

**Name:** Babar Zaman

**Id:** 13259

**Subject:** Islamic Studies & Pakistan Studies

**Assignment # 1**

**Teacher:** Miss Beenish Shouja

## **Kashmir issues and your views**

### **The Kashmir problem**

As long as the territory's existence was guaranteed by the United Kingdom, the weaknesses in its structure and along its peripheries were not of great consequence, but they became apparent after the British withdrawal from South Asia in 1947. By the terms agreed to by India and Pakistan for the partition of the Indian subcontinent, the rulers of princely states were given the right to opt for either Pakistan or India or—with certain reservations—to remain independent. Hari Singh, the maharaja of Kashmir, initially believed that by delaying his decision he could maintain the independence of Kashmir, but, caught up in a train of events that included a revolution among his Muslim subjects along the western borders of the state and the intervention of Pashtun tribesmen, he signed an Instrument of Accession to the Indian union in October 1947. This was the signal for intervention both by Pakistan, which considered the state to be a natural extension of Pakistan, and by India, which intended to confirm the act of accession. Localized warfare continued during 1948 and ended, through the intercession of the United Nations, in a cease-fire that took effect in January 1949. In July of that year, India and Pakistan defined a cease-fire line—the line of control—that divided the administration of the territory. Regarded at the time as a temporary expedient, the partition along that line still exists. SINCE 1947, INDIA and Pakistan have been locked in conflict over Kashmir, a majority-Muslim region in the northernmost part of India. The mountainous, 86,000-square-mile territory was once a princely state. Now, it is claimed by both India and Pakistan. The roots of the conflict lie in the countries' shared colonial past. From the 17th to the 20th century, Britain ruled most of the Indian subcontinent, first indirectly through the British East India Company, then from 1858 directly through the British crown. Over time, Britain's power over its colony weakened, and a growing nationalist movement threatened the crown's slipping rule. Though it feared civil war between India's Hindu majority and Muslim minority, Britain faced increasing pressure to grant independence to its colony. After World War II, Parliament decided British rule in India should end by 1948. Britain had historically had separate electorates for Muslim citizens and reserved some political seats specifically for Muslims; that not only hemmed Muslims into a minority status, but fueled a growing Muslim separatist movement. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, a politician who headed up India's Muslim League, began demanding a separate nation for India's Muslim population. "It is high time that the British Government applied their mind definitely to the division of India and the establishment of Pakistan and Hindustan, which means freedom for both," Jinnah said in 1945. As religious riots broke out across British India, leaving tens of thousands dead, British and Indian leaders began to seriously consider a partition of the subcontinent based on religion. On August 14, 1947, the independent, Muslim-majority nation of Pakistan was formed. The Hindu-majority independent nation of India followed the next day. Under the hasty terms of partition, more than 550 princely states within colonial India that were not directly governed by Britain could decide to join either new nation or remain independent. At the time, the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, which had a majority Muslim population, was governed by Maharaja Hari Singh, a Hindu. Unlike most of the princely states which aligned themselves with one nation or the other, Singh wanted independence for Kashmir. To avert pressure to join either new nation, the maharaja signed a standstill agreement with Pakistan that allowed citizens of Kashmir to continue trade and travel with the new country. India did not sign a similar standstill agreement with the princely state. As partition-related violence raged across the two new nations, the government of Pakistan pressured Kashmir to join it. Pro-Pakistani rebels, funded by Pakistan, took over much of western Kashmir, and in September 1947, Pashtun tribesmen streamed over the border from Pakistan into Kashmir. Singh asked for India's help in staving off the invasion, but India responded that, in order to gain military assistance, Kashmir would have to accede to India, thus becoming part of the new country. Singh agreed and signed the Instrument of Accession, the document that aligned Kashmir with the Dominion of India, in October 1947. Kashmir was later given special status within the Indian constitution—a status which

guaranteed that Kashmir would have independence over everything but communications, foreign affairs, and defense. This special status was revoked by the Indian government in August 2019. The maharaja's fateful decision to align Kashmir with India ushered in decades of conflict in the contested region, including two wars and a longstanding insurgency.

## Summary

On August 5, India decided to take a long-considered move using article 370 of its constitution to change the status of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Although this has long been a part of the platform of Prime Minister Narendra Modi's Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), most parliamentarians across all parties supported the decision—with 351 votes for and 72 against. Even the general secretary of the opposition Congress Party expressed his approval. This has been a move long in the making, with the backing of a wide swath of Indian political actors. But, the question remains, why now? New Delhi made this move to stabilize Jammu and Kashmir and integrate it more fully with the Indian state. The Modi government's decision is aimed at promoting local governance and encouraging investment in a state that has lagged for decades. The lack of effective local governance has hampered the development of the entire state of Jammu and Kashmir, including Ladakh, Jammu, and tourism dependent areas like Sona Marg and Gulmarg. Although much criticized, New Delhi's stepped-up security and communications restrictions implemented along with the August 5 decision were lifted in 136 of 197 police station areas. Many schools have also reopened. Jammu and Kashmir will gradually return to normal, barring any terrorist activity or violence. India believes that the accession of Jammu and Kashmir is final, and any unfinished business regarding partition of the greater Kashmir region only concerns areas occupied by Pakistan. Reorganizing Jammu and Kashmir made no territorial changes but sought to more closely integrate the state with the rest of India. Therefore, for India, the dispute between India and Pakistan remains unchanged. The advancement of U.S.-Taliban talks, and the imminence of a deal, has demonstrated to India that the U.S. is serious about withdrawing from Afghanistan. India fears that this could lead to history repeating itself. When another superpower, the Soviet Union, left Afghanistan some 30 years ago, intense terrorism in Kashmir immediately followed, as those who fought the Soviets turned to India. To India, Islamabad's objections to the move ring hollow. Over the years, Pakistan has unilaterally changed the status of other territories it occupies in the greater Kashmir region, namely Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan. Just last year, Pakistan changed the structure of Azad Kashmir's government. India protested the change. But, unlike Pakistani Prime Minister Khan's warning of a heightened risk of war and terrorism following the August 5 decision, India did not resort to threats over Azad Kashmir. Islamabad now has a choice. It can continue to support terrorism in Kashmir, which has not only devastated the region, but also severely hurt Pakistan's economy. Or it can choose to cease such support and focus on its internal economic problems. Once the threat of terrorism is removed, there will surely be room for dialogue. By rooting out terrorism, Pakistan can focus on economic development and more effectively leverage its immense resources to boost its economy. This could encourage economic linkages across the region, leading to greater regional stability in the long run.

Women empowerment and Islam and also write down a note on any Pakistani female life history and her struggle?

## Women empowerment and Islam

The prevailing idea of a woman's place in Islam is that women are deprived of freedom and equality. This is the result of either ignorance about Islam or the biased propaganda of anti-Islamic ideology and a prejudiced media. The fact is just the opposite. It is not out of place here to examine the place given to women in some of the so-called glorious civilizations prior to Islam. For instance, in Greek mythology a woman, Pandora, was considered to be the source of all

evil. In the name of art, the Greeks depicted women in such a way that promoted unbridled sex. In the second civilization, the Roman one, their philosopher, Seneca, reprimanded Romans about the degenerating family system. A sport named "Floralia" promoted licentious atmosphere. When it came to Christianity, Chrysostom says: "Woman is an unavoidable evil, a delicious calamity and an attractive trouble." Aristotle declared: "The female state is a deformity." A Roman Catholic, Aquinas, believed: "A female is a misbegotten male." Nietzsche, the German philosopher, opines: "Woman is the source of folly, unreason." In modern Europe, women were not given equal rights and the situation led to feminist movements that have been constantly struggling for equal rights for women. Before the advent of Islam in Arabia, the position of the fair sex was appalling. Girls were sometimes killed as soon as they were born. The infant girls were buried alive. A man could marry and abandon or divorce a woman any number of times. The number of wives was unlimited. Islam emancipated woman in all respects.

Provisions for empowerment of women in the Islamic system of life are

1. Freedom
2. Equality
3. Security
4. Economic empowerment
5. Dignity

## **Pakistani female life history and her struggle:**

### **Fatima Ali Jinnah**

Historically, Muslim reformers such as Syed Ahmad Khan tried to bring education to women, limit polygamy, and empower women in other ways through education. The founder of Pakistan, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, was known to have a positive attitude towards women. After the independence of Pakistan, women's groups and feminist organizations started by prominent leaders like Fatima Jinnah started to form that worked to eliminate socio-economic injustices against women in the country.

Jinnah points out that Muslim women leaders from all classes actively supported the Pakistan movement in the mid-1940s. Their movement was led by wives and other relatives of leading politicians. Women were sometimes organized into large-scale public demonstrations. Before 1947 there was a tendency for the Muslim women in Punjab to vote for the Muslim League while their menfolk supported the Unionist Party.

Many Muslim women supported the Indian National Congress Quit India Movement. Some like Syeda Safia Begum of Muslim Town Lahore started the first English School for Muslim Children in Muslim Town in 1935. Pakistani women were granted the suffrage in 1947, and they were reaffirmed the right to vote in national elections in 1956 under the interim Constitution. The provision of reservation of seats for women in the Parliament existed throughout the constitutional history of Pakistan from 1956 to 1973.

Had General Ayub Khan run fair elections, Ms. Fatima Jinnah of Pakistan would have become the first Muslim President of the largest Muslim country in the world. However, despite that setback, during 1950–60, several pro-women initiatives were taken. Also the first woman Lambardar or Numberdar (Village Head Person) in West Pakistan Begum Sarwat Imtiaz took oath in Village 43/12-L in Chichawatni, District Montgomery (now Sahiwal) in 1959. The 1961 Muslim Family Law Ordinance, which regulated marriage, divorce, and polygamy continues to have a significant legal impact on the women of Pakistan.

### **Mukhtaram Mai**

In 2000, the Church of Pakistan ordained its first women deacons. In 2002 (and later during court trials in 2005), the case of Mukhtaran Mai brought the plight of rape victims in Pakistan under an international spotlight. On 2 September 2004, the Ministry of Women Development was made an independent ministry, separating from the Social Welfare and Education Ministry.

In July 2006, General Pervez Musharraf asked his Government to begin work on amendments to the controversial 1979 Hudood Ordinance introduced under Zia-ul-Haq's régime. He asked the Law Ministry and the Council of Islamic Ideology (under the Ministry of Religious Affairs) to build a consensus for the amendments to the laws. On 7 July 2006 General Musharraf signed an ordinance for the immediate release on bail of around 1300 women who were currently languishing in jails on charges other than terrorism and murder.

In late 2006, the Pakistani parliament passed the Women's Protection Bill, repealing some of the Hudood Ordinances. The bill allowed for DNA and other scientific evidence to be used in prosecuting rape cases. The passing of the Bill and the consequent signing of it into law by President General Pervez Musharraf invoked protests from hard-line Islamist leaders and organisations. Some experts also stated that the reforms will be impossible to enforce.

The Cabinet has approved reservation of 10% quota for women in Central Superior Services in its meeting held on 12 July 2006. Earlier, there was a 5% quota for women across the board in all Government departments. In December 2006, Prime Minister Shaukat Aziz approved the proposal by Ministry of Women Development, to extend this quota to 10%.

In 2006, The Protection of Women (Criminal Laws Amendment) Act was also passed. In December 2006, for the first time, women cadets from the Military Academy Kakul assumed guard duty at the mausoleum of Muhammad Ali Jinnah.

The Women's Protection Bill, however, has been criticised by many including human rights and women's rights activists for only paying lip service and failing to repeal the Hudood Ordinances.

### **Experience of democracy in Pakistan?**

Pakistanis have yearned for democracy for the last 68 years. Most of their struggles had been for the survival of democracy. They successfully reclaimed their right to be governed democratically by defeating four usurpers in uniform and by frustrating many more carefully orchestrated conspiracies. The risk of reversal is still there but the journey to realise democratic dreams continues.

The narrative of democracy in Pakistan reminds me of a childhood story, 'Blind Men and the Elephant'. The elite view it as a share in the economic cake including loot and plunder. The poor regard it as an agency for patron-client relationship and then there is the mufassil and modern middle class that has read somewhere that democracy is about equality, inclusion, justice and rule of law — concerns deliberately avoided by the elite and the poor. Critics of Pakistani democracy promote numerous unexploded myths. On September 15, the world celebrates International Day of Democracy. To mark the occasion here is an attempt to bust a few myths.

#### **Myth 1 — Presidential system is more suitable than the messy parliamentary architecture**

Reality: Pakistan has spent more time under highly centralised presidential dispensations at the cost of its federal diversity. The odd experience of One Unit (1955-1970) cost the nation its federal unity. The Dominion status after Independence imported the centralised federal system embedded in the Indian Act of 1935. Pakistan has had pure parliamentary governance for only 34 per cent of its national life, spanning 24,488 days till August 31, 2014. Therefore, denial of federal-parliamentary democracy is the real problem.

**Myth 2 — The Constitution does not address core critical issues and does not offer bread and butter**

Reality: Pakistan has experienced high constitutional mortality. The single product – Pakistan – had been operated through multiple user manuals — the Constitutions of 1956, 1962 and 1973 and a series of Provisional Constitutional and Legal Framework Orders. Resultantly, the product has crashed on many occasions. Lesson: please stick to the compatible manual that is nothing but federal-parliamentary democracy.

**Myth 3 — The Peoples’ part of the Constitution – fundamental rights and the Principles of Policy (Article 8-40) – has never been implemented**

Reality: Whenever there is martial law, fundamental rights are suspended. The dictators do get a set of obedient judges through Provisional Constitutional Orders and puppet parliaments like the Majlis-e-Shura. But we, the people, don’t even remain citizens as our rights are suspended. The total life of the Constitution of 1973 is 14,992 days (41 years). Practically it has been operational for only less than 20 per cent at different stages. So who actually denied our rights? In terms of the resources to realise these rights, the weak civilian governments only had a pastry to share with the 200 million whereas the big cake was baked only for the garrison state.

So what is the way out? Address the civil-military disequilibrium and negotiate peace with neighbours. Pakistanis also need a compulsory vaccine of ‘democratic civic education’ and a series of crash courses in democracy, constitutionalism, due process and democratic conflict resolution to transform our heated political culture into a delivering democracy. Only then will we be out of the thick woods and be able to see the real dawn of democracy that cares and caters to the socio-economic needs of its citizens.

Zafarullah Khan is Islamabad based civic educator/researcher with interest in democratic development and federalism.

**Period of any dictator in Pakistan?**

During this two years rule of Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto it is observed that the GDP of Pakistan declined by 2% GDP growth rate also declined by 10%. There was an increase in the production of electricity but only by 8%. There was an increase in the inflation and inflation during those two years increased by 15%. In the short ruling period of Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto the unemployment in Pakistan decreased by 18%.

Under the rule of Zia-Ul-Haq for the period of ten year the GDP of Pakistan was on the increasing trend during the ten years of Zia-Ul-Haq’s rule the GDP of Pakistan increased by 154% while the average GDP growth rate was 6.5%. Electricity Production during Zia-Ul-Haq’s Era increased by 200% in the ten years which shows that Electricity production was given much preference by him. The data of inflation shows that that the in this ten year rule the average inflation rate/year was 7% while in these ten years a negative growth of 13% can be seen in the observed. The unemployment rate also decreased by 27% in the ten year of Zia-Ul-Haq. 1988-1999 Third Democratic Era: This decade is regarded as the third democratic era in this period of approximately eleven years Pakistan’s political history experienced two democratic government twice i.e Late Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif ruled Pakistan alternatively each being elected twice with heavy mandate of the people.

After extensive research on the topic and careful evaluation of each form of government and each and every political party government the following things were concluded: In terms of GDP the highest growth was observed during the rule of Musharaf and Zia-Ul-Haq which shows that if we consider GDP as the factor for evaluation of governments then dictatorship proves a better option. The second economic indicator used in this report is Electricity production which also indicates the highest growth rates in the terms of electricity production was under the government of Musharaf and Zia-Ul-Haq therefore this factor also supports dictatorship. Our third economic indicator in in this report is inflation and it also indicates that the inflation rates were low and controlled under the governments of Musharaf and Zia as compared to government of PPP and PML(N) therefore this factor also supports dictatorship as a better form of government.

Unemployment is the fifth economic factor which we have used to evaluate governments in the past thirty years and this also shows that the unemployment was least during the rule of Zia-Ul-Haq while Musharaf had the highest unemployment rates. After considering the above mentioned points we have reached to the conclusion in the previous thirty years the best government according the selected economic indicators was the government of Zia-Ul-Haq while Musharaf also did well as compared to PPP and PML(N) and it can be said that dictatorship has proven as a better form of government for Pakistan.