



RESEARCH PAPER

The Tricky Proposition and Probability of Regional Autonomy in Pakistan: A Philosophical Insight

¹Fayyaz Ahmad Hussain, ²Dr. Abdul Basit Khan and ³Kaleem Raza

1. Former Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Government College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.
3. PhD Scholar, Department of Political Science, Government College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author | abdulbasit@gcuf.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Nationalism can be defined as a feeling in which the individual senses that everyone owes his supreme secular allegiance to the nation, nevertheless, scholars believe that nationalist movements in colonially subjugated countries can be described as having a negative nature since these were movements more against western colonialism than for seeking a positive, coherent national identity. Furthermore, any political system addressing societal heterogeneity must uphold the terms of the constitution through a genuine dispersal of power among a number of substantially self-sustaining polities established by the federal compact. Also, regional autonomy can be attained within a broader national structure and is short of sovereignty which is the most significant ingredient of an independent state. After 1947, Pakistan has been facing the crucial problems of national solidarity, integration and nation building which could have been averted if the federal solution blended with regional autonomy had been ensured to the various ethnic, racial, linguistic and cultural segments of the populations divided and settled in different geographic regions within the country. To properly diagnose the issue, the current work discusses the theoretical concept of nationalism and federalism along with various allied concepts seeking at the same time their relevancy with the existing ground realities in Pakistan. It finds that the application of federal solution to the integration problems of Pakistan was made difficult by the absence of a minimum consensus over fundamentals among the political elite and the over-centralized seizure of power by the federally controlled civil-military bureaucracy of Pakistan. It argues that a federal design allowing a maximum acceptable amount of autonomy to various subnational groups is desirable to help evolve a mixed political culture and integrate these groups into the framework of a single nation.

KEYWORDS Nationalism, Federalism, Nation Building, Regional Autonomy in Pakistan

Introduction

In a polity where there are different regions, a sense of regionalism and a demand for regional autonomy may prevail and it is only the principle of federalism which can satisfy such feelings and demands, evolving a system of devolution and non-centralization in the power structure of the state. On the other hand, if the federal solution is not applied in such polities or its working becomes unsuccessful, the feeling and demands are bound to intensify and then the region, regionalism and regional autonomy can ultimately manifest themselves into State, Nationalism, Sovereignty and independence. To understand the problem of federalism and national integration in Pakistan, it is necessary

also to consider concepts like "Region", "Regionalism" and "Regional autonomy" since "Federalism" cannot be explained in isolation. The polities like Pakistan, which consist of different regions, have feelings of regionalism and demand regional autonomy whereas they have the problem of national integration as well. The explanation of this problem therefore involves the discussion of the concepts of "Nation" and "Nationalism"; hence, we shall deal here with these concepts at some length.

Region

The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences defines region as a homogeneous zone with physical and cultural characteristics distinctive from those of surrounding parts, whereas, while framing part of a national domain, a region is appropriately unified to have a consciousness of its customs and ideas and thus owns a sense of identity different from the rest of the state (Vance, 1972:377), nevertheless, historians, political scientists and anthropologists are concerned mostly with its non-physical facets i.e. historical, cultural and linguistic regions. For instance, the territory of post-1971 Pakistan is geographically a compact single region but, culturally, linguistically and historically it is divided into different regions which have maintained their unique identities through a long period of history. We can compare it with the case of England, Wales and Scotland, which is a geographically compact region but they individually form different historical, cultural and linguistic regions, nevertheless, being part of Great Britain. Ali rightly observes that, although, the shape, definition and geographic makeup of the Indian subcontinent produce an overall unity, which distinguishes the Indian realm from adjoining lands but the vast size and distances coupled with the lack of effective forces of integration and the racial and cultural divisions combine to produce distinct regional personalities within the larger territorial framework (Ali, 1966:3). The same view was expressed by Nehru, who, while discussing the probabilities for the unity of India, observed that the desire for political unity in India as in other countries, before the advent of nationalism, was usually the aspiration of the ruler or the conqueror and not of the people as a whole who were far more concerned with their local autonomy and rights than in the machinery of government at the top (Nehru, 1948:13). Some other scholars, too, have observed that the political unity and nationalism in the countries of the subcontinent is still a goal and its success is not beyond doubt (Wilson & Dalton, 1982).

The cultural, linguistic and historical regions in Pakistan do not correspond to the boundaries of the provinces which are administrative units and a province may contain more than one cultural and linguistic region or a single historical, cultural and linguistic region may be divided and contained by more than one administrative province or even may form parts of different countries. For instance, Bengal, before 1947, was single historical, linguistic and cultural region, nevertheless, it contained Muslim and Hindu population and there was a division of urban and rural areas but still they had a common language, culture and historical background. In 1947, it was divided between India and Pakistan and, in 1971, between India and Bangladesh. Similarly, the province of Balochistan consists of three or four regions which have different linguistic, cultural and historical identities (See *The New Encyclopedia Britannica* 15th ed. (1978). Chicago: Chicago University Press. Vol. 2, P.677 and Khan, M. A. Y. (1975). *Inside Baluchistan: Political Biography of Khan-e-Azam Mir Ahmad Yar Khan Ex-Ruler of Kalat State*. Karachi: Royal Book Company. P.114.)

A very strong but unsuccessful attempt by the Hindu-Muslim Bengalis to secure a united Bengal outside India and Pakistan in 1947 supports our argument. In the same way, the Pathan or Pakhtun region is divided into three different areas. The British Empire in India annexed some parts of the Pathan region which were formerly parts of Afghanistan and then they included some part of these areas in Balochistan and created a new province

of the Northwest Frontier in the rest of the areas while adding some areas to the new province which are non-Pakhtun e.g. Dera Ismail Khan Division, where the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants are Saraiki speaking and belong to a different cultural and linguistic region.

In some other cases, a compact linguistic, cultural and historical region may cease to be so when people belonging to some different cultural and linguistic region migrate and may cause a significant demographic change hence making that compact region a mixed and complex linguistic, cultural region. For instance, the province of Sindh was a compact linguistic and cultural region before 1947, but after the establishment of Pakistan, a heavy influx of migrants from India as well as from other regions of Pakistan brought demographic changes and converted the natives into a minority (49%) (Malik, 1976:60).

What has made the situation more complex is that the migrants, who had been more educated and more extensively exposed to the modern techniques of industry and agriculture, managed to capture many of the key positions in the power structure of this region. In this regard, Sindh as a province, posed a serious problem for national integration in Pakistan and the said demographic change and domination of the Sindhis by the non-Sindhis had the potential to convert the Sindhi regionalism or sub-nationalism into a Sindhi nationalism.

Regionalism

The concept "Regionalism" is somewhat different than that of the region. According to Bernard Cohen, it refers to the conscious or unconscious growth of symbols, behavior and movements which mark off different clusters within some geographic boundaries for political, economic or cultural ends. The term region refers to a form of description; regionalism to a call to action. Regionalism is a phenomenon of self-assertion which does not just happen but comes into existence when certain conditions develop in a society. Specifically, Cohen mentions three; 1) a symbol pool; 2) selection, standardization of symbols; and 3) establishment of regional elites. Precisely speaking, regionalism characterizes the regional idea in action as an ideology, as a social movement, or as the theoretical basis for regional planning. It is also applied to the scientific task of delimiting and examining regions as entities which lacked proper boundaries (Vance, 1972:378). If we carefully examine Bengali regionalism (1947-1970) and then its culmination in Bengali nationalism, it appears that Cohen's analysis is useful.

According to political and social scientists like K. B. Sayeed and Hafeez Malik there have been the following regional movements in Pakistan (Malik, 1976; Sayeed, 1967).

- 1) Bengali regional movement which led to Bengali sub-nationalism and ultimately culminated in Bengali nationalism and statehood.
- 2) The Sindhi sub-national movement which after the demographic changes, referred above, was frustrated and went underground and once again has come forth since August 1983 with a demonstration of violence and chauvinism (in an interview with Fayyaz Ahmad Hussain, one of the authors of the instant study, Mr. Wali Khan, a renowned Pakhtun leader from NWFP, predicted in September 1982 that Sindh was ahead of all the Provinces in the demand for regional autonomy and it would become chauvinist. The riots and demonstrations in Sindh during August-October 1983 and then since the Summer 1985 continuing well into Summer 1988 indicated that there was a widespread unrest felt in Sindh and there was a feeling

of frustration and deprivation among the native Sindhis. The Zia regime admitted that this unrest was a result of long rooted political and economic deprivation).

- 3) The Pakhtunistan Movement.
- 4) The Baloch nationalist movement.
- 5) The Saraikistan movement.

To sum up, regionalism, in its extreme form, may result in separation. In such instances, regions are referred to as "Sections" (Vance, 1972:378) and sectionalism may culminate in self-determination, secession and self-regulating nationalism as it did in the case of Irish Free State in Great Britain and Bangladesh in Pakistan. In such cases, the qualitative difference between regionalism and nationalism is a matter of degree rather than of content and of legal recognition, which may or may not legitimize regionalism (Malik, 1976).

Autonomy

The concept "Autonomy" has been omitted by the leading Encyclopedias, nonetheless, it has been defined in some dictionaries "as the right of self-government, of making its own laws and administering its own affairs (See New English Dictionary of Historical Principles and the Oxford English Dictionary)." Hence, it entails a freedom to act without external constraint, specifically referring to limited, qualified and defined jurisdiction of self-determination. The term autonomy in its absolute form and meaning may be misleading but we are using this term in its qualified sense, for instance, in reference to a federation, autonomy is qualified by the jurisdiction of the components of a federation within their boundaries specified and demarcated by a written constitution, and is bound to be short of sovereignty which rests only with the federation and not the components.

The term autonomy is usually limited by some objectives such as local, administrative, political, provincial or regional autonomy, e.g. English boroughs have a local autonomy, the British colonies like India had an administrative autonomy; in Pakistan, there is a demand for regional autonomy and the Indian constitution has granted provincial autonomy to its States whereas political autonomy not short of sovereignty means national independence as was granted to India and Pakistan by the British Parliament in 1947. Political autonomy may be enjoyed by the components of a federation, albeit in a qualified nature and is bound to be short of sovereignty.

The term "Regional Autonomy" can be defined as the right of self-government by the people of a region directly or through their representatives, of making their own laws and administering their own affairs in the sphere specified by the constitution as regional concerns and hence fall within the regional jurisdiction. Regional autonomy, therefore, can be attained within a broader national structure and is short of sovereignty which is the most significant ingredient of an independent state. The amount and the extent of regional autonomy may vary from system to system and under different constitutions. Moreover, the exercise of regional autonomy may differ in theory and practice. For instance, the autonomous character of the Soviet Republics of the erstwhile USSR represented two different pictures when studied both in theory and practice. They differed from the components of a federation enjoying the rights of self-government. In the first place, the federating components have the inherent rights of self-government while the local bodies in a unitary state have delegated rights which are subject to withdrawal at any time by the

central authority as, in 1986, the Greater London Council was abolished by an act of the British parliament. Secondly, the powers and sphere of jurisdiction of a component of a federation are defined and specified by the constitution while the powers are delegated to any local authority in a unitary system by the central government under an act or a law which can be changed. Moreover, in a unitary state, the local bodies or the local governments may enjoy autonomy in making their laws and administering their affairs but altered or abolished by it any time at its own will. The concept of regional autonomy could be better understood in a federal structure and hence it seems desirable that the concept "Federalism" should be discussed. In the case of Pakistan, the terms regional and provincial autonomy interchangeably as in Pakistan the units are called the provinces, nevertheless, there is a demand that these provinces contain different regions and the provinces should be re-demarcated according to these regional boundaries.

Federalism

We can define federalism as an approach of political organization by means of which distinct polities are to be unified within an overarching political system so as to permit each (constituting unit) to enjoy the preservation and maintenance of its fundamental political integrity. Federal systems attain this objective by distributing power amongst central and constituent governments in a manner designed to shelter the existence and authority of all the governments within the sphere identified by the constitution. In principle, then, an impenetrable wall is constructed between the jurisdiction of the central and the constituent governments (Elazer, 1972). If we relate the notion of federalism to the different theories of social contract, it can be genuinely characterized by the aspiration to build society on the basis of coordinative rather than subordinated relations and by the stress on partnership amongst the parties with identical claim to legitimacy (in their respective spheres defined by the contract) which pursue to cultivate their diverse integrities within a collective social order.

Davis (1978) and Wheare (1967) both define federalism as a structure which stands for multiplicity in unity, can provide unison where it is desirable and also guarantees variety and independence in issues and matters where unity and uniformity is not necessary. Davis explains US federal design as a system with two tiers of popularly elected governments, each of which possess the basic facilities to make, manage and enforce its laws within its jurisdiction specified by the constitution, and where the jurisdictional disputes between the two tiers of the government are settled by judicial arbitration. In case, the actions of both the governments are valid, then the principle of national supremacy prevails. The US federal edifice has been widely celebrated as a great, even genuine contribution to political science and it has delivered the model for many succeeding governments (Elazer, 1972).

The idea of federalism has broadly appealed to spokespersons for minority interests- whether religious, ethnic or economic- who are eyeing for institutional and constitutional sureties against the supremacy of a majority. To be precise, federalism provides a sustainable structure for the reconciliation of the power of the majority and rights of the minority. It is why the idea of federalism was generated to meet the problems of such polities which are composed of diverse and separate regions based on the physical aspect, i.e. geographical or on the non-physical aspect, i.e. historical, linguistic and cultural. Such regions can be classified in two types, on the one hand, they could be separate entities before the formation of the federation e.g. Canada and, on the other hand, federation could be created out of a previously unitary state, e.g. West Germany.

If we trace the history of federalism, it appears that the federal idea has been abstracted in two different ways. On one side, it has been conceived as a tool to integrate a people already linked by some ties of shared tradition and benefits through distribution of political power among the constituent units of the country. The polities that create the federation are more or less parts of the national whole in such cases and federalism, there, may possibly lead to the development of a resilient national government functioning in direct connection with the people it serves, similarly as the constituent governments do. On the other side, the federal concept has also been perceived as a means of uniting dissimilar/diverse people, without disrupting their primary bonds to the distinct polities, that establish the federation. In such cases, the federal government is mostly limited in its scope and authorities, running through constituent governments which enjoy their plenary autonomy and, to a considerable degree, the federal government is reliant upon them.

After this discussion one may ask what is a perfect model of federalism? There is no answer to such a question because it is not only difficult, but impossible. No federal system has been built nor indeed could be constructed in the mirror image of any set ideal. No arrangement has come to the federating act exactly from the same needs, the same causes, for the same motives or under the same conditions. No system has adopted the precise separation of legislative, executive and judicial powers and the language of any other federal constitution. This is the reason one cannot find any two federal systems alike. However, to evaluate the nature and the working of federal system, one can outline some basic characteristics and qualifications of such a system on the basis of which it can be decided whether a system is a federal one or not. The following are the basic characteristics (Elazer, 1972).

Written Constitution

The federal connection must be established or confirmed through a perpetual covenant of union, inexorably embodied in a written constitution that sketches, among other things, the terms by which state power is distributed or shared in the political system and which can be changed while adopting only the extraordinary processes and with the consent of the constituent units of the federation. Even this covenant does not serve the purpose unless it has a provision of arbitration by some independent judicial authority if any provision is abused by any tier of the government (local or national) and, moreover, it should be clearly laid down in the constitution that any such arbitration by a lawful and competent authority shall be binding for both the parties. In Pakistan, since 1947, all the constitutions (1956-1962-1973) were written constitutions which provided lists of subjects of legislation, i.e. provincial, federal and concurrent but none of these constitutions provided any legal or judicial remedy in case of a conflict between the federal government and any provincial government or between the various provincial governments. The Martial Law administration of General Zia has gone a step forward and in March 1985 when he issued the Revival of the Constitutional Order (RCO) and amended the 1973 constitution, he put a clause in the new constitution that no act of the President taken by him in his discretion would be challengeable in any of the law courts (See the Revival of the Constitutional Order 1985 issued by Zia in the Daily Jang, London, 13 March 1985).

Non-Centralization

The system must maintain the terms of the constitution through a genuine dispersal of power among a number of substantially self-sustaining polities created by the federal compact. Such a diffusion of authority may be termed as non-centralization. Non-centralization differs from devolution or decentralization i.e. the qualified diffusion of particular powers to subordinate local governments by a central government subject to

recall by unilateral decision. Such decentralization or devolution can be found in the British political system where, in spite of the unitary form of government, the local governments have been delegated some powers under the system of decentralization or devolution. The Russian political system though claiming to be federal in theory, allowed only decentralization in practice instead of non-centralization because the powers at the Soviet Republic level were used and exercised only for administrative and implementation purposes as the actual power of decision and policy making was vested in the party leadership at the central level.

In Pakistan, none of the constitutions referred above provided the principle of non-centralization of powers. In the 1956 and or 1973 constitutions, a provincial government could be dismissed or suspended, the legislature could be dissolved and the province could be placed under the direct rule of the central government at any time when the central government was satisfied that the governmental machinery had failed in maintaining law and order or there was a serious danger to the integrity and solidarity of the state. We do not intend to suggest that there should be no check on the provincial governments if and when any such situation may arise, but it seems desirable that, in order to protect the provincial government against the abuse of such powers by the central government, there must be some legal and judicial remedy embodied to the constitution and some competent judicial body should have the authority to examine the merit of the act of the central government in these matters. In the absence of any provision for such a remedy, it appears that the provincial governments possess just an administrative structure and do not have their own independent existence. Though, they have inherent powers specified by the constitution, they do not have independent existence or entity to exercise those powers because their existence is at the mercy of the central government. Under the 1962 constitution, the provincial governor who had substantial executive and legislative powers, was a non-elected appointee of the President, was responsible to him alone and could only hold the post at his pleasure. In such a system, if a provincial government is given vast executive or legislative powers by the constitution, it does not have in fact any such powers because its structure is subservient to the central government and its existence is at the mercy of the latter.

Moreover, the structure of bureaucracy in Pakistan since 1947 has been almost the same as it was under the British system. This structure of the whole bureaucracy is under the direct control of the central government named as the Central Superior Services (CSS) which are responsible for the running of the entire administration, policy making and decision implementation. The officers of these services, though serving any provincial government, are appointed, transferred, dismissed, promoted or punished by the central government and they always seek the favor of the central government rather than pleasing any provincial government. For instance, a Chief Secretary, Home Secretary or an Inspector General of Police serve under the provincial government but they are appointed by the Establishment Division of the central government and can serve in their capacity during the pleasure and up to the satisfaction of the central government. Hussain, one of the writers of the instant study, was once told by the former governors of Balochistan, Bugti and Bizenjo (1972-1973) that the Chief Secretary of the Balochistan government many times refused to carry out the orders of the provincial governor and the Chief Minister. One should not be misled by the changes Bhutto made in the bureaucratic structure of Pakistan. In fact, he did not touch the basic structure of the institution, rather he made it more subservient to the central government. Firstly, he abolished the cadres in these services, which meant that he could appoint any officer from any cadre to any post he wished. Secondly, he recruited some persons who did not come through the normal procedure laid down for these services, thus politicizing the bureaucracy. To sum up, the structure and

function of the bureaucracy in Pakistan is not conducive for the working of a federal system in general and the principle of non-centralization in particular.

Areal Division of Power

A third element that appears to be essential in any federal system is the internal division of authority and power on an areal basis. The federal government cannot alter this areal division without the consent of the component units of the federation. If such alteration can be accomplished without the consent of the federating units, then it amounts to the violation of the federal principle.

Besides these characteristics, the successful and desirable operation of the federal system requires a specific type of environment, one which is conducive to popular government and has the robust traditions of political collaboration and self-restraint that are required to maintain a system which minimizes the use of coercion. Beyond the level of tradition, a federal scheme functions best in those societies which, in spite of having heterogeneity in their political cultures, can maintain a sufficient quantity of homogeneity in fundamental interests or consensus to permit a great deal of latitude in political processes and to place primary reliance upon voluntary cooperation (Elazer, 1972).

Nationalism

To Smith (1979:87), the concept of nation involves four elements, a distinctive history, a culture, solidarity and a polity within a definite territory whereas, other scholars like Kant (Rustow, 1972) and Snyder (1954 & 1968) believe that a common language and common religion are the most significant components of a nation. While Fichte (Rustow, 1972) and Hans Kohn, in his various studies published in 1958, 1962 & 1965 emphasize that without a common language a nation cannot emerge. Still there are others like Hertz (1944), Lord Bryce (See *Race Sentiments as a Factor in History*. University of London, Creighton Lecture, 1915), Pillsbury, Littré (Gooch, 1920), Kedourie and Minogue who believe that a common race is the most significant factor for the creation of a nation. On the other hand, Renan (Rustow, 1972:10) and Barker (1927) believe that it is not a common race, language or religion which generates a nation, but what constitutes a nation is having accomplished great things in common in the past and the wish to accomplish them in the future. Moreover, according to Barker, nation is not a physical fact of one blood rather the mental fact of one tradition which can be acquired by the thinking, feeling and willing of human minds in the course of history.

Nationalism, like all other historical movements, is deeply rooted in the past. The product of political, economic, social, intellectual and psychological factors, it emerged over the course of centuries. Nationalism may be defined as a state of mind in which the individual feels that everyone owes his supreme secular loyalty to the nation (See *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*. Vol.12, P.851).

Though nationalism had its powerful manifestation in the American and French revolutions which stimulated and spread its force in motion, nonetheless, we can find Dutch, Roman, Spanish and earlier French nationalism in the past. The rise of nationalism is linked with the growth of secularism, the lessening of the older religious, tribal, clannish or feudal loyalties and the spread of urbanization, industrialization and improved communication.

In the twentieth century especially after World Wars I, II, nationalism became a mass-elite movement in those countries of Asia and Africa (like India and Algeria) which

were ruled by the colonial powers. Independence movements were launched and many of these countries were freed after the world war II. In fact, these nationalist movements in such countries were a reaction to the foreign rule and thus can be described as having a negative nature. It was a movement more against western colonialism than for a positive, coherent national identity. Pye (1966), Kedourie (1971) and Snyder (1954) believe that the nationalism which swept these countries in the post-war period was superficial and a product of psychological response to the impact of the western concept of nationalism and demand for independence from the colonial rule.

It is interesting to note here that the concept of Asian nationalism was placed on the agenda of the Pacific Relations Conference (India 1950) when Nehru, in his inaugural address, admitted that he could not define nationalism in a free country. He said it could be defined only in a country under foreign domination as an anti-foreign power or movement (Snyder, 1954:142).

It appears that the views of the above mentioned scholars carry some weight. If we analyse Indian nationalism through the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, we find that the movement was lacking a positive coherent national identity. Especially, at the verge of the partition, a compromise among the Hindu-Muslim Bengalis to achieve a united Bengal outside Pakistan and India supports this view. But when the top leadership of the Indian National Congress emphasized that a United Bengal must join the Indian Union, the Bengali Muslims again shifted to a Muslim Pakistani nationalism. In the same way, the congress elite in the NWFP demanded a separate nationhood for the Pathans. Moreover, on an All India level, there were many occasions when the Muslims and Hindus could have reached a decision to save the unity of India but if we carefully examine the history, the nationalist movement in India was confused, complex and very fragile.

Still, there is another theory of nationalism which suggests that nationalism is a combination of the processes of integration and conflicts (Hah & Martin, 1975).

So whilst integration theories suggest that modernization causes groups to become integrated at the societal level, conflict theory suggests that these groups make nationalist demands when faced with an unacceptable level of inequality. This theory makes the following points.

- 1) Modernization generates nationalism indirectly by integrating at the societal level and directly by causing relative deprivation. The level of modernization varies directly with (a) the level of integration and (b) curvilinearly with the level of relative deprivation.
- 2) An integral group is necessary for generating group demands.
 - a) Group integration varies curvilinearly with the level of relative deprivation.
 - b) Hence the capacity for integrated groups to exert nationalistic demands also varies curvilinearly with the level of relative deprivation.
- 3) Nationalism is primarily a phenomenon of transitional societies which are not extensively exposed towards political modernization and secularization.

The Case of Pakistan

Now we can apply this theory to the Indian and Pakistani nationalism before 1947 and then within Pakistan to Bengali, Sindhi, Balochi and Pathan nationalism after 1947. So

we find that against a vast Hindu majority, the level of relative deprivation among the Muslims was quite high which consequently caused group integration and ultimately a Muslim Pakistani nationalism. After 1947 within Pakistan, the level of deprivation was the highest among the Bengalis so they developed group integration and ultimately a Bengali nationalism. Among the Pathans, the level of deprivation is quite low so they lack group integration and thus a desire for separate nationalism. Among the Balochs, there is no modernization thus they lack group integration and, in spite of a high level of deprivation, are not able to promote a feeling of Baloch nationalism and the differences between different Baloch tribes are being played off by the central government. While, in Sindh, there we can find modernization, group integration, a high level of deprivation and strong feeling of Sindhi nationalism and in past Sindh was the most rebellious province in Pakistan and posed a challenge to its integrity.

In short, to sum up, with the concept of nationalism, we can say that after World War II it has become a socially revolutionary movement demanding equal economic and political opportunities for all members of the national group and the active promotion of the welfare of the underprivileged classes. The newly emerged independent countries, where after the independence, a certain section of the population or a group has become dominant by capturing the power structure and has caused frustration and deprivation among other groups, have faced the problem of national integration and in some cases, have dismembered as Pakistan did in 1971. Such countries have become a "state nation" rather than a "nation state".

Pakistan, since its emergence in 1947, has been facing the crucial problems of national solidarity, integration and nation building. Even after the emergence of Bangladesh in 1971, it has not been successful in integrating the different nationalities of post-1971 Pakistan into a single Pakistani nationalism and the power structure has failed to distribute at least equitable if not equal economic and political opportunities among the different ethnic, cultural and linguistic groups which has caused deprivation, frustration and a feeling of non-participation in the country's decision and policy making process among the minority ethnic groups which constitute the country hence there seems to be neither a common culture nor a recognition among the different nationalities of Pakistan of belonging to the same nation. To conclude in the words of Emerson (1960:94) "By the accepted criteria of nationhood, there was no such thing as a Pakistani nation."

Conclusion

After the establishment of Pakistan, the Punjabis and the migrants who had an earlier exposure towards economic, social and political modernisation as compared to the other subnational groups, though ethnically and linguistically a minority, became the ruling elite. Neither Jinnah nor Liaquat belonged to any of the provinces which constituted Pakistan and thus established an alien rule in Pakistan what Morris-Jones has described as "Refugee Raj." (W.H. Flow in Morris-Jones Realities and Dreams: Ebb and Flow in the Politics of Separatism. The Round Table No. 298 April 1986). The most significant problem after the establishment of Pakistan was the high level tension between the ruling elite and the regional elite who were either dislodged from their positions and status they had enjoyed during the British Raj or were forced to accept just a subordinate position or status inferior to that they had enjoyed under the colonial rule. At the time of independence, the Bengalis, though constituting a majority of the population, and other subnational groups like Balochs, Sindhis, and Pushtoons, had little or no representation at all in the civil military bureaucracy, the professions, commerce and trade. In these circumstances, it was but natural that the feelings of regionalism would take place. Such feelings were suppressed by the ruling elite instead of being accommodated and the regional elite from

the outset were dubbed as anti-state and traitors. It was none other than Jinnah who urged Ghaffar Khan in 1947 to pack up his organisation of Khudai Khidmatgars and join hands with the Muslim League hence exhibiting an attitude of intolerance towards any difference of opinion. This attitude of the ruling elite brought home to different subnational groups that the government was determined to establish one party system in Pakistan and that their demands would not be responded to by the ruling elite which negatively impacted the overall political culture of Pakistan at large.

References

- Ali, T. (1966). *Pakistan: A Political Geography*. London: Oxford University Press
- Barker, E. (1927). *National Character and the Factors in its Formation*. London: Methuen.
- Davis, S. R. (1978). *The Federal Principle: A Journey Through Time in Quest of a Meaning*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Elazer, D. J., (1972). Federalism. In Sills, D. L. (Ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol.5. New York: Macmillan.
- Emerson, R., (1960). *From Empire to Nation*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gooch, G. (1920). *Nationalism*. London: The Swarth More Press.
- Hah, C. D., & Martin, J. (1975). Toward a Synthesis of Conflict and Integration Theories of Nationalism. *World Politics*, 27(3), 361-386.
- Hertz, F. (1944). *Nationality in History and Politics: A Study of the Psychology and Sociology of National sentiment and character*. London: Kegan Paul.
- Kedouri. E. (1971). *Nationalism in Asia and Africa*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Kohn, H. (1958). *The Idea of Nationalism*. New York: MacMillan
- Kohn, H. (1962). *The Age of Nationalism*. New York: Harper.
- Kohn, H. (1965). *Nationalism, its Meaning and History*. Revised Ed. Princeton: Van Nostrand,
- Malik, H., (1976). Problems of Regionalism in Pakistan. in Wriggins, W.H. (Ed.) *Pakistan in Transition*. Islamabad: University of Islamabad.
- Nehru, J. L. (1948). *The Unity of India: Collected Writings, 1937-40*. The John Day Company
- Pye, L. W. (1966). *Aspects of Political Development*. Boston: Little and Brown.
- Rustow, D. A. (1972). Nation. In Sills, D. L. (Ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol.5. New York: Macmillan.
- Sayeed, K. B. (1967). *Political System of Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, (1979). *Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*, London: Oxford University Press. 1979,
- Snyder, L. L. (1954). *The Meaning of Nationalism*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Snyder, L. L. (1968). *The New Nationalism*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Vance, R. B. (1972). Region. In Sills, D. L. (Ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol.5. New York: Macmillan.
- Wheare, K.C. (1967). *The Federal Government* (4th Ed/Reprinted). Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, A.J. & Dalton, D. (1982). *The States of South Asia: Problems of National Integration*. London: C-Hurst Company.