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In the last four decades, particularly after the break-up of Pakistan in 1971, different interpretations have emerged on the creation of Pakistan. Some have argued that the place was ‘insufficiently imagined’, another claims it was used as ‘bargaining counter’ to maximise concessions from the colonial ruler; others have equated its birth with ‘shameful flight’ of the British and yet other scholars are still trying to ‘making sense of Pakistan’. While a more recent study has characterised the creation of Pakistan as ‘Muslim Zion’-- calling the ‘rejection of old land for the new’, fallaciously equating the creation of Pakistan with the making of Israel. The questions on the nature, origins and circumstances of Pakistan’s birth have also roused considerable interest on the role and leadership of Jinnah- the founder and creator of Pakistan.

Most of these studies have looked at Jinnah as some kind of passive bystander; whether he is portrayed as ‘savior’, or driven by personal ambition to be the ‘sole spokesman’ of Indian Muslims, or because there was a ‘vacuum’ and dearth of leaders, hence Jinnah could emerge as filler or the hostility of the Indian National Congress and Mohandas K. Gandhi, that prompted his rise. It is ironic and sad that, until 1993, the first volume of his collected papers could not be published; in Pakistan itself many continue to see Jinnah, as ‘uncomfortable father of the nation’. Patrick French has incisively remarked that neither Indians nor Pakistanis seem keen to claim him as a ‘real human being’; Pakistanis have confined him to ‘an appearance on the bank notes in demure Islamic costumes’... his achievement, howsoever, ‘flawed it may be, was phenomenal.’

Dr. Sikandar Hayat, in an updated and revised edition of his book, *The Charismatic Leader: Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah and the Creation of Pakistan* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2014) challenges these explanations and interpretations and draws attention towards the centrality of Jinnah as ‘the Charismatic Leader’, who with a commitment of purpose, integrity, dedication and unflinching support from his followers, at the most critical juncture in the
history of Indian Muslims offered the 'formula of a separate state' that led to the creation of Pakistan. In other words, creation of Pakistan is neither the doing of the British nor a gift of Grace, as many seem to believe. He also dismisses the notion that Jinnah used the idea of a separate state as a 'bargaining counter' to seek concessions from the colonial rulers. Dr. Hayat brings persuasive arguments and evidence together to make us believe that during the distressful period of 1920s, and 30's for the Indian Muslims, Jinnah, was man of the moment; principled and determined, a man with a mission, who had a clear vision, a sense of purpose and who knew how to accomplish it.

Dr. Hayat makes a persuasive effort to recast, re-imagine, re-interpret the history of Pakistan Movement (1937-47) and the studies on Jinnah's leadership by center-staging him as the 'Charismatic Leader', who was visionary, had an eye on the goal and pursued a strategy slowly and peacefully with dedication, determination and personal devotion to the cause. Of course, this phase of Pakistan's history is well researched and studied but leadership of Jinnah has begun to attract scholars only recently. Why Jinnah mattered then? Why is he relevant today and for times to come? How studying his leadership is vital for understanding the adversarial circumstances under which he provided not only hope but a concrete formula to the dismayed and distressed Muslims of undivided India. Dr. Hayat has been researching and refining the concept and theory of charismatic leadership for over two decades and in the process he provides a refreshing and insightful analysis of the final phase of Pakistan Movement.

In focusing on charismatic leadership of Jinnah, Dr. Hayat makes three important contributions in refining, synthesizing and expanding the theory of charismatic leadership; first, connecting charisma with institutionalization, second, dispelling the notion that charismatic leadership is always/mostly irrational, he highlights the rational dimensions of charisma, third, synthesizing personal attributes of leadership with situational circumstances. All three contributions resonate and could be instructive for leaders and political parties in contemporary Pakistan.

I have found five chapters in his book of particular interest and theoretically and conceptually enlightening (chapters 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7). In the first chapter, Dr. Hayat takes readers into confidence by explaining what charismatic leadership is and why Jinnah excels as a charismatic leader? Like many other scholars he also starts with the original source—Max Weber, who defined, conceptualized and theorized the relevance and need of the charismatic leader.

Operationalizing the concept of charismatic leadership through the lens of Weber, Dr. Hayat goes beyond it and weaves the arguments of Ann Ruth Willner, David Apter, Robert Tucker and Dankwart Rustow to point out the extraordinary qualities of his leadership and how such a leader is able to inspire ordinary
citizens to follow his calling and they exalt him. Charismatic leader has ‘prophetic qualities’, integrity, compassion, commitment of purpose and who is able to evoke devotion among his followers. A charismatic leader has emotional appeal among his followers, who bond, listen and follow the leader with devotion. These are extraordinary and rare qualities, which establish an unbreakable bond between the leader and the follower, thus charisma is as much a function of personal attributes but also follower-judgment and bonding with the leader. Supernatural qualities and myths abound and followers’ allegiance and obedience to the charismatic leader progressively grows. According to Dr. Hayat, among the Muslim leaders during that period (see his chapters 3 and particularly 4 on Leadership Crisis) Jinnah, was the only leader, who had these personal qualities and could establish personal rapport with distressed Indian Muslims. Thus, Dr. Hayat insists that charisma is a function of both, ‘personal’ and ‘situational’ factors and that aptly describes Jinnah’s role in the creation of Pakistan.

In that spirit, Dr. Hayat, amplifies the concept, adding that charismatic leader is sober, responsible and rational, and does have ‘passions’ but tempered by ‘reason’. In his analysis and theorization, Jinnah emerges as the charismatic leader who steers, guides course of history and events and the decisions that he makes are ultimately the best. The masses charmed by this ability, flock around him and follow his call. Invoking Willner, Dr. Hayat reminds readers that while an ordinary leader may be respected by the followers, the charismatic leader, like Jinnah by sheer commitment of purpose, could compel his followers to act upon his commands and obey--- this becomes more meaningful when one looks at chapter 4, where Dr. Hayat has real hard time developing a typology of social elites, provincial leaders and traditional leaders and ulama, who in their own right and locality had support among followers but not the degree of devotion that Jinnah was able to solicit from the Muslim masses across regions that were to constitute Pakistan. This helps Dr. Hayat to gel personal factor with crisis situation and present a synergetic perspective on charismatic leadership of Jinnah, how through personal following he was able to rescue his followers from the crisis situation.

Dr. Hayat is conscious that the rise and fall of charismatic leader could be ephemeral depending on the ‘crisis’ situation and need of people at the moment (think Churchill at the end of Second World War, Nkrumah at his fall); however, he points out that Jinnah was different as he did not rely only on personal attributes but made consistent efforts to develop Muslim League as a political party—which is a hard sell. This dimension is explained and interpreted with rigour and evidence in chapter 6. In chapter 7, Dr. Hayat, highlights Jinnah’s fortitude and political skills to resist Cripps and Cabinet Mission Plan through which, according to him, the British aimed to preserve the unity of India and
oppose ‘Jinnah’s concept of sovereign Pakistan of all the six Muslim majority provinces, that is, the Punjab, NWFP, Sind, Baluchistan, Bengal and Assam’. However, by managing and steering the factional politics of the Muslim majority provinces, Jinnah was efficacious in presenting Muslim League as the sole representative body of Muslims, and after due deliberations within the League and tough negotiations with the British he accepted the Partition Plan that paved the way for the creation of Pakistan.

In this perspective, he adds theoretical rigor by pointing out how some extraordinary leaders are able to ‘routinize’ charisma in a social or political institution and in case of Jinnah, Dr. Hayat argues that some of his charisma was inevitably placed in the Muslim League, as the people saw it strictly as Jinnah’s party. Therefore, the attraction of a charismatic leader becomes two-fold: firstly, there is the allure of their personality, and secondly, even more tantalizing, is the favour of the social positions they can confer, perhaps upon a particularly devoted follower. In this sense, Dr. Hayat has made an enormous contribution on leadership studies. Such a perspective could rouse greater curiosity and perhaps more rigorous research on hitherto unexplored facets of Jinnah’s leadership.

Dr. Hayat’s up-dated and revised version stops at the creation of Pakistan in 1947, and thus invites others to reflect on Jinnah as Governor General of Pakistan, could he still be considered charismatic? May be some younger researchers and policy analysts would be tempted to test if Jinnah’s charisma holds beyond the creation of Pakistan? The study offers a new angle to leadership of Jinnah and opens up fresh avenues on the subject. All those who are interested in understanding why political will, clarity of purpose, a sense of vision, mission, integrity and dedication to a cause is essential for leadership, will find the study invigorating, inviting and instructive to understand the past and charter future direction of Pakistan.
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Sikandar Hayat’s The Charismatic Leader: Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah and the Creation of Pakistan, now available in a revised edition from the Oxford University Press, seeks to explain the creation of Pakistan in terms of structures, ideas, and personalities. Hayat has long advocated the development and application of theories to South Asian studies and what sets The Charismatic Leader apart is the employment of Weber’s concept of charisma to the study of Jinnah’s rise and the realization of Pakistan.

At first glance Jinnah may seem to be an unlikely candidate for charismatic leader status. Normally, the use of the term “charisma” conjures up images of totalitarian ideologues like Hitler and Mao, military modernizers like Mustafa Kemal, or, more benignly, the dhoti-clad liberator of the Indian realm, Mahatma Gandhi. Jinnah, in contrast, was freakishly alienated from the mainstream of Indian culture and never took the populist pretensions of the Indian National Congress (INC) leaders seriously. In a society steeped in arbitrariness, Jinnah was the arch-constitutionalist and liberal consensus builder. In an age of rising religiosity fueled by Gandhi’s and the Khilafatist’s propaganda Jinnah was decidedly out of place and would eventually be accused by his Muslim opponents of being an infidel. In a period where all manner of socialisms (from the National Socialism of Hitler to Stalinism and Fabian programs) were in style Jinnah resolutely resisted the urge to promise imminent utopia. And yet, Jinnah’s achievement as the founder of what was in 1947 the largest Muslim-majority state in the world and the restorer of Muslim political sovereignty over those territories of South Asia where they were demographically concentrated, is such that a serious explanation is in order.

Hayat’s theoretical starting point is that our understanding of Weber’s concept of charisma is flawed as it does not incorporate the post-First World War development in Weber’s thought. This development was that, disillusioned by the collapse of Imperial Germany, Weber came to regard rationality and sobriety as
core qualities of authentic charismatic leadership. The importance of personal charisma being institutionalized in the state or political party was equally important for otherwise charismatic leaders would be little more than demagogues with a death wish. Having clarified this important point, Hayat proceeds to provide the historical and socio-political context in which Jinnah operated and eventually emerged as the leader of the Muslims. In this Hayat identifies certain conditions that needed to be met for a charismatic leader to emerge.

The first condition is that of a crisis that has the potential to imperil the core interests of a group or a community. In the context of Muslim India this crisis had several dimensions. First, the Muslims were demographically in a minority and as India headed towards greater representation in local, provincial, and, eventually, central, governments, inferior numbers translated into reduction of the Muslims to the status of a permanent minority in most of the provinces and local government, as well as in the central government. Second, numbers aside, colonial representation was determined by educational, property, and income qualifications, and here, even in those territories where the Muslims were in a majority, they were underrepresented due to their backwardness. Third, as demands for self-government escalated during and after the First World War the question of British imperial succession became the central long-term issue of Indian politics. The Congress was quite clear on what it wanted – a British exit accompanied by handing over power to a strong central government that would operate on the basis of universal suffrage and pretend minorities were diabolical contrivances of the Raj. The local and provincial Muslim leaders had little to say about what kind of India would emerge if the British left and many hitched their wagons to the Congress hoping for some magnanimous concessions that might materialize after a centralized, majoritarian, democracy, under the Congress had come into existence. Hayat makes the case that among the Muslim leaders Jinnah alone had a long-term perspective on the evolving situation. He understood that the real question was the distribution of sovereign power and that the Muslims needed to get organized so that they too could have a say in what an independent South Asia might look like.

In terms of vision, Jinnah advocated a formula in the form of the Lahore Resolution of March 23, 1940 (dubbed the “Pakistan” Resolution by its critics). The formula was vague and deliberately so, but it held out the promise that sovereignty would be restored to the Muslims wherever they were in a majority. For Hayat, the ambiguity of the formula led people to read into their own preferences or fears, and it focused the attention of the Muslims, and the Muslim League, on a grand objective. Opposition to the “Pakistan” scheme served to lend it substance and turned it into a key component of Indian political discourse.

Actually organizing the Muslims to achieve this objective was a very difficult task and one in which Jinnah did not succeed as much he would have liked to. Still, the growth of the Muslim League between 1940 and 1945 was considerable, while the Second World War made it evident that the actual succession to British rule was at hand. Hayat explains in detail the mobilization strategy of the Muslim League, its activation of students, women, traditional elites, businessmen, and at least some ulema and the creation of a national coalition. The
growth of the League was such that by 1946 it claimed all the Muslim seats at the center and nearly all at the provincial level. With such a resounding victory, the time for finally working out what Pakistan meant had arrived and here Jinnah was prepared to accept a sovereign Muslim India within an Indian confederation, or, failing that, an independent Pakistan with no constitutional connection to India. Once the Congress reneged on the Cabinet Mission Plan, which promised the former, Jinnah had no compunctions about doing what was necessary to carve an independent Muslim-majority state out of the British Empire in India and moving towards the latter option. For Hayat, the creation of Pakistan and its consolidation meant that Jinnah’s mission had been accomplished and his charisma was routinized in the new state.

So, at a structural level, the demand for Pakistan was the outcome of internal asymmetries of demography, economy, and socio-political consciousness, which had emerged during the British Raj. These asymmetries, barely managed by concessions, reforms, and repression, threatened to permanently erase the Muslims as a political community and became unmanageable as the British Empire went into decline after the First World War. The central question was of succession, and here Jinnah picked his idea and timing perfectly, which was to advocate the restoration of sovereignty to the Muslim-majority areas of South Asia. The idea resonated and connected with the anxiety and distress of the Muslim triggering the Pakistan Movement. Jinnah’s leadership in terms of organization of the League, deal-making, and negotiating with the British, the Congress, and other groups, led to extraordinary electoral success in 1946. This success meant that Pakistan would either come into existence as a vast Muslim-majority sovereign region that comprised the whole of present-day Pakistan and Bangladesh plus the Hindu-majority areas of Bengal and Punjab, or as a smaller but completely independent state. Acceding to either of these options was galling to the Congress, but Jinnah’s success was that they now had to choose between a notionally sovereign united India or an actually sovereign divided India. The Congress’s pain and confusion were evident in its dithering as it went from preferring a loose confederation and then changed its mind and went for the two-state solution.

Hayat’s The Charismatic Leader is a fine study of political leadership in South Asia. Historically grounded, theoretically sound, and argumentatively plausible, it provides a rich starting point for further debate and scholarship. What sets Hayat apart from other writers is that he seeks to explain Jinnah’s leadership in terms of phenomena, leadership and in doing so breaks new ground. Scholars, students, and the general readership can all benefit from the book under review.
Yaqoob Khan Bangash reviews a new book on Jinnah that challenges some fixed notions about his personality and leadership.

The Charismatic Leader

Yaqoob Khan Bangash reviews a new book on Jinnah that challenges some fixed notions about his personality and leadership.
One might question why we need another book on Jinnah. But the distinct format and approach in Sikandar Hayat’s latest addition to the subject, A Charismatic Leader: Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah and the Creation of Pakistan is reason enough to revisit the subject. The general pattern of Indian history leading to Partition is rooted in an evolutionary framework of analysis of the constitutional debates. It typically draws on a relatively unbroken line of events as well as initiatives taken by the three protagonists — the British government in India, the Congress and the Muslim League — that seem to move to an inevitable endgame in the form of Partition. In contrast, the present book deals with certain deeply endemic crises that solve the grand riddle of social, cultural, political and constitutional life of Muslims in British India. The author elaborates on this theme by focusing on the ‘Muslim crisis’ spread over half a century, which provides the structural context for the emergence of Muslim nationalism. However, as electoral politics took root in India, there was a dire need for a shift in emphasis from ‘structure’ to ‘agency’. Muslim leaders at this point failed to consolidate their hold over the community and there was a dearth of leadership. Hayat makes a convincing argument about the nature and characteristic of Jinnah’s leadership beyond traditional explanations and shows how Jinnah’s role seems to be carved out by history itself when seen in the broad context of structure-agency dichotomy.

In the transition from the first to the second edition of his book, Hayat specifically seeks to address Jinnah’s new profile based on some historians’ portrayal of him — for example Jaswant Singh, Ajeet Javeed and Saleena Karim — as a secular person par excellence. The author revisits the controversy over Ayesha Jalal’s thesis about the Pakistan demand being a bargaining counter, from which she has distanced herself in recent writings. The author finds enough ground in Jalal and her critics’ positions to put aside this so-called ‘revisionist’ thesis. The new edition of the book explores the theme of nation-making with reference to some of the famous theorists of nationalism such as Ernest Gellner and Paul Brass, especially in the context of shaping an ethnic variety of nationalism based on Islam.

In the current edition, the author engages himself in a dialogue with more recent writers on the subject, agreeing or disagreeing with their arguments as the case may be. In the former case, he endorses the view about not mixing Partition as the finale of a long process of development of Muslim nationalism with communal violence that accompanied it, inasmuch as these were two separate phenomena. In the latter case, the author confronts a writer on the controversial role of the NWFP governor Olaf Caroe in such matters as the 1947 referendum, and later Pakistan’s entry into the Western military alliances. The author’s willingness to expand and update his findings in the light of newer insights on Partition and Jinnah is commendable. In the matter of production of the book, one cannot overemphasise the fact that this is a high quality publication worth reading for anyone interested in the history of the subcontinent.

Mohammad Waseem is a professor of political science at the Lahore University of Management Sciences.
Jinnah and political discourse in Pakistan

There is an increased invocation of Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah in political discourse in Pakistan. In addition to political leaders and societal activists, many religious leaders and parties talk about Jinnah while projecting the political and social order they wish to establish. When Dr Tahirul Qadri used to address press conferences or give interviews to TV channels from Canada, Jinnah’s portrait could be seen in the background.

Even some Jamaat-e-Islami leaders talk positively about him. The leader of the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat (reincarnation of the Sipah-e-Sahaba) recently invoked the Quaid in support of his demand for establishing an Islamic political system in Pakistan. On March 23, 2014, the Jamaat-ud-Dawa staged a street march in Lahore for reaffirming commitment to Pakistan and the Islamic political system.

The increased use of a commonly shared historical icon should promote political harmony and consensus-building on the nature and direction of Pakistan’s present and future political-economic and social arrangements. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Pakistan’s social and political order is facing greater fragmentation and, at times, it appears that Pakistan might become an increasingly unmanageable society.

Jinnah is not necessarily invoked in popular political discourse to understand what he stood for and why and how he began to employ Islamic symbols and principles to articulate a nationalism to counter the Congress party nationalism’s based on secularism and a single nation in India. There is no desire to know what he meant when he emphasised the Islamic idiom in the post-1934 period. He also talked of a modern democratic state system, constitutional rule and equal citizenship irrespective of religious or any other considerations.

Today, Jinnah’s legacy is often pursued to strengthen partisan political agendas. Those who wish to dominate the present and want to give respectability to their partisan views of state and society often attempt to rewrite history in order to justify what they are currently doing in the political and cultural domains. Therefore, those advocating a conservative, Islam-based religious state system only talk of Jinnah’s Islamic discourse and give their own preferred meanings to the idioms and terms used by him. Those advocating a secular system mention those statements of Jinnah that serve their current political agenda.

However, it is a matter of great satisfaction that there have also been efforts to undertake a sober and non-partisan understanding of Jinnah. Well-researched and scholarly articles and books have appeared since the centenary celebrations of Jinnah in 1976. This has contributed to a comprehensive understanding of Jinnah’s personality, political orientations and political career, especially since 1934 when he returned from England, revitalised the All-India Muslim League and led the demand for a separate homeland for the Muslims of British India. These writings have relied on official documents, personal papers of the leaders, the Muslim League’s records, memoirs of Jinnah’s contemporaries and writings on Jinnah and the Partition.

The wrings of Shariful Mujahid, Ayesha Jalal, Stanley Wolpert, Waheeduzzaman — to name a few accomplished works — offer a comprehensive view of Jinnah, covering his personality, role and leadership in the freedom movement. These writers place his leadership in a broader academic context of the study of freedom movements, leadership and the nation-building processes.

A recent publication, *The Charismatic Leader: Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah and the Creation of Pakistan* by Dr Sikandar Hayat (OUP, 2014), is an updated edition of the book published in 2008. It not only maintains the strong theoretical framework of the earlier edition, but also adds discussion on some issues that are part of the current discourse on the Pakistan Movement and the role of Jinnah.

The central theme of the book is the notion of charisma while studying the leadership of Jinnah. The author pulls together all the major theoretical writings on charisma in the social sciences and combines it with a dispassionate, analytical and documented study of the political career of Jinnah to describe him as a charismatic leader for the Muslims of British India who had complete faith in him for securing their identity, rights and interests. By establishing Pakistan as a homeland for the Muslims of British India, Jinnah changed the course of history and left a strong imprint on it. The author focuses mainly on the post-1934 period to analyse how Jinnah’s charisma was established, surpassing the attributes of charisma as articulated by Max Weber, Edward Shills, David Apter, Dankwart Rustow and others.

The evolution of the political identity of the Muslims that became the basis for movement for a separate homeland can be fully understood from the discussion in the book on the six phases of Hindu-Muslim relations and the evolution of the Muslim political struggle in British India (pp.135-146). This needs to be coupled with the analysis of Jinnah’s political transition from a champion of Hindu-Muslim unity to an ardent advocate of Muslims’ identity, rights and interests and the demand for a separate homeland (pp.88-109, 258-262).

The discussion of the political context and the text of the Lahore Resolution, March 1940, (pp.273-283) is instructive for those who often get bogged down in polemical debates on this issue for justifying current partisan political agendas. The author discusses the British opposition to the making of Pakistan, rejecting the arguments of many Indian writers that the creation of Pakistan was a British conspiracy to weaken an independent India. The fast moving political developments in 1946-47 have been dealt with some detail in an easy-to-understand narrative of how and why the All-India Muslim League accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan and then walked out on it. This also includes its decision to join the interim government in October 1946.

Jinnah is a national symbol whose relevance has increased over time. There is a need to pursue a non-partisan and research-based understanding of the development of Jinnah’s political orientations, his politics and the changes therein and how he articulated an alternative nationalism to the Congress-led secular, one-nation nationalism.

The writer is an independent political and defence analyst. He is also the author of several books, monographs and articles on Pakistan and South Asian Affairs.