

Saif Ullah

ID,15860

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Monarchy

BY: BEENISH SHUJA

A monarchy is a form of government where the individual or group of people in power are determined through bloodlines. Specific rules are in place that dictate who can be named the ruler of the state in a monarchy. Most are ruled by kings or queens, but some allow for a group of nobles to be the head of the government as well.

The advantage of a monarchy is that there is predictability in the government. Secession goes through the family who leads the government, so there are no situations where people must vote “for the lesser of two evils.” There are specific rules and laws in place that would determine who would be the ruler and when they would ascend to that leadership position. The disadvantage of a monarchy is that the people being ruled rarely have a say in who gets to be their leader. Because everything is pre-determined, a society could become stuck with an abusive individual in power for multiple decades and have little recourse to save themselves.

There are two main types of monarchy that differ based on the level of power held by the individual or family currently in power. Absolute monarchy exists when the monarch has no or few legal limitations in political matters. Constitutional monarchies, which are more common, exist when the monarch retains a distinctive legal and ceremonial role but exercises limited or no political power. The most familiar example of a monarchy is the constitutional monarchy that exists in the United Kingdom. Queen Elizabeth II is the head of state of the U.K. as well as monarch of fifteen other independent countries. She and the royal family have ceremonial roles but do not make up the laws that govern the people.

Advantages

1. Balance is still provided in the government.

The modern monarchy is typically a figurehead in the government instead of being the all-ruling overseer of everything. The government structure of the United Kingdom is a good example of this.

2. It can be cheaper to run a monarchy.

Rulers in a monarchy are often treated to exorbitant wealth. From the lavish estates where they live to the massive amount of wealth they can provide themselves, the ruling class separates itself from the other classes in terms of wealth. From the government's perspective, however, the wealth of a monarchy can be more cost-effective than the recurring charges of frequent elections. CBS News reports that the total cost of the 2016 election cycle in the United States was \$6.8 billion. In comparison, Bloomberg estimates the Queen's net worth at \$425 million.

3. It can be a more efficient form of government.

Because decisions run through the ruling class, and often through a specific individual, a monarchy is more efficient than most other forms of government. Instead of a massive bureaucracy and lots of red tape to navigate to get laws passed or benefits authorized, one decision can be made that decrees everything that needs to be done for the society.

Disadvantages

1. It is difficult to change the direction of a country under a monarchy.

Because only one family or one “noble” group is allowed into the ruling class under the structure of a monarchy, it becomes difficult for the people to direct a change in what happens in their society. Unless the ruler or group of rulers agrees, there is no way for the average person to create change. The public has no voice, which means a selfish or power-hungry monarch could create instant and long-term oppression.

2. Monarchies are supported by local tax policies.

Taxpayers are forced to furnish the costs that a monarch incurs over the course of governing in virtually every instance of this government structure. It is no different than paying a President or Prime Minister a salary, but other costs are government-funded as well.

5. Class discrimination is more prominent.

Every society has socioeconomic classes. In a monarchy, they tend to be more pronounced. Wealth is directly associated with power. If one has no wealth, then there is no chance to provide influence. In other government structures, those who have no wealth would still have the opportunity to vote and have their vote be equal to any other vote.

IDEOLOGY OF PAKISTAN

- Pakistan is the only state that came into being on the bases of strong ideology. Since its establishment it has been demanded to accomplish its basic aim.
- ***The Ideology of Pakistan***
- The Ideology of Pakistan was the consciousness of the Muslims in the historical perspective of the south Asian sub-continent that they were a separate nation on the basis of the Islamic ideology. No doubt Islamic ideology is the base of ideology of Pakistan so the basic fundamentals of Islam are also the bases of the Ideology of Pakistan.

Ideology of Pakistan & Different Scholars

Ideology of Pakistan is defined by the different sociologists as

- **1. Syed Ali Abbas**
- Syed Ali Abbas former professor of history defined ideology of Pakistan as.
- *“Ideology of Pakistan and Ideology of Islam have same meaning. Actually ideology of Pakistan is the practical shape of the teachings of Islam.”*

- **2. Dr. Aslam Syed**
- Dr. Aslam Syed defined the ideology of Pakistan as.

- *“Ideology of Pakistan is the name of molding of individual and collective lives according to Islam and also of saving from conflicting ideologies.”*

3. Allama Allaud-Din-Siddiqui

A well known scholar Allama Allaud-Din-Siddiqui defined ideology of Pakistan as.

“Ideology of Pakistan is the name of implementation of Islamic principles on persons. On groups & on government and Islam should be stronger than the strongest forces here”

QUAID-E-Azam AND IDEOLOGY OF PAKISTAN

Quaid-e-Azam was the liberator of the Muslim nation in Sub-Continent. He struggled for the separate state on the bases of Islamic Ideology. He himself explained this basic ideology.

What were the efforts of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan for Education?

Two nation theory

Meaning of Two Nation Theory

- The Two Nation theory means the cultural, political, religious, economic and social dissimilarities between the two major communities, Hindus and Muslims of the Sub Continent.
- This theory means that there were two nations in the subcontinent, the Hindus and the Muslims.
- Subcontinent consists of two different communities having their own philosophy of life.
- This theory gave rise to two distinct political ideologies that was responsible for the partition of India into two independent states.

BASIS OF CREATION OF PAKISTAN

- The Two nation Theory was the basis of the struggle for creation of Pakistan as an independent state.
- In spite of living together for centuries the two communities not forgot their individual cultures and civilization.
- It raised a direction for the Muslims on the basis of which Pakistan was achieved.

Al - Beruni

- Al - Beruni recorded his ideas in 1001 A.D in his famous book "***Kitab-ul-Hind***" as

"The Hindu society maintained this peculiar character over the centuries. The two societies, Hindus and Muslims, like two streams have sometimes touched but never merged, each following its separate course."

Factors that split the subcontinent into two nation

- There are a few factors which split the inhabitants of the Sub Continent into two nations. Let us examine each of them separately.
- ✓ ***Religious Differences***
- ✓ ***Hindu Nationalism***
- ✓ ***Cultural Differences***
- ✓ ***Social differences***
- ✓ ***Economic Differences***
- ✓ ***Educational Differences***
- ✓ ***Political Differences***
- ✓ ***Language***

Religious Differences

MUSLIMS BELIEVES

- ◉ Islam preaches Tawheed (oneness of Allah) and believes that Allah is the creator of the universe.
- ◉ Muslims are the believers of Allah, the Holy Prophet (P.B.U.H) the messenger of Allah.
- ◉ Muslims firmly believe on the Holy book Quran (complete code of life) and the life hereafter.

HINDUS BELIEVES

- ◉ Hindu believes in many gods. They have thousands of gods.
- ◉ Prophets (or rishi) are people who see god. they teach about god. And they have characteristics of god.
- ◉ Their writings are called vedas.

Hindu Nationalism

- A number of Hindu nationalist movements were started in the subcontinent that added fuel to the fire, and increased the conflict between the two communities.
- The Hindu nationalist leaders totally ignored the great contribution of Muslims in the Indian society and push the Muslims on one side.
- There was also some movements that aimed to merge the Muslims with Hindu culture.

Cultural Differences

ISLAMIC CULTURE

- Muslim followed the Islamic culture .
- Muslims buried their dead bodies.
- Muslims slaughtered the cow.
- Muslims abhorred the tradition of 'Sati'.
- In Islam every human beings are equal.

HINDU CULTURE

- Hindus inherited a self build culture.
- The Hindus burnt their dead bodies.
- Hindus considered the 'Mother cow' as a sacred animal.
- They performed 'Sati' and worshipped.
- There exists a caste system in hindus.

Social differences

- ◉ The two communities of the Sub Continent differ in their social life.
- ◉ The clothes, the foods, the household utensils, the construction of homes, the words of greeting, the gestures and every thing about them was different and immediately represented to their distinctive origin.
- ◉ The moral values, ethics and norms of both the communities are totally different.

Economical differences

MUSLIMS

- There is a proper check and balance of economy in Islam.
- Zakat aushur is compulsory for Muslims.
- Interest(suut) is strictly forbade in Islam.
- Muslims were thrown out side the government sector, they were financially week.

HINDUS

- No check and balance.
- No concept of Zakat in Hindu's religion.
- No concept of interest.
- the Hindus were provided with ample opportunities to progress economically.

Educational Differences

MUSLIMS

- Muslims did not receive modern education which heavily affected their economic conditions.
- They could not cope with the society because they ignore the modern education.

HINDUS

- The Hindus were advanced in the educational field because they quickly and readily took to the English education.
- They occupied the best social status because of the modern education.

Political Differences

The political differences between the Hindus and Muslims have played an important role in the evolution of Two Nation Theory.

(i) Hindi Urdu Controversy

In 1867, Hindus demanded that Urdu should be written in Hindi Script instead of Urdu Script. This created another gap between Hindus and Muslims.

(ii) Congress Attitude

The Indian national Congress was founded in 1885. It claimed to represent all communities of India but oppressed all Muslim ideas and supported the Hindu

(iii) Partition of Bengal

In 1905, the partition of Bengal ensured a number of political benefits for the Muslims, but the Hindus launched an agitation against the partition and partition was annulled in 1911.

Language

MUSLIMS

- The language of the Muslims was Urdu and it was written in Arabic Script.
- Urdu language had the difference in writing, thoughts of poetry, arts, painting and words of music.
- Even this small difference lead to a stirring conflict between the two nations.

HINDUS

- Hindi language was spoken by Hindus and it was written in Sanskrit.
- Hindi language had its own way of writing in every art which is quite different from urdu.

Two nation theory and political leaders

- Sir Syed Ahmad Khan the pioneer of two nation theory, said:
"I am convinced now that Hindus and Muslims could never become one nation as their religion and way of life was quite distinct from each other."
- Quaid-e-Azam's Statement on Two Nation Theory
"Muslims are not a minority, they are one nation by every definition of the word nation. By all canons of international law we are a nation."

Two Nation Theory in the View of Allama Iqbal

"India is a continent of human beings belonging to different languages and professing different religions... I, therefore, demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim state in the best interests of the Muslims of India and Islam."

Conclusion

The Muslims realized that they would lose their religious and cultural identity if they remained a part of British India. They also were able to understand the above-mentioned differences between them and hence demanded a separate homeland on the ground where they freely practiced their religion in accordance with Quran and Sunnah and Islamic teachings. They demanded a piece of land where their property and life would be safe, guarded, and secure.