

PAKISTAN: ISLAMIC OR SECULAR STATE?

TERJUMAN-UL-QURAN

March 2002

PROF. KHURSHID AHMAD



PAKISTAN: ISLAMIC OR SECULAR STATE?

By Professor Khurshid Ahmad

Every transaction, either between two individuals or between two states, always has two aspects: one purely legal and political and the other ideological. The spheres of law and politics are well-known. If an individual or a nation wants to avoid the path of confrontation, collision and bloodshed, it is imperative for them to settle their disputes by remaining within these spheres. As for the ideological dimension of issues, there are infinite possibilities for settlement with persuasion, preaching and canvassing, dialogue and mutual understanding – provided that no party suffers from the notion of its own being powerful and dominant and refrains from trying to impose its terms or views on the other. Confrontation in ideological context takes place only when the doors are shut on freedom of opinion and mutual understanding, or when logic and persuasion are replaced by the force of sword.

With the eternal principle of "there is no compulsion or coercion in regard to religion; and the right thing has been made distinct from the wrong thing", the Qur'an has established a lasting framework and criteria for acceptance and rejection, adoption or abandonment, give and take, compromise and accommodation for all people and nations. Then, binding the individual and the nation in respecting the demands of justice on the one hand, Qur'an provided man with infinite possibilities for development; and on the other gave an objective framework for civilized life and justice-based peace for all people and nations, of fulfilling their mutual rights and obligations by doing away with the 'law of the jungle'.

'Allah enjoins justice, generosity and kind treatment...'

(Al-Nahl 16:90)

O Believers! Be steadfast in righteousness and in being just in giving witness for the sake of Allah; the enmity of any people should not so provoke you as to turn you away from justice. Do justice for it is akin to piety. Have fear of Allah (in your affairs), He is indeed fully aware of what you do. (Al-Maida 5:8)

Justice has to be dispensed to all, to friend and foe, irrespective of who gets the brunt:

And whatever you say should be just, even if it is concerning your own relatives.

(Al-Ana'am (6:152))

Abuse of power and drift from the path of fairness and justice is one of the major causes of chaos and anarchy, oppression and injustice among people as well as nations. It is for the same reason that we are seeing a hold of injustice and oppression everywhere in the world today.

Objectives of Pakistan's Creation

A glance at history clearly shows that colonial powers have always violated these principles (of justice and fairness). In the past, these powers performed the 'feat' of subjugating and enslaving other nations. When freedom movements of these nations bore fruits in the first half of the 20th century, the colonial powers countered this wave by changing their geography to suit their own aspirations and interests. For the so-called nation-states that were emerging on the map of the world, these powers adopted the course of imposing such rulers, their own chosen ones, who were concerned with seeking pleasure of their Western lords rather than with freedom, progress and cultural development of their people. Now, at the start of the 21st century, these powers have taken upon themselves the task of determining the ideological objectives of nation-states and tidying their beliefs and concepts according to the 'need' of the time.

In this context, for the last few months in particular the US President, the Secretary of State, the British Prime Minister and even the Secretary General of the United Nations, among others, are all deliberating on the objectives of the creation of Pakistan. Along with the ministers and diplomats, intellectuals, writers and journalists have joined the effort. Having annihilated Afghanistan, President Bush is looking for something new, like the "axis of evil". Margaret Thatcher has also woken up, rubbing her eyes to see what is on and to come up with her own 'vision'. In her special essay that has been published in the British press on Feb. 12, 2002, she compared 'Islamic extremism' with 'Communist threat' at the start of the Cold War. In this international atmosphere, Pakistan has been made a focus of attention. Leader after leader, everyone considers it their duty to lecture on the rationale of Pakistan, especially on the vision of Iqbal and Jinnah for Pakistan. Then, all the lecturing and instructions end up in suggesting that there is only one way to progress for Pakistan – the way of viable, progressive, modern, secular and irreligious Pakistan.

In the forefront of this effort is American leadership of all levels. Quite brazenly, it is bent upon imposing its own concepts and views on other nations and peoples in the name of global campaign for democracy and human rights. This is how America is trying to bring other nations under its world-wide political and economic domination. Muslim countries are a particular target and, according to the practice of striking at the weak point, Pakistan is on the receiving end of 'special attention'.

There is nothing new in it, however, as the attitude of these powers has always been hostile to others. At the time of the creation of Pakistan, Britain showed its dishonesty in the formula of the division of the subcontinent and created problems like Kashmir issue and unjust distribution of water. The United Nations played a grossly unjust role in the case of Kashmir problem. America, on the one hand, patronized dictatorships while repeating the mantra of democracy, on the other, it sucked Pakistan economy with its parasitic and 'visibly invisible' agenda and ensnared it in debts to the extent that it needs more debts only to continue its life. Then, Muslim world, Islamic

movements and Pakistan in particular became a special focus of attention in the wake of events of Sept. 11. On the one hand, the noose is being tightened politically, economically and militarily; on the other, such ideological debates have been kindled that pertain to Muslims' concept of religion (Deen), state and Muslims' nationhood, i.e. the concepts that are concerned with our ideological existence.

The background to the hair-splitting and recurring analysis of General Musharraf's interview to the weekly Newsweek and Quaid's speech of Aug. 11, 1947 in the English press and television is that lesson that the US intellectuals and diplomats are repeating for the last few months.

American Vision for Pakistan

On June 27, 2001, two statements came to the fore that shed light on the US-Pakistan relations with respect to Islam and Muslims' view of religion and civilization. To us, these statements have far-reaching implications. One of these was by the then US ambassador Mr. William B. Milam, who was going back to America after completing his diplomatic tenure here. He expressed his views about Pakistan first in Karachi and then in Lahore (on June 27). What he said, and the manner in which he said that, was against the well-recognized diplomatic etiquette. Talking philosophically and in the context of history, he gave advice in the form of foretelling and prediction. And, on the same day when Mr. Milam was speaking his mind, the newly appointed ambassador to Pakistan Ms. Wendy Chamberlain was expressing her views about Pakistan and her program before the Senate's Standing Committee on foreign affairs for approval of her appointment. It is necessary for the Pakistani people to study and analyze both the speeches, for they clearly expose American mentality and plan as well as the harmony between American diplomats and columnists. The faces of all players in the game can be seen in the pattern of this 'harmony'. This also provides an opportunity to the Pakistani nation to understand the role of America along taking to account those of its own people who have been reigning the country. Moreover, the standard that is employed for an assessment of Pakistan should be applied for evaluating the role of America.

Mr. Milam claimed that he knew Pakistan, since he spent his childhood here. He discharged his diplomatic duties in quite chaotic times. While he had delivered speeches on 'Islam and religious extremism' even earlier as well, the title of his farewell speech was "Is Pakistan Lost in the Stars?". It was not the kind of speech a friendly ambassador delivers at the time of his departure. Rather, it was a statement of an important American representative about our history, rationale and future. Not taking cognizance of it would, therefore, be criminal and detrimental to the nation.

Let us see, first of all, what the ambassador had said:

1. America and Pakistan are not mere geographic entities but visionary states. There is, however, a difference between letting your vision inform you and letting it

dominate you. Visions that dominate, especially visions that are interpreted in a narrow and literal sense can lead, as they have, to great disasters.

2. Pakistan got independence from the same colonial power against which America had struggled and achieved freedom from. The ideas that all men are equal and that there is no taxation without representation were embedded in the vision that guided the forefathers of America when they declared independence from Britain in 1776. This paved way for democracy and constitutional rule, and the civil war 85 years later completed this revolution. Now, America is the champion of democracy, human rights and equality in the world.
3. Pakistan, that too came into being in the wake of a great struggle, was founded on Jinnah's vision of establishing a modern and democratic homeland for Muslim that is governed by secular laws and where the rights and customs of non-Muslims would be respected. The ambassador also asserted that Pakistan was founded by the hard work of Sunnis, Shias, Christians, Ahmadis, Parsees and other people.
4. The ambassador thought that there was a Jinnah's vision as well as an anti-Jinnah vision. The vision that Quaid-e-Azam laid out was of a liberal, tolerant, modern homeland for Muslims, of a country in which one is a Pakistani first and a member of a religion second, of a Pakistan governed by secular laws. The anti-Jinnah vision rejects national boundaries that call Pakistan to serve as a beacon to the worldwide Muslim Ummah and the defender of the Faith. According to this vision, Pakistan's *raison d'être* is much more than to offer a place to live and work, to develop individually and collectively. In this vision, Pakistan is to provide a home base for a crusade against any force seen to be endangering Muslims or the Islamic faith.
5. The anti-Jinnah vision seems more powerful in Pakistan's foreign policy directions, especially on Kashmir and Afghanistan. For those who follow this vision, Kashmir is a holy crusade.
6. Mr. Milam based his argument on Quaid-e-Azam's speech of Aug. 11, 1947 that has always been used by secular elements for their assertions. But he made a far-fetched point that would serve as a new argument for the intellectuals of this group: the oath Quaid-e-Azam took as the Governor General! His message is clear that the correct oath was the one that was taken as a representative of the British throne for Governor-Generalship before the adoption of Constitution. This oath was:

I Muhammad Ali Jinnah do solemnly affirm that I will truly serve our sovereign, King George VI, in the office of Governor General of Pakistan and that I will do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of Pakistan without fear or favor, affection or ill-will.

He regrets that even the oath to office has evolved to something far different from the oath taken by Jinnah.

We are grateful to His Excellency for his straight talk and presenting the case for secularism without any covering or scruples. We have refreshed this speech also because the later events have added to its significance. General Pervez Musharraf's speech on Jan. 12, 2002 and interview to the Newsweek just after that, earlier U-turn on Afghan policy, and now Kashmir policy, attempts to discipline Madaris (Religious Education Institutions) and mosques, and babbling about bigger and smaller Jihad – what all these are taken to mean becomes quite clear. Moreover, the context of today's chatter also becomes clear. This is why we felt the need to cast a glance at the 'source' from where this is being 'revealed'.

An Analysis of the Ambassador's Assertions

The most important dimension of the speech is that America's interest is not restricted to democracy and basic human rights; it is stretched to our ideological foundations. Its unhappiness is not for the nuclear capability and the business of elections; rather it is concerned with Pakistan raison d'être and the nation's vision about itself. In its eye, democratic values and human rights are not trampled by violation of the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and state terrorism and Indian forces' cruelties; the real threat emanates from those oppressed people who have risen against oppression and for their rights! Human equality, democratic principles and freedom do not mean that nations can decide their future in the light of their beliefs and historical and ideological identity; these values are acceptable to America only when they subordinate their religion and beliefs, and their values and traditions to secular system! Their foreign policy does not reflect their own national interests, rather they think only about their food and clothing within the limits of the nation-state!

The demagogues who do not tire lecturing on democracy and secularism forget that it is the mentality and policy that are a manifestation and essence of imperialism. If you have selected secularism for yourself, you may adhere to it; but what right do you have imposing it on others? Our fear is that today's secularism has taken the form of an ideology that is becoming the biggest threat to peoples' freedom of establishing a system of life according to their own beliefs and views. Does a Muslim woman have the freedom to cover her head in Western countries that champion individual freedom under secularism? Was not an elected prime minister in Turkey ousted from power in the name of secularism? Apparently, secularism championed the cause of freedom; but now it has become an oppressive philosophy and is strangulating human freedoms and principles of equality. A view in the light would show that the real American objective is not the promotion of democratic freedoms and human rights, but the imposition of secularism and color all others in the colors of Western thought and civilization. This is nothing but the latest onslaught of imperialism.

Then, the manner in which the US ambassador has given the outlines of Jinnah and anti-Jinnah visions is a unique example of academic dishonesty. Only the one who is dominated by his

prejudices can dare to suggest that the oath of office that was adopted for dominion status in a colonial system, that was considered necessary only during the transitional period before independence, should have been Quaid's model even after the newly independent country had adopted its own Constitution. Analyzing the issue purely in legal terms, does this mean that what was constitution and tradition under the colonial legacy in 1947 became Pakistan's Constitution and laws under it? What does Quaid have to do with this colonial constraint? Had Quaid prepared the draft of the oath? Had not Lord Mountbatten taken the same oath in India? If the oaths of Australian and Canadian Governor Generals were any different from it before they adopted their own Constitutions? Had this expert of foreign affairs taken into consideration all these points, we would not have gone to this detail.

Quite like the other secular elements, he has erected the whole structure on the basis of Quaid's speech of Aug. 11, 1947. The question is "Is it the lone speech about Quaid-e-Azam's concept of Pakistan? Did the Quaid not outline his concept of Pakistan more than hundred times before and after the establishment of Pakistan?" What is the logic for considering a few quotes of this speech alone, which is about the principles of citizenship and the rights of minorities in the context of the inhuman riots at the time of the Partition, reflect the vision?

Rights of minorities and equal citizenship rights are not controversial. These are the demands of Islam, as the Quaid has repeatedly said. But, do minorities' rights mean that minority imposes its views on majority and vetoes majority's right to give form to its collective life according to its own beliefs and values? And the majority is the one that waged country-wide democratic struggle for the realization of its concept that they had a distinct ideological, civilizational and religious identity for whose protection and development they needed their own independent homeland.

The ambassador has said, "Pakistan was founded by the hard work of Sunnis, Shias, Christians, Ahmadis, Parsees and others." Thanks God, he did not mention Hindus and Sikhs though Hindus were the largest minority at the time of Pakistan's creation, about one-fifth in East Pakistan! The Pakistan Movement was ideological. The Muslims of the subcontinent enriched it with their blood. Even those Muslims participated in it who knew that their areas were not going to become parts of Pakistan. Indian National Congress represented the non-Muslim Hind while the Muslim League represented the Muslim Hind. It is this division that was quite clear and unambiguous. Wherefrom did the ambassador find the role of Christians, Ahmadis, and Parsees in it? Christians, in general, were supporting the British colonial rule, Parsees joined the Congress and had no role in the Muslims' movement, and Ahmadis (Qadiyani) too were part of the British colonial team. Pakistan is the result of the struggle of the subcontinent's Muslims. During the Pakistan Movement and after the creation of Pakistan, not just Quaid-e-Azam but the whole nation declared that with the establishment of the two independent states, all, majorities and minorities, enjoy the right to live under law (irrespective of their role in the freedom movement). Whoever pledges loyalty with the new independent state enjoys as citizen the rights of equality and equal opportunities for

development, but the system of government would, of course, be established according to the beliefs and values of the majority and minorities would have full protection in it.

Vision of Quaid-e-Azam

It would amount to doing great injustice to Quaid-e-Azam if some sentences of his Aug. 11, 1947 speech are twisted to serve as a basis for the establishment of a secular state and for ending the role of religion in the sphere of collective life. Quaid-e-Azam, entire leadership of the Muslim League and, above all, the whole Muslim community of the subcontinent had vividly made express their destination and goal. These were the objectives for which struggle was waged and invaluable sacrifices were offered. How can those who talk about secular values refute that Allama Iqbal based the argument of his famous address of 1930 on the unity of religion and state, of the spiritual and the mundane. Iqbal says that Islam is a religion that has its own collective system of life without which it is incomplete and Muslims remain deprived of its blessings.

In his letter to Quaid-e-Azam on May 28, 1937, Allama Iqbal maintained that:

“The enforcement and development of the Shariah of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India.”

In other words, he held that the establishment of an independent Muslim state and enforcement of Shariah were imperative for economic development and peaceful existence. This was the real issue and Quaid-e-Azam, too, repeatedly explained:

“Pakistan not only means freedom and independence but the Muslim ideology which has to be preserved, which has come to us as a precious gift and treasure and which we hope, others will share with us.”

It is noteworthy that Quaid highlighted not only the importance of Islamic ideology but also underscored the need of its protection and progress. This is what Quaid-e-Azam stood for. But those who are pressing for secular values and structure see it as "Anti-Jinnah Vision"!

As to what kind of democracy it would be where non-Muslim majority and un-Islamic views are imposed on Muslims, Quaid said:

“I was told that I was guilty of disservice to Islam because Islam believes in democracy. So far as I have understood Islam, it does not advocate a democracy which would allow the majority of non-Muslims to decide the fate of Muslims. We cannot accept a system of government in which the non-Muslims merely by

numerical majority would rule and dominate us.”

(Speech at Aligarh University, March 6, 1940)

Yet, we see that the ambassador and the secular lobby are all out to impose secular values on Muslims just to appease a handful of non-Muslim minority. Is it the latest interpretation of democracy?

Quaid-e-Azam repeatedly said that Islam is a complete code of life, Muslims are a nation based on belief and religion, Qur'an is their law for life, the Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) is their real leader and law-giver, and Qur'an and Sunnah are the forces that shape Muslims' individual and collective life. This concept of life and secularism are antithetical to each other. Ignoring all his commitments and pledges, his speeches and statements and talking about secularism is a dishonesty that is committed with great audacity, to say the least.

The leaders of the Pakistan movement passed the Objectives Resolution on March 12, 1949 wholeheartedly and with complete unity of heart and mind. This Resolution provides the basis for Pakistan's Constitution, governance, and collective policy making and the whole nation is behind it. Quaid-e-Azam has unequivocally said that Pakistan's Constitution would not reflect somebody's personal whims and desires; rather the whole Pakistani nation would formulate it through the Constituent Assembly. Whether Aug. 11, 1947 or Jan. 12, 2002, nobody is above the Constitution, nor can he be allowed to consider Constitution as echoing his own sound.

If these are the views of Quaid-e-Azam, then wherefrom has secularism descended? Loudly and unequivocally, Jinnah is expressing the vision whom the ambassador is saying is anti-Jinnah. This vision reflects in every line of the Pakistan Resolution and manifests itself throughout the Constitution. What kind of democracy it is where people's will, clear demands of the written Constitution and the nation's historical traditions are declared 'vocal minority' and 'anti-Jinnah' while the utterances of a foreigner and a few secular intellectuals is considered 'Jinnah's vision' of Pakistan!

Contradictions in the argument of those who present Quaid's or Iqbal's views in such a way as to suit their own secular ends are exposed because of their self-contradictory nature. On the one hand, they talk about democracy, but on the other call for dictatorial action for negating the will and aspirations of the entire nation on the basis of some extract from Quaid's speech. It is not difficult to find out whether these elements are sincere with democracy or are ready to frustrate the struggle and aspirations of the whole nation for the pleasure of foreign forces. Before dilating upon this issue, the point that should be kept in view is that Qur'an and Sunnah are the fountain-head of guidance and the ultimate standard of truth for every Muslim. Position and views of others, however respectable and revered they might be, not only comes after that but their views and thoughts and decisions would be evaluated by the touchstone of Qur'an and Sunnah.

Secularism: Iqbal and Jinnah

Western scholars created confusion first by coining the term 'fundamentalist' for Islamic revival movements. This term is taken to mean that fundamentalist is the one who is against progress, neglectful of the demands of modern times or adheres to such an interpretation of Islam because of which Islam could not face the challenges of the time. Factually, it is an entirely wrong, one-sided, malevolent and exaggerated propaganda. However, the West's orient lists has used the term of 'Muslim fundamentalists' some three decades ago for those who wanted to implement Islam, as it is and as Muslims understand it, with its spirit.

The West wishes that Islam may remain in name, like Christianity, but God's Word, Revealed Guidance, and Sunnah of the Prophet have no more decision powers. Instead, man should decide his affairs in the light of his own will and changing interests and goals according to the Western criteria of thought. Moreover, what the Westerners like should be accepted without question. If the Muslim molds himself in this way, he is 'progressive', 'sensible and prudent' and 'moderate', but if he wants to act upon his own principles, ideology, history and civilization in the light of Qur'an and Sunnah then he is 'fundamentalist'. This is clear in the writings of Western intellectuals these days, and the famous orient list Montgomery Watt has openly said that those are fundamentalists who want to make dominant the traditional concept of Islam that Qur'an and the Prophet presented. Whereas those who are ready to mold Islam according to the Western standard are liberals and 'our' real friends.

Now, the views of Iqbal and Jinnah can be analyzed. Iqbal benefited from both old and new sources of knowledge and forcefully said that Islam presents the truth while the foundation of the West – ie secularism, nationalism, rationalism, and scientism – is weak.

In the last address of *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, Iqbal has expressed his views on modern legislation and law-making and the role of assemblies in this regard. Toward its end, he says that the West is the biggest hindrance in the way of human progress and human problems cannot be solved unless man gets rid of the Europe's view of life. Humanity needs three things today – spiritual interpretation of the universe, spiritual emancipation of the individual, and basic principles of a universal import directing the evolution of human society on a spiritual basis. These are the foundations on which the life should be based. This was Iqbal's message and mission.

Of course, there was a time when Jinnah was not only active in the Indian National Congress but was also one of its central leaders, and a champion of Hindu-Muslim unity. He was a close friend of Mahatma Gandhi and Madanmohan Malvia. But having observed the Brahmin mentality, he reorganized the Muslim League and deeply analyzed the situation of Muslim Hind from 1936 to 1940. With this, he had reached the conclusion that Muslims were a distinct and separate nation

on the basis of their religion, their ethics, beliefs, history and civilization. He realized that they were not a mere minority and that there was no solution of the Muslims' problems except of establishing an independent Islamic state in the Muslim majority areas in the light of Iqbal's thought and that Muslims run this state on the bases and principles of Islam. Here, I want to draw attention to the Quaid's speeches of his last five years, which would help determine the standpoint of Quaid in this regard.

As far as a modern, democratic Islamic state is concerned, what Quaid and Iqbal stood and strived for was the establishment Islamic society and state in the light of Qur'an and Sunnah of the Prophet (pbuh), which could meet the demands of social justice and where Islamic law is enforced in its entirety. This should be a state where Muslims present Islam as a religious of guidance and permanent culture, instead of being servile to the Western nations and imitating them. These were the views of the founders of Pakistan. Those who were treading away from this path, Iqbal and Jinnah admonished them, especially Turkey that was busy in molding itself into the European standard.

This is exactly the concept that Jama'at-e-Islami has espoused and presented. In fact, we are struggling to translate the thought of Iqbal and Jinnah's views that is derived from Qur'an and Sunnah and is subordinate to them. In this respect, there is no difference between the Pakistan's founders and us. Those have drifted from the vision of Pakistan's founders who promoted irreligiosity, materialism, Westernization and vulgarity, or those who pave way for socialism or supported those who gave rise to capitalism and allowed the sore of landlordism to spread and grow unchecked, those who are searching for ways to move away from Islamic law, and those who created regional and ethnic prejudices. We are facing these challenges with complete faith in Allah and with unshakable determination. We are fighting the fight Iqbal and Jinnah had fought. So, there is no confrontation or contradiction between the founder of Pakistan and us.

Theocracy and Islam

Confusion is created also by talking about theocracy. The fact is that, and Iqbal and Jinnah have openly made it clear, there is no theocracy in Islam. Some people try to show as if there is some discordance between their and our views. They forget that Iqbal has deliberated upon this subject in *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. In the sixth address, he has said this in the following words:

The essence of Tauhid, as a working idea, is equality, solidarity and freedom. The state, from the Islamic standpoint, is an endeavor to transform the ideal principles into space-time forces, an aspiration to realize them in a definite human organization. It is in this sense alone that the state in Islam is a theocracy, not in the

sense that it is headed by a representative of God on earth, who can always screen his despotic will behind his supposed infallibility.

There is no such concept in Islam where some people have exclusive hold over some affairs and serve as the sole means to knowing Allah's will and attaining his pleasure. This was the thought of Iqbal in the light of Islamic teachings and Islamic taste.

Quaid-e-Azam, too, had said that he was against theocracy because Islam has no such concept where some people are 'custodians' of religion, as is in Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, and Judaism. In the words of Maulana Maududi, "we are against theocracy because it has nothing to do with Islam". Jama'at-e-Islami has always said the same thing in the same tone. Maulana Maududi's books confirm this point of view. Now, if an educated person wants to declare without studying himself that the West-given accusation and insinuation is knowledge, it proves his ignorance and narrow-mindedness.

The degenerated thinking of the so-called liberal people can be gauged from the ironic fact that on the one hand they distance themselves from theocracy but, on the other, they say that whoever has come to power, no matter how, has in a way been honored by God and therefore has a right to rule!

We submit that the views of Iqbal, Jinnah and Maududi are identical also with respect to theocracy. Those who are trying to find out some difference or create a rift at the practical level are exposing their academic dishonesty, or their information is raw, or they are suffering from secular bias instead of exploring for the facts. Such elements are neither aware of the meanings of theocracy, nor do they have any acquaintance with the collective, social, economic, international and political concepts of Islam. From this perspective, they should reform their point of view at the national level so that the message that Iqbal had given, for which Jinnah waged struggle, could be practically translated in this country today. At the level of thought, Maulana Maududi was a champion and upholder of this message.

Quaid-e-Azam's speech of Aug. 11, 1947 is presented out of context. Quaid-e-Azam had made this speech in peculiar conditions: it was the maiden session of the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan where Quaid was elected President. Expressing his thanks for the election, Quaid had made this speech.

The Quaid shared his sorrows with the nation that human blood was spilling in the subcontinent, man was killing his compatriot, innocent people were being massacred and rights were being violated. In the state we were establishing in such circumstances, all would have equal rights (whatever might be their religion: Islam or Hinduism). The speech is not about the nature of the state, it is about the rights of citizens and protection of their lives and belongings. Islam gives equal rights and protection to Muslims and non-Muslims with respect to citizenship and protection of life

and property. This is a tradition of Islam, not of secularism. The Quaid's words 'Business of the State' are much talked about, but this too amounts to academic dishonesty because 'business of the state' is different from 'nature of the state' and only means management and administration. It cannot be interpreted in any different way.

I would like to say to those who use Quaid's this speech to substantiate their argument for secularism that both before and after this speech Quaid-e-Azam has continuously and without cessation talked about Pakistan's adopting its Islamic identity, making Islamic law its base, formulating the system in the light of Qur'an and Sunnah, and the need and importance of establishing the society on the foundation of Islamic social justice. His last speech in this connection is the one that he delivered in July 1948 on the occasion of the State Bank's inauguration. In it as well as in his message on Eid the same year, he said the he wanted to implement Islamic law in the country. The question is: "How the Quaid's Aug. 11 speech be considered in isolation with his other statements? How can it be considered to have canceled all other statements and speeches that Quaid made before or after it? Is it the only credible speech while rests of the speeches are incredible and irrelevant? If one extract from a person's speeches or writings is taken out of context to find out his thought and vision, or his all writings or speeches are kept in view to arrive at a result? If all of his views are kept in view, as they should be, then Quaid's concept of Islamic state is quite clear.

Was Quaid-e-Azam an unprincipled man in their view who promised for Islamic system with the nation and said that he was inviting the people to the struggle for Pakistan so that they could wage the struggle as an ideological nation, as a champion of Islamic system and Islamic law, yet he undid all his doing just three days before attaining independence. Is it that he retracted from his long-held view and said that he had been working for an irreligious and secular state? Then he contradicted himself again and repeats the case of Islam and talk about making Pakistan a model of Islam in all his speeches from Sept. 1947 to July 1948!

Pardon! Quaid-e-Azam did not make contradictory statements. Similarly, he was neither unprincipled nor can he be accused of convoluted thinking. Nor can he be accused of hypocrisy. He upheld his views with courage and said what he thought was right. He never indulged in contradictory talk. This speech of the Quaid has to be seen in the context of his rest of the speeches, and accordingly applied and interpreted. He is quite right that there is nothing like theocracy in Islam and that all citizens have equal rights in Islam. This is in accordance with Islam, Muslims and non-Muslims all enjoy equal rights provided they meet the demands of their citizenship. This does not mean, likewise, that Pakistan would be a secular state or a state that would have nothing to do with religions or a state where Islamic laws would not be enforced. This would be wrong interpretation of his speech.

To me, this is an accusation and allegation on Quaid. It is so abominable that even his arch rivals and critics could not dare accuse him more wrongly. Unfortunately, those who claim to be the

champions of Quaid's vision are doing all this to tarnish his image and character. In contrast, our interpretation of the views of Quaid-e-Azam is the one that is in harmony with his character and his all statements. This presents an honest and fair picture of Quaid, a picture that represents his own aspirations.

PROF KHURSHID AHMAD