

# Joys of Western Democracy: American Victory and Loss of Political Sovereignty in Pakistan

By [Dr. Ejaz Akram](#)

Global Research, April 19, 2022

Region: [Asia](#)

Theme: [History](#)

In-depth Report: [PAKISTAN](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Visit and follow us on [Instagram](#), [Twitter](#) and [Facebook](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

\*\*\*

*After committing the shameful atrocities of direct colonization against the non-West, the West felt it was necessary to invent methods of indirect colonization. Other than institutional controls, they would incarcerate and assassinate many of the non-Western leaders who disobeyed the West. But killing was bloody and messy, reminiscent of their colonial atrocities. Hence a new mode of injustice was perfected, that of the regime change. Advances in information technology and impact of corporate and social media on human consciousness, brought about more subtlety to the science of regime change. This icing on the cake of international institutions such as UN, FATF, IBRD & IMF, are all used to bring down representative and pro-people governments. Methods used for regime changes are bribery, threat, extortion and blackmail. If the above observation be true, then who says that the West is civilized? If the populations of EU and USA claim that it is them who vote such governments into power who are against self-determination in the developing world, then West’s democracy is opposed to universal self-determination to which they are signatories inside the UN. Law of the jungle, brutality and injustice are ways of uncivilized barbarians.*

This is what the barbarians have done once again in Pakistan. The West has successfully conducted ‘operation regime change’ in Pakistan in an attempt to steal Pakistan away from its family of Asian nations. Instead, Pakistan has been by force shoved back into its old role, as NATO’s minion. Imran Khan’s elected government was struck down in a campaign in which a weak state and a weak civil society were bought out with money. Opposition political parties, PTI’s turncoat members, an extremely poisonous, seditious and anti-people media, dishonorable judges, US-subservient Army top leadership, all collaborated to take down an honest leader and replaced him with well-known thugs, a staggering number of whom are either indicted or convicted for crimes ranging from corruption, treason and murder.

If homegrown governments are replaced with foreign imposed rule, then Pakistan can never

be sovereign enough to make its own policies. This means that China cannot pledge its future to an uncertain Pakistan and must help Pakistan in bringing about political stability. If CPEC is existential for BRI and BRI is existential for China, then bringing stability to Pakistan by counter-intervention is China's only option. If the US is not ready to let go of Pakistan, then China should consider 'buying' more influence in Pakistan in order to defeat the Indian and American influence in Af-Pak-Iran region. As a Pakistani I say that with shame that since our ruling elite gets sold so cheaply that it may not be an expensive proposition for China to beat America in its dirty game by out-bidding the US in Pakistani parliament's horse-trading. However, it is against the Chinese principles of governance to do such a thing.

So, why did the US do that?

It is public knowledge that the West has been openly against CPEC and BRI. West's regional agent, India, has made dozens upon dozens of statements against the Chinese plans of connectivity and threatened to invade Gilgit-Baltistan to cut off Pakistan from China. Imran Khan was in favor of CPEC and Eurasian integration. He was also in favor of good bilateral relations with Russia. Particularly, he was in favor of promoting more connectivity and cooperation amongst the Muslim countries. This is a necessary prerequisite of the BRI since the Muslim world occupies the central and the biggest landmass without which no land connectivity would be possible between Europe and East Asia. This is also why FM Wang Yi made a statement last month that China wants to help the Muslim world to bring about peace. This statement was diametrically opposite of America's 'war policy' in the Muslim world. The Western imperialism doesn't allow intra-Muslim cooperation at all because of its necessity to oppose self-determination in the Muslim World. They killed Liaquat Ali Khan, Z. A. Bhutto, Zia, Shah Faisal, Gaddafi, Nasser, and many others whom they found guilty of promoting solidarity and cooperation among Muslim countries. This is why the West constantly promotes the three phobias; while Imran Khan spoke against Islamophobia, and rejected Sinophobia and Russophobia.

What Should Pakistan Do?

Out of the formerly colonized world, only China escaped West's iron cage because they cleverly negotiated a political system for themselves which suited their needs. I cannot go into the details for this system here, but I will focus on just one aspect of it which is its one party system. In addition to the 'one party', there are numerous small parties that work in tandem with the CPC inside China. However, the biggest party that leads all aspects of life in China is the CPC. More importantly, to call the CPC a 'party' is perhaps too narrow of a description. It is much more than just a 'party' because of how the word 'party' is understood in the Western world. For lack of another term for now, we can call it a single party system.

In a book length discussion elsewhere I have argued that single party systems with state based governance which are pro-people have more in common with the essence of Islamic political thought than does Western democracy which thrives on divisive individualism rather than society's need for inner unity across different levels. Pakistan should consider a state based single party system of governance which is based on the widest understanding of the Islamic tradition. From a purely traditional point of view, Western democracies defy the principles of Islamic political thought in a way that state-based single-party systems which affirm transcendence may not. From an Islamic point of view, Western democracies

may not be permissible because of their deep secularism is tantamount of denial of transcendence.

More importantly, after trying and failing for 75 years, it is the call of common sense that Pakistan should abandon its overall Westernization project in favor of its own traditions. Pakistan should carefully analyze the Chinese path of development and security to see how it worked for China.

The Problem with Western Democratism:

The West presents itself that it has political and ideological diversity because of its multiple party or two party democracies, but in reality they are only superficially pluralistic because their puppet masters are the same. The corporations and bankers who bankroll the campaigns of both political parties wield the decisive influence on state policies. Many Western governments of EU and America are deeply influenced by this international establishment.

In an effort to protect itself from Western regime changes, China conceived of a single party system, which has served it well, so much so, that when the CPC took over China, the Western history books soon added a chapter to their history of China books titled 'loss of China'. The West lost China because it came up with a system which made infiltration difficult for the outsiders and very dangerous for the inside collaborators. This is why the West is always sulking about China's 'dictatorship'. Whereas in reality, China's pro-people system is more democratic than the elite-privileging democracies of the West whose people are falling by the wayside at a fast pace.

Some scholars of contemporary history and social sciences have argued that China is unique, hence not copyable. I dispute that China is unique. In one sense all people are unique and in another sense, all people are similar. The ability to relate across cultures lies in the latter principle, otherwise there would be no intercultural understanding, interfaith dialogues and inter-civilizational harmony. I believe it is possible that people, cultures and civilizations have learnt from each other. There is historical evidence for this. Therefore, if Pakistan failed in its experiment with Western democracy (like China did from 1900 to 1949) it is alright. It can try something new and off the beaten path of backward Western ideologies of 300 year old enlightenment and 200 years old modernism. Pakistan should not hesitate to consult with friendly neighbors to see what has worked for them. It is my claim that considering elements of China's journey to development and security will be very useful for Pakistan.

How can Pakistan prevent such a thing from happening again?

Foreigners are in control of the Pakistani parliament with the help of the insiders. This is nothing new for Pakistan, as in the case of many developing nations. History has reminded Pakistan again; Pakistan institutions are weak because its system is faulty. Large swaths of state officials and civil society can be easily bought. Civil bureaucracy, media, judiciary; all of them become compromised. Importantly, out of all the institutions, Pakistani military is more functional than other sectors of the state and it is dearly loved by its people. How could officers like Bajwa make it to the top who are willing to sacrifice national interest under the US influence? It is common knowledge in Islamabad that in 2016, most army officers in Pakistan thought that Gen. Zubair Mahmood Hayat was more competent and deserving than Bajwa for the position of the army chief. But the American influence inside

the senior military elite was so strong, that it prevented the smooth meritocratic functioning of our military.

In a paper titled “Is there an Islamic Theory of Civil-Military Relations?” I have argued that civilian rule is superior to military rule because of the very nature of military command. This is why in China a civil president is head of the military commission. Since militaries are powerful, their presence is bound to be political. But Western democratism opposes political role of military in theory, but often supports military rule elsewhere as in Pakistan. In Pakistan the size and strength of the military makes it the most powerful and the most political out of all institutions. But under the influence of Western ideas our military claims that we have nothing to do with politics, which isn't true. However, since that is the official stance, military can easily evade accountability of their political actions. If military's political calculus is right, they claim applause from the nation. If their political calculus is wrong, they say we are neutral to national politics. This gives our military plausible deniability while transgressing an important principle: if you have political power, you must also have political accountability.

To pretend that militaries will never be political is a daydream. This is why President Xi Jinping routinely speaks to his military and encourages them to play their 'political role' with dutiful diligence and responsibility. Pakistan needs the same. It needs a system which give our military due space to play their political role, but openly and responsibly.

Pakistan is a country of intelligent, well-meaning and hospitable people, a strong military, but it has a weak political system that cannot protect itself against foreigners. The West not only proposes but also disposes an archaic system of governance for us. Like most psychologically colonized societies of South Asia, their Westernized ruling elites accept the 'white man's gospel' uncritically and naively to think that Western democracy is the only legitimate form of government. Even if they follow the dictates of their Western masters, the masters are still not happy. As demonstrated in Musadeq's Iran, Morsi's Egypt, French overthrow of democracy in Algeria, all of these cases indicate that the West is not serious about either proposing a democratic system, let alone respecting one if one has come about.

China's situation during Guomindang period was somewhat similar. Only after having a single party system could they come out of under the Western thumb. The Western critics often say that the single party system doesn't allow for choice and dissension. This is propaganda. All dissension in a single party system is shared on the widest platform. This type of rule keeps the foreigners out. Despite this, the West created problems for China in Hong Kong, Tibet and Xinjiang. But laws in China are tough enough and it doesn't take CPC's judicial system very long to send the corrupt to the gallows. Pakistan should seriously consider it. First Pakistan should go for system change, second it should go for cultural change, which means saying no to all forms of westernization which is harmful for our civilization, and secondly, delving into intelligent understanding of Islam while doing socio-political reforms to replace westernization.

Rahul Gandhi, the head of India's opposition political party tweeted: “Modi should explain to the nation why he spent billions of USD to purchase expensive weapons in the name of fighting Pakistan, when whole Pakistan can be bought in less than 1 billion USD”. But regime change in Pakistan according to some estimates may have only taken a few million dollars. If modest amount of money can overthrow our regimes, then certainly our security is compromised. Who is responsible for our security? It is not only the military but our civil

society institutions and public too. A political system that better protects one's state is more superior than the one that is ready to sell the state for personal gains. The path of Western democracy is disastrous for humanity. Many Muslims disagree with the Taliban's understanding of Islam, but for 20 years they could not be decisively infiltrated by the US and the Indians. US and NATO forces spent trillions of dollars in Afghanistan, but could not infiltrate to their core. One of the biggest reasons for this was that the Taliban do not believe in westernization of their political system.

The new regime is ready to do for the West what Imran Khan was not prepared to do. They don't want us to support Kashmiris' human rights. They want us to give the US military bases to kill our brothers in Afghanistan and our tribal areas. They want us to become part of wars of global fascism against humanity. They want to weaken our military, tarnish its image. They want us to accept the Indian hegemony (like Bangladesh), they don't want us to be close to China and Russia and eventually they want to go for our nuclear weapons (like Ukraine).

Pakistan needs help in form of counter-interference from China. Only 1,500 people have taken hostage the future of 220 million people. The cost of losing Pakistan to the US is prohibitive for China in the long run.

\*

*Ejaz Akram is an Associate Professor of Religion and Political Science at the Lahore University of Management Sciences.*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, Twitter and Facebook. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

*Featured image is from OneWorld*

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Dr. Ejaz Akram](#), Global Research, 2022

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Dr. Ejaz Akram](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long as the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)