

Dr. Muhammad Naeem Zafar<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Rizwan Ali<sup>2</sup>, Samana Mehreen<sup>3</sup>**Abstract**

The study was aimed at investigating the Islami Jamhoori Ittehad as a governmental alliance. The Islami Jamhoori Ittehad was one of the most significant political coalitions in Pakistan's history. IJI may have been an alliance formed to prevent the PPP from taking power. Governmental alliance in 1988 includes; these parties MQM and PPP in centre and as well as in Sindh. The PPP and ANP in NWFP in 1988. Furthermore, ANP and IJI in NWFP in 1990 governmental alliance. The IJI, ANP, MQM, and JWP made governmental alliance in 1990 in centre. Pakistan's 70 years of politics show political instability. It was seen that political alliances were made between organized political parties and weak groups. Even when democratic governance was restored in 1988, there was no single party with the majority to form a government, resulting in crumbled alliance governments. Pakistan's political environment is characterized by power politics, institutional inequities, and a constant struggle of political factions to achieve power and rule.

**Keywords:** Islami Jamhoori Ittehad, political coalitions, governmental alliance

**1. Introduction**

One of the most significant political coalitions in Pakistan's history was the Islami Jamhoori Ittehad (IJI), also known as the "Jamaat". It has been thought of as a coalition amongst right-wing parties. It is also believed that IJI was an alliance formed with the purpose of preventing the PPP from gaining power. The political parties forming this alliance were PML (N), "Jamiat-Ulama-i-Islam" (JUI) "Darkhawasti group", "National Peoples Party" (NPP), "Markazi Jamaat-i-Ahle Hadith" (MJAHL) (Lakhvi-Group), "Jamiat Mashaikh" (JM) (Sahibzada Fazal-e-Haq Group), "Hizb-e-Jihad" (HJ) and "Independent Parliamentary Group" (IPG) (Ahmad et al., 2014). This political alliance consisted of both conservative religious and liberal political groups working together. It was a common misconception that it consisted of nine parties; however, this was not the case. The nine stars on the banner were merely a symbol of the cohesion of the PNA and were meant to indicate the seriousness of the purpose, which was the execution of Nizam-e Mustafa and a stance against the PPP. Nevertheless, this has led to a misunderstanding. In 1988, the PML (Fida and Muhammad Khan Junejo Groups), the JI, the NPP, the HJ, the IPG, the JUI-D, the MJAHL, and the JM all joined together to form the IJI (Feyyaz, 2016). With the benefit of hindsight and a study of the competing parties' thorough premeditated preparation, it is evident that the coalition's principal objective when the National Assembly was abolished in 1988 was to challenge the PPP's supremacy, but this was not the only one. In Pakistan's history, there have been a number of different political parties; yet, elections have frequently produced a mandate that is divided along ideological lines as a result of ideological disagreements between the parties as well as the geographic importance of the political parties. In the elections of 1988, the IJI was the most visible group. Because IJI was a coalition of several political parties, member parties could only agree on a few core issues, which were subsequently incorporated into IJI's political agenda, which was then utilized as the party's election platform. The army founded the IJI to prevent the PPP from achieving a decisive electoral victory (Zafar, 2004).

The establishment was more worried with the rising popularity of the PPP and opposed any review of Bhutto's death sentence. The most important goal of IJI was to limit the power of the PPP while keeping some of Zia's programmes going. Despite the lack of a convincing reason for IJI's creation, various more factors may be cited, as some politicians have argued. (Zafar, & Ali, 2018). Alliances are made to help the parties in them reach their short-term goals, like winning elections, overthrowing a government, or supporting a government over and over again. Such coalitions are typically short-lived and lose credibility after their immediate objectives are attained. The vast majority of Pakistan's political alliances are comprised of members of this group. A lot of alliances are met with excitement and hope. On the other hand, many coalitions are constantly put back together. The political culture that is predominant in the society has played a role in the formation of alliances.

There are many interpretations that can be given to the word "alliance." According to one definition, an alliance is a close link between a nation and other groups that are organized to further mutual interests or purposes. It could take the shape of a relationship or a formal agreement, such as one with another country. It is also possible to think of it as a collection of states cooperating in order to achieve a common objective. The word "alliance" can also be used to refer to a collection of nations, political groups, or even individuals who have decided to work together in the pursuit of a shared purpose or set of goals. The word "alliance" can also be used to refer to a collection of nations, political groups, or even individuals who have decided to work together in the pursuit of a shared purpose or set of goals. An alliance is a connection that can be established by kinship, marriage, or a common interest in the form of a board or a tie. One possible definition of an alliance is "an association to serve the shared interests of the members through treaty," with the emphasis being placed on a confederation of nations. Regional and smaller political parties became powerful in the provinces alongside large national political organizations. This circumstance remained in Pakistan not long after the country gained its independence and has carried on uninterrupted to the present day. It is the emblem of the multiethnic and multinational variety that the major political parties have come to be recognized for representing. The development of alliances between national and regional political parties from 1988 to 1999 and again in 2002 shows constructive representation by preventing deprivation among smaller and regional political organizations to preserve national solidarity (Hamid, 2010). Unfortunately, after creating alliances with mainstream political parties, regional and minor parties used this chance to promote their interests and get benefits from the administrations, rather than fostering a healthy governance culture. They threatened mainstream parties to leave the alliance to get their demands met and continued to influence alliance politics. These kinds of scenarios led to political instability inside the system

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author, Department of Pakistan Studies Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan, Multan, Pakistan, [muhammadnaeemzafar044@gmail.com](mailto:muhammadnaeemzafar044@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Pakistan Studies Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan, [malikrizwan8616@gmail.com](mailto:malikrizwan8616@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Department of Pakistan Studies Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan, [samanaamehreen78@gmail.com](mailto:samanaamehreen78@gmail.com)

and sparked a conflict between the political forces that were at work in the various areas and provinces. In order to acquire power bases in the provinces and reinforce their governments, the mainstream political parties began to appeal to the voters in their respective regions by attempting to influence the attitudes of those voters with a variety of slogans (Khan, 2005).

In Pakistan, multiple coalitions of varying types have coalesced around the goal of reestablishing parliamentary democracy. The opposition fronts in Pakistan have utilized a strategy with three different components. To begin, some of the opposition fronts were electoral alliances formed for the purpose of debating the incumbent party. It is possible to recognize the Pakistan National Alliance (PNA-1977), the Joint Opposition Parties (1964), and the United Front (1954) as belonging to this category. Second, several opposition fronts came into existence first as protest movements directed against the repression and regimentation of the government. The second group includes the Pakistan Democratic Movement (1967), the United Democratic Front (1973), the National Democratic Front (NDF-1962), and the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy (1981). The third example is that of an alliance of parties, many of whose members had previously served in caretaker governments. These individuals came together to establish the Islami Jamhoori Ittihad (IJI-1988) in order to fight against the Pakistan People's Party. It first took the shape of an electoral alliance, after which it constituted the government of the most populous province, and then it formed the government of the centre.

## **2. Governmental Alliances**

It is possible for parties operating under a parliamentary system of government to work together in order to support the government. In a democracy with many parties, it is normal practice for political parties to work together to establish coalitions that can run for office. After the elections, no single party will have the ability to form a government on their own. The scenario calls for the more powerful party to form coalitions with the other parties and the more marginalized groups. Awami National Party, Muhajir Quami Movement, Jamhuri Watan Party, Islami Jamhuri Ittihad made the governmental alliance in centre in 1990. In addition, in 1990 in NWFP governmental alliance was made by Islami Jamhuri Ittihad and Awami National Party. Previously, in NWFP in 1988, Awami National Party, Pakistan People's Party and Muhajir Qaumi Movement formed governmental alliance in centre and as well in Sindh. The different beliefs and tendencies of allies, as well as the different social structures and interests they look out for, become clear very quickly. A cartoonist from France drew a picture of a vehicle being pulled by three horses in 1945, during the time that France was governed by a system known as the Three-Party Alliances. The image depicted one horse pulling the vehicle to the right, another to the left, and the third to the middle. It would be much simpler for the allies to communicate with one another if they had just settled on a single plan. Normally, a programme of this type will include catchphrases and broad titles that are designed more for the purpose of attracting sites than for the development of a good action programme (Rizvi, 2002).

Alliance politics is more about the ends than the means, and this makes it hard for the parties to agree on what to do. The difference between electoral alliances and governmental alliances is that electoral alliances are required to appease voters through the use of promises, catchy slogans, and enticing programmes rather than demonstrating the actual economic and social challenges and problems that the nation is currently facing, whereas governmental alliances are required to address a greater number of actual issues. During the process of electing a new government, the associated parties are tasked with catering to the varying requirements of the voters, but once they are in power, they must deal with a variety of obstacles. Because of this, the most extremist faction of the coalitions tends to dominate the election procedure, while the most moderate faction tends to prevail at the governing level (Pasha & Muhammad, 2016).

Many ethnic groups, each with their own social customs, may be found dispersed throughout the various regions of Pakistan. These communities make up Pakistan. These variations are seen to a considerably greater extent in the several provinces. It is challenging for a society that is multi-ethnic and multi-traditional to have two or three political parties at the same time. In addition, political parties are unable to advance and develop to the level of a national presence when military control is present. In Pakistan, political parties that assert they are on a national level but primarily advocate for the interests of a particular region do so under the guise of being on a national level. One example of this is the Pakistan People's Party (PPP), which claims to be on a national level but primarily advocates for Sindhi interests. Numerous other parties, such as the ANP in NWFP and the JWP in Baluchistan, act as representatives for their respective regions. Certain political parties are seen as the voice of an entire racial or linguistic group. One such party is the MQM, which is seen as the voice of Pakistan's Urdu-speaking population, particularly in Sindh.

In general, political parties do not adhere to any particular set of beliefs; rather, they get divided into factions as a result of differences of opinion among the leaders of the party. Another remarkable aspect of Pakistan's political system is that the majority of the country's political parties don't adhere to any one ideology. In general, they are neither leftists nor rightists, and they adhere to no particular worldview. Instead, the ideology of a political leader is followed by the party's ideology, and any change in the attitude of the leader results in a change in the ideology of the party. For instance, the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) was initially a socialist party; however, when Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was succeeded by his daughter Benazir Bhutto as party leader, the PPP's ideology transformed to reflect Benazir Bhutto's grasp of a wider range of political perspectives.

In a multiparty system, when different parties reflect different regional or ethnic identities, it is difficult for political parties to be consolidated into two or more parties at the same time. In this kind of situation, political parties ought to get together to establish political coalitions so that they can make their voices heard on the national level and create or promote a national agenda. They need to establish alliances within the parliament in order to be able to form a government and generate a powerful opposition. Because of these connections, they are able to influence national agendas and engage in national politics. Partnerships between political parties do not result in the parties' surrendering of their autonomy. They are not cut off from the rest of their community and continue to be in a position to fight for the rights and concerns of their province, ethnic group, or community.

After forming a coalition government, the extremist ally seeks refuge in support but does not take part in the coalition's activities. This allows them to keep the coalition alive, but in a diminished capacity. For instance, during the elections that took place in Pakistan in 1988 and 1990, an alliance known as the Islami Jamhuri Ittihad (IJI) remained powerful, despite the fact that a more

radical branch of the coalition known as the Jamiat-e-Islami was far more prominent in the election campaign. The other significant aspect was that Jamaat-e-Islami did not participate in government and did not have any ministries. This was a significant turning point. From her point of view, the Jamat would still be in opposition to the government even if they stayed with them in the process of building the administration. As the disparities between the two allies widened, the Jamat-e-Islami eventually severed its ties with the alliance government. In this regard, the Muslim League government's coalition with a party that adheres strictly to the left, the Awami National Party (ANP), grew even more powerful. The right-wing alliance was eventually disbanded. In spite of the fact that it began with the right-wing coalition legislative, the IJI ultimately formed an alliance with a party on the left, which is the ANP (Khan et al., 2008).

The reality of heterogeneous societies are distinct from those of civilizations devoid of ideological and ethno-social divisions. When compared to societies that are more homogenous, these kinds of societies present a unique set of challenges for democracies. Pakistan is a varied nation that is governed democratically and is home to a wide number of political parties that are active on the national, regional, and local levels of politics. Pakistan's population is also quite diversified. A fragmentation of the population into distinct ethnic groups and geographical areas is the primary barrier to the development of national political parties that are capable of representing the entire nation. Another factor that has impeded the country's political development is the sporadic imposition of authoritarian military control, which has led to the suspension of democratic government on multiple occasions. As a direct consequence of this, there were extended stretches of non-democratic rule, which thwarted the organic growth of political parties to the point where they could have otherwise achieved national prominence.

### 3. Conclusion

Pakistan adopted a multi-party system after gaining independence after a massive movement. Pakistan's complex political landscape created on a large scale as a result of philosophical and pluralistic thinking and cultural diversity. Even after democratic government was brought back in 1988, no single party had enough votes to form a government on its own. This led to alliance governments that fell apart. Pakistan's political environment is defined by power politics, institutional inequalities, and a never-ending struggle of political factions for control of the country, all of which contribute to the tension between political culture and power politics. Pakistan has been politically unstable for the past seventy years, and this is reflected in the country's history of politics. It was discovered that weak groupings and organized political parties created political alliances with one another. The dynamics of these alliances showed that they were transient efforts to achieve limited objections and did not create long-term stability. Almost all political alliances in Pakistan had trouble because they had different ideas and different ways of doing things. The inability to agree on a common strategy, the prevalence of self-interest over shared values, and the agitation nature of the conflict all reduced the effectiveness of these coalitions. Society supported most political combinations promoting democracy with different interests. Politicians were immature and frequently changed sides, betraying public trust. Alliance politics influence on Pakistan's political history is generally acknowledged, regardless of its legitimacy.

### References

- Ahmad, S. M., Yusafzai, F., & Bari, T. (2014). Assessment of heavy metals in surface water of River Panjkora Dir Lower, KPK Pakistan. *Journal of Biological and Environmental Sciences*, 5, 144-152.
- Feyyaz, M. (2016). The discourse and study of terrorism in decolonised states: the case of Pakistan. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 9(3), 455-477.
- Hamid, S. (2010). Impact of the 18th constitutional amendment on federation-provinces relations. *PILDAT Briefing Paper*, (39).
- Khan, H. (2005). *Constitutional and political history of Pakistan*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Khan, M. A., Iqtidar, H., & Khan, E. A. (2008). Allelopathic effects of Eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis* L.) on germination and seedling growth of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Pakistan Journal of Weed Science Research*, 14(1/2), 9-18.
- Pasha, M. I., & Muhammad, A. (2016). Religious Political Parties in Political Enclave of Pakistan (A Case Study of MMA 2002-2008). *Political Science*, 24(2), 238.
- Rizvi, H. A. (2002). Pakistan's strategic culture. *South Asia in 2020: future strategic balances and alliances*, 11, 305.
- Zafar, M. N., & Ali, A. A. (2018). MMA and Alliance Politics in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 38(2), 651-663.
- Zafar, S. M. (2004). *Dialogue: On the Political Chess Board*. Brite Books.