

The discomfiture of the Pakistan Army and the forced secession of East Pakistan have led us into a maze of distorting mirrors. The concepts that gave rise to the State of Pakistan appear to have failed. The propaganda machine of our detractors is determined to lead us along a corridor of distorted images. Along this corridor are placed carefully hidden trap-doors designed to open one after another taking us to a doom far greater than that we have already suffered.

## WHOSE FAILURE IN PAKISTAN ?

Kalim Siddiqui

In a very real sense the 'destiny' that was reached in 1947 was merely a milestone. The destiny itself was never really discovered or defined though we indulged in a great deal of confused talk about 'Islamic State' and now 'Islamic Socialism'. The challenge that now faces the Muslim intelligentsia everywhere, and particularly in Pakistan, is one of defining a new destiny that will lead to national cohesion and economic and political mobilisation of our energies and resources to a far greater extent than that which was achieved during the Pakistan Movement. For this, the first and foremost precondition is an understanding of the role of Islam.

It is important to realise that Islam is knowledge as well as a theory of knowledge. In its role as knowledge Islam is pure science; in its role as an epistemology Islam encourages the continuous development of the applied sciences in all fields of human endeavour. As a pure science, Islam gives us a body of eternal concepts, but Muslims in each epoch must continuously apply and re-apply these concepts according to the changing needs and demands of time and place.

As scientists, social scientists and technocrats we know that a concept or theory can be applied to produce alternative operational models. All aircraft, for instance, are operational models of the theory of aeronautics. But military aircraft look different from civil aircraft; and within each category bombers look dif-

ferent from fighters, and freighters are different from passenger airliners. While the theory of aeronautics stays the same, the size, shape, range, weight, design, engine, fuel, capability and other features can all change. Once an aircraft, no matter how primitive in technology, has flown, the theory of aeronautics has been proved. No number of subsequent crashes can disprove that theory. When an aircraft crashes, attention is centred on that particular design, technology, engine, fuel, navigation, or on human failure in the air or on the ground, but never on the theory of aeronautics. This is, of course, simple common sense and everyday experience.

Let us now take an example from the social sciences. Human psychology assumes self-preservation though each individual knows he has to die one day, the individual and the social order as a whole does everything possible to postpone that day for each member of the society for as long as possible. Hence the doctors and hospitals and medicines. But a number of individuals also commit suicide. The incidence of suicides does not in any way alter the basic premise of human behavioural psychology, i.e., self-preservation. Suicides, like aircraft crashes, are rightly regarded as resulting from psychological disorders or "technological" failures.

Another example from the social sciences may be taken from the field of economics. When, in the depression of the 1930s, the Western world suffered the capitalist system's greatest setback, their economists blamed it on to 'structural failure'. The concepts of the capitalist system were not challenged, at least not by the capitalist system itself. John Maynard Keynes's famous *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* merely reoperationalised the concepts of the capitalist economy, though he came close to challenging the concept of interest or usury on which the whole system rested. Karl Marx had earlier effectively destroyed the rationale of the capitalist system. But neither Marx nor Keynes succeeded in destroying the capitalist system; in fact both in their own ways helped to make the system stronger. It is significant, however, that both Marx and Keynes were prepared to challenge and re-examine not only the structural defects of the operation model of capitalism, but also its most basic concept—interest.

The capitalist economic concept of interest or usury is, however, itself the operational form of another more fundamental concept of human nature—that man is by nature selfish and private gain or profit is the universal motivation of man. Ultimately this view of human nature emanates from Christendom's doctrine of 'original sin'. As such man is born sinful. In this formulation man is by nature bad and aggressive and human relationships consist of, as Thomas Hobbes puts it in his *Leviathan*, perpetual war of 'every man against every man'. The economic concept

of usury, therefore, is merely an extension of the West's religio-philosophical view of the nature of man.

Marx, far from challenging this concept of the nature of man, merely transferred the concept of on-going conflict from man to a collectivity of men called 'class'. He re-wrote economic history in terms of class conflict and went on to make projections into the future and called it 'scientific socialism'. Marx believed that man is by nature bad, selfish and aggressive but, according to him, man acts in his class interest. Marx, therefore, merely reoperationalised the same concept which had given rise to capitalism and ended up with socialism. He merely transferred the capitalist function from man to State. This is why what we see in Communist countries today is 'State capitalism'—hardly a great or 'scientific' advance on private capitalism. In fact, to borrow a phrase from Lenin, we can say that socialism is the highest stage of capitalism! Marx himself admitted this when he said that an advanced stage of capitalist development is a prerequisite to the creation of class conflict, the emergence of the proletariat whom he called the 'gravediggers' of capitalism.

So in fact we find that even in the social sciences all the failures of their structures and models have failed to persuade the Western thinkers to re-examine their most basic concepts.

By contrast what has the Muslim intelligentsia done? Every time we or our models have failed we have persuaded ourselves to believe that Islam has failed or its concepts have failed! Because we failed to build Pakistan on the concept that gave rise to the State, our detractors have gone into a spell of joy proclaiming from all corners of the world that 'Pakistan was never a nation' and that religious beliefs of a people are an insufficient ground for building a nation—State. Using the same 'scientific' and deductive mind the same people do not go on to advocate the disappearance of either of the Vatican or of the State of Israel! Are they being irrational or illogical? To them success in *conflict* is basic to the validity of any concept. Since some people lost a war so their concepts must be defective; because Israel has won a succession of wars, Zionism must be right.

That is by their logic fair enough. But did Muslims really *apply* their concepts and fail? The answer is—and Muslim history is proof of it—that whenever and wherever we have applied our concepts we have nearly always succeeded. The odd failure was merely the exception that proved the rule—like the odd aircraft that falls to the ground or the individual who commits suicide.

But of course in recent years our rate of failure has reached alarming proportions. Almost every time we fail. The time has come when not the individual model but the basic design and concepts must be closely scrutinised.

Let us look at these. What is the situation? Virtually every part of the Muslim world has recently emerged from between a hundred to two hundred years of Western colonialism. The political control of the colonial powers has been withdrawn. They are supposedly 'free'. But an essential feature of the present situation is that the political structures and economic and educational systems are still the same as bequeathed by the departing colonial powers. In particular, before the Western powers withdrew they took care to destroy the Muslim tradition of scholarship. They created among us a group of people baptised in Western philosophy, literature, history, science, economics, politics and sociology. This Western oriented elite was established in the Muslim countries as a politically and economically powerful wealthy and corrupt middle class.

This elite inherited power from its mentor—the colonial power. Before the colonial powers withdrew they had taken care to integrate the colony's economy with their own highly developed economies in a relationship in which the former could not escape from the appointed place of being latter's poor relations!

The Western powers, through a process of education and political socialisation, also gave the concepts of geographical, linguistic and ethnic nationalism. These were secured in a capitalist system of economic structures based on usury—or the concept of 'every man against every man'. They were thus made 'modern'.

This goes to show that the recent Muslim failures are primarily the failures of Western concepts in these societies. If the post-colonial history has proved anything, it is that Western political concepts and *laissez faire* economics are irrelevant to our needs. To hide this obvious fact, Western propagandists tell that Muslim concepts have failed and that if they want to succeed, they ought to become even more modern, more Western, more nationalistic, and more capitalistic. The only spark of originality most of the Muslim intelligentsia is showing is to advocate our headlong advance towards socialism—the highest stage of capitalism! That immediate action is needed to eliminate the injustices perpetrated by the capitalist system is self-evident. It is also true that social justice and economic amelioration is the most urgent need of the Muslim society. But to seek social justice is not necessarily to be a socialist in the Marxist sense.

The other aspect of socialism that attracts the Muslim intelligentsia is the rapid economic development achieved by Russia and China and an equally spectacular economic advance happens to be their pressing need. What the 'socialists' among Muslims advocate is the adoption of economic policies and models of economic development followed in Russia or China in preference to Western economic policies. To advocate certain

*policies* is far from being a socialist. By confusing *policies* and tools of economic management with socialism they betray an ignorance of socialism. Socialism as practised in Russia and China, in Marxist theory itself, is not socialism at all—it is the stage of 'State capitalism' on the road to Utopian socialism when the State would 'wither away'. What is euphemistically called the dictatorship of the proletariat is in fact the dictatorship of capital controlled by a party and State bureaucracy. No socialist State has yet shown any signs of withering away.

Socialism and capitalism have one thing in common—both insist that the values of the people be forcibly changed. Capitalism and its political concomitant, social democracy, have already achieved this among the Western educated elites and the dominant classes in our society. Because democratic capitalism excludes the great mass of the people from political or economic participation—except as wage labourers, peasants, tenants-at-will and ballot box fodder for competing bourgeois parties—it purports to leave the values of the society relatively 'free'.

In fact, as Marx conclusively showed, bourgeois democracy uses such values to its own ends. Thus, though Marx's comment about religion being the 'opium of the masses' was directed at India of his day, he was in fact drawing on European experience. Marx had never been to the Indian subcontinent, or indeed anywhere outside Europe. In Europe the highly institutionalised, structured and hierarchical Churches in fact played into the hands first of the feudal system, and subsequently the capitalist system. Indeed, the Church was the greatest single feudal institution. The Reformation and the Renaissance were revolts against the Churches' feudal-political authority. Once the rise of the emperors against the Pope had broken the R.C. Church's political authority, there emerged the nation-State and the politically subservient Churches. The Church of England and Protestantism are the prime examples. The reformed Churches then became allies of the capitalist/democratic system.

But, with the arrival of full-employment economies and capitalism's advance to the stage of 'high mass consumption', the opium function of Christianity has been replaced by the movie, television, football, horse and dog racing, dance and bingo halls, betting shops, the 'popular' nude-a-day press, and now the sex shops. Capitalism and democracy have as effectively destroyed the Christian values of the European peoples as socialism is said to insist upon doing as part of the proletarian revolution. And yet one is endlessly told that socialism would destroy Islam while a band of so-called religious leaders are content with accepting the capitalist version of Islam. The fact remains that neither capitalism nor socialism can tolerate a situation where the social order is

based on, and draws its ultimate justification from, a set of values that are most generally held by the people.

In bourgeois politics the values of a people—whether Islamic, Christian, Jewish or any other—are used as the 'opium' of the masses. It is precisely in this role that the rulers of Pakistan have attempted to use Islam since 1947. But the attempt failed in so far as the capitalist system failed to legitimise its power in a 'democratic' political framework and the feudal/capitalist/bureaucratic dominance had to be secured through a succession of dictatorships.

The 'Islamic socialism' approach within a bourgeois political system is an admission of the failure of capitalism to use Islam as the legitimising factor. Maulana Maudoodi and his Jamaat-e-Islami fell in the trap of becoming identified with the *status quo* and paid dearly for it. Maudoodi and the Jamaat also became identified as the upholders of the ritualised Islam with greater emphasis on the salvation of the soul than on the needs of the body and mind in the immediate business of living. In any case, to succeed in the politics of a class ridden society, one has to be a bourgeois—a condition which neither Maudoodi nor his party sufficiently met.

Maudoodi insisted on democracy on the premise that the majority of the people being Muslims and being genuinely desirous of a truly Islamic order, would vote for his party in preference for the bourgeois parties of the Right and Left. Here Maudoodi made the most elementary of mistakes in predicting political behaviour. He assumed that the people's political behaviour would follow their *beliefs*. In fact *beliefs* seldom are a decisive factor in a behavioural equation unless these are mixed with an equally strong *reason*. The Pakistan Movement led by Jinnah succeeded because for a brief period the *beliefs* of the Muslims of the subcontinent were combined in a political programme that also appealed to their *reason*.

But *beliefs* on their own are not a sufficient condition for political behaviour. The belief-based Muslim political culture needed the infusion of a rationally articulated political programme which the Pakistan concept provided in the struggle to secure a homeland. But, unfortunately, the alienation of beliefs from reason re-emerged after 1947.\* The results are all too obvious. In one form or another the Muslims of the subcontinent—in Pakistan, Bangladesh and India—are once again under the hegemonic control of Delhi. It was this Hindu domination that they thought they had escaped with the establishment of Pakistan. The reason for rebuilding Pakistan is back with them. Unless they do that they shall piecemeal, like Bangladesh, disappear into the ever open arms of 'Mother India'.

\* The social, economic and political reasons for this are fully discussed in my book, *Conflict, Crisis and War in Pakistan* (London: Macmillan 1972).