37</sup> MMA’s agenda caused speculation that the Taliban’s attempt to establish sharia in the rest of the country would soon materialize. In 2008, however, the Awami National Party (ANP), a liberal party, won provincial elections. The party soon came under pressure from various Taliban groups whose anchor in mainstream politics, MMA, had been discredited and voted out. After terrorist attacks killed several ANP members, the provincial government entered into peace agreements with the Taliban, thinking that if it cannot fight them, it should make a deal with them. Despite the Taliban’s intimidation, political modernization has allowed for the integration of the province into the mainstream legal and political system rather than being administered under a traditional system of justice and administration.

<sup>34</sup> C. Christine Fair, *The Counterterror Coalitions: Cooperation with Pakistan and India* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2004), 34, <[http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND\\_MG141.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG141.pdf)>.

<sup>35</sup> Catherine Collins and Ashraf Ali, “Financing the Taliban: Tracing the Dollars Behind the Insurgencies in Afghanistan and Pakistan” (Counterterrorism Strategy Initiative Policy Paper, New America Foundation, Washington, DC, April 2010), 2, 7, <<http://counterterrorism.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/collinsali.pdf>>.

<sup>36</sup> Mohammad Waseem, *Democratization in Pakistan: A Study of the 2002 Elections*, 219.

<sup>37</sup> Hassan Abbas, “Inside Pakistan’s North-West Frontier Province: The Political Landscape of the Insurgency” (Counterterrorism Strategy Initiative Policy Paper, New America Foundation, Washington DC, April 2010), 5-6, <[http://counterterrorism.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/abbas\\_0.pdf](http://counterterrorism.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/abbas_0.pdf)>.

# REGIONAL FACTORS AND THE U.S.-PAKISTAN RELATIONSHIP

---

## REGIONAL FACTORS

Pakistan's internal dynamics and national security concerns are affected by the regional environment and most notably the strained relations between Islamabad and Delhi. From Kashmir's controversial accession in 1947, the 1971 fall of Dhaka, and the 1984 occupation of Siachin Glacier to the building of Baghliar Dam—allegedly leading to Delhi's control of the water supply to Pakistan as the lower riparian country—Pakistan has perceived India as an expansionist power. Pakistan has also been concerned about India's ambitious arms build-up program, its penetration into Afghanistan through infrastructure projects, and the alleged use of its consulates to support insurgents in Balochistan.<sup>38</sup> India has established good relations with the Northern Alliance, the mainstay of Hamid Karzai's ruling outfit. India seeks to penetrate Central Asia through Afghanistan and has managed to include the latter in the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). Delhi also wants to constrain Pakistan's influence in Afghanistan by ensuring that a Taliban takeover of Kabul does not happen again.<sup>39</sup> India's strategy toward Central Asia via Afghanistan,

along with its strategic relationship with Iran, has therefore presented a challenge for Pakistan.<sup>40</sup>

Pakistan's relationship with Afghanistan has been complicated by its strategic concerns vis-à-vis India. Negotiations in October 2010 between Karzai and the Taliban leadership, facilitated by Pakistan's release of Mullah Abdul Ghani Baradar, were a strategic breakthrough. A negotiated settlement between Karzai and the Taliban could allay Pakistan's fears of India's increased presence in Afghanistan, currently or after the protracted withdrawal of NATO forces. Nonetheless, the situation continues to be fragile, with the potential collapse of the initiative or a flare-up any time after the agreement. Pakistan's maneuvers in Afghanistan are, in large part, due to the former's insecurity vis-à-vis India. This raises the question of whether Pakistan wants to try to install a Taliban regime in Kabul—to assert its power in the region—against the will of regional and global stakeholders. Further, will Kabul's tensions with Islamabad based on the Durand Line—the disputed border between the two countries—and the latter's involvement in the war on terror serve as justification for Kabul to continue to allow Indian

---

<sup>38</sup> C. Christine Fair, "Pakistan's Relations with Central Asia: Is Past Prologue?" *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 31, no. 2 (April 2008): 209-10.

<sup>39</sup> Sumit Ganguly and Nicholas Howenstein, "India-Pakistan Rivalry in Afghanistan," *Journal of International Affairs* 63, no. 1 (Fall/Winter 2009): 129-32.

<sup>40</sup> C. Christine Fair, "Pakistan's Relations with Central Asia: Is Past Prologue?" 201, 212-13.

influence in Afghanistan? Or, will India's engagement with Afghanistan be difficult, given historical, linguistic, and cultural differences?

Pakistan is also concerned about how the other regional actors—China, Russia, India, and Iran—will react after the U.S. leaves Afghanistan. Pakistan worries that its own interests will be sidelined in any forthcoming exit strategy. Pakistan has continued to engage in the war effort in Afghanistan in order to assert itself among regional powers. This strategy, however, has come at the cost of its internal security needs—namely dealing with the Pakistani Taliban and its allies—and has led to a diplomatic dilemma internationally. Afghanistan faces the Herculean task of state building in its ethnically fragmented society and as a weak state among strong regional powers.<sup>41</sup> This challenge leads to an argument in favor of a regional understanding and recognition of Pakistan as a legitimate stakeholder in the Afghanistan effort, especially because of its geographic proximity and Pakhtun connection.

### “DISENCHANTED ALLIES”:<sup>42</sup> THE U.S. AND PAKISTAN

Regional instability and the 9/11 attacks have influenced Pakistan's relationship with the United States, which in turn has shaped the former's internal political dynamics. American reliance on Pakistan's security apparatus in combating terrorism has sometimes complicated relations between state and civil institutions and between the ruling elite and the public. In the 1980s, when Pakistan faced security threats emanating from the war in Afghanistan, there was consensus on policy and strategy not only between

Washington and Islamabad, but also between state and society and between Islamists and modernists in the country. In the 1990s, Washington and Islamabad's policies and strategies were no longer aligned as they had been in the previous decade. Growing anti-Western sentiment in the Muslim world—along with an Islamic perspective that came to be viewed as an alternative after the Afghan resistance movement in the 1980s and was in part unwittingly facilitated by the United States—led to a growing divide between state and civil institutions in Muslim countries. In Pakistan, the desire to remain in power kept the ruling elite, including former president Musharraf, firmly allied with the U.S. While the rulers were on the right side of the American “with-us-or-against-us” formulation,<sup>43</sup> they were viewed unfavorably by many in their own country for this stance.

Despite this alliance between Islamabad and Washington, Pakistan's relationship with the U.S. was strained after the events of 9/11, in part because of confusion and mistrust between the two sides. Many Pakistanis came to believe that the war on terror was imposed on Pakistan by the Americans, while many in the U.S. questioned Islamabad's sincerity in its commitment to fighting terror. In particular, Washington has not trusted Pakistan's security apparatus, especially the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), because of its alleged support of the Taliban by providing weapons, ammunition, intelligence, and even direction to suicide bombings.<sup>44</sup> The strategic community in Washington has also expressed disappointment with the level and quality of support from Pakistan and has raised concerns about the latter's potential for survival as a functioning state.

<sup>41</sup> Rasul Bakhsh Rais, “Afghanistan: A Weak State in the Path of Power Rivalries,” in *South Asia's Weak States: Understanding the Regional Insecurity Predicament*, ed. T.V. Paul (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010), 211–13.

<sup>42</sup> Dennis Kux, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947–2000: Disenchanted Allies* (Baltimore: MD, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).

<sup>43</sup> See Tony Judt and Denise Lacorne, eds., *With Us or Against Us: Studies in Global Anti-Americanism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

<sup>44</sup> Seth G. Jones, “Pakistan's Dangerous Game,” *Survival* 49, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 18. The ISI has been alleged to orchestrate, sustain, and influence Taliban activity, provide sanctuary to its clients such as the Haqqani group, keep contact with the Quetta *Shura* and play a double game at a high scale. See Matt Waldman, “The Sun in the Sky: The Relationship between Pakistan's ISI and Afghan Insurgents” (Crisis States Discussion Paper 18, Crisis State Research Centre, London, June 2010), <[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/files/fp\\_uploaded\\_documents/100613\\_20106138531279734lse-isi-taliban.pdf](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/files/fp_uploaded_documents/100613_20106138531279734lse-isi-taliban.pdf)>.



Serious concerns are also raised about the manner in which the Pakistan Army has conducted its counterinsurgency (COIN) operations. Rather than following the COIN doctrine based on best practices learned from Iraq,<sup>45</sup> Pakistan has opted for a combatant approach to counterterrorism. During the Swat and South Waziristan operations in 2009, the army relied on slow and bulky missions against the enemy and did not provide security for civilians—thus displacing millions of people.<sup>46</sup> Pakistan was criticized for not following COIN doctrine that is based on a policing approach, which relies on law enforcement agencies—such as police, intelligence agencies, the magistracy, and the court system—to be the primary actors for maintaining social order and establishing security. To make matters worse, various Taliban strongholds were allowed to emerge as “no go areas” under Musharraf, enabling the Taliban to run a parallel government in several parts of FATA and later Swat. Additionally, various Islamic parties and groups who supported jihadi organizations continued to operate from within the state system via electoral and parliamentary politics,

further complicating the relationship between the state and the Islamic establishment.

On the other hand, Pakistan feels wronged by Washington’s demands to do more. It finds no justification for the “trust deficit” between the two allies. Islamabad argues that it is serious in its war effort, pointing to the number of troops deployed on the northern front—ninety thousand—the thousands of Pakistani casualties, and the killing and apprehension of Al-Qaeda members, both foreign and local. Similarly, Pakistani officials refer to 1,100 check posts, each manned by fifty paramilitary personnel,<sup>47</sup> and argue that anti-Taliban militias are in place to help the army keep vigil along the border. They further argue that Pakistan is a victim, not a perpetrator, of violence and that Afghanistan should do more to support initiatives to stabilize the country and the border.<sup>48</sup> The lack of progress in state building in Afghanistan has created a power vacuum that exacerbates an already tense relationship between Pakistan and the United States.

---

<sup>45</sup> COIN doctrine would focus on political initiatives, security of the civilian population, non-reliance on aerial bombardment and small and slick rather than bulky and slow missions, along with co-option tactics and local strategic help.

<sup>46</sup> Sameer Lalwani, “Pakistan’s COIN Flip: The Recent History of Pakistani Military Counterinsurgency Operations in the NWFP and FATA” (Counterterrorism Strategy Initiative Policy Paper, New America Foundation, Washington DC, April 2010), 3-5, <<http://counterterrorism.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/lalwani.pdf>>.

<sup>47</sup> Kamran Rasool, “Pakistan’s Perspective on the ‘War on Terror’,” *Military Technology* 32, no. 11 (November 2008): 13.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 14-17.

## CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The internal conflict between the three main actors in Pakistan (the civilian wing of the state, the military, and Islamic parties and groups) has caused the country to face political instability at home and a diplomatic and strategic crisis abroad. The effects of partition, migration, military rule, Islamic militancy, and regional instability have all contributed to the country's instability. Contending forces—whether driven by religious, sectarian, ethnic, tribal, and linguistic identities<sup>49</sup> or by civilian-military and modernist-Islamist struggles—can adversely affect the authority of the state in the long term.

Despite its history of military rule and regional instability that exacerbate internal political conflict, the state in Pakistan has a long history of legal and institutional development. Pakistan is not a “generic” Muslim state, but rather a constitutional state akin to India. Its authority is based on the Westminster model, characterized by legitimacy based on popular mandate, an elaborate judicial system, the prevalence of political parties, but it also has primordial loyalties of tribe and caste, the use and abuse of religion in electoral campaigns, and discourse based on ethno-linguistic divides.

Various civil society actors in Pakistan have been vocal proponents of the rule of law and of curbing jihadi propaganda and the perceived appeasement of the Taliban and proto-Taliban groups. While civil society in the West has been more concerned about the illiberal legal constraints on people's freedoms and their governments' overreach in the war on terror, civil society in Pakistan has challenged the government's insincerity in controlling the menace of Talibanization in the country. However, Pakistani civil society has also been critical of certain counterterrorist legislation in Pakistan, including the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA). First introduced in 1993 in the National Assembly, the ATA was passed in 1997, thereby establishing the Anti-Terrorism Courts (ATCs). The ATCs were criticized for violating human rights by shortcutting the legal and investigation process. Musharraf expanded the jurisdiction of ATCs both by increasing the scope of detention and trial and by raising the threshold of punishment. Although it can play an important role in Pakistan's political and social landscape, the civil society sector is constrained to operate on two fronts. First, it struggles to uphold the agenda of political freedoms and civic liberties in the face of the institutional stranglehold represented by the ATCs.

---

<sup>49</sup> Joel S. Migdal, “Integration and Disintegration: An Approach to Society-Formation,” in *Between Development and Destruction: An Enquiry into the Causes of Conflict in Post-Colonial States*, ed. Luc Van De Goor, Kumar Rupesinghe and Paul Sciarone (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 94.

Second, it is on the defensive against the efforts of some who claim that the modicum of democracy in the country is un-Islamic and against sharia.

These challenges underscore the importance of strengthening the civilian framework of constitutional authority, enabling the government to control policy, and stabilizing the political system in the country. All stakeholders, in the country and abroad, need a long-term perspective for producing a stable political order in the country. Economic, educational, cultural, media, and peace initiatives falter when the state and society go in different directions. Political modernization therefore emerges as the most crucial variable for producing political stability and social harmony within a pluralist framework of policy and practice. Several policy recommendations are presented below, along with recommendations related to regional diplomacy, education and media, and civil society. These recommendations primarily address policymakers in Islamabad and Washington.

## POLITICAL MODERNIZATION

1. Islamic militancy and the political ascendancy of proto-Taliban groups only become stronger in the absence of political modernization and good governance.<sup>50</sup> In recent history, successive governments faced strident local millenarian movements that wanted to implement a traditional system of justice and administration, and the state felt helpless in its inability to control security matters.<sup>51</sup> Therefore, Pakistan must:

- Integrate unadministered areas such as FATA and other peripheral regions into the mainstream legal and political system.

- Strengthen the rule of law, especially the court system, in order to deliver justice and handle citizens' complaints.

- Implement a policy of zero tolerance for militant organizations, based on a one-country-one-system formula.

2. Political modernization also requires the strengthening of democracy, which can be enhanced by:

- Ensuring regular elections and that extra-constitutional measures are not taken to invalidate those elections.
- Providing incentives for political parties to move from identity politics characterized by religious and ethnic distinctions to issue politics relating to economic, administrative, environmental, health, educational, gender, and minority problems.
- Shielding the parliament against pressures from the other branches of the government.
- Strengthening political parties organizationally, beyond the donor-driven managerial approach to a political approach based on institutional links with various sectors of society.
- Investing in the "political class," and not just the educated middle class.

3. To avoid the spread of militancy beyond FATA, Swat, and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

<sup>50</sup> Nicholas Schmidle, "Talibanistan: The Talibs at Home," *World Affairs* 172, no. 2 (Fall 2009).

<sup>51</sup> For a long list of "don'ts" meant for a civilian ruling set-up, see Mushahid Hussain Sayed, "Parliamentary Oversight of Security Sector in Pakistan" (background paper, Pakistan Institute of Legislative Development and Transparency - PILDAT, Islamabad, October 2010), 17, <<http://www.pildat.org/publications/publication/CMR/PILDATBPParliamentaryOversightoftheSecuritySectorinPakistanOctober2010.pdf>>.

into Punjab and Karachi, counterterrorist operations must be based on a policing, rather than a military, approach. The state should also eliminate the “no-go areas,” which would consolidate the authority of the state, without compromising and overstretching the role of the armed forces.<sup>52</sup> This makes sense as the threat of terrorism is increasingly in urban areas with high population density.

4. There should be a genuine effort to “federalize” the state to make the smaller provinces equal stakeholders in the political system.

## REGIONAL DIPLOMACY

1. Pakistan and India should establish viable, long-term diplomatic, commercial, educational, and cultural links, which could secure regional stability. Some concrete steps to improve their bilateral relationship are as follows:

- India and Pakistan must start thinking outside of the box on Afghanistan. India’s ambitious quest for a strategic role in and beyond Afghanistan has the potential to jeopardize the agenda of regional stability. Also, Pakistan should reconsider its options vis-à-vis the Taliban, whom the world community abhors as an anachronistic, anti-modern force out to destabilize the region.
- The two South Asian nuclear states must sort out Kashmir as a step toward regional peace.<sup>53</sup> A non-belligerent and non-

expansive India is as good for Pakistan as a secure and confident Pakistan for India.

- The two countries should view each other as more than just neighbors, but as valuable assets for both economic development and political stability.
  - Indians and Pakistanis should be involved in people-to-people dialogue as part of track-three diplomacy.
2. The U.S. should move from a policy of dealing separately with India and Pakistan and an Af-Pak-centric approach to an integrated approach toward South Asia.

- In order to establish regional consensus, dialogue between India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan should be strengthened.
- Diplomatic efforts must be advanced to resolve various regional conflicts and stem the tide of alienation among Muslims.
- Washington and Islamabad should agree about the ends and means of the war on terror. Pakistan’s advantage of being on the ground, and in the vicinity of the main theater of war in Afghanistan, qualifies it to certain priorities of policy and strategy that should not be considered anti-U.S. or anti-NATO.
- Regional stakeholders should agree to a broad-based bargaining deal over the unfolding scenario of a post-withdrawal Afghanistan.

<sup>52</sup> See Stephen P. Cohen, C. Christine Fair, Sumit Ganguly, Shaun Gregory, Aqil Shah, and Ashley J. Tellis, “What’s the Problem with Pakistan? Washington and the Generals” (roundtable, *Foreign Affairs*, Washington, DC, March 31, 2009), <<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/discussions/roundtables/whats-the-problem-with-pakistan>>.

<sup>53</sup> For example, former president Musharraf was keen on thinking outside of the box. He abandoned Islamabad’s traditional position based on the 1948 UN resolution for a plebiscite, proposed division of Kashmir into several religio-linguistic regions with a focus on the Muslim-majority valley of Srinagar, and even considered the idea of joint sovereignty over selected areas.

## EDUCATION AND MEDIA

1. Policymakers should increase their support for the public school system and other educational projects to counter the current militant discourse of an internal cultural civil war and a clash of civilizations abroad. Policymakers and educators should:

- Create and implement a comprehensive curriculum reform program at the primary and secondary school, college, and university levels.
- Teach civics and law in schools.
- Promote intellectual discourse based on the rejection of violence as a legitimate means of conflict resolution.

2. Similarly, policymakers should encourage and support the proliferation and use of electronic media to open up society, move away from an insular worldview and towards integration with the rest of the world by:

- Encouraging electronic media outlets as well as the press to introduce unbiased reporting and objective analysis in the news coverage.

- Ensuring the security of journalists, newspaper offices, and broadcasting stations against harassment from militants.

## CIVIL SOCIETY

1. International civil society actors can enhance the potential of their Pakistani counterparts in defining the national agenda in liberal, democratic, and pluralist terms and monitoring the violation of law, the Constitution, and human rights.
2. International actors should partner with liberals in Pakistan, instead of seeking a role for self-styled “secular” allies who may not have enough public support.
3. Institutional links between lawyers, judges, academics, journalists, artists, human rights activists, feminists, and other social activists should be forged between Pakistani and international civil society.
4. The donor community should move away from local developmental projects to consortium-based mega projects dealing with governance-related issues such as access to medical aid, justice, public transport, clean water, and good education.

## ACRONYMS

ANP	Awami National Party
ATC	Anti-Terrorism Court
COIN	Counterinsurgency (doctrine)
CRS	Congressional Research Services
CTC	Combating Terrorism Center at West Point
FATA	Federally Administered Tribal Areas
FCR	Frontier Crime Regulations
JI	Jamaat-e-Islami
JM	Jaish-e-Mohammad
JUP	Jamiat Ulema-e-Pakistan
LeT	Lashkar-e-Taiba
LJ	Lashkar-e-Jhangvi
MMA	Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal
MQM	Muttahida Qaumi Movement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
PCO	Provisional Constitutional Order
PPP	Pakistan People's Party
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SSP	Sipah-e-Sahaba Pakistan
TNSM	Tanzim Nifaz Shariat Mohammadi



## GLOSSARY

Ahmadis	Followers of a heretical sect
Barelvis	Followers of a Sunni sub-sect
Deobandis	Followers of a Sunni sub-sect
Hawala system	Informal foreign exchange system
Ismailis	Followers of a Shia sub-sect
Jihad	Holy war or struggle
Jirga	Council of tribal elders with no appellate body
Madrasah	Islamic seminary
Majlis Shura	Advisory Committee
Mohajirs	Urdu-speaking migrants
Nizam-e-Adl	System of (traditional) justice
Sharia	Islamic law
Shia	A sect of Islam
Sunni	A sect of Islam
Ulema	Islamic theologians
Zikris	Followers of a heretical sect

## About the Brookings Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World

*The Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World* is a major research program housed within the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution. The project conducts high-quality public policy research, and convenes policy makers and opinion leaders on the major issues surrounding the relationship between the United States and the Muslim world. The Project seeks to engage and inform policymakers, practitioners, and the broader public on developments in Muslim countries and communities, and the nature of their relationship with the United States. Together with the affiliated Brookings Doha Center in Qatar, it sponsors a range of events, initiatives, research projects, and publications designed to educate, encourage frank dialogue, and build positive partnerships between the United States and the Muslim world. The Project has several interlocking components:

- The U.S.-Islamic World Forum, which brings together key leaders in the fields of politics, business, media, academia, and civil society from across the Muslim world and the United States, for much needed discussion and dialogue;
- A Visiting Fellows program, for scholars and journalists from the Muslim world to spend time researching and writing at Brookings in order to inform U.S. policy makers on key issues facing Muslim states and communities;
- A series of Brookings Analysis Papers and Monographs that provide needed analysis of the vital issues of joint concern between the U.S. and the Muslim world;
- An Arts and Culture Initiative, which seeks to develop a better understanding of how arts and cultural leaders and organizations can increase understanding between the United States and the global Muslim community;
- A Science and Technology Initiative, which examines the role cooperative science and technology programs involving the U.S. and Muslim world can play in responding to regional development and education needs, as well as fostering positive relations;
- A Faith Leaders Initiative which brings together representatives of the major Abrahamic faiths from the United States and the Muslim world to discuss actionable programs for bridging the religious divide;
- A Brookings Institution Press Book Series, which aims to synthesize the project's findings for public dissemination.

The underlying goal of the Project is to continue the Brookings Institution's original mandate to serve as a bridge between scholarship and public policy. It seeks to bring new knowledge to the attention of decision-makers and opinion-leaders, as well as afford scholars, analysts, and the public a better insight into policy issues. The Project is supported through the generosity of a range of sponsors including the Government of the State of Qatar, The Ford Foundation, The Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation.

The Project Conveners are Martin Indyk, Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies; Kenneth Pollack, Senior Fellow and Director, Saban Center; Bruce Riedel, Senior Fellow in the Saban Center; Stephen R. Grand, Fellow and Director of the Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World; Shibley Telhami, Nonresident Senior Fellow and Anwar Sadat Chair for Peace and Development at the University of Maryland; and Salman Shaikh, Director of the Brookings Doha Center.

## About the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at Brookings

THE SABAN CENTER FOR MIDDLE EAST POLICY was established on May 13, 2002 with an inaugural address by His Majesty King Abdullah II of Jordan. The creation of the Saban Center reflects the Brookings Institution's commitment to expand dramatically its research and analysis of Middle East policy issues at a time when the region has come to dominate the U.S. foreign policy agenda.

The Saban Center provides Washington policymakers with balanced, objective, in-depth and timely research and policy analysis from experienced and knowledgeable scholars who can bring fresh perspectives to bear on the critical problems of the Middle East. The center upholds the Brookings tradition of being open to a broad range of views. The Saban Center's central objective is to advance understanding of developments in the Middle East through policy-relevant scholarship and debate.

The center's foundation was made possible by a generous grant from Haim and Cheryl Saban of Los Angeles. Ambassador Martin S. Indyk, Vice President of Foreign Policy at Brookings, was the founding Director of the Saban Center. Kenneth M. Pollack is the center's Director. Within the Saban Center is a core group of Middle East experts who conduct original research and develop innovative programs to promote a better understanding of the policy choices facing American decision makers. They

include Bruce Riedel, a specialist on counterterrorism, who served as a senior advisor to four presidents on the Middle East and South Asia at the National Security Council and during a twenty-nine year career in the CIA; Suzanne Maloney, a former senior State Department official who focuses on Iran and economic development; Daniel Byman, a Middle East terrorism expert from Georgetown University; Stephen R. Grand, Fellow and Director of the Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World; Salman Shaikh, Fellow and Director of the Brookings Doha Center; Ibrahim Sharqieh, Fellow and Deputy Director of the Brookings Doha Center; Shadi Hamid, Fellow and Director of Research of the Brookings Doha Center; and Shibley Telhami, who holds the Sadat Chair at the University of Maryland. The center is located in the Foreign Policy Studies Program at Brookings.

The Saban Center is undertaking path breaking research in five areas: the implications of regime change in Iraq, including post-war nation-building and Gulf security; the dynamics of Iranian domestic politics and the threat of nuclear proliferation; mechanisms and requirements for a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; policy for the war against terrorism, including the continuing challenge of state sponsorship of terrorism; and political and economic change in the Arab world, and the methods required to promote democratization.



# BROOKINGS

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

1775 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-2103

[www.brookings.edu](http://www.brookings.edu)