CHAPTER 1

USE OF RELIGION AS A DIPLOMATIC TOOL
AND THE ROLE OF RELIGION IN
THE GENESIS OF PAKISTAN
Religion and diplomacy have had an interesting but complex inter-relationship since ancient times. Diplomacy uses several overt and covert methods for the attainment of its objectives. It does not consist only of the art of conducting international relations through negotiations between the accredited envoys of states. There are, in fact, few disciplines in which the tension between theory and practice is more acute than in diplomacy.¹ "Through the ages, and specially under the impact of twentieth-century technological evolution, it (diplomacy) has got transformed into a complex mechanism encompassing the totality of means, short of war, through which relations between nations are managed. These means include, interalia, clandestine operations or covert action, collection of information or intelligence, counter-intelligence, propaganda, economic aid, military aid, and of course negotiations".² The Herter Committee on Foreign Affairs in its report submitted to the US Government in 1962 mentioned; "In pursuit of our international goals, we developed an arsenal of instruments more varied than ever before... all of them must be considered actual or potential elements of United States programme. Together they constitute what is here called, new diplomacy."³

² Satish Kumar, CIA and the Third World: A Study in Crypto-Diplomacy, New Delhi, 1981, p.1
Covert action is the intervention of one state in the internal affairs of another for the purpose of achieving some sort of political, economic, religious etc., control through means which are neither visible nor acknowledged. Also called crypto-diplomacy, covert action is mostly used to supplement the more widely respected means of conducting inter-state relations. But in effect, covert action has served to distort and devalue the process of diplomacy.

According to Plano and Olton the pursuit of national objectives by crafty-conspiratorial, and deceitful tactics motivated solely by narrow self interest can be described as Machiavellian diplomacy. Covert operations carried on by states in promoting subversion, revolutions, coups de’etat etc. are not very different from the Machiavellian intrigues of the sixteenth century.

But notwithstanding the distortion and devaluation in the process of diplomacy, the use of religion in diplomacy has had a chequered history. That Pakistan is neither the first nor the only country taking covert diplomatic advantage of religion has been brought out in the following examples.

---

4 Ibid., p.73.
5 Jack C. Plano; Roy Olton, The International Relations Dictionary, California, 1982, p.239.
6 Ibid., p.240.
Some examples of Diplomatic Use of Religion

1. Constantine, the first Roman Emperor of the fourth century “cannily and politically postponed his own baptism as a Christian until his death-bed so that he could continue to serve the majority of his subjects and their pagan pontific maximus”. But when in 325 AD Christianity became the official religion of the Empire, Constantine played the role of its great champion. When he became convinced of the significant growth of the community he played the card of religion against Licinius and ascribed his successes to his being the chosen servant of God. He declared his attacks against the heathen Germanic tribes as aimed at bringing them within the fold of Christianity.

2. The Crusades occupy an important place in the history of Medieval Europe. “The term ‘crusade’ is commonly used to refer to military expeditions organised by Western Christians against Muslim powers in order to take possession of or maintain control over the Holy city of Jerusalem and the places associated with the earthly life of Jesus

---

Historians have formally enumerated eight major conflagrations between 1095 and 1291 as part of the larger conflict.

For the most part, the Christian and the Muslim princes forgot their internal differences to put up a united front against each-other. Religion became a prime factor in diplomacy and conduct of foreign affairs. Frederick II, the Holy Roman Emperor from 1220 to 1250 led the sixth Crusade but used it to pursue "his dynasty’s imperial policies against the papacy itself and the Italian city-states". He was "anything but the enemy of Islam". Though Frederick II was excommunicated by the Pope, Gregory IX, his entire Eastern policy remained connected with his European concerns. In AD 1229, after several months of negotiations and bargaining backed by a show of force, he won back the Holy places for Christiandom. His subsequent "reconciliation with the Pope strengthened his hand in the East".

3. Gustav II Adolf, the king of Sweden from A.D. 1611 to A.D. 1632 is often called the "Protestant Hero and the Lion of the North (and) he made religion an important aspect of his foreign policy". He invaded

15 Ibid., p.195.
Germany during the Thirty Year War and argued to the princes of Europe that he was not annexing the Sovereign German Empire but fighting the 'rotten papal Christianity'. Indeed "without a full appreciation of the close links between secular and religious issues it becomes impossible to comprehend the Thirty Years War".\(^{17}\) Gustav succeeded in posing himself as the hero of the anti-Catholic Protestant Christianity. As a result both Lutheran and Calvinist Protestants extended their support to him.

4. In the nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire ruled over a large number of Slav people belonging to the Orthodox Greek Church. *Czarist Russia* tried to exploit this situation with the real motive of securing a warm water port in the Black Sea and control over the Dardanelles. "The nineteenth century ideal of nationality began to touch the Balkan Peninsula, and the Christian subjects under Turkish rule became restive under its impression... wars and atrocities became almost chronic the Ottoman Empire (was) threatened from both within and without, by Russia as well as by her own Christian subjects".\(^{18}\)

The successive Czars stoked the ethnic and religious feelings of the Balkan Slavs in no uncertain manner. "Ever since the Crimean war missionaries of the new gospel of pan-Slavism, mostly Russian, had been


engaged in an unceasing propaganda. In 1867 a grand pan-Slavist Congress was held at Moscow... Behind the popular propaganda were the forces of high diplomacy. Every Russian consul in the peninsula was a pan-Slavist,"^{19} Russia went to the extent of mobilizing its navy on the Danube so as to encourage the rebels and pleaded that its aim was to liberate the Christian subjects of the region from the Muslim rule. During the Great Eastern Crisis of 1875-78 the "Russian policy was deeply affected by pan-Slavism which had and swept Russian throughout in the previous twenty years".^{20} Finally Russia and Turkey fought a war in 1877-78 which Turkey lost. The Treaty of San Stefano was imposed on Turkey which resulted in the creation of a greater Bulgaria with a Christian government and national militia. Thus Russia got a foothold in the Balkans and the Ottoman Empire received a severe blow.

**The Post 1945 Phase**

In the present period also, the examples of use of religion in diplomacy can be cited. In this context I have discussed Israel, Iran and Iraq.

5. Like Pakistan, Israel is also an ideological state. It is based on the ideology of Zionism. The creation of Israel in May 1948 was an expression

---


of Jewish territorial nationalism. "Jews are the descendants of an ancient people called Hebrews. During Biblical times, the Hebrews lived in what is now Israel. But... (later on) scattered throughout the world". At the end of the nineteenth century a world Zionist movement erupted. The Balfour declaration of 1917 demanded the establishment in Palestine as a national home for the Jewish people provided that the rights of existing non-Jewish Communities were not prejudiced. In 1948, Britain terminated its Palestine Mandate, and Jewish leaders immediately proclaimed the state of Israel. The Palestinians and the neighbouring Arab-Islamic states attacked Israel within hours of its creation.

Israel played the Judaism vs. Islam card and claimed that it needed more territory including the entire Jerusalem in order to survive. Ben Gurion, the Israeli PM, asserted in the Knesset, "...It is an integral part of Israeli history... Jerusalem is the heart of hearts' of Israel". In violation of a U.N. Resolution, Israel annexed the entire Jerusalem by evicting Jordan from its eastern part in 1967. "Huge crowds of joyful Jews soon entered the old city... to pray at the Wailing Wall... In 1980 the Israeli

24 Quoted, Michael Brecher, Decisions in Israel's Foreign Policy, London, 1974, pp.13-14.
government passed a law that officially stated that the entire city is the capital".  

Meanwhile, Israel has succeeded in creating and maintaining strong Jewish lobbies in the UN and the US, the two most important variables with which the Israeli diplomacy has had to contend with. Israel portrays itself as the last non-Muslim bastion in a sea of Islam and as a safe-keeper of Western interests in West Asia. The Islamic Revolution in Iran (1979) and the Iraqi missile attacks on Israel (1991) went only to strengthen Israel’s diplomatic standing.

6. Following the Islamic Revolution of Feb 1979, a new regime led by Islamic fundamentalists assumed power in Iran. Imam Ayatollah Khomeini emerged as the “supreme leader” and the Iranian foreign policy underwent a radical change. The new leaders accused both the superpowers of trying to defeat and destroy the revolution. Khomeini himself termed the US as the Great Satan. He lent religious sanction to anti-Americanism. “The Great Satan ... resorts to all possible means and satanic plans... (Carter has made) a solution more complicated by, handing over the

---

deposed Shah, the enemy of Islam, to another enemy (Egypt) who by his shameful action has severely harmed the Muslims of the world".27

The strident shouts of *Marg bar America* (Death to America) echoed through the revolution and the Gulf war. The volunteers were sacrificing themselves in a holy war against all the enemies of Islam whether Iranis, zionists, atheist communists or the US.28 In March, 1979, Iran withdrew from the CENTO, in Nov, 1979, it repealed its “colonizing agreement” signed with the US in 1959 and in the same month Muslim Students followers of the Imam’s line took over the American Embassy in Tehran.29 Iran also severed ties with Morocco calling it an ‘American affiliate’.30

Iran begun to support militant Shia and other radical groups in other countries particularly targeting the US interests. Rulers of moderate Islamic countries were also targeted. “Clearly, Iran’s regional policy was not merely determined by its threat perception, but also by its solidarity with Islamic fundamentalist groups”.31 By and large Iran still retains a pariah status in the comity of nations. The death fatwa issued by Khomenei

---

27 Text of speeches, *The Echo of Islam*, vol.1, Teheran, year Not Mentioned, p.3.
30 Ibid., p.129.
against the writer Salman Rushdie, a British citizen, provided another
evidence of how religion has got inter-linked with Iran’s external policies.

7. In August 1990, Saddam Hussain, the President of Iraq, attacked
and annexed Kuwait. Kuwait was declared as another ‘province’ of Iraq
and repeated UN resolutions for its vacation were ignored. As the US led
UN troops began to arrive in Saudi Arabia, Saddam Hussain invoked Islam
for diplomatic purposes. “Donning the spiritual mantle of ... Khomeini,
Saddam was zealously agitating the Arab masses to launch a holy war
(Jihad) against the corrupt Saudis who had defiled Islam’s holiest Shrines
by allowing the presence of Western troops on their territory”.
In a
speech delivered in August, 1990, he thundered; “Arabs, Muslims,
believers in God...This is the day for you to stand up and defend Mecca,
which is the captive of the spears of the Americans and the Zionists... (The
Saudis have) challenged God (by placing) Mecca and the tomb of prophet
Muhammad under foreign protection”.

When the Allied offensive began in January 1991, Saddam Hussain
declared; “…the deaths on the Allied side will be increased with God’s
help.. the infidels will leave and the flag of Allahu Akbar will fly over the
mother of all Battles”.

33 Quoted, Ibid., pp.229-30.
34 Quoted, Ibid., p.352.
Saddam's diplomatic onslaught put Saudi Arabia, Egypt etc. on the defensive. To further accentuate their dilemma, Saddam attacked Israel with scud missiles killing 4 and wounding about 200 Israelis. The aim was to provoke Israel into retaliation which would make untenable, the position of Muslim nations supporting the UN offensive against Iraq. Therefore "The need to maintain Israeli restraint and non-involvement became the most crucial issue for the US... If Saddam Hussain was eager to drag Israel into the war, the multinational coalition was equally opposed to this idea". Ultimately, Israel was made to exercise restraint and the eviction of Iraq from Kuwait could proceed at the hands of the UN troops.

Although, the above examples are by no means exhaustive, their discussion would help in providing a background to the Pakistani diplomacy of religion. It has to be borne in mind that the nature of the Pakistani diplomacy derives directly from the circumstances in which Pakistan was born. Pakistan was meant to be a nation for the Muslims of the sub-continent where their interests would be safeguarded from the Hindu majority. Thus Pakistan is an ideological state based on the ideology of Islam. To comprehend this feature of Pakistan it is essential to go into India's freedom struggle and the genesis of Pakistan.

The Genesis of Pakistan

Pakistan’s creation on August 14, 1947, is an event of history quite extensively discussed and debated. A lot of polemical writings have also taken place on the Pakistan Movement. It may be noted that, “Historians like other people sometimes fall into rhetorical language and speak of an occurrence as ‘inevitable’, when they mean merely that the conjunction of factors leading one to respect it was overwhelming and strong”.  

This seems to happen to the Pakistani historians. While using phrases like the Pakistan Movement, they overlook the fact that the word Pakistan was not mentioned even is the Lahore Resolution of 1940. Yet they trace the evolution of the Islamic nationalism in the sub-continent practically from the time when the Muslims first came to India in the 7th - 8th centuries. The logic of the Pakistani historians resembles that of Alberuni’s who came to India in the eleventh century and wrote: “…the Hindus entirely differ from us in every respect… The barriers that separate Muslims and Hindus rest on different causes”. The Pakistani historians propound that since the Muslims and the Hindus never merged their identities into each-other they can be said to be two different nations, and they must have different territories.

But they ignore the fact that even within a family, no two individuals are carbon-copies of each-other, and each member of the family maintains his own individuality, personality and identity. If religions were a sound and sufficient basis for nationhood then there would have been only six-seven nation-states in the world and not two-hundred. Moreover, Pakistan would not have broken up in 1971.

To justify Pakistan with the benefit of hindsight several arguments have been forwarded. According to one, "Geography and history have determined the natural orientation of Sindh, Baluchistan, Punjab and N.W.F.P. towards the Middle-East and Central Asia. the diverse Muslim communities were knit into a common Ummah...".\(^39\) According to another: "Two men were the leaders of the anti-Muslim movements among the Hindus: Swami Dayanand Saraswati and Bal Gangadhar Tilak\(^40\) ... the agitation against the partition of Bengal... was as much directed against the Muslims as against the British."\(^41\) It has also been argued that it was one of the tricks of the Congress Hindu leaders to equate the Hindu Mahasabha

\(^39\) M.Yusuf Abbasi, "The Evolution of the Muslim Nationalism and the pakistan Resolution" in Dr. Miss Kaniz F. Yusuf; Dr. M. Saleem Akhtar; Dr. J. Razi Wasti, (ed.), Pakistan Resolution Revisited, Islamabad, 1990, pp.3-4.


\(^41\) Ibid., p.249.
with the Muslim League and to assign to the Congress the role of a mutual arbitrator.\textsuperscript{42}

Apart from the sweeping generalisations and categorisation of everything as ‘Hindu and Muslim’, the accounts of the Pakistani historians suffer from factual errors. For example the comment about the partition of Bengal being ‘as anti-Muslim, as anti-British’ is not borne out by facts. History writing in not so much a matter of interpretation, as of ‘informed interpretation’ of events that have taken place. It has been suggested that a good historian selects those facts and sequences of cause and effect which are historically significant and the standard of historical significance is his ability to fit them into his pattern of rational explanation and interpretation.\textsuperscript{43} The most significant earliest date for Pakistan was probably, 1857. Here I would attempt to trace some of the important events which ultimately culminated in the birth of Pakistan.

Like the mythological churning of the epic ocean, the cataclysmic events of 1857 released myriad social forces and ideas. 1857 was, \textit{inter alia} a last gasp attempt to revive the lost glory of the Mughal Empire by ousting the British from India. However in many ways the rebels suffered from a reactionary and backward outlook and could not withstand the sustained

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., p.275.  
\textsuperscript{43} E.H.Carr, no.37, p.105.
onslaught of a relatively modern British Indian army. "The events of 1857 have a two-fold significance in the history of Modern Muslim India. They dealt a final blow to the idea of the Mughal Empire and they put a seal on the decline of the Muslims in all walks of life". The Mughals were a symbol of Muslim rule in India and the fall and humiliation of the last Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah Zafar left a deep impact on the Indian and particularly the Muslim psyche.

"The British believed that the Muslims were responsible for the anti-British uprising of 1857 and, therefore they were subjected to ruthless punishment and merciless vengeance. In every department of life where government patronage was essential, the doors were closed on Muslims. The Muslims were hounded out of employment and opportunities. The landed gentry were disinherited through large scale confiscation". This may be a sweeping comment but there is no doubt that most of the British politicians, authors and administrators held the Muslims responsible for the gory events of 1857-58. Generally the Muslim reaction to the British attitude took the shape of either quiet sulking or of advocating an alliance with the British and taking advantage of modern institutions. The Wahabi movement, which was revivalist in nature and "the earliest organised Muslim response to Western influences... was crushed by the superior

---

44 Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi, The struggle for Pakistan, New Delhi, 1989, p.17.
military force of the British." At the same time important opinion makers such as Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Sir Richard Temple, Sir John Strachey and W.H. Gregory were arguing to the effect that the Muslims were not essentially disloyal to the Crown and that the unpleasant past should be forgotten. W.W. Hunter’s book *The Indian Musalman* made a vigorous plea for reconciling and rallying the Muslims’ round the British government through thoughtful concessions. The British Government cleverly used the attractions of government service to create a split along religious lines among the educated Indians who depended on government service as there were few other openings for them. Thus the British were not averse to playing the game of divide and rule for their own advantage.

The founder of the Aligarh Movement, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan (1817-98) wanted the Muslims to keep pace with modernity and science. He “began his educational career without any communal bias… (but) ironically – communalism in India got its initial start in the 1880s when Syed Ahmed Khan counterposed it to the national movement initiated by the National Congress”. He believed that the Muslims’ share in administrative posts and in professions could be increased only by

---

47 Ibid., p.375.

professing and proving loyalty to the British and opposing the Congress. He also took active support of the big Muslim zamindars for his educational institutions such as the Aligarh college. In 1893 Sir Sayyid categorically stated: “The proposals of the Congress are exceedingly inexpedient for a country which is inhabited by two different nations... (if) the English were to leave India...Is it possible that under these circumstances two nations – the Mohammedan and the Hindu-could sit on the same throne and remain equal in power? Most certainly not”. Later on, taking a cue from his thinking and founded as a loyalist, communal and conservative political organisation, the (Muslim) League supported the partition of Bengal, raised the slogan of separate Muslim interests, demanded separate electorates and safeguards for Muslims in government services, and reiterated all the major theories of communal politics and ideology enunciated earlier by Syed Ahmed and his followers.

The partition of Bengal in 1905 was a classic example of the British divide-and-rule policy. Administrative convenience was cited as the official reason but an official note written by Risley, the Home Secretary to the Government mentions the real motive:

“Bengal united is a power, Bengal divided will pull several different ways ... in this scheme... one of our main objects in

50 Ibid., p.415.
51 G. Allana, (Ed), Pakistan Movement: Historic Documents, Karachi, Year Not Mentioned, p.3.
52 Bipin Chandra, no.49, p.417.
to split up and thereby weaken a solid body of opponents to our rule". 53

The Viceroy, Lord Curzon himself noted:

"If we are weak enough to yield to their (Bengalis’) clamour now, we shall not be able to dismember or reduce Bengal again; and you will be cementing and solidifying, on the eastern flank of India, a force already formidable and certain to be a source of increasing trouble in the future". 54

It may justifiably be said that the partition of Bengal was another manipulation of the unholy alliance between two aggressors – the British Government and the Separatists among the Muslims. 55 Henceforth, the British profitably employed the separatist Muslims to weaken the Indian National Movement which was striving for national regeneration and independence. Unfortunately the militant nationalism as propagated by some of the extremist leaders like B.G. Tilak, B.C. Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai, and Bhai Parmanand had a strong Hindu religious tinge. They glorified the ancient Indian culture to the exclusion of the medieval one. Issues like the cow-protection movement also became prominent. "Originating from the Punjab, the movement for cow-protection soon engulfed large part of northern India and became particularly strong in the Bhojpuri speaking areas of UP and Bihar. Along with the movement for the replacement of Urdu by Hindi, the cow-protection movement must be considered as one of the most powerful manifestation of Hindu resurgence in late-nineteenth

54 Quoted, Ibid., pp.270-71.
century India. That movement had behind it a complex of motivations including economic.\textsuperscript{56}

As a result of these developments and the policy of the British, a section of the Muslim intelligentsia came to view the National Movement as a ‘Hindu Movement’. Wilayat Ali, a close associate of Muhammad Ali suggested in 1913, “The Hindus and the Muhammadans should be segregated – northern India to be assigned to the Muslims and the rest to the Hindus”.\textsuperscript{57}

There were other forces at work. The glorification of Islam contained in the works of persons like Ameer Ali (1849-1928), Shibl Numani (1857-1917), and Abdul Halim Sharar (1860-1928) were spread among the middle and lower middle class Muslims by innumerable known and unknown writers and intellectuals through pamphlets, editorials, lectures and small clubs and societies.\textsuperscript{58} The most important ideas emphasized by these publications and lectures were the great civilizing role of Islam and the unique personality of the Prophet but the contribution made by Islamic culture to India was less than glorified.\textsuperscript{59}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Bimal Prasad, The Foundation of Muslim Nationalism, New Delhi, 1999, p.219.
\item Prasad, no.56, p.167.
\item Ibid.,
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
“The Controversies fostered by the different groups of Ulama and the debates between either of them and the Hindu revivalists and Christian missionaries also contributed in a major way to the growth of community consciousness among Muslims in north India”.  

The main Muslim Ulama involved in such controversies and debates were the Deobandis; the Ahl-i Hadis, who relied only upon the Koran and Hadis, i.e., the teachings a practice of the Prophet, as interpreted by themselves; the Bareilvis, who stood for traditional Islam, including Sufism and other religious practices which were opposed by some reforming Ulama, and the products of Nadwatul-Ulama of Lucknow, who stood for a middle position between modernists and traditionalists and worked for the removal of sectarian differences. 

The Muslim communal and separatist elements got a rallying point in the shape of the All-India Muslim League (AIML) formed in Dec. 1906 at Dacca by the Aga Khan, Nawab Salimullah Khan and Nawab Mohsinul-Mulk. From its inception the League was a hand-maid of a section of the educated Muslims and some big Muslim Nawabs and landlords who had no compunction in conniving with the British for their sectional gains. The delegates to the first meeting of the League, passed the following resolution defining the objective of the AIML in these words:

---

60 Ibid., p168.
61 Ibid.
(a) to promote among the Musalmans of India the feeling of loyalty to the British Government and remove any misconception that may arise as to the intention of the Government with regard to any of its measure

(b) to protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Musalmans of India, and respectfully to represent the needs and aspirations to Government. 62 Etc.

Thus the League aimed at leading the Indian Muslims without in any way hurting the British. Moreover it was not even dreaming of Pakistan.

The Indian Councils Act of 1909, also known as the Morly – Minto Reforms was a clear reflection of the nexus between the Muslim communalists and the British. The Act had “two innovations: direct election for non-official seats and separate or communal representation for Muslims... the plea being that with a property franchise, poverty would prevent Muslims from having an influence in general constituencies in proportion to their numbers".63

Thus, from now on Muslim members to the Legislative councils were to be elected by the Muslim voters only and the number of such members was fixed. It also meant that the Muslim community was recognised as a completely separate section of the Indian nation.

62 G. Allana, no.51, pp.22-23.
The Lucknow Pact (1916) between the League and the Congress was actuated by political opportunism rather than any meeting of hearts. The Hindu revivalists also got organised as a result of which the *Hindu Mahasabha* and the *Rashtra Swayam Sewak Sangh* (RSS) came into existence in 1917 and 1925 respectively. Communal polarisation resulted in a large number of Hindu-Muslim riots on a regular basis. The situation became ripe for the emergence of Mr. Muhammad Ali Jinnah as the top leader of the AIML.

Jinnah was born on 25 December 1876 in Karachi, to a Gujarati parents. His father was a businessman. After returning from London as a barrister he began to practice law in Bombay. Being ambitious by nature he entered politics and joined the Congress but failed to emerge as one of its leaders. In what is an adverse commentary on his political, ideological and moral integrity, Mr. Jinnah got himself enrolled as a member of the (Muslims) League in 1913 without first resigning from the Congress. This he did on foreign soil (London) and despite being fully aware that the AIML and the INC stood for totally different and to a certain extent diametrically opposite goals and aspirations.

---

65 Ibid., p.28.
66 Ibid., p.74.
67 Ibid.
Meanwhile, the Congress leaders failed to fully comprehend the dangerous potential and implication of the AIML and its brand of politics. The AIML openly stoked the sentiment of pan-Islamism to strengthen itself domestically and to gain visibility at the global level.

The writings and thoughts of other Muslim intellectuals such as Moulana Hasrat Mohani (1878-1951), Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal (1877-1938), Chaudhry Rahmat Ali (1897-1951), and to some extent Maulana Maududi (1903-1979) also helped in shaping the idea of Pakistan. Mohani was a great Muslim divine, a poet and a selfless revolutionary who as a leader of the Muslim League sincerely hoped for a free Islam in a free federal India. Dr. Iqbal was a poet-philosopher and lawyer who proposed an autonomous state in north-west India in the course of his presidential address in the annual session of the AIML in 1930. Rahmat Ali asserted as early as 1915, “North of India is Muslim and we shall keep it Muslim. Not only that we will make it a Muslim state”. Further developing the idea, on 18 January, 1933, he issued a declaration entitled Now or Never: Are we to Live or Perish for Ever? Addressed to the world “on behalf of the 30 million Muslims of north-west India... the homeland of these Muslims was defined in the first sentence as Pakistan, by which we mean

70 K.K. Aziz, no.57, vol.1, p.86.
the five Northern units of India, viz., Punjab, North West Frontier Province (Afghan provinces), Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan".71

Maulana Maududi wrote a series of articles on the Hindu-Muslim problem, rejected the Congress claim of secularism as a mere pretense and its slogan of democracy as another name for Hindu rule.72 As the founder of Jamat-i-Islami he opposed the formation of Pakistan since the ‘Islamic state could not be delimited.’ Rather he gave certain proposals – such as creation of an International Federation. He also opposed the major policies of the Muslim League. In 1969, K.K. Aziz requested Maulana Maududi to clarify his position with regard to Pakistan and Muslim League. Maulana Maududi replied that he wanted an Islamic state, whereas the Muslim League wanted a national state, and hence their clash.73

The keen interest shown by the AIML towards the problems and issues of Muslim communities in other parts of the world may have become a causatory factor for the pan-Islamic streak in the thinking of the future leaders of Pakistan. In July 1938, in Delhi, the AIML passed a Resolution on Palestine which inter-alia called for observance of 26 August 1938 as the Palestine Day.74 When the League demanded for a seat

72 Ibid., p.420.
73 Quoted, Ibid., pp.422-23.
74 G. Allana, no.51, p.163.
in the Palestine Conference to be held in London in Feb 1939 was rejected, Jinnah sent the following telegram to the Secretary of State: "Deeply disappointed his Majesty's Government not inclined (to) extend representation (to) Muslim India at Palestine Conference... Muslims deeply and vitally concerned (about) their Holy places.'’

The League celebrated Nov 1, 1940 as the Day of Observance to, in the words of Jinnah, "express the bonds of brotherhood that exists between Muslim India and the other Muslim countries...”. On Nov 2, 1940 addressing a large congregation at the Jama Masjid, Bombay, Jinnah declared, "It is our duty to help our Muslim brothers wherever they are, from China to Peru, because Islam enjoins that it is our duty to go to the rescue of our Muslim brothers...” Similarly, as the Governor General of Pakistan he delivered his 'Eid Greetings to the Muslim World’ on 27 August 1948, in the following words: "We are passing through perilous times. The drama of politics that is being staged in Palestine, Indonesia and Kashmir should serve as an eye opener to us. It is only by putting up a united front that we can make our voice felt in the counsels of the world".

---

76 Ibid., p.128.
77 Ibid., p.130.
78 Quaid-I-Azam Mahommed Ali Jinnah: Speeches, Karachi, Year and Author Not Mentioned, p.156.
The Gandhi – Jinnah correspondences provide some good insights into the thought process and politics of the Muslim League. In one of his letters written on Sept 15, 1944 Gandhi asked 15 pointed questions, including, “Is the goal of Pakistan Pan Islamism?” In his letter of Sept 17, 1944 Jinnah fudged this all-important question and answered, “This point does not arise, but still I reply that the question is a mere bogey”. He could not satisfactorily reply to other questions also and often resorted to short answers mentioning that the question was “irrelevant”.

Although Jinnah was evasive in this answers to Gandhi, he relished the role of a rabidly communal orator when addressing Muslim audiences. In a speech at Aligarh in March 1944 he provided a novel, if strange interpretation of the Indian history: “...Pakistan started the moment the first non-Muslim was converted to Islam is India... As soon as a Hindu embraced Islam he was outcast... As for the Muslim it was the duty imposed on him by Islam not to merge his identity... in any alien society... they (the Hindus and the Muslims) have not merged their identities – that was the basis for Pakistan.”

---

80 Ibid., p.112.
81 Ibid.
It may be noted that the so called "Pakistan Resolution" passed by the AIML at its Lahore session in 1940, does not mention the word Pakistan even once. In his presidential address Jinnah resorted to wrong generalisations, sweeping comments and the creation of a fear psychosis in order to justify the demand for a separate nation "The Musalman are a nation by any definition.." (the Hindu and the Muslims) belong to two different civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions... democratic system... can only mean Hindu Raj... We wish our people to develop to the fullest... according to the genius of our people... Come forward as servants as Islam..."

The Resolution passed at Lahore set out the 'basic principle' according to which geographically contiguous units in the North-Western and Eastern parts of India were demanded to be so organised as to leave Muslims in a majority and "to constitute independent states in which constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign".

The posture of the Muslim League gradually hardened and it virtually became non-negotiable. The Rajgopalachari formula which

---

84 Ibid., p.19.
85 Ibid., p.20.
86 Ibid., p.21.
87 Ibid., p.22.
suggested that the North-Western and Eastern areas of India should be
demarcated so as to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants of the area was
rejected by Jinnah for not fully conceding the basic demands of the Lahore
Resolution. 89 At the Simla Conference (June-July 1945) called by Lord
Wavell, the talks broke down because the League insisted that all the
Muslim members of the Executive Council would be nominated by it. “All
this goes to show that had it not been for the so called intransigence of
Jinnah, Pakistan might not have been achieved within slightly more than
seven years of the Lahore Resolution”. 90

Meanwhile communal frenzy gripped the country and chances of
reconciliation between the League and the Congress receded. The League
declared August 16, 1946 as the Direct Action Day which witnessed mass
killings in Calcutta. Left with no option the Congress had to accept the
Mountbatten Plan (June 3, 1947) for the partition of India and the British
Parliament passed the independence of India Act on July 18, 1947.
Pakistan came into existence or August 14, 1947 and Jinnah became its
first Governor General. Already Bengal, Punjab, Sindh and Baluchistan
had opted for Pakistan. Referendums were held in NWFP and Sylhet
which also opted for Pakistan under controversial circumstances. 91

---

90 Ibid., p.131.
91 Ibid., pp.204-5.
Thus the two-nation theory triumphed for the moment but the irony was that even the League was not altogether jubilant about obtaining a Pakistan stripped of East Punjab and west Bengal”.$^{92}$ Subsequently Kashmir, though Muslim majority, also decided to join India and not Pakistan with the result that a sense of non-fulfillment gripped the minds of the Pakistani leaders. “It is a paradox that the demand for separate Muslim statehood based on the existing Muslim provinces with territorial adjustments should finally have found recognition in a Pakistan truncated to a degree never envisaged by Jinnah and the League. It is inconceivable that they did not realize that the truncation was a logical corollary of the distribution of the peoples of the two nation”.$^{93}$

Unfortunately, the Pakistani leaders continue to strive for completing the ‘unfinished agenda’ of Partition with harmful consequences for both India and Pakistan.

---

$^{92}$ Ibid., p.174.