Quaid’s Vision of State: Perspective and Prospects for Pakistan

“Few individuals significantly alter the course of history. Fewer still modify the map of the world. Hardly anyone can be credited with creating a nation-state. Muhammad Ali Jinnah did all three”

(Stanley Wolpert)
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Abstract
Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah a seasoned politician was western educated lawyer who sought to have learned a lot from the British during his stay in England. He started his political career as a young nationalist and believed that religious issue should not be mixed with national affairs. He wanted equal rights to all communities, including the Muslim community. He chose to call himself a nationalist. He initially wanted the subcontinent to have a united state, providing equal facilities for all communities; but this proved impossible in a country which was predominantly religious. The secularists also claimed that Jinnah differentiated between the Muslim State and the Islamic State. Jinnah probably avoided using the phrase ‘Islamic state’. Instead, he described Pakistan in more innocuous and acceptable phrases like ‘Muslim State’ and ‘National State’, although he was never tired of telling that Islam was the basis of Pakistan, that ‘every Musalman’ was its author, and so on and so forth. Islam and Muslims were synonymous and interchangeable terms to him. With a deep understanding of the political situation of British India, Quaid-i-Azam transformed the Muslims of India into a nation. He is remembered as a leader of admiration who left a deep impression in the history. In the Quaid’s leadership, Muslims of subcontinent not only achieved freedom but also won an independent state for themselves, where they could lead their lives according to the teachings of Islam and could protect their Culture and civilization.
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I. Attributes of Quaid’s Ideological Perspective
Pakistan was the second Islamic State after Madina as an Islamic State in 622 AD. Why Hindu and Muslim could not coalesce into one nation although they lived together for centuries. Quaid delivered a speech in this regard at Aligarh, in 1944, saying:

Pakistan movement started when the first non-Muslim was converted to Islam in India long before the Muslims established their rule. As soon as a Hindu embraced Islam he was outcast not only religiously but also socially, culturally and economically. As for the Muslim, it was a duty imposed on him by Islam not to be merged his identity and
individuality in any alien society. Throughout the ages, Hindu had remained Hindu and Muslim had remained Muslim. (Ahmad, 1976: 246-47)

Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah was democrat and a man of principles. He was an enlightened person. To him Islam was a complete code of life which covered all aspects of life. The speeches and statements of Quaid-i-Azam can help understand his perception of Islam and his struggle for Pakistan based on Islamic social democratic system. While addressing a public gathering at Gaya in January 1938, he expressed his views about Islam in these words:

The flag of Muslim League is the flag of Islam, for you cannot separate the Muslim League from Islam. Many people misunderstand us when we talk of Islam particularly our Hindu friends. When we say ‘this flag is the flag of Islam’ they think we are introducing religion into politics a fact of which we are proud. Islam gives us a complete code. It is not only religion but it contains laws, philosophy and politics. In facts, it contains everything that matters to man from morning to night. When we talk of Islam we take it as an all embracing world. We do not mean any ill will. The foundation of our Islamic code is that we stand for liberty, equality and fraternity. (Ahmad, 1992: 221)

It can be said rightly that the state of Pakistan was established to be an Islamic and the people wanted it to be an Islamic. Secularism has no place in an Islamic society. A small number of people, who considered Jinnah secular, quote his speech of August 11, 1947, as their argument in which the Quaid said:

......... You are free, you are free to go to your temple, you are free to go to your mosque or any other place of worship in the state of Pakistan. You may belong to any religion, caste or creed that has nothing to do with the business of the state. (Ahmad, 1976: 403)

The fact is that Quaid-i-Azam wanted a modern Islamic democratic welfare state and to him there was no difference between Islamic and democratic principles. If we study the speeches of Quaid we find that he never used the word secularism in his speeches while Islam is the central figure of his speeches. He never supported Secularism, Nationalism, Socialism, Capitalism or any other isms throughout his life. In a speech at Lahore on March 19, 1944 to the Punjab Muslim students’ Federation, the Quaid warned the Communist Party “to keep their hands off the Muslims. They did not have any other flag than the League flag, and Islam was their leading and complete system. They did not want any Isms”. (Ahmad, 1976: 24)

II. Perspective for Pakistan: An Islamic or Secular State

Now the question is whether Quaid-i-Azam wanted Pakistan as an Islamic State or not? Quaid clearly said to the people of USA in February 1948:

“... Pakistan is not going to be a theocratic state—to be ruled by priests with a divine mission...” (Dar, 2014: 124-25). Of course in Islam there is no concept of theocracy. Quaid with his forceful argument proved that Islam rules the mind and heart of the people. He said those who consider Islam for theocratic state where only Muslims could be the first citizen and non-Muslim would be the second “throwing water on the
duck’s back” which means having no knowledge of Islam. On the other side after the establishment of Pakistan if we study the statements and speeches of Quaid he stressed the role of Islam in Pakistan (Dar, 2014: 347). While addressing in Edwards College, Peshawar on April 18, 1948, the students and staff, he considered that the establishment of Pakistan is a great victory, when he said:

What more can one really expects than to see that this mighty land has now been brought under a rule, which is Islamic, Muslim rule, as a sovereign independent State. (Dar, 2014: 125)

When Sharifuddin Pirzada was asked lately about the distinction made between the Muslim and Islamic State, he described it as “dim arguments” (Jan, 2003: 162) raised by either those ‘who are probably not intellectually reconciled to Pakistan as an ideological state as against a National State’, or by those who are ‘not educated in the history of Pakistan Movement (Jan, 2003: 162). Pirzada questions: Do they mean to say that a Muslim State means an un-Islamic state?’ His testimony is that the Quaid himself used ‘the term Islamic to define the Muslim State of Pakistan on more than one occasions, and that’s after the independence of Pakistan (Jan, 2003: 162). In the Muslim League council’s resolution of December 1947, Jinnah says, it was Maulana Jamal Mian Farang-Mahle who sought the deletion of the world “Muslim” whenever it described Pakistan, could hardly take pride in calling itself a “Muslim League”. He found many un-Islamic things in the state from top to bottom. Jamal Mian added, ‘the behaviour of the ministers is not like that of the Muslims. The poor cannot enter the house of the ministers; the needy and ordinary cannot see them. Only those can enter, who possess large bungalows. The name of Islam has been disgraced enough. (Pirzada, 1969: 571)

Quaid in a letter in November 1945 to Pir Manki Sharif said, “It is needless to emphasise, that the Constituent Assembly which would be predominantly Muslim in its composition, would be able to enact laws for Muslims, not in consistent with the Shariat laws and the Muslims will no longer be obliged to abide by the un-Islamic law” (Pirzada, 1966: 210-11). The Quaid assured to Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Osmani in June 1947 that ‘Islamic constitution would be implemented’. (Waheed-uz-Zaman, 1976: 36)

III. Prospects for Pakistan

Since all these sayings of the Quaid-i-Azam belong to the pre-independence era, it may be legitimately argued that it was hardly anything more than a well-known device on the part of a politician who used Islamic vocabulary to gather Muslims to the platform of Muslim League. This line of interpretation is supported by the affirmation that the Quaid-i-Azam dropped all references to Islam and Islamic state in his speeches after partition. Indian High Commissioner to Pakistan Sri Prakasa has tried to strengthen this view by reporting a conversation between himself and the Quaid soon after partition. He allegedly said to the Quaid “that partition has been affected on the basis of differing religions. Now that this has taken place, see no reason why stress should be laid on Pakistan being an Islamic State”…. At this he (Quaid-i-Azam) said that he had never used the word “Islamic” (Waheed-uz-Zaman, 1976: 36). This unbelievable story stands clearly discredited in the face of many speeches of Quaid-i-Azam after partition. Indeed, he was even more straightforward towards Islamic principle. Quaid-i-Azam was anxious to give Islamic Ideology a dynamic interpretation and to him, making Pakistan an Islamic State meant based upon Islamic principles of social justice, equality, fraternity. He found these
principles of Islam not contrary with democratic ideals of Islam. What he tried to mean that Pakistan should not be Islamic and democratic state, having these qualities as two diverse and separate attributes, but that it should be through Islamic democratic process (Choudhury, 1967: 46). Islam and democracy are not paradoxical terms. He emphasized how the Muslims could own both concept of without giving rise to any discordance or dichotomy in their body-public. Pakistan was not to be Islamic democratic state, to be run on democratic lines, but with Islam as its underlying ethical principles (Mujahid, 1981: 144). When in June 2005, Prime Minister of India Mr. Lal Krishna Advani came Pakistan he said, ‘Jinnah was indeed a secularist, but unfortunately his successors were not as enthusiastic about his secular ideology, views and objectives’. He said the Quaid’s speeches and statements have no doubt showed that he wanted Pakistan to be a secular state. He left the Home Rule league and the Congress after Gandhi took them over because he strongly condemned Ghandi, who disapproved the introduction of religion into politics and because he disapproved unconstitutional means to secure Swaraj (independence) (<http://www. Jang.com.pk>). The Quaid-i-Azam never referred to Pakistan as “Islamic Republic” but as the “State of Pakistan”, “Sovereign State of Pakistan”, “Dominion of Pakistan” or “Federal Republic of Pakistan” (Jalal, 1999: 8-9). Almost all authors of the books on Quaid-i-Azam, including Stanley Wolpert, Lawrence Ziring, Ayesha Jalal and K.M. Munshi, substantiate and support the view that the Quaid-i-Azam was himself secular and wished for Pakistan to be a secular state. (Home<.../>index.htm)

According to Dr. Mansoor Alam some people say that Quran or Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was not inspired Quaid. He struggled for Pakistan, but his motives were not Islamic only political and economic. He wanted to improve the Muslims economic condition that was subjugated by the Hindus. Jinnah did not struggled for an Islamic state but he used Islam as tool for gathering the Indian Muslim. He had nothing to do with Islam as such. He wanted to make Pakistan a secular state not an Islamic state. In August 1941, Quaid-i-Azam gave an interview, to the Students of the Osmania University. The replies he gave to the questions asked by the students explain his depth and comprehension of the basic foundation of Islam. Here are excerpts from the interview:

Q. What are the essential features of religion and a religious state?
A. “When I hear the world “religion” my mind thinks as once, according to the English language and British usage, of private relations between man and God. But I know full well that according to Islam, the word is not restricted to the English connotation. I am neither a Maulavi nor a Mullah, nor do I claim knowledge of theology. But I have studied in my own way the Holy Quran and Islamic tenets. This magnificent book is full of guidance respecting all human life, whether spiritual, or economic, political or social, leaving no aspect untouched”. It is clear that Quaid was did not like western-style democracy neither Mullah-Style theocracy. He basically advocated what may be called Islamic social democracy.

A. Quaid-i-Azam, Theocracy and Pakistan
Quaid used more than hundred times the words Islam, Islamic democracy and Islamic socialism in his speeches and statements. Although he stressed on the rights of minorities but never used the term secular etc. (Karim, 2010: 45) While addressing on April 10, 1946 to the Muslim League Legislators Convention in New Delhi, Quaid said:
Pakistan is not going to be a theocratic state. Religion of course played an important part in a nation's life, but there were other aspects which were vital for a nation’s existence. Social, economic, and political aspects were the main pillars which would enable them to live according to their faith. With their social life demoralized and economically ruined and with no political power, they would not defend their faith. (Ahmad, 2000: 611)

Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah was not in favour of a theocratic state. He wanted a state where all people will be equal irrespective of caste, religion and creed. When on July 14, 1947, he was asked a question “will Pakistan be a secular or theocratic state? Quaid replied: you are asking me a question that is absurd. I do not know what a theocratic state mean.’ A correspondent suggested that a theocratic state meant a state where only people of a particular religion, for example, Muslims could be full citizens and Non-Muslims would not be full citizens... When you talk of a democracy, I am afraid you have not studied Islam. We learned democracy thirteen centuries ago (Afzal, 1966: 422-23).

Quaid wanted Pakistan an Islamic democratic but he believed that an Islamic state is not and need not be a theocracy. He believed that Islam stresses on freedom equality, fraternity, solidarity and social justice also secular or humanistic values. Thus, his conception was essentially Islamic (Mujahid, 1981: 266-67). He also described these words as the essence of Tauheed. To the people of Australia on February 19, 1948, he stated:

The great majority of us are Muslims. We follow the teachings of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH). We are members of brotherhood of Islam in which all are equal in rights, dignity and self respect. Consequently, we have a special and a very deep sense of unity. But make no mistake: Pakistan is not a theocracy or anything like it. Islam demands from us the tolerance of other creeds and we welcome in closest association with us all those who, of whatever creed, are themselves willing and ready to play their part as true and loyal citizens of Pakistan. (Ahmad, 1976:456)

The above words of the Quaid show that he was in favour to give equal citizenship to all the people whether Muslims (majority) or non-Muslims (minority). His state policy was based on tolerance.

B. Pakistan: A Modern Democratic State

“We are starting with this fundamental principle that we are all citizens and equal citizens of one state”. On August 11, 1947, Quaid was elected as the first President of the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan. Quaid-i-Azam provided guidelines for the new state of Pakistan in his inaugural speech and laid down the policy of the new state towards its minorities. On the occasion, he said:

One can quite understand the feeling that exists between the two communities wherever one community is in majority and the other is in minority... On both sides, in Hindustan and Pakistan, there are sections of people who may not agree with it, who may not like it, but in my judgment there was no other solution... Now if we want to make this great state of Pakistan happy and prosperous we should wholly and solely concentrate on
the well being of the people and especially of the masses and the poor. (Ahmad, 1976: 399-405)

Jinnah did not mention Islam or an Islamic constitution in his opening address but touched on the equality of all citizens and equal opportunities for all people. He also spoke against bribery, corruption, black-marketing nepotism and jobbery and urged the Assembly to take strong measures against these evils. This speech of Jinnah was criticized by many for it was considered a departure from his earlier stand before the creation of the nascent state. It is said in certain quarters that he neglected the ‘Two-Nation Theory’ and his vision of a state was Secular Pakistan (Khaliq-uz-Zaman, 1961: 321). G.M. Sayed, who had voted against Pakistan in the Sindh Assembly, came out with the statement that Jinnah's speech customized a “chastened mood” and neglected those basic principles on which the Muslim League carried its agenda, the struggle for Pakistan (Sayeed, 1960: 254-55). Dawn tried to correct this ‘misinterpretation’ of Quaid’s speech. It was said that Quaid stated: “Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense...but in the political sense”, he meant that “a Hindu or any other person not professing the Muslim faith will not be debarred from participating in the administration of Pakistan, nor will he be discriminated against by its laws, nor will he suffer economically” (Sayeed, 1960: 255). Chief Justice of Lahore High Court Munir said in his book *From Jinnah to Zia*, “There can be no doubt that Jinnah was a secularist and against theocracy. In his speech to the Constituent Assembly on August 11, 1947, he has given a picture of Pakistan which was nothing short of a secular state in which Muslims and non-Muslims could live together and be its citizens, with equal rights of citizenship, and that religion would be a private affair of the individual having nothing to do with the administration of the state” (Munir, 1980: 29-30). What is the spirit of this speech? Does it mean that Quaid wanted an Un-Islamic state? Or, that Islamic principle would not be the basis of future constitution of Pakistan? If not, what did he mean by saying that “Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims...in the political sense as citizens of the state”. Quaid made this speech when the whole Indian sub-continent was swayed with communal frenzy; millions of people, both Muslims and Hindus were victims of communal riots. The Quaid-i-Azam was stressing the communal harmony and peace for the progress of the new nation. He again and again stressed in this memorable speech that there would be no distinctions made between Hindus and Muslims on the ground of religion, caste, or creed, but he at no time said that Islamic principles should not be the guiding factors in the constitution of Pakistan. In fact, he made no reference to the future constitution; he was speaking only against recent communal bitterness between Hindus and Muslims, and said that Hindus would have equality as citizens (Choudhury, 1967: 45-46). This declaration of the founder of the state was warmly welcomed by minorities (Choudhury, 1967: 59-60). The minority leaders in defending their claims in the Constituent Assembly and elsewhere have referred to this memorable speech on many occasions. It was regarded as the *Magna Carta* of the minorities in Pakistan (Choudhury, 1967: 60). On many occasion stressed Quaid spoke about the status of non-Muslim minorities in Pakistan. Before the creation of Pakistan he had assured the non-Muslims that they would treated in the state of Pakistan.

**IV. Conclusion**

All these show that Quaid-i-Azam was a true democrat. Being a democrat how it was possible for him to impose his own made constitution in the country and to shape it a secular state. He wanted a democracy based on Islam. He wanted to protect the rights of
minorities. By advocating the rights of minorities, it doesn't mean that he wanted a secular state. If the speeches of the Quaid are keenly studied, it will become clear that Pakistan envisaged by Quaid was a liberal Islamic democratic welfare state completely dedicated to the good well of all its citizens treated equally in accordance with the principles of Islamic democracy, social justice and tolerance. He was neither secularist nor a fundamentalist rather a simple Muslim and a true believer.
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