

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322793167>

# Landed Elites and Politics of Agrarian Reforms in Pakistan: A Case study of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's Era

Article · January 2018

DOI: 10.15520/ijcrr/2018/9/01/402

CITATIONS

0

READS

1,147

3 authors, including:



Khizar Abbas

China University of Geosciences

9 PUBLICATIONS 1 CITATION

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Sanwal Kharl

Government College University, Lahore

8 PUBLICATIONS 6 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



China Pakistan Economic Corridor [View project](#)



Energy Poverty [View project](#)

Section: Social Science

## Landed Elites and Politics of Agrarian Reforms in Pakistan: A Case study of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's Era

Khizar Abbass<sup>1</sup>, Sanwal Kharl<sup>2</sup>, Xie Xiaoqing<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author- student at School of Public Administration, China University of Geosciences Wuhan P. R. China, 430074

<sup>2</sup>School of Public Administration CUG

Received 2017-11-25; Accepted 2017-12-22

### Abstract:

The harsh fact, history of India, confessed that landed gentry comprised of feudal lords, landlords, jagirdars and zamindars were created in British colonial raj. Before that in Mughal epoch, *mansabdars* or zamindars played a role of middleman. They performed a duty of government employer and got stipulated salary. They were responsible to collect land revenue on annual bases. They had not given vast powers. All the land was belonged to none but king. But when Britishers conquered India, they started to reform the whole social structure by making constitutional changes and introducing constitutional reforms. They created a class of local collaborators which voluntarily agreed to assist imperial power to control social imperatives. They were Indians in blood, race and color but had colonial mindset. The provinces that would form Pakistan, jagirdars and feudalism became a potent social organization; that could not be culminated even after independence despite of much so called radical experiments; Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's 'Islamic Socialism' in 1970s. Landed elites perpetuating colonial legacy obstructed every constitutional reform or policy regarding agrarian sector either it was 'green revolution' of Ayub Khan or so called radical land reforms of Z.A. Bhutto. Every attempt to terminate landed elites was put into basket due to rampant pressure by this notorious class in Pakistan which monopolized state paraphernalia and this bandwagon is still being perpetuated.

**Key words:** elitism, landed gentry, agrarian reforms, politicization, Z. A Bhutto

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author- student at School of Public Administration, China University of Geosciences Wuhan P. R. China, 430074 , khizarabbass971@yahoo.com

<sup>2</sup> School of Public Administration CUG, sanwalkharl@yahoo.com

<sup>3</sup> School of Public Administration CUG, cathywh@163.com

## 1. Introduction:

The notion of *Elitism* got attention in late nineteenth century in the domain of social science profoundly after the work of two exponents of classical elite theory, Pareto and Mosca. Pareto (1848-1923) mainly focused on psychological characteristics of elites in his masterpiece 'The Mind and Society' and Mosca (1858-1941) preached organizational approach of elites in his edifice 'The Ruling Elites' in nineteenth century. Many other writers discussed about different features and characteristics of elites including Michels, Mills and Burham. But commonly, this notion can be interpreted that 'elites are persons who, by virtue of their strategic locations in large or otherwise pivotal organizations and movements, are able to affect political outcomes regularly and substantially'.<sup>4</sup> They are in organized capacity to determine destiny of a society, mainly are considered the minority and enjoy most prestigious and advantageous position in social preponderance. They are at zenith of pyramid of political, social and economic power. High level civil servants, top politicians, profound businessmen and industrialists or land owners and senior military envoys may be incorporated in this very phenomenon. The reasons behind their intense friendly clique are their small size and common shared interests.

Elitism, broadly speaking, may be defined in two categories; in first strata 'classical or traditional elites' and 'modern or emerging elites' in second echelon<sup>5</sup>. The eminent classical theorists are Pareto, Mosca and Michels and in contrast, modern elite theory is traced in the works of Wright Mills and Burham. The classical elites, which will be the prime focus of this paper, includes landowning and religious elites (Jagirdars, zamindars, Waderas,) whereas emergent category of elite theory saturated by professional elites (lawyers), military elites, bureaucratic elites and industrial elites as for as study of Pakistan is concerned.<sup>6</sup> In the context of Pakistan's political structure, Pareto's categorization of elites in governing elites, non-governing elites and non-elites is clear since its

inception in which 'governing elites operating centrally as direct power holders to exert influence,

<sup>4</sup> John Higley, *Elite theory in political sociology* (Austin: University of Texas, 2008), 3

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 4

<sup>6</sup> Asaf Hussain, 'Elites and Political development in Pakistan', *The Developing Economies*, vol:14(1976), pp.225-6

non-governing elites wielded extensive institutionalized influence, and non-elites were effectively isolated from exerting any real impact on political system'<sup>7</sup>. If we just put aside temporally the categorization of Pareto's elite theory, religious elites had routes in Mughal Dynasty, military elites, bureaucratic elites, and landed elites emerged during British Raj, professional elites and industrialist elites appeared in post-independence era, further more professional elites dominated the East Pakistan and Industrialist elites monopolized political and economic imperatives in West Pakistan. Every Elite group wanted to make different Pakistan as compare to his dissident group. Military Elites wanted to make Pakistan a 'praetorian state', Bureaucratic Elites had desire of 'administrative state', Landed Elites wished for 'feudal state', Industrialists struggled to achieve a 'bourgeoisie state', Professional Elites hoped for a 'democratic state', and finally Religious Elites howled to make 'Islamic state'<sup>8</sup>. In resultant Pakistan became an unknown dish having known recipes.

In the subcontinent, stick of leadership provided by political elites on the platform of All India Muslim League (AIML) for Muslims under the direction of M. Ali Jinnah and Indian National Congress for Hindus (INC) against His Majesty Governments (British Empire). Unfortunately, junta of All India Muslim League was mainly comprised of landed aristocracy and religious pirs unlike the leadership of Indian National Congress composed of middle class i.e., professionals and intellectuals. All India Muslim League except Mr. Jinnah was drenched of nawabs and big land lords. Historical background of prominent founding fathers of All India Muslim League was, Sir Khwaja Salimullah Bahadur, Nawab of Dhaka from 1901-1915, belonged to Dhakka's Nawab Family and founded Bengal Muslim League in 1907, Hakim Ajmal Khan was from the family called Raees of Dehli, Maulana Muhammad Ali Johar belonged to strong and rich religious family, Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Nawab Waqar-ul-Mulk were also from landlord family of Uttar Pardesh, Sir Agha Khan III was the 48<sup>th</sup> Imam of Nizari Ismaili community and was born with golden spoon, Nawab Syed Shamsul Huda was born in zamindar family of Gorkarna, Brahmanbaria District, Nawab Ismail Khan inherited Nawab Dynasty of Meerut, United

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 224.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 233.

Province of Agra and Oudh. The politicians which later became the part of All India Muslim League were also from feudal or aristocratic background. Evidences showed that politicians of Punjab Unionist Party which later switched to All India Muslim League were founded by landed gentry. They became part of All India Muslim League by signing a famous pact between Mr. Jinnah and Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan known as *Sikandar-Jinnah Pact* on October 1937<sup>9</sup>. Punjab's Unionist Party was purely the party of Muslim, Hindus and Sikh landlords of Punjab and they were loyal to British Raj. The struggle for independence continued and resulted in emergence of a sovereign state for Muslims of sub-continent in 1947 and British Empire came to an end. These classical elites were created by colonial masters to control Indian society and to extract maximum revenue. They worked as collaborators to consolidate the roots of imperial power. They also betrayed their fellow people in War of Independence of 1857 by providing cavalry to Imperialists and rewarded by infinite lands. Adeel Khan glimpsed, 'For effective control of a society whose main source of income was land revenue, it was imperative to devise an elaborate system of revenue collection. But to employ British citizens would have cost the government dearly. Therefore a system of local collaborators was erected, in which willing collaboration of certain Indians was used to carry out the task that British administrators were not able to perform. Unlike the horizontal involvement of Mughals, a system of vertical and hierarchical involvement was set in motion. To deal with society without personal involvement colonial administration turned individuals and collectivities into abstract social and legal categories. Categories like ruling classes, martial races and noble blood were constructed. By introducing private ownership, a class of landowners was erected<sup>10</sup>.' The anatomy of classical elites was fabricated during colonial rule. Twice in history of Pakistan, failed attempts were made to curtail the nexus of this traditional power structure. These landed elites continued exerting their influence through hegemony of local governmental portfolios in post-independence era, persuaded their vested interests by dominating major political parties to preserve

their lands. The role of these classical elites in freedom movement, monopolization of state power structure in post independence epoch and repercussions due to their involvement in politics of agrarian refinement specifically in Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's era will be investigated as objective of this paper. Hypothetically, the role of landed aristocracy in monopolizing and politicizing agrarian reforms will be examined that how they obstructed and curtailed every step to introduce land reforms for termination of suzerainty.

### 1.1 Methodology:

The research report is conducted through Historical, Descriptive and Analytical methods of research. Data has been collected through Secondary resources including books, articles, journals, magazines and newspapers etc. This paper will analyze two variables of research methodology: Landed elites and agrarian reforms. Landed elites as independent variable and agrarian reforms as dependent variable; their co-relation is paradigm of this report.

### 2. Emergence of Landed Elites and Politics of Agrarian Reforms: A historical perspective:

Indian soil is able to espouse with agriculture. The traditional agrarian society was too much engaged in cultivation and it was the only source to feed themselves so whole family worked in the fields as labor. 25 per cent of population of India was one way or the other connected with it. In the reign of Mughal bloodline, all land was belonged to king, there was no right of private proprietorship. Land was endowed to cultivators and in reciprocal way stipulated ratio of land revenue was extracted<sup>11</sup>. That revenue was not specified to pay in cash but in other forms like cereals at the end. That land revenue was collected by special government servants entitled *Mansabdars*. Those officials was picked cadre, inducted by emperor himself, civil servants of that time and were blessed with handsome salaries<sup>12</sup>. They were waged either in cash or allotted *jagirs* temporally.<sup>13</sup> They were transferred one place to another to accomplish his duty.

<sup>9</sup> Stanley Wolpert, *Jinnah of Pakistan*(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1999), 151

<sup>10</sup> Adeel Khan, *Politics of Identity: Ethnic Nationalism and the State in Pakistan*( New Delhi: Saga Publications India Pvt Ltd, 2005), 53

<sup>11</sup> S. Akbar Zaidi, *Issues In Pakistan's Economy*(Karachi: Oxford University Press,1999), 12

<sup>12</sup> Anil Saxena, *Mughal Administration*(Delhi: Anmol Publication Pvt. Ltd, 2007), 24

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

Furthermore, Moreland postulated that in Jalaluddin Muhammad Akbar's government, revenue was collected by nobles, regarded as spokespersons and agent of emperor formally and paid specific amount of wealth from imperial treasury and rest was retained by King<sup>14</sup>. Despite of that mechanism, one or more villages were consigned to a *zamindar* and expected to flock income from cultivators. Their position was resembled with other employees of court and security portfolios<sup>15</sup>. The fact that is sought of attention, it is quite hard to distinguish which group was dominant. Thrice *jagirdars*, *zamindars*, or *mansabdars* held extravagant life style because after demise all rewarded land was confiscated by the state again and sealed. No *jagirdar* could have right to transfer the land to his offspring inherently<sup>16</sup>. In Mughal Monarchy, *jagirdar* was not considered a feudal due to his ostentation of living standards and was not permitted to own land legally. While feudal can be titled who hold legal right to possess land. Mr Sharma argued about *jagirdar* of Mughal Era, 'he did not stand between cultivator and king; he simply took position of royal officer who would have otherwise collected land revenue'.<sup>17</sup> Before coming of British in subcontinent, method of cultivation was in form of small households. Cultivators resembled with rentier rather an entrepreneur.<sup>18</sup> The backwardness of Mughal Emperors in sophisticated technology and education snatched India from them and power was now in the hands of White Men. A new class of collaborators was fabricated as junior partners to rule over. Many changes were brought legally to let that happened. Pitt's Act in 1784 repudiated annual leases and directed to avail permanent holders for revenue collection.<sup>19</sup> George Cornwallis who was himself belonged to feudal family tried to produce a feudal class of collaborators like in Europe. Because European suzerain had legal right of possession of land, that was decided to plant in India too. So in resultant, on 22 March 1793, the famous Permanent Settlement

was passed and *zamindars* now became actual landlords<sup>20</sup>. That was a newly created landed gentry, stable one and strong enough to rule. It was the settlement that defined proper land revenue, nature of possession of land and granted separate property ownership to individuals and families.<sup>21</sup>

The newly born class of zamindars was totally different from that in Mughal Era. This tier had right of inheritance, hold legal right to transfer land, permanent hold over land and responsible to collect revenue. Their living style was not extravagant. After death land could be transferred to siblings or offspring. *Zamindars* constructed a type of landed gentry due to hereditary imperatives just to enhance revenue. As defined by Thompson, 'To enhance the revenue income, the recommendation of Cornwallis was adopted and made law by Act of Parliament; and thus zamindars from being mere middlemen between government and people, as they had been under Mughal and Hindu rulers, were raised to a position resembling that of English landlord who is the owner of his estate'<sup>22</sup>.

Consequently, infinite land was confiscated from poor peasants and cultivators and was endowed to those who were voluntarily shared their destiny with colonial masters. Best irrigated system in the world was built in Punjab through construction of canals for that purpose. Land Alienated Act of 1900 perpetuated same intention. According to that act, land transformation to non-agriculturists was forbidden. Exposure revealed that it was problematic to differentiate agriculturists and non-agriculturists clique. That act was only for specified castes and community, decisive power was headed by Masters whom they entitled as agriculturists and whom they excluded. In most of the cases particularly in Punjab beneficiaries were ex soldiers for purpose to attract more candidates for induction in Indian Army.<sup>23</sup> Another writer glimpsed at whole panorama in these words, 'Punjabis endeared themselves to the British authorities by helping them in putting down the armed resistance movement of 1857. The British showered their favors on Punjab through the irrigation schemes that led to reclamation of large areas of West Punjab.

<sup>14</sup>W.H.Moreland, *India at the Death of Akbar*(Delhi: Sunita Publications, 1988),91-2

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 129.

<sup>16</sup>Anil Saxena, *Mughal Administration*(Delhi: Anmol Publication Pvt. Ltd, 2007), 26-7

<sup>17</sup> Sri Ram Sharma, *Mughal Government and Administration*(Bombay: IND Kitabs Limited, 1951),76

<sup>18</sup> Hermann Kulke & Dietmar Rothermund, *A History of India*(London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 1986), 260

<sup>19</sup> Percival Spear, *The Oxford History of Modern India 1740-1947*(London: Oxford University Press, 1965), 91

*International Journal of Contemporary Research and Review*, Vol. 9, Issue. 01, Page no: SS 20368-20376  
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15520/ijcrr/2018/9/01/402>

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 92.

<sup>21</sup> Peter Robb, *A History of India*(Hampshire: Macmillan Publishers limited, 2011), 132

<sup>22</sup> E.W.Thompson, *History of India*(New Delhi: Srishti Book Distributors, 2004), 307

<sup>23</sup> Hermann Kulke & Dietmar Rothermund, *A History of India*(London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 1986), 276

Thus came into being a large class of Punjabi Landowners, who played an important role in strengthening the colonial system of control by providing men for army service. Punjab had the highest share in British Indian Army (BIA). Over 50 per cent of BIA personnel were from Punjab, especially those parts of province which later to form Pakistan<sup>24</sup>.

## 2.1 Classical Elites: Quest for Independence:

As well as Independence Movement is concerned, in late nineteenth century a political party named Indian National Congress (INC) established, sponsored by British that represented both Hindus and Muslims. In the beginning of twentieth century another political party, All India Muslim League (AIML) based on communal politics, was created with the help of British government to counter INC.<sup>25</sup> Unlike INC which had deep roots in society at that time and absorbed all tiers of society from professional elites to industrial elites and from teachers to lawyers, All India Muslim league throughout its history has been dominated by landed elites. The Founding fathers as aforementioned mainly were *nawabs*, *zamindars*, *pirs* and *jagirdars*. All were loyal to His Majesty Government and hold titles given by Crown. In this scenario, Punjab Unionist Party appeared in 1924 comprised of purely feudal lords of Punjabi Muslims, Hindu Jats from Ambala District and some Sikh landed gentry. Under the leadership of Khizr Tiwana<sup>26</sup>, it became strong political party of Punjab in 1930s, won the 1936 elections and formed government but AIML was severely defeated. Surprisingly, when INC declared in late 1930s that party would introduce land reforms and attempted to abolish feudalism in India after getting emancipation from colonial raj, The Unionist leaders switched into AIML and started supporting Freedom Movements for preservation of *jagirs*. The famous Sikandar- Jinnah Pact Signed between AIML and Unionist Party in 1937 for combined opposition to INC. That pact aimed to placate Punjabi land lords to join hands for emancipation<sup>27</sup>. Unionist Party drew its support

from rural areas of Punjab on *biradari* (kinship) politics that continued its pre-eminent stance even after independence. It was 'elite convergence' between two parties of AIML and Unionist Party to get share in India and to confront with INC in Freedom Movement. It can be seen in WWII, when INC put into garbage the companionship of England in war but Muslim league hold its support and Unionist Party recruited many soldiers from Punjab to fight against Axis Forces. Then in 1940s Muslim League was encouraged by lord Linlithgow to demand division of India and message was conveyed through Sir Zafrullah Khan. It was planned to pressurize INC to grasp support in war.<sup>28</sup> So landed gentry of Punjab, Bengal and Sind became leading figures in movement for guarantee of their estates.<sup>29</sup>

Aurora of feudalism in AIML from 1930s proved retrogressive and undemocratic in post colonial era. Overall 'weak system which was based on a colonial heritage has predominately exposed to deteriorating influence over years' after liberation<sup>30</sup>. Jamil and Hassan illustrated, 'at independence, feudal land lords of Pakistan, the zamindars, khans, sardars and pirs emerged as dominant class in country.... a number of land reforms acts passed by various governments including an act to abolish *sardari* system, had failed to substantially weaken the grip of feudal class on land ownership'<sup>31</sup>. So eventually initiative was taken by East Bengal Assembly in 1950, East Bengal Estate Acquisition and Tenancy Act was preceded by assembly to take action against kulaks. Ceiling was specified on 33 acres. East Bengal Assembly mainly was under control of professional elites and middle class politicians unlike West Pakistan's assemblies. In East Pakistan approximately 75 per cent of land was possessed by Hindu zamindars, so result was obvious. Seventy thousand acres of land was confiscated from 421 kulaks and distributed amongst landless. Several petitions were filed against it but Supreme Court hold decision in favor

<sup>24</sup> Adeel Khan, *Politics of Identity: Ethnic Nationalism and the State in Pakistan* (New Delhi: Saga Publications India Pvt Ltd, 2005), 64

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 64.

<sup>26</sup> Ian Talbot, *Khizr Tiwana* (Richmond Serrey: Curzon Press, 1996), 51

<sup>27</sup> Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan The Enigma of Political Development* (Kent, England: Wm Dawson & Sons Ltd, 1980), 138

<sup>28</sup> Wali Khan, *Facts are Facts: The Untold Story of India's Partition* (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd, 1987), 29-30

<sup>29</sup> S.V.R Nasr, "Pakistan: State, Agrarian Reform and Islamization," *Springer* 10, no.2 (1996): 250.

<sup>30</sup> K.M. Azam, *Pakistan Economy, Politics, Philosophy and Religious* (Karachi: Royal Book Company, 2002), 23

<sup>31</sup> Hassan Gadezi and Jamil Rashid, *Pakistan: The Unstable State* (Lahore: Vanguard Book Ltd, 1983), 34-35

of act till 1956<sup>32</sup>. The Pakistan Muslim League set Agrarian Reforms Committee in 1949 to decide about future of feudalism in Pakistan. It was agreed to abolish hereditary lands without any compensation and ceiling was stipulated on 150 irrigated and 450 non-irrigated. Furthermore, recommendations were made to provinces for implementation but except East Bengal there was not seen any seriousness.

In Punjab and Sind condition was out of control, Punjab Muslim league was become a toy in the hands of Mumtaz Muhammad Daultana and Khan of Mumdot; both belonged to landed gentry, prevented any act against their family interests and created severe problems in redistribution of land to refugees. Mian Iftikhar-ud-Din, who remained president of Punjab Muslim league, was stepped down from his office in demanding the breakup of big landlordism. Organization for Protection of Rights of Landlords according to the Shariat opposed Punjab Tenancy Act of 1950. In resultant, Firoz Khan Noon (Landlord, succeeded Daultana) rejected it saying communistic spirit<sup>33</sup>. Yusuf Harun (an Industrialist) became the chief minister of Sind with the blessings of Ayub Khuro. He agitated to ameliorate the conditions of haris and wanted further proceedings on Tenancy Bill because of pressure by federal government to abolish *jagirdars* and *waderas*. But *waderas* got help from Mr. Khuro to not abolish *zamindari* system. In that wax situation Yusuf Harun felt quit helpless and resigned finally in 1950. In West Pakistan, if we evaluate the successes of implementation of land reforms in overall provinces, NWFP took dispersion. NWFP Tenancy Act was moved and empowered the courts to assure the implementation of act. The government of Abdul Qayyum Khan terminated all *jagirs* excepted owned by military services.<sup>34</sup> Overall "Pakistan Muslim League failed to introduce any meaningful land reforms primarily because the landlords dominated its ranks and this failure tarnished the party image" that resulted first military coup in 1958 in history of Pakistan.<sup>35</sup>

### 3. Z.A Bhutto's Politics of Land Reforms:

Z. A. Bhutto was the first popular politician who emerged as most powerful ruler after first general elections in history of Pakistan in 1970 in West Pakistan. He came up with an ideology of Islamic Socialism, although Islam has nothing to do with socialism; Islam and socialism are two antagonist ideologies and are two parallel banks of river that can never meet each others. The slogan of *roti, kapra aur makan* (food, clothe and shelter) cleaned sweep in West Pakistan. After obliteration of Pakistan in 1971, Bhutto formed government and series of radical reforms launched; Land Reforms of 1st March of 1972 were one of them. Land reforms of Bhutto were different in many ways those of Ayub Khan which he called Magna Carta for peasants. More important the philosophy behind them; the objectives were 'affectively break up the iniquitous concentration of landed wealth, reduce unemployment, reduce income disparities, increase production, streamline the administration of land revenue and agricultural taxation, and truly lay down the foundations of a relationship of honor and mutual benefit between the landowner and tenants' and more important to eradicate the deteriorating influence of landed bourgeoisie on national politics.<sup>36</sup> In an address on television he accentuated, 'We are as much against the ignorant and tyrannical landlord as we are against the robber baron of industry. We are as much for creative and humane landowner as we are for a productive and conscientious owner of industry.... I can't nationalize land. It's not possible. At the same time, I can't allow bigger estates to remain. I must cut them down so that production increases'<sup>37</sup>. Strangely, Z.A. Bhutto introduced land reforms and nationalization policy when he was civil martial law administrator (CMLA). Being CMLA he was in his full form of Bunapartism.

Bhutto's socialist and populist orientation compelled him to reduce ceiling on 150 acres of irrigated and 300 of non- irrigated land according to Martial Law Regulation 115<sup>38</sup>. Bhutto introduced land reforms after criticising Ayub's agrarian policies and alleged Ayub for having soft corner for feudalism. As portrayed, 'In introducing his land

<sup>32</sup> Talukdar Muniruzzaman, "Group Interests in Pakistan Politics 1949-58," *Pacific Affairs* vol.39, No.1/2 (1966):84-5.

<sup>33</sup> M. Rafique Afzal, *Pakistan History & Politics 1949-1971*(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2001), 53-58

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 59-61.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>36</sup> S.Akbar Zaidi, *Issue in Pakistan's Economy*(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1999),35

<sup>37</sup> Omar Noman, *Pakistan Political and Economic History Since 1947*(London: Kegan Paul International Ltd, 1988), 94

<sup>38</sup> Hamid Khan, *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan*(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2001),125

reforms in 1972, Bhutto termed Ayub Khan 's 1959 reforms, a subterfuge, designed to fool people in name of reforms with all manners of concession to buttress and pampered the landed aristocracy and fatten the favoured new<sup>39</sup>. In both cases exemptions were there in 1959 reforms; farms, orchards and hunting fields, but in contrast these exemptions in 1972 were in form of trusts, charity, educational institutions and religious societies<sup>40</sup>. In resultant, some 42 per cent of land was seized in Punjab and 59 per cent in Sind, overall approximately 0.6 million of acres were confiscated. The resumed land in 1972 was less than of 1959 operation and some 131000 tenants were granted with property rights.<sup>41</sup> Bhutto did not pay any compensation to landed elites when he seized lands and jurisdiction of reforms applied on individual rather family<sup>42</sup> and transfer to another was invalid in any ways. 'When Bhutto came into power political culture was dominated by landlords and waderas... one of whom he was himself'<sup>43</sup>. But Bhutto's charismatic leadership, great oratory skills and charming personality spilled over the people of West Pakistan. For first time in history of Pakistan, a man like Bhutto talked about poor, helpless and dejected people.

Bhutto's land reforms were nothing but old wine in new bottle. Although these reforms got some popularity and in some cases results were adequate particularly in Baluchistan but gradually became part of bandwagon. His policy of nationalization and land reforms were tactics to heal the wound of 1971 and to divert attention from that fatal blunder; of that Bhutto was also a part. How he could be so stupid that he hit his feet with an axe! Irony was, on one side Bhutto was in action against feudalism but on the other hand he opened his window for the entrance in his party. That act dejected leftists which

eventually denounced his party on that increasing sideline<sup>44</sup>.

Moreover, there were many lapses and no proper surveillance or monitoring on that field in Sind, Baluchistan and even in Punjab that hampered its implementation in true sense because there was indispensable opposition by landlords of Sind and Punjab. So efficiency in accessibility and redistribution of lands was compromised<sup>45</sup>. Apprehension from victimization and eviction prevented tenants to go for legislative benefits<sup>46</sup>. There was deducted a gap between legislation and implementation that paved the way for illegal manipulation of laws for vested interests. Shaikh Rashid (minister for land reforms) openly confessed about ambiguities in legislations and admitted the interval between implementation and legislation. Along with that the capacity of government to effect reforms was questionable<sup>47</sup>. Despite of those loopholes, number of opposition leaders severely censured government's staggered stance against feudalism. Ghulam M. Khan and Mir Ghaus Bux, leaders of National Awami Party, revealed that reforms failed to satisfy haris regarding their expectations and approximately 80 per cent of tenants of states would not be benefitted by new reforms<sup>48</sup>. 'Makhdoom strengthened and deepened Bhutto's links with waderas and religious leaders without whose support; a decisive victory in Sind would not have been possible'<sup>49</sup>. How could Bhutto desalinate himself from them and lose his political support?

Fatal legal mistake was its application of individual rather on family which little hurt landlords and did not improve the life of poor as it would be. As usual, Bhutto justified ownership of individual to manipulate Islamic teachings. He was of the view

<sup>44</sup>Ishtiaq Ahmed, *Pakistan The Garrison State Origins, Evolution, Consequences 1947-2011*(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 206

<sup>45</sup>Attar Chand, *Pakistan in search of Modernization*(New Dehli: Anmol Publishers, 1992), 61-63

<sup>46</sup>Ronald Herring and M. Ghaffar, "The 1972 Land Reforms in Pakistan and their economic implications: A Preliminary Analysis," *Pakistan Institute of Development Economics* Vol.13, No. 3(1974):272-73.

<sup>47</sup>Ronald J. Herring, "Z. A. Bhutto and Eradication of feudalism in Pakistan," *Economic & Political Weekly* Vol.15, No.12(1980):605.

<sup>48</sup>Bruce. T. Esposito, "The Politics of Agrarian Reforms in Pakistan," *University of California Press* Vol.14, No.5(1974):430-33

<sup>49</sup>Khalid Bin Sayeed, "How Radical is the Pakistan People's Party," *Pacific Affairs* Vol,48, No.1(1975):45

<sup>39</sup> Ronald J. Herring, "Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and Erdaication of Feudalism in Pakistan," *Economic and Political weekly* Vol.15, No. 12(1980):602.

<sup>40</sup> Ronald Herring and M. Ghaffar, "The 1972 Land Reforms in Pakistan and their economic implications: A Preliminary Analysis," *Pakistan Institute of Development Economics* Vol.13, No. 3(1974):246.

<sup>41</sup>S. Akbar Zaidi, *Issue in Pakistan's Economy*(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2005), 36

<sup>42</sup>Omar Noman, *Pakistan Political and Economic History Since 1947*(London: Kegan Paul International Ltd,1988), 94

<sup>43</sup>Shahid Javed Burki, *Pakistan The Continuing Search for Nationhood*(Boulder: Westview Press,1986), 63

that in Islam individual has the right to possess land rather family. In reality he like previous leaders followed a selective approach regarding the commandments of Islam and Sunnah. Feudal do not pay even a single rupee of tax. Nevertheless, regime failed to gain enough for landless and poor cultivators which were dependent on their *Mayi Baap* (Feudals)<sup>50</sup>. Furthermore, transformation of land was made quite easy for owner to transfer it in daughters, sons, wife and other offspring. It also failed to interrupt the stronghold of squirearchy in Sind and Punjab particularly in terms of politics and economy.<sup>51</sup>

Last effort was also made by Mr. Bhutto in 1977 when he announced another land reforms reducing ceiling on 100 acres of irrigated and 200 of non-irrigated. But reverse to previous it was like blinking of lamp which was going to its end. The land reforms of 1977 were just to win next elections but unfortunately destiny had something else in mind. Finally, Feroz Ahmed concluded, 'peasants have not gained much from reforms and government failed to redistribute confiscated land affectively among peasants that showed feudalism still strong in the country'<sup>52</sup>. In Pakistan suzerainty is obstacle for amelioration of society not by their wealth but their control over tenants and neighboring peasants as a strong political force. So there is need for radical and indiscriminate political measures to crush this deadly socio-political and economic disease. The land reforms of Bhutto left more to be desired. Later after his eclipse in 1979, petition was writ in Federal Sharia Court by zamindars and waderas against land reforms and finally reforms were declared as un-Islamic. Implementation of reforms was announced suspended by Shariat Appellate Bench.

### 3.1 Comparative Analysis:

After Inception two regimes bothered to introduce land reform as above mentioned Ayub Khan and Z.A. Bhutto respectively in the decades of 1960s and 1970s. Ironically, Ayub Khan and Z.A. Bhutto went for such radical reforms when both were martial law administrators and introduce land reforms policy through martial law regulations.

<sup>50</sup>Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan in the Twentieth Century*(New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 403

<sup>51</sup>Hamid Khan, *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan*(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 200), 250

<sup>52</sup>Feroz Ahmed, "Land Reforms and Social Structure," *Pakistan Forum* Vol.3, No. 4(1973):9.

When they succeeded to civilianize their rule, their radical and revolutionary initiatives and orientation gradually grew dim. Ayub Khan stipulated ceiling on 500 hundred irrigated but Z. A. Bhutto fixed 150 of arable. Ayub Khan paid compensation but Bhutto did not due its socialist imperatives. The main difference between Ayub's land reforms and of Mr. Bhutto can be elaborated in term of philosophy behind these reforms. Ayuk Khan presented capitalist reforms while Mr. Bhutto was more inclined towards socialism and communism. Ayub Khan opened his hands while fixing the ceiling to increase production. His reforms were the part of Green Revolution but Mr. Bhutto reduce ceiling just to create egalitarian society in terms of economy.

Populism of 1970s accentuated the eradication of feudalism due to leftist preponderance. Bhutto's land reforms were more socialist rather Islamic. Nationalization in industry and banking, labour policies and improvements in social sector strengthened its socialist stance. Mr. Bhutto followed the practices of Egypt, Syria, Algeria and Iraq at that time<sup>53</sup>. In contrast Ayub Khan's policies were western ward. Ayub Khan's economic and agricultural policies resulted in the emergence of twenty two most powerful and wealthiest families. His green revolution attracted researchers from Taiwan, South Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand because it was emerging South Asian economic giant of liberal democracy. Their antagonist philosophies regarding industry, agriculture and social sector also influenced land reforms which become cause of politicisation. Despite of this, Ayub Khan's reforms had more satisfactory results than of Mr. Bhutto. The ratio of confiscated land in 1960s was more in numbers than that of 1970s.

### 4. Conclusion:

If we take the example of Pakistan and India in the light of land reforms, elites were there on both sides of Muslim and Hindus in United India, they provide leadership in quest of independence from foreign rule; Congress for Hindus and AIML from Muslims. They both fought against same enemy and got liberation. The questions are, why did land reforms succeed in India (after division) and termination of feudalism became inevitable eternally in 1949? And why did land reforms not bring same kind of results in Pakistan? Why could Ayub Khan and Z.A.

<sup>53</sup>Syed Rasul Raza, *Z.A Zhutto Architect of New Pakistan*(Los Angeles: Sani H. Panhwar,2008),18-19

Bhutto not parish the *jagirdari* system? Obviously the difference was in leadership's farsightedness, sincerity and struggle.

INC unlike AIML presented and secured the interests of peasants, lawyers, industrialists, workers, bourgeoisie and proletariats. More Important INC leadership was influenced by socialism and communism. Their stance was anti-feudalist as openly declared in 1937 that in independent India, feudalism would be eradicated through effective radical land reforms which of course they did. AIML leadership was comprised of almost landed gentry, *nawabs*, religious *pirs* (bishops) and *zamindars*. There was no place for poor peasants and workers because they were unable to pay its membership fee. It opened its door for landlords of Punjab Unionist Party which used to promote British interests.

This wanton difference in independence movements clarifies that why INC effectively terminated feudalism. That is why in initial years AIML failed to introduce effective land reforms. 'When British left India they handed over state power in Pakistan to leadership of Muslim League, the party of bourgeoisie and big landlords'<sup>54</sup>. In post colonial era *jagirdars* and *zamindars* of Punjab, *waderas* of Sind, khans, malik and sardars of North Western Frontier Province (NWFP) occupied key position in Muslim League. Liaqut Ali Khan was himself from landed gentry of East Punjab. Many others like Malik Feroz Khan (PM of Pakistan in 1957-58), Mumtaz Muhammad Daultana (CM of Punjab 1951-53), Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani, Mian Iftikharuddin, Syed Nawab Shah Gardezi and Khan of Mamdot (CM of Punjab 1947-49) were prominent Punjabi landlords; Ghulam Ali Talpur and Mr. Ayub Khuro (Governor of Sind 1947-55) were from Sindhi landed gentry, and in category and migrants were Ch. Khaliquzzaman (Governor of Sind 1953-54) occupied potent position in their respective provincial Muslim League branches<sup>55</sup>. How could they be so stupid that they let Muslim League and government to take action against them? All initiatives to terminate large landed estate were put into dustbin by these landed elites.

Same happened in Mr. Bhutto's regime, because first he took initiatives to challenge traditional power structure which was monopolized by feudal lords but failed to break it completely. This

traditional power structure was so powerful that ultimately they both had to join hands with them to consolidate their rule as civilian leaders. Land reforms failed to receive satisfactory results due to preventive measure by landed elites. They obstructed every initiative to introduce land reforms. The existence of feudalism in present time proves failure of land reforms of Z.A. Bhutto. Ayub Khan joined his hands with zamindars and offered platform of his party and Mr. Bhutto did the same. Assemblies were drenched with landed elites in 1960s and 1970s, so, there was a negligible opportunity for radical reforms and initiatives being implemented.

Landed elites in politics of Pakistan used Islam as a tool against the infiltration of communism. As illuminated by McGrath, 'If there was one point of agreement among the landowners and well-to-do lawyers who made up the League's leadership, it was the fear of communism or other agencies of radical social and economic changes'<sup>56</sup>. Fear of communism due to its radical stance against feudalism compelled them to go for Islamization. When communism approached in neighbor country China, they went for Objective Resolution as preventive action and made Pakistan an Islamic State rather secular. Islamic features were incorporated in thrice constitutions of Pakistan not because of affection with Islam but to contain communist expansion in south by manifesting Pakistan as Fortress of Islam. This was all done just to retain huge jagirs in their hands. How it could be that specter of feudalism would be terminated through two staggering land reforms initiatives that were breaded in centuries? The traditional power network knitted by classical elites could not be broken by Mr. Bhutto due to immense opposition from feudal lords. These classical elites caused politicization and obstruction of agrarian reforms in Pakistan and in Z.A. Bhutto's regime.

<sup>54</sup>Y.V. Kankovsky and L.R. Gordan, *A History of Pakistan 1947-58* (Lahore: People's Publishing House, 1964), 113

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 114.

<sup>56</sup>McGrath, *The Destruction of Pakistan's*

*Democracy* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 53