

**PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF FEDERALISM IN PAKISTAN: A  
CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF THE EMERGENCE OF BALUCH  
NATIONALISM AND CONFLICT IN BALUCHISTAN**

*Gulawar Khan  
Saeeda Mengal*

**ABSTRACT**

*The aim of this paper is to investigate the problems of Pakistani federation vis-à-vis its basic principles, theoretical foundations, and to explore various ways that causes nationalism and conflict within its geographical units/provinces. It also examines the factors which are responsible for the emergence of Baluch nationalism and conflict(s) within the Pakistani federation. The main argument of this paper revolves around the principles and practices of Pakistani federation and opines that there are weaknesses in the federation of Pakistan which could be held responsible for the emergence of Baluch nationalism and conflict in Baluchistan. However, it also suggests ways in which the smaller ethno-national groups could easily be accommodated in Pakistani federation through democratic dispensation.*

---

**Keywords:** Federalism, Pakistan, Baluchistan, Nationalism, and Conflict.

**INTRODUCTION**

Since its inception the state of Pakistan adopted federalism as a form of government to run the affairs of the newly established country. The reason behind choosing federalism was to accommodate and keep unite the diverse ethno-national population, intact geography, and to avoid fragmentation owing to its diverse population (Ali, 1996; Ahmed, 1990; and Sayeed, 1954 and 1959). However, very soon crisis erupted over various issues, such as the accession of princely state(s), national language, representations in legislatures and resource distribution amongst ethnically based units and regions (Khan, 2014 and Choudhury, 1969). The seventy years of the Pakistani federation is a history of political crisis and upheavals especially, the relations of the Baluch and the federation have witnessed various conflicts at small and large scales in different years

including the on-going conflict which was started in 2002 during Mushraf era. Various explanations can be put forward for these conflicts. For instance, many Baloch nationalists opine that the Pakistani federation incorporated Balochistan into Pakistani federation without the consent of the Baloch masses, while others are of the view that the lack of socio-economic development in Balochistan led the Baloch towards nationalism and conflict(s) with the federation. However, this paper argues that the weaknesses of the principles of federalism and failure of the centripetal forces of are the main factors which can be held responsible for various conflicts of the Baloch with the Pakistani federation that resulted in the emergence of Baloch nationalism.

### **FEDERALISM AND ITS PRINCIPLES**

Federalism in essence is a system of government under which diverse population (divided ethnically, culturally, and linguistically) can be accommodated in a way where each would be able to maintain its distinct identity. It is a system of government which aims at keeping unity in diversity (Arora, 2010; Balcha, 2007; and Kymlicka, 1995 and 2006). Scholars on federalism are of the opinion that countries that are divided on the basis of ethnicities, culture, language, and region or geography adopted because of the factors and characteristics such as: (1) Federalism is based on mutual consultations; (2) It accommodates the diverse society wherein each group maintains its distinct identity through the principle of self-rule and shared rule; (3) It provides opportunities to all the constituent units for greater economic prosperity; (4) It safeguards each unit from external and internal military threats; and (5) It is dynamic and flexibly democratic in character.

It is therefore, after the World War II most of the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa adopted federalism to run and accommodate the ethnically and linguistically diverse population under federal system of governance. Pakistan too has no exception to this and the founders of the time agreed on the principle of federalism to be implemented in Pakistan to keep intact the diverse nature of the population that was/is based on ethno-national, cultural, linguistic, and regional affiliations.

Constitutionally speaking, federations represent a specific system of government under which neither the federal nor the unit is

subordinate to the other. Each level of government under the principles of federalism derives sovereign power from the constitution rather than from another level of government (Khan, 2014). The federal and the units(s) has constitutional powers to deal with its citizens directly in exercising various governmental powers like legislative, executive, and taxing powers. The governments of each level are directly chosen by the citizens through fair and free elections after fixed intervals. Federation is the name of an institutional arrangement where the federal government incorporates its sub ethno-national groups of various units into its decision making procedures at national as well as international levels (ibid, 2014).

Broadly speaking, there are three different kinds of federations vis-à-vis its orientations such as centralist, decentralist, and balance.<sup>1</sup> The existing 27 federations around the world follow any of these three types. Besides of various types of federalism, it has some fundamental principles and features according to which it can be called as federation. These principles are seen in most of the world federations in one or another form. According to Watts (2008:22-23 and 1996:7), Dikshit (1971:97-115), Sarita (2009:14-20), and Where (1946: Part III) these principles are:

- 1) Two-fold sovereignty or sharing of powers between the constituent unit(s) and the federal government;
- 2) A supreme written and rigid constitution which cannot be amended unilaterally. For amending the constitution in a federation, the consent of a significant portion of the constituent unit(s) is required. It is because the written constitution represents the birth certificate of every federation, those aspects that establish its fundamental federal character cannot be unilaterally amended by just one order of government because that would render the other level of the government subordinate to it;

---

<sup>1</sup> Centralist federations are those in which the Central Government have an overwhelming say in its internal and external affairs. Decentralists are those in which the constituent units have some sort of autonomy powers while the balance federations are those in which power sharing is made in such ways where balance between autonomy and independence; unity and diversity is maintained.

- 3) Each set of government enjoys constitutionally delegated powers in the sphere of legislation and execution under the constitution;
- 4) The constitution ensures allocation of revenue resources between the two levels of governments and also some areas of genuine autonomy for each other; and
- 5) Every federation has an umpire (though with different set up in different federations) either in the form of courts, provision for referendum or an upper house of parliament. The function of such body is to avoid the clash between the regional governments as well as regional and central government in the spheres such as distribution of powers, control over resources, and overlapping of governmental functions (Khan, 2014).

However, when a federation did not adhere to the above mentioned basic principles than it is expected that such federal society would become weak and the emergence of ethno-national movements and conflicts would arise. Nonetheless, in spite of all the reasons mentioned above due to which federations came into being and the principles due to which one can recognize a federal country, there are various ways where federalism and its policies towards its component parts (units) gave birth to nationalism and conflict. Such ways are: (1) deviation from following the basic principles and factors due to which federalism emerged would lead to ethno-nationalism and conflict. (2) The ways which gave birth to ethno-nationalism or conflict within a federal state are attached to the structures of federations and its policies towards the regionally based identity groups as well as the democratization of the polity. For instance, if a federation is structurally imbalanced vis-à-vis its demographic composition than there are chances where majority or tiny skilled groups would override the smaller groups in the central institutions and policy making at home as well as abroad. In return, the smaller identity groups would feel that they are deprived and denied equal opportunities within the government structure. And this is what happened in Pakistan in case of Balochistan.

Now keeping in view the aforementioned discussion, this paper is going to look into the nature of Pakistani federation that how it came into being? How it functions? And how it gave birth to the Baloch nationalism and conflict over the time?

**A BRIEF HISTORICAL VIEW OF BALOCHISTAN**

The Khanate of Kalat (Kalat State-Balochistan)<sup>2</sup> was a semi-independent state in treaty relations with the British Government until 1947 (see Dashti, 2012 and Khan, 1975). However, with inception of Pakistan, the states of Lasbela, Kharan, and Makran became part of the Pakistani federation on 17<sup>th</sup> March 1948 through an instrument of accession signed between the rulers of the respective states and the Governor General of Pakistan (Mss EUR D971/2). The Khan of Kalat, Mir Ahmed Yar Khan is said to be forced to accede to Pakistan on 27<sup>th</sup> March 1948 (Khan, 1975). Although, it is plausible to say that once the state of Lasbela, Kharan, and Makran acceded to Pakistan than there was no option left for the Khan of Kalat other than to join the Pakistani federation. Since Balochistan became part of the Pakistani federation, the relations between the federation of Pakistan and the province of Balochistan remained troublesome with on and off conflicts of various natures and resurgence of Baloch nationalism.

Balochistan is one of the largest provinces of Pakistan in terms of area which constitutes 44% of the total territorial land while in terms of population; it is the smallest of all units which comprises 6.85 % of the total population of Pakistan (Khan, 2014; Faiz, 2015). It is the richest province in terms of energy and mineral resources. It also has some 770 km of coastal line. However, despite being the richest, it remains one of the most backward and underdeveloped provinces with its people living in extreme poverty (Ahmed, 2013). Thus, looking into the relations of the Baloch and federation of Pakistan from 1948 to 2000s there has been disagreeable relationship between the two. Though, in federal states such relations rarely happen because federation has the capacity and essence to accommodate diverse ethno-national groups under the umbrella of federalism and shun differences through mutual understandings.

---

<sup>2</sup> It was consisted of the areas of the State of Kalat, Lasbela, Kharran, and Makran including the leased areas such as Noshki, Nasirabad, Marri, and Bugti tribal areas. Later on, the leased areas including the Pashtun areas were merged into a British Balochistan directly administered by the British India. The states of Kharran, Lasbela, and Makran became more independent of the Kalat State. By 1930s, these states were more like an independent entities, though were under the British control and suzerainty of the Kalat State (for detail see, Khan, 2014).

Going back to history, when the British announced the third June plan in 1947, according to which India was divided into two sovereign states i.e. India and Pakistan. All the princely states, numbered almost 565, were given choice to join either of these countries or remained independent states. However, in reality nor India and Pakistan and neither the British Government were in favour of granting independent status to these princely states for various reasons and one of the reasons was to avoid having small and fragile international entities. Thus, the Khan of Kalat, after the accession of the state of Lasbela, Kharan, and Makran, also signed an agreement of accession on 27 March 1948 and became part of Pakistan federation. However, many Baloch nationalists and historians are of the opinion that the Pakistani federation coerced the Khan to join Pakistan. Thus, the incorporation of the Kalat state to Pakistan caused the rise of the Baloch nationalism within Pakistan. In this regard, Prince Abdul Karim Khan, the younger brother of Khan of Kalat, launched an insurgency at a small level against the incorporation of Kalat state into Pakistani federation but was controlled by the former on time.

Furthermore, the complex geographic and demographic character of the newly born state of Pakistan made it very difficult for her to come up with mutually agreed constitution. The Eastern wing was dominantly monolingual Bengali speaking with 56% of the total population of Pakistan while the Western wing was home to various ethno-national groups speaking different languages (table 1.1).

<b>TABLE 1.1</b>				
<b>CENSUS HISTORY OF THE MAJOR LANGUAGES OF PAKISTAN</b>				
<b>Language</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1982</b>	<b>1961</b>	<b>1951</b>
Punjabi	44.15%	48.17%	56.39%	57.08% (Saraiki was included with Punjabi in 1951-1961 census)
Saraiki	10.53%	9.54%		
Pashtu	15.42%	13.35%	8.47%	8.16%
Sindhi	14.1%	12.7%	12.59%	12.85%
Urdu	7.57%	7.60%	7.57%	7.05%
Balochi	3.57%	3.02%	2.49%	3.04%

Population wise the share of the Punjabis, Sindhis, Pashtuns, Urdu speaking (Mohajirs), and the Baloch was 28%, 8%, 6%, 3%, and 1% at that time respectively. Thus, the demographic and geographic factors demanded a constitution with more constituent units and a loose federal structure with maximum autonomy for the units. But such arrangements were not acceptable to the majority elites, who wanted to gain and possess disproportionate power share.

Constitution is the backbone of any country according to which the country may be governed. However, Pakistan did not have a constitution of its own but rather run according to the Government of India Act, 1935 with certain amendments until it framed its first constitution which was formally promulgated in 1956 after 9 years of intense discussions, deliberations, and proposals, which however, lacked the multi-ethnic and multi-national character of federalism. It failed to suit the ethno-national, linguistic, and geographic needs of Pakistan. It provided a federal form of Government with two constituent units; Eastern Wing (East Pakistan) and Western Wing (West Pakistan). This constitution came out with a decentralized federalism which was more unitary rather than federal.

Principally, federalism accommodates a diverse society under one political system wherein each group maintains its distinct identity through the principle of self-rule and shared rule (Watts, 2008:8-11 & 1996:6-7). However, in case of Pakistan this principle was ignored from the very beginning through the introduction of Urdu as national language undermining the other local languages of ethnically diverse society. In fact, Urdu was the mother tongue of only 7.05 % of the population of Pakistan. Not only has this but the One Unit Scheme was introduced in the country in 1955, according to which the Western wing of Pakistan was merged into a single unit called West Pakistan. The logic behind the merging of the West Pakistan into One Unit was to bring parity between the two wings of Pakistan, but in fact it was a move to undermine the numerical majority (56 %) of the Eastern Pakistan i.e. now Bangladesh (Khan, 2014 and Mazari, 1999). This move was severely criticised by the smaller ethno-national groups where the Baloch were in forefront because they have felt their identity was in threat (Khan, 2014).

Thus, the 1956 constitution happened to fail to accommodate the diverse society under the banner of federalism. After a military coup, a second constitution was introduced by the than military

dictator, General Muhammad Ayub Khan in March 1962. Under article 1 of the 1956 constitution, Pakistan was declared as a federal republic, to be known as Islamic Republic of Pakistan. However, under the 1962 constitution, the relevant article simply declared that the state of Pakistan shall be a Republic, named as Republic of Pakistan. Here one can notice that it was not only a departure from parliamentary to presidential democracy but it did remove the word „federation“ altogether. It only appears in the preamble of the constitution and nowhere else. For instance, the preamble to the 1962 constitution states that the territories now and hereafter included in Pakistan should form a federation with the provinces enjoying such autonomy as is consistent with the unity and interest of Pakistan as a whole. The stress on unity and interest of Pakistan looks somewhat vague on the part of the provinces because the Eastern Pakistan was demanding more provincial autonomy and the smaller ethno-national groups of Western Wing stood for the undo of One Unit arrangement and demanded separate provinces.

Therefore, it can be said that the federal principles were largely ignored or made dubious by the ruling elites of Pakistan right from its creation till the separation of East Pakistan, now Bangladesh. The federal system under the constitution of 1962 was more unitary than federal. It was more centralized as compared to the 1956 constitution. All powers were rested with the powerful military dictator. He was the reservoir of all powers. At the same time he was the head of the state as well as of the government. General Ayub Khan was of the opinion that through a strong centre he could hold together the diverse society and secondly, he could affect rapid economic development with the backing of the army, the support of civil bureaucracy and feudal aristocratic families. However, neither the Bengal and nor the smaller ethno-national groups of West Pakistan were ready to breathe under such a centralized system. They consistently demanded more provincial autonomy and a weak central government including the undo of One Unit Scheme.

Owing to the structural and demographic realities of Pakistan, the idea of a strong centre did not work because the Bengal went off and became an independent country in 1971. The Baloch were also at confrontation with federation of Pakistan from 1955 to 1970 for protecting their respective identities and securing more autonomy for their units including the protection of sub-national cultures and



languages. Thus, due to immense pressure from the smaller communities, the One Unit Scheme was withdrawn in 1970 and Balochistan was given a status of a full fledged province for the first time. So, it can be argued that the concept of unity in diversity and self-rule and shared rule which is one of the main principles of federalism is not seen from 1948 to 1970 in the constitutions of Pakistan whether it was 1956 or 1962 constitution.

The smaller ethno-national groups as well as the majority group, the Bengali, were agitating for more autonomy and equal representations in the central institutions, such as parliament and the armed forces. However, it was the establishment, dominated by the majority groups in civil and military bureaucracy, who were ruling the country in a way as they wished. For instance, from 1947 to 1970 they did not conduct general elections in Pakistan due to the fear that they would lose the powers to the Bengalis who were in majority at that time in terms of population.

When in 1970, the first ever general elections were held, Mujib-Ur-Reham of Awami League from East Pakistan won majority of the seats and emerged as a dominant parliamentary party in the country but he was denied to form the Government at centre, a clear violation of democratic and parliamentary norms, which resulted in the dismemberment of Pakistan 1971 (Misra, 1972).

#### **FEDERATION OF PAKISTAN: EMERGENCE OF BALOCH NATIONALISM AND BALOCH GRIEVANCES**

In the remainder Pakistan the Baloch, however, with passage of time tried to accommodate themselves within the federation of Pakistan. They took part in elections and became members of national and provincial assemblies in various years but the civil and military bureaucracy dominated by the majority groups violated the basic principles of federalism and undermine the smaller ethno-national groups including the Baloch to a lower degree of citizenship (see Khan, 2014 and Jaffrelot, 2002). They were always portrayed as traitors, but in fact they stood for greater autonomy and control over their resources and affairs within the parameters of the Pakistan's federation. They demanded a decentralised federation but such idea was never materialized due to various reasons.

Nonetheless, in the province of Balochistan, the Baloch nationalist formed ministries on the basis of election results which

were meant for the united Pakistan. Their intentions were that the federal Government would allow the federating units for more autonomy and control over their resources after the dismemberment of the East Part. Thus, a new constitution was approved by the National Assembly (NA) in April 1973 which came into effect on 14th August 1973. However, it may be noted that out of the five MNAs (Member of NA) from Balochistan, only two put their signatures on the constitution while the rest refused to sign the constitutional document due to lack of provisions vis-à-vis the provincial autonomy and control of provinces over their natural resources (Khan, 2014).

The distribution of powers between the central Government and the constituent units is one of the basic principles of a federation. The distribution of powers remained one of the key issues throughout the constitutional history of Pakistan. However, contrary to the earlier constitutions where there was only one house of the parliament, the National Assembly (NA) but under 1973 constitution another house, the Senate, was introduced which was meant to represent the provinces in the national parliament. In 1973 constitution two lists of powers were also provided, federal legislative list and concurrent legislative list. All the residuary powers were given to the provincial Governments. The central legislature was empowered to legislate on the matters enumerated in the federal legislative list, containing 67 items and both the central and provincial governments were empowered to legislate on the matters enumerated in the concurrent list, containing 47 items but in case of conflict the central law will prevail. This simply means that the central Government had actual competence not only on the subjects mentioned in federal legislative list, but also on the matters enumerated in the concurrent list.

Furthermore, the federal legislative list was divided into two parts wherein part I contain 59 items and Part II, 8 items. In part I, important matters such as defence, external affairs, currency, major ports, and financial affairs were included on which only the NA can legislate. Part II consisted of more general matters such as railways and industrial development on which both the houses were given equal powers to legislate on the matters enumerated in part II of federal legislative list. In case of any differences between the two houses the matter will be resolved at joint sitting of the parliament. However, if we look at the composition of federal parliament there is

no chance or very little chance for the smaller provinces to override the majority province, the Punjab in either house separately or in any joint sitting of the parliament. It is because of the overwhelming majority of a single province in the central parliament. Thus, owing to its 56 % population, the province of Punjab can pass or reject any bill if it stood against her interests. Therefore, due to the dominant position of Punjab in the central parliament, the smaller provinces persistently demanded more provincial autonomy, control over their resources, some taxation powers, and the abolition of the concurrent list from the constitution. For instance, Balochistan was striving to get hold of its mineral resources and ports, NWFP (now KPK) was struggling for the ownership of electricity, and Sindh demanded for the ownership and control over oil and gas in its respective province. While on the other hand the province of Punjab did not raise such demands ever.

When it comes to Balochistan, in spite of all that Sardar Attaullah Mengal and Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo of National Awami Party (NAP) became the Chief Minister and Governor of the province of Balochistan respectively (Kutty, 2009). As NAP was a progressive liberal political party, advocating for the interests of smaller nations and more autonomy for the provinces. Therefore, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, having centralised tendencies, was not happy with the NAP leadership and its ideological orientation. According to Kutty (2009), he put various allegations against the NAP leadership especially those hailed from Balochistan. Consequently, Balochistan's Assembly was dissolved after nine months of its working in spite of the fact that it enjoyed the support of two-third of its total members. The provincial Government in KPK (then NWFP) resigned in protest (Kutty, 2009). The NAP was declared unlawful on the grounds that it worked against the ideology and sovereignty of Pakistan. Later on, the Central Government banned it in February 1975 while the Supreme Court also endorsed the government decision in October 1975. In this way, the membership of national and provincial assemblies of all the party's office-bearers was nullified.

Thus, the impartial umpire, the Supreme Court instead of defending the Provincial Government of Balochistan as it was enjoying two-third majority in the house endorsed the Government decision. Therefore, a reaction and dissent on the part of an aggrieved party was natural. So, the Baloch reacted (Harrison, 1981). Thus, the

Government arrested most of the Baloch leaders including Ghuas Bakhsh Bizenjo, Nawab Khair Bakhsh Marri and Sardar Attaullah Mengal on charges of treason. This marked the opening of another phase of conflict, lasted from 1973 to 1977. However, the federal Government was in a position to solve it amicably but instead of solving it, the federal Government used military force against the Baloch.

Thus, as stated earlier that federalism came into being to safeguards each unit from external and internal military threats as mentioned by Watts (2008) and Dikshit (1971), but in case of Balochistan the federal Government used pressure against the Baloch population due to which the feelings of Baloch nationalism resurfaced in the minds of the Baloch masses. According to one estimate some 80000 armed personnel were deployed by the Government of Pakistan in the province of Balochistan for the purpose to suppress the insurgents and protesters. On the other hand, some 55000 Baloch fighters took part in this combat against the federal government. Hundreds of the Baloch activists were put behind the bars (Harrison, 1981).

Furthermore, federalism is said to provide equal opportunities to all the constituent regions for greater economic prosperity and well-being of the people. So far the plight of the province of Balochistan and its people are concerned; it is one of the most backward regions as compared to the rest of Pakistan in all fields of life (Faiz, 2015). The federal Government hardly showed any flexibility vis-à-vis Balochistan to bring it at par with the rest of the provinces economically, socially, and educationally; in spite of the fact that it is one of the richest provinces in energy and mineral resources. For instance, Gas has explored in Balochistan at Sui in 1952. The same gas has reached to Pakistan but the inhabitants of the area from where the gas comes out are deprived of this facility. Quetta, which is the capital city of Balochistan, got the Sui Gas only in 1980s. Out of 32 districts of Balochistan, only two are provided with Gas facilities, though with very limited access.

As argued by various theorists mentioned above that federation are normally formed on the basis of mutual benefits of economic and military nature, but in Pakistani federation the story is different. Balochistan not only suffers because of the misuse of its natural resources but also in employment in central institutions. The Baloch

feels that in the long run, due to the policies of federation with regard to the Gwadar deep sea port and other mega projects, they would be converted into minority in their own province. This perception is getting stronger day by day amongst the Baloch masses. On the other hand, the federation hardly tried to remove the grievances of the Baloch democratically. Federation has tried but remains unsuccessful to stand for reconciliations and solving the issues facing by its units in a flexibly democratic ways. It (federation) stands for unity in diversity. In federation, the Central Government has no right to marginalize the ethnic composition of any of its ethnic groups but in Pakistan the case is the opposite. It is because the composition of the Central Government and its associated central organizations are predominantly belonging to majority ethnic groups.

It is important to mention that in 1973 constitution of Pakistan, it had been promised that the concurrent list of powers would be removed from the constitution (The Constitution of 1973). However, such promises have never been materialized and fulfilled even after many decades. The withdrawal of the concurrent list only became possible under the 18th Amendment Act in April 2010. There are various reasons for such delays. However, the military coup of 1977 is one of the most important ones amongst others. The prelude to the military coup is the general elections of 1977 wherein the military dictator, General Zia-ul-Haq imposed Martial Law in July 1977 and stayed as President of Pakistan for 11 years consecutively.

Furthermore, if one look into the era from 1977 to 2000, it was an era of assimilation and political pragmatism. During this period, the relationship between the Baloch and federation of Pakistan remained less hostile. Various explanations can be put forward for this relative calm and peace between the Baloch and the state of Pakistan. Firstly, Khair Bakhsh Marri and Attaullah Mengal went into self-imposed exile and almost remained inactive politically. Secondly, the Baloch were shattered and were busy in organizing themselves in the neighbouring Afghanistan. Thirdly, Zia with the help of Saudi Arabia and United States of America established *Madrasas* around Balochistan to inculcate Islamic ideological thoughts among the people of Balochistan to use them against the Russians in Afghanistan. For instance, in 1950 Balochistan had only seven Madrasas and by the end of 2003, the number reached to 1045 (PIPS, 2008:87). And fourthly, the Baloch political leadership failed to be

united under one political platform. Resultantly, the Baloch nationalism got many voices and political pragmatism is one of the key elements of this era. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that notwithstanding the political differences, the majority of political parties possessed a common stance on key issues such as provincial autonomy and control over resources.

It is therefore, whenever the federation tried to initiate mega projects in the province of Balochistan, the Baloch nationalist forces reacted. For instance, when General Pervez Musharraf came into power in 1999 through a military coup, he announced mega development projects in the province, such as the establishment of military cantonments, construction of Gwadar deep sea port, and exploration of mineral wealth at various localities. He did not take into confidence the nationalist forces of Balochistan. Therefore, the Baloch nationalists remained suspicious over the construction of such mega projects. They feared that the construction of cantonments in various parts of Balochistan, especially Dera Bughti, Kohlu, and Gwadar meant to exploit the resources. It was also feared that the construction of Gwadar deep-sea port would convert the Baloch population into minority in their own province. It is because it would attract an influx of non-Baloch population into Balochistan which would ultimately change the demographic realities not only of the Gwadar but of the whole province in future. For these reasons, few forces of Balochistan rejected and opposed the construction of these mega projects but the state was determined to materialize its plans. However, it could be argued here that these type of issues between the Baloch and the federation needs to be addressed amicably and through mutual consensus for the vested interest of the Pakistani federation. Furthermore, it is also argued that the recent conflict has emerged in response to Musharraf military regime's plans that aimed to have a strong grip over the resources and territory of Balochistan. This move was not in line with the federal principles. As mentioned earlier that federation is the name of an institutional arrangement where the federal Government incorporates its sub ethno-national groups of various units into its decision making procedures at national as well as international levels.

In nutshell, those Baloch who believe in federal and parliamentary politics are optimistic and are of the opinion that they would get more provincial autonomy and control over their resources

within the existing federal structure of Pakistan. They took part in the elections held in May 2013 and formed the provincial Government of Balochistan.

## **CONCLUSION**

To sum up, it is argued that it is the failure of the structure of the federation of Pakistan and the policies of federal Government towards Balochistan that can be held responsible for the rise of the Baloch nationalism within the federation. Pakistan can be an exemplary federation around the world if the Government of Pakistan changes its policies towards the smaller ethno-national groups and could overcome the Baloch conflict. As in the past, the Baloch nationalists asked for administrative and financial autonomy while remaining within the federation of Pakistan. However, with the passage of time their demands have been significantly changed. Now the Baloch, who once were demanding maximum provincial autonomy followed by self-determination, has transformed their instances into a violent conflict. On the other hand, the State of Pakistan is applying all possible ways to bring the Baloch into mainstream Pakistani polity and take them on board in decision making bodies vis-à-vis Balochistan and such move will be proved more productive in future. So, a lack of cooperation on the part of federation, decentralization, representations of the Baloch in the central institutions as well as a fair distribution of federal divisible pool including the right on the natural resources and the fear of the demographic changes of the Baloch population owing to the mega projects in Balochistan are at the head of the Baloch masses. These grievances and the fears of the identity extinction led the Baloch to nationalism and conflicts within federation.

## **REFERENCES**

- Ahmed, Manzoor (2013), Fiscal Decentralization and Political Economy of Poverty Reduction: Theory and Evidence from Pakistan. PhD Theses, University of Durham, UK.
- Ahmed, Syed Jaffar (1990), Federalism in Pakistan: A constitutional Study. University of Karachi: Pakistan Study Centre.
- Ali, Syed Mehrunnisa (1996), Politics of Federalism in Pakistan. Karachi, Pakistan: Royal Book Company.



- Arora, Balveer (2010), Diversity and Unity in the Republic of India. In: Moreno, Luis and Colino, Cesar (eds.), Diversity and Unity in Federal Countries, McGill Queen's University Press, pp.200-226.
- Balcha, Berhanu Gutema (2007), Restructuring State and Society: Ethnic Federalism in Ethiopi, SPIRIT – Doctoral Programme, Aalborg University, Denmark, SPIRIT PhD Series.
- Baluch, Mir Ahmed Yar Khan, (1975), Inside Baluchistan: A Political Autobiography of his Highness Baiglar Baigi, Khan-e-Azam-XIII. (2nd eds.), Karachi, Pakistan: Royal Book Agency.
- Choudhury, G. W. (1969), Constitutional Development in Pakistan. (2nd eds.), London: Longman.
- Dashti, Naseer (2012), The Baloch and Balochistan: An Historical account from the Beginning to the fall of the Baloch State. USA: Trafford rev Publishers.
- Dikshit, R.D. (1971), Geography and Federalism. In: *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol.61, No.1:97-117.
- Faiz, Jalal, (2015), Politics of Education, Conflict and Conflict Resolution in Balochistan, Pakistan; PhD Thesis, University of Westminster, London, United Kingdom.
- Harrison, Selig S. (1981), In Afghanistan's Shadow: Baluch Nationalism and Soviet Temptations. Washington, D.C.: Carnage.
- Jaffrelot, Christophe (2002), Pakistan Nation, Nationalism and the State. (eds.), Lahore, Pakistan: Vanguard Books (Pvt.) Ltd.
- Khan, Gulawar (2014), Politics of Federalism, Nationalism, and Separatism: The Case of Balochistan in Pakistan, an unpublished PhD thesis, University of Westminster London, UK.
- Kutty, B. M. (2009), In Search of Solutions: An Autobiography of Mir Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo. Karachi: Pakistan Study Centre, University of Karachi.
- Kymlicka, Will (1995), Multicultural Citizenship. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will (2006), Emerging Western Models of Multinational Federalism: Are They Relevant for Africa? In: David Turton (eds.), Ethnic Federalism: The Ethiopian Experience in Comparative Perspective, Oxford: James Currey, Athens: Ohio University Press and Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University, pp.32-64.
- Mazari, Sherbaz Khan (1999), A Journey to Disillusionment. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Misra, K. P. (1972), Intra-State Imperialism: The Case of Pakistan. In: *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.9, No.1:163-184.



- Others Paper Concerning the Accession of Kalat to Pakistan. Indian Office Records and Private Papers (Mss Eur D971/2).
- Pakistan Institute for Peace Studies (PIPS), (2008), Balochistan: Conflicts and Players. Islamabad: PIPS.
- Sarita, Dr., (2009), Federalism in India: A Quest for New Identity. New Delhi: Regal Publication.
- Sayeed, K. B. (1954), Federalism and Pakistan. In: *Far Eastern Survey*, Vol.23, No.9:139-143.
- Sayeed, K. B, (1959), Martial Law Administration in Pakistan. In: *Far Eastern Survey*, Vol.28, No.5:72-79.
- The Constitution of 1973: Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan.
- Watts, Ronald L. (1996), Comparative Federal Systems in 1990s. Queen's University (Kingston, Ont.): Institute of Intergovernmental Relations.
- Watts, Ronald L. (2008), Comparing Federal Systems. (3rd eds.), London: McGill Queens' University Press.
- Wheare, K. C. (1946), Federal Government. (4th eds.), London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
-