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Abstract:

The objective of this research is to highlight the importance of parliament in democracy. It will present the comparative analysis of the parliamentary system of Turkey and Pakistan. The focus of this study will provide a comprehensive study of the challenges to Parliamentary Democracy in developing countries. Democracy is a system of government in which all the people of a state or polity are involved in decision making process directly or through representatives. Turkey and Pakistan have multiparty, parliamentary democracies with unicameral and bicameral parliaments. This paper will present the comparative study of parliamentary systems of both countries under the theories of comparative politics. System analysis theory and comparative theory will be adapted to examine this work as research methodology. Behavioural approach will also be helpful to conclude this discussion. The study will examine the similarities and differences of the Parliamentary contribution to promote democracy in both countries. The research will find out the answers of different research questions, whether the Parliament is quite necessary to strengthen democracy in developing countries, weather role of non-political actors in governments is a major impediment in progress of democracy, Military intervention in politics disturbs democratic process in new democracies especially in Turkey and Pakistan. Fair and free elections strengthen the parliament. The research topic is related to the 24th World Congress of Political Science theme. The study of New Democracies. Problems, Challenges and Progress related this work to the Congress Main Theme
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Analytical framework

Parliamentary Democracy in Turkey: The politics of Turkey is demeanor in a framework of Secular Parliamentary Representative Democracy. In this kind of rule, the Primer is the head of government while the President is the head of state who grasp a ritual position with considerable preserve authority. Its political scheme is founded on a theory of separation of powers. Decision-making authority is put into effect by the council of Ministers. Turkish Grand National Assembly deals with legislation with its particular legislative process The judiciary is autonomous and self-determining. It presents constitution, that was made on 7 Nov,1982, after the Turkish constitutional referendum (Sayari and Esmer, 2002). In Turkey, Grand National Assembly (with 550 seats) is empowered to exercise legislative power (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi). It signifies 81 regions. The constituents are nominated for four years’ tenure by alleviated proportional representation. To subsist exemplified in legislature a party has to prevail not less than 10 percent of the general election of legislative body. Independent candidate might scamper and get selected. They have to only succeed 10 percent of the
vote in the prefecture, from that they are organizing. The porch is put to be abridged. The present Speaker of the assembly is Ismail Kahraman (Sayari and Esmer, 2002).

**Military involvement in politics:**

From the time when Mustafa Kemal Atatürk originated the new secular Republic of Turkey (1923), the Turkish armed forces have professed itself like the protector of Atatürkçülükk i.e. the official state ideology. The TAF preserves a significant level of manipulation over politics of the country, moreover, the verdict making procedure concerning matters allied to Turkish national security although dwindled in the earlier time through the National Security Council’. The armed forces have an evidence of overruling in politics. They interfered in politics in 1960, 1971 and 1980. In 1997, it contrived the exclusion of Prime minister Necmettin Erbakan.

“On 27 April 2007 (in advance of 4 November 2007 presidential election, and in reaction to the politics of Abdullah Gül who has a past record of involvement in Islamist political movements and banned Islamist parties such as the Welfare Party) the military has given a proclamation of its welfare. It assumed that the military is an institution to urging about secularism that Islamism ran counter to the secular nature of the Turkish Republic and to the legacy of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. The military's declaration, completed by an apparent caution, that the Turkish army is geared up to interfere if the secular character of the Constitution of the country is conciliated by declaring that the Turkish Armed Forces maintain their sound determination to carry out their duties stemming from laws to protect the unchangeable characteristics of the Republic of Turkey. Their loyalty to this determination is absolute. Inconsistently, the armed forces have together been an imperative strength in incessant Westernization of Turkey, however on the parallel moment also signifies an impediment for Turkey's desire to join the EU. On the similar moment, the armed forces take pleasure in a high degree of trendy authenticity with incessant view census signifying that the armed forces are the country’s organization that the Turkish nation reliance on a large part”. (Jenkins and Doorn, 2009).

**Military Coup of 1960:**

“The armed troop of 1960 has been raised, because of the rising emporium of Adnan Menderes government that turn into the source of antagonism of Reformist Elite with a number of the armed official unit. In 1960, the army intervened in the state and has no confrontation. In substitute, the Turks was recognized their government. The military adduce its interference with the fortification of the democratic scheme” (Vogit, 2007).

The Turkish armed officials repudiate their fortitude of enduring in authority. In 1961 the army has been give up the control of government to democratic government and has accomplish their pledge. Contrasting in the past, the armed government tendency was that, to linger in authority for further legitimate the enduring role for the superior leaders. Therefore, the head of the novel parliament was selected by the skull of stratocracy (military clique). The army used authority on the democratic administration; its members became the undeviating constituents of the legislature.
Furthermore “National Security Council has been formulated in order to beckon the head of the military as well as chief of staff alongside the democratic heads of the uppermost level in the direction of the President to consider the belongings concerning the safety and the defense of the state. Yavuz asserts that The greatest damage inflicted upon Turkey by the DP was that it almost forcibly brought the army into politics, permanently injuring the tradition of civilian rule meticulously preserved since Ataturk”. (Yavuz, 2006).

Military Overthrow of 1971:

The constitution of the second Republic structured the check and balance system in the political scheme and that was not as booming as it was envisioned. Thus the armed intrusion was anticipated. The comparative demonstration draws out those who grasp an unfavorable attitude with key parties and spawn their own political associations. Consequently, in 1969, common parties communicated in the national assembly that was substantiated by the Turkish nation, although the slighter associations enthralled the supporters, in order to avert either the Justice Party or the Republican Party from getting an absolute majority. Thus the practice of legislation became immobilized along with the disgruntled groups snubbing the defined traditions of politics and making a march and passed a vow to the avenue.

The political brutality has been initiated by the citizens. Various depraved actions e.g. abducting and bank burglary has also been conducted. The bylaw position of the state has turned into shoddier. “The leaders of the three armed forces were precursory that absolute proclamation (in March 1971) that was propel to President and solicited him an understanding above party politics otherwise military would use its legal rights and seize power directly to accomplish its duty of protecting and supervising the Turkish republic” (Rubin & Heper, 2002).

Suleiman Demiral, the Prime Minister was dismissed from his position. On another side the fortified officials developed their strength which amplified their potency. In imperative regions the parliament overtly affirmed Martial law. The National Security Council converse the ultimate avowal by an appropriate direction. “Subsequently, no corpse could refute the armed meddling in the political affairs of the country” (Yavuz, 2006).

Military Overthrow of 1980:

There was monetary as well as political chaos in 1979. From 1977-1980, the fanatic actions became enlarged, which distressed the tranquility of the state. According to Mcfaelden “This political violence badly affected the circumstances. Resultantly 5,241 people were killed and 14,152 were injured in the war of independence. The Turkish government was unable to cope with the situation and to get rid of these circumstances” (Hale, 1994).

“Commencing the June frontward the state was steadily poignant to the civil warfare. The General Evren (Chief of staff) squanders an epistle and beseech to the chiefs to restrain this unfairness and scuffle and to create national union on a huge pedestal
Furthermore, he assumed the changeover of anti-terrorist procedures, that was opposed by Bulent Ecevit” (Yavuz, 2006).

The current administration was not functioning appropriately hence the indomitable intrusion in affairs of state. According to Hale “On 12 September 1980 the National Security Council claims superiority on the administration. The council was comprised of five highest ranking generals in Turkish armed forces. It determined to hand over the power to the democratic government. It formulates a new constitution through which the parliamentary government would work properly”. (Hale, 1994).

The triumph or malfunction of the military in restricting the transition procedure has a crucial brunt on their potential to propel the ensuing condition. A number of identifying a forfeit able transition is political accords between the military and the democratic administration. “Martial laws had been existing as an imperative character to preserve political equilibrium between the army and civilian administration by created the constitutions of the state. The Turkish armed forces must not be expelled from the speech of civic strategy. Yet, the temperament and measurement of military dialogue have to be tainted. Even so the political management differentiates in Turkey’s civic martial linkage stumble upon different arguments”. (Ahmed, 2014).

The Turkish militia grasps respect and privilege. “The martial has also prepared its political supremacy with the support of National Security Council (NSC). President Kennan Evren as well as the another NSC are in that position, from where, they can monitor the political apparatus i.e. to scrutinize aspirants planned the National Security Council to hoist its accent for the defense and fortification of the realm. In March 1971 commandants presented vigorous ardent avowal, which as the part of NSC fired the Demirel administration. In 1973 a variation has been applied in the constitution that enlarges the essential role of the NSC (to make suggestions to the Govt). The military intervened in 1980 and the inhabitants had steer clear of the suggestion for develop relationship among the party skulls” (Ahmed, 2014).

“Eventually (under the 1982 constitution) its authority has been amplified and its proposition would be esteemed by the council of Minister. The quotient of contribution of superior commandants has improved, through the concern of inhabitants. Article 1 of the 1982 constitution prepared concede of the chanter depend assign General Evren, as head of the state for the time of seven years (till 1989). The article 9 of the constitution authorized the Evren to prohibit modifications to the constitution, for tenure of six years. The decrees endorsed by the legislative body can be assessed by the Council, mainly on the theme of individual rights, secularism, martial law, emergency rule, national security, public order etc on the command of the head of the state. In short; the 1982 constitution was made to protect army as mediator in a political scheme by means of government and the National Security Council”. (Tursan, 2004).

**Parliamentary Democracy in Pakistan:**

Pakistan is sixth densely inhabited state in the earth that formed on the foundation of determination of a nation (in 1947) with the visualization to have a noninterventionist, restrained and democratic parliamentary federation. Immediately, following the self-
determination Pakistan assumed British heritage legal configuration and set up the parliamentary democracy that subsequent entirely from the Government of India Act 1935.

The democratic practice of Pakistan, nevertheless, in post colonial period, was fortified by the brace casing of Bureaucracy as well as political strength and traditional democratic system lingered a secluded reverie. The state has a plaid record by way of some interval of democratic ruling, in sixty-eight years of its survival. Democracy is a format and inspiration that lead Pakistan was required to be emerged in 1947 as a nation state when envisioned by the pride of the realm, named, Muhammad Ali Jinnah. Basically, Pakistan is a Parliamentary Democratic Republic. Though, olden times there have been divergence from democracy in the appearance of armed triumph and political vagueness. (www.jstor.org).

The military coup of 1958 was the astounding paradigm of Pakistan that showed how a politicized militia could steadily impede keen on the political turf to oversee the liberal democratic organizations. The armed coups carried out the plan and aspirations of the preceding government. The objectives of modernization, industrialization and democracy also linger parallel to the goals of the new army administration. In 1957 the higher staff of army apparent to reinstate the democratic administration, for annihilation of political sleaze. There were two perceptions and make clear that General Ayub Khan undergone that, the military would accomplish supremacy in the country. He toured East and West Pakistan in 1957. He congregated with militia delicate, “whilst the Ayub was visited the East Pakistan Major General Umrao Khan (G.O.C. East Pakistan) prearranged dialogues with different provincial as well as political officials to offered him firsthand information concerning the political stipulation, Ayub Khan stated: if the people want me, I shall not shirk my duty” (Hassan, 2013).

**Martial Law Imposed in Pakistan:**

The “President Iskander Mirza stamped out the constitution, on 7th October 1958. The general and regional assemblages were breaking out. Gen. Ayub Khan was chosen as Supreme Commander of the military. Martial Law has been proclaimed in Pakistan. General Ayub stated: Army entered optics with great reluctance but with the fullest conviction that there was no alternative to it except the disintegration and complete ruination of the country. The soldiers and the people are sick of the sight of you. So it will be good for yourself to turn a new leaf and begin to behave, otherwise retribution will be swift and sure” (Rizvi, 2013).

“Iskander Mirza (after 20 days) was constrained by the Military Generals to leave the office. Then, the tangible political influence was exercised by the military. They didn’t veteran antagonism. No confrontation has been appeared. Inhabitants had very passive thoughts. They anticipated martial to provide a well-organized and secure administration. In Pakistan the state of affairs was lingered average on the preliminary time of Martial Law. The army had its control on the governmental associations. On that basis the military was noticeably resourceful and evidently candid. It felt pleasure in preserving the civilization derivative from the British soldiers it was skilled as it survived by a schedule and nonentity in Pakistan visualized of doing accordingly” (vorys, 1965).
The writer averred: “The military leaders who seized the government enjoyed over the predecessors an increment in the capacity to coerce. The rigorous discipline of the troupes improved prospects of implementation. Perhaps more important, the military leaders also enjoyed an increment in the capacity to persuade. The armed Forces were genuinely popular, their past record of protecting Muslim lives and property during the post-partition massacres and in Kashmir inspired confidence. In general, soldiers were exempted from the resentment which had crystallized against the deposed government. Their reputation for integrity was untainted. The army was widely hoped, would be more responsive to popular aspirations and more effective in improving the standard of living” (Vorys, 1965).

The army mainly depends on the “civil administration to leading the country in a good mode. In 1958 the continuance in Force Order has been authoritatively fetched by the CMLA. This array announced that Pakistan would be ruled according to the suspended constitution unless and until the new one is form. The Judiciary was permitted to perform its duty yet the fundamental rights were abolished. Reciprocally the Martial Law’s instructions along with the judgment of Military Courts might not be refusing into the courts. The Supreme Court of Pakistan presented its endorsement to the novel armed administration in 27th October, 1958” (www.zklwaassociates.com).

According to Hassan Rizvi “The operation of Marital Law through the civil machinery did not mean that the real power was in the hands of civil service. The army served as the brain and civil servants as the hands of the new regime. The army was conscious of the fact that it needed the help of the civil servants to run the administration. The civil servants knew that they could not continue in service, if they worked against the wishes of the new leaders. The Martial law authorities had dismissed and retired a good number of civil servants. The army authorities wanted their decisions to be implemented and the civil servants took the opportunity to exercise greater powers under the protection of Marital Law” (Rizvi, 2013).

“Ayub Khan was buoyant by militia Basic Democrats and bureaucracy. He synchronized on different political affair. He was adjacent to the revival of political parties. Subsequent to the drafting of 1962 constitution he thinks that political parties are definite in the political scheme. For this reason, he persuaded for its revitalization concurrently fundamental rights were illuminate and the name Islamic has been applied in the label of Republic of Pakistan” (Myrdal, 1954).

The incidents (from October 1968 to March 1969) precisely showed that the political stability given by his regime was personalized rather than institutionalized. The issues which led to the political crises in Pakistan in 1968 to 1969 were various and complicated. They were constitutional, political religious, parochial, regional and emotional. There are many reasons that are responsible for the political catastrophe. An ideal constitution reflects the demands and aspirations of the people of the country. For instance: The British citizens are conventional loving individuals. Hence, their constitution is consisting on political customs or conventions. In general, the representatives set the constitution of the state.
The 1962 constitution of Pakistan was prepared by the constitutional board to accomplish the requirements of one person that is Ayub Khan. So the president of the country utilizes the utmost power. In democratic rule legislature has its own worth. Nevertheless, in 1962 the legislature had simply titular supremacy, whereas tangible supremacy has been used by Ayub Khan. There was no check and balance system. There was presidential despotism. Thus the constitution of the realm was just too justifiable the despotism of the armed forces. In 1962, the applicants of the governing body had to be signed up by the applicants of Basic Democrats. In the modern era the envoy scheme is universal and broadly acknowledged by the community. “Nevertheless, there was no democratic structure in 1962. So, one of reason of the breakdown of Ayub rule was the procedure of Indirect Election. The (EBDO) Elective Bodies Disqualification order of Ayub Khan emancipated the political policies, moreover, by mean of Public Official Disqualification Order (PODO), he ineligible many officials. Thus there was a frequent conflict among the persons for Ayub Khan. Bengalis were not granted the symmetry role and President has been practiced approximately the entire powers. There were assorted social as well as moral evils that take part in the political upheaval. There was no proper election. Ayub Khan obsessed the powers of the entire realm. The foreign minister of the state Zulfikar Ali Bhutto head off from Ayub’s command. Bhutto prearranged a mass contact movement that laid up the Ayub’s rule. Bhutto has got the expectation of the general public of both divisions of Pakistan. All these occasions grasp an immense impact on the admin of Ayub Khan”. (www.zklwaassosiates.com).

Political movement that forced Ayub Khan to resign and hand over power to General Yahya Khan was unique in the sense that it was spontaneous and unplanned. The scope and intensity of the movement was without a parallel in Pakistan and left few institution and concepts untouched. In November, 1968, the movement began in the sort of student agitation, but no political observer could notice that the government of Ayub Khan would be decline. In March 25 1969, Ayub Khan has given a concluding debate on radio (as the President of the country). He confirmed his verdict of resignation; moreover, give up command to General Yahya Khan (C-In-C of the Army). He stated: “the situation in the country is fast deteriorating. The administrative institutions are being paralyzed. No one has to courage to problem the truth. Every principle, restraint and way of civilized existence has been abandoned. Except the armed forces, there is no constitutional and effective way to meet the situation” (Rizvi, 2013).

General Yahya rescinded the constitution. The legislative body along with local assemblage has been authoritatively conked out. He executed Marital Law in the state. He believed the supreme Authority of the forces. On 31st March 1969; he avowed himself, as the president of the realm. He acknowledged: “The armed Forces could not remain ideal spectators to this state of near anarchy. They have to do their duty and save the country from disaster. It is my firm belief that sound, clean and honest administration is a pre-requisite for sane and constrictive political life and for a smooth transfer of power to representatives of the people elected freely and impartially on the basis of adult franchise”. (Ahmed, 2015) General Yahya Khan used the power and gives assurance to demeanor fair and free elections and gives up control to the designated envoys. Even though the martial law continues from 1st January 1970’ yet the political tasks and proceedings were permissable to perform (TNIS, 2014).
On 30 March 1970, the Legal Framework Order (LFO) was legitimately commenced. It offered the values for elections, moreover, emphasized the policies that militia leaders deemed, that the legislative body should perceive the constitution of the state. The political leaders valued the stride that has been grabbed by the military regime that is to conduct general elections. On 7th and 17th December 1970' the elections of National and provincial assemblies have been demeanor (www.uni.weimar).

The Yahya Khan’s government was the turbulent moment in history of the country. The military regime explains that it could be easy (for an army) to seize political authority in a state such as Pakistan which needs stable political organizations. Nonetheless the military couldn’t determine the essential political, social and financial matters. Then Chief of army staff (COAS), Gen. Zia came and proclaimed Martial Law in the state. In 5 July, 1977, he systematized the fresh elections (in 90 days) for national and provincial assemblies. No proscription was forced on political parties and schedules for seats were listed. Later on Zia deferred the elections as he initiated criminal inquisition of senior PPP leadership. As a result, Bhutto was penalized for scheme to slay a political proficient. On 6th April, 1979 Bhutto was hanged. Zia-Ul-Haq became the head of state, moreover, affirmed to conduct elections (in November).

The MRD was fetched by the center and remaining parties that were steered by the PPP (in 1980). This movement was apprehended for several reasons, e.g. decline of Zia’s regime, end marital law, conducted free and fair elections etc. In December, 1984 Zia stated a nation referenced for 19th December on the program of Islamization. The affiliates of MRD snubbed to participate in elections. Zia affirmed official modifications to amplify the influence of the Presidents VS Prime Minister (under the 1973 constitution the President had been mainly a rubber stamp). He selected Muhammad Khan Junejo, as a prime minister of the realm. The new legislature grants endorsement regarding Junejo as prime minister. In October, 1985 the legislature conceded 8th amendment to the constitution (which was presented by Zia). It makes lawful the actions of martial admin and fervent them from Judicial review (including the verdict of military court). Besides that, it amplified the power of the head. On 30 Dec, 1985 the martial law was elevated by the head of the state and reinstatement of fundamental rights has been carried out that were secluded according to the constitution. In 1985, the political endeavors have been occurred in the state. The entire political parties (including those continuing to deny the legitimacy of the Zia / Junaijo government) were permitted to form convoy (TNIS, 2014).

Afterwards, Benazir Bhutto came to Pakistan in April 1986. The ornamental political influence of Prime Minister Junaijo as well as his conflict with Zia (over Afghan Strategy) created severe problems. On 29 May 1988, Zia suspended the Junaijo and announced fresh elections (in November). In June 1988, he affirmed the supremacy of Sharia (Islamic Law) in the state. A flight coming back from a military equipment trial near Bahawalpur (17 August 1988) crashed and the president Zia, American ambassador Arnold Raphael U.S.A. Brig. General Herbert Wassom as well as 28 Pakistani armed officers were died. Afterwards ‘Ghulam Ishaq Khan (Chairman of Senate) performed his role as an Acting President (TNIS, 2014).

It has been stated: “Pakistan's politics has been shaped by the dynamics of civil-military relations and Islamism's relation to the state. This has created an ongoing
negotiation for power in which the military, civilian politicians, and Islamist forces have individually in alliance with one another vied for control of Pakistan politics, and General Pervez Musharraf’s’ regime has been no exception to this trend. As its Claim to secular military rule proved untenable, it has turned to rely on Islamist forces to manage civilian-military relations. Musharraf’s phase began from 12 October, 1999. He remained in power till 18 August, 2008” (Saeed,2013).

These eight years were tremendously considerable in record of the state. Musharraf’s rule had heartening distinctiveness with some pessimistic. 12 October 1999 was the momentous day in the documentation of the country. It was the inexplicable moment for the democracy of the state. Musharraf became the head of the state. He pronounced emergency and lined out the democracy. He possessed the position of the “Chief Executive of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The legislative body (national assembly and senate) with local assemblies has been suspended. The intact officials e.g. speaker, deputy speaker, chairman, deputy chairman, chief ministers, federal and provincial ministers as well as governors were discharged. The state was ascended by armed forces. General Musharraf set up this array to govern the country. There is national security council (NSC) consisted of retired officials (bureaucrats and technocrats). There was a central cabinet to oversee its sectors. The regional management was deal by the governors the majority of them were from martial. There were provincial cabinets that lend a hand to governors. The judges were selected, under the median of PCO” (www.britanica.com).

Parliamentary Democracy was unsuccessful remarkably promptly subsequent to autonomy since Pakistan obsessed with a feeble and scrappy political party, which was incapable to unravel leading inconsistency. From the time of autonomy, Parliamentary democracy of Pakistan has oscillate between civilian and military administration at an assortment of epoch during its political history mostly because of political volatility, civil and military inconsistency, sleaze, and the cyclic coup d'état by the military institution in oppose to feeble civilian administration that resultant in the implementation of military rule throughout the state (occurring in 1958, 1977 and 1999, and led by chief martial law administratogenerals Ayub Khan, Zia-ul-Haq and Pervez Musharraf respectively). Nevertheless, in Pakistan, parliamentary democracy has not at all permissible to function. Pakistan (in 2013) did not practice hitherto one democratic relocate of authority, from one democratically selected regime that had accomplished its term to another. The entire of its earlier democratic transition have been terminating by martial coup (Aqil, 2014).

The foremost Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan was manipulated in 1956 which was suspended after two years and martial law. In early eleven years, eight succeeding regimes were made and then abolished. Fatefully, the incoherent democratic past continued till 2008, sporadic between selected governments along with elongated enchantment of military ruler seeing as its commencement. Pakistan has voyage an extensive space towards its tramp on the passage of democracy. The parliamentary democracy falls down (four times) mainly because of negligence, inconsistent progress of organizational milieu and the increasing political aims of the armed generals. The military ruler has constantly incapacitated political growth and conventional political parties’ as well as have promote spiritual, racial along with ancestral politics, in order to
legalize their rules through referendum. The prop up to pious and racial groups has directed to subversive nursery for propagation of radicalism and intimidation. Throughout military rule, there was substantial financial progress and affluence. Nevertheless, Pakistan democratic associations were compressed and state had to undergo two warfare with India. In contrast chosen statesmen have not greatly participated towards democracy, moderately have been engaged in ceaseless phase of sleaze, partiality and wealth decontaminating through the petite period they were at the tiller of interactions. (Aqil, 2014).

With the result of general elections 2013 a politically selected government productively accomplished its term (for the first time) was reinstated by the other democratically selected management. Nonetheless, the reliability and suitability of these ballot vote skulked debatable, by a few opponent parties until an “Inquiry Commission consist of Supreme Court Judges that stated the 2013 elections were in huge fraction ordered and demeanor moderately according to the law and reflection of the accurate authorization specified by means of the people entitled to vote. Yet the nation of Pakistan has to endure a protracted mode in pursuit for the craving of accurate democracy that directing to crucial object of good governance” (Saeed,2013).

**Similarities and Differences between Turkey and Pakistan**

Geographically: Turkey and Pakistan are similar in many respects. Geographically, both of these countries are located on key positions on world map. Pakistan links Arabian Sea, South Asia, Middle East, East Asia and Central Asia. Likewise, Turkey connects Europe and Middle East, Europe and Central Asia. Turkey also connects to Bosporus, Mediterranean Sea and Aegean Sea.

Relations with Neighbors: Both countries have disputed relations with neighbors. Turkish-Greece relations had been complicated over Cyprus Island because the peninsula of Anatolia was a part of Greece. Later on in 11th century, the Turks began to move there. Similarly, Pakistan’s relations with its neighbor India have not been easy. The sole conflict is the Kashmir issue between Pakistan and India.

Turkey’s relations with Armenia have also difficult since World War-I. Likewise, Arab countries are not happy with Turkey because of colonial era. On the other hand, Afghanistan has been Pakistan’s worst neighbor instead of India. Pak-Iran relations have also seen many ups and down especially the Iranian revolution caused strains between both nations. Moreover, Pakistan’s grouping with America and Iran’s disliking for Talibaan has also proved a hurdle for smooth relations. Only China has been a good and reliable neighbor for Pakistan till now. But Turkey has made a difference by developing beneficial and workable relations with its neighboring countries. But there has been no progress as far the case of Pakistan is concerned and with Afghanistan has become worst.

Economic Stability: Both countries have faced economic problems and inflation. But the difference is that Turkey has overcome its economic crisis to some extent and now is the 17th biggest economy of the world. But Pakistan’s economic conditions have not been stable. That is why Pakistan stands on 27th position in world economy. (Tosheeb, 2010)
“Turkey used to be called the ‘the sick man of Europe’ and suffered inflation rates as high as 80 per cent per annum. But eventually, it fought back, reformed its economy with some tough decisions and made a remarkable economic turnaround. Successive International Monetary Fund support programmes also contributed in the economic recovery and consolidation. Though still somewhat volatile and beset with bouts of inflation every now and then, Turkey is not a risky economy any more for the simple reason that its economic managers are quick to make adjustments whenever needed. Turkey owes this turnaround also to political stability, heralded by the ruling Justice and Development Party — AKP.” (Gul, 2012)

Secularism: The identity of both Turkey and Pakistan are drastically different because Turkey is constitutionally secular country while Pakistan is a religious state in spite of the fact that both have largely Muslim population.

Democracy and Military Interference: Military has been influential since the first days of inception of both Pakistan and Turkey. Moreover, the behavior of armed forces has been quite similar as well as both assume themselves as the sole guardian of their nations and have stabbed the civilian governments at times. Pakistan has been under military rule more than thirty years which is much longer than military rule in Turkey. But, the fact is that Turkish military’s influence in state affairs in incomparable with that of Pakistan.

Though Pakistani armed forces abrogated the constitutions and introduced one in 1962 under the rule of General Ayub Khan which was later eliminated. But, all constitutions of Turkey have been created by military representatives and even currently, Turkey is working under 1982 constitution which was solely created to serve the interests of military. On the contrary, Pakistan is being governed under a civilian constitution of 1973.

A notable difference is that the behavior of military in both countries is quite different as the Turkish army has interfered directly into the civilian affairs many times. One of its examples is the issuing of memorandum by general staff of the army on the eve of presidential elections in May, 2007 and threatening the civilians openly.

But, one aspect of armies of both countries is similar that they assume themselves as perfect and sole guardian of their nations that could kick out civilian government at any time considering their policies against the foundations of their nations. Expectedly, this behavior and assumed position would not be changed in future too.

However, Turkish politicians have shown courage to marginalized the army into its limits by amending the constitution of 1982 to make it a democratic one. Especially, the Justice and Development Party has introduced radical amendments to democratize the constitution by eliminating the armed forces’ representatives from civilian institutes. The JDP has successfully amended 13 times the constitution of 1982 to minimize the influence of army that include the reduction of powers of secretary general of National Security Council and most importantly ensuring constitutional cover for basic human and individual rights of Turkish citizens. (Coskun, 2013)
Conclusion:

After observing the above stated depiction, it can be avowed that Pakistan and Turkey both have same system of parliamentary democracy, both have endeavor with secularism and Islam. Reciprocally they had various armed interferences that have ousted their relevant government. In evaluation of the two Muslim states, they equally exerted to settle democracy, Islam and dominance of martial laws. But the military of both states are incredibly disparate. The previous deem itself like a defender of ‘secularism’ while the subsequent supporting Islam. The main difference between both countries is that in Turkey politicians break the assemblies and military make the constitution, while in case of Pakistan military break the assembly and imposed martial law. The significance of military is comprehended in political turmoil.

As far as Turkish military is concern, it is exceedingly respected and has authoritative place. Its intrusion is constitutionally acknowledged. Besides the 1960, 1971 and 1980 coups the modern officers of armed forces are the supporters of democracy. They deem that civilians have the last word. In their entire military intercession, officers of Turkish Republic have never proceeds blatantly against communal determination instead they stride into reinstate order. The distinction is that; they abandon to leave the ground for an elected government. Therefore, they regarded as guardian of the republic.

In Turkey (unlike Pakistan) the elected officials rescind the constitution and the legislature, while in Pakistan, army break up the political institutes and imposed martial law. The crucial liability of the military is to secure the frontiers of the state. Thus they should not take part in politics. There should be practical implementation of democracy. Political awareness as well as political participation should be increase in order to make a strong parliamentary democratic government. Political leaders must have to carry out their tasks to keep the state stable. Everyone should remain liberated to live out with his belief. But, it should not turn into the means of unfairness, inequity and prejudice.
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