

FROM THEORY TO REALITY: UNDERSTANDING THE ROOTS OF PRAETORIANISM AND IT'S PERVASIVE IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN'S SOCIO-POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

MUHAMMAD IMRAN¹, DR. ASIA SAIF ALVI²

¹Ph.D. Scholar of Political Science, Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan, (imranuos47@gmail.com)

²Assistant Professor, Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

Abstract

The article explores the idea of praetorianism, a phenomenon marked by the military's excessive meddling in domestic politics, and its consequences for Pakistan. This theoretical investigation seeks to illuminate the complex forces that have shaped Pakistan's political landscape from its foundation by drawing on a wealth of literature on civil-military relations and historical case studies. The paper starts off with a thorough discussion of praetorianism, pointing out its salient characteristics and regional forms. It looks at how military establishments frequently become significant players, interfering with civil governance and undermining democratic procedures. The paper then dives into Pakistan's historical background, chronicling its ongoing battles with praetorianism. The military routinely intervenes in politics in Pakistan, ostensibly to protect national security or rectify perceived governance shortcomings. Pakistan has seen numerous military coups. The political stability, economic growth, and civil society of Pakistan have all been significantly and permanently impacted by these initiatives. The article also explores the effects of praetorianism on Pakistan's socioeconomic advancement, rule of law, and democratic consolidation. It looks at how the alternating periods of military and civilian administration have hampered the development of strong democratic institutions and weakened the notion of civic authority.

Key Words: praetorianism, Socio-Political Landscape, Implications for Pakistan

INTRODUCTION

When someone refers to a country as a praetorian state, what do we mean? What factors define a praetorian army? Is praetorianism characterized by an action, such as the execution of a coup d'état or the rule by uniformed officers? Or is it more structural and systemic, as seen in the everyday activities of an army and governmental processes?

Definition of Praetorianism

“A situation when the military class of a given society exercises independent political power within it by virtue of an actual or threatened use of military force” (Shpak, 2022, p. 625)

Praetorian Theory

The Praetorian theory, also referred to as the Praetorian Guard theory or the Iron Law of Oligarchy, is a political theory that emphasises the function of elite organisations and their impact on governance. The Praetorian Guard, an elite military corps in ancient Rome that had a tremendous impact on politics and the succession of emperors. (Bingham, 2013, p. 13). According to the Praetorian theory, authority tends to be concentrated in the hands of a limited number of elites in all political systems, whether they are democratic or dictatorial. These elites frequently possess resources, clout, and knowledge that give them an edge over the average populace. They gradually have a vested interest in keeping their position of authority, and they employ a variety of strategies to preserve and protect it. In a praetorian political system, the armed forces have the authority to overthrow or subjugate the civilian government as they see fit and are independent of and unaccountable to it. In comparison to their civilian counterparts, generals have higher levels of confidence in their skills and sense of patriotism. Senior officials also have institutional and private interests in the economy and control all levels of the government apparatus. The power of the



military to rule or play the role of kingmaker, to veto or influence legislation, and to make decisions that are independent of and unaccountable to civil workers is known as praetorianism. This idea is in line with H. Lasswell's classic notion of the "garrison state," according to which the military is compelled to pursue and maintain a dominant political role since its authority and prerogatives vastly outweigh those of civilian institutions and actors (Lasswell, 1941, p. 458). The military holds a sizable portion of authority in a praetorian political system and actively participates in political decision-making. Contrary to Lasswell's viewpoint, which holds that the military aspires to share political authority with civilians, praetorianism sees the military as the source of power that bestows authority on submissive citizens.

In the study of the relationship between society and the military, the concept of praetorianism has lost some of its prominence in modern research. However, researchers still draw upon the classical definition of praetorianism to analyze and understand the dynamics of military intervention in politics and its impact on political structures, governance, and democratization.

Praetorianism, as described by Drew Holland Kinney, refers to a situation where the military assumes a dominant role in political structures and institutions. This dominance often manifests through frequent interventions by the military to influence political processes and constitutional change. Furthermore, the military may have the ability to exert control over the political system or even exert outright domination (Kinney, 2019, p. 685). O'Donnell sees praetorianism because of the weak state capacity and political instability. He suggests that praetorianism arises when the military perceives itself as the only institution capable of maintaining order and stability in times of crisis or political breakdown (O'Donnell, 2010). Peter D. Feaver's view focuses on the interaction between civilian political leaders and the military. He suggests that praetorianism can be a product of civilian leaders' manipulation or reliance on the military for political purposes. This dynamic can erode civilian control over the armed forces and lead to praetorian tendencies (Feaver, 2003).

Naunihal Singh offers a different perspective, suggesting that praetorianism can sometimes be a rational response by the military to political instability and threats to its own interests. He argues that military intervention may occur when civilian politicians engage in corrupt or divisive behavior, and the military perceives itself as a guardian of the nation's interests (Singh, 2014, p. 67).

Another scholar, Renaud Egretreau, conceptualizes praetorianism as a range of political interventions carried out by armed forces. These interventions can vary from direct rules to more indirect forms of influence and policy control. Egretreau focuses on assessing the impact of such military interventions on political stability, governance, and the prospects for democratization (Egretreau, 2003, p. 225).

It's critical to recognise the various ways that the military might influence policy in order to comprehend the type and scope of military intervention. The military may openly seize power and take direct control of political institutions in a military coup. The use of force can, however, sometimes be subtle. The military's ability to manage the security services, sway public opinion, and wield economic and political power may be exploited in this indirect engagement. When this happens, the military makes an effort to have an impact on political decisions without taking direct control. 'Praetorian' is a phrase that is frequently used without definition. In other words, the praetorianism model does not exist in political science. Amos Perlmutter's book, "Egypt: The Praetorian State" (1974), is considered a significant contribution to the understanding of praetorianism.

In his work, Perlmutter identifies several key characteristics that define a praetorian state. These characteristics provide insights into the nature of praetorianism and help us understand its manifestations in different contexts.

Political Instability. Praetorian states are often marked by frequent political upheavals, such as coups, military interventions, or the threat of such actions. The military becomes deeply involved in the political affairs, often using its power to shape or even overthrow governments.

Interventionism. The military in praetorian states actively intervenes in civilian affairs and governance. It may exert influence over policy decisions, appointments, or even assume direct control of key institutions of power.



Political Role of the Military. In praetorian states, the military assumes a significant political role beyond its traditional defense responsibilities. It may act as a kingmaker, deciding who holds power, or directly assume political leadership.

Institutional Weakness. Praetorian states often have weak or ineffective civilian institutions, such as political parties, judiciary, or civil society organizations. This power vacuum allows the military to step in and assert its authority.

Rent-Seeking Behavior. The military in praetorian states often engages in rent-seeking behavior, seeking personal or institutional benefits, such as control over economic resources, monopolies, or corruption. This behavior helps consolidate and perpetuate military dominance.

National Security Justification. Praetorian states often justify military intervention or dominance by invoking the need for national security, stability, or protection from external threats. This rhetoric can legitimize the military's actions and maintain its influence (Perlmutter, 1974).

In the case of Pakistan, the country has experienced significant historical and social contexts that facilitated the rise and maintenance of praetorianism. The term "praetorian tendency" in Pakistan from 1958 to 2022 refers to a continuing pattern of military intervention and influence in the country's political affairs. These trends have shaped the direction of Pakistan's governance and influenced its democratic development and stability. Over seven decades, Pakistan has experienced several military coups, martial law, and periods of military supremacy, resulting in an imbalance of power between civilian and military institutions. The first significant Praetorian intervention occurred in 1958, when General Ayub Khan seized power in a military coup. General Ayub Khan's government, known as the "Decade of Development," implemented economic reforms but restricted political freedoms and sidelined civilian institutions. This set the stage for future military intervention and set a precedent for military intervention. After Ayub Khan's resignation in 1969, Pakistan experienced a brief period of civilian rule under President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. However, tensions between Bhutto and his army eventually led him to a new military coup by General Zia-ul-Haq in 1977. Zia ul-Haq's regime lasted for more than 10 years, ushering in an era of Islamization and authoritarian rule. During this period, the military expanded its influence over various state institutions and suppressed political opposition. After Zia-ul-Haq's death in a 1988 plane crash, Pakistan entered an era of unstable democracy. The civilian government struggled to assert its authority amid continued military influence. In 1999, General Pervez Musharraf seized power in a bloodless coup. Although General Musharraf's government initially enjoyed some popularity, it encountered significant resistance and protests, particularly from legal and political perspectives. When democracy was restored in 2008 following President Musharraf's resignation, the civilian government was led by the Pakistan People's Party (PPP). However, tensions between the military and civilian leadership continued. Military influence was evident in security and foreign policy matters, leading to concerns about the erosion of civilian control. Throughout this period, praetorian tendencies in Pakistan had a significant impact on the country. Their effects include a weakened civilian political class, limited institutional development, and repeated cycles of political instability. Concerns about national security, corruption, and civilian government inefficiency often justified military involvement. However, these interventions have perpetuated cycles of military rule and impeded the growth of democratic norms and institutions. It is important to note that the praetorianism model is a conceptual framework rather than a precise measurement or verification method. It helps scholars and analysts to understand and analyze patterns of military involvement in politics. However, due to the complex and context-specific nature of praetorianism, applying the military model to specific situations may require adaptation and refinement.

Under Praetorianism, the military has the ability to seize control of the government through coups and other means. Once in power, the Praetorian military retains the power to determine the level of civilian participation in the decision-making process. This ranges from complete control over all aspects of governance to a more limited role in which civilian participation is allowed but requires military approval. A central feature of the Praetorian system is that the military can appoint and approve civilian members of the government. The military's influence has extended beyond the initial appointment of civilian leaders and continues to exercise control and influence over the decisions



and actions of civilian leaders. Praetorian political systems often arise in countries where the military is highly influential or has a history of intervening in politics. The consequences of praetorianism can vary widely, ranging from stable military-led governments to more volatile and authoritarian regimes (Seločan, 2004, p. 14). The impact on democratic principles, civilian rights, and overall governance largely depends on the military's intentions, the level of civilian inclusion, and the checks and balances in place to limit military dominance.

According to this theory, the concentration of power occurs through a process known as "elite reproduction." Elite groups establish mechanisms to ensure their continuity and succession, creating self-perpetuating cycles. They can control access to political office, build patronage networks, and manipulate political and economic systems to their advantage (Hejdej Ijlic, 2000, p. 97). Nevertheless, praetorian theory serves as a careful framework for understanding power dynamics in political systems. It highlights the potential dangers of unchecked elite rule and emphasizes the importance of maintaining checks and balances, promoting transparency and encouraging public participation to prevent consolidation of power. . Why do we believe the military can effectively maintain the civilian political system? Here's why.

A) Professionalism

According to Samuel Huntington's concept of military professionalism in "The Soldier and the State," praetorian armies can indeed meet the criteria for professionalism. These criteria include a high level of corporateness, which refers to the organic unity within a bureaucratic organization and the presence of barriers to entry. Technical expertise in the management of violence is another crucial aspect of military professionalism (Huntington, 1957, p. 17). Huntington's extrapolation suggests that professional militaries are likely to obey civil authorities. In contrast, David Shambaugh argues that professional militaries are more prone to political intervention, implying a greater inclination to interfere in political affairs beyond their prescribed roles (Shambaugh, 2002).

Morris Janowitz's reaction to Huntington's ideas was that professionalism in the military could undermine civilian control. According to Janowitz, a cohesive and united military is more likely to intervene in politics, making it harder for civilians to maintain authority and control over the armed forces. (Janowitz, 1968, p. 36). Samuel Finer, in opposition to Huntington, argued that military professionalism could increase the propensity for political interference. He believed that a highly professional military, characterized by a strong sense of identity, expertise, and organizational autonomy, might be more inclined to involve itself in politics. According to Finer, military professionals possess specialized knowledge and skills that can provide them with a sense of superiority and a belief that they know what is best for the nation. This confidence, combined with their hierarchical structure and access to weapons, can lead them to view themselves as custodians of national security and guardians of the state's interests (Finer, 1962). In this context, military personnel may believe that they have a duty to intervene in political matters to protect what they see as the well-being of the nation. It is important to note that Finer's argument does not suggest that military expertise necessarily leads to political interference. Rather, he emphasized the potential risks associated with a highly professional military and maintaining effective civilian oversight mechanisms to protect democracy and maintain the primacy of elected officials in decision-making. It emphasizes the importance of Furthermore, the military's professional autonomy can lead to local organizational interests that promote paternalism. The Praetorian approach may be more in line with those who argue that the threat of war can strengthen rather than diminish civil authority. After the 1971 war with India, Pakistan's military moved to a more passive role, refraining from extensive interference in politics and governance.

B) Developed Political Culture

The next paradigm explaining military involvement in politics emphasizes the significance of a "developed political culture." In this view, the likelihood of military intervention is diminished when there is an effective and legitimate civilian government. The military only seeks political power when the civilian institutions fail to govern effectively or meet the people's needs (Diamond L. , 2016). It is difficult to analyze political culture, which encompasses the dominant ideas, attitudes, values, ideals, sentiments, and assessments about the political system and individual roles within it (Dawood,

2014, p. 290). The question arises, does developed political culture precede military non-intervention, or is non-intervention a precondition for a developed political culture? But the answer is, in general, a developed political culture is more likely to precede military non-intervention. A society with a mature and inclusive political culture tends to prioritize diplomacy, conflict resolution, and respect for international norms (Thomsen, 2006, p. 10). This mindset fosters a greater inclination towards non-intervention, as it values peaceful resolutions and avoids military interventions. However, it is important to note that non-intervention can also serve as a precondition for the development of a political culture, as staying out of external conflicts allows a society to focus on internal governance and democratic processes. Ultimately, the interplay between these factors is nuanced and contingent on specific historical, cultural, and geopolitical circumstances.

The regimes of Pakistani Presidents Musharraf and Zia are often compared to that of President Ayub Khan due to their praetorian characteristics. This dominance is reflected in the fact that military generals hold important positions in government and civilian leaders are dependent on military support. In Pakistan, all three presidents, Musharraf, Zia, and Ayub, were from the officer corps and had military backgrounds. They had a deep understanding of military structures and maintained close ties with the military, and this commonality contributed to their praetorian character. This military background allowed them to control the political system and maintain a firm grip on power. During the reigns of Pakistan's Prime Ministers Mohammad Khan Junejo and Zafarullah Khan Jamali, civilian leaders relied heavily on military support to secure and maintain their positions of power. This dependence on the military strengthened the pro-official nature of these regimes, where the military had great influence over political affairs. Because the president was the highest military position in the praetorian state, he played an important role in consolidating military supremacy within the political system. This meant that the position of president allowed him to take control of the military and use it as a means of ensuring his own governance, further strengthening the military's role in politics.

Long-Term Consequences of Military Intervention and Praetorian Tendencies

Destabilization and Conflict Proliferation Military interventions can escalate conflicts and exacerbate existing tensions, leading to prolonged instability. The use of force may create power vacuums, allowing extremist groups to rise and sparking civil wars or regional conflicts. These conflicts can last for years or even decades, leading to a cycle of violence and humanitarian crises.

Negative Impact on Civilian Population Military interventions often result in civilian casualties and infrastructural damage. The suffering of civilian populations can breed resentment towards the intervening country, fuelling anti-foreign sentiments and causing long-lasting animosity.

Economic Implications Military interventions are costly endeavours that divert significant financial resources away from domestic priorities. Funding wars can lead to increased national debt, economic stagnation, and reduced social spending, affecting education, healthcare, and infrastructure development.

Radicalization and Terrorism Prolonged military interventions may radicalize certain segments of the population in the targeted country. The resentment towards foreign forces and perceived interference can motivate individuals to join extremist groups and engage in acts of terrorism, both locally and internationally.

Erosion of International Norms Frequent military interventions can undermine the norms of sovereignty and non-interference in the affairs of other states. This erosion may encourage other nations to resort to military force rather than diplomatic solutions to address disputes, leading to a less stable and more confrontational global environment.

Weak Civilian Institutions A history of military interventions can weaken civilian institutions and erode the separation of powers. The military may gain more influence in decision-making processes, leading to a decline in democratic accountability and oversight.

Cult of Personality Praetorian tendencies may lead to the emergence of strongman leaders who prioritize military interests over the rule of law and democratic governance. Such leaders may rely on the military to suppress dissent and consolidate their power. The "Cult of Personality" phenomenon may give rise to strongman leaders like Nicolae Ceaușescu of Romania, who

prioritized military interests, suppressed dissent, and undermined democratic governance. He utilized the military to consolidate power, leading to an authoritarian regime that violated the rule of law and human rights (Fischer, 1983, p. 45).

Coup D'état Risk Praetorian tendencies can make the military more likely to view itself as the guardian of the nation, leading to an increased risk of coups d'état to remove civilian leadership deemed unfit or corrupt.

Suppression of Civil Liberties In praetorian states, civil liberties and human rights may be compromised in the name of maintaining order and security. Political opposition and media freedom may be curtailed, further undermining democratic principles.

Regional and Global Instability A nation with praetorian tendencies may project its influence beyond its borders, potentially disrupting regional and global stability through aggressive foreign policy decisions or military actions.

Methods of Praetorian Setting

A) Foundational Praetorian Coup

Following a coup d'état, civilian political actors are frequently ousted due to perceived incompetence and infighting, resulting in a power vacuum. The military then steps in and establishes a new political system with its own set of regulations (Lasswell, 1941, p. 145). As Morris Janowitz argued, the garrison state is a new pattern of coalition in which military groups directly and indirectly wield unprecedented amounts of political and administrative power (Janowitz, 1968, p. 113). In this scenario, the military becomes the central source of legitimacy for the government and its officials. This created a system known as an "officer's republic" in which military personnel took control and ran the country. Such transitions reflect a perceived need for stability and a lack of trust in civilian politicians. According to Samuel P. Huntington, in a "praetorian society" all members of the community reject the legitimacy of political institutions and authority. In this context, the military plays an important role as the only recognized arbiter between political actors. It can be seen as a proxy for imaginary social forces that represent sources of stability and potential power brokers in the absence of established political institutions (Huntington, 1957, p. 29).

What researchers envisioned as a "basic Praetorian coup" referred to a coup that went beyond a mere transfer of power. These coups aim to dissolve political parties, limit civil society organizations, suppress popular protests, and restrict political participation. These lead to the exclusion of political parties and civil society from the electoral process, and at the same time enable limited and unfair elections. The military often plays an important role, influencing the drafting of new constitutions that strengthen its privileged position within the regime. These coups emphasize social demobilization and political restructuring, systematically undermining democratic principles and freedoms.

The 1958 coup d'état in Pakistan, led by General Ayub Khan, can indeed be classified as a foundational praetorian coup. This type of coup refers to military interventions that not only overthrow the existing government but also dismantle democratic institutions, such as parliament, political parties, and social movements, establishing a new order dominated by the military. The coup effectively ended Pakistan's nascent democratic system, which had struggled to establish itself since independence in 1947 (Nawaz, 2008, p. 131).

B) Restorative Military Coup

A restorative military coup is a situation in which a country's military overthrows an existing government with the aim of restoring order, stability, and often the rule of law. The military's capacity to efficiently handle the transition period, hand over power to a legitimate civilian government, and guarantee a peaceful restoration to democratic governance will be crucial to the Restoration coup's success. By deposing the Pakistan People Party (PPP), the coup of 1977 in Pakistan, sometimes known as a restorative coup, sought to re-establish military control over politics. Despite being formally outlawed, the PPP was effectively marginalised by the coup and prevented from running in parliamentary elections (Rizvi, 2013, p. 239). Moreover, Pakistan had implemented highly restrictive laws on the freedoms of assembly and speech since the initial coup in 1958 (Siddiq, 2007, p. 19). The rights of citizens to openly express their thoughts and assemble were also restricted by



these regulations, which further restricted political engagement. As a result, the nation's democratic institutions and civil rights were severely restricted.

Preventing Praetorian Tendencies

Maintaining a political atmosphere, supporting democratic ideals, and retaining civilian control over the armed services all depend on preventing or minimising praetorian inclinations in social and military organisations. The importance of institutional planning and legal frameworks in averting Praetorianism was emphasised by Alfred Stepan. Putting a focus on democratic institutions, civilian governance, and checks and balances, he contended, could help lessen praetorian inclinations (Stepen, 2018, p. 155). Addressing this issue requires a combination of institutional, cultural, and societal measures to safeguard against the undue influence of the military in politics. Here are some potential strategies,

Strong civilian oversight Establishing robust civilian oversight mechanisms is crucial to ensure that military actions and decisions remain within the framework of civilian authority. This includes effective parliamentary committees, independent defense and security reviews, and clear legal regulations defining the limits of military involvement in politics.

Professional military education Promote professional military education that emphasizes the importance of the military's role in defending the constitution and the nation, rather than getting involved in domestic politics. Training should focus on building a strong sense of duty, loyalty to the country, and adherence to democratic values.

Strong civilian-military relations Foster healthy civilian-military relations by encouraging regular communication, transparency, and trust-building measures. Civilian leaders should be receptive to military advice while also clearly articulating their expectations and red lines.

Non-politicization of the military Ensure that the military remains apolitical and non-partisan. This can be achieved by strictly enforcing laws that prohibit military personnel from engaging in political activities while in service and for a reasonable period after retirement.

Diverse recruitment and leadership Encourage diversity within the military ranks, promoting representation from different ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Diverse leadership can help mitigate the risk of the military becoming a narrow interest group with political ambitions.

Independent judiciary Strengthen the independence of the judiciary to serve as a check on any unconstitutional military actions. The judiciary should be empowered to review military decisions and hold the military accountable for any unconstitutional acts.

Media freedom and civil society engagement Uphold media freedom and the right of civil society organizations to monitor and criticize military actions. A free press and engaged civil society can play a crucial role in exposing any attempts by the military to undermine democratic processes.

Professional codes of conduct Develop and enforce stringent professional codes of conduct for military personnel, emphasizing loyalty to the constitution and respect for civilian authority.

International cooperation and military exchanges Engage in military exchanges and cooperation with democratic nations, promoting shared values and best practices in upholding civilian control over the military.

Economic reforms Address socioeconomic disparities within society, as extreme economic inequality can exacerbate political tensions and tempt the military to intervene in politics.

Constitutional reforms Periodically review and update the constitution to ensure its relevance and effectiveness in guarding against praetorian tendencies. Consider constitutional clauses that explicitly uphold civilian supremacy and democratic governance.

The Praetorian Army, throughout history, has encountered political regimes ranging from individualist/one-party patrimonial dictatorships such as the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) to individualist charisma illustrated by Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. They have also experienced instances of competitive authoritarianism, such as during the ill-fated 1977 election. However, their primary role remains intact: defending against elite civilian actors. The Praetorian Army is ready to intervene if necessary, ensuring stability and protecting its position in the political landscape. These situations, in the terminology of this study, are called

- A) the dangerous emergence of a potentially hegemonic party and



B) a challenge to the pillars of the praetorian system

The aforementioned types are used by praetorian armies to adapt to these varied political structures. These categories describe the specific political role that a praetorian army chooses to perform at any given time.

Pros and Cons of Praetorianism

However, when discussing the pros and cons of praetorianism in modern society, it is important to note that this concept is generally seen in a negative light. Praetorianism tends to undermine democratic principles and can lead to the concentration of power in the hands of a few. Nevertheless, let's explore the potential pros and cons:

Pros of Praetorianism

Efficient Decision-Making In some cases, a centralized power structure can lead to swift decision-making processes and the ability to implement policies without significant delays or opposition.

Stability and Order Praetorianism can provide a sense of stability and order in society, especially in times of crisis or uncertainty. When power is concentrated, it becomes easier to enforce policies and maintain control.

Cons of Praetorianism

Lack of Accountability Praetorianism often results in a lack of accountability and transparency. Those in power may not be held responsible for their actions, leading to corruption, abuse of power, and a disregard for the rights and needs of the general population.

Suppression of Dissent A praetorian system can stifle dissenting voices and discourage diverse opinions. This can lead to a lack of innovation, creativity, and the exclusion of minority perspectives, ultimately hindering social progress.

Inequality and Social Division Praetorianism can exacerbate existing social inequalities and create a hierarchical society with limited social mobility. The concentration of power in the hands of a few can lead to the exploitation of marginalized groups and a lack of opportunities for others.

Vulnerability to Authoritarianism Praetorianism lays the groundwork for potential authoritarian rule. When power is consolidated in a select group, it becomes easier for autocratic leaders to emerge and manipulate the system to maintain their control, eroding democratic principles.

Loss of Civic Engagement Praetorianism can result in disillusionment and apathy among citizens. When people feel that their voices and opinions are disregarded or marginalized, they may disengage from civic participation, leading to a weakened democracy.

It is important to note that the pros mentioned above are highly contextual and can vary based on specific circumstances. However, the cons generally highlight the potential risks and negative consequences associated with praetorianism in society. It is generally preferred to promote inclusive, democratic systems that ensure accountability, transparency, and the participation of all members of society.

Civil-Military Relations (CMR) Under Praetorian Setting

Civil-Military Relations (CMR) refers to the complex interactions and dynamics between the civilian government and the military establishment within a given political system (Welch J. M., 1998, p. 7).

A "praetorian setting" refers to a political and societal environment in which the military establishment wields disproportionate influence over the government, often leading to a distorted civil-military dynamic. In modern context, a praetorian setting signifies a situation where the military's authority and involvement extend beyond its designated security and defense roles, encroaching upon civilian governance and decision-making processes.

The military's role, on the other hand, is to safeguard the nation's security within the boundaries set by these civilian leaders. However, in a praetorian setting, this equilibrium is disrupted.

The Praetorian framework departs from ideal equilibrium in a number of significant ways. First, historical reasons like previous military coups or powerful military commanders, which can feed the perception that the military holds the key to stability, may be to blame for the military's excessive dominance. Because of this impression, civilians may give the military more authority in return for assurances of law and order and security. Second, military institutions have the ability to amass financial resources through either direct economic sector control or dishonest business practises. Due



to its financial clout, the military is able to influence civilian institutions and keep its hold on power after it has fulfilled its mandate. An unbalanced situation in a praetorian context is fuelled by a combination of political opportunism, economic interests, and insecurity. Military leaders may view civilian institutions as being inefficient or corrupt, which would justify their actions as being necessary for the welfare of the country. Gains in economic standing can help them maintain their position, while divided politics present chances for military leadership to increase their hold on power. To counter the emergence of a praetorian setting and restore a healthy civil-military balance, several measures are crucial. Strengthening civilian institutions, promoting transparency and accountability, and ensuring a robust system of checks and balances can reduce the appeal of military intervention. Additionally, nurturing a professional and apolitical military culture is vital to prevent the military from overstepping its bounds.

Such perceptions may lead governments to strengthen security forces to maintain control and stability, inadvertently increasing the likelihood of military intervention in political affairs. Additionally, alliances can influence praetorianism by providing military and political support to governments, thereby enabling authoritarian practices under the guise of security cooperation.

The history of Pakistan has been marked by a complex relationship between its civilian authorities and the military. The initial attempts at civilian control of the military during the country's transition to democracy in the 1960s were indeed flawed and did not meet the conditions for objective and democratic control (Rizvi, 2013). The 1962 constitution, which was short-lived but significant in shaping civil-military relations, granted the military substantial authority and autonomy that hindered civilian oversight. Under the 1962 constitution, the military retained several privileges that undermined civilian control. Secondly, the military's budget was insulated from legislative inspection, meaning that civilian authorities had limited oversight over defense spending. Furthermore, the 1962 constitution explicitly prohibited civilians from serving as defense minister, thereby ensuring that the military retained control over this critical portfolio (Rashid, 1983, p. 41).

The military might influence national security policy by maintaining the defence ministry under its control, thus solidifying its authority. These constitutional clauses strengthened the military's power and constrained civilian authority over the military system. Following a very successful election campaign, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) took office in 1971, which alarmed the military about a possible threat to their hegemony. Bhutto tried to take control of the military by appointing officer who he thought would be more supportive of his government's goals. (Shahid Javed Burki, 1980, p. 71). This coup exposed Pakistan's unequal civil-military bonds, with the military turning to arbitrary rule when its privileges and autonomy were in jeopardy. The military's participation proved its authority as a "praetorian institution," able to overthrow civil authority in order to further its own objectives. Because of the strained civil-military ties and the military's entrenched power, achieving effective civilian control required a more deliberate and sophisticated approach. The new civilian authorities should have been acutely aware of these dynamics and worked towards building consensus and cooperation with the military while safeguarding democratic principles.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the idea of praetorianism, which has its roots in Roman history, has unmistakably materialised in Pakistan's socio-political landscape, having a significant influence on the country's governance, stability, and democratic aspirations. We have discussed in this debate how a complex interaction of historical, institutional, and societal variables has formed this occurrence. Praetorianism has emerged as a result of Pakistan's historical legacy of military interference in politics. Early military takeovers, including those by General Ayub Khan in 1958 and General Zia-ul-Haq in 1977, established a precedent for the military's active participation in national politics. In addition to weakening democratic institutions, these events also helped to normalise military rule as a tool for political sway. Additionally, the Praetorian ethos has persisted as a result of the military's institutionalisation as a significant political force in Pakistan. The military has a considerable impact on economic, social, and even foreign policy decisions in addition to dominating the government. The

expansion of civilian institutions has been hampered by the military's concentration of power, and a climate of political instability has been sustained as a result. Praetorianism's effects on Pakistan are wide-ranging and pervasive. Because civilian officials are constantly worried about military interference, it has resulted in a fragile democracy. This has slowed down the growth of efficient government, economic development, and social cohesiveness. Furthermore, Pakistan's ongoing periods of military control and political instability have damaged its reputation internationally. Pakistan needs to start a democratic consolidation path in order to deal with these difficulties. In order to do this, civil institutions must be strengthened, the rule of law must be upheld, and a political climate that upholds democratic values must be promoted. Both civilian and military leaders must cooperate for the sake of the country and with a commitment to defending democratic principles.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aziz, S. (2009). *Between Deams And Reallity: Some Milstones In Pakistan'history*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [2] Bingham, S. (2013). *The Praetorian Guard A History Of Rome's Elite Special Forces*. New York: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd.
- [3] Croissant, A. (2011). *Civilian Control Over The Military In East Asia*. Eai Fellows Program Working Paper Series No. 31, 1-64.
- [4] Dawood, M. (2014). *The Causes Of Military Interventions In Politics: A Case Study Of Pakistan And Bangladesh*. *European Scientific Journal /Special/ Edition Issn: 1857 - 7881 (Print) E - Issn 1857- 7431*, 283-294.
- [5] Diamond, L. (2016). *In Search Of Democracy*. New York: Routledge.
- [6] Egreteau, R. (2003). *Wooing The General: India's New Burma Policy* . New Delhi: Authors Press.
- [7] El-Shimy, Y. (2016). *A Model Of Praetorian States*. *Mei Working Paper 2016-01*, 1-34.
- [8] Feaver, P. D. (2003). *Armed Servants Agency, Oversight And Civil Military Relations*. London: Harvard University Press.
- [9] Ferrell, B. (2014). *Avoiding Praetorian Societies: Focusing U.S. Strategy On Political Development*. Carlisle: United State Army War College.
- [10] Finer, S. E. (1962). *The Man On The Horseback The Role Of Military In Politics* . London: Pall Mall Press Limited.
- [11] Fischer, M. E. (1983). *Nicolae Ceaușescu And The Romanian Political Leadership: Nationalization And Personalization Of Powe R. National Council For Soviet And East European Research* , 1-74.
- [12] Hejdej Ijlic, A. R. (2000). *From Elite Production To Elite Adoption The Dynamics Of Changing In Personal Network Of Slovenian Elites* . *Dr.Vol.Xvi* 32-33, 95-111.
- [13] Huntington, S. P. (1957). *The Soldier And The State* . Cambridge: The Belknap Press.
- [14] Janowitz, M. (1968). *The Professional Soldier*. Chicago : The University Of Chicago Press.
- [15] Kinney, D. H. (2019). *Politicians At Arms: Civilian Recruitment Of Soldiers For Middle East Coups*. *Armed Forces & Society*, 681-701.
- [16] Lasswell, H. D. (1941). *The Garrison State*. *American Journal Of Sociology*.
- [17] Luckham, A. R. (1971). *A Comparative Typology Of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [18] Macdonald, M. T. (2010). *Corruption And The Military In Politics: Theory And Evidence From Around The World*. *Department Of Economics*, 10.
- [19] Menchik, J. (2017). *The Constructivist Approach To Religion And World Politics*. *Comparative Politics* , 561-581.
- [20] Mietzner, M. (2008). *Military Politics, Islam And The State In Indonesia: From Turbulent Transition To Democratic Consolidation*. Singapore: Utopia Press Pte Ltd.
- [21] Nawaz, S. (2008). *Crossed Swords: Pakistan Its Army And The Wars Within*. New York: Oxford University Press .
- [22] Nordlinger, E. A. (1995). *Isolationism Reconfigured Amrican Foreign Policy For A New Century*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- [23] O'donnell, G. (2010). *Democy, Agency And The State*. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press .
- [24] Perlmutter, A. (1974). *Egypt The Praetorian State* . New Jersey : New Brunswick.
- [25] Rashid, H. G. (1983). *Pakistan: The Roots Of Dictatorship The Political Economy Of A Praetorean State* . London : Zed Press.



- [26] Rizvi, H. A. (2013). *The Military And Politics In Pakistan 1947-1997*. Lahore : Sang E Meel Publications
- [27] Schmidt, T. A. (2022). *Praetorian Propencies* . Army War College , 1-8.
- [28] Schmitt, C. (2007). *The Concept Of The Political*. London: University Of Chicago Press.
- [29] Selochan, R. M. (2004). *The Military And Democracy In Asia And The Pacific*. Canberra: Anu E Press.
- [30] Shahid Javed Burki. (1980). *Pakistan Under Bhutto 1971-77*. London: The Macmilan Press.
- [31] Shaman, B. (2019). *Pakistan's Internal Security Challenges And The Army's Ability To Overcome Them*. New Delhi: Vij Books India Pvt Ltd.
- [32] Shambaugh, D. (2002). *Modernizing China's Military Progress, Problems, And Prospects*. California: University Of California Press.
- [33] Shpak, V. (2022). *Indirect Praetorianism: The Case Of Turkey's Military*. *Scientific Journal Of The Military University Of Land Forces* Issn: 2544-7122 2022, Volume 54, Number 4(206), Pages 624-638, 624-638.
- [34] Siddiqa, A. (2007). *Inside Pakistan Military Economy* . New York: Oxford University Press .
- [35] Singh, N. (2014). *Seizing Power: The Strategic Logic Of Military Coups*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- [36] Stepen, A. (2018). *Democratic Transition In The Muslim World* . New York: Columbia University Press.
- [37] Thomsen, G. H. (2006). *Politics, Culture And Self East Asian And North European Attitude*. Copenhagen: Nias Press.
- [38] Topih, W. J. (2018). *Pakistan The Taliban, Al Qaeda, And The Rise Of Terrorism*. California: Praeger Security International.
- [39] Welch, J. M. (1998). *Civil-Military Relations Usaid's Role*. *Center For Democracy And Governance*, 1-47.
- [40] Zerba, S. H. (2019). *Civil-Military Relations In Authoritarian Regimes* . Arizona State University, 1-236.