

Typology of Political Alliances in Pakistan

Akhtar Hussain,¹ & Muhammad Idrees²

Abstract:

Alliance formation is an essential part of electoral politics; hence, they are formed in most democracies worldwide. The political history of Pakistan is rich in political alliances but, no objective study of these alliances has been conducted. Questions like, what are the various types of alliances that emerged in Pakistan? How alliance can be classified? What affects the relationship amongst the allies? What are the characteristics of the alliances formed during the military and civilian regimes? need to be studied objectively. The present study attempts to answer some of these questions. This paper mainly deals with a conceptual discussion about the various forms of alliances formed in Pakistan and a brief introduction of the alliances that functioned during the civilian and military rule in Pakistan. Based on the differences and similarities amongst these divergent alliances, an effort is made to establish a typology of these alliances. A descriptive analytical method is used for this paper where the functionality of various alliances is studied by going through both primary and secondary data available. Analysis is done through a comparison of the traits of the alliances formed in different eras of the political history of Pakistan.

Key Words: Pakistan, political parties, alliances, electoral system, political system, democracy

INTRODUCTION

Political alliances despite their contribution to the political culture and history of Pakistan, have received very little and in-adequate attention of the contemporary scholars. The available literature on political alliances is very scarce and insufficient. Various references one finds about these alliances are mostly present in books dealing with political parties like Rafiq Afzal's work in three volumes, (Afzal, 1976; 1986a; 1986b), (K. K. Aziz, 1976), (Pobre, 1970), political issues (Callard, 1968; Salamat, 1988), various regimes and biographies and autobiographies of some politicians, civil and military rulers as well as in books on political culture and history of Pakistan. In recent years, researchers like Yunus, 1993; Ahmed, 1993; Mushtaq, 2015; Malik, 2014; Mustafa, 2010; and Hussain, 2008 have started studying political alliances in Pakistan.

Political alliances mean the coalitions or confederation of various political parties or groups for the achievement of common goals. Similarly, a party coalition is defined as coming together of a minimum of two political parties for a certain period, in pursuit of an agreed set of common goals to be reached through a common strategy, joint actions, the pooling of resources and the distribution of possible subsequent pay-offs (Kadima, 2006). Generally, alliances vary significantly in their form and degree (Duverger, 1957). Normally, the factors involved in the formation of alliances are determined by the political culture prevailing in that society where they are formed. Secondly the number of parties plays a determining role in the formation of alliances. In a political culture where there is "bi-party" system, political alliances are quite exceptional. However, they may develop

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of History & Pakistan Studies, International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: akhtar.hussain@iiu.edu.pk

² PhD Scholar, Department of Politics & International Relations, International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: writetomidrees@gmail.com

consensus when they confront serious internal or external problems (Duverger, 1957). In countries where multiple party system operates, the emergence of coalitions and political alliances is more common because it is difficult for the weak political parties to survive the pressure of government or to perform well in elections. Under authoritarian regimes, governmental interference is quite a significant factor in the formation of political alliances (Kapa, 2008). Political exigencies contribute a lot in promoting cohesion among various groups. However, stable multi-party regimes can manage without alliances when one of the parties obtain an absolute majority.

The influence of the electoral system predominate the formation of alliances. Though, it is challenging to state the exact influence of any particular form of the electoral system on the formation of alliances. It can be expressed in a way while taking into consideration some of the electoral systems in practice in the contemporary democracies. The simple majority second ballot system encourages the formation of alliances (Hussain, 2008). Proportional representation, on the other hand, encourages complete independence. It is the very essence of the proportional representation to isolate parties. It tends to confer on each party complete electoral autonomy, but it very rarely gives an absolute majority "to a single party.", Nevertheless it leads to parliamentary alliances. It makes parties totally independent of each other at the first level and obliges them to collaborate at the second (Hussain, 2008).

In the simple majority single ballot system, the results vary according to the number of the parties functioning under it. In a two-party system, it encourages total independence, but in a multi-party system, it favours very strong alliances (Duverger, 1957). As stated, the electoral system of the simple majority ballot system is different according to whether it coincides with a two-party or a multi-party system. This needs further elaboration because this system operates in Pakistan and the focused area discussed in the current paper. In the first case, the idea of electoral alliances is logically unthinkable. If the two parties were to unite, there would be only one candidate, and the election would take on a plebiscitary character to completely change the nature of the elections (Duverger, 1957). On the other hand, if the single ballot system coincides with multi-partism, it will favour the formation of strong alliances; for it becomes necessary to share the constituencies before the elections making it possible for the voters to give their votes to the single candidate of the alliance (Hussain, 2008).

The present study is limited to a brief and abridged conceptual discussion on political alliances based on the author's earlier study (Hussain, 2008). It heavily relies on the arguments of stalwarts like Duverger (1957).

Research Methodology

Descriptive and analytical method is used for this paper where the functionality of various alliance is studied through primary and secondary data and researcher's observation to the political development of some of the alliance during the couple of decades. Analysis is done through a comparison of the traits of the alliances formed in different eras of the political history of Pakistan.

Typology of Alliances

There is no uniform and precise way to classify political alliances because of the varying nature of alliances and the dynamism of the political process in which the position of various parties changes

with the alterations in the political conditions. All this makes the classification of alliances difficult as one finds oneself on uncertain and shifting ground (Duverger, 1957). In view of the available models of political alliances (Hussain, 2008), these may roughly be categorized as the following:

- i. Electoral Alliances;
- ii. Opposition Alliances;
- iii. Parliamentary Alliances (which include)
 - a. Governmental Coalitions
 - b. Opposition Coalitions

The alliances can be classified on vertical lines as well. In the vertical plane, electoral alliances can be differentiated as parliamentary alliances, and governmental alliances. The first occur at the level of the candidate, the second of the Member of Legislature (both National and Provincial as is the case in Pakistan) and the third of the ministerial level. All can coexist or may occur in isolation (Hussain, 2008).

Electoral Alliances: Electoral alliances themselves vary according to the voting procedure and the closeness of the union amongst the allies: putting up joint candidates or joint lists at the first or at the only ballot, agreements for the friendly arrangements in certain proportional systems, and so on. They may be implicit or explicit, local or national. In Pakistan, both types of alliances had worked. There are examples where the parties have formed open alliances and have fought the elections from one platform, one electoral symbol and joint candidatures. This type of open alliance is more effective but at times, happens to be more embarrassing for the ideologically opposed parties. Tacit alliances are fairly common in electoral systems with a second ballot. However, in the first part, the poll system of Pakistan tacit alliances have also been formed where parties without openly declaring an alliance has tacitly agreed to support each other either by not contesting the elections on the agreed constituencies or withdrawing their candidates at a particular stage of the contest. This kind of alliances formation is common in single-ballot systems like Pakistan. Particularly, if there are several parties (two or some of them avoid putting up candidates against one another) in a proportional system, such arrangement is impossible.

Another feature of the electoral alliances is that it seems to be more common locally/provincially than nationally. The parties leave it to their local party units to form coalitions. In such kind of arrangement, the parties seem less dependent than if they enter into a national level alliance. Thus, this system allows major parties to employ profitable see-saw tactics, benefiting from the support of one party in some constituencies and another in other constituencies. Hence, a loose kind of arrangement is made between alliances without compromising on their ideological standing or differences on policy matters. The allies mainly focus on winning the elections to maximize their representation in the legislature. Thus, the electoral alliances are very often tactful alliances to convert political arithmetic in the favour of allies.

Opposition Alliances: The opposition alliances are usually formed to cope with the governments' authoritarian pressure. This sort of alliance is usually formed before the elections and is directed towards evoking a favourable public response. Once in the parliament, the parties may unite in support of the government or against it. Alliances very often determine the life span of a multi-party parliament, same is the case in the life span of governments which cannot be formed without

coalitions. Every governmental alliance, which takes members of other parties as ministers, obviously strengthens its parliamentary strength. In Pakistan's case, this type of alliances are numerous as these are formed not only during the military rule but also during the authoritarian civilian rules. Most of the times, the politics is dominated by one or two major political parties. In Pakistan the political stagewas mainly dominated by Pakistan Muslim League (PML) or Pakistan People's Party (PPP) until the recent past where a third party Pakistan Tehrik e Insaf(PTI) has emerged on the scene. Previously either of the two parties when not in power struck opposition alliance with the smaller parties against each other. A deviation has occurred recently as major parties of the past have joined hands of cooperation to oppose the ruling PTI.

Parliamentary Alliances: Parliamentary alliances in opposition and in support of government both can be formed. A minority party may govern with the support of its own parliamentarians and nearby groups who give it their votes without agreeing to share power with it (Budge, 1992). Since they are less involved in its activity, they seem in the public eye to have less responsibility. Duverger describes this attitude as "they may therefore combine an affectation of pure disinterestedness with a much more demagogic attitude" (Duverger, 1957). Sometimes alternative support is utilized, reliance on the Right for help in passing conservative measures, and reliance on the Left for help in securing progressive reforms (Duverger, 1957). In some cases, simple abstention may also be adequate to provide support to a political party in the parliament.

The history of Pakistan is also opulent in the formation of parliamentary alliances. Parliamentary coalitions are formed both for opposition and formation of governments not only at federal or central level but also in the provincial legislatures. In the central legislature, most of the times, governments are formed as a result of parliamentary alliances. Exception are PPPP's first government established after the succession of East Pakistan and PML-Nawaz's government when it managed to get overwhelming majority in 1997. The opposition parties in the National Assembly of Pakistan have more often countered the party in government by forming opposition alliances in the parliament.

At the provincial level, smaller provinces of Pakistan have experienced such alliances more frequently as the population is culturally or lingually divided into ethnic groups and tribes or divided ideologically. Provinces of Khyber Pukhtoonkhwa (KP) and Baluchistan have a rich history of coalition governments, whereas such kinds of alliance are scarce in Punjab assemblies and are rare in the province of Sindh.

All these categories can be further divided into temporary or long lasting alliances. The alliances' unique aspect is that all these forms can sometimes operate simultaneously or may fall into more than one category. For example, all opposition alliances could be electoral. Over the time, the nature of alliances undergoes various changes. Sometimes strong alliances break-up, and weak coalitions emerge stronger. This is determined by the political issues and the overall character of national politics.

Relationship between Allies

The relationship between all sorts of alliances is very complex because there is diversity in the doctrines and gild tendencies of the allies they exhibit in different circumstances. These differences are very much influenced by their interest and are determined by their role in the political process.

The relations between electoral alliances and parliamentary and governmental alliances are very complex. The second may exist without the first. In a system of proportional representation without agreement on lists, the parties face the electorate independently still, they are obliged to unite to form or support a government if there is no absolute majority. Obviously, the absence of alliance at the electoral level disappears by allying in the parliament for or against the government. Each party in an alliance normally tries to lay on its ally the responsibility for unpopular acts and take the credit for popular ones. But when the voting system drives them to electoral alliances, these do not always coincide with the governmental alliances. It is easier to join forces to win seats than to exercise power. The former type of alliance only requires a negative agreement against an opposition, the latter a positive agreement upon a programme which demands a more deep heated similarity. In some cases, electoral alliances cannot be converted to the parliamentary level. Because the allies normally have contradictory ideologies, and it is always complicated to prolong it into power. Divergence between the allies in doctrines and tendencies, differences in social sub-structures, and the interests they safeguard very quickly show themselves, making it difficult to continue in with the alliance.

However, if the allies have reached an agreement on a common programme their relations become much easier. However, such a programme is always vague, being made up of slogans and general headings more calculated to attract voters than to formulate a plan for positive action. In particular, it generally defines aims than means. The government is a problem of means, and the basic difference between allied parties generally concern means. Another point worthy to be mentioned here is that there seems to be a natural difference between electoral alliances and governmental alliances. Electoral alliances tend to be dominated by the most extreme party while governmental alliances by the most moderate party. "The contrast is" in the words of Duverger (1957), "a reflection of the normal antipathy between governors and the governed." He further elaborates that "those who govern are compelled to take into account all the interests involved, which compels them to give no more than a partial satisfaction to any; they are faced with facts which limit the scope of action" (Duverger, 1957). About the governed he writes that "the governed never see more than their individual interests which they try to defend with the utmost energy, knowing all the time that they will not obtain total satisfaction but must ask for more than they expect to get" (Duverger, 1957). Electors therefore, votes for those who defend their point of view with greatest energy that is why at the electoral level, alliances are dominated by the extremist components. Once they assume power, there is a complete change. The moderate element in the alliance is the most alive to the necessities of government. Its moderation coincides with the limits imposed by facts; thus, it becomes the most capable of governing without much straying away from its electoral programme promises (Duverger, 1957). Consequently, if maintained at the governmental level, any electoral alliance is normally dominated by this moderate section as it is much in touch with reality. The extremist party, on the other hand, is reduced to the alternative of taking part in government and deviating from its programme or else breaking up the alliance. In an attempt to find out a compromise solution, Duverger (1957) maintains that, "the extremist component of the alliance takes refuge in support without participation, which makes it possible to maintain the coalition in weakened form whilst benefiting from the advantages of criticism and opposition" (Duverger, 1957). This position itself is however, provisional. The practical difficulties of government gradually incline the party in office to more significant moderation. This draws it further from the

standard electoral programme and nearer to moderates on the other side. The disappointment of some voters increases which leads the extremist party to adopt a more intransigent attitude, so that the distance between the allies increases. Overstretched, the rope one-day breaks and the alliance is over. It is often reconstituted sometime before the new elections.

Finally, a form of alliance that is less common and more strange than the rest; the meeting of extremes, must be considered. The coalition of the party farthest to the Right with the party farthest to the Left, for each of whom the other represents public enemy number one seems, contrary to nature. But in nature, everything is possible and in fact such unions between carp and rabbit are not infrequent. The reason behind this kind of alliance is explained by Duverger (1957) as "for extreme parties always share a common opposition to moderate parties and sometimes a common opposition to the regime." The meeting of extremes is quite common in the form of an opposition alliance within or outside the parliament. Such alliance among extremes is less common in the form of an electoral alliance and particularly of a governmental alliance but is much common when it comes to opposition (Duverger, 1957).

Another point of elaboration is the two types of relationships that operate within the political system used to mobilize resources for exercising power or influence over others. Temporary relationships are formed through horizontal and vertical alliances. On the other hand, permanent relationships link the political elites to the social structures to which they belong. Horizontal alliances link elite groups with one another and vertical alliances link the elites with the non-elites or masses. The political elites always try to form such alliances but at no time have any inter-elite or elite-mass consensus been visible in the political system of Pakistan. These alliances are formed through coalitions, compromises, corruption or coercion. In almost all sorts of political alliances, the allies' formal relations are less important than the power relationship. Despite being the enthusiastic participant in an alliance, each ally remains anxious to preserve its freedom of action. That is why the charters of alliances are, usually undefined and vague compared to the original manifestoes of allied parties. The relationship among the allies is very much determined by the notion of equality or lack of it. Very often, the question of degrees of inequality among the allies remains unsettled. The principle elements which define these inequalities are; (i) Allies respective strength, (ii) The strength of their internal structures and effectiveness of their organizations and (iii) Allies' individual position on the political issues (Duverger, 1957).

The selection of leadership among the unequal allies remains one of the greatest obstacles. In such kinds of situations, personality links play an important role: while analyzing this relationship, study found that opposition and electoral alliances extremist tendencies are dominant while the governmental alliances are moderate in nature.

Martial Law, dictatorship, unstable government and illegitimate government are contrary to democracy. In such kind of situation, the channels of communication fail to function effectively. The intuitional structures and processes fail to resolve a conflict among demands and to implement expectable policies and the political system, it ceases to be responsive. It gives birth to crisis. The situation ultimately leads to the formation of alliance with the view to tackle the existing system which is not considered legitimate by the majority of the population. These alliances are of various types, some alliances are made to tackle the undemocratic government having no legitimacy. Some alliances are made for elections, while others are made inside the parliament house for making an

effective group of parliament. Sometimes, alliances are made for resolving certain issues of vital national importance. Even the governing elites and the opposition ally to form national government in situation of national emergency or any other grave crisis faced by the nation. All these alliances are short-term and long term based on the nature of case.

As described earlier, in countries where multi-party political system operates, the emergence of political alliances is very common. Pakistan too has a multi-party political system hence the formation of political alliances remained an integral part of her political culture. It four times witnessed military rule, covering half of its political history. During the military regimes, most of the political parties joined hands against the ruling military Junta forming opposition political alliances. While the process of making alliances continued in the civilian regimes too. The formation of political alliances thus remains common both during the civilian and military regimes.

POLITICAL ALIANCES: THE PAKISTANI EXPERIENCE

The various types of alliances experienced by Pakistan include opposition, electoral and governmental alliances. Out of these, the opposition alliances worked mainly during dictatorial regimes of the military adventuress. The alliances were made outside the parliament; however, opposition alliances formed during the civilian regimes included parliamentary opposition alliances. Examples of the first category of opposition alliances formed outside parliament include almost all the alliances challenging Ayub regime i.e., National Democratic Front (NDF), Combined Opposition Parties (COP), Pakistan Democratic Movement (PDM), and Democratic Action Committee (DAC). The COP was both opposition as well as electoral alliance of the opposition parties. The rest were aimed at the restoration of the democratic system and removal of the military ruler. The second category of opposition alliances formed either within the parliament or outside as electoral alliance. After the elections ,these worked within the parliament in two capacities i.e., either as opposition to the ruling party or as a coalition to run the government. This category includes United Front (UF), United Democratic Front (UDF), Islami Jamhoori Itihad (IJI), Combined Opposition and Peoples Democratic Alliance (PDA).

The UF, an electoral alliance of the Opposition parties, was the first among these political alliances, was formed in 1954 to challenge the ruling PML during the provincial elections of 1954 in East Pakistan (Mustafa, 2010; Afzal, 1976). The formation of this alliance started a new era of political alliances in the country's politics which continues to date.

During Ayub Khan's era, opposition as well as electoral alliances were formed. NDF (1962) was the first opposition alliance against Ayub Khan (Salamat, 1988). COP (1964) was an electoral alliance against Ayub Khan to confront him in the presidential election of 1965 (Hussain, 2018) (Afzal, 1986). PDM (1967) and DAC (1969) were formed for the removal of Ayub Khan from presidency (Afzal, 2009). After Ayub Khan's rule an alliance named United Coalition Parties (1971) was formed during the second martial law i.e. Yahya Khan's regime, to find out a peaceful solution to the then grave national crisis (Afzal, 1986b).

The formation of alliances continued after East Pakistan's secession and UDF (1973) was formed during Z.A Bhutto's regime (Burki, 1980). It was a parliamentary opposition alliance of those political parties who had a say in the parliament comprising members elected in the 1970 general elections. An important feature of the alliance is the framing of 1973 Constitution of Pakistan and

the subsequent amendments. PNA (1977) was an electoral alliance, which challenged Z.A Bhutto's PPP in the general election of 1977 (Ziring, 1997). The PNA, which was an electoral alliance, became a mass agitation movement after the election and attained the shape of Tehrik-e-Nizam-e-Mustafa. This alliance carried the features of an electoral and opposition agitational alliance.

Zia-ul-Haq's military regime also faced an opposition alliance called Movement for the Restoration of Democracy (MRD) formed in 1981. The main objective of the alliance was the restoration of democracy and the removal of Zia from office (Talbot, 2010). This alliance carried the traits of opposition as well agitation.

After the restoration of democracy in 1988, an era of political instability continued in the country. During the subsequent decade, an era of alliance formulation started in the country in which a variety of alliances were formed. The IJI (1988) an electoral alliance at the first instance was a unique alliance in the history of Pakistan. It was the first alliance which carried variety of traits. Initially, it was an electoral alliance that then functioned as parliamentary opposition alliance in the central legislature and parliamentary government alliance in Punjab's provincial legislature (Malik, 2014). After the 1990 general elections, it became parliamentary government alliance at the central level. Carrying all these divergent traits made it an interesting case for studying political alliances in Pakistan. PDA (1990) was another electoral alliance of this period backed by another major party PPP. The alliance played active part in national politics after the 1990 general elections by countering IJI within the Parliament though dominated by PPP. The alliance was also instrumental in the dismissal of IJI government in 1993. Combined Opposition (1989) a parliamentary opposition alliance worked against PPP in collaboration with another alliance IJI in the no-confidence move against Benazir Bhutto. It was a kind of loose alliance having agreement on countering the PPP government in the parliament. National Democratic Alliance (NDA) formed in 1992 was an electoral alliance formed to contest election jointly but soon withered away without actually taking part in any election (Hussain, 2008). Before the imposition of martial law, Grand Democratic Alliance (GDA), formed in 1998, by the opposition parties emerged against Nawaz Sharif's PML-N government. The alliance claimed to have formed to counter the authoritarian style of Nawaz Sharif's governance after the landslide victory in the 1997 elections.

The martial government of General Musharaf faced an opposition alliance with the name of Alliance for the Restoration of Democracy (ARD) in 2000. ARD struggled for the restoration of democracy and the end of military rule in the country. Although it failed to pose any serious threat to the military regime of Musharaf, but it remained instrumental in highlighting the cause of constitutionalism in the country. ARD carried a unique feature because both PPP and PML-N, who had remained dagger drawn political enemies in 1990s joined hands against the military ruler. The union was praised highly by the democrats being positive for the promotion of democratic norms in the country. During this period, an electoral alliance of the religious parties Mutaheda Majlis Aamal (MMA) was established in 2002 to oppose Gen. Musharaf and change electoral arithmetic's in its favour. This alliance was an opposition cum electoral alliance but it also functioned as a parliamentary opposition alliance in the central legislature and a governing coalition in the provinces of KP and Baluchistan. An opposition alliance All Parties Democratic Movement (APDM) was established in 2007 by the opposition parties for restoration of full democratic system and resignation of General Musharaf as President of Pakistan. This alliance was an extension of the ARD.

PPP and some other component parties of the ARD participated in the 2002 general election held under the umbrella of military rule which made ARD irrelevant. APDM enjoyed the support of another alliance MMA.

The current civilian government of PTI also face an opposition alliance Pakistan Democratic Movement (PDM). It is demanding resignation of the Prime Minister Imran Khan, fresh elections to be fair and free from any interference or involvement of establishment - a term used by the opposition to mean both civil and military bureaucracy but they target mainly the army and its involvement in politics.

The above description makes it clear that the history of Pakistan is full of alliance formation. There is a variety of alliances formed both against civil and military rulers. These alliances vary from electoral to opposition and from inside to outside of the national and provincial legislatures. Side by side, one finds alliance that worked for short-term goals and alliances that remained active on the political scene for quite a long time. Relating these alliances' functionality and objectivity with the conceptual discussion of the first part of this paper presents an interesting case for establishing a typology of alliances in Pakistan.

CONCLUSION

The politics of alliances is a common feature of the political culture of democratic countries. This is particularly true in the context of sub-continent politics. Here alliance politics is directly connected with the phenomenon of multiplicity of political parties. Pakistani politics has also witnessed noticeable political alignments in its brief history; first due to multiplicity of political parties and second due to long oppressive and authoritarian regimes. Almost the majority of the parties big and small in the country face considerable difficulty to attain their respective electoral targets all alone. Most of the parties revolve around personalities instead of certain well defined ideologies or attractive political programmes aimed at the solution of the problems faced by the general masses. In the absence of ideological lineage, parties are organized for and around personalities resulting in mushroom growth of political organizations. With long periods of repression in the shape of martial laws and the absence of well-organized and strong political parties with national characteristics, the country faced considerable difficulty in developing stable and cohesive political organizations. Further, the political parties with few exceptions have been founded as vehicles for one person or for a few individuals to achieve specifically defined goals. In addition, political parties are handicapped with regional and ethnic factors that have limit their national appeal and have also been torn by personal and class rivalries.

Under the Martial law rules, where marginal space for political activities was provided, the political parties were left with no practical alternative other than the formation of political alliances. This is why most of these alliances were agitational by nature, where the allies tried for democratizing the country, lifting of martial laws and ending military rule. Thus, these opposition alliances played a crucial role in pressurizing authoritarian and dictatorial regimes to facilitate democratization in the country.

In the light of this entire discussion, it can be safely concluded that in the absence of well-organized and strong political parties, having a national outlook, these alliances played a pivotal role both in

electioneering and opposition during the civilian and military regimes. After analyzing the emergence and politics of these alliances, one comes across certain commonalities that:

- These alliances were a marriage of convenience among divergent groups for short term gains. With the change of objectives, conditions and realities, these alliances ended in chaos or their allies parted away and adopted their own stands, in changed political circumstances.
- The dynamics of opposition alliances during military and political regimes show that individually, it was difficult to challenge the authority for small and disorganised political parties. Therefore, they took the route of alliances based on minimum common points.
- In creating these alliances, leadership of the component parties played a more dominant role than their common political programme.
- The functioning of the alliances was limited only to the opposition of the ruling personalities. Whenever these personalities disappeared from the political scene, it appeared to be a death blow to these alliances.
- Ideological contradictions remained a bone of contention among the component parties of these alliances while chalking out future strategies.
- The lack of clarity regarding actual political issues, dominance of personal ambitions over national interest, and agitative mode of struggle decreased these alliances' effectiveness.
- During the alliances, the sentiment for democracy has always remained very strong. The society at large co-operated with all these political alliances seeking to promote democracy with different intensity. But the politicians frequently changed sides defying public trust, and thus failed in bringing any healthy change in Pakistani politics.

Despite these harsh realities yet the political leaders expressed their faith in democratic norms, but they hardly practiced them in their true spirit. They are often engaged in politics of exclusion of their adversaries from the political arena. Such an intolerant and non-accommodative disposition towards dissent and desire to grab power at any cost has made it challenging to create a broad based consensus on the operational norms of the polity which is a pre-requisite for the smooth functioning of the democratic order.

References:

- Afzal, M. R. (1976). Political parties in Pakistan, 1947-58, Vol.I. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.
- Afzal, M. R. (1986). Political parties in Pakistan, 1958-69, Vol.II. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.
- Afzal, M. R. (1986). Political parties in Pakistan: 1969-1971, V-III. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.
- Afzal, M. R. (2009). Pakistan history and politics, 1947-1971. Islamabad: Oxford Pakistan.
- Ahmed, M. (1993). Pakistan kay syasi ittihaad. Lahore: Frontier Post Publications.
- Budge, M. J. (1992). Party policy and government coalitions. Hampshire: The MacMillan.
- Burki, S. J. (1980). Pakistan under Bhutto, 1971-1977. CITY: Macmillan.
- Callard, K. (1968). Pakistan: A political study. London: Oxford University Press.
- Duverger, M. (1957). Political parties: Their organisation and activity in the modern state. New Feter Lane: Methuen and Co.

- Hussain, A. (2008). *Politics of alliances in Pakistan:1954-1999*. Islamabad: Quaid-e-Azam University.
- Hussain, A. (2018, Jan.-Jun.). Politics of Combined Opposition Parties (Cop) during Ayub Khan Era (1958-1969). *Journal of the Punjab University Historical Society*, 31(1), pages.
- K. K. Aziz. (1976). *Party politics in Pakistan, 1947-58*. Islamabad: Islamabad: National Commission on Historical and Cultural Research.
- Kadima, D. (2006). *The politics of party coalitions in Africa*. Stiftung Houghton South Africa: Konrad-Adenauer.
- Kapa, M. A. (2008). The politics of coalition formation and democracy in Lesotho. *Politikon* , 35(3), 339-56. Retrieved from <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a91313642~fulltext=713240>
- Malik, R. Z. (2014). *Politics of alliances: A case study of Islami Jamhoori Ittehad(IJI)*. Islamabad: Quaid-i-Azam University. Retrieved from <http://pr.hec.gov.pk/jspui/handle/123456789//8955>
- Mushtaq, A. Q. (2015). *Political alliances and movements in Pakistan*. Faisalabad: Misaal Publishers.
- Mustafa, G. (2010). Alliance politics in Pakistan: A study of the United Front. *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, 31(1), 103-29.
- Pobre, C. P. (1970). *History of political parties in Pakistan (1947-1958)*. Karachi: University of Karachi.
- Salamat, Z. (1988). *Pakistan 1947-58: An historical review*. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.
- Talbot, I. (2010). *Pakistan: A modern history*. Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Yunus, S. (1993). *Syasi ittihaad aur Pakistani syasat per asarat (1947-1990)*. Lahore: Jang Publishers.
- Ziring, L. (1997). *Pakistan in the Twentieth Century: A Political History*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.