# Political History India and Pakistan: 1947-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>India</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected Governments</td>
<td>Elected Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-2007</td>
<td>1947-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But ‘The Emergency’</td>
<td>1971-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-77</td>
<td>1988-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why the difference?

India
1. Longevity of leaders
2. Dominance of politicians
3. Strength of Congress in the provinces that comprise India
4. India’s contiguity
5. By 1937 Congress had links with dominant cultivating castes.
6. Early land reforms strengthened support of dominant castes.

Pakistan
1. Deaths of Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan
2. Significance of bureaucrats
3. League weak in Punjab pre-independence
4. East-West tensions a disadvantage.
5. League urban middle-class: links in Punjab with landlords.
6. Early land reform only in East.
The Pakistani Army has played a major role in politics: the Indian Army has not. Why should this be the case? Some hypotheses:

1. Recruitment patterns?
2. Defeat by Chinese?
3. The Pakistani Army - though it has had limited success against the Indian Army - is seen as the major defender of the nation. It has prestige.
4. It remains one of the better organised and run institutions in Pakistan.
Threats to political systems

India
1. Separatist movements
2. Left-wing extremists (aka Maoists; Naxalites). Now widespread from Bihar to Andhra.

BUT - in Uttar Pradesh a political party based on the Scheduled Castes, has secured a majority in its own right.

Pakistan
1. Separatist movements:
2. Muslim extremists - challenge democracy as the basis of the state.

BUT - in the past electors have rejected Islamist parties who have challenged a democratic state.