



The Executive Arm

The State is an executive institution. What this means is that the State is supposed to take actions. The essence of the State is that it takes action on behalf of the society. So the State is an agent of the society. For obvious reasons the society needs agency in collective action. The society is composed of many individuals and there would be chaos if everyone starts acting as a representative of the broader society. Different individuals may see the society's interest in different ways. Different subgroups within the society may see society's interests in different ways. Such a difference can emerge from selfish concerns of individuals and subgroups involved and such a difference may genuinely exist with benevolent intentions. Whatever the case may be, the State solves this problem. It represents the society in action. That is the very nature of the State. Executive. Action. What this means is that the State implements a broader consensus of the society as to how it should be governed. This is where all the debates about narratives, shaping public opinion, developing a consensus and discussions about public good become relevant. Different individuals and subgroups try to convince the whole society as to what are its interests. Eventually a consensus emerges. And the State implements it. This is what the State is. Executive. Action.

Politics is the taking care of the affairs of the Ummah. It is done verbally and practically (meaning through actions). It is done verbally by individuals, where they express their opinion about what the interest of the Ummah is and how will it be safeguarded. It is also done verbally by political parties which again express their opinion about what the interest of the Ummah is and how it should be safeguarded. In both cases, this verbal mode of doing politics has the same audience. The State. Because it is the agent which acts on behalf of the society. It is the executive. The action arm of the society. The State however does do verbal politics. In certain situations, it expresses its opinion and intentions on how it intends to manage the affairs of the Ummah or what is the thinking of rulers on managing the affairs of the Ummah. However, these are seen as words, which may be translated in to actions in the future, because the State is the executive, the action arm of the society. So verbal politics from the State is different from verbal politics of individuals and political parties. The words coming out of officials of the State are seen or interpreted as being backed by action or to be converted in to action soon. So for all practical purposes the State is the executive and the action arm of the society.

The Pakistani government's policy on #Kashmir after India's annexation of occupied Kashmir is shocking. Condemnations of Indian actions by Pakistani State without any threat of action is the State doing verbal politics when it really should be doing action politics. A verbal condemnation by a State means nothing if that condemnation is not seen as being backed by action. It has zero value. And this is the problem with the Pakistani State. By its nature, it is a colonial State. It was not designed by the British colonialists to represent the local society. Therefore, it does

not take action to protect the interests of Muslims of Pakistan when required. It starts acting like an individual or a political party doing verbal politics when it should be acting like a State, executive, action arm of the society. On the other hand this very State resorts to what it is, an executive, when it comes to protecting the interests of foreign powers. So verbal politics on #Kashmir by the State actually means that the State does not want to do anything on #Kashmir because the State does not do moral lecturing, it takes actions.

Verbal politics is not done by individuals or political parties for the sake of it. Verbal politics has a goal. Verbal politics is aimed at the action arm of the society. The State. So individuals and political parties have an audience, the State. In other words, individuals and political parties try to shape the actions of the state and incite it or motivate it in to action. This is how the state society relationship works. Verbal politics done for the sake of shaping the action of the State, the State taking action on behalf of the society.

India has annexed #Kashmir by force and nothing other than force would reverse the Indian occupation. What Pakistan's politicians don't tell us is that dialogue or negotiations on #Kashmir means leaving claim on some part of #Kashmir. As dialogue between states is aimed at compromising on interests. Islam does not permit us, Muslims, to abandon our fellow Muslims in face of tyranny or to negotiate away Muslim land in dialogue with Kuffar.

The only solution to the #Kashmir issue is liberating it from Indian occupation by Jihad through Pakistan's Armed Forces. We as individuals or members and supporters of political platforms are therefore duty bound to do verbal politics by urging Pakistan's Armed Forces to mobilize in support of their brothers and sisters in #Kashmir. And let us account and force the State to do what it should do. Actions, nor moral lecturing.

#PakArmyLiberateKashmir

**Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by
Engineer Moez – Islamabad**