

*Fakhr-ul-Islam**
*Farmanullah***

Civil Society and Democracy in Pakistan

Abstract

The role of civil society cannot be ignored in the development of a country in the modern era. Civil society in democratic arena compels the undemocratic elements to follow democratic culture and tradition in a given society. The civil society keeps a vigilant watch on the activities of legislature, executive and judiciary. It criticizes any organ of the government which misuses its power or violates the constitution or meddles with the activities of other organ of government.

In Pakistan the role of civil society is also significant in the promotion of democracy in Pakistan. This paper, apart from the conceptual clarification of civil society and democracy, will throw a light that how civil society played its role in the promotion of democratic culture and tradition in Pakistan.

Keywords: Civil Society, Pakistan, Democracy, government.

Introduction

Civil society has become an important concept in the social sciences, and has emerged as a central topic among policymakers and practitioners alike. With such prominence comes a need for clearer understanding, better information and ways to position civil society and its various dimensions in the context of economy, polity and society at large. The notion of civil society reemerged in political and sociological theories during transitions from authoritarian rule toward more liberal democratic governments in Eastern and Central Europe, South America, and, recently, Asia and Africa. Many struggles against communist and military dictatorships have revived the concept of civil society.

* Prof. DR. Fakhar ul Islam, Director, Pakistan Study Center, University of Peshawar.

** Farmanullah, Pakistan Study Center, University of Peshawar.

A phenomenon as complex and multifaceted as civil society invites a variety of definitions and attempts to capture its "conceptual essence". Even though the concept of civil society has become prominent in the social sciences, it remains somewhat unclear and even contested in terms of its actual meanings and uses. Ultimately, it may not be possible to develop a standard definition of civil society that would apply equally well to different settings. By contrast, an approach that views any conceptual definition as part, and indeed the outcome, of ongoing empirical efforts to understand civil society appears as the more fruitful strategy. In this sense, any definition of civil society will evolve over time, and it neither can be regarded as given nor seen as something that can be imposed.

In characterizing the difficulties in defining civil society, some quote U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart's remark about obscenity: "I know it when I see it." Some further believe that fundamental differences exist between civil society in the developed and the developing world. Others contend that civil society varies at the conceptual level: because it is historically bounded, different societies have different concepts. Commentators have noted the vagueness of the terminology and the variations in what it connotes for different thinkers. The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) has tried to capture the "conceptual essence" of civil society, yet LSE's definition, like everyone else's, remains contentious.

Many different definitions of civil society exist, and there is little agreement on its precise meaning, though much overlap exists among core conceptual components. While civil society is a somewhat contested concept, definitions typically vary in the emphasis they put on some characteristics of civil society over others; some definitions primarily focus on aspects of state power, politics and individual freedom, and others more on economic functions and notions of social capital and cohesion. Nonetheless, most analysts would probably agree with the statement that civil society is the sum of institutions, organizations, and individuals located among the family, the state and the market, in which people associate voluntarily to advance common interests.

Civil society is primarily about the role of both the state and the market relative to that of citizens and the society they constitute. The intellectual history of the term is closely intertwined with the notion of citizenship, the limits of state power, and the foundation as well as the regulation of market economies. The prevailing modern view sees civil society as a sphere located between state and market--a buffer zone

strong enough to keep both state and market in check, thereby preventing each from becoming too powerful and dominating. In the words of Ernest Gellner, civil society is the set of "institutions, which is strong enough to counterbalance the state, and, whilst not preventing the state from fulfilling its role of keeper of peace and arbitrator between major interests, can, nevertheless, prevent the state from dominating and atomizing the rest of society." Civil society is not a singular, monolithic, separate entity, but a sphere constituted in relation to both state and market, and indeed permeating both.

Civil society is self-organization of society outside the stricter realms of state power and market interests. For Jurgen Habermas, "civil society is made up of more or less spontaneously created associations, organizations and movements, which find, take up, condense and amplify the resonance of social problems in private life, and pass it on to the political realm or public sphere". Dahrendorf sees the concept of civil society as part of a classical liberal tradition, and characterized by the existence of autonomous organizations that are neither state-run nor otherwise directed from the centre of political power.

Nonetheless, a working definition is needed for methodological development and empirical measurement. We would suggest the following formulation as the initial working or operational definition:

"Civil society is the sphere of institutions, organizations and individuals located among the family, the state and the market, in which people associate voluntarily to advance common interests."

This operational definition does not attempt to define all aspects of civil society, nor does it necessarily fit different perspectives and approaches equally well. What the definition does, however, is to list elements and components that most attempts to define civil society would identify as essential.

The operational definition of civil society includes separate component parts: institutions, organizations and individuals, which can also be depicted visually.

Institutions: Under this category you will find the rule of law, are structural patterns that address and regulate specific areas or tasks. For example, an institution for political decision-making would be democracy, although there are different ways in which democratic decision-making can be organized, as is the case for parliamentary or presidential democracies. In the case of justice, the institution would be the legal system and the rule of law; in the case of social inclusion, a

central institution would be citizenship; for reproduction, the family; and for information and communication needs, the media.

Organizations: These would be voluntary associations, and non-governmental or non-profit organizations, social movements, networks and informal groups. These organizations make up the infrastructure of civil society; they are the vehicles and forums for social participation, "voice" processes, the expression of values and preferences, and service provision.

Individuals: Citizens and participants in civil society generally. This would include people's activities in civil society such as membership, volunteering, organising events, or supporting specific causes; people's values, attitudes, preferences and expectations; and people's skills and in terms governance, management and leadership.

As an analytic, conceptual term, civil society is very abstract, even somewhat vague, and certainly highly complex, seemingly resistant to any precise measurement. Yet as an operational definition, it refers to the activities, values and other key characteristics of institutions, organisations and individuals located among the market, the state and the family.

Civil society includes multiple units, each with its own range of dimensions and characteristics. For each unit (institutions, organisations, individuals), we would be interested in their basic structural features, the values the units represent, the activities they carry out, and the contributions they make. For example, an institution like the media has institutional as well as organisational and individualistic characteristics attached to it.

Some social scientists have defined civil society by giving the following three characteristics.

1. First, it operates under the rule of law, not the state of nature.
2. Second, civil society lies between the state and the market, where state interests and market interests are contested. Civil society thus stands in opposition to the market as well as to the state, and civil society is also influenced by both forces. When a variety of civil society organizations emerge, some may be arms of the market, such as business associations and entrepreneur organizations; others may be arms of the state, such as government-owned non-governmental organizations (GONGO). Salamon terms this space between the state and the market the third sector.

3. Third, voluntary associative relations dominate civil society. As a consequence, civil society is a sphere of free public debate. Civil society is thus more than associations, because any association might be influenced by the market or the state. Rather, the members of civil society organizations hold diverse interests. As a result, civil society's pluralism is maintained.

What is not included in civil society?

Civil society is not synonymous with the more general term 'society'. A society includes economy, market, judiciary, family and other institutions as well as civil society; in other words, civil society is part of the larger society. It is not identical to the non-profit sector, or other terms like third, voluntary or NGO sectors, however defined. The third sector and civil society overlap in terms of organisations, and it would be fair to say that civil society includes large parts of the third sector, even though some non-profit organisations can be close to market firms or state agencies in constitution and behaviour. It does not include the market and market firms, even though some earlier theorists and neo-liberal thinkers see the market economy and its self-organising and self-regulating capacity as an essential component of "non-state" society. What is more, some institutions like the media, while essentially based on market organisations, nonetheless have significant civil society elements.

Further, civil society does not include the state and public agencies even though, through its judiciary and regulatory function, the state upholds the rule of law, social order and other essential components of society and civility. However, aspects of the legal system and specific laws dealing with civil society institutions and organisations can be included. And finally, it does not include the family. Cross-cultural family forms vary significantly and tend to imply different demarcation lines between the private sphere of the family however defined and the public sphere of the wider society. In either case, the family as an organisational unit (e.g., households, extended family systems, dynasties) will be excluded from the nexus.

Origin of Civil Society

As a concept, civil society is essentially an intellectual product of eighteenth-century Europe, in which citizens sought to define their place in society independent of the aristocratic state at a time when the certainty of a status-based social order began to suffer irreversible decline. The early theorists of civil society welcomed these changes. For Adam Smith, trade and commerce among private citizens created

not only wealth but also invisible connections among people--the bonds of trust and social capital in today's terminology. Others like John Locke and Alexis de Tocqueville saw civil society less in relation to the market but more in political terms and emphasised the importance of democratic association in everyday life as a base of a functioning polity. Friedrich Hegel sounded a more cautionary note about the self-organising and self-regulatory capacity of civil society, and emphasised the need of the state to regulate society. For Hegel, state and civil society depend on each other, yet their relation is full of tensions and requires a complicated balancing act. The role of the state relative to civil society was also emphasised in the writings of Montesquieu, von Stein, and other thinkers, who saw the rule of law as the essence of state-society and society-market relations.

In the twentieth century, civil society became associated with notions of civility, popular participation and civic mindedness (Verba), the public sphere (Jurgen Habermas), social capital (George Putnam), culture (Antonio Gramsci) and community (Amitai Etzioni). The various concepts and approaches emphasise different aspects or elements of civil society: values and norms like tolerance in the case of civility; the role of the media and the intellectual; the connections among people and the trust they have in each other; the moral dimensions communities create and need; and the extent to which people constitute a common public space through participation and civic engagement.

The complexity of civil society and the many relations and intersections it has with the economy, the state and institutions like the family, the media or culture, make it not only possible but almost necessary to examine the concepts from different perspectives and orientations. Some analysts adopt an abstract, systemic view and see civil society as a macro-sociological attribute of societies, particular in the way state and society relate to each other. Others take on a more individualistic orientation and emphasise the notions of individual agency, citizenship, values and participation, using econometric and social network approaches in analysing civil society. There is also an institutional approach to study civil society by looking at the size, scope and structure of organisations and associations, and the functions they perform. Note that the different perspectives of civil society are not necessarily contradictory, nor are the various approaches to understanding it necessarily rival; to the contrary, they are often complementary and differ in emphasis, explanatory focus and policy implication rather than in principle.

Measurable Characteristics Of Civil Society

Civil society has nine measurable characteristics.

The Commons

Civil society is advanced when citizens share a social right of access to the commonwealth of resources produced, used, and exchanged through natural and social economies in a community and through a society. Access, in this context, includes the abilities both to contribute to the resources and to benefit from them. Broad, community-based civic engagement in economic activities occurs in the arena of what is historically called “the Commons,” as in the Greek agora and the English market. As citizens participate in the open exchange of commonwealth resources, they can form and strengthen social connections and networks with others.

Office

Civil society is advanced when citizens can exercise their civic duty of self-governance by participating in political structures that exhibit decentralized power and authority. Community-based civic engagement in political governance exists when community members have the opportunity to hold positions or “offices” of public decision-making and leadership.

Associations

Civil society is advanced when citizens can openly and voluntarily participate in diverse social affiliations, groups, networks, and structures for self-governance and social transformation. “Association” refers to those social places where people gather and interact with others to exchange ideas, offer support, and receive a sense of belonging. Community-based civic engagement in systems of social exchange exists when diverse social groups and gatherings are present and permeable.

Trusteeship

Civil society is advanced when citizens hold decision-making power, work to strengthen and improve local and regional economies, and exercise sustainable and socially transparent stewardship of societal resources (e.g., human, social, material, and ecological) on behalf of the “common good.” Community-based activities of civic

responsibility in systems of economic development exist when citizens enjoy the legitimate authority of resource trusteeship.

Sovereignty

Civil society is advanced when citizens have the right to be involved in all aspects of political governance and the authority to make decisions and perform actions affecting all levels of public life, without the institutions of public life being “captured” by the interests of specific groups or individuals. The presence and legitimacy of community-based civic authority through systems of political governance increase the ability of citizens to exercise sovereignty over policies and programs that can positively affect their lives and the quality of life in their community.

Accountability

Civil society is advanced when citizens, acting through community-based groups and associations, are able to use basic civic freedoms and rights (e.g., fair elections, free speech, a free press providing access to information, freedom to organize in groups) to hold economic and political actors responsible for the outcomes of policies, programs and patterns of resource distribution, and the exercise of political power.

Equity

Civil society is advanced when each citizen is given equitable access to and use of resources required for constructing a satisfying life. A moral condition of equity forms the foundation of activities that expand and strengthen economic conditions for all community members. Economic equity of resources is necessary for producing and sustaining an improved quality of life for all people, especially the poor.

Justice

Civil society is advanced when citizens pursue social justice by (1) consistently and compassionately using the “rule of law” in fulfillment of their civic obligations, and (2) advocating for those excluded from the political process and harmed by unjust laws.

In classical Greek thought, justice was accomplished by having people serve the city-state according to their status by birth. Gender, merit, rank, and wealth all were criteria for the role one was expected to play in the society, whether citizen or non-citizen. If the social order became disrupted, “justice” was accomplished by restoring people to

their former positions of power and status. Unfortunately, the practice of justice according to this particular "rule of law" allowed previous inequalities to continue. The disenfranchised remained excluded after the work of justice.

Contemporary views of citizenship and justice reflect these classical ideas in their adherence to a rule of law that is based on the ethical norms of society, but the particular ethical norms have largely shifted. In the United States, the bases of citizenship and political participation have changed. Heredity, wealth, and social position have given way to the unalienable right of common citizenship legitimized by the Constitution. A law or policy is considered unjust if it is unconstitutional or contrary to the democratically formed rule of law.

Reciprocity

Civil society is advanced when citizens (1) pursue social transformation through reciprocal, mutually dependent collaboration with others, and (2) negotiate, mediate, and resolve conflict through peaceful, nonviolent means. The nature of civic environments requires that social relationships in communities be limited and conditional. Not everyone in a society is invariably viewed as a legitimate member and given equal access to its resources. The term reciprocity highlights two interrelated moral issues of social relationships: how people to treat one another, especially when conflict exists; and how group boundaries are defined and transcended.

Democracy

Democracy is the combination of two words i.e. "Demo" and "Cracy" which means people and power respectively. It is a political system in which the people of a country rule through any form of government they choose to establish. In modern democracies, supreme authority is exercised for the most part by representatives elected by popular suffrage. The representatives may be supplanted by the electorate according to the legal procedures of recall and referendum, and they are, at least in principle, responsible to the electorate. In many democracies, such as the United States, both the executive head of government and the legislature are elected. In typical constitutional monarchies such as the United Kingdom and Norway, only the legislators are elected, and from their ranks a cabinet and a prime minister are chosen.

Although often used interchangeably, the terms democracy and republic are not synonymous. Both systems delegate the power to govern to their elected representatives. In a republic, however, these officials are expected to act on their own best judgment of the needs and interests of the country. The officials in a democracy more generally and directly reflect the known or ascertained views of their constituents, sometimes subordinating their own judgment.

Webster Dictionary defines democracy as, “a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections”.

U.S. president Abraham Lincoln (1809-1865) defined democracy as, “Government of the people, by the people, for the people”.

Sir Winston Churchill (1874-1965) defines democracy as, “No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed, it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time.”

This famous quote attributed to the former British Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill (1874-1965) focuses right on the weak spot of democracy. There is no such thing as the "perfect form of government" on earth, but any other form of government produces even less desirable results than democracy. Until today, no other form of government has been invented that could regulate public affairs better than democracy.

Key Elements Of Democracy

In order to deserve the label modern democracy, a country needs to fulfill some basic requirements - and they need not only be written down in it's constitution but must be kept up in everyday life by politicians and authorities. These are:

- Guarantee of basic Human Rights to every individual person vis-à-vis the state and its authorities as well as vis-à-vis any social groups (especially religious institutions) and vis-à-vis other persons.
- Separation of Powers between the institutions of the state i.e. Legislature, Executive and Judiciary.

- Freedom of opinion, speech, press and mass media.
- Religious liberty.
- General and equal right to vote (one person, one vote)
- Good Governance (focus on public interest and absence of corruption)

Democracy In Ancient Greece And Rome

Rule by the people played an important part in the democracies of the pre-Christian era. The democracies of the city-states of classical Greece and of Rome during the early years of the Republic were unlike the democracies of today. They were direct democracies, in which all citizens could speak and vote in assemblies that resembled New England town meetings. Representative government was unknown and unnecessary because of the small size of the city-states (almost never more than 10,000 citizens). Ancient democracy did not presuppose equality of all individuals; the majority of the populace, notably slaves and women, had no political rights. Athens, the greatest of the city democracies, limited the franchise to native-born citizens. Roman democracy resembled that of the Greeks, although Rome sometimes granted citizenship to men of non-Roman descent. The Roman Stoic philosophy, which defined the human race as part of a divine principle, and the Jewish and Christian religions, which emphasized the rights of the underprivileged and the equality of all before God, contributed to the development of modern democratic theory.

The Roman Republic ended in the despotism of the empire. The free cities of Italy, Germany, and Flanders carried on the democratic tradition and applied some principles of democracy during the Middle Ages. Slaves ceased to constitute a major portion of national populations. As feudalism ended, a rich commercial middle class arose, possessing the money and leisure necessary to participate in governmental affairs. One result was the rebirth of a spirit of freedom based on ancient Greek and Roman principles. Concepts of equal political and social rights were further defined during the Renaissance, when the development of humanism was fostered, and later during the Reformation, in the struggle for religious freedom.

Western Europe and the U.S.

Beginning with the first popular rebellion against monarchy in England (1642), which was brought to a climax by the execution of King Charles I, political and revolutionary action against autocratic

European governments resulted in the establishment of democratic governments. Such action was inspired and guided largely by political philosophers, notably the French philosophers Montesquieu and Jean Jacques Rousseau, and the American statesmen Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. Before the end of the 19th century, every important Western European monarchy had adopted a constitution limiting the power of the Crown and giving a considerable share of political power to the people. In many of these countries, a representative legislature modeled on the British Parliament was instituted. British politics was then possibly the greatest single influence on the organization of world democracies, although the French Revolution also exerted a powerful influence. Later, the success of democratic institutions in the United States served as a model for many peoples.

The major features of modern democracy include individual freedom, which entitles citizens to the liberty and responsibility of shaping their own careers and conducting their own affairs; equality before the law; and universal suffrage and education. Such features have been proclaimed in great historic documents, for example, the U.S. Declaration of Independence, which asserted the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, which affirmed the principles of civil liberty and of equality before the law; and the Atlantic Charter, which formulated the four basic freedoms.

By the middle of the 20th century, every independent country in the world, with only a few exceptions, had a government that, in form if not in practice, embodied some of the principles of democracy. Although the ideals of democracy have been widely professed, the practice and fulfillment have been different in many countries.

Civil Society And Democratic Transition In Pakistan

The democratic transitions that we have witnessed in the recent past in Eastern Europe or Latin America came about with activist and effective democratic civil societies that worked as an ally of the political forces. It is necessary to make a distinction between democratic and non-democratic civil society, as the latter chooses violence as its weapon and has ambitions to capture the state. A democratic civil society, on the other hand, functions within the limits of law, is internally democratic and works in the public sphere to make the state responsive, accountable and transparent; and constrains it to not transgress its constitutional limits. Such a civil society plays a critical role not just in supporting a transition to democracy, but also

during democratic consolidation when the shift from authoritarianism to representative government has taken place. It is, however, questionable if civil society alone can lead a democratic revolution in any society. At best, it can be a vital component of a larger democratic movement and help sustain it until a real change in the political order has occurred. And its role does not end there: it must continue to assist in promoting civic culture, encouraging citizens' participation in the political process and recruiting new leadership. Democratic movements in our time are revolutionary in character for they attempt to restructure the system of governance according to modern principles of popular sovereignty, and shift political power from autocratic/authoritarian/oligarchic rule to representative government. These movements acknowledge the worth of ordinary people, equality of rights and campaign for representative government; these ideas have roots in the Western philosophical tradition. Social movements over the last few centuries across the world have sought to establish people's rule for that is the only form of government that can be considered representative of the needs and aspirations of society. Democratic movements differ from classical revolutions in the sense that they have been, and should be, non-violent and they seek change in the system by changing its fundamental rules. These movements focus on social and political mobilisation and their weapons are civil disobedience and peaceful protest.

Democratic movements of Pakistan in the past have applied some of these tools, but apart from toppling two incumbents, they have not achieved any substantial gains. The military, waiting in the wings, took over, quite opposite to the objectives of the movements. Now there is a new movement in the making, surrounded by vastly changed social and economic circumstances in the country. One of the key features of this new movement is civil society activism. The lawyers' associations are important, but are only one element in the overall struggle for democracy in Pakistan. They must gather the support of other civil society groups to sustain the movement.

Pakistan's civil society has been growing for the past two decades in various spheres of social life. Its traditional focus has been on human rights, especially minorities and women, and on social development in rural communities. Its fresh focus is on rule of law, representative government and democracy as a universal social value. While activism in these areas grew appreciably, the traditional associations, like labour unions and student groups that had played a major role in toppling Ayub Khan and crippling Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's government, declined.

After several dormant decades, the traditional civil society of Pakistan is undergoing a major change, redefining its vision and role. Its components are not the same as they were in the anti-Ayub movement, which was truly broad-based, or the anti-Bhutto movement. The students unions that brought thousands on the street are no longer active for democracy, except a faction of students allied with the Jamaat-e Islami.

The new movement for democracy, led by lawyers' associations from all over the country, was spurred by General Musharraf's action against the Chief Justice of Pakistan. The question is, can the lawyers, on their own, lead the movement to the next stage of democratic transition? Democratic movements are collective social enterprises and represent all major sectors of the society. The lawyers' associations are important, but are only one element in the overall struggle for democracy in Pakistan. They must gather the support of other civil society groups to sustain the movement. The lawyers have shown remarkable solidarity and tenacity but they cannot go it alone. Opposition political parties along with their subsidiary groups; students; labour; intelligentsia and the business community could help drive the current movement towards its final goal of democracy. It is difficult to see that happening in the immediate future as the main opposition parties, much like the ruling coalition, are essentially elite groups. They have shallow roots in society and reach their electoral base through local influentials. Also, they do not have democratic structures within their parties. Nor does their past performance inspire confidence in the growing urban and sub-urban middle classes of Pakistan. The religious political parties are the only exceptions that might be relatively more effective in bringing their supporters out on the streets but that is not what would define a social movement for democracy, which must be inclusive and broad-based.

Perhaps the Pakistan People's Party could be a critical factor in giving the opposition movement some measure of popularity and a greater social support base. If all the political parties had stood together on the issue of restoring parliamentary democracy under the 1973 Constitution, it would have given the social energy needed by the currently fragmented democratic movement. For reasons its chairperson understands better than the rest, the PPP seems to be sitting on the fence. The transition that Benazir Bhutto claims to achieve is not through deals but through open collective action, which is possible as the regime and its allies have lost legitimacy and can only prolong their stay in power via intimidation and manipulation of the law. Another fact of Pakistani

politics is that the coalitions of elites from different political parties tend to cooperate with the military to keep the political dispensation in their favour. This has been a regular pattern since Ayub Khan captured power in 1958. Once again, elite realignment is taking place with the consideration that the PPP will share power with other groups under the leadership of a re-elected Musharraf, if he is not prevented by the Supreme Court of Pakistan. The movement for democracy in Pakistan may have its weaknesses but it cannot be easily derailed or destroyed. It has succeeded in making democracy a political issue and it does represent popular ethos. Its challenge lies in mobilising people, creating unity among diverse social and political groups and providing an alternative leadership that would win the trust of the people.

Conclusion

Civil society has played a pivotal role in the promotion of democratic culture and tradition in Pakistan. The civil society compelled the ruling class to enact the Objectives Resolution (1949) and the first constitution of Pakistan (1956). Civil society compelled General Ayub Khan to resign from the State's power. When the sugar prices increased, the civil society could not tolerate it and came forward in open protest and agitations. The Student's union abuses him and demanded his immediate resign which the latter did under the pressure of the former. Similarly, it was the civil society which made Z.A. Bhutto a public leader. The public was so impressed from him that in public crowds, people responded to his slogans and statements. His democratic notions had been supported by the civil society.

Likewise, the despotic government of General Zia-ul-Haq was pressurized by the political forces of the civil society. A political alliance of the political parties was made so that to apply a common pressure on the dictatorial rule of Zia. No doubt, that his ruling came to an end due to his killing in air crash but it is also fact that political forces gave him a tough time during his despotic rule. In the same way, the role of the civil society during Musharraf period is more evident. It was the civil society that compelled Musharraf to resign from his office. When General Pervaiz Musharraf elected himself as a President of Pakistan through so-called referendum, the civil society criticized him greatly. Similarly, when Musharraf ousted judges of the Supreme Court of Pakistan, the civil society more particularly the lawyer's association started a movement for the restoration of the deposed judges of the Supreme Court. Finally the lawyers were succeeded in restoring the deposed judges to their original position. This lawyer

movement brought an independent judiciary in Pakistan which is the pre-requisite of a true democracy.

Bibliography

BOOK

1. Anheier, Helmut K. *Civil Society: Measurement, Evaluation & Policy*. UK: Creative Print, 2004.
2. Cohen, Jean L., Andrew Arato. *Civil Society and Political Theory*. USA: MIT Press, 1994.
3. Edwards, Michael. *Civil Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009.
4. Kaviraj, Sudipta, Sunil Khilnani. *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2001.
5. Kultgen, John H., Mary Lenzi. *Problems for Democracy*. New York: Rodopi B.V. Amsterdam, 2006.
6. Lansford, Tom. *Democracy*. Malaysia: Michelle Bisson, 2008.
7. Seligman, Adam B. *The Idea of Civil Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Encyclopedia

1. Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia. New York: Microsoft Corporation, 2002.
2. *The Encyclopedia Americana*. USA: Grolier Incorporated, 1972.
3. *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 4, Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1987.

Internet

1. <http://fathom.lse.ac.uk/features/122552/>
2. http://www.icnl.org/knowledge/ijnl/vol10iss1/art_3.htm
3. http://www.kansalaisyhteiskunta.fi/civil_society/the_essential_characteristics_of_civil_society

Dictionary

1. Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979.

Magazine

1. Rais, Dr. Rasul Bakhsh. "Civil society and Democratic Transition." Daily Times, September 25, 2007

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT

1. Schulz, Carl G. Addresses in Memory of Abraham Lincoln, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, 1910.