CHAPTER II

The Formative Years

Pakistan acquired sovereign status in 1947 as a result of the conviction and struggle of the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent to have a separate and independent entity of their own under the banner of All-India Muslim League led by Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah.\(^1\) Opinion among scholars varies as to the nature and character of the League, the evaluation of which does not form part of this chapter.\(^2\) However, scholars do agree that the League did have some considered views on issues that confronted the world in the early decades of the century, even though, "unlike the Indian National Congress, the Muslim League had remained discreetly silent and

---------------------------------

1. The emergence of Pakistan as a sovereign state had led some columnists to interpret it in terms of an offshoot of Pan-Islam. *The Times* (London, 15 August 1947) Editorial envisioned Pakistan as filling "the gap" in the Muslim world - the gap created by the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in 1918/1919 - and Karachi, the then Pakistan’s capital, taking rank "as a new centre of Muslim cohesion and a rallying point for Muslim thought and aspirations." *The Dawn’s* (Karachi, 14 August 1947) supplement commemorating Pakistan’s birth carried a Muslim world map on its cover page, with arrows connecting the capital of the new born state (Karachi) with the capitals of other sovereign Muslim states.

Continuing the external response to the birth of Pakistan on the political map of the world, the Agha Khan, spiritual head of the Ismaili community, described it as "the greatest achievement since the fall of the Caliphate" (quoted in Sharif al-Mujahid, *Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah: Studies in Interpretation*, (Delhi: Low Price Publications, 1993), p.300.

Egypt’s premier Islamic movement, the *Ikhwan-ul-Muslimeen* (The Muslim Brotherhood), in its organ *al-Ikhwan*, hailed Jinnah as "a Muslim hero fighting for the glory of Islam" (cited in *ibid.*, p.300), King Abd al-Aziz ibn Saud "saw the greater glory of Islam", while the Chinese Muslim goodwill Mission, visiting Pakistan in 1947 called Jinnah "the greatest Muslim leader of the world" (cited in *ibid.*, p. 300).

2. Voluminous historiographical literature abounds on this specific subject. Some scholars stigmatize the Pakistan Movement spearheaded by League as 'communal' and others as 'progressive'. The former school of thought is, by and large, held by Indian scholars and the latter by their Pakistani counterparts. Readers may have recourse to this literature reflecting both the perspectives.
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@never committed itself on issues as Spain and China, Abyssinia and Czechoslovakia, Fascism and Communism, thereby implicitly hinting at the absence of a comprehensive foreign affairs orientation on the part of the League. The League had few "emotional or intellectual commitments" apart from its "historical sympathy and interest of the Moslems of India for other Moslem countries of West Asia and North Africa". An example would suffice to vindicate this point. During 23 March-2 April 1947, the Delhi-based Indian Council of World Affairs acted as the host for the Asian Relations Conference, which was attended by twenty-four Asian countries and Egypt. Jawaharlal Nehru was the leading architect of the whole affair. This fact was not lost upon the League, which not only distanced itself from the convention, but also inveighed it as "a thinly disguised attempt on the part of the Hindu Congress to boost itself politically as the prospective leader of Asiatic peoples." This was one illustration of an attempt on the League's part to vindicate its freedom from the Congress concerning international issues. Further, it was primarily because of the opposition of the Muslim League that the Arab League in particular was most unresponsive to the Conference and sent only an observer. The Muslim League's opposition was also grist to the mill of the smaller Asian countries which feared India's domination. In retrospect, it may be conjectured that the League endeavoured to relate its internal demand for a separate Muslim homeland to its support for Muslims struggling for emancipation from the Western colonial powers in West Asia and North Africa, in particular. Such a symbiotic relationship did not go unnoticed by historians. As observed by a scholar of note:

4. Ibid., pp. 88-89.
5. The Indian Annual Register (New Delhi), January-June, 1947, p.298.
Every issue of the Muslim world occupied a prominent place in Indian Muslim thinking and planning, because they were a minority in their own country and, for that reason, obsessed with the consciousness of being Muslim. Islam had special appeal for them because it was the only source of their comfort and hope.7

By way of corroboration at the beginning of the twentieth century, events outside India added to the concern of the Indian Muslims. During the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, the Indian Muslims for the first time demonstrated their sympathy for the Turks on a wider scale. All Turkish causes, namely the 1897 war with Greece, the 1911 war with Italy and the Balkan war of 1912 evoked agitation in India.8 Some scholars even go to the extent of asserting that the Pakistan Movement was waged as part of a world-wide movement for Muslim revival and renaissance.9 In a general sense, Pakistan does not suffer from a discord between its internal vocation and its external behaviour in so far as its attachment with the Muslim world goes. This has been consistently reiterated by the rulers of Pakistan since the partition times. (This was equally true in the case of the leaders of Pakistan Movement). Sometimes, the enthusiasm displayed by Indian Muslims towards Muslim causes outside British India ran higher than the one shown by the affected Muslims themselves which led

critics to stigmatize it as evidences of 'extra-territorial loyalty'. The Khilafat movement amply bears testimony to this. Hence, this enthusiasm manifested itself, as the subsequent pages would show, through the instrumentality of the League when 'the League...did develop a broad sense of sympathy for the "Moslem" causes in the world.' One can gauge the depth of the League's attachment which led Wayne A. Wilcox to make a very broad remark thus: 'The new state (i.e. Pakistan) was a product of a successful foreign policy pursued in the pre-independence period by the leadership of the Muslim League'.

The present chapter aims at delineating the broad contours of Pakistan's foreign policy in its formative phase in which Islam came to shape and influence the State's external behaviour, in order to posit its foreign policy in perspective in the

10. Quoted in Chaudhri Muhammed Ali, The Emergence of Pakistan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 379. To quote Ali: "...during the British rule the Muslim country of the sub-continent was noted for what others called its extra-territorial loyalty". p. 379. In view of the highly unstable political conditions prevalent in the beginning of this century, the Muslim world, as a quid pro quo, could not show keen interest in the Indian Muslim situation. For details on the lack of outside Muslim interest in the Indian Muslim community, see K.K. Aziz, A History of the Idea of Pakistan, vol.3 (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 1987), pp. 800-807. This viewpoint is also shared by Mushtaq Ahmad. See the latter's Pakistan and the Middle East (Karachi: Kitab Markaz, 1948), pp. v+213.

11. Ibid., p. 90.

subsequent years. Such an endeavour needs to address itself to pre-Partition international activities aimed at reorganising Islamic unity on the part of the leaders of the wider Islamic world.

**Khilafat Agitation**

The Khilafat movement of the 1920s was a significant addition to the chain of Indian Muslims' attachment to the Muslim causes elsewhere in the Muslim world. It was a political movement impregnated with religious zeal and exuberance designed to defend the tottering Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Caliphate. It's all-too familiar Pan-Islamic, romanticist, and revivalist nature stood in good stead for the protagonists of Pakistan Movement during the subsequent years. It equipped them with the techniques of political agitation and prepared a ground for a visionary political consciousness. As a movement towards Pan-Islamism, 'it was inherently and profoundly altruistic, but utterly out of accord with the realities and requirements', of the colonial India's imperial politics. Indian Muslims' ire against the British was due to the 'pretty terrible injustice' which the latter had meted out to the Turks via the unrelentingly severe, and iniquitous, Treaty of Sevres (1920).

Spurred by the British high handedness against the Ottomans, the Khilafatists not only declared India a *dar al-Harb* (the Abode of War), but also called on Muslims to migrate (*Hijra*) to neighbouring Muslim countries, especially Afghanistan.

---


The Khilafat fall-out on the subsequent Pakistan Movement could be visualized in that the former had imbued the latter with a new political consciousness, it inculcated in them a spirit of self-reliance; it helped to create leadership and train political workers at the grassroot level. All these political inputs proved to be of significant value to the champions of Pakistan Movement. Besides, as the movement was clothed in the religious attire, "it had the ultimate effect of intensifying Indian Muslims' loyalty to Islam,"¹⁵ even though Mahatma Gandhi, by supporting the movement, envisioned a broad Hindu-Muslim unity as a strategic weapon to drive out the British from the Indian soil. The religious dimension of the Khilafat agitation bore an imprint on the later Muslim campaign for a separate Muslim homeland. In terms of sharpening Islamic political consciousness, the contribution of the Khilafat movement was immense. It reminded the agitators and the broad Muslim populace of the salience of Islamic principle and practice under the painful convulsive historical circumstances, which in turn made them resort to corrective measures. Writing in the later 50s, Keith Callard believed that the Khilafat movement had added "a number of elements...to the ideology of Muslim politics...that were to be of importance in the ensuing years"¹⁶ (in particular, to the movement for a separate Muslim homeland). It accelerated the Islamic principle in terms of "the vocabulary and concept of classical Islam" and the Muslim practice symbolized in the legacy of Islamic civilization. The ideas and emotions thrown up by the movement contributed later to the campaign for Pakistan, which "unleashed a second wave of Muslim political enthusiasm".¹⁷ Without being engulfed by the gloom accompanying the failure of their Khilafat


¹⁷. Ibid., pp. 35-36.
cause, the Indian Muslims felt that, as the most substantial body of believers in the world, it was more incumbent upon themselves than upon others to strive for the solidarity of Islam. Allama Iqbal gave vent to such a resolve when he made a statement in 1933: "Indian Muslims who happen to be a more numerous people than the Muslims of all other Asiatic countries put together, ought to consider themselves the greatest asset of Islam". Further, in March 1937, he wrote to Jinnah saying that "We must not ignore the fact that the whole future of Islam as a moral and political force in Asia rests very largely on a complete organisation of the Indian Muslims" (implicitly hinting at a separate Muslim state).

The movement's positive impact on Turkey's political fate during the turbulent 20s of the century could not be underestimated considering the circumstances of the times. The agitationists forced the government of India to intervene on their behalf, with the Imperial Government in London, to soften the British attitude towards Turkey at Lausanne (1923) (and retreating from the harsh provisions against Turkey as contained in the Treaty of Sevres (1920), to the extent of conceding practically all of the Turkish nationalists demands. In this context, in 1919, the Indian National Congress also lent its support to the Khilafat cause. In a resolution passed in that year, it protested against the hostile attitude of some of the British ministers towards the Turkish and Khilafat questions and urged His Majesty's Government to settle the Turkish question bearing in mind the sentiments of Indian Muslims. In a perceptive

19. Ibid., Letter of Iqbal to Jinnah, p. 11.
vein, a Pakistani scholar wrote later that `next only to the successful Kemalist war of liberation, the Khilafat movement had contributed the most towards the political recovery of Turkey.' 22 In Valentine Chirol’s judgement, the Khilafat agitation was "one of the decisive factors" at the Lausanne Conference, where the "Sickman of Europe" was able to obtain greatly improved terms. 23

Following on the heels of the abolition of Caliphate by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey in 1924, a private non-governmental conference, the first ‘Caliphate Congress’, was convened in Cairo in May 1926 in which representatives from British India participated. 24 The Congress came into being with the initiative taken mainly by the al-Azhar ulama. It was attended by some thirty Muslims from thirteen countries, none of them representing their governments. An idea to give the Congress a more permanent character by extending the terms of office of its Administrative Council and by founding branches all over the Muslim world was adopted, but not executed. 25 The Conference, however, resolved that

It is indispensable that all the Muslim peoples should be represented adequately at an assembly to be held in a country which will be chosen by the delegates of the Islamic peoples in which the delegates of the Muslim peoples shall meet to discuss the measures to be taken with a


24. Besides British India, delegates from Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco, South Africa, the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia), the Yemen, the Hijaz, Palestine, Iraq and Poland took part in the deliberations. However, Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan, the Nejd and Russia were not represented. Maulana Shaukat Ali and Mohammad Iqbal were the two of the four Indian delegates who attended the convention.

view to the establishment of the Caliphate fulfilling all the conditions prescribed by the *Shariah* (Islamic Law).26

The Congress aimed at exploring the feasibility of appointing a Caliph, but would not do so in view of the fact that 'the most important of the...conditions [which a Caliph should fulfil according to the Islamic scriptures] being [the] ability to defend the possessions of the Faith in all Islamic countries and to put into execution the precepts of the Islamic Law - is incapable of realization at the present time, in view of the situation in which the Muslims find themselves.27

When the second meeting of Muslim leaders took place in June-July 1926 in Makkah (Hejaz), at the time of pilgrimage, it could not take up the Caliphate issue as decided by the 1926 Cairo meet in view of Turkish opposition. Nor were international political issues. However, the conference could decide to constitute itself into a permanent body called Motamar al-Alam al-Islam, or the Muslim World Congress which was to assemble annually at Makkah and to extend its scope to Islamic affairs in general. The Makkah Congress was inaugurated by King Abdul Aziz ibn Saud. A British Indian delegation took part in the meeting which included the Ali brothers of the Khilafat agitation fame: Maulana Mohammad Ali and Maulana Shaukat Ali. At the meeting, Mohammad Ali made a proposal that Makkah and Medina be declared international territory and become the spiritual capital of all the Muslims of the world. However, the proposal was not accepted.28 The Congress also witnessed dissension

------------------------


in its ranks regarding the adoption of Arabic as its official language. The Indian delegates wished to address the gathering either in Urdu or in English. It was basically a conflict involving the Arabic-speaking participants who claimed that the language of the Quran was the only really Pan-Islamic one, and the non-Arab participants, who underlined the heterogeneous nature of Pan-Islamism. Five years later, this language controversy vitiated the Jerusalem conference in 1931.

The new body was to deal not only with matters related to the holy places and pilgrimage but also wider Islamic issues. The meeting also decided to constitute a permanent Standing Committee of the Congress which, however, could not see the light of the day, in view of the reluctance of the concerned Muslim governments (including Saudi Arabia) to commit themselves to the membership of any permanent organisation of this kind.\(^{29}\) As King Ibn Saud evinced no interest in organising any annual conference as was decided upon at the Makkah Congress (for his position in the Hijaz was still insecure), others endeavoured to take a fresh initiative, thus paving the way for the entry of the President, Muslim Council of Palestine and the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, al-Haj Mohammad Amin al-Husaini, into the picture. Those were the times (in the early thirties) when the unfolding, fast-changing developments in Palestine deeply affected Indian Muslims who displayed their widespread concern by giving support to the Arab claims over Palestine. Under these circumstances, the Supreme Muslim Council of Palestine, in its meeting held on 26 July 1931, authorized the President of the Muslim Council in his individual capacity, to send invitations for the proposed conference in Jerusalem with a view to discussing the Wailing Wall issue of the Al-Quuds mosque and the expanding Zionist desires over Palestine. India's Khilafat leader, Maulana Shaukat Ali, who was associated with the Preparatory

Committee of the Congress (Motamar) declared that the purpose of the Conference was "to investigate the actual situation" of Islam and means to be taken in defence of its interests".\textsuperscript{30} Opinion among scholars differ as to who exactly moved the idea to convene a Pan-Islamic Conference in Jerusalem. Izzat Darwaza, a historian of Palestinian descent, attributed it to al-Thaalibi, a Tunisian. Others - notably Kupferschmidt - assumed that it was a child of circumstances; the post-funeral talks held between Shaukat Ali and al-Haj Amin al-Husaini, following the sudden demise in London in January 1931 of the former's brother, Maulana Mohammad Ali. It needs to be noted in this context that the latter was interred near one of the inner walls of the Haram al-Sharif (the Sacred Shrine, the Al-Aqsa Mosque) in Jerusalem. Further, Shaukat Ali and the Mufti were held together by 'a more or less accidental convergence of interests, though not of identical political convictions...the two men understood that they were dependent upon each other for the realization of the Congress, which was a common aspiration.\textsuperscript{31}

Preceding the convening of the Jerusalem Congress in 1931, increasing contacts marked the relations between the Indian Khilafat Committee - constituted by the Ali Brothers, Maulana Muhammad Ali and Maulana Shaukat Ali - and the Supreme Muslim Council of Palestine, headed by al-Haj Amin al-Husaini. During the 'Pilgrimage Congress' of 1924 and 1926, both al-Haj Amin and the Khilafat duo found occasions to cement their contacts with each other. Subsequently, Haj Amin engaged himself in a regular correspondence with the Indian leaders. Two instances solidified this fact. In 1928, Haj Amin wrote two letters to Shaukat Ali, which were intercepted by the censor - one on the alleged evils of the Christian Missionary.


\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., p. 130.
Conference held in Jerusalem, and the other on alleged designs of the Jews with the Buraaq and the Aqsa Mosque, requesting the Indian Muslims to protest against such designs. 32

Other developments too cemented the relations between the Muslim leaders of Palestine and the two Indian champions of the Khilafat movement. In 1928, Muhammad Ali paid a visit to Palestine, where he divulged his plan to form a world-wide Pan-Islamic organisation, suffused with branches in every Muslim country, with a view to fighting foreign influence. 33 He also strongly advocated the founding and strengthening of branches of the Muslim Young Men's Association, which were closely linked to the parent branch in Egypt. 34

Indian Muslims showed their deep concern for the unfolding developments associated with Palestine during the preceding years of the Jerusalem Congress. Certain incidents marked their direct involvement. Palestinian accusations against the intentions of British mandate authorities to excavate the Haram area led to the appointment of an Indian Commission of Enquiry which in turn visited Jerusalem as early as 1911 on the request of the British. The Commission held invalid the malafides attributed to the British. From the side of the mandated Palestine, three delegates representing Supreme Muslim Council made a tour of India for nine months during 1923-1924, with the explicit purpose of raising funds for the restoration of the Haram. 35

32. Ibid., p. 129.
33. Ibid., p. 129.
34. Ibid., p. 129.
35. Quoted in ibid., pp. 128-129.
In 1929, the Wailing Wall question evoked a spontaneous response from Indian Muslims which resulted in the observance of an annual Palestine Day (with the first one commemorated on 16 August 1930) in support of, and in solidarity with, the Muslims of Palestine. With the formation of the International Wailing Wall Commission in 1928, the Indian Muslims found themselves presented with another opportunity to show their loyalties towards their co-religionists in Palestine. Consequently, they resolved to send a delegation to the Commission on behalf of the 70 million Muslims of India. It was, indeed, Muhammad Ali, who delivered one of the three closing speeches for the Muslim side before the Commission.36

The Conference, at the outset, was preceded by a hostile environment from the British Mandate authorities, the Zionist press, and the Palestine opposition mounted against the Mufti. A canard was spread that the real objective of the Conference was to nominate ex-Ottoman Caliph, Abdul Majid, to the Caliphate: a suggestion which led to vigorous opposition from the organisers of the Conference. There were also reports to the effect that both the Grand Mufti and Shaukat Ali desired, through the instrumentality of the Congress, to strengthen their individual positions in their respective countries. Some analysts gave credence to such reports. Notable among them was Uri M. Kupferschmidt.37 Despite vehement denials of such charges by the organisers, the misgivings could not be washed off fully.38

Despite the clear absence of conviviality implicit in these charges, the Congress took two significant decisions which later proved to be of very little value: the establishment of a Muslim University in Jerusalem, and the convening of a World Muslim Congress every two years. Maulana Shaukat Ali raised the former issue,

36. Quoted in ibid., p. 129.
37. Ibid., p. 128.
besides wishing to set up a consultative Caliphate body composed of eight to ten persons - a kind of Shura - and to transfer the residence of the ex-Caliph, Abdul Majid, from Nile to Jerusalem. On the basis of this evidence, it could not be surmised that he had envisaged a complete restoration of the Caliphate. However, the convention’s majority, overriding Shaukat’s arguments, did not even debate the Caliphate issue and insisted, ignoring his demand, that the medium of instruction in a Muslim University ought to be in Arabic\textsuperscript{39} as any Muslim should be able to converse in their language of the Quran. Shaukat Ali, on the other, insisted that the instruction was to be in all Islamic languages. However, a great number of Egyptian delegates and the \textit{ulama} of the revered al-Azhar opposed the Congress’s proposal to set up the University in Jerusalem as they feared that it might reduce their importance.\textsuperscript{40} Their attachment to al-Azhar seemed to dominate everything else, whereas Shaukat Ali felt that the Egyptian institution had lost its religious zeal.

Concerning the decision to convene a World Muslim Congress every two years, a committee was formed to give an institutional shape to the Congress for the first time. To this effect, Working Rules and Regulations for the World Muslim Congress were drawn up and the first elections to the various offices of the \textit{Motamar} and those of its councillors (Executive Council) were held, who totalled 25 members, of whom four belonged to the sub-continent. Allama Iqbal led the Indian delegation and was elected the first Vice-President of the \textit{Motamar}, the President being the Grand Mufti of Palestine and Jerusalem was chosen the headquarters of the Congress.\textsuperscript{41}


\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Ibid.}, n. 38, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid.}, n. 29, pp. 105-106.
The Poet-Philosopher of the sub-continent, in a speech delivered at the Congress venue, the al-Aqsa Mosque, underlined the need for protecting the Holy Places. One major success of the Motamar was that it brought to an end the war between Saudi Arabia and Yemen following a Peace Delegation sent by it in 1933 in order to mediate in the 1934 war between Ibn Saud and Imam Yahya. However, the Congress had a short-lived existence. It did not hold the proposed meeting after two years, nor did it meet until the end of World War II. However, the convention witnessed militant and acrimonious debates against Zionist-British designs over Palestine. The General Muslim Congress of Jerusalem, thus, became a chain in the development of an ever increasing involvement of the Arab and Muslim worlds in the struggle against Zionism. Many of those who had participated in the Congress of 1931 were later to take an outspoken anti-Zionist and pro-Palestine stand in their respective countries. Demonstrations against the Jewish National Home policy of Great Britain became a more common phenomenon in many a Muslim country during the years which followed the Jerusalem Congress. The track records of the All-India Muslim League and the Post-Independence Pakistan do bear ample testimony to these realities.

League's Support for the Muslim Causes
Palestine Question

One of the most important issues that engaged the serious attention of the League was the question of Palestine. The seriousness with which this particular

42. Ibid., p. 109.


44. This was the problem with which independent Pakistan was passionately engaged. "Pakistan espoused the cause of the Arabs in Palestine with as much vigour and force as it was capable of. On no subsequent problem of Middle East had Pakistan's advocacy exhibited greater passionate devotion than it did in respect of Palestine". Originally, Dawn (Karachi), 3 June 1952, and quoted in G.S. Bhargava, Pakistan in Crisis (Delhi: Vikas Publications, 1969), p. 105.
issue had come to dominate the Muslim thinking and concern at the time made a scholar to say:

From the 1920s onwards there was no Muslim organisation or party which did not press the British government to give full protection to Arab rights and stop planting Jews in an Arab land.45

In order to comprehend its seriousness on the subject, it would be apt to quote the Resolution, at length, passed by the Patna Session of the League held during December 26-29, 1938. Condemning the Balfour Declaration on Palestine as "unjust", the Session went on to say:

...regards those Arabs who are being subjected to all kinds of persecutions and repressions and who are making all sacrifices for preserving their sacred land, protecting their national rights and emancipating their motherland as heroes and martyrs and congratulates them on their bravery [and] sacrifice...the problem of Palestine is the problem of the Muslims of the whole world (emphasis added), and if the British Government fails to do justice to the Arabs and fulfil the demands of the Muslims of the world, the Indian Muslims will adopt any programme and will be prepared to make any sacrifice that may be decided upon by a Muslim International Conference of which the Muslims of India are duly represented in order to save the Arabs from British exploitation and Jewish usurpation. [The Session]...warns the British Government that if they persist in trying to give a practical shape to the idea prevalent among certain sections of the British and the Americans that Palestine be made the national home of the Jews, it will lead to a state of perpetual unrest and conflict [(emphasis added)].46

The Patna Session also called for the commemoration of 'Palestine Day' on 26 August 1938, which was observed throughout the sub-continent by holding protest meetings and by offering prayers. In October 1938, a deputation consisting of four

leaders was sent to Cairo to attend the Conference on Palestine and to promote the cause of Palestine. It stayed overseas for nine months, visiting Cairo, London, Geneva, Rome and Beirut. In the following year, a Palestine Fund was opened.

Further, the League exhorted the Muslim world to come forward to assist the cause of Arabs of Palestine, as the resolution passed at the Lucknow Session during 15-18 October 1937, demanded:

\[\text{The All-India Muslim League appeals to the rulers of Muslim countries to continue to use their powerful influence and best endeavours to save the holy places in Palestine from the sacrilege of non-Muslim domination and the Arabs of the Holy Land from the enslavement of British Imperialism backed by Jewish finance.}^{47}\]

The same Session further passed a resolution to the effect that

\[\text{... warns the British Government that if it fails to altering the present neo-Jewish policy in Palestine, the Musalmans of India, in consonance with the rest of the Islamic world, will look upon the British as the enemy of Islam and shall be forced to adopt all necessary measures according to the dictates of their faith.}^{48}\]

Reacting to the British decision to partition Palestine, Mohammad Iqbal emphasized that the problem... does not concern Palestine alone but will have wide repercussions in the entire Islamic world,\(^{49}\) thereby bringing out its Pan-Islamic character. Further, in an interview given to Duncan Hooper, Correspondent of Reuter on October 25, 1947, the Quaid-i-Azam said:

\[\text{-----------------------------}\]


The partition of Palestine would entail...the greatest danger and unprecedented conflict and that the entire Muslim world will revolt against such a decision which cannot be supported historically, politically and morally. 50

He further warned that Pakistan would have no other course left but to give its fullest support to the Arabs and would do whatever lies in its power to prevent what was considered to be an outrage. 51 In this context, it would also be pertinent to recall the statement made by Jinnah on the problem of Palestine, in an interview given to Robert Simson, a BBC Correspondent, on 19 December 1947. To quote his statement:

...the Muslims of the sub-continent had been compelled to condemn in the strongest possible manner the unjust and cruel decision of the United Nations concerning the partition of Palestine....Our sense of justice obliges us to help the Arab cause in Palestine in every way that is open to us. 52

Further, in a cable sent to the US President, Harry S. Truman, Jinnah urged the latter to "uphold the rights of the Arabs" and "avoid the greatest consequences and repercussions". 53

It is very instructive to note how prophetic the foregoing proved when one considers the subsequent history of Arab-Jewish relations. Further, there is no

50. Ibid., p.76. Also see Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, Speeches and Statements as Governor-General of Pakistan, 1947-48 (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan, 1989), pp. 81-82.


denying the fact that Palestine is also a Muslim problem in that Jerusalem, being held now by the Israeli state under its control, is the third holy city for Muslims. The passion with which Pakistan espoused the just cause of the Palestinian people in all kinds of international fora had earned it a distinction to head an "Islamic office for military coordination with Palestine" set up at the General Secretariat of the Organisation of Islamic Conference (OIC) in Jeddah. The said office is headed by one of its retired Generals.54

It was Pakistan which took up the cause of the Palestinian Arabs and led the common Muslim battle, shoulder to shoulder with her brother Arab states. Its Foreign Minister, Chaudhri Zafrullah Khan, who held this office during 26 December 1947 to 7 October 1954, was not only elected the leader-in-chief of this fight, but also made a record speech of six hours and a half in the U.N. General Assembly.55 He too, like other Pakistani leaders, opposed tooth and nail the partition of Palestine approved by the UN General Assembly on 29 November 1947 by adopting dubious means.56 It voted against partition and the creation of Israel. Pakistan, though a new entrant to the World Body (admitted to the latter in early October 1947), took up with great vigour, the advocacy of the Arab cause in Palestine as the principal non-Arab Muslim state. Zafrullah presented the clearest and most persuasive statement of the Arab case.57 He canvassed for the Arabs even outside the forums of the United Nations. His brilliant advocacy of the Palestinian Arabs' cause had raised Pakistan's


stature in the Middle East. Such a steadfast championing of the Arab cause in Palestine led a commentator to say that it was almost possible to talk of a 'Middle East bloc, formed by Pakistan and the Arab states.\textsuperscript{58}

**North African Issues**

Besides Palestine, there were some other issues that drew the attention and concern of the League in the pre-partition years which were reflected in its foreign policy orientation.

On January 1926, the League expressed its disapproval of the mandates system; in fact, it demanded its abolition; in December 1926, it condemned the British colonial policy in Egypt; in 1929, sympathy was shown for King Amanullah of Afghanistan; in 1931, Italy was condemned for its atrocities on the people of Tripoli; in 1933, annulment of the Balfour Declaration was demanded; in 1938, it expressed full faith and confidence in the leadership of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem; in 1941, it expressed its anxious concern at the intrusion of allied troops in Iran and Iraq; in 1943, the League demanded the right of self-determination for the peoples of Muslim countries of Maghreb (North Africa) against the colonial rule of European countries, particularly of Italy, and France in the Lebanon;\textsuperscript{59} in February 1942, it viewed with concern and sympathy the question of Muslim Kazakhs of Soviet Russia, and in February 1945, it expressed sympathy with the sufferings of the Musalmans and other Indians in Malaya, Singapore and Burma.\textsuperscript{60} It had sponsored the Indonesian case for Independence before the U.N. Security Council. Prior to that, it condemned the

---

\textsuperscript{58} "Islam in the United Nations", \textit{Round Table} (Oxfordshire), December 1951, p.31.


Dutch attack on Indonesia and considered it as an attack upon itself and denied transit facilities to Dutch ships and planes, carrying war material to Indonesia. On this subject, Quaid-i-Azam had unequivocally extended the League’s support to the Indonesian cause in a statement issued on July 26, 1947:

The action of the Dutch Government in declaring war against Indonesia...will not be tolerated by the civilized nations of the world. Muslim India and Pakistan will consider this an unfriendly act on the part of the Government of Holland which is calculated to crush the freedom of the new democratic Muslim nation of Indonesia. I am sure no right thinking nation can approve of this unjustified act on the part of the Government of Holland, particularly democracies of the United States and the United Kingdom.61

Continuing his indignation, he further expressed himself:

Our deep sympathies go to the people of Indonesia and... that we deeply sympathise with them and will support them in every way that is possible for us in their resistance against this uncalled for and sudden onslaught on the people of Indonesia by the Armed Forces of Holland.62

This was the position adopted by Jinnah barely a month before Pakistan had emerged on the world political map. Independent Pakistan followed it up with verve and renewed energy. The news of the Dutch "police action" against Indonesia in December 1948 raised a storm of protest in Pakistan. The subject came up before Parliament on 23 December through an adjournment motion. Zafrullah Khan, the Foreign Minister, described the Dutch action as "gross stupidity and incredible folly" and "an affront to the soul of Asia and an outrage against human decency". He was aghast that a nation which had "passed through the furnace of invasion and occupation" by the Nazis should take recourse to methods that were the unique


62. Ibid., p.33.
trademark of the latter. On 25 January 1949, he said, in a poignant statement to the press, that newly independent states like Pakistan, viewing the Indonesian struggle for freedom, "felt like a bird, one of whose wings was free but the other was still nailed to the ground", and that that feeling would persist till all Asian countries became completely free.63 The fact that over ninety percent of the people of Indonesia were Muslims made their suffering and misery Pakistan's own. The public perception and the governmental response in Pakistan were largely conditioned by the Muslim factor, inadvertently concording with the response of India whose Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, felt that the subject issued from, and belonged to Imperialism. His statements on the subject bore this fact. Delivering a presidential speech to the Conference on Indonesia (convened with the blessings of the Indian government) in New Delhi in January 1949, Nehru warned that "Asia, too long submissive and dependent and a plaything of other countries, will no longer brook any interference with freedom."64 Pakistan was represented in this inter-governmental Conference by its able foreign minister, Zafarullah Khan, who once again mounted a bitter attack against Netherlands for its military offensive against the Indonesian freedom fighters. In one of the resolutions adopted by the Conference, it was enjoined upon the conferees that they should "instruct" their representatives at the United Nations "to consult among themselves",65 a process resulting in the birth of the Arab-Asian group at the World Body which subsequently expanded into the Asian-African group.

Not contented with the mere denunciatory statements on its part, Pakistan took some concrete steps with a view to showing its solidarity with the people of Indonesia in their hour of suffering. It cancelled the license of the Dutch civil airline KLM, whose aircraft were being used in aid of the Dutch military action in Indonesia. As a


demonstration against the Dutch aggression, the publication of all daily newspapers in Pakistan was suspended on 6 January 1949. The dawn of independence in Indonesia was enthusiastically greeted with a public holiday in Pakistan.

Pakistan's expressions of religious solidarity with the Indonesian people in their struggle for emancipation did not cut much ice with the ruling elites of this Southeast Asian nation in its immediate post-independence years. This new post-colonial state adopted socialism and secularism as the organising principles in the politics of internal transformation. In the arena of external relations, non-alignment provided a canopy which brought it nearer to India than to Pakistan. Muhammad Hatta, the first prime minister of Indonesia, described his Indian counterpart, Jawaharlal Nehru, as the "second father of the Republic of Indonesia", the first being President Soekarno. The Indonesian President considered Nehru as his political "father". During his Indonesian tour in June 1950, Nehru was enthusiastically greeted by the people of Indonesia. The bonhomie was reflected in Nehru's statement to the Indian parliament on 17 March 1950 that Indonesia and India were becoming more and more intimately connected "not by formal treaties and alliances and pacts but by bonds, which are much more secure, much more binding - the bonds of mutual understanding and interest and,...even of mutual affection." However, this initial India-Indonesia bonhomie was not to last long. By the early sixties, bilateral relations between Pakistan and Indonesia improved considerably (as will be shown in the Third Chapter) which was mainly reflected in the extension of Indonesia's support to Pakistan in the latter's war with India in 1965 over the question of Kashmir. Moreover, Indonesia did not appreciate India's support to the formation of the Malaysian Federation which came into being in September 1963. Soekarno's
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differences with Nehru on the subject of Afro-Asian solidarity against colonialism further brought the former closer to Pakistan and China.

Libya owed its creation entirely to the untiring efforts of Pakistan's U.N. delegation, headed by Chaudhri Zafrullah Khan. He led the smaller nations in a remarkable success in defeating the proposal of the Western powers to hand back Libya to Italy. 70

Following World War II, Britain was in occupation of Libya (except Fezzan) and France, the Fezzan. The First Committee of the U.N. General Assembly, at the latter's third session, was of the view that Libya should wait for independence for ten years during which period, it should be divided into three trusteeships - that of Britain in Cyrenaica, France in the Fezzan and Italy in Tripolitania. Zafrullah played a leading role in marshalling opposition to these proposals, and espoused the cause of a United Libya and of its immediate freedom. Thus, the General Assembly disregarded the recommendation of the First Committee in relation to Libya and in November 1949 decided that the whole of Libya should become independent by January 1952. Pakistan's steadfastness in pursuing the course of Libya's independence made an author to say that but for its "efforts... the question of Libya's independence would have remained in cold storage for ten years and might have perpetuated her division into three parts." 71

The independence of the Italian colonies in Africa had engaged Pakistan's diplomatic attention which was carried out under the principle of self-determination. Pakistan bitterly opposed the proposed division of Eritrea between Sudan and Ethiopia. Instead, it wholeheartedly lent its support for the creation of an independent state of Eritrea, but could not carry through the proposal for want of a requisite


majority in the General Assembly. Pakistan's insistence on an independent Eritrea was premised on the principle that "the total Muslim population [of Eritrea] is opposed to anything like the Ethiopian rule." However, the correctness of its stand has been vindicated recently when it became a sovereign state. Till it attained statehood, Eritrea was an autonomous unit federated with Ethiopia.

Zafrullah also opposed Italian trusteeship over Somaliland and supported the UN trusteeship over the territory, which ended with it's independence in 1960.

The Maghreb states - Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco — owed their entire support in the Muslim world to Pakistan. Pakistan campaigned for the independence of these French colonies, within the precincts of the United Nations, over and above the mounting objection raised by France that the matter fell exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of France.

Against this background, it is obvious that there existed "historical sympathy and interest of the Moslems of India for other Moslem countries of West Asia and North Africa."

Other Issues

The League, on a number of occasions also addressed itself to the question of the conditions of Indians in British colonies. Displaying such a concern, the League in a resolution, adopted at the Nagpur Session in December 1910:

...protests against the unrighteous and barbarous treatment of Indian immigrants in British colonies and dependencies, and draws the attention of the Indian and Imperial Governments to the grave consequences of permitting these dominions of the King to enforce regulations and legislative enactments based on racial distinctions, which are humiliating to his Majesty's Indian subjects, and earnestly appeals to the Imperial Government to assert its undoubted supremacy in matters of Imperial importance, and to secure for the Indian subjects of the British Crown the full rights and privileges of British citizenship by the removal of such racial distinction within the Empire.  

On another occasion, the Anglo-Russian rivalry for hegemony over Persia caught the attention of the League at its Calcutta Session held during March 3-4, 1912.

The All India Muslim League places on record its deep sympathy with the people of Persia, who are connected with the Indian Muslims by the closest ties of blood, religion and a common culture, in their unremitting sufferings in their noble efforts to save their unfortunate country from Russian encroachments ... urges upon the Imperial Government to get Russia to adhere to the spirit of the Anglo-Russian convention and more effectively ensure the integrity and independent development of the country.

The aftermath of the First World War had seen the disintegration of the Muslim world and their immediate absorption by the western colonial powers. Mindful of the doom that such an eventuality would spell on the Indian Muslim community, the League, at its Delhi Session held on December 30, 1918, expressed its anxiety, thus:

Having regard to the fact that the Indian Muslims take a deep interest in the fate of their co-religionists outside India and that the collapse of the Muslim powers of the world is bound to have an adverse influence on the political importance of the Muslims in the country, and the annihilation of the military powers of Islam in the world cannot but have
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a far reaching effect on the mind of even the loyal Musalmans of India, the All India Muslim League considers it to be its duty to place before the Government of India and His Majesty’s Government the true sentiments of the Muslim community ... and see that in the territorial and political redistribution to be made, the fullest consideration should be paid to the requirements of the Islamic law with regard to the full and independent control by the Sultan of Turkey ... over the holy places....77

In 1925, suspecting that Iraq was about to be handed over to Britain as a mandatory power, the League passed a resolution declaring that Iraq was a part of Jazirat-ul-Arab.78

Post-Independence Phase

The League’s pre-independence concern for Muslim causes were, after the attainment of statehood, sought to be transformed into organisational forms by means of hosting international conferences (diplomacy of Pan-Islamism), signing bilateral friendship treaties with Muslim states and the like.79 It did not treat its independence as an end in itself, but the beginning of a supreme end - the emancipation of all Muslims wherever they might be, and the rebirth of the Muslim world as a powerful

77. Ibid., p.500.

78. Literally, it means the island of Arabia but "according to Muslim history, tradition, and belief, does not mean the Arabian peninsula alone, but also includes Syria, Mesopotamia [modern Iraq], and Palestine. As the name indicates, Arabia is an island with the waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris making its fourth boundary". See K.K. Aziz, The Indian Khilafat Movement, 1915-1933 : A Documentary Record, pp. xxi-xxii.

79. By the middle of 1951, Pakistan concluded formal treaties of friendship with Syria, Turkey, Iran and Indonesia. From the day Pakistan came into existence, the people of Iran showed a tremendous amount of goodwill and friendliness to the people of Pakistan. The Shah of Iran visited Pakistan in March 1950 and was given grand receptions at all places in Pakistan. See, Afzal, M. Rafique, Coll. and ed., Speeches and Statements of Quaid-i-Millet Liaquat Ali Khan (1941-1951) (Lahore: Research Society of Pakistan, 1975), Second Impression, p. xxvii.
force in the councils of the world. The goals of Pakistan's foreign policy, the tone of which was set by the Quaid-i-Azam himself, were in no small measure, paved the way for the subsequent developments in the area. The pages that follow will analyse Pakistan's endeavours in this respect.

The Quaid-i-Azam, during his pre-and post-partition political career, issued numerous statements and addressed various gatherings, inter alia, on subjects concerning external affairs. If coalesced together and understood in the context to which they were geared, it would not be improper to say that they will form part of Jinnah's and later, Pakistan's external worldview, at least in the latter's formative phase. Addressing a Press Conference at New Delhi on July 14, 1947, Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah outlined the basic tenets of the foreign policy of yet-to-be-born new state of Pakistan:

Pakistan's foreign policy will be most friendly to all the nations. We stand for the peace of the world. We will make our contribution whatever we can do.

Further, in a telegram sent to the President of the London Muslim League on July, 1947, in response to an invitation for a dinner party to commemorate the achievement of Pakistan, the Quaid said:

"Muslim India will discharge its responsibility with full credit and make its contribution towards world peace."
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In a message issued to the nation on the occasion of the inauguration of the Pakistan Broadcasting Service on 15th August, 1947, the Quaid-i-Azam said:

Our object should be peace within and peace without. We want to live peacefully and maintain cordial and friendly relations with our immediate neighbours and with the world at large. We have no aggressive designs against any one. We stand by the United Nations Charter and will gladly make our full contribution to the peace and prosperity of the world.\footnote{Ibid., n.81, pp. 55-56.}

On a different occasion, Jinnah further elaborated the foreign policy objectives of Pakistan in the latter's youthful career. In a broadcast talk on Pakistan delivered to the people of the United States of America, Jinnah, \textit{inter alia}, touched upon the field of foreign policy which outlined Pakistan's external orientation:

Our foreign policy is one of friendliness and goodwill towards all the nations of the world. We do not cherish aggressive designs against any country or nation. We believe in the principle of honesty and fair play in national and international dealings and are prepared to make our utmost contribution to the promotion of peace and prosperity among the nations of the world. Pakistan will never be found lacking in extending its material and moral support to the oppressed and suppressed people of the world and in upholding the principle of the United Nations Charter.\footnote{Ibid., n. 81, pp. 157-158.}

The intent of these pronouncements was to strengthen, in the outside world, the image of Pakistan as a peace-loving state, and to refurbish its distinct sovereign status to the rest of the world.

Jinnah possessed a multi-layered personality. He was amenable to a variety of interpretations depending upon a standpoint taken by an analyst. Some of his statements could be rightfully considered as secularistic, while the other, definitely not inconsiderable, were interspersed with Islamic texture. Symbolic of the former

\footnote{Ibid., n.81, pp. 55-56.}
variety was an excerpt extensively quoted by analysts to buttress Jinnah’s secularistic worldview, from his Presidential Address delivered to the constituent Assembly of Pakistan at Karachi on 11 August 1947.

...if we want to make this great state of Pakistan happy and prosperous, we should wholly and solely concentrate on the well being of the people, and especially of the masses and the poor. If you will work in cooperation, forgetting the past, burying the hatchet, you are bound to succeed. If you change your past and work together in a spirit that everyone of you, no matter to what community he belongs, no matter what relations he had with you in the past, no matter what is his colour, caste or creed, is first, second and last a citizen of this state with equal rights, privi- leges and obligations, there will be no end to the progress you will make... you are free; you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go to your mosques or to any other place of worship in this state of Pakistan. You may belong to any religion or caste or creed - that has nothing to do with the business of the state...

If the foregoing is solely relied upon to evaluate Jinnah and his Weltanschauung by excluding his not-so-inconsiderable references to Islam, made at different times and on different occasions, then Jinnah is bound to be meted out a segmentalized treatment by historians which may not be a correct depiction of his personality. Jinnah’s Address to the Constituent Assembly needs to be situated in its historicity. The immediate objective of the Address was to heal the wounds of partition and to assure the minorities of their safe and secure future in an independent, Muslim-predominant Pakistan. National reconstruction was on top among the priorities of Jinnah following partition. He rightly visualized that national solidarity alone could achieve national reconstruction. Juxtaposing the paraphrased statement with Jinnah’s numerous other references to Islam, a reader may find that Jinnah was an amalgam of contradictions. However, in a deeper sense, his exhortations to Islam were civilizational in nature, and not theological in any sense. In fact, Jinnah had no
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stomach for theological disputations. Notwithstanding this, it would be erroneous to say that he had no sense of Islam in his veins. By Islam, he meant a historical, civilizational entity which inspired mankind to fight for freedom, equality, fair play, justice in all dealings among human beings. Jinnah’s emphasis was, thus, on humanistic egalitarian ethos of Islam as he understood them. 86

**Pakistan and Iran**

In respect of Pakistan’s relations with Muslim countries in its formative years, it was able to build useful contacts with its neighbour, Iran. Pakistan’s relations with the latter were decidedly close from the very beginning. Iran not only adjoins Pakistan but culturally is closest to Pakistan. More students in Pakistan read Persian than any other foreign language. The Urdu and Persian alphabets are identical and Pakistanis have been greatly influenced by Persian literature and art. Iran was the first state to accord diplomatic recognition to Pakistan. Besides, it was also the first country to give every possible help in the rehabilitation of the uprooted Muslim refugees. 87

During 1948-1952, Raja Ghazanafar Ali Khan was accredited as Pakistan’s Ambassador to Iran. In this period, he played a very important role in cementing relations between the two countries, facilitated by historical legacy, common culture and religious antecedents. Liaquat Ali Khan, who visited Iran during 14-18 May


1949, aired his country's special attachment towards Iran among the Muslim states. At Tehran on 15 May, 1949, he declared that "Iran is the closest to our heart and that Pakistan and Iran would stand together in prosperity and in adversity" and that "all Muslim countries are our affectionate friends".\textsuperscript{88}

Assessing the outcome of Liaquat Ali Khan's tour of Iran, Ghazanfar Ali Khan observed:

I remember most vividly the few days that he spent in Iran which was the first country to have extended an official invitation to the Prime Minister. Five days is a period too short to produce any result and yet in this short span of time, Liaquat left such a deep impression on the people of Iran that every class which came into contact with him, the Shahanshah, the ulema, the Press and the people, became such enthusiastic admirers of Pakistan that it became for them a symbol for faith, for purity and for progress.\textsuperscript{89}

In a different context, Ghazanfar also observed the pro-Pakistani attitude of the Iranian Press in regard to Kashmir issue and the problem of the tribal areas of Pakistan.

The Pakistan-Iran cordiality as evidenced in the foregoing had resulted in the treaty of friendship signed by them in Tehran in February 19, 1950. The treaty provided for good neighbourly relations and reciprocal most-favoured-nation treatment.

Ghazanfar Ali Khan had further noted that Liaquat Ali Khan had made a joint plan in collaboration with the Egyptian Prime Minister Nahas Pasha and the Iranian Premier Mohammad Mossadeq in connection with the liberation of Suez from the

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., p.44.
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British colonial occupation, the right of Iran to nationalise the Anglo-Iranian oil company, the dispute of Kashmir, and the problem of Palestine. Before he could do anything further on these issues, Liaquat was assassinated in 1951.\footnote{Ibid., p.49.}

Both Raja Ghazanafar and Liaquat Ali Khan cherished together an avowed objective of Pakistan’s foreign policy to bring Islamic unity among Muslim states of the world.

**Pakistan and Turkey**

From the beginning, Pakistan’s ties with Turkey had been friendly. In reply to the Turkish ambassador’s presentation of credentials to him, the Quaid-i-Azam endearingly paid glowing tributes to the Turkish people and its leaders and referred to the ceremony’s "unique significance to the people of Pakistan". Continuing his reply, the Quaid indicated as to what Turkey stood in store for the people of Pakistan.

Turkey has been in our thoughts constantly and has drawn our admiration for the valour of your people and the way in which your state’s men and leaders have struggled and fought almost single-handed in the midst of Europe for your freedom and sovereignty which have been happily maintained....right from the very birth of political consciousness amongst the Muslims of this great sub-continent, the fortunes of your country were observed by us with deep sympathy and interest...the Muslims of Pakistan entertain sentiments of affection and esteem for your country, and now Turkey and Pakistan both are free, sovereign and independent countries, can strengthen ties more and more for the good of both.\footnote{Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, *Speeches and Statements as Governor-General of Pakistan, 1947-48* (Islamabad: Government of Pakistan, 1989), pp. 161-162.}

Such affectionate feelings towards Turkey played no insignificant a part in the subsequent cementing of variegated ties both at bilateral and multilateral levels

\begin{flushright}  
90. Ibid., p.49.  
\end{flushright}
between the two countries. The Baghdad Pact and the Regional Cooperation for Development (RCD) were the cases in point with regard to the latter. Turkey's practice of secularism (Ataturkism) as the state ideology did occasionally lead to frictions with Pakistan's espousal of Islamic ideology. For instance, in November, 1951, Ankara demanded the recall of Pakistan's Ambassador to Turkey, Mian Bashir Ahmad, on the ground that the latter was encouraging "religious reactionaries".  

However, Turkey's laicist policy did not prevent it from recognizing Islam as a civilizational and historical entity in whose configuration it had played a no mean role. It was the custodian of the unique Islamic institution of Caliphate from 1517 till the latter's abolition in March 1924. With Pakistan's formal admission into the Baghdad Pact (later CENTO) on 23 September 1955, its relations with Ankara reached a decisive phase.

**International Islamic Economic Conference**

Pakistan hosted an international Islamic Economic Conference in Karachi, its capital, during 25 November to 6 December 1949, with a view to developing, from Islamic fundamental principles, a programme of economic and social justice among the societies of Muslim states. By then, Pakistan as an young state, was thinking in terms of introducing certain reforms in its domestic economy. Such an enthusiasm on its part found its resonance at the international level also as evidenced in its efforts to promote economic cooperation among Muslim states. In the domestic sphere, the Muslim League recommended the ending of the zamindari system in 1949. Cooperative farming in a selected area was started.  

--------------------------------------


Finance Minister, was quoted to have said in an address to the All-Pakistan Economic Conference that "we are trying to aim at new ideas and we mean to achieve them".95 Further, at an international forum, he was reported to have said that "Lands belong to God and sovereignty belongs to God".96 It was within this perspective that Pakistan's international behaviour found its rationale in the context of its attempted forays into the Muslim world. Multilateral economic diplomacy was one of the tactics employed by Pakistan to arrive at the strategic goal of Islamic solidarity among the Muslim countries. With this end in view, Pakistan's Prime Minister, Liaquat Ali Khan, inaugurated the Islamic Economic Conference by saying that 'Pakistan has one and only one ambition: to serve Islam and humanity....We all belong to the great brotherhood of Islam. Islam alone can solve some of the problems facing the world today.'97 Speaking further, he exhorted the delegates to formulate a course of action which would benefit the people of the Muslim countries and strengthen the ties of brotherhood which already existed between them.98 Speaking on the occasion, Finance Minister, Ghulam Mohammad, who actually founded the Conference remarked: 'Besides being united in a common faith, a common outlook and a common way of life, we form also a geographic unity'.99 In his Presidential speech, he exhorted the Muslim countries to go beyond economic cooperation and "become an organic whole in which each part strengthens the whole and the whole imparts life to each part" and also to "develop a system of collective bargaining and collective
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security". Underlining the ideological basis for solidarity, Ghulam Mohammad continued:

We are now under pressure from two different ideologies (western democracy and Soviet Communism), both striving to gain our allegiance. We are told that there are only two ideologies... You must accept one and repudiate the other... One purpose of convening this conference is to grapple with this dilemma and determine objectively and frankly whether we are constrained to subscribe to the one or the other.

Answered he in the same vein:

We cannot put implicit faith in the western democratic system nor can we subscribe to communism, although there are some aspects of this vast and comprehensive experiment which we must appreciate.... Islamic society has never been subjected to the stress and strains of class war and morbid hatred of the rich has never been one of its characteristics.... Islam is the golden mean between these two extremes; it is a non-violent method of rectifying unsocial and detrimental inequalities.

The Conference, it is worth noting, condemned the West for its imperialism and also the Muslim autocratic rulers who did not go scot free either. On the positive side, the Conference recommended the formation of a ‘Commonwealth of Muslim Nations’; and within the brotherhood of Islamic countries, economic cooperation, mutual exchange of knowledge and expansion of trade; the creation of a
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102. Ibid., n. 97, p. 97. Much of what his answer contained is reflected in what it does with the name of Islamic Resurgence in the contemporary Muslim World. Implicit in these statements was the perceived self-sufficing nature of Islam which was interpreted as having the potential to be independent of both Democracy and Communism, in its worldview, and hence its ability to provide a third alternative to the Muslim world at the least during the Cold War years.

Pan-Islamic Air Company and Pan-Islamic Bank, and the formation of an International Federation of Islamic Chambers of Commerce and Industry, but unfortunately the resolution has not been implemented. However, the recommendation pertaining to Pan-Islamic Bank could see the light of the day only in 1974 when the Islamic Development Bank (IDB) came into being, as a result of the decision of the organisation of Islamic Conference (OIC).

The Conference was well organised and elaborately prepared. It was sponsored by a number of private businessmen in Pakistan; it had a semi-official character and was attended by official observers from all the Muslim countries; and the businessmen, industrialists and engineers from Muslim countries belonging to North Africa, the Middle East, Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan participated in it. Among those dignitaries who attended the Conference were Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia and Aden Abdullah Osman of Somalia, who later became the first heads of state of their respective countries upon achieving independence. Commenting upon the Conference while it was in session, the London-based Economist noted that the wider issue behind the whole effort was "whether Pakistan will be able to assume the leadership of widely flung people who, however much they may have in common, have hitherto been more noted for their 'agreement to disagree' than for any effective cooperation. Pakistan undoubtedly has ambitions of this sort".

The Conference was to meet every year in some Muslim country. In 1950, the second meeting of the Economic Conference was held in Tehran. No concrete achievement emanated from this Conference except the establishment of a permanent


Secretariat. The Tehran Convention was attended by ten states. The Secretariat was required to undertake the following tasks:

1. Collection, compilation, analysis and dissemination of statistics regarding social and economic matters;
2. Preparation of a Statistical Year Book;
3. Survey of economic and social conditions obtaining in various countries of the region;
4. Research on economic problems of the region;
5. Assistance to individual countries of the region in preparing development plans;
6. Preparation of regional development plans with the help, where necessary, of experts specifically engaged for this purpose; and
7. Maintenance of register of technical, scientific, educational and research institutes within the region. 108

Various Committees were appointed which reported on ways and means of achieving economic cooperation and these did some valuable work. At Tehran, a change was made in the constitution, by which membership was to be channeled through the government of the country concerned. 109 Although the International Islamic Economic Conference continued to function, no conference took place from 1951 to 1952. Syria accepted to play host in 1951, and in May 1954, it was held again in Karachi. It was an association recognised by the United Nations but the initial enthusiasm died after 1950. 110 Such a state of affairs was testified by Foreign
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Minister Zafrullah Khan himself in his Presidential address to the third assembly of the Conference. Describing it as a 'profound pity', he told the assembled gathering that progress towards the attainment of the aims of the organisation had not kept pace with the initial enthusiasm.111 This conclave redefined the original objectives of the organisation with a view to giving new life to it but all in vain. After the 1954 Karachi meeting, the conference silently passed away.112

Other Pan-Islamic Endeavours

The Motamar-e-Alam-e-Islam

The Motamar is the oldest and largest International Muslim Organisation. It was founded in 1926 in Makkah.113 Among its founder-members, from the Indian sub-continent were: Maulana Muhammad Ali and Maulana Shaukat Ali, the Mufti Kifayatullah and the renowned Islamic scholar Syed Sulayman Nadvi. Allama Mohammad Iqbal and Liaquat Ali Khan were among those who were associated with the Motamar.114 Inamullah Khan, the Secretary-General of the Motamar and who was a 'Myanmarese-born Pakistani, started his public Pan-Islamic career in October 1950, presented to the UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie a scroll with one million Muslim signatures which he brought himself to New York, together with a memorandum on the Kashmir case.

111. S.M.Burke, Mainsprings of Indian and Pakistani Foreign Policies (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974), p.135.
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113. The Motamar was said to be a continuation of the Muslim Convention held in Makkah (1926) and in Jerusalem (1931). Its beginning dates back to the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine. It met for the first time in 1931 in Jerusalem, to discuss the protection of the Islamic shrines in Palestine. See F.W.Fernau, Moslems on the March (London: Robert Hale, 1955), p.84.
The Motamar held its first meeting in February 1949 in Karachi. As an international Muslim body, it seems that the Motamar had, in 1948, succeeded a Cairo-based pre-World War II Organisation, called the Association of Islamic Brotherhood (Jamiat al-Ukhwa al-Islamiyya, in Arabic)\textsuperscript{115} It was set up as a non-governmental organisation on the following principles: propagating the principles of Islam; eliminating the nationalist ties and communal hostilities imposed by geographical conditions; cooperating with all Muslim lands in order to promote Islamic unity.\textsuperscript{116}

The Motamar's Karachi meeting was attended by delegates from 19 countries, all in their non-official capacities. The Motamar met twice before Pakistan came into being: in 1926 at Makkah and in 1931 at Jerusalem. It could not meet during the inter-War years, and also during the years immediately succeeding World War II, and "remained dormant till revived by Pakistani efforts"\textsuperscript{117} as evidenced when it met in Karachi in 1949. In the same year, the government of Pakistan did its utmost to host a Congress which was to be attended by official delegates from the Muslim World but ended in vain as there was no overt enthusiasm from the Arab and non-Arab Muslim states for such a gathering.\textsuperscript{118} Through such an ill-fated Islamic Conference which Pakistan wanted to convene in the winter of 1949 in Karachi, it unsuccessfully sought to enter into treaties of formal alliance with the members of the Arab League and other Muslim states.\textsuperscript{119}
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The second meeting of the Congress was held in the same city during 9-11 February 1951, with the tacit support and patronage of Liaquat Ali Khan. The second convention undertook to strive to persuade Muslim governments and peoples to renounce their differences; to propagate Arabic as the lingua franca of all Muslims; to assist any Islamic people which was attacked; and to unite in defence of Islam.\(^{120}\)

The meeting was presided over by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, al-Haj Amin al-Husaini, who was made to do so as a symbolic gesture to lend greater respectability to Pakistan's efforts and to emphasize its links with the first two Congresses (Makkah, 1926 and Jerusalem, 1931). Muslim delegates from all countries, except the Soviet Union and India, took part in its deliberations. The Conference proposed projects in the spheres of commerce, education, and social welfare; establishment of a Red Crescent Medical Relief Organisation and an Inter-Islamic peoples' volunteer corps to pursue relief activities within the Muslim countries. A proposal to establish an international education and welfare trust was made in order to facilitate exchange of professors and students and award scholarships for higher learning and research. Besides, Motamar had planned to institute seminars of Islamic studies to study various aspects of Islam in the spirit of objective scholarship.\(^{121}\)

In his Presidential address, Liaquat Ali Khan queried the audience:

> If the Western democracies can enter into pacts to promote their way of life, if the communist countries can form a bloc on the basis that they have an ideology, why cannot Muslim people get together to protect themselves and to show to themselves and show to the world that they have an ideology and a way of life which ensures peace and harmony for the world?\(^{122}\)

\(^{120}\) Ibid., n.115, pp. 281-282.
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The query makes it obvious that the exhortation for Islamic unity and solidarity was sought not only on economic, political and security reasons, but also on ideological considerations: to posit Islam as an ideological system vis-a-vis the West's democracy and the Soviet Union's Communism. Al-Haj Amin al-Husaini endorsed Liaquat's call for unity and asked for the creation of a Muslim bloc cooperating in matters of culture, economy, politics, and defence. Liaquat's and al-Husaini's exhortations were further reinforced by Pakistan's Minister for Industries, Chowdhry Nazir Ahmed, when the latter addressed the Congress on the final day (11 February 1951) and summed up the results of the conclave. While endorsing the calls for unity, he added that it was not a pious wish and mere conferences were not suffice. These sentiments must be translated into practical achievements, "so that all Muslim countries become part of an integrated whole capable of rendering active service to each other in times of need." Pakistani leaders' endeavours to ideologize Islam at different Muslim forums could be underlined in the contemporary context of Islamic reassertion in the Muslim states. On 9 February 1951, in an address to the Motamar, Liaquat Ali Khan defined the place of Pakistan in the wider Islamic world, in such a formulation which signified her aspirations thereto. For its elucidation and clarity of thought, the formulation deserves to be quoted at length:

To us in Pakistan nothing is dearer than the prospect of the strengthening of the world-wide Muslim brotherhood. Any endeavour, from whatever direction it is made, to bring the Muslims of far-flung countries together and to stimulate in them brotherly feelings of mutual affection, understanding and cooperation readily finds an echo in the hearts of the Muslims of Pakistan...the underlying idea of the movement for the achievement of Pakistan was not just to add one more country to the conglomeration of countries in the world or to add one more patch of colour to the multi-coloured global map. Pakistan came into being as a

---------------------

123. Mushtaq Ahmad believes that the Motamar and the Economic Conference were parts of the scheme for the reconstruction of Muslim polity. See his Pakistan's Foreign Policy (Karachi: Space Publishers, 1968), p.103.
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result of the urge felt by the Muslims of this sub-continent to secure a territory, however limited, where the Islamic ideology and way of life could be practised and demonstrated to the world. A cardinal feature of this ideology is to make Muslim brotherhood a living reality. It is, therefore, part of the mission which Pakistan has set before itself to do everything in its power to promote closer fellowship and cooperation between Muslim countries.  

In this session, Liaquat praised the Motamar for having adopted as their motto the Quranic saying, "verily, all Muslims are brethren.". Arif Hussain remarked:

Pakistan was making a wholehearted bid for the leadership of the Muslim world, or at least for the leadership in achieving its unity. The practicability of taking as an aim of policy the formation of a Muslim bloc did not look very encouraging in the circumstances of the day.  

However, the Economic Conference and the Motamar meeting had enabled Pakistan to establish its credentials as a champion of Pan-Islamic solidarity. The London based Islamic Review in an Editorial of its November issue of 1953, quoted Liaquat Ali Khan as having warned the Muslim world of the danger of losing its entity if it did not take steps to form a bloc of its own. He knew that for the Muslim there was not but one escape from the slavery of the West and the East - the Muslim bloc; for the divided Muslim world was too weak to withstand the pressure from the West or the East if its component parts did not weld themselves into one unit.

129. 'The Future of the Muslim World' The Islamic Review (London), Vol.XLI, No.11, November 1953, p.3.
In 1950, Chaudhury Khaliquzzaman, President of the Muslim League, proposed in an environment dominated by Pakistan's enthusiasm to bring about Islamic unity, a union of Islamic states explicitly based on the Quranic injunctions:

If the Muslims started recognising Pakistan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Iran, Iraq, Turkey or Afghanistan (and others) which are Muslim states, as Islamic states, they would be guilty of dividing Muslim polity for all time to come and making further progress in the direction of the unification of the Muslim states into any form or association, federal or otherwise, an impossibility. It is the duty of Muslims all over the world to work for the establishment of the Quranic state (emphasis added), through political associations, social contact, economic cooperation and linguistic changes, so that Muslim genius in statecraft may be able to evolve a central authority for the Muslim world through democratic federation or otherwise, not for aggression, not for exploitation, but to discharge the duty which has been cast on them by the Divine Will.130

Notwithstanding all this, in 1952, Karachi was the host to an international Islamic Conference of religious scholars (Ehtifalul Ulama-i-Islami) to which ulama from different countries were invited. Addressing the delegates, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin al Husaini, underlined the need for Muslim unity in the following words:

....blocs are being formed...in the world on the basis of belief and thought. On the one hand, there is the Anglo-American bloc. On the other hand, the nations believing in Communism are forming themselves into a bloc. Each nation and each country is joining one bloc or the other. Only the Muslims in the face of so many difficulties and problems have so far failed to form themselves into the ummah. Therefore, it was our duty to respond to the call of the 'ulama' of Pakistan to consider closer cooperation among the 'ulama' of the world, to popularize Islamic culture, jurisprudence and way of life [emphasis added], and to replace the modern laws in Muslim countries with Islamic laws.131


131. Ibid., p. 15.
Of the two resolutions passed at this meeting, one related to the expulsion of Christian missions from Muslim lands and the other urged the Muslim scholars to evolve a new concept of Muslim nationality\textsuperscript{132} In 1952, Chaudhury Khaliquzzaman, the President of the Muslim League, made a move to found a Muslim Peoples' Organisation\textsuperscript{133}, and also to set up a Muslim bloc of states which he labelled as 'United Islamistan' (a united land of Islam purported to override the specific nationalistic and ethnic loyalties existing amongst the Muslim states). With this end in view, in September 1949, he embarked on a two-month long tour which took him to Tehran, Baghdad, Damascus, Beirut, Makkah, Cairo and London. The tour was intended to sound "public opinion

-------------------


\textsuperscript{133} It stood for the following objectives:

(a) "The Organisation's first objective is to strengthen the Islamic faith among all Muslims and its advancement by good morals and the providing of all services in the spirit of a generous Islam;

(b) To liberate Muslim peoples, politically and economically, from foreign rule, and to bring together all their forces and resources for the benefit of their peoples and states;

(c) To rise the intellectual and material levels of the individual in muslim lands, to guarantee his social and political rights, to work for establishing and buttressing economic justice among Muslim peoples, in accordance with the principles of Islam, to publicise true culture among them and to protect them from factors of decline preventing their progress until the Muslim countries take up their appropriate place among nations;

(d) Broadening the scope of foreign language teaching in Islamic lands, in order to facilitate reciprocal understanding, and fostering instruction in the language of the \textit{Koran} among Muslim peoples, as it is the language of their religion, in which every Muslim ought to be proficient;

(e) The organisation will strive to strengthen the economic and cultural relations among Muslim lands and to spread mutual understanding and affection between Muslim individuals and groups. It is to be noted in this context that the architects/founders of this Organisation stated themselves as "we, the representatives of the Muslim peoples...." For details, see Jacob M. Landau, \textit{The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organisation} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 373-74.
for the formation of a peoples’ organisation representing all the Muslim countries of
the World with a view to discussing common factors among themselves as also
evolving of necessary common policy which may benefit Islam and the Muslim World
as a whole". During the course of his travels, he met a plethora of "state
dignitaries: the Iraqi Premier, King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia, the Egyptian premier,
the Secretary General of the Arab League, the Grand Muftees of Palestine and Egypt,
and the leaders of the Majlis-e-Istiqlal party in Iraq and the Wafd party in Egypt.
Ostensibly, having begun his tour with a view to achieving people-to-people
solidarity, the Muslim League leader came out with an ambitious scheme known as
United Islamistan. Elaborating the nature of the project in Cairo, he described it as an
"Atlantic Pact" which was supposed to take into its vortex all the Middle Eastern
Countries from Pakistan to Turkey. "If and when Islamistan is formed" he declared,
"it will be an iron curtain against foreign ideologies". Reflecting the transnational
character of his project, he declared in Cairo that "nationality to Muslims is like Idol
worship". After explaining his plan for a bloc of Islamic states (to be read as
United Islamistan) to the leaders and peoples of the Middle Eastern countries, the
Pakistani leader left for London to discuss Islamistan with "responsible British
officials" He sought and failed to obtain British support for his plan.


135. S.M. Burke, *Mainsprings of Indian and Pakistani Foreign Policies*
    (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974), p.136


In the Pakistani leader's scheme of things, the base of the Arab League needed to be broadened by supplementing it with a Muslim bloc of states (United Islamistan), with the former serving as a nucleus for the latter. The reformulated (or reformed) body was intended to serve as a clearing house for debates about, and solutions to, issues of general relevance, such as the liberation of Muslims governed by others.  

In March 1949, and in May 1952, Khaliquzzaman convened conferences in Karachi attended by delegates from Pakistan and several other Muslim states. But his emphasis on involvement in the political problems of all Muslim nations and his slogan, 'break the boundaries between Muslim countries', all in true Pan-Islamic style, might have frightened some delegates away.

At personal level, Khaliquzzaman appeared to have been pleased with his Pan-Islamic schemes. In fact, all was not well. His efforts to recruit supporters for the Muslim Peoples' Organisation from other countries bore no fruit and the Organisation appeared active only in Pakistan. Moreover, news media in Pakistan was not favourably disposed towards the "Islamistan" proposal. For instance, in an editorial titled "caution Islamistan", Dawn, sought "to reassure all those in the Middle East and elsewhere in whose minds doubts and question marks may have arisen", and asserted that Khaliquzzaman's vision of Islamistan as a basis for a Muslim security pact obtained support neither from the ruling party over which he presided (the Muslim League) nor from the government of Pakistan. In the National Assembly, members sought government's clarification regarding its position vis-a-vis Chaudhuri's tour. The government replied that it had nothing to do with it. The
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Daily further commented: "However well-intentioned Chaudhuri Khaliquzzaman's 'Islamistan tour' might have been, it has actually resulted in far more harm than good to Pakistan."\textsuperscript{142} Khaliquzzaman's move to undermine the Arab League through the Muslim Peoples' Organisation did not go well with the Arabs. Further, the fact that his itinerary did include London which was the last leg of his tour, enabled many to cast aspersions on his real intentions, so much so that his proposed scheme was perceived by his critics as a brainchild of Western imperialism. Mindful of these charges levelled by his critics against his plans, Khaliquzzaman, several years afterwards, realized that his Middle Eastern mission was ill-timed as it took place barely two years of post-Independence Pakistan. He was later to say that Indian propaganda about Pakistan's ability to survive partition had its effect on the Arab world. He bemoaned that the latter was "completely ignorant of all we [Pakistanis] had done for Palestine and other Muslim countries".\textsuperscript{143}

During his London stay, Khaliquzzaman met the Turkish ambassador to London and asked him as to why the Turks had given up the institution of Caliphate, which had conferred on them unique status in the world. In his reply, the ambassador stated that the war, in which the Indian army including many Muslims had fought against the Turks, had resulted in the depletion of Turkey's empire and resources as a consequence of which she could no longer meet the obligations stemming from the revered institution of Caliphate.\textsuperscript{144}

In 1952, Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, the Foreign Minister, paid an official visit to Turkey. On 22 February 1952, he said in Ankara, the Turkish capital, that he

\textsuperscript{142} Dawn (Karachi), 15 November 1949.

\textsuperscript{143} Chaudhuri Khaliquzzaman, \textit{Only If They Knew It!} pp. 31-32.

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., p.16.
had not known of any specific proposal to form a Muslim bloc but "as so many countries with the same faith and culture have achieved their independence, there is] bound to be a tendency towards closer relations."\(^ {145}\) Following the orders of his Prime Minister, he visited a number of Muslim countries in March 1952. Consequently, Pakistan invited the Prime Ministers of twelve Muslim countries to attend a meeting in the near future to consider the setting up of a system of consultation on issues of common concern. Sir Zafrullah said that he had discussed the idea and the countries had "revealed a general desire for closer collaboration"\(^ {146}\) Among the twelve invitee countries, seven had acceded to the proposal in principle, but others including Turkey, Lebanon and Afghanistan had declined to attend.\(^ {147}\) Egypt was steadfastly opposed to the holding of such a meeting. Turkey contended that it was not interested in the setting up of the proposed system of consultation as it felt that political alignments based on religion had not found favour with its government. It was, thus, obvious from the very outset that Pakistan's abortive bid, in the summer of 1952, to convene a Muslim Prime Ministers' Conference in Karachi evoked no worthwhile positive response from the invitees. Moreover, it vindicated the apathy prevalent among the latter towards Pakistan's alleged ambition to seize the leadership of the Muslim world. Denying that Pakistan had nourished such an ambition, Zafrullah, in a Press Conference on 2 May 1952, made a long statement:

> In some quarters it has been said that this is an attempt by Pakistan to lead the Muslim World. This is to restrict cooperation among the Asian and African States. Every one of these and similar other assertions, if they are due to misunderstanding and misconception, are deliberate falsehoods by mischievous people. It is also said that there is some game

\(^ {145}\) Pakistan News (Islamabad), 8 March 1952.

\(^ {146}\) Ibid., 5 April 1952.

\(^ {147}\) Round Table (Oxfordshire) June 1952, p.259.
Pakistan wants to play; that it desires the States whom it wants to invite to participate in this system, so that they should pull Pakistani chestnuts out of the fire. If such an idea exists, I wish to completely refute it.\footnote{Dawn (Karachi), May 3, 1952.}

Notwithstanding this, the apathy found among the invitees could not be stemmed; instead, it was further reinforced by the political dynamics of the times. Making an oblique reference to them, the Pakistani Foreign Minister himself informed the Parliament on 30 September 1953 that due to changed circumstances in some of the countries, the idea could not be pursued further. Those changed circumstances, it may be averred, pertained to the fact that Islam was not then an issue in the politics of the Arab countries. Moreover, the introduction of cold war politics into the region via the bilateral and multilateral security pacts had created a wedge between the Arab and the non-Arab Muslim countries, namely Pakistan, Iran and Turkey. With the Arab Iraq joining the defence pacts, a split in the Arab ranks became inevitable. In view of these changed scenario, Pan-Arabism and anti-imperialism occupied a primacy of place in the then political landscape of the Arab world. The former emphasized linguistic and territorial nationalism to get rid of European domination.

In an article captioned "Pakistan Comes Back to Earth", The Economist, in its issue of 24 May 1952, made a reference to the proposed Prime Ministers' Conference, and observed that Pakistan's venture appeared to have ended in disappointment and a halt was likely to be called to the Pan-Islamic trend in Pakistan. It also quoted the remark of the revered al-Azhar Rector to the effect that 'too many Islamic conferences had been called in Pakistan.' The same magazine, in its issue of 29 May 1953, revealed that the Government of Pakistan was now giving up its policy of 'running after' Muslim countries. Dawn in its issue of 4 May 1952, contextualized the 'running after' by stating that "Pakistan is not adding to its prestige on the
international field by running after certain other countries which are economically and otherwise in a far less stable position than Pakistan itself and which can really be of little help to us." Sir Zafrullah, however, refuted this allegation and said that if espousing any of the Middle East causes is a key to our policy, it has been there ever since Pakistan took birth.149 Further, he denied any endeavour on Pakistan’s part to assume a leadership role of the Muslim world. Be that as it may, the proposed parley never materialized. Commenting retrospectively on the subject, a Pakistani writer observed that the proposed Prime Ministers meet had to be abandoned for want of enthusiasm on the part of the invitee countries.150

The other Pan-Islamic efforts that Pakistan made did not evoke much interest and enthusiasm in the rest of the Muslim world. In April 1954, Karachi hosted a third session of the International Islamic Economic Conference which confined itself to purely economic issues. In January 1955, an International Assembly of Muslim Youth was started in Karachi, whose Chief Organiser was the Secretary of the Motamar. In his address to the Assembly, Prime Minister Mohammad Ali of Bogra suggested a great commonwealth of Islam extending from Morocco to Indonesia, adopting a middle road between conflicting ideologies.

Further, in August 1954, Pakistan under Ghulam Mohammad signed an agreement with Egypt and Saudi Arabia (King Saud) in their meeting at Makkah for the establishment of what was described as the 'short-lived and vaguely defined


'Islamic Congress' with the latter's headquarters in Cairo. Anwar Sadat was made Secretary-General of the Congress while King Saud acting as its Chairman. The Congress was sponsored by Egypt under the leadership of Gamal Abdel Nasser, who, after having effected an 'Officers Revolution' in 1952, regarded imperialism as the greatest enemy of the Arab and Muslim countries. The Congress, symbolising the third aspect of his foreign policy triad of Arab, African, and Islamic circles (as contained in his The Philosophy of the Revolution, 1954), aimed at devising ways and means by which bonds of unity could be established among all the Muslim nations of the world. Analysts quoted Sadat as having cited in his autobiography that the objective of the Congress was to work for closer links between Arab Muslim countries as well as for certain foreign policy goals of Egypt such as 'frustrating the Baghdad Pact'. To say in broad terms, the objectives of the Congress were "to strengthen the ties of confidence and Islamic brotherhood, to raise the standard of Muslims in their economy and education, to establish new relationships or strengthen older ones, to organise their efforts towards cooperation and unity, to give attention in a general way to the affairs and interests of Muslims, and to do all it can to bring about the good and welfare of all Muslims in various countries". Thus, the objectives of the Congress were couched in such an ambiguous parlance (rightly described by James Piscatori as 'vaguely defined') as to enable the sponsoring states to utilize the Congress to serve their respective foreign policy goals. This was what actually happened when Nasser sought the goal of achieving Pan-Arab nationalism under his leadership.


The Congress was expected to encourage religious, cultural and educational exchange among Muslims of the World.\textsuperscript{154} In fact, the Congress awarded scholarships to students from Islamic countries to study in Egypt.\textsuperscript{155} In the initial stages, both Saudi Arabia and Pakistan gave Congress wholehearted support and promised continuous participation in its deliberations.\textsuperscript{156} The Congress, however, failed to generate enough response among the Muslim nations. Pakistan did not even pay dues and Saudi Arabia stopped payment after a year or two, and ultimately, the Congress remained purely an Egyptian concern which was expected to use Islam in Black Africa and elsewhere for political ends to find support for Nasser's policies.\textsuperscript{157} In fact, in January 1956, the Egyptian minister of endowments travelled to Senegal and Liberia to show Egypt's concern for the Welfare of Muslims there.\textsuperscript{158} In this connection, Sadat too paid visits to various countries of the region. However, differences over the Baghdad Pact among Arabs did not allow Nasser to effectively assume the leadership of the Arab Muslim world.

In retrospect, the Congress could not have a long life in view of the internal differences and dissensions among the sponsoring states. By 1954, Pakistan became a member of the Western alliance system sponsored by the United States of America, following the former's disillusionment with the Pan-Islamic foreign policy cultivated by it till then. Egypt, on the other hand, started espousing the cause of Afro-Asian
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solidarity and the movement of non-aligned countries. Besides, Pakistan, with the death of Ghulam Mohammad, withdrew from the Congress which practically rendered it defunct and redundant.

In 1957, an Islamic colloquium was held in Lahore in which some Western scholars on Islam participated. However, the colloquium had no political significance.

These and other similar Pan-Islamic ventures of Pakistan were further reinforced by the stipulation in the 1956 Constitution, enjoining the Pakistani state 'to endeavour to strengthen the bonds of unity among Muslim countries, to promote international peace and security, to foster goodwill and friendly relations among all nations, and to encourage the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means.'

Liaquat Ali Khan, during his official visit to the United States in May 1950, made public addresses in which he frequently referred to what he called 'Islamic way of life' that the new state had deliberately adopted in its national and international vocation. This was envisioned to create empathy and understanding among the American people and policy-makers with Pakistan. As some commentator put it: Liaquat Ali made 'right noises' - telling the Americans what they wanted to hear. Liaquat said: 'I have come to assist America to discover Pakistan'. In a similar vein, Quaid-i-Azam, in a broadcast talk to the people of Australia on 19 February 1948, endeavoured to familiarize them with the reality of Pakistan and its Islamic ethos as interpreted in the light of modernism. The broadcast, it may be said,


160. Pakistan News (Islamabad), 13 May 1950.
sounded like a general lecture. The visit provided the first real opportunity for Pakistani leadership to explain the goals and aspirations of the new Muslim State to the leaders and people of the world's most powerful state. Besides, it enabled the Pakistani Prime Minister to enlighten the American audience about the rationale of Pakistan's creation by emphasising the conviction of Muslims that under a Hindu majority rule, their culture was in danger of being effaced and their already inferior economic position was likely to sink further. Such a large discontented minority in the vast Indo-Pakistani sub-continent 'would have been the greatest single unstable element in the world'.

Reflective, thus, of the well-springs of Pakistan was his address made at the National Press Club in Washington on 4 May 1950, wherein he said at length:

"The Pakistani Muslims are determined to pursue the aims for which they sought independence ... to hold their opinions, worship God in freedom and follow the Islamic way of life" (emphasis added). The phrase "Islamic way of life" has on so many occasions been misinterpreted by some people. It has been misconstrued variously as religious intolerance, theocratic rule, return to medievalism and so on. We have in mind no special privileges of citizenship for the Muslims in our country and we abhor the idea of applying any religious or cultural coercion to our non-Muslim nations. But we firmly believe that our religion has taught us certain principles of social and economic justice, and of human values, whose application in state-craft is bound to promote human welfare. Furthermore, Islamic belief in the right of private ownership, with Islamic laws and institutions which tend to level down inequalities of wealth, is the best way of tackling economic disequilibrium... we are determined in our country to apply them afresh to the domain of human affairs. Such principles held and practised in the name of religion do not mean intolerance or medievalism. There are certain states in the modern world which though avowedly secular are proud to claim that they believe in the Christian way of life and in the pursuit of Christian values. They pursue some of the fundamental human values in the name of Christianity. We pursue them in the name of Islam. As followers of Islam, we could not do otherwise.


Liaquat Ali Khan had, as the foregoing indicates, endeavoured to remove
misgivings about Islam that the very utterance of which might have created in the
minds of Americans. It was also an attempt to allay fears among Pakistan's
Non-Muslim minorities about their status in an Islamic state of his conception.
Further, his utterances were reflective of Islam's congruence with modern times thus
interpreting Islam in modernist terms. In such a modernist milieu, Islam's association
with medievalism (as erroneously resides in the popular mind in the West) was sought
to be erased by him during the course of his tour. Behind such endeavours lied
political, economic and security interests which Pakistan desired to achieve by means
of establishing relations with the United States. His interpretation of Islam as being
congruent with the notions of democracy, social and economic justice, private
ownership of property, etc., was to bring Islam closer to the spirit of Capitalism.
Elaborating the Islamic position of property relations, Liaquat said that 'It [(Islam)]
firmly believes in the right of private ownership, although it frowns on large
accumulations of unearned wealth and is greatly concerned over menacing
inequalities' 163 His rejection of the invitation to visit Soviet Union may be
understood in the context of his propensity to come closer to the United States than to
the Soviet Union. In a veiled reference to an enveloping ideological tussle between
democracy and communism as represented by the United States of America and the
Soviet Union respectively, Liaquat laid bare before the audience the loyalties of the
new state in no uncertain terms in May 1950:

In a world of conflicting ideologies, nations that have recently achieved
full sovereignty are likely to be the victims of mental confusion and
consequent instability. Is it not, therefore, a matter of suprem atisfaction
that at least one nation amongst such nations should not suffer from such
confusion and should as a matter of tradition and belief be pledged to
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clear cut and easily intelligible principles of democracy and social and economic justice?\textsuperscript{164}

Further elaborating as to where Pakistan stands in an ideological tussle between liberal ideology and the communist ideology, Liaquat Ali referred to the 'dark forces at work threatening to extinguish the torch of civilization which liberal institutions...are trying to keep alive'; however, no threat or persuasion, no material peril or ideological allurement can deflect' Pakistanis from their chosen Islamic ideology. Besides, 'until 1962 ... ideology was an important element in Pakistani foreign policy, and translated into practice it meant preference for the western countries and dislike of communism ... and in 1954, Pakistan had openly subscribed to the western system of defence alliances.\textsuperscript{165}

Furthermore, Liaquat Ali Khan, besides his rejection of the Soviet invitation and his desire to forge links with the United States, had, at the same time, underlined the importance of the Muslim world to Pakistan not only in economic and political terms but also in cultural and religious terms:

...we feel a natural affiliation with other Muslim countries and our relations with them are of the friendliest. We are keenly interested in the progress and development of the Middle East countries and in the maintenance of their independence, as they are in ours. When I talk of our friendship with the Middle East countries, I do not wish you to infer that I am talking in terms of any power bloc. I am merely talking of the natural and religious links, the common culture and the identity of economic outlook that exist between the people of these countries and our people - links that will stand the strain of many a test and will... prove a stabilising factor in Asia.\textsuperscript{166}

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{164} Ibid., p.6.
\item\textsuperscript{165} S.M. Burke, \textit{Pakistan's Foreign Policy : An Historical Analysis} (London: Oxford University Pres, 1973), p.91.
\end{enumerate}
\end{flushleft
On different occasions, he underlined the centrality of Muslim countries in the historical perspective of Muslims' external orientation. He claimed that Independent Pakistan's foreign policy towards the Muslim world was a natural product of its past:

Even when we were a subject people, we regarded the distress of Muslim countries as our own. Now that we are free, our attitude is the same. Even today, we are bound by those natural postulates of Islamic fraternity which were formulated for our guidance thirteen centuries ago [when Islam was born]."167

As a result of Liaquat Ali Khan's numerous public addresses made to the American public during the course of his visit to the United States in 1950, his emphasis on the Islamic foundations of Pakistani nationhood did not go unnoticed, particularly by those ambassadors of Muslim countries stationed in the United States. According to them, 'it was for the first time that the Prime Minister of an Islamic country had the moral courage to preach Islam in America' . . . and that 'they could never muster enough courage to say like things even in private parties in America'.168 Notwithstanding this, Liaquat Ali Khan was keen on winning America's friendship. When he breathed his last following an assassination in 1951, the final words that he uttered were Biradaran-i-Millat (Brethren-in-Faith), and not Biradaran-i-Punjab or even Pakistan169 This clearly shows that he addressed himself, and wanted others to do likewise, to the cause of the wider Muslim world.

-------------------
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The Suez Crisis

One of the most crucial issues that made the Pakistani foreign policy undergo severe test had been the Suez crisis of October 1956 following President Nasser's nationalisation of the Suez Canal company in July 1956. From the Pakistani point of view, the timing of the crisis was hardly opportune as it barely completed a couple of years after assuming membership of a defence alliance (Central Treaty Organisation, CENTO) sponsored by Western powers. It was, thus, torn asunder between two conflicting loyalties: its historic tradition of supporting Muslim causes everywhere (its first penchant) and its obligations springing from its recent association with security pacts. The resultant tight-rope treading between the two

170. A brief summation of the causes of nationalization appears to be in order in this context. Following the overthrow of the monarchy symbolised in King Farouk in a bloodless 'Free Officers' Revolution' ushered in in 1952, by Gamal Abdel Nasser, Britain in October 1954, agreed to evacuate her military base in Suez and left its defence to the Egyptians. The new government (under Nasser) formulated a scheme to build a High Dam at Aswan (hence called the Aswan Dam) on the river Nile and it was believed that the project would be financed by the UK, USA, and other States. Due to cold war politics in which Egypt was perceived to fall in the other side of the barricade(strengthened by Egypt's increasing arms procurements from the Soviet bloc states), the USA on 19 July 1956, announced that it would not participate in the proposed construction of a Dam, a decision later echoed by the UK and the World Bank. A week later, as riposte and retaliation to the withdrawal of Western commitment of aid for the Aswan Dam, Nasser nationalized the Canal Company and also declared that his country would itself build the dam with revenues accruing from the Canal. Britain and France, smarting under their recently abdicated suzerainty over their respective colonial possessions and still retaining strategic and economic interests with the countries of the region, felt threatened by this Nasserite move. Nasser, with political power safely under his belt, had embarked upon the policy of resurrecting Pan-Arabism bolstered by his increasing tirade against the West and colonialism symbolised in his attack on the Western sponsored Baghdad Pact. The Suez Crisis was, thus, caught in the web of cold war rivalries. For details, see Hugh J.Schonfield, Suez Canal in World Affairs (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1967). For a Pakistani perspective on the subject, see (a) Sajjad Hyder, Foreign Policy of Pakistan: Reflections of an Ambassador (Lahore: Progressive Publishers, 1987), pp. 16-31, and (b) Saeeduddin Ahmad Dar, "Anglo-Egyptian Dispute and Pakistan", Asian Profile (Hong Kong), Vol. 19, No. 3, June 1991, pp. 247-251.
paths did convince neither its population at home nor endeared it to the rest of the Muslim world, barring its Muslim colleagues in the military pact, i.e., Iran, Iraq, and Turkey. Thus, the governments' handling of crisis during its entire course did not go unscathed in the hands of the critics.

The way the governments responded to the crisis was all the more intriguing in the context of Ayub Khan's own assertion that he had alerted the government of the imminent danger of a surprise attack by Britain against Egypt. As he wrote in his Autobiography:

As the Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan Army, I had approached the Government at that time, and warned them about the possibility of Egypt being attacked by Britain in conjunction with others. My anxiety was that the Egyptian authorities should be alerted and something done to avert the disaster.171

Pakistan could not have expected the events in the Arab world to turn in such a way as to test its foreign policy in its formative, evolving phase. Pakistan's policy towards the crisis was actually conducted under two governments which happened to be in power then. Prime Minister Chaudhri Mohammad Ali who had Hamid ul Haq Chowdhury as his Foreign Minister and Prime Minister Hussain Shaheed Suhrawardy with Malik Feroze Khan Noon serving as his Foreign Minister. The Government headed by Suhrawardy assumed office in September 1956 and held it till October 1957, a little more than a year. Those were the times (predating and also coinciding with the crisis) which saw political instability in Pakistan characterized by the regular change of governments at the centre popularly known as palace coups. The crisis witnessed the unusual spectacle of the leaders of Pakistan and Egypt levelling invectives against each other. It put under severe strain the bilateral relations existing between them till the crisis erupted. (In any case, they were far from cordial or

friendly). In this section, an attempt is made to portray the variance that obtained
between the loyalties of the people on the one hand and that of the governments on the
other, vis-a-vis the crisis. 172

Nasser's action in nationalising the canal resulted in an instant popular acclaim
in Pakistan. 173 A perceptive analyst wrote that 'the Suez invasion brought the deep
and basic loyalties of Pakistan to the surface. Asian, Muslim, Middle Eastern and
national sentiments were stirred all at a time. 174 It convulsed public opinion in
Pakistan more than any other event since independence. 175 Public support of Egypt in
its predicament were marked by demonstrations in both wings of Pakistan. The
Secretary of the East Pakistan Awami League, Mujibur Rahman, called for observing
a 'Suez Day'. The Muslim League Parliamentary Party declared in a resolution that
the imposition of international control over the canal was a direct interference with the
sovereign rights of Egypt, and pledged wholehearted support to Egypt. 176 A public
meeting in Lahore, in which more than 300,000 persons participated, criticized the

---

172. Interestingly, a parallel could be discerned with regard to the Gulf Crisis (War)
of 1990 in which the public opinion in Pakistan in the later stages of the war
differed from that of the stand taken by government, even though the two crises
fell under two different historical contexts. The Suez crisis did see a minor
schism among the Western alliance partners as reflected in the US stand on the
one hand and the collective postures of Britain and France, on the other.
However, cold war overtones were not altogether absent from the crisis, for the
Western powers perceived the Nasserite leadership as having tilted towards their
bete noire, the Soviet Camp, and that Nasser's influence in, and the domination
of, the Arab world would proliferate if left unchecked. In contrast to this, the
Gulf War ushered in, and was said to be the harbinger of, the New
World Order, premised to be dependent upon the Unipolar International system
dominated by the USA.

173. S.M. Burke and Lawrence Ziring, Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical

174. Hafeez-ur-Rahman Khan, 'Pakistan's Relations with U.A.R.', Pakistan Horizon

175. Ibid., n. 173, pp. 181-182.

government for its lukewarm support to Egypt.\textsuperscript{177} \textit{Dawn}'s London correspondent noted that the Suez Conference was the first occasion in which Pakistan had lent her moral support to the West in its quarrel with a Muslim country.\textsuperscript{178}

The tripartite aggression of Egypt launched first by Israel on 29 October 1956, later simultaneously followed by Britain and France on 31 October, was seen by both the people and government in Pakistan for what it was: a naked aggression. Both were forthright in condemning the invasion. \textit{Dawn} in an unusual front page editorial on 1 November 1956 castigated the Anglo-French assault on Egypt and referred to Eden as 'Hitler Reborn' who was 'dyeing red the Nile with Muslim blood'. Further, viewing the invasion through civilizational lenses, it queried, 'Is this not the rise once again of bigoted and perverted Christendom against the world of Islam in alliance with Jews? Is this not a threat posed against the Moslems from the Atlantic to the Pacific?'

Thus, a stage was set wherein the Government's policy started unfolding. Making a statement on the subject, the Foreign Office spokesman said that Pakistan would favour 'such a control of the Suez as would ensure free transit of goods and reasonable dues' but desisted from commenting on the events of nationalisation.\textsuperscript{179} On 2 August Foreign Minister Hamidul Haq Chowdhury stated that Pakistan had not questioned Egypt's right to nationalize a 'commercial concern' within the country and the only question had been how far the exercise of that right affected other countries.\textsuperscript{180} Prime Minister Chaudhuri Muhammad Ali said that Egypt had the right to nationalize the Canal but added a caveat that Pakistan and many other nations were

\textsuperscript{177} \textit{Dawn} (Karachi), 17 August 1956.
\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Dawn} (Karachi), 9 September 1956.
\textsuperscript{179} \textit{Dawn} (Karachi), 2 August 1956.
\textsuperscript{180} \textit{Dawn} (Karachi), 3 August 1956.
'vitaly concerned with the maintenance of the freedom of navigation in the canal'. It is within this context that the subsequent stand taken by Muhammad Ali and his Foreign Minister Hamudl Huq need to be located. The opportunity to present Pakistani viewpoint on the crisis was provided by the First London Conference which was convened with the initiative taken by the USA, UK, and France. The Conference (16-23 August 1956) was attended by 22 States (including Pakistan) which were principally concerned with the use of the Canal. Egypt and Greece, however, did not attend. It was convened with a view to taking stock of the situation arising out of Nasser's nationalization of the Canal Company which had threatened the freedom of the Canal and [that] it was necessary that 'operating arrangements, under an international system' should be restored. Pakistan, in conjunction with Iran and Turkey, proposed some amendments to the Joint Declaration which were accepted by the Conference. At this Conference, Pakistan's Foreign Minister said that Nasser's nationalising the Suez Company was an act in the exercise of Egypt's sovereignty but also added that nationalization ' at the time and under the circumstances had shaken the confidence' of a large number of concerned countries and that the purpose of the Conference was to restore that confidence. On 18 August 1956, he proposed that 'an effective machinery be set up in active collaboration with Egypt to ensure the efficient, unfettered and continuous freedom of navigation of all nations'. Anthony Eden was to write later in his book that Pakistan (besides Turkey and


182. The Three-Power Joint Statement issued by USA, UK, and France in London was adopted by 18 members of the conference. See ibid., p. 183.

183. Ibid., pp. 185-186.

184. For text of Haq's speech at the Conference on 18 August 1956, see Government of Pakistan Handout E.No.4463, dated 19 August 1956 and also quoted in ibid., p.186.

Iran, as cited above) were in favour of reasserting international control over the canal but the troika 'wished to emphasize Egyptian sovereignty over the Canal....It was no inroad on Egyptian sovereignty to ask for international control of passage through the canal in return for a financial return. At the conference....the Pakistani, Iranian and Turkish points of view (were met) by accepting their amendments'. To put the proposals in a nutshell: The conference recognized the Egyptian sovereignty over the Canal including its right of nationalization; it asserted the principle of international control and entrusted the operation of the Canal to an international board of which Egypt would be a constituent member. Nasser reacted to the proposal by saying that it would amount to 'the restoration of collective colonialism' 186 thus killing the first Western (and their Muslim alliance partners') attempt to seize control over the canal. It may be mentioned in this context, that in contrast to the pro-West Pakistani stand, India, USSR, Ceylon and Indonesia adopted a pro-Egypt stance by favouring a purely advisory board, with no power of control, to look after the affairs of the Canal.

With the rejection by Nasser of the first conference proposals, the Western Powers did not cease their further efforts. On 12 September, 1956, the Western Powers declared their intent to create a Users' Association which would run the Canal and pay Egypt appropriately for the facilities provided by her.187 Reacting to this announcement, Nasser, on 15 September, said that Egypt would 'resist any attempt on the part of any nation or group of nations to have an international body exercise Egypt's sovereign rights'188 The second conference was held in London on 19 September 1956 to which Prime Minister Suhrawardy sent his foreign minister Feroze Khan Noon without commitment. Nasser, having already rejected the concept of a Canal Users' Association (created by Western powers in London on 1 October 1956),

186. Ibid., p.470.
187. Ibid., n.181, p. 184.
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Feroze Khan Noon felt that there were only two nations left: (1) the use of force, and (2) reference to the Security Council.\(^{189}\) As the first option would be an a dictated settlement of the dispute, Noon proposed that the users invite Egypt to negotiate a fresh settlement. If this did not bear fruit, the matter should be referred to the Security Council.\(^{190}\) When the Users' Association was set up on 1 October 1956, Pakistan declined to join it.

Following the invasion, Government's diplomatic activity surfaced which, inter alia, insisted on cease fire and evacuation of invading forces from the Egyptian soil. Suhrewardy told Britain that if the latter persisted with aggression, Pakistan would withdraw from the Commonwealth. He also said that the Baghdad Pact could not survive if one of the partners continued such aggression.\(^ {191}\) At his initiative, the Prime Ministers of the Muslim members of the Baghdad Pact met at Tehran and demanded the withdrawal of all invading forces from Egypt and settlement of the dispute under the UN auspices.\(^ {192}\) Once these twin objectives were secured in accordance with Security Council resolutions, the government was intent on resuming friendly ties with Britain and France. The people at large, on the other hand, (distancing themselves from the Government stand) did not take to these government moves with any sense of ease or equanimity. They, on the contrary, demanded of the Government to sever Pakistan's association with the Commonwealth, to expel the UK from the Baghdad Pact, and to terminate diplomatic ties with France.\(^ {193}\) Some Muslim League politicians, notably Mian Mumtaz Daultana also extended their support to this public demand. The vociferous public persisted with its agitations all

\(^{189}\) Ibid., n. 181, pp. 186-187.

\(^{190}\) Quoted in ibid., pp. 186-187.

\(^{191}\) Dawn (Karachi), 9 November 1956.

\(^{192}\) Ibid., n. 181, p.188.

\(^{193}\) Ibid., p.187
over Pakistan. In Dhaka, angry crowds burnt down the British Information Services Office and smashed the windows of the French Consulate; at the British High Commission in Karachi, thousands of students burnt the Union Jack; and the working Committee of the Muslim League demanded Pakistan's withdrawal from the Commonwealth and Britain's expulsion from the Baghdad Pact.194

Suhrawardy was not, however, in a mood to oblige the restive public on their demand that Pakistan leave the Commonwealth or the Baghdad Pact. He said: 'I refuse to be isolated. We must have friends'.195 He said the British attack on Egypt had to be condemned, but it was an attack to ensure free access of nations to the Suez Canal. Britain did not wish to re-occupy Egypt. Owing to the closure of the Canal, goods came to Pakistan via the Cape and were dear by 30 per cent more.196 The government's stand was also influenced by other considerations. Pakistan being a member of the Western security alliances, did not want to displease its Western patrons, particularly the USA and the UK whose assistance was very crucial for facing India. (Militarily, no Muslim country was then in a position to provide security umbrella to Pakistan in the latter's perceived threat from India. Hence, Suhrawardy's statement 'Zero plus Zero plus Zero plus Zero is after all equal to Zero'197 was often quoted to refer to the weak state of military capabilities of Muslim states and that this position would not improve even in the event of their achieving unity. Inherent in his statement was the implied justification for seeking membership in the cold war related security pacts sponsored by the Western powers though Pakistan sought primarily to bolster its security vis-a-vis India. The Suez episode brought into bold relief the fact that Prime Minister Suhrawardy stood his ground in extending 'guarded support' to

194. Ibid.
195. Daily Telegraph (London), 15 November 1956 and quoted in ibid., n. 181, p. 188.
196. Ibid., n.181, p. 188.
the West (in particular to the USA) for its position on the crisis and in designing an 'unabashedly pro-Western' foreign policy converging on the episode.\textsuperscript{198}

The analytical treatment made so far covered the triangular interaction of Western, Pakistani and Egyptian position vis-a-vis the crisis. The analysis would be far from complete if it does not take into account how the crisis impinged adversely on the bilateral ties between Egypt and Pakistan: a state of affairs which persisted for a considerable number of years.

Nasser openly complained that Foreign Minister Hamidul Huq who had seen him in Cairo on 14 August 1956 en route to London, had personally assured him of Pakistani support for Egypt’s cause at the First London Conference (16-23 August 1956), but had gone back on his promise. Voicing his anger, the Egyptian President, in an interview given to Frank Moraes of the \textit{Times of India} in the first week of September said, ‘Do you know that before the London Conference the Pakistani Foreign Minister, who came to see me, spoke for three hours and he vowed support for Egypt’s cause? You know what he did?\textsuperscript{199} Piqued by this Pakistani volte face, Nasser in turn rejected the Pakistani offer of troops to join the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) in the Middle East, while welcoming the inclusion of an Indian contingent, and also made it known that Prime Minister H.S. Suhrawardy, who was about to make a visit to Cairo, would not be welcome there.

To this effect, the then Ambassador of Egypt to Pakistan hurried to the Pakistani Prime Minister and informed him that President Nasser did not consider it a suitable time for a visit. Forced by these circumstances, Suhrawardy had to give up the idea. Further, much to the chagrin of Pakistan, Nasser declared later that Suez

\textsuperscript{198} Ibid., n.181, p. 182 and 251.
\textsuperscript{199} \textit{Times} (London), 3 September 1956.
was as dear to Egypt as Kashmir was to India.\textsuperscript{200} Nasser’s fulminations against Pakistan and its leaders, as cited in the afore said, did not go unresponded by his counterparts in Pakistan. The response was addressed not only to the merits or otherwise of Egypt’s case under question, but also touched upon the entire gamut of Egypt’s foreign policy under Nasser. Speaking in the National Assembly of Pakistan, Suhrawardy questioned Egypt's claim to be a champion of the Arab causes against Israel. He argued that Pakistan had not recognized Israel, and in a tone of prognostication, said that it would "never" recognize it. He said that India, on the contrary, had recognized Israel, and alleged that the former had "amicable relations" with the latter. Notwithstanding this, Nasser had accepted Indian troops on Egyptian soil but had spurned the offer of Pakistani troops.\textsuperscript{201} On a later occasion, the Pakistani Prime Minister alleged that Egypt favoured the re-union of Pakistan with India and regarded Kashmir as a part of India. He felt that Pakistan could get closer to Egypt only if she became a secular state like India and deleted Islam from her constitution. Pakistan, he thought, should think twice before she adopted a step "in the right direction for forming a Muslim combination with Arab nationalism" \textsuperscript{202} thereby implying that his country should first look after its own national interests : a tendency described by analysts as Pak-Islamism in contrast to Pan-Islamism dutifully chased by Pakistan till the mid-fifties when disillusionment with it began to set in.

As though these mutual recriminations resorted to by both the leaders of both the countries were not enough, their print media too, sans some exceptions, joined the foray, thus adding further to the already deteriorated bilateral equations. Pakistan’s Dawn, in a vitriolic Editorial, warned against attaining Muslim unity by taking the Muslim Middle East "bound hand and foot, to Cairo’s modern little Pharaoh, to be
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commanded at his will, or to become collectively the satellite of Moscow and be damned both in body and soul, as Hungary's thousands of escaped refugees can tell how. A few days later, another *Dawn* Editorial piece captioned "So This Is Nasser" said that Nasser's "hatred of Pakistan and love for Bharat" [a Hindi word meaning India] was conditioned by "insensate bias and blind prejudice the source of which might well be examined by psychiatrists", and regretted that "in the veins of this turbulent egotist not the blood of Islam should seem to flow but the turbid waters of the Nile. Nasser will never be our friend." The Daily, thus, bemoaned that Nasser's intellectual horizon was guided/conditioned by his "countryism" at the cost of Islamic universalism, as perceived by it. The Daily's ideological loyalties were here explicitly oriented towards Pan-Islamism. This would become evident when the subject is viewed from an holistic perspective. Even though, the Pakistani Press was very angry with President Nasser, as an individual, it made a distinction between the political leadership and the Egyptian nation. Being co-religionists, the Egyptians received unwavering and wholehearted support from their counterparts in Pakistan during the entire course of their Suez predicament. This would become evident as *Dawn* in its issue of 1 December 1956 (referred to earlier in this section), did editorially conclude thus: "Let none of us [Pakistanis] forget that Nasser is but an incident that will pass while Egypt and Egyptians will always abide [endure]. Despite Nasser ... our support and sympathy should continue to be extended to our brethren there in their hour of trial [resulting from the Suez Crisis]."

This being the Pakistani media perception of the Egyptian leadership, Egyptian news media, on the other hand, reserved a special treatment of sorts for Suhrawardy labelling him 'the tail of colonialism' a greater lover of Britain and America than the English and the Americans themselves', in addition to painting Pakistan as Egypt's

---

enemy number one which must be cowed down before the West could be effectively tackled.205

The poor state of Pakistan-Egypt ties during the course of the Suez crisis need to be viewed from a perspectival angle as it might throw some light on the vituperative temperature ran high between the leaders of the two countries as outlined above.

Prior to the Suez Crisis, Egypt-Pakistan relations got off to a poor start. Such a state of affairs might be attributable to the fact that the Egyptians, much like other Arabs, scarcely understood the raison d'être of Pakistan. To them, and to Arabs in general, the word 'partition' was anathema - it reminded them of the imminent partition of Palestine, the example of Ireland and the separation of Sudan from Egypt. Colonial Britain's strategy of 'Divide at Impera' easily metamorphosed to 'Divide and Quit', keeping in view the former's interests. Moreover, Britain was the League-approved Mandatory Power in Palestine and was also the colonial power of the pre-partitioned Indian sub-continent. Even though, partition was an ostensible commonality between the two, the historical circumstances leading to the phenomena in the two cases were highly dissimilar and brook no similarity to each other. The subtle nuances between the two were hardly appreciated by the general Arab Public. The Indian argument that Britain was the villian of the piece for partition carried conviction among the Arabs, familiar as they were with the fate that had befallen on the Palestinian Muslims. And skepticism was spread among Arabs about the continued survivability of Pakistan as a new, Independent state. In such an unfriendly milieu, Pakistan's claim of its being the largest Muslim state geared to play its befitting role as a pioneer of Islamic solidarity, was not well received by other Muslim countries, much less Egypt, which were proud of her own heritage. It was because of these reasons that Pakistan's convivial gestures towards Egypt, in its early

post-Independence years, were not favourably reciprocated by the latter. Some instances bore out the point. At a reception given at Karachi by the Egyptian Ambassador to Pakistan on 11 February 1951, in connection with the birthday celebrations of King Faruq, Governor-General Khwaja Nazimuddin said in an eulogistic tone: "We are not celebrating the birthday of a foreign Monarch in the conventional sense of the word, but of the Head of a State to which Pakistan is bound by unbreakable ties of brotherhood and deep affection". But the same King Faruq, in an oblique dig at Pakistan's "wholly unrealistic and manifestly amateurish" zeal to lead the Muslim world, was quoted as having said to his courtiers, "Don't you know that Islam was born on 14 August 1947" As though this were not a sufficient slight for Pakistan, Egypt's Foreign Minister, Salahuddin Pasha, rubbed further salt to the already bruised ego of Pakistan when he told an Indian correspondent in November 1951 in Cairo that his country looked to India for moral support in her struggle for national liberation. Further, during the fifties and the early sixties, Egyptian foreign policy, as noted in the preceding section, was shaped and conducted under the nomenclature of Pan-Arabism in which Islam had formed but a minor component; a trend further reinforced with the ascendance of Gamal Abdel Nasser onto the centre stage of Egyptian and Arab politics. Reflective of this ideology, Azzam Pasha, an Egyptian and the first Secretary-General of the Arab League, asserted that "we are Egyptians first, Arabs second, and Muslims third". In his The Philosophy of the Revolution, Nasser's Pan-Arabism relegated Islamic


207. Burke's phrase. Ibid., p. 133.


brotherhood to the third and last circle, and gave a primacy of place to the Arabic circle and the African continent circle, virtually in that order.\textsuperscript{211} In a Pakistan-U.A.R. trade agreement concluded during Nasser's post-Suez visit to Pakistan in April 1960, a reference was made to the inspiration of the Islamic bonds of brotherhood to be attained through the medium of economic cooperation. Both the Egyptian President and his Pakistani counterpart, President Ayub Khan, also discussed the idea of forming a Muslim bloc. Later, they abandoned the idea as they perceived that the scheme might entail more problems than advantages. Symbolising his Pan-Arab proclivities, a typical Nasserite epitome put paid to these Islamic cliche when he said in Pakistan that 'I do not want to use Islam in International Politics'.\textsuperscript{212}


\textsuperscript{212} Dawn (Karachi), 15 April 1960.