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Nineteenth Century was a period of great trial and tribulation for Muslims of the Indian sub-continent. It was a period of decay and degeneration and a sense of intense pessimism and extreme cynicism had gripped the Muslim masses. Their glory had become a thing of the past and after facing adverse buffets of fortune, they had lost all faith in their survival and regeneration. Dawn of twentieth century had brought a message of hope and buoyancy for other communities, but the political horizon for Muslims was bleak as ever. Then, lo, and behold! Allah, through His infinite mercy, designated Iqbal and Jinnah as their saviours. Through their total commitment to the Muslim cause and their relentless and unswerving involvement with their mission, they extricated their Muslim brethrens from the abyss of ignominy and degeneration. Iqbal, through his soul-stirring message infused a new spirit of hope and light. He exhorted Muslims of the sub-continent to wake up and rally round one banner.

Wake up, o Muslim in deep slumber, be attentive; Lo, horizon is shining, you should also be active. (Baang-e Dara)

And again he says:

The night is dark and you had drifted away from the caravan; for you the flame of my melody will act as the guiding light! (Baal-e Jabril)
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Iqbal also gave the idea of a free Muslim state in the Indian sub-continent, and further more, he discovered a leader of great vision and integrity. It was Mr. Jinnah who later, succeeded in carving out an independent Muslim state, called Pakistan.

It was during first decade of twentieth century, when both Iqbal and Jinnah, started taking active interest in politics. Till then, they were under the influence of Western nationalism. Iqbal, however, soon disassociated himself from this mainstream, as he had realized the impracticibility of Western nationalism, in the peculiar Indian environment. Jinnah, however, continued his political journey along with other liberal Indian leaders, like Dadabhoy Naoroji, G. K. Gokele, Feroz Shah Mehta and C. R. Das. In view of his political convictions, he was popularly known as ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity. In fact, he was the originator of Lucknow Pact between Congress and Muslim League in 1916. However, this marriage of convenience, did not last very long. In 1929, when Mr. Jinnah put forward his fourteen points, Jinnah and Iqbal started understanding each other in a much better way. In fact, it was Mr. Jinnah who had exhorted Iqbal to preside over the Annual Session of All-India Muslim League in 1930 at Allahabad. There, Iqbal presented his famous historical address, which, later proved a turning point in Muslim politics. Undoubtedly, both Iqbal and Jinnah had played the historic role during the first half of the twentieth century.

It is now no longer a secret that both Quaid-i-Azam, Muhammad Ali Jinnah and Allama Iqbal had worked in their own way for the establishment of an independent Muslim state. It is pertinent to note here that a Muslim state, particularly a Muslim state, was identified by them with reference to Islam and Islam alone. Those who interpret Quaid’s speeches in the secular vein may be asked to explain, why the Quaid had made desperate efforts to create a state in the name of Islam, if it had nothing to do with Islam?

It is interesting to note here that Quaid-i-Azam in his speeches from 1940 to 1947, had clearly spelt out that the new state would be an Islamic one, and that this would enforce Shari‘ah. To quote just one example: in his speech to the government functionaries on
October 1947, he had underscored the State’s Islamic character in the following words:

The establishment of Pakistan, for which, we have been striving for the last ten years is, by the grace of God, an established fact today, but the creation of a state of our own was a means to an end and not the end in itself. The idea was that we should have a state, in which we could develop according to our light and culture, and where principles of Islamic social justice could find free play.\(^1\)

Commenting on the speech, Dr. Waheed Qureshi says that the speech in question was important for three reasons: One, it was made after the controversial 11, August 1947 speech; two, it was loud and clear, with no ambiguity and then, it was addressed to government officials, who were primarily entrusted with the task of implementing the state policies.

Both, the Lahore Resolution (later known as Pakistan Resolution) and the Quaid’s speech made on the occasion, refer to the establishment of an Islamic welfare state. Thereafter, in his speeches of March 10, 1941, November 2, 1942 and 1943, he had explained in depth the kind of state, he had envisioned to be. Some extracts from these speeches are offered below:

In [British] India, under democracy a paramount and perennial majority, of necessity, dominates over a society in minority. There is no instance in the world of two nations, having been yoked under a unitary constitution. We have seen from actual experience that the British parliamentary system of government results in the establishment of complete Hindu domination over all others in India. The Muslims and other minorities are rendered absolutely powerless, without any hope of achieving a share of power under the constitution.\(^2\)

In his July 1942 interview to the American press representatives, he said:

The Hindu Congress during these 27 months made every effort to suppress the language, customs and culture of the Muslims. Even in educational institutions, which were wholly Muslims, students were compelled to use text books, prescribed by the Hindu Congress governments, emphasizing the Hindu culture and traditions and belittling that of the Musalmaans’ what little of Muslim culture they
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contained. Hundreds of instances can be given of their having trampled upon the elementary rights of [the] Musalmans.\(^3\)

Again, in his November 2, 1942 address to the Students Union of Muslim University, he had based his intent of having a state where Muslims should live free from the Hindu influence. Note his words:

It is an historical fact, that for nearly one thousand years, the Hindus have not ruled any part of India, worth mentioning. Our proposal concedes to them three fourth of India and they can control the government of Hindu zones, according to our proposal. I appeal to them not to be greedy, because it seems to me that the Hindus think that we have conceded and according to our proposal, they have got three-fourth in their pocket and therefore why not manoeuvre and grab the remaining one-fourth and establish Hindu Raj over the entire sub-continent. I say, take three-fourths and do not grudge my one-fourth. Let me live according to my history in the light of Islam, traditions, culture and language and you do the same in your zone. Let us thus live in peace.\(^4\)

Jinnah’s concluding speech to all India Muslim League, Karachi, praised Islam and its abiding role in nation building:

What is it that keeps the Muslims united as one man, and which is the bedrock and sheet anchor of the community? It is Islam. It is the Great Book, Qur’an, which is the sheet anchor of Muslim India. I am sure as we go on and on, there will be more and more oneness — one God, one Book, one Prophet and one Nation.\(^5\)

However, the most disputed, is the Quaid’s speech of August 11, 1947. Excerpts:

… you are free, you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go to your mosques or to any other place to worship in the State of Pakistan. You may belong to any religion or caste or creed — that has nothing to do with the business of the state — we are starting with this fundamental principle that we are all citizens and equal citizens of one state.\(^6\)

Reading secularism into Jinnah’s above quoted speech is at best a marginal view. The secularists say that the Quaid, used the

\(^{3}\) Ibid., p.28.
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name of Islam for the sole objective of securing the country, which once he had it, he stopped using it. This is not tenable because if in his August speech, he had meant a secular dispensation for Pakistan, as is being contented here, then it should have its reverberations in his subsequent speeches as well. After all, he lived one more year following the controversial speech. For instance, note his speech of Oct 11, 1947, in which he said:

The division of India was agreed upon with a solemn and sacred understanding that minorities would be protected by the two Dominion’s Governments and that the minorities had nothing to fear so long as they remained loyal to the state. If that is still the policy of the Governments of India — and I am sure it is — they should put a stop to the process of victimization of Muslims which, if persisted in, would mean ruin for both the states.\(^7\)

Similar are speeches of Oct 30, 1947 and Jan 25, 1948. To give protection to the minorities, he had invoked even Islamic teachings. “The tenants of Islam”, he said, “enjoin on every Musalman to give his protection to his neighbours and to the minorities, regardless of caste and creed.”\(^8\) The same theme was repeated by him in his message to the American people. He said:

The Constitution of Pakistan has yet to be framed by the Pakistan Constituent Assembly. I do not know what the ultimate shape of this Constitution is going to be, but I am sure, it will be a democratic type, embodying the essential principles of Islam. Today, they are as applicable in actual life as they were 1300 years ago. Islam and its idealism have taught us democracy. It has taught equality of man, justice and fair play to everybody. We are the inheritors of these glorious traditions and are fully alive to our responsibilities and obligations as framers of the future Constitution of Pakistan.\(^9\)

Jinnah, had convinced the minorities that Pakistan would in no way, be a theocratic state — to be ruled by priests with a divine mission. In Pakistan resided Hindus, Christians, and Parsis and they were all true Pakistanis. Quaid assured them that they would enjoy the same rightful part in the affairs of Pakistan.\(^10\)

In his Sibbi speech of February 1948, he said:

\(^7\) Rizwan Ahmed, p.104.
\(^9\) Jamil-ud-Din Ahmed, p.463.
In proposing this scheme, I have had one underlying principle in mind, the principle of Muslim democracy. It is my belief that our salvation lies in following the golden rule of conduct set for us by our great law giver, the Prophet of Islam. Let us lay the foundation of our democracy on the basis of truly Islamic ideals and principles. Allah Almighty had taught us that our decisions in the affairs of the state shall be guided by discussions and consultations.

Quaid’s speech of August 11, 1947 has been presented out of context. What is required is to view it within its real context. Syed Abul Ala Maududi’s analysis of the speech seems nearer the truth. To him, it reflects that the Quaid had made it in the assembly at a time when he was keen to assure the minorities that they would remain safe in Pakistan and that they would enjoy all rights including religious freedom.

Iqbal, the post-philosopher of the East, had also worked hard for furtherance of the Quaid’s mission.

Keeping in view his cumulative work, we see that Iqbal had accorded special priorities in the propagation of Islam and religious affairs, and the promotion of cultural and economic issues. He had expressed himself on these issues even before his idea of a separate homeland for the Muslims in South Asia had gained currency.

In his December 5, 1928 letter to Ghulam Bheek Narang, he says:

To me, the propagation of Islam should be accorded a precedence over all other issues. If the objective of the Muslims in India is only freedom and economic betterment, and not the protection of Islam, as evidenced by the behaviour of today’s nationalists, then Muslims will never succeed.

His letter to Mr. Jinnah on March 20, 1937, also reaffirms his views. He holds the cultural integrity of Muslims was crucial to their survival in British India. Note his words:

It is absolutely essential to tell the world that the economic problem is not the only problem in the country. From the Muslim point of view, the cultural problem is of much greater consequence to most Indian
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Muslims. At any rate, it is no less important than the economic problem.\(^\text{14}\)

In his February 7, 1929 interview to the editor of a newspaper, named Sorajia, he had remarked:

I am feeling the need of imparting religious education in our educational institutions. The fact is that being an Indian [Muslim], I prefer religion over soraj (freedom). Personally, I would have nothing to do with freedom unhinged from religion. Our problem is how to combine in one plan spiritual and material aspects.\(^\text{15}\)

Interestingly, Iqbal would, at times, differ with the ‘Ulema’ on certain modalities. However, when it came to enforcing Islam as a life code, he was with them. In one of his letters to Jinnah, he had affirmed his faith in the efficiency of Islam to run the state affairs: “Happily, there is a solution in the enforcement of the law of Islam and its further development in the light of modern idea”, Iqbal says.

Iqbal always acknowledged the contribution made by the scholars of Islam, but also emphasized addressing the complete problems arising out of modern developments. Iqbal did not look at past, present and future as separate entities. Instead, he viewed them in continuation, each phase supplementing the other.\(^\text{16}\)

The secularists’ reading of Iqbal’s Allahabad’s speech reveals a mind set which reflects that he was not in support of an Islamic state as he had conceded to support “territorial electorates” with “demarcation of the provinces”. Also, his demarcation of the provinces based on “comparatively homogenous communities possessing linguistic, racial, cultural and religious unity”, proved that he had considered religion only as one of the four attributes of the proposed state.\(^\text{17}\)


\(^{15}\) Sayed Abdul Wahid, Thoughts and Reflection of Iqbal, (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1973), pp.139-149.


True, Iqbal said these words but honesty demands that conclusions from these observations, isolated by secularists, as his support to secular order, smacked intellectual dishonesty.

We, on the other hand, are convinced that Iqbal had highlighted in clear terms four things in his 1930 speech. To him, Islam is not a church or a theocracy; it is a state — a complete way of life. And as a system of governance, it is certainly better than anything else. Iq bal, in this speech, also underscored that the Indian nationalism was an impossible dream and Muslims must beware of this trap. Instead, they should go in for a consolidated status of their own in the future.  

Contrary to the secularists’ notions of religion as a private affair, both Jinnah and Iqbal looked upon Islam as a civilizational force, which could assert itself even in none-too-happy situations. It played a vital role in social environments of British India, where Muslims had been marginalized in the post-1857 colonial setup. Iqbal eulogized Jinnah for his Islamic essence and looked upon him for safe guidance. He shared with him, his belief that the “enforcement and development of the Shari’ah of Islam was impossible in that country with a free Muslim state or states.

It may be noted here that unlike the secularists, Jinnah did not believe in the contentless democracy. Nor did he think that democratic dispensations was an end by itself. In that sense, he was not a blind follower of existing norms of democracy, otherwise, he would not have remapped British India. He was also conscious of the implications of the secular game, which had weighed heavily against the Muslims and would have resulted in “the complete destruction of what was more precious in Islam.

For him, Pakistan was a must, “to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way, we think best and in accordance with our own ideals.  
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21 Sharif-ud-Din Pirzada, pp.338-342.
Here, one feels non-plussed to offer any befitting explanation to his August 11, 1947 speech. One would like to ask if had made a somersault. To say so, would amount to Jinnah’s character assassination. That he was a consistently secularist or a liberal in the Western tradition, as has been alleged, would be equally unfair. This is an attribute out-rightly false. And even if he was a liberal, it was not in the same, philosophical sense, but within the Islamic traditions — a matter of approach and not of substance.24

Then, the question arises to what was precisely the message that he wanted to convey to the Muslims and non-Muslims alike in his August 11, 1947 speech? For an honest evaluation of his speech, three things merit special attention. To him, the first significant statement from Jinnah on minority protection came in 1941, when he said that “Islam stands for justice, equality, fair play, tolerance and even generosity to non-Muslims who may be under our protection”.25

Second, in 1942, when he said “Their (minorities) rights would be fully safeguarded according to the injunctions from the highest authority, namely [the] Qur’an; that a minority must be treated justly and free play.”26

Third, in 1943, he repeated himself while talking to a Hindu delegation “we will treat your minorities not only in a manner that a civilized government should trust them but better because it is an injunction in the Qur’an to treat the minorities so.”27

Obviously, in giving protection to minorities, his context was Islam. In his July 14, 1947 press conference, he was asked for a brief statement on the minorities. This reply was candid as well as consistent.

… they (minorities) will have their rights and privileges and no doubt along with it goes obligation of citizenship.28

24 Ibid., p.487.
26 Ibid., p.422.
27 Ibid., p.422.
These statements were made at the time when the minority problem was brewing fast. The refugees from Central Indian and East Punjab had begun trekking their way into Pakistan. Muslims had not seen the calamity of this proportion before. The whole environment was charged with the cries of revenge. A terrible blow as it was to Quaid’s Pakistan, he wanted to defuse it, by making a two plank move — assuring minorities of their equal status on the one hand and asking Muslims to be magnanimous on the other. “You may belong to any religion or caste or creed — that has nothing to do with the business of the state.”

Quaid’s hope was that with the passage of time “Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense, because that is the personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense, as citizens of state.”

Quaid-i-Azam believed that when it comes to administration of justice, rights and services, religion is not the criterion. Everybody must get it irrespective of his faith as a citizen.

Second, since the new state had come into being as a consequence of the Muslim strivings, Muslims must not think that they were more equal than others. Such a thinking on their part will be wrong because in the political sense as citizens, their religious identity would not matter, the state will dispense its services to all alike.

Responding to a question from the Reuters’s correspondent on the possible peace between Pakistan and India, Quaid had said, that among others, he had repeatedly made it clear, especially in his opening speech to the Constituent Assembly, that the minorities in Pakistan would be treated as equal citizen and would enjoy all the rights and privileges that any other community got.

Time and again, he had preached tolerance and patience and the rights of the minorities in the Islamic context. In his famous

30 Rafiq Afzal, p.448.
31 Ibid., p.442.
32 Ibid., p.442.
speech of October 20, 1947 in Lahore, he said, “We have been victims of a deeply laid and well planned conspiracy executed with utter disregard of the elementary principle of honesty, chivalry and honour.”

He asked them to “take inspiration and guidance from the Holy Qur’an, the final victory, once again say, will be ours.” In brief, he reminded them that, “Islam enjoins on every Musalmaan to give protection to his neighbours and to minorities, regardless of caste and creed”.

Addressing the Karachi Bar Association on January 25, 1948, he said, “Islamic principles today are applicable to life as they were 1300 years ago”. In an address to the State Bank officials, he said:

the economic system of the West has created almost insoluble problems for humanity… the adoption of Western economic theory and practice will not help us in achieving our goal of creating a happy and contented people. We must work our destiny in our own way and present to the world an economic system based on true Islamic concept of equality of mankind and social justice.

Such an accomplishment, he said, would “be fulfilling our mission as Muslims”.

From the above, it becomes clear that our leaders, particularly Iqbal and Jinnah, had come to the conclusion that an independent homeland for Muslims was indispensable in order to preserve the identity of the Muslims as a nation, separate from Hindus in all respects — history, culture, nomenclature, religion, worldview etc. At the clarion call of their leaders, the entire Muslim community had risen to a man to fight for Pakistan.
Interestingly, Quaid-i-Azam had aptly remarked that Pakistan had come into being on the day the first Hindu embraced Islam. This was the advent of a new ideology an ideology which ushered in a new behaviour, a new code of ethics, a new culture and a new world view. This ideology brought into being a new society, not fettered by geographic and racial chains. This new society was destined to establish in the world, the principles of brotherhood which humanity had not known before. It was a spiritual revolution.\(^{40}\)

It is interesting to note here that the first Muslim on the Indian social was a great event, the principle consequence of which was the birth of a two-nation theory. Hindu leaders, including Gandhi, did not like the very mention of the ideological basis of Muslim nationhood and he had kept on challenging the idea of a nation, based on religion and not on geography, colour, language and race etc. Muslim nationhood was indeed a new political phenomenon.\(^{31}\)

However, Indian Muslims, in spite of combined Hindu — British opposition had succeeded in achieving Pakistan. The idea of Indian nationalism, which had potentially meant Hindu nationalism, suffered defeat, mainly due to the compelling appeal of two-nation theory for the Muslims.

Hindu leaders’ desperate propaganda about one Indian nation and the unity of India, was nothing but a mischief to hoodwink the world on one hand and to browbeat Muslims of the sub-content into submission to the majority community, on the other. Hindus were bent upon appropriating all to themselves and thus depriving the Muslims of their legitimate democratic rights as a nation, separate from Hindus religiously, culturally and historically.\(^{32}\)

Hindus could not tolerate to see Muslims flourish in trade, banking, industry and agriculture. They seldom recruited Muslims in establishment where they wielded authority. Even in those days of spirited propaganda of one-nation, they could not take food touched by a Muslim. That was their collective behaviours yet the
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\(^{40}\) Ibid., p.129.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., p.185.

\(^{42}\) Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi, Struggle for Pakistan, (Karachi: University of Karachi, 1979).
Hindu propagandists went on making impassioned speeches, in which they dubbed the Muslims as separatists.\textsuperscript{43} Hindus had proved that practically they were a nation alien as well as hostile to the Muslims. There was a clash of interest with the Muslims in every matter of social life. What then, should the Muslims, have done as a self-respecting nation with their glorious past and a future full of promise? After prolonged and cool deliberations, the great majority of them decided, at least not to bow before the ruthless Hindu nation. They refused to accept the status of second class citizens of a Hindu state.\textsuperscript{44}

According to Allama Iqbal, the future of Islam as a moral and political force not only in India but in the whole of Asia, resented on the organization of the Muslims of India, led by the Quaid-i-Azam. The “Guides of the Era”, Iqbal had envisaged in 1926, was found in the person of Muhammad Ali Jinnah. The “Guide” organized the Muslims of India, under the banner of the Muslim League and offered determined resistance to both the Hindu and the English design for a united Hindu-dominated India. Through their united efforts, under the guidance of the Quaid-i-Azam, the Muslims succeeded in dividing India into Pakistan and Bharat. In Allama Iqbal’s views, the organization of Indian Muslims which achieved Pakistan would also have to defend other Muslim nations in Asia. The caravan of the resurgence of Islam has to start from this land, far off from the centre of the Ummah. Let us see how and when Pakistani nation prefers itself to shoulder this august responsibility.\textsuperscript{45}

Also, note his views on Islam as God’s special gift and its ability to achieve independence. “There is only one course open to us to organize our nation, and it is by our dint of arduous and sustained efforts that will create strength and support among our people, not only to achieve our freedom and independence but to be able to maintain it and live according to Islamic ideals and principles. Pakistan not only means freedom and independence but

\textsuperscript{44} G. Allana, \textit{Quaid-i-Azam, Jinnah: The Story of Nation}, p.282.
the Muslim ideology which has to be preserved and which has come to us as a precious gifts and treasure and which we hope other will share with us.” He also said that the Muslim League stood for Pakistan so that the Muslims could rule there under Islamic laws. Further, he says that the Constituent Assembly would be able to enact laws for Muslims, not inconsistent with the Shari’at laws and the Muslims will no longer be obliged to abide by the un-Islamic laws.

He kept on repeating the same views until his last speech on July 1948 at the inauguration of the State Bank of Pakistan.

In brief, there are a large number of Jinnah’s speeches, in which he had declared that Pakistan would be a Muslim state, that the formats of its legislation would be the Qur’an and that its laws would be Islamic. Even when Jinnah and Iqbal were talking about the acceptance of the Muslim rights, they were demanding a separate state and not coexistence in the same geopolitical set up.

Jinnah’s August 11, 1947 speech, should be read in the Islamic context. His words, “Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims in the political sense as citizens of the state” are not only Islamic in construction but in feelings as well. The nascent Islamic state of Madinah had this very clause in the Mithaq that the Prophet (PBUH) had concluded with the non-Muslim factions in which they were all treated as equals, with the Prophet (PBUH), as the final arbiter in disputes between them. By declaring the Qur’an as the format of all legislation and by according equal status to different religious denominations as citizens of the new state, Jinnah was following the Prophet’s footsteps.

Iqbal also emphasized that separate electorates and distribution of territories among the Muslims and the Hindus should be source for promoting peace and harmony in diverse India. This was Iqbal’s tactical move to create conducive environments in the womb of
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48 Rizwan Ahmed, p.69.
49 Tarik Jan, p.443.
time for the birth of Pakistan. He also exhorted Muslims to go in for a consolidated state of their own in the future.\textsuperscript{50}

We conclude by offering a few excerpts from his March 1939 that he had delivered in the Legislative Assembly: “You may be the largest number; you may be more advanced and you may be stronger economically — but let me tell you, you will never be able to destroy the culture which we have inherited, the Islamic culture, and that spirit will live, is going to live and has lived. You may overpower us, you may oppress us, and you can do what you want. But we have come to the conclusion and we have made a grim resolve that we shall go down, if we have to go down, fighting.\textsuperscript{51}
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