CONTENTS

Introduction

THIS BOOK IS CONCERNED with the history of, and the contestations on, Islam in colonial India and Pakistan. The first modern Muslim state to be established in the name of Islam, Pakistan was the largest Muslim country in the world at the time of its foundation; today, it is the second most populous, after Indonesia. All the key facets of modern Islam worldwide were well represented in colonial India and they have continued to be so in Pakistan: Sufism; traditionalist scholars, the `ulama, and their institutions of learning, the madrasas; Islamism; and Islamic modernism. Several of them received their earliest and what proved to be highly influential articulations in this vast region. It was in colonial India, for instance, that some of the first modernist Muslim intellectuals had emerged, and their work soon came to resonate well beyond South Asia.[1] Sayyid Abul-A`la Mawdudi (d. 1979), whose career straddled British India and the first three decades of Pakistan, was, for his part, one of the most influential Islamist ideologues of the twentieth century. South Asia did not pioneer madrasas, but few countries match the growth that this institution and those associated with it have witnessed over the course of Pakistan's history. It is in Pakistan, too, that the movement of the Taliban emerged in the years following the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. And in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Pakistan has been not only a major front in the global War on Terror but also the site of an Islamist radicalism that has had important implications for contemporary Islam, and not just in South Asia.

As one might expect, there is a significant body of literature on different facets of Islam in colonial South Asia and in Pakistan. What is lacking is a work that brings them together within the confines of a single study.[2] Such studies have seldom been attempted for other regions of the Muslim world either. This is hardly surprising, given that the examination of any particular facet, whether Islamism or the Islam of the `ulama, already poses enough challenges to allow a venture very far beyond it. Yet, the sum of more specialized

studies can fall considerably short of meeting the need for a broader view of the religious landscape. This book is an effort in that direction. How have various facets of Islam interacted with one another and with a state created in the name of Islam? How are the different Islamic orientations to be distinguished from one another? What sort of constraints have the differences among them placed on the ability of their adherents to join hands at particular moments in history? How significantly and to what effect had the various religious orientations that occupied the South Asian Islamic landscape at the beginning of the twentieth century changed in relation to one another by the early twenty-first century? What is the context, both immediate and long term, in which Islamist militancy has emerged in Pakistan? What has hampered the ability of the governing elite to effectively combat it? And why has Islamic modernism undergone a decline in the course of Pakistan's history, as I would argue it has? These are among the questions I address in this book.

Though the scope of this study is necessarily broad, certain facets of Muslim religious life have had to remain largely unattended here. How Islamic beliefs and practices are reflected in and shaped by poetry and fictional literature, art, media, and film falls, with some exceptions, outside the scope of this book. So does the lived practice of Islam. It would take extensive ethnographic work, not attempted for this study, to shed light, for instance, on the nature and meaning of devotional practices at Sufi shrines or how such shrines participate in the political economy of the region in which they are located. The question of how madrasas are viewed in or sustained by the local communities among which they operate likewise requires the kind of work that lies beyond the ambition and scope of this study. By the same token, questions relating to the religious beliefs of ordinary women and men and the changes their understandings of the faith have undergone would have to depend not only on microlevel studies but also on large-scale surveys, neither of which exist in abundance for Pakistan.

This is not intellectual history in the narrow sense of being concerned only with a history of ideas; it is keenly interested in the political and other contexts in which particular ideas developed and why certain understandings of Islam found themselves disadvantaged vis-à-vis others. Nor does it posit any sharp distinction between belief and practice, between normative and lived Islam.[3] Yet, it does rely more often than not on written expressions of Islam, of debate and contestation on it, of the development and change it has continued to undergo. It is therefore more attentive to the discourses and the initiatives of those aspiring to shape people's religious and political life than it is to those whose lives were presumably being informed or shaped by such discourses. Once again, however, the barriers between these two sides look firmer in outward appearance than they may be in reality. Official archives, too, can shed much light on life, thought, and agency at the grassroots, after all. For instance, the extensive records of the Court of Inquiry that the govern-

ment of the Punjab had established in the aftermath of a religio-political agitation directed against the Ahmadis, a heterodox community, in 1953 is an unusually rich resource for an understanding not only of the views of the modernist elite governing the new state but also of the perspectives of the religio-political groups that had been involved in the agitation. We also get occasional glimpses in these records of small-time mosque-preachers, local leaders, and ordinary people caught up in it. An archive such as this, despite its focus on one particular set of events, has much to say about varied facets of Islam in Pakistan and that is how I have utilized it here.[4] When it comes to state legislation, to take another example, we may not always know very well how particular initiatives relating to Islam actually shaped people's lives. But even here, what we can try to understand is not only what vision animated those legislative initiatives but also what responses they evoked from members of particular religious groups and how the initiatives and the responses in question have shaped a contested religious sphere in colonial India and in Pakistan.

If not all facets of Islam can be accommodated into this study, not all even among those represented here can obviously occupy center stage. That belongs to Islamic modernism, which I understand as a complex of religious, intellectual, and political initiatives aimed at adapting Islam—its beliefs, practices, laws, and institutions—to the challenges of life in the modern world. Such challenges were felt most forcefully under European colonial rule. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century modernists—and not just the Muslims among them, though it is on them that I focus here—had internalized to various degrees colonial assessments of the societies under European governance. These were seen, in contrast with the European world, as tradition-bound, stagnant, priest-ridden, and superstitious; their laws as antiquated, capricious, and barbaric; their precolonial rulers as corrupt and despotic; their intellectual cultures as decadent, and their systems of education as devoid of useful knowledge.[5] Defeat at the hands of the European powers had exposed the hollowness of traditional norms, practices, and structures, showing them all to be unsustainable. While colonial officials saw such contrasts as a justification for their rule, the early modernists viewed them as necessitating a thoroughgoing reform of Muslim thought and practice.

Modernist reformers tended also to differ from colonial, and Orientalist, analyses of Muslim societies in their conviction that Islam could, in fact, be adapted to the needs of the modern world without ceasing to be Islam. Writing in the early twentieth century, Lord Cromer, the consul-general of Egypt (1883–1907), had cautioned: "let no practical politician think that they have a plan capable of resuscitating a body which is not, indeed, dead, and which may yet linger on for centuries, but which is nevertheless politically and socially moribund, and whose gradual decay cannot be arrested by any modern palliatives however skillfully they may be applied."[6] The modernist enterprise was, however, predicated precisely on the conviction that the decline of Muslim

societies could indeed be remedied and that it did not require relinquishing Islam itself. What it did require was that Islam be restored to its original purity, and its core values combined with what European science and other forms of modern knowledge had to offer. Only then would the adherents of this religion be capable of scientific, moral, and material progress in the modern world. Yet, the acquisition of Western knowledge, a key facet of modernist reform, carried significant costs, some of which threatened only to substantiate predictions about the irreconcilability of Islam and the modern world. As Sayyid Ahmad Khan (d. 1898), the pioneering modernist of Muslim South Asia observed in 1884, "May the English-educated young men … forgive me, but I have not seen a person … with an inclination for the English sciences who still has complete faith in the Islamic matters as they are current in our time."[7] The silver lining to this sobering assessment was, of course, that the "Islamic matters … current in our time" were not the authentic teachings of Islam. Yet, it did underscore the herculean nature of the project of giving Islam an expression that was true to its original teachings, at home in the modern world, and capable of being seen by the community at large as authentic. Nearly nine decades later, Fazlur Rahman (d. 1988), an influential scholar who will figure prominently in this book, found that a robust combination of properly Islamic norms and modernizing reform was still elusive among the governing elite of countries like Pakistan: "many of the bureaucrats in these countries are not Muslim modernists but simple modernists, i.e., Westernizers, while quite a few are simple conservatives and the instances of Muslim modernists are very few indeed. But it is my belief that Islamic modernism has good chances of eventual success, although … the final outcome is uncertain."[8] That belief and that uncertainty have continued to characterize Islamic modernism.

The modernists have never become anything akin to a school of law or theology, let alone a sect.[9] They have had significant differences among themselves and their positions have continued to evolve, as one might expect. Even so, as the foregoing would already suggest, some core convictions are recognizable as having frequently guided modernist thought and policy: that the true "spirit" of Islam resides in the Qur'an and in the teachings of the Prophet Muhammad rather than in how Muslims have either lived or thought about their religion for much of their history; that self-professed loci of Islamic authority, such as the `ulama and the Sufis, have distorted the teachings of Islam, illegitimately assumed the role of intermediaries between God and the believers, fragmented the unity of the faith and, in concert with unenlightened despots, been at the heart of Muslim decline; that the fundamental teachings of Islam are not merely in accord with but superior to, and no less universal than, the best of what modern, liberal, values have had to offer to the world.[10] As Liaquat Ali Khan, the first prime minister of Pakistan, had put it in the constituent assembly in March 1949, in moving what has come to be known as

the Objectives Resolution, the goal in establishing the new state was "to give the Muslims the opportunity that they have been seeking, throughout these long decades of decadence and subjection, of finding freedom to set up a polity which may prove to be a laboratory for the purpose of demonstrating to the world that Islam is not only a progressive force in the world, but it also provides remedies for many of the ills from which humanity has been suffering."[11]

Easy to caricature today for their idealism and bombast, such convictions have had great purchase in Muslim circles seeking to find a way of simultaneously being good Muslims and leading successful lives in the colonial—and postcolonial—dispensations. Those holding them have often sought much more than that, however. Enjoying positions of considerable influence as intellectuals, makers of public opinion, political leaders, and the governing elite, they have sought to transform the entire religious landscape in accordance with their conceptions of Islam and of how its interests, and those of ordinary believers, are best served. Insomuch as the sweep and audacity of their aspirations relate to all facets of Islam, it does seem worthwhile to study Islam in conditions of modernity with reference to them.[12]

Some scholars have seen Islamic modernism as a particular phase in the intellectual and political history of the modern Muslim world, one largely limited to the era of European colonialism. Later generations, according to this view, would go in other directions, among them secular nationalism, Marxism, and Islamism.[13] I take a rather different view in this study. Secular nationalism and Marxism have not had much purchase in Pakistan, and while Islamism has always been an important part of the religio-political landscape, it has never come close—despite warnings from different quarters—to governing the country, either through electoral or other means. For its part, modernism has continued to guide official policy on matters relating to Islam, its institutions, and its practices. Modernism has indeed been in gradual decline in Pakistan. But it took several decades after the establishment of the state for that decline to set in. Among my concerns in the following chapters is not only to illustrate and account for this decline but also to shed some light on how, both in its aspirations *and* in its decline, modernism has shaped, even as it has been shaped by, other facets of Islam.

To speak of decline in this case is not, moreover, to posit that modernism has exited the scene or is about to do so. The fact that it remains ensconced in the corridors of power is enough to suggest otherwise. In the wider Muslim world and beyond, too, modernist intellectuals have continued to make their presence felt.[14] Though couched in a rather different language, the key concerns of such intellectuals in the contemporary world reveal broad continuities with their acknowledged and unacknowledged predecessors. Such continuities are to be observed in discourses on the Qur'an's "universals," which alone are held to encompass the shari`a's principal concerns and the religion's true spirit, as opposed to the specifics of a medieval consensus on this or that

matter. They are equally in evidence in the purported concordance between Islam and liberal values. Speaking in terms of any clearly recognizable end to the phenomenon of Islamic modernism misses such continuities. Some scholars would posit the transformation of an earlier modernism into what is sometimes referred to as today's Islamic liberalism, with the latter consisting in constitutionalism, the rule of law, the universality of human rights, the empowerment of women, and social justice, all justified in terms of a critique of traditionalist Islam by way of a rereading of the foundational texts—the Qur'an and hadith, the reported teachings of the Prophet Muhammad.[15] Given, however, that there are major similarities of approach between the modernists and the Islamic liberals in question, with the same figures sometimes characterized in the scholarly literature as modernists and at others as liberals, the analytical value of a sharp distinction between the two remains unclear. [16] It can also obscure the fact that, for all its stress on constitutionalism, Islamic liberalism, like statist liberalism elsewhere, has tended to have an authoritarian streak.[17] As will be seen, such authoritarianism has long been a marker of Islamic modernism, too.

Though it is modernism that this study foregrounds, a different choice could arguably have been made as a way of studying broader religio-political trends in colonial India and Pakistan. The audacity of modernist aspirations is matched by that of the Islamists, who in fact share much with them in their social and educational backgrounds as well as in their dim view of how Islam has been lived in history.[18] If anything, the Islamists go further in seeking to harness the state to the project of implementing their scripturally anchored vision of Islam. As Mawdudi, the preeminent Islamist ideologue of South Asia, had it in an early work:

> The state that the Qur'an envisions has not just a negative but also a positive goal. It does not seek merely to prevent people from oppressing one another, to guard their liberties, and to defend itself against foreign aggression. It strives also to implement that balanced system of social justice that the Book of God has presented. Its aim is to erase all those forms of evil and to establish all those facets of the good that God has elucidated with His clear guidelines. To accomplish these goals, political power, persuasion and proselytism, means of education and upbringing, societal influence and the pressure of public opinion will all be used, as necessitated by the circumstances. . . . This is an all-encompassing state. The sphere of its operation extends to the entirety of human life. It seeks to mold all areas of culture in accordance with its particular moral conceptions, its reformist program.[19]

In the case of the Islamists, this vision is predicated, of course, on the very opposite of a self-conscious accord with Western, liberal values.[20] It is based,

rather, on the aspiration to make the shari`a the law of the land, to order all aspects of Muslim life in accordance with its presumed dictates, to have everyone submit altogether to the implications of the sovereignty of God. One could, in principle, write about various dimensions of Islam by showing how the Islamists have sought to shape, even as they have been influenced by, those *other* dimensions, diverging from or converging with them and illuminating in the process some major Islamic developments in the region as well as their social and political contexts.

One could likewise write about Islam with the `ulama as a key point of reference. After all, a good deal of the intellectual, religious, and social history of medieval Islam is intertwined with that of the `ulama, not only because of their claims to religious leadership but also because their intellectual concerns straddled a variety of disciplines and because they were well-represented among the local notables across Muslim societies.[21] The transformations their institutions and practices have undergone since colonial times are a useful index of many broader changes that have shaped Islam and Muslim societies in the modern world. At the same time, the `ulama's identity and authority are defined, more than anything else, by their grounding in a long-standing religious and scholarly tradition, and it is with reference to this tradition that they typically articulate their understanding of Islam, answer questions of belief and practice, and draw boundaries between themselves and others. This fact can open revealing vistas on the transformations in question. Tensions between resistance to perceived encroachment on their hallowed tradition and their acknowledged and unacknowledged adaptations to change provide fertile means for understanding not just the thought and politics of the `ulama but also the larger world they inhabit.[22]

Despite such competing and potentially fruitful possibilities, I have chosen to give center stage to modernism in this study of Islam in colonial India and Pakistan. Besides their intrinsic interest, this is largely because the modernists were some of the most influential intellectual and political elite under the British, and, as noted, it is they who have controlled the levers of power since the inception of Pakistan.[23] While the Islamists have *aspired* to the public implementation of Islamic norms through the state as, indeed, have the `ulama, they have not come to power, as they did in Iran after the revolution of 1979, in Afghanistan with the Taliban, and, more recently, under the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Instead, it is the modernists who have actually defined, if with mixed results, what position Islam would have in the Pakistani constitution, how and on what terms the madrasas would be reformed or Sufi shrines brought under state regulation, what shari`a-based laws would be enacted and within what boundaries they would have effect, and so forth. The justification, scope, and limits of such measures have been matters of intense contestation. It is in the context of such contestation

that competing conceptions of Islam are cast in sharp relief and rival claims to religious authority have continued to be articulated.

Four methodological points are worth noting before proceeding further. First, that the modernists—the intellectuals among them as well as members of the political and the governing elite—loom large in this study and yet the book is not exclusively devoted to them has required choices of its own. I have tried to delineate major aspects of competing religio-political trends in British India and in Pakistan in such a way that they are not reduced to how the modernists have viewed them, or vice versa. Nor have I limited my account of those other facets to points of direct contact with modernism. The fact that modernism does occupy center stage in my account has nonetheless allowed me to highlight some particular dimensions rather than others of the wider landscape. For instance, the career of Sufism in twentieth-century South Asia could be described from a variety of different angles: the history of particular Sufi orders; reformist discourses among the Sufis; Sufism, politics, and the colonial and the postcolonial state; South Asian Sufi trends in their interaction with those in the wider Muslim world, and so forth. My account is especially attentive to how Islamic modernism has figured in some of the contestations on Sufism, but the ways in which the `ulama and the Islamists have viewed Sufism and how they have been variously shaped by aspects of Sufi thought and practice is part of my discussion, too. The concern throughout is to offer a broadly illustrative view of Islam in some of its key dimensions and the complex ways in which these dimensions have interacted with and been shaped by one another. This approach would, I hope, allow for a fuller account of the changing Islamic landscape in British India and Pakistan than has usually been attempted while helping avoid a reification of any of the Islamic orientations under discussion here.

Second, a focus on Islam, as is the case here, admittedly poses some interpretive danger: of assuming that it plays a greater role in people's lives than does anything else and of making it the key explanatory factor in accounting for their thought and practice; conversely, of setting it apart from the rest of their lives. Without engaging in a detailed methodological discussion of such matters, suffice it to say here that I have tried to remain mindful of these pitfalls in what follows. I have done so primarily by placing my discussion of varied facets of Islam in the relevant historical, social, and political contexts, without reference to which it is impossible to make sense of the developments in question. We ought to be equally mindful of the fact that treating putatively religious matters as merely incidental to the study of a society, polity, or economy poses at least as many interpretive problems as does an examination that takes Islam seriously. Indeed, such neglect can be quite misleading in studying a society and state where contestations on Islam have indeed occupied center stage.

Third, a discussion of Islam in the modern world often made it tempting for scholars of an earlier generation and still does for many observers and policy analysts today to posit an age-old "tradition" in conflict with "modernity," with the former visualized as either in the process of being swept away by the latter or as thwarting it from ushering in an era of enlightened progress.[24] Tradition in such narratives is the very opposite of change—it is blindly imitative of the past, inflexible, anachronistic, sterile; modernity is the sum of values one ought to aspire to. The language of such binaries poses special problems in the study of Muslim societies since the nineteenth century because this is precisely the language that the Muslim modernists have themselves used to characterize their rivals;[25] the latter, for their part, have often been equally enamored of this language, with the difference that the *pejorative* implications of what the modernists call traditionalism are abandoned and the modernist concern with reform, innovation, and change is invested in turn with the darkest, most foreboding colors.[26] Yet, as will be seen in the following chapters, traditionalist scholars could be flexible and pragmatic in accommodating themselves to new circumstances; to the extent that their critics have recognized this, they have attributed it to their opportunism. We need not rule out political opportunism in all instances, of course, but it hardly accounts for the variety of positions the `ulama and the Islamists have been capable of taking on particular issues. Likewise, it is important to recognize that they have often had good strategic and rhetorical reasons to be *in*flexible when they have chosen to be so. Conversely, the modernists have not necessarily been more open to rethinking *their* certainties than have many `ulama and Islamists, and over the course of their history, they too—without becoming a school of law or theology—have evolved a tradition of their own. In what follows, I will need to occasionally speak in terms of the modernists versus the traditionalists, of the conservative opposition to modernism, and so forth. On such occasions, it should be kept in mind that this language is intended principally to evoke certain contrasts in the religio-political landscape, usually as seen by those inhabiting it, not to give it any normative value. Nor is it to prejudge the outcome of the contests, of which we will observe many instances in this book, among feuding but not always clearly delineated sides.

Finally, the use of the term "modernism" for the kind of thought and practices that I examine in this book might be seen by some as problematic. In the context of early twentieth-century European and American art and literature, modernism has other connotations, among them, "the recurrent act of fragmenting unities (unities of character or plot or pictorial space or lyric form), the use of mythic paradigms, the refusal of norms of beauty, the willingness to make radical linguistic experiment, all often inspired by the resolve (in [T. S.] Eliot's phrase) to startle and disturb the public."[27] There *could* be overlaps between the philosophical underpinnings of that modernism and the aspirations of particular figures among Muslim modernists, but it is not my concern

to explore them in this book.[28] Though commonly used by earlier scholars and observers of Islam, modernism has come to be replaced by categories such as liberalism and reformism. As used by the critics of the modernists, the term can also carry pejorative suggestions about a new-fangled and inauthentic Islam.

Yet, its usage in the context of Western art and literature does not, by itself, render the term unserviceable for other purposes. As Nils Gilman has argued, American modernization theorists of the 1950s and the 1960s, too, can be characterized as modernists. In their case, "modernism was not just an aesthetic phenomenon but also a form of social and political practice in which history, society, economy, culture, and nature itself were all to be the object of technical transformation. Modernism was a polysemous code word for all that was good and desirable."[29] Something similar could be said of the Muslim modernists who will figure in this book. Further, there is no clear dividing line between modernism and liberalism, as has been observed, and a category like "reformism" would not allow us to distinguish the approaches of many among the `ulama and the Islamists from those characterized as modernists here. As for its pejorative connotations, it is worth bearing in mind that the modernists have used this characterization for the likes of themselves.[30]

Needless to say, terms used to describe other religious and political trends can have their own difficulties. Islamists, for instance, do not usually characterize themselves as such, preferring to be seen simply as good Muslims. Islamism tends, moreover, to be conflated by many observers with militancy, yet violence is not a defining feature of this phenomenon. And even as many scholars and political leaders have been keen to insist that Islamists are not representative of Islam as a religious tradition, the term *Islam*ist could be taken to posit precisely that conflation between the phenomenon and the wider tradition. Such difficulties do not make Islamism unusable as category of analysis, but they do suggest the need for some careful handling. Much the same is true of modernism.

The Structure of This Book

This book on the whole is organized in thematic rather than chronological terms. The first two chapters are designed, however, not only to highlight certain facets of Islam but also to provide a broad historical overview of developments in colonial India and in Pakistan, roughly from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. In focusing on particular groups or themes, subsequent chapters fill in historical detail as needed, but their primary goal is to illustrate evolving trends as they relate to the group or theme in question and, of course, to show how the various facets of Islam have interacted with one another. Consequently, these chapters will often range freely over the entire

period covered by this book, though the primary focus continues to be on developments since the birth of the state of Pakistan.

Chapter 1 introduces many of the groups that will form the subject of this book and charts their emergence and development in conditions of British colonial rule. As will be seen, the traditionalist orientations that enjoy great prominence in the South Asian landscape had begun to take a recognizable shape only in the late nineteenth century, though they drew, of course, on older styles of thought and practice. The early modernists, for their part, were rooted in a culture that was not significantly different from the `ulama's. Among the concerns of this chapter is to trace their gradual distancing from each other. The processes involved in it would never be so complete, in either British India or in Pakistan, as to preclude the cooperation of the modernists and their conservative critics at critical moments. Nor, however, were the results of this distancing so superficial as to ever be transcended for good.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of modernism in Pakistan, from the country's inception to the present. It draws attention to the salience of ethical commitments in modernist conceptions of Islam—commitments that were often meant as a counterweight to traditionalist understandings of Islamic law and as justifications for its reform, but which also stood in some tension with the authoritarianism that has often characterized Islamic modernism. Much of this authoritarianism came from the fact that it was the modernists who populated the ranks of the governing elite, that this elite has remained in power for long periods of time without much accountability to the people, and that the best chance that many modernist intellectuals have had of seeing their ideas implemented has been through unsavory alliances with unrepresentative rulers. But some of the authoritarianism has been endemic to modernist conceptions of Islam itself, a fact far more apparent to those at their receiving end than to the modernists themselves.

The `ulama are the focus of chapter 3, which seeks to bring out some of the ambiguities of the relationship in Pakistan between them and the modernists. The traditionalist `ulama have had some very particular ideas about an Islamic state, ideas at considerable variance with those of the modernist governing elite. Yet, even as the `ulama have bitterly resisted modernist legislation on matters seen as encroaching upon their understandings of Islam, they have often been willing to accommodate themselves to constitutional and political developments in the country as spearheaded by the modernists, and they have continued to benefit from the patronage extended to them by successive governments. The modernists, for their part, have seldom been able to develop a significant constituency among the `ulama, and this despite the existence in Pakistan's early decades of some `ulama with a modernist orientation. Besides drawing attention to the latter, and thereby to fractures within the ranks of the `ulama, this chapter seeks also to shed some light on how the

`ulama associated with particular doctrinal orientations have fared in relation to one another and how one of these, represented by the Deobandis, has overtaken others in the religio-political sphere.

In turning to Islamism, chapter 4 provides an account of one of the most central of all Islamist ideas, in Pakistan and in the wider Muslim world—the idea that sovereignty belongs to God alone. As Mawdudi and other Islamists have articulated it, the implication is that all legal and political authority derives from God and His injunctions, as enunciated in the Qur'an and in the normative example of the Prophet Muhammad. One could not be a Muslim without accepting this idea, nor could a state be Islamic without recognizing it. As will be seen, however, the Islamists are not the only people who have espoused the sovereignty of God. It has figured prominently in non-Islamist, including modernist, circles, too. For instance, the previously mentioned Objectives Resolution endorses it as well. Part of the concern of this chapter is to examine what it has meant in different circles. We would seek also to explore the provenance and history of this idea. Though it is usually taken for granted that Mawdudi had put this idea into circulation, the question of how he may have come upon it has never been asked. Then there is the question, which we will also examine in this chapter, of why *his* formulation, rather than any other, has been the most influential among competing conceptualizations of the idea.

Any study of Islam in a predominantly Muslim state and of aspirations to give it a prominent place in the state necessarily raises questions about religious minorities. Though I touch briefly in this book on non-Muslim minorities, the focus of chapter 5 is on two *Muslim* minorities, the Ahmadis and the Shi`a, and some of the contestations around their position in the state. How these communities have fared in Pakistan is part of the story here, with the Ahmadis being declared a non-Muslim minority in 1974 and significant Shi`i-Sunni sectarian violence in the country since the 1980s. The principal concern of the chapter is, however, to explore the anxieties that the existence and activities of these minority communities have generated among the `ulama and the Islamists. In case of the Ahmadis, it will be seen that the anxieties in question have had to do not merely with the peculiarities of Ahmadi beliefs about the Prophet Muhammad, but with Islamic modernism itself. Though most South Asian modernists are not Ahmadis, Ahmadi discourses have tended to echo ideas similar to those of many modernists, and this has served to aggravate conservative opposition to the Ahmadis. The anxieties generated by the Shi`a, much exacerbated by the impact and rhetoric of the Iranian revolution of 1979, have a different locus, and they, too, go beyond Sunni discomfort with particular Shi`i beliefs and practices. Much more than the Ahmadis, the Shi`a have raised difficult questions about what, if any, kind of Islamic law can be given public force in Pakistan, laying bare in the process nagging uncertainties about whether Pakistan can ever fully claim to be an Islamic state.

Chapter 6 moves to some other expressions of contestation in the religious sphere, taking place in this instance on the once expansive terrain of Sufism. Long a core part of Muslim identity, in South Asia and elsewhere in the Muslim world, Sufi practices, doctrines, and institutions have continued into modern times to exercise considerable influence not only on common people but also on the religious and political leaders of the community. Though many among the `ulama, including the reformists in their ranks, have often had a relatively seamless relationship with Sufism, the Islamists, too, and even the modernists have been receptive to the appeal of Sufism. It is not difficult, for instance, to detect ideas of a Sufi provenance in some core modernist commitments. Yet, the conditions of modernity, the claims of the modern state, and modernist and Islamist efforts to radically reshape Islam in a particular image, with some recent help from militant Islamist groups, have hit institutional Sufism hard. Sufism has had some other vulnerabilities, too, which have also contributed to a certain shrinking of the space it has traditionally occupied in this part of the world.

Chapter 7 focuses on religio-political violence, whose widespread incidence, after Pakistan's realignment in the US-led War on Terror in the aftermath of September 11, 2001, and the subsequent rise of a new, *Pakistani*, Taliban, has threatened the very fabric of state and society. Like the rest of the book, this chapter takes a long historical view, one that goes well beyond the post-2001 developments and their immediate context. I examine the violence in question from two broad and intertwined perspectives, one relating to the state and the other to Islam and those speaking in its terms. Part of my concern in this chapter is to contribute to an understanding of how the governing elite and the military have often fostered the conditions in which the resort to religiously inflected violence has been justified. But I also suggest that the non-state actors—ideologues and militants—have had an agency of their own, which is not reducible to the machinations of the state, and that their resort to relevant facets of the Islamic tradition also needs to be taken seriously in order to properly understand their view of the world and such appeal as they have had in particular circles. By the same token, even as it has helped cultivate a certain narrative of jihad, the Pakistani ruling establishment has often labored under severe constraints in trying to control that narrative, and some understanding of such constraints, too, can shed useful light not only on religio-political violence but also on the career of Islam in Pakistan.

The epilogue ends this book with some reflections on the changes Islam has undergone in Pakistan, over the course of the country's history but also in comparison with where the relevant religious trends stood in the early twentieth century.

INDEX