

# **IQBAL REVIEW**

**Journal of the Iqbal Academy, Pakistan**

**October 1976**

**Editor**

**Muhammad Moizuddin**

**IQBAL ACADEMY PAKISTAN**

Title : Iqbal Review (October 1976)  
Editor : Muhammad Moizuddin  
Publisher : Iqbal Academy Pakistan  
City : Karachi  
Year : 1976  
Classification (DDC) : 105  
Classification (IAP) : 8U1.66V12  
Pages : 138  
Size : 14.5 x 24.5 cm  
ISSN : 0021-0773  
Subjects : Iqbal Studies  
: Philosophy  
: Research



**IQBAL CYBER LIBRARY**

([www.iqbalcyberlibrary.net](http://www.iqbalcyberlibrary.net))

**Iqbal Academy Pakistan**

([www.iap.gov.pk](http://www.iap.gov.pk))

6<sup>th</sup> Floor Aiwan-e-Iqbal Complex, Egerton Road, Lahore.

# Table of Contents

---

**Volume: 17**

**Iqbal Review: October 1976**

**Number: 3**

---

1. IQBAL AND QUAID-I-AZAM* .....	4
2. MUHAMMAD ALI JINNAH.....	11
3. ISLAMIC UNIVERSALISM AND TERRITORIAL NATIONALISM IN IQBAL'S THOUGHT' .....	70
4. IQBAL AND QUAID-I-AZAM .....	104
5. SOME IMPORTANT FACTORS IN THE POLITICS OF SAYYID AHMAD KHAN .....	123
6. SOME REMINISCENCES OF QUAID-I-AZAM .....	133

# **IQBAL AND QUAID-I-AZAM\***

*Mr Abdul Hafeez Pirzada*

Federal Minister for Education and Provincial Coordination

I am indeed very glad to associate myself with the scholarly de-liberations held today. Such deliberations are crucial to our collective self-discovery and our national advancement. They are also a measure of our gratitude to the towering personalities of Allamah Muhammad Iqbal and Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad All Jinnah, who played the most significant role in shaping the destiny of Muslims in South Asia. In the perspective of the general Muslim decline in the subcontinent for over two centuries, for nearly a whole century the achievements and ideals of Iqbal and Quaid-i-Azam represent a climax in the growth of our national consciousness.

Iqbal derived spiritual sustenance from the historical foundations of Muslim culture. With his mastery of Western philosophy and the history of Islam, he analysed in depth the contribution made by Muslim thinkers to the world of knowledge which, in its turn, led to the formulation of modern renaissance and humanism.

Iqbal was one of those bold modern thinkers who believed that the world revealed through sensations is real and that there are natural laws governing the spatio-temporal events. For him, matter is nothing but spirit in space and time. He vigorously

marked out the thesis that the dichotomies between spirit and matter, space and time are unreal. These dichotomies, he thought, are the expressions of the fragmented personality of modern Western man.

Whatever, according to Iqbal, is real needs to be changed by revolutionary action. It is only in the act of transforming the real into the ideal "What is" into "What ought to be" that man fulfils his destiny.

The concept of Pakistan was, therefore, not merely a dream for Iqbal, but the application of his principles to the social realities of South Asia.

\*The text of the Presidential Address delivered at a special meeting held on 28 February 1976 at the Iqbal Academy, Lahore, in connection with the Birth Centenary of the Quaid-i-Azam.

Iqbal passionately believed in the truth that the concern of Islam was man as a whole. To him prejudices of creed, colour and caste were just alien. He studied the condition of man in the twentieth century employing all the tools that contemporary knowledge offered and came to the conclusion that the message of Islam was the need of humanity J at large. He discovered that capitalism and feudalism with their emphasis on concentration of sources of production in fewer hands led to large scale exploitation. After an incisive analysis of the major streams of civilization of his day, Iqbal found that man's soul had been polluted, his heart vitiated and his

mind poisoned. To purge humanity of these ailments Islam presented a remedy to which there was no substitute. Aware as he was of this regenerative and revolutionary potential of Islam, Iqbal was no less conscious of the painful fact that Islam had been exploited by forces of obscurantism, both of indigenous and of alien hue. He, therefore, set out to express the Islamic principles in their true colour through the media of his powerful prose and poetry. All men are equal before God and they are partners in the cosmic creative process. All such barriers as stand in the way of this fundamental equality and integrity have to be destroyed. They may appear in the form of particular classes of people, or social, political and religious institutions. Whatever their shape, Iqbal directs his revolutionary wrath against them and challenges us to destroy them so that a truly egalitarian socio-economic order may be born.

It is in the context of this universal framework that Iqbal's role in directing the course of history in South Asia should be evaluated. His clarion call to the Muslims of this subcontinent to awaken to the injustices done to them and to struggle for an independent homeland of their own formed a part of his total vision. I could therefore say that Iqbal is of great relevance to us in our struggle to consolidate our State on the basis of principles enunciated by him. He is of equal relevance to the world as a whole because it continues to be plagued by the destructive forces he has so clearly identified in his works.

It is indeed a rare coincidence of history that the period of Iqbal's intense intellectual frenzy should have synchronised with the Quaid-i-Azam's equally intense political struggle. This brought into play an unparalleled collaboration between a man of vision and a man of action. While Iqbal stirred a burning desire amongst Muslim masses for a common ideal by tapping the reservoir of their psychological and historical experience, the Quaid-i-Azam pleaded the Muslim cause. The integrity of character he brought to bear upon his performance and the vision of the future he delineated before the masses made him an unrivalled leader of the Muslims of South Asia. He strictly adhered to the constitutional path and evolved his political strategy to fight the enemy keeping in view the limitations imposed by well-recognised principles of democracy. The pragmatic approach of the Quaid and his faith in the power of his people soon made his struggle a mass movement. The emergence of Pakistan in the wake of this movement symbolizes a rare phenomenon where a country was brought into existence by dint of unflinching national determination solidified by the will of a single political leader. Fighting without any arms for a minority encircled by majority which was assisted by the alien rulers, the Quaid-i-Azam truly performed a miracle which places him in the forefront of world statesmen.

Though physically shaken by the rigours of the struggle for in-dependence, the Quaid was determined to

consolidate the State he had created. He had to start from a scratch, but he was very clear in his mind as to the basic principles on which Pakistan was to be built. And in his vision he was guided by his own experience as well as the thought of Iqbal who had said last farewell to him years before Pakistan was won I refer to a few principles the Quaid enunciated during the short period he lived after independence:

"Brotherhood, equality and fraternity of man—these are all the basic points of our religion, culture and civilisation. And we fought for Pakistan because there was a danger of denial of these human rights in this subcontinent... .

"You are only voicing my sentiments and the sentiments of millions of Mussalmans when you say that Pakistan should be based on sure foundations of social justice and Islamic socialism ... which emphasises equality and brotherhood of man. Similarly you are voicing my thoughts in asking and in aspiring for equal opportunities for all. These targets of progress are not controversial in Pakistan."<sup>1</sup>

"Islam and its idealism has taught us democracy. It has taught equality of man, justice and fairplay to everybody. We are inheritors of these glorious traditions

---

<sup>1</sup> Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, Ed., *Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah* (Lahore : Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1964), II, 506.



and are fully alive to our responsibilities and obligations as framers of the future constitution of Pakistan..."<sup>2</sup>  
"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."<sup>3</sup>

"Having failed to prevent the establishment of Pakistan, thwarted and frustrated by their failure, the enemies of Pakistan have now turned their attention to disrupt the State by creating a split amongst the Muslims of Pakistan. These attempts have taken the shape principally of encouraging provincialism.... As long as you do not throw off this poison in our body politic, you will never be able to weld your, self, mould yourself, galvanise yourself, into a real true nation."<sup>4</sup>

From these quotations from the speeches of the Quaid and what I have said about Iqbal, it is clear that they were in agreement with each other as to the social, economic and political goals for which we must all strive. But before the basis could be

---

<sup>2</sup> M. Rafique Afzal, Ed., *Selected Speeches and Statements of Quaid-i-Azam `Mohammad All Jinnah* (Lahore: Research Society of Pakistan, 1966), p. 455,

<sup>3</sup> Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, Ed., op. cit., II, 464-6S.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., II, 487-88.

laid, alas, the Quaid went on a long long journey from where no one returns and the nation soon after went in for a very long winter, a winter for palace intrigues, adventurism, martial law, disruption of democratic principles, poison of provincialism and eventual dismemberment of the country. We had to pass through a series of tragic experiences before we could take to the Islamic and democratic road defined for us by Iqbal and the Quaid. The People's Government under the leadership of Quaid-i-Awam Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is endeavouring to rebuild Pakistan in consonance with the wishes of its founding fathers and the spirit of modern times. We, therefore, welcome such deliberations as you have held. We need clarity to do away with conceptual cobwebs. Who can help us more than Iqbal and Quaid in this direction? Happily the first birth centenaries of both the luminaries succeed each other, that of Quaid being this year and that of Iqbal next year. The Government is doing its best to organize the celebrations. But these are national events and the nation as a whole must participate in them. I appeal for this participation. Let us all unite to make these events an occasion for national re-appraisal and for dissemination of the achievements and ideals of Iqbal and Quaid-i-Azam.

# MUHAMMAD ALI JINNAH

The Architect of Pakistan

(25 December 1876—11 September 1948)

Dr L.S. May

“I fervently pray that God Almighty make us all worthy of our past and hoary history and give us strength to make Pakistan truly a great nation amongst all the nations of the world...”<sup>5</sup>

## *Introduction*

“... I, Sir, stand here with a clear conscience and I say that I am a nationalist first, a nationalist second and a nationalist last...”<sup>6</sup>

These words spoken by Mr. Muhammad Ali Jinnah in 1925 clearly indicate where he stood during the first and greater part of his political career. He was an Indian nationalist. It meant a broader secular approach because he ignored the role of religion

---

<sup>5</sup>The Quaid-i-Azam's `Id Message, 18 August 1947 (reproduced in Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, Ed., *Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah* (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1964). II, 409.

<sup>6</sup>Mr M.A. Jinnah's 1925 Legislative Assembly speech on the Indian Finance Bill (*Eminent Mussulmans* [Madras: G.A. Natesan, 1926], p. 435).

in politics. Stressing faith as predominant in the political ordering of a people signifies a more restricted and, what has been called a communalist, orientation. The terms “patriot” and “country,” therefore, can have, and in India had, a double meaning. They may refer to loyalty to the land and its people as a whole, reflecting unitedness on the basis of a national majority consensus.<sup>7</sup> Or they point to a strong affiliation with a particular community, whose faith defines its educational, social, cultural, including linguistic, and legal traditions and life. It involved geographic distribution. Such a close communal affiliation implies the elevation of one’s own group above any other. It contains the seeds of division. This in fact was the case in India where the large Muslim minority<sup>8</sup> increasingly feared their suppression by the vast Hindu majority. Mr. Jinnah for a long time was a non-communal patriot. He intensely tried to stop the schismatic divisionary trend that resulted in the growing communal (Hindu-Muslim) tensions since the late 1910’s. Although he confessed in October 1920: “I have no voice or power to remove the cause...”<sup>9</sup> he pleaded in the aforementioned 1925 speech:

‘I once more appeal to this House, whether you are a Mussulman or a Hindu, for God’s sake do not import the discussion of communal matters into this House, and degrade this

---

<sup>7</sup> As in the United States of America—through secret balloting.

<sup>8</sup> In 1875, British India had a 232 million total population, of whom 70 millions were Muslims.

<sup>9</sup> Letter to Mr M.K. Gandhi (1869-1948).

Assembly, which we desire should become a real National Parliament. Set an example to the outside world and our people!”<sup>10</sup>

His reference to “our people” instead of “our peoples”<sup>11</sup> and his plea for “a real national Parliament” “again reflect his commitment to unity as also to “Home Rule” (swarai). Both remained his utter concern until 1937. That year marks a watershed in his thought and life. He turned increasingly separatist, formally endorsed “the Pakistan movement” in 1940 and effectively worked toward establishing the independent Republic of Pakistan on 15 August 1947! Mr. Jinnah as Quaid-i-Azam (“great leader”) would steer his now sovereign land for another year.

His life, therefore, is divisible into two main parts, namely, (1) as an Indian nationalist until 1937; and (2) as a Pakistan patriot. A discussion of the first phase of his career is essential to understand better why he changed his political viewpoint and thereby so deeply affected the Indo-Islamic community’s future course.

---

<sup>10</sup> Eminent Mussulmans, p. 435.

<sup>11</sup> The Indo-Muslim modernist, Sayyid Ahmad Khan (1817-1898), referred to the Muslims and Hindus as “two different nations” in his 12 January 1883 Speech in Governor General’s Council. For the text, see Sir Reginald Coupland, Report on the Constitutional Problem in India (Oxford University Press, 1942), Vol. I, Appendix II).

I. Mr. Jinnah as an Indian Nationalist (1906-1935) Born of Muslim parentage at Karachi, the capital of Sind<sup>12</sup> which at that time was a Muslim-majority province within British India, he received his grade-school education at Bombay,<sup>13</sup> then a swaraj stronghold<sup>14</sup>; went to high school<sup>15</sup> in his native city; and, upon a family friend's advice, in 1892 sailed for London to prepare himself for the bar at Lincolns Inn. Returning home as a full-fledged barrister at the early age of twenty, he settled in Bombay about 1897. He already drew the attention of that city's political circles to him by becoming the first Indian reader in the chambers of its then Advocate General, Mr. McPherson.<sup>16</sup> He gained some contacts and at the same time familiarised himself with legal and administrative processes grooming him for his subsequent brilliant career.<sup>17</sup> He refused to remain in British Government

---

<sup>12</sup> Sind at that time formed part of the Bombay Presidency. For his later demand that they be separated, see below, Sec. II.

<sup>13</sup> At the Gokul Das Tejpal Primary School.

<sup>14</sup> So was Bengal where the swaraj movement may have begun as a reaction to British rule first exercised by the East India Company since its forces' victory at Plassey (on 22 June 1757) and, after the 1857-58 "Mutiny" by Great Britain's Imperial Throne. The capital remained Calcutta until 12 December 1911 when it was shifted to New Delhi.

<sup>15</sup> Sind Madrasah High School.

<sup>16</sup> Mr Jinnah in 1900 became Third Magistrate during the three months' leave taken by Mr Dastur.

<sup>17</sup> He apparently also was the private secretary of the prominent Liberal Dadahai Naoroji (1825-1917) who was the first Indian

service, however,<sup>18</sup> The reason was his preference for personal independence so that he could freely argue India's right to freedom. His political career officially started when he joined All-India National Congress<sup>19</sup> (founded in 1885) in 1906. The press, surprised that he, a Muslim, did not join the All-India Muslim League<sup>20</sup> (set up in late December 1906) drew his response that he "was proud to belong" to the Hindu-majority body.<sup>21</sup> The reasons why Mr. Jinnah felt pride in his Congress membership were:

- (a) their acceptance of him as a legitimate member;

---

member of British Parliament (1892-1895) and President of the All-India National Congress in 1886, 1893 and 1906, viz. in the year that Mr Jinnah joined that organisation. He already had associated himself with Mr Naoroji during his London student years.

<sup>18</sup> It was not only a money question. His wish to earn more than offered to him again resulted from his preference to remain even financially independent and use the money he earned as he desired. It had a moral implication for he did not want to use Government wages against it.

<sup>19</sup> Henceforth called the Congress.

<sup>20</sup> Henceforth called the League.

<sup>21</sup> Congress wished to represent all Indian groups which Sayyid Ahmad Khan already opposed in his above-mentioned 12 January 1883 speech. He expressed fear that it would not adequately advocate Muslim interests. It remained above all a Hindu body, and although it had Indo-Islamic community members, they remained a minority. It also lost its Liberalism in the 1920's.

(b) his self-awareness that it symbolised a new phase in his life ;

(c) his ability to work for self-rule through an organisation established for that purpose; by signing its pledge, he formally subscribed to its swaraj platform;

(d) his preference for unitary to separatist politics, for secular to religious nationalism.

He did not immediately join the League because

(a) it appeared only toward the end of 1906, viz. it was non-existent so that he could not have entered it;<sup>22</sup>

(b) it mainly focussed upon the Muslims' needs; and

(c) at first it was less concerned with "Home-Rule".<sup>23</sup> He nevertheless did not repudiate his Islamic heritage for he demanded a fund to aid the poor and orphaned children (waqf al-aulad), in his 1906 Congress speech marking his political debut It made him popular while his subsequent success in gaining the Wakf Validating Bill (in 1913) widened his Muslim contacts and support.

---

<sup>22</sup> Could it also be because it was set up in Dacca by Bengali leaders and that he did not think that it would become as prestigious as Congress?

<sup>23</sup> please see below. For its 1911 resolution.



Running on the Muslim ticket under the 1909 Indian Councils (Reform) Act,<sup>24</sup> incorporating separate electorates<sup>25</sup> to guarantee sufficient minority representation in the local assemblies and higher Councils. he was elected in autumn of that year by his co-religionist Bombay Presidency constituents to the Supreme Legislative (Imperial) Council. In addition to his Congress and new Council duties, he accepted the invitation to participate in the 1910 Allahabad Muslim Conference called<sup>26</sup> to attain better Muslim-Hindu understanding, for the majority<sup>27</sup> disfavored the electoral principle; to work with the League Council between 1910

---

<sup>24</sup>The 1909 Act. based on the 1892 Government of India Act, allowed for the expansion of the hitherto British-staffed Viceroy's Cabinet and Secretary of State for India Council by adding one or two Indians respectively to either organ. Under the 1858 Act, the title "Viceroy" (royal or imperial representative) was bestowed upon the Governor-Generals, while the Secretary of State for India residing in London, was set up Mr Jinnah criticised the 1909 Act for not giving adequate representation and say by Hind's people in the higher administrative bodies and government of their country.

<sup>25</sup>They were demanded by a deputation led by The Aga Khan to Simla, a hill station constituting the Governor-Generals' summer residence, on 1 October 1906. The Simla Deputation as it hence became known, gained a triumph for Lord G.J. (fourth Earl of) Minto, the then Governor-General (1905-1910) acceded to their request (See also Conclusions.)

<sup>26</sup>The Conference was convened by Sir William Wedderburn, then Governor of the Bombay Presidency.

<sup>27</sup>See below for the Nehru Report.

and 1911; and to attend the 1911-1913 deliberations. He finally joined the League in 1913—upon the eve of the First World War—after it passed its (1913) resolution mirroring his insistence on “national unity . . . by cooperation with other communities,” viz. mainly the Hindus, but also the Sikhs and other faith minorities.<sup>28</sup> To emphasise unity and “harmonious cooperation,” for which he was lauded in that year, he remained in Congress. During the (annual) Bombay 1915<sup>29</sup> Muslim League session, Mr. Jinnah moved a very important resolution to appoint a committee having powers to negotiate with non-Muslim representatives. Even Bengal’s “Lion.” Maulvi Abul-Kasim Fazl-ul-Haq (1873-1062) and the Indian nationalist, Maulana Abul-Kalam Azad (1888-1958)—both of whom then were Leaguers—supported his resolution guaranteeing its unanimous adoption. After the new committee’s months of difficult negotiations with a similarly appointed Congress group, both approved a “Joint Scheme” of intended reforms. Mr. Jinnah, chairing the 1916 Congress-League Lucknow session, effected its acceptance by both organizations. It involved a compromise by allotting to the (Muslim) minority, where they actually constituted a majority, less seats in the

---

<sup>28</sup> Jains, Parsees, Christians. Sikhism and Jainism both are offshoots from Hinduism. The Parsees are Zoroastrians. India also has a small Jewish community.

<sup>29</sup> The League and the Congress yearly—and sometimes jointly—convened in different cities.

Legislatures than numerically justified (principle of underweight age). The percentage-wise proportion was as follows:<sup>30</sup>

Punjab <sup>31</sup>	50 %
United Bengal	40 %
Bombay Presidency	33k- % (one-third)
United Provinces	30%
Bihar	25 %

The Hindu stress on “a majority with joint electorates” dissatisfied him as much as other Muslim leaders for fear that the Hindus might impose their will. About one-fifth of the British Indian population, estimated at circa 283 million (1901), and reaching circa 300 million by 1920, were Muslims. The proportion rose to a little under one-fourth in the following decades.

Madras Presidency	15%
Central Provinces	15%

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. V.P. Menon, *The Transfer of Power* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957), p. 15. I rearranged the table according to the percentages. This Pact’s other conditions included a three-fourth quorum in the councils.

<sup>31</sup> Despite the Muslim majority in the Punjab and Bengal, the Muslims only had 40% of the vote. Cf. Jinnah’s brief September 1931 Bombay visit speech (MM. Saiyid, *Mohammad Ali Jinnah, A Political Style* [Karachi: Elite Publishers, 1962], p. 157).

The famed Lucknow Pact as it became known is the high-water mark in twentieth-century Hindu-Muslim relations. It raised Mr. Jinnah's already considerable prestige as "an ambassador of unity" and out-standing Muslim "parliamentarian". But the future course of events would disillusion him. Two measure known after their sponsor, Sir Sidney Rowlatt, as the Rowlatt Act(s), promulgated on 21 April 1919 —after the end of the First World War<sup>32</sup>—permitted instant arrest and imprisonment without due process of law of anyone suspect of conspiring against the British raj. Free speech, press, and assembly were forbidden. The results were mass jailings including of nearly all Hindu leaders, communal riots,<sup>33</sup> "passive resistance" (satyagraha), between 1919 and 1922,<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> 28. A major reason for British policy undoubtedly was to subdue Indo-Muslim pro-Caliphate feelings (amongst mostly the middle class) at a time when the huge Turkish-centred State was dismembered by Great Britain and France after the War. Although India never formed part of the Caliphate, its fall meant the tearing apart of their freedom symbol ! Mustafa Kemal Pasha (alias Ataturk) formally abolished the Caliphate on 3 March 1924.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Richard Symonds, *The Making of Pakistan* (London: Faber and Faber, n.d., but Preface dated "Oxford, November 1919"), p. 49, gives communal riot statistics and cites Dr B.R. Ambedkar's view (stated in the latter's *Pakistan*, [Bombay: 1947], pp. 152 ff.) that the 1920-1940 period actually saw a Hindu-Muslim "civil war" with some "brief intervals of armed peace".

<sup>34</sup> Initiated and led by Mr Gandhi with full Congress approval at its December 1920 Nagpur session. Mr Jinnah and Dr M. Iqbal

and bloody British reprisals.<sup>35</sup> The 1919 Government of India Act containing Devolution Rules permitting presumably independence to a Provincial Government within a diarchy or double-headed State seemed an attempt to bypass the central issue of Federation and “distribution of powers”.<sup>36</sup> The British neither granted self rule nor true representation, for which reasons Congress refused to enter the new Government installed in February 1921. Meanwhile, Mr. Jinnah presiding over the Muslim League’s special meeting held on 7 September 1920 at Calcutta, forcefully spoke out against British policies:

“One thing there is which is indisputable and that is that this Government must go and give place to a complete responsible

---

(1877-1938) disliked it because they feared that sweeping up the irrational emotions could have disastrous consequences. History proved them right.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. the Amritsar massacre caused by General Dyer’s order to his troops to shoot into a crowd assembled to hear a speaker ; 1200 persons were killed ; 379, wounded.

<sup>36</sup> S.C. Dash, *The Constitution of India*, Allahabad : Chaitanya Publishing House, 1960. The Act’s many other provisions included direct instead of indirect election ; a 0% minimum elected membership, ranging between 139% in Bengal to 53% in Assam, in the representative bodies ; residency and property qualifications (not applicable to University bodies) ; but the British Government led by the Viceroy and the Secretary of State retained control over defence, foreign affairs, and even budgetary matters so that the provincial assemblies had very little effective authority,

Government... One degrading measure upon another, disappointment upon disappointment, and injury upon injury, can lead a people to only one end It led Russia to Bolshevism... May it lead India to freedom.<sup>37</sup>

His disagreement with Congress on satvagraha as the best way to make the Indians' will known to the colonialist rulers led to his resignation after his fourteen-year membership. He furthermore refused to “enter the legislature till the Congress lifted the boycott”. He nevertheless did not give up hope for better times. Despite the installment of more Conservative Viceroy. Lord Reading (1921-1926)—and Lord Peel (1867-1937) as Secretary of State—asserting that autonomy (Dominion Status) was out of the question. Mr. Jinnah convened a Muslim League meeting at Lahore in May 1924. He stated as its aims:

to discuss the constitutional issue; improve Hindu-Muslim relations particularly in the Punjab; and to effect “an amicable settlement between the Hindus and the Muslims, as was done at Lucknow in 1916.”<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Also quoted in my (L.S. May) book entitled *Iqbal, His Life and Times* (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1974), p. 136. Original source: *Englishman*, 8 September 1920.

<sup>38</sup> After the March 1924 All-India Muslim League Council meeting at Delhi to discuss the agenda of the forthcoming League session Cf. M H. Saiyid, *op. cit.*, p. 101 Cf. S.M Ikram, *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan (1858-1951)* (Lahore: Sh

This wish furthermore is enshrined in his 1925 speech, cited above. He nearly succeeded in his attempt to revive the spirit of the Lucknow Pact through his Delhi (Muslim) Proposals presented during the League's (annual) 1926 Delhi session. Its Resolution,<sup>39</sup> moved by him, insisted on: (1) "adequate and effective representation of the minorities in every province without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even to equality"; (2) communal representation "by means of separate electorates as at present provided" with the option granted to any community "to abandon its separate electorates in favour of a joint electorate"; (3) "any" possibly needed 'territorial redistribution... shall not in any way affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal and North-West Frontier Province"; (4) "liberty of belief, worship ... propaganda, association and education shall be guaranteed to all communities"; and (5) a three-fourth quorum for passing any "bill or resolution or any part thereof . . . in any legislature". It furthermore demanded "the speedy attainment of full responsible Government," a further examination to make the necessary "amendment" of "the present constitution of India,"<sup>40</sup> and Sind's separation from the Bombay Presidency. In his lengthy speech, Mr. Jinnah insisted upon the revision of the 1919 Act to assure a more democratic government

---

Muhammad Ashraf, 1965), p. 247. (Note.—In March 1924, the Caliphate formally was abolished ; see above, footnote).

<sup>39</sup> See Sayyid op. cit., pp 115-16, for the Resolution and p. 117 for a summary of Mr. Jinnah's "long speech".

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 117 39.

and asserted that League and he, personally, rejected non-cooperation and obstruction to effect the required constitutional reforms. His grateful Bombay constituents re-elected their unopposed able and fearless spokesman to the Assembly in November 1926. If the Punjabi Muslims rejected giving up representation through the electoral principle, the Hindus generally gave a lukewarm reception to the said Proposals. While the League approved them<sup>41</sup> and the Congress Working Committee recommended them to the All-India Congress Committee, Congress affirmed rather than “welcomed” them during its (annual) Madras convention. Amidst high praise from Hindu and Muslim quarters for his zeal and hard work to promote the two causes of Indian unity and freedom, there was critique.<sup>42</sup>

After the All-India Congress Working Committee’s unanimous acceptance of the Muslim Formula,” the matter was referred to an All-Parties Conference which held meetings between February-March and December 1928.<sup>43</sup> After the earlier discussions, it was passed to the Nehru Committee—so called

---

<sup>41</sup> So did the Khilafat Conference. Cf. Ikram, *op. cit.*, p. 247. This Conference founded in reaction to the Ottoman Caliphate’s end (see above note) first met on 23 November 1919. It also stood for *swaraj*.

<sup>42</sup> . From the “influential” Hindu newspaper, *The Hindustan Times*, for instance, which asserted that the Muslims’ demand for separating Sind to make it a Muslim majority province might provoke the Hindus’ insistence upon readjusting the Punjab’s and Bengal’s borders “to eliminate Muslim majorities from these two provinces” (Sayyid, *op. cit.*, p. 119).

<sup>43</sup> Other meetings were held during May 1928 in Bombay.



because it was chaired by Motilal Nehru (1861-1931), father of the later Indian Prime Minister Jawarharlal Nehru (1889-1964)—for further study. The Nehru Report published in August 1928, that is, while Mr. Jinnah was in England on holiday,<sup>44</sup> was negative because it preferred a united instead of a federated India and rejected the separate electoral principle. It further asserted that the Muslims form a large minority, and that “religious liberty... and cultural autonomy” would solve the “communal problem”.<sup>45</sup> While it acknowledged Muslim fears concerning harassment by “the majority,” the Report nevertheless countered the Indo-Islamic community’s preference for a weak rather than a strong centre, an issue which would remain a thorn in all future discussions and negotiations.

Upon Mr. Jinnah’s return, he nevertheless joined with Congress in opposing the Simon Commission<sup>46</sup> (November 1927-Spring 1930) which did not include one single Indian and which Mr. Jinnah amongst others boycotted because “we are denied

---

<sup>44</sup> Mr. Jinnah often went to England on shorter or longer vacations.

<sup>45</sup> See Nehru Report, pp. 28-29.

<sup>46</sup> Headed by Sir John Simon (1873-1954). It is also called the Statutory Commission. Cf. Simon Report. For further details, see, for example, Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims, A Political History (1858-1947)* (London: Asia Publishing House, 1959); *Parliamentary Debates*; M. Shafi, *Some Important Indian Problems* (Lahore: 1930); M.H. Saiyid, *The Struggle for Pakistan* (Karachi: 1948), apart from innumerable newspaper and other journalistic reports.

equal partnership”.<sup>47</sup> He furthermore continued his deliberations with not only Muslim, but also Hindu, politicians, attending the Unity Conference called by the Khilafat Committee and held between 20 and 31 August 1928, at Lucknow, as well as December 1928 All-Parties Conference which met during the last week of December 1928 at Calcutta. Mr. Jinnah insisted on one-third Muslim representation in the Central Legislature whose distribution of seats should be left to the Muslims; the provinces should have full “federal and residuary powers”; Sind’s and the North-West Frontier Province’s separation. His demands for adequate Muslim representation were keyed to his certainty that adult suffrage on a truly national<sup>48</sup> scale would not become a reality so soon. His suggested amendments, despite receiving some Hindu support,<sup>49</sup> were rejected<sup>50</sup>

A “heart-broken” Jinnah confessed to Karachi’s future mayor, Mr. Jamshed Nusserwanji, who had brought him to the train: “Jamshed, this is the parting of the ways.” It was a prophetic

---

<sup>47</sup> Cf. The Indian Quarterly Register, 1927, II, 451. Also my cited work on Iqbal, pp. 171 ff.

<sup>48</sup> Two major problems affected the voting in India at the time: (a) the lack of political consciousness amongst the rural masses forming the majority of the population ; and (b) the will of those inhabiting the many semi-autonomous States (such as Hyderabad and Kashmir) could not prevail over their respective rulers’ preference. Kashmir Province’s 93% and Jammu’s 53% Muslims had to follow their Hindu Maharaja’s choice to join India in 1947.

<sup>49</sup> Tej Bahadur Sapru (1875-1949), an erstwhile member (1920-1923) of the Viceroy’s Council, and President of the National Liberal Federation of India (1923, 1927) particularly urged the acceptance of Mr Jinnah’s “Fourteen Points”.

<sup>50</sup> Their rejection was due to the argumentation against them by the Mahasabha leader, M.R. Jayakar, who won over the Congress majority. The extremist Mahasabha, “the right-wing group within Hinduism,” rejected “com.

statement! He still clung to the hope of effecting better Hindu-Muslim understanding and “harmonious cooperation”. He summarised the last year’s events before the Central Legislative Assembly’s March 1929 hearings on the Nehru Committee Report, but was disillusioned in the Hindu “counter-proposals” which he felt were against the “letter and spirit” of his recommendations. Undaunted, he (apparently) formulated his “Four-teen Points”<sup>51</sup> shortly after the All-Parties Conference, held at Calcutta during the Christmas week of 1928. Submitted by him to another All-Parties Muslim Conference, held in January 1929 at New Delhi, they once more stressed adequate minority representation through separate electorates, thus assuring the smaller religious blocs a voice in the lower and higher legislatures in a free federated India. The last clause of its resolution moved by Sir Muhammad Shafi (1896-1932)<sup>48</sup> asserts “municipal electorates,” vowed to get the imperialists out of India and retain control over its Muslim population. Cf. Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Muslim Islam in India* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1946), p. 186.

The resolution’s third paragraph (viz. what resolution containing the said “Fourteen Points”) refers to “the attitude taken up by the Hindu Mahasabha” which “from the commencement through their representatives at the Convention was nothing short of an ultimatum”(cf. Sayyid, M. A. Jinnah, p.137) They again stress a federal set-up “with the residuary powers

---

<sup>51</sup> For their full text, consult amongst other works, Sayyid, M.A. Jinnah, pp. 137-40.

vested in the provinces” (1). They shall be granted full autonomy (2) ; “not . . . less than one-third” representation for Muslims in the Central Legislature (4) ; the option to any province to abolish separate electorates which for the time being would continue ; ‘ at least one-third Muslim Ministers” in any “cabinet, either Central or Provincial” (13) ; safeguards for full religious freedom, worship, and all other, including educational and legal, aspects related to the continuance of Muslim life and thought (7 and 12). The alternative provisions to these Points also state that “the question of excess” Muslim representation “in provinces where they are in a minority is to be considered hereafter” (p. 140 in Sayyid, M.A. Jinnah).<sup>52</sup> Sir Muhammad Shad had already disagreed with Mr. Jinnah by preferring cooperation with the Simon Commission. This policy advocated during the previous century by Sayyid Ahmad Khan had as its main reason these leaders’ feeling that it would protect their community against particularly the more extremist Hindu groups. It led to the All-India Muslim League split, which deepened by 1929 when The Aga Khan headed a bloc. called the National Convention; another named the All-India Nationalist Muslim Party (formed in July 1929), contrary to the National Convention, accepted the Nehru Report; a fourth seceded from the League on the Delhi (Muslim) Proposals because it rejected joint electorates; and a fifth, headed by Mr. Jinnah himself, urged Muslim and Hindu-Muslim

reconciliation, League and national unity and cooperation, while refusing its unconditional support to the Nehru Report that:

“This Conference emphatically declares that no constitution, by whomsoever proposed or devised, will be acceptable to Indian Mussulmans unless it conforms with the principles embodied in this resolution.”<sup>53</sup>

Meanwhile, the author of the Fourteen Points, for which he again was highly praised, wrote in his 19 June 1929 letter addressed to England’s (then) Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald:

“...there is a section in India that has already declared in favour of independence, and I may tell you without exaggeration that the movement for independence is gaining ground, as it is supported by the Indian National Congress. . . .”<sup>54</sup>

Total independence rather than Dominion Status had been advocated by the more revolutionary Hindu politicians<sup>55</sup> even at the beginning of this century. Amongst the Muslims, Sayyid Fadlul-Hasan Hasrat Mohani (1878-1951) insisted in his December 1921 Ahmedabad Congress speech: “ ‘Swaraj can have only one

---

<sup>53</sup> . Cf. Times of India, 2 January 1929.

<sup>54</sup> 4950 L.S. May, op. cit., p. 178 ; p. 145 in Sayyid, M.A. Jinnah, which, on pp. 141-47, contains the letter’s full text. The textual quotation also is taken from it.

<sup>55</sup> Amongst them Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal (1858-1932) who asserted in his May 1907 Madras speeches that “self-government under British paramountcy” was impracticable (B.C. Pal, Swadeshi and Swaraj ; he also edited a monthly called New India). In his 1887 National Congress speech, he had “welcomed the British Government in India” because of his conviction that it would lead his country to democracy and independence

meaning and that is complete independence.”<sup>56</sup> On 1 January 1922, he again pounded on the need for a clearer, viz. such a, definition of swaraj and on a thorough transformation of the Indian administration by declaring it a Republic “similar to that of the United States,” but with this difference that “the United States of India” should have “a parallel government”<sup>57</sup> (viz. a dyarchy) so that “the Hindu majority in Madras, Bombay, and the United Provinces will not be allowed to overstep the limits of moderation against the Mussalmans.”<sup>58</sup> Al-though he still proposed a federal structure, the Punjabi politician, Mr. Lajpat Rai (1895-1928), immediatly concluded: “ ‘It means a clear partition of India into a Muslim India and a non-Muslim India.’ ”<sup>59</sup>

That a Hindu and a Muslim autonomous Government within federated Indian Republic would not work was stated in 1923: “ joint Hindu-Muslim State is sheer nonsense, which under no circumstance can exist. . . . The reason is that every State is ultimately dependent on its customs, its national languages and its nation history.”<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Report of the Thirty-sixth Indian National Congress, 1921, p. 50.

<sup>57</sup> The Indian Annual Register, 1922, Vol. I. Appendices, pp. 68-77.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., Appendices, pp. 71-72.

<sup>59</sup> Sayyid, M.A. Jinnah, p. 109. Mr. Lajpat Rai together with Dr M.A. Ansari (1880-1936) had been appointed as special Committee members by the Christmas

<sup>60</sup> Indra Prakash. Where We Differ, as quoted by F.K. Khan Durrani in Meaning of Pakistan (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1947), pp. 98-99. quotation has been put in reverse.

The two-nation theory which it already implies had been given political expression by Sayyid Ahmad Khan in the nineteenth century.<sup>61</sup> It was crystallised by Dr Muhammad Iqbal in his 29 December 1930 Presidential Speech to Allahabad session of the League:<sup>62</sup>

“I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to be the final destiny, of the Muslims, at least of North-West India.”<sup>63</sup>

Although he gave the option concerning Dominion Status,<sup>64</sup> he seemingly preferred complete freedom from any “British paramountcy”, Mr. Jinnah in his previously cited 1929 letter expressed himself (other) wise:

---

<sup>61</sup> Cf. L.S. May, *Evolution of Indo-Muslim Thought after 1857* (Lahore: Muhammad Ashraf, 1969), p. 83, for Sayyid Ahmad’s 12 January 1883 speech given in the Governor-General’s Council. He added: “To hope that both could in a Hindu-dominated land ‘is to desire the impossible and the inconceivable.’ remain equal” That Mr. Lajpat Rai therefore did not “pioneer” the schism idea (contrary to Sayyid’s speech), seems borne out by the historical record.

<sup>62</sup> Mr. Jinnah had succeeded in re-unifying the League in February 1930. See above note for its divisionism.

<sup>63</sup> “Shamloo,” *Speeches and Statements of Iqbal* (Lahore : Al-Ma Academy, 1948), p. 12. Italics in the original.

<sup>64</sup> The term “Dominion Status” first appeared with regard to India in 1919.

“I would most earnestly urge upon you at this moment to persuade His Majesty’s Government without delay to make a declaration 1922 Congress to devise a National Pact. Their report presented to the 191 Cocanada Congress silently died. Mr. C.R. Das at the same time had reached politico and religious agreements with the Muslim leaders; but the same (1923) Congress rejected them because it felt that they included too many concessions. Sayyid statement (M.A. Jinnah, p. 108) that Mr. Lajpat Rai in his analysis went beyond the federation proposal presented by Hasrat Mohani would imply that some non Muslims agreed that separation was the only solution that Great Britain is unequivocally pledged to the policy of granting to India full responsible government with Dominion status. . . .”<sup>65</sup>

That his, apart from other leaders’, urgent plea carried some weight in the British Government decision for Dominion Status announced on 31 October 1929, is not unlikely. That he disagreed with any separatist idea is clear from his early September 1931 Bombay declaration: “I am an Indian first and a Muslim afterwards”<sup>66</sup> By then he had settled in London whither he had sailed to attend<sup>67</sup> the first Round Table Conference (12 November

---

<sup>65</sup> Saiyid, M.A. Jinnah, p. 145.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., p. 156.

<sup>67</sup> So did other Indian notables and the Viceroy Lord Irwin. Messrs Gandhi, Nehru, twenty other prominent Congressmen and a host of dissidents had been jailed on 5 May 1930 and freed only on 26 January 1931. The reason was Gandhi’s call and he December



1931-19 January 1931) called. by the Government to hammer out India's future constitution. Its relatively successful conclusion caused Mr. Jinnah to reassert his long and deeply felt Indian nationalism on his few days' cited visit to Bombay. He nevertheless returned to London, which now was his home and where he practiced before the Privy Council. His hope for a settlement lessened because the second (7 September-1 December 1931) which he attended,<sup>68</sup> and the third Round Table Conferences (17 November-24 December 1932), to which last one he was not invited, failed to solve the thorny communal representation issue. He further-more did not fully approve the British Government's

---

1929 Lahore resolution of the Congress for a second satyagraha campaign, announced by him in his 2 March 1930 letter to Lord Irwin. This Viceroy gained his freedom and a Pact with Mr. Gandhi—also called the Delhi Pact—concluded on 4 March 1931, under which the Mahatma promised to call off his civil disobedience campaign and recognise the Round Table Conferences. The British, in turn, promised to release many political (Indian) prisoners. Satyagraha was suspended in 1934.

<sup>68</sup> So did Mr. Gandhi and Dr Muhammad Iqbal who also participated in the third Conference. Jawaharlal Nehru was jailed for the sixth time between 26 December 1931 and 30 August 1933 ; rearrested “5 months and 13 days later” (Frank Moraes, *Jawaharlal Nehru A Biography* [New York : The Macmillan Co., 1936], p. 207) and freed on 4 September 1935. Mr. Gandhi was rearrested on 4 January 1932, when he began his ‘fast unto death,’ while the mass struggle for independence was resumed across India. He was freed shortly.

1932 Communal Award announcement<sup>69</sup> because it legitimised the schism for which he held his co-religionists and the Hindus responsible. He in fact criticized during his brief 1932 Oxford visit<sup>70</sup> the “spineless people” found “in the Muslim camp” and accused the Hindus for being “short-sighted and I think incorrigible.” He asked: “Where is, between these two groups, any place for a man like me?”<sup>71</sup> “The reason for his verdict was the former’s, including the nationalist Muslims’, insistence on a communal solution to assure adequate safeguards in all elected bodies, and the Congress refusal to come to any immediate decision which, announced only in June 1934, favoured

---

<sup>69</sup> The Award which lessened Muslim representation in the Punjab, for instance, was announced by Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald. The British Government, taking advantage of Hindu-Muslim disagreement, thus declared communalism to be “politically valid,” thereby embarrassing Congress. Cf. W. Cantwell Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 174. A more conservative Lord Willingdon meanwhile had been appointed as Governor-General (1931-1936), succeeding Lord Irwin.

<sup>70</sup> Mr. Gandhi had spoken at Oxford in October 1931.<sup>67. 68. 69.</sup>  
<sup>70</sup> Was he “in the pay of the India Office”? Cf. Cantwell Smith, *op. cit.*, note 20, p. 327, putting the word “student” between quotation marks and asserting that his “means of support were not obvious”.

<sup>71</sup> Ikram, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

“neutrality” on this key issue.<sup>72</sup> Mr. Jinnah brooding over his country’s situation in London still rejected schism, which apparently was favoured by the British Government by 1933, and probably earlier.<sup>73</sup> Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, while at Cambridge University, circulated a pamphlet, entitled *Now or Never*, on 26 January 1935. It for the first time contained the name “Pakistan”! Did it reflect Government’s official view?<sup>74</sup> As late as 1935, Mr. Jinnah would denounce “the Pakistan movement” as “a crazy scheme”.<sup>75</sup>

A few months later, in April 1933,<sup>76</sup> a joint parliamentary committee began its review of the London Conferences and the

---

<sup>72</sup> Cf. W. Cantwell Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 174 and 215, stating further that Congress began to lose many Muslims who either joined existing or founded new institutions—e.g. the Kirshak Proja Party in Bengal and the Ahrar Party in the Punjab.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *Minutes of Evidence Given Before the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform (Session 1932-33)*, (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1934), He, 1496. Cf. Khan A. Ahmad, *The Founder of Pakistan, Through Trial to Triumph* (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd.), p. 16, mentioned by Cantwell Smith, in *op. cit.*, note 20, p. 327; *cr.* his statement on p. 254.

<sup>74</sup> Was he “in the pay of the India Office”? Cf. Cantwell Smith, *op. cit.*, note 20, p. 327, putting the word “student” between quotation marks and asserting that his “means of support were not obvious”.

<sup>75</sup> K.A. Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>76</sup> The All-India National Congress in December 1929 resolved on another civil disobedience campaign which Gandhi initiated in

Simon Commission's proposals so as to develop a draft constitution; it ended its work on 22 November 1934. The voices for Mr. Jinnah's return to India meanwhile had grown so insistent<sup>77</sup> that he no longer could ignore them. The reasons were: the League's nearly defunct state; the death or retirement of other prominent Muslims<sup>78</sup> leaving Islamic India leaderless; his Bombay Muslim constituency's preference for him as their legislative representative; and the nation-wide recognition of his political and parliamentary qualifications, the respect in which he was held, and his popularity. Although he sailed home in April 1934,<sup>79</sup> and was re-elected in that year to the Bombay Legislature,<sup>80</sup> he did not return finally until the beginning of 1935, to take his seat.

---

March 1930. Cf. his 2 March b30 letter to the Viceroy Lord Irwin ; Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

<sup>77</sup> Dr Muhammad Iqbal had pressed for his return while attending the London Conferences. Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan, Pakistan's future first Prime Minister, carried a formal invitation to Mr. Jinnah to come back home from London in 1933

<sup>78</sup> Sir Muhammad Shafi died in 1932; Muhammad Ali and his brother Shaukat Ali respectively died in 1930 and 1937; Dr Muhammad Iqbal feeling ill concentrated on writing and would die in 1938.

<sup>79</sup> Saiyid, *M A Jinnah*, p. 161. Cf. I. H. Qureshi, *Ulema in Politics* (Karachi Ma'aref Ltd., 1972), p. 346, giving "the end of 1934" for Mr. Jinnah's return. 'net probably is correct as the newly elected Assembly first convened in January 1935.

<sup>80</sup> Mr. Jinnah accepted the renomination; his papers were examined on 11 October 1934 ; they showed that he was the only

The expert administrator began to reorganise the All-India Muslim League at the centre, but its revival actually is dated in April 1936 when it reconvened under Sir Wazir Hasan's presidency at Bombay and authorised Mr. Jinnah to set up and preside over Its Central Parliamentary Board with branches to "fight the elections"<sup>81</sup> under the new Government of India Act<sup>82</sup> announced on 2 August 1955 and taking effect on 1 April 1937. Mr. Jinnah travelled across the land to found the said branches and to win support for the League from the provincial Muslim

---

nominee and thus was the uncontested candidate. Cf Saiyid, M.A. Jinnah, p. tel.

<sup>81</sup> Ikraal, op cit., p.234

<sup>82</sup> This Act, based on the Round Table Conferences and the Simon Commission Report, divided British India into eleven provinces (Aden and Burma were detached), each to be lee by a (British) governor and an appointed executive council. It furthermore provided for: dyarcny's abolition in the provincial legislatures ; the creation of a bicameral legislature in six provinces, a unicameral legislature in one ; separate electorates ; a widening of the franchise to thirty million voters out of 295 million, of whom about eighty million were Muslims (in British lethal ; Princes willing to enter the Union to sign an "Instrument of Accession". The Governor-General retained control over defence, foreign affairs; the provincial governors were to supervise the budget, etc., and remained accountable to the GovernorGeneral rather than to the legislative bodies. Cf. also the 1939 "Amend-meet" to the 1935 Government of India Act. The Act '(and the "Amendment") were very unpopular Its federal portion never was implemented.

leaders.<sup>83</sup> It nevertheless fared badly.<sup>84</sup> In the 1936 elections. Congress triumphed,<sup>85</sup> causing Jawaharlal Nehru to state that the Congress and the British were the only two parties in India. A disagreeing Mr. Jinnah added the Muslims and the Indian Princes.<sup>86</sup>

He said on the eve of the National Convention of the Congress

held in March 1937 called by its President, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, at Delhi:

“I have often said that I am trying to see that Muslims should wholeheartedly and sincerely adhere to the policy and programme of the All-India Muslim League, which is both national and patriotic, and we shall always be glad to co-operate with the Congress in their constructive programme. . . . In conclusion, I say: Let us now concentrate on those causes which stand in the

---

<sup>83</sup> Sir Sikandar Hayat, the Unionist Party head, and Fazl-ul-Haq, the Krishak Proja head, did not tolerate League interference in their provinces at that time.

<sup>84</sup> Their parties won in these elections, showing the strength of provincialism in politics. The League attracted under 5% of the 30% Muslim electoral vote.

<sup>85</sup> 81. Although it held a minority position in Bengal, the Punjab and Sind.

<sup>86</sup> Saiyid, M.A. Jinnah, p. 172.

way of a united front.”<sup>87</sup> Although he stressed that the League was the only truly national Muslim representative body, which he decided needed to be trans-formed from a middle class into a popular organ, he nevertheless kept alive his long hope for settling outstanding issues amicably with Congress. By late July 1937 he said: “...nobody will welcome an honourable settlement between the Hindus and the Muslims more than I, and nobody will be so ready to help it...”<sup>88</sup> Until that time, he had resisted “the two-nation theory” causing Dr Iqbal to ask him in his letter of 28 May 1937: “Don’t you think the time for such a demand has already arrived?”<sup>89</sup> When Congress rejecting his co-operation offer installed its ministries,<sup>90</sup> it crushed his hope for reaching a work-

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., pp. 178-79. The National Convention was held during the third week of March 1937. Congress and League were contesting a League seat at Bharaich fallen vacant through its occupant’s death.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., p. 180.

<sup>89</sup> Richard V. Weekes, *Pakistan, Birth and Growth of A Muslim Nation* (Princeton : D. van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1964), p. 84, citing from one of Dr Iqbal’s many 1937 letters to Mr. Jinnah, trying to convince him, as he had done in 1930-32, of the need for an independent Indo-Islamic State.

<sup>90</sup> sardar Vallabhnbhai Patel offered the Bombay Muslim ministry seat to a Congress Muslim although no Muslim Congressman had been elected in that Presidency. Sir Sikandar Hayat, on the other hand, invited the Mabasabha President, Raja Narendra Nath, to occupy his provincial ministry’s Hindu seat. Mr. Nath declining the offer because of his age, he nominated instead Sir Manohar Lai.

able compromise with Hindu leadership. He, therefore, followed Dr Iqbal's suggestion—made right after the Congress President's speech:

“You should immediately hold an All-India Muslim Convention in Delhi to which you should invite members of the new Provincial assemblies as well as other prominent Muslim leaders. To this Convention you must re-state as clearly and as strongly as possible the political objective of the Indian Muslims as a distinct political unity in the country...”<sup>91</sup>

The Muslim Conference was held at Karachi in October 1938. Its Sind Resolution showed the new way by asserting “that Hindus and Muslims were separate nations.”<sup>92</sup> The Conference members also suggested to the League (President) that it (he) “review” the constitutional question. A sub-committee then wrote a Report stating that the only solution was to create an independent Islamic State whereby it followed the trend of political thought of Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Hasrat Mohani, Lajpat Rai and Dr Iqbal. Mr. Jinnah after some hard thinking finally accepted its recommendation. He publicized his new stand in 1940! II. Mr. Jinnah, the Pakistan Patriot (1940-1948)

“No power on earth can prevent Pakistan.” That famed Lahore Resolution<sup>93</sup> pronounced by him as League President

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.,



during its (annual) March 1940 session—it was moved by Fazl-ul-Haq who once again accepted the League as the national Indo-Muslim representative organization—indicates the fundamental change in Mr. Jinnah’s thought. It meant his acceptance of the “Pakistan scheme”. It deeply would affect Islamic India’s (and even Hind’s) future. It shook Congress whose members<sup>94</sup> well understood its implications.

Mr. Jinnah now worked harder than ever to obtain Muslim mass support for the League and convince as yet uncommitted provincial co-religionist leaders of the need to back it rather than their own par-ties His efforts would bear fruit. He also made it clear to everyone, including the Hindus and the British, that they would have to consider his organization as the only one nationally representing India’s Muslims and that it was fully committed to “the Pakistan scheme”,<sup>95</sup> He nevertheless continued his talks with other groups in order to obtain agreement concerning the division of powers guaranteeing proper Muslim status at the Centre in a federated India’s Constituent Assembly<sup>96</sup> The League nevertheless joined the Congress in observing “Deliverance Day” on 22 December 1939, and in rejecting the proposals presented by the

---

<sup>94</sup> Many diverse proposals for a division between Hindu and Muslim India were given since 1939

<sup>95</sup> . Cf. L.S May, *Evolution*, pp 286 ff

<sup>96</sup> Cf. his 2 August 1940 and other meetings of that time with the new Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow (1936-43), Hindu leaders and his 1942-47 correspondence.

Cripps' Mission<sup>97</sup> which reached and left India respectively on 22 March and 12 April 1942, that is, amidst the Second World War.<sup>98</sup> The Congress reasons were its insistence upon the immediate rather than the post-war withdrawal of the British troops; and its objection to the provision of granting the option to any province or State to remain out of the "Union of India" and with British Government help devise a constitution giving it "similar status" to Hind. On the same day that Sir Stafford broadcast his "draft declaration," viz, on 11 April--his first announcement came on 30 March—the League Working Committee passed and Mr. Jinnah publicised its resolution rejecting "one Indian Union" and "that the only solution of India's constitutional problem is the partition of India into independent zones; and it will, therefore, be unfair to the Muslims to compel them to enter such a constitution-making body whose main object is the creation of a new Indian Union..."<sup>99</sup> He complained "that 'the talks had been carried on with the Congress leaders over the heads of the Muslims, and other parties had been utterly ignored.'"<sup>100</sup> He thereby consistently

---

<sup>97</sup> So called after its head, Sir Stafford Cripps, sent to India by the late Sir Winston Churchill's 11 March 1942 order to the House of Commons.

<sup>98</sup> May 1940-45. The Japanese attacking Pearl Harbour on 7 December 1941 forced the then isolationist United States of America into that war.

<sup>99</sup> See the Muslim League Working Committee Report, II April 1942.

<sup>100</sup> V P. Menon, *op. cit* , p 1W Mr. Gandhi apparently "begged Cripps not to publish the declaration". Cf. Robert Eric Frvkenberg, "The Partition of India: A

followed his March 1940 declaration that they constitute a separate nation and the said Lahore Resolution. His reiteration of the League stand in response to the Cripps' Mission provoked the Hindu feeling that Sir Stafford's declaration was "an open invitation for Muslims to create a Pakistan,"<sup>101</sup> The reason for its withdrawal was lack of "sufficient support," implying that the British Government itself was not prepared to back up Sir Stafford. After the Congress Working Committee's 6 July 1942 Wardha resolution approving "the Quit India movement,"<sup>102</sup> Mr. Jinnah severely criticised it for "blackmailing the British and coercing them to concede a system of government and transfer power to that government which would establish a Hindu Raj immediately . . ., thereby throwing the Muslims and other minorities and interests at the mercy of the Congress Raj."<sup>103</sup> These words reflect his anxiety, shared with many of his compatriots, that Hindu supremacy resulting from immediate independence would blot out the League and give the deathblow to its programme which at least since 1942 was supported by all

---

Quarter Century After," *The American Historical Review*, LXXVII/2 (April 1972), 467.

<sup>101</sup> Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

<sup>102</sup> Mr. Gandhi after 15 July 1942 started to harpen weekly on "Quit India". Cf. his articles written in his journal entitled *Harijan*. He and many Congress Working Committee members were re-arrested on 9 August 1942, soon followed by the jailing of all prominent Congress leaders.

<sup>103</sup> Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

non-League Muslim parties<sup>104</sup> as well. How strong that organisation had become between 1942 and 1943 is clear from (a) its gaining by late 1942 such important members as the Sindhi, Mr. Ghulam Husain Hidayatullah, who succeeded in pushing a resolution affirming that India's Muslims form a separate nation and therefore are entitled to their independence through his provincial legislature in the fall of 1942; (b) the inclusion of two Leaguers—apart from one non-Leaguer and two Hindus—in his ministry installed at about the same time ; and (c) the establishment of its ministries as a result from the 1937-1943 provincial by-elections in Bengal<sup>105</sup> on 24 April and in the North-West Frontier Province on 25 May 1943.<sup>106</sup> Feeling the need for its reorganisation at the Centre and in the provinces in order to respond better and give further leadership, the League set up a Committee of Action and a Planning Committee during its December 1943 Karachi plenary session. Their job was to devise

---

<sup>104</sup> Amongst them the Khuda'i Khidmatgars or "Servants of God" founded by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan; and Shaikh Muhammad Abdullah's Jammu and Kashmir National Conference. His hope that his friend, the later Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, would permit a fully autonomous State motivated him to join India against the will of the vast Muslim majority.,

<sup>105</sup> After Mr. Fazl-ul-Haq's 28 March 1943 resignation from Bengal's Provincial Assembly, causing that province to fall under Governor's rule until 24 April of that year.

political and economic policies.<sup>107</sup> “Why should we not undertake planning ?” Mr. Jinnah had asked during his presidential speech. His question partly was motivated by the growing division,<sup>108</sup> and partly by the economic “clash between Hindu and Muslim interests,” causing many amongst the urban Muslim middle class “to work as labourers” or in petty Government jobs.<sup>109</sup> The aggravated Muslim-Hindu schism was apparently encouraged by

---

<sup>107</sup> cf. Menon During 1942-43, the League’s motto was: “Buy from Muslims!” He also founded the All-India Muslim Students’ Association., op. cit., pp. 147 if., for the provincial developments during these years.

<sup>108</sup> See Menon, op. cit., p. 151, quoting Sir Tej Bahadur’s comment concerning his country’s greater division since Lord Linlithgow’s administration.

<sup>109</sup> W. Cantwell Smith, op. cit., p. 2-4, and notes 40-41, pp. 327 and 328,

quoting from “M.R.T.,” “Protection Versus Separatism,” Eastern Times, Lahore, 5 January 1940. It was republished in India’s Problem of Her Future Constitution, pp. 35-37. Cf. Menon, op. cit., p. 151, concerning “economic distress” due to rising prices and scarcity “of essential commodities”. Hindu-Muslim competition also was mentioned by Sayyid Ahmad Khan and regarding the Punjab by Dr Muhammad Iqbal (cf. my Iqbal, op. cit., p. 170) showing his interest in industrial development. However, the Hindu “Banias” controlling “trade and commerce” also were buying up landed properties “pledged as securities for loans” (Qureshi, op. cit., p. 320). In Calcutta (a Hindu majority centre) 356 Muslims versus 2237 Hindus were land-owners, Weeks, op. cit., p. 97).

the Viceroy<sup>110</sup> who undoubtedly supported by his Government actually forbade League-Congress negotiations by late 1942.<sup>111</sup>

The British nevertheless insisted on conserving India's "territorial unity". They thus practiced a double policy respectively of "divide and rule" and by professing the need for retaining the Union. Mr. Jinnah during the afore-mentioned December 1943 League session had reformulated the Pakistan Resolution in capsule form: "Divide and Quit".<sup>112</sup> It responded to the country's general longing for swaraj, within or without Dominion Status, and to the consensus of many Muslims except for those remaining Indian nationalists,<sup>113</sup> that separatism was the answer. To this end, he conferred with Mr. Gandhi between 9 and 27 September 1944.<sup>114</sup> They apparently disagreed on four major issues:<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> Lord Linlithgow whose seven and a half years' regime was replaced by Lord Wavell on 20 October 1943.

<sup>111</sup> W. Cantwell Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 271 and note 58, p. 328, stating that Mr. "C. Raj gopalacharya, able apostle of Congress-League agreement," was forbidden by "the Government . . . shamefully . . . to see Gandhi. (See *The Tribune*, Lahore, 13-11-42)".

<sup>112</sup> Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

<sup>113</sup> Amongst them Maulana Abul-A'la Maududi regarding Islam "incompatible" with nationalism, although he, like many Indo-Muslim theologians, later accepted Pakistan where he resides.

<sup>114</sup>

<sup>115</sup>. See W. Cantwell Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 281 *if.*, culled from Mr. Jinnah's

(1) “a provincial government” to supervise a referendum in those provinces to be divided; partition; and boundary adjustments—rejected by Mr. Jinnah fearing that a Hindu administration in a free India might not honour such a commitment ;

(2) a referendum to be held amongst those provinces’ Muslim and Hindu inhabitants—Mr. Jinnah insisting on a Muslim plebiscite only in the affected regions ;

(3) “matters of common interest,” meaning “defence, foreign affairs” and “internal communications”—Mr. Jinnah asserting that they can be agreed upon only after separation; and

(4) the boundary issue, Mr. Gandhi envisaging a Pakistan consisting of “contiguous” Muslim-majority “Districts” embracing Sind, N.W.F.P., Baluchistan, parts of the Punjab and Bengal, and “one District in Assam”—Mr. Jinnah complaining that “ ‘the present boundaries of these provinces would be maimed and mutilated beyond redemption and leave us only) with the husk.’”<sup>116</sup>

Mr. Gandhi asserting that he did not really represent Congress, whose members since July 1942 again had been jailed, gave Mr. Jinnah, despite his assertion that Mr. Gandhi

---

23 and 25 September 1944 letters to Mr. Gandhi.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid. p. 284, citing Mr. Jinnah’s 25 September 1944 letter to Mr. Gandhi.

nevertheless acted in such a capacity, the opportunity to claim that any settlement reached with him, therefore, would not be binding on that Hindu organisation.<sup>117</sup> Fearing virulent attacks upon him because these conferences failed, Mr. Gandhi instead was criticised severely by a “very bitter” Mahasabha, the angry Punjabi and Bengali Hindus, and the Sikhs un-happy at the prospect of their stronghold’s (Punjab’s) division without their consultation and consent. The Mahasabha leader, Mr. V.D. Savarkar, cuttingly remarked: “The Indian provinces were not the private properties of Gandhiji and Rajaji so that they could make a gift of them to anyone they liked.’ Despite their strong resentment,<sup>118</sup> the partition tide could not be stopped. Mr. Jinnah announced on 27 September his deep regret that he could not come to terms with the Hindu party because, as he already had written in his 25 September letter to Mr. Gandhi, the Lahore Resolution’s main principles had been rejected. He added, however: “We trust that this is not the final end of our efforts.”<sup>119</sup> While the new Viceroy, Lord Wavell, was intent on pursuing the setting up of an

---

<sup>117</sup> The League at its 30 July 1944 Lahore meeting gave him formal permission to conduct these talks (Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 163). It and The Hindustan Times published them.

<sup>118</sup> This may have caused some diminishing of Mr. Gandhi’s popularity, particularly amongst the Mahasabha held responsible for his assassination on 30 January 1945, or less than six months after secession took place.

<sup>119</sup> Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 166, citing from Mr. Jinnah’s 27 September letter to Mr. Gandhi. Doesn’t it show that he still hoped for a settlement? (See also Conclusions.)



acceptable “transitional government,”<sup>120</sup> Sir Tej Bahadur and Mr. Gandhi took the initiative in calling for a meeting of the Standing Committee of the Non-Party Conference<sup>121</sup> on 19 November 1944, when it was decided to found a special committee “to examine the whole communal and minorities question from a constitutional and political point of view”<sup>122</sup> and consult all parties concerned. Sir Tej, commissioned to appoint this “conciliation committee,” assured the press also on 19 November—after the session—that no member of a political party or anyone else known for his public statements on the communal issue would be appointed so as to lift it above partisan

---

<sup>120</sup> See above note for his take-over as Viceroy. During his August 1944 conference with the provincial Governors, he asserted that his Government pre-occupied with the war had little time to devote to Indian affairs, but that he nevertheless was prepared to proceed with solving constitutional and other issues upon the Governors’ unanimous recommendation. (For details and British Government disagreements, cf. Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-73.)

<sup>121</sup> It first met in the middle of March 1941 at Bombay upon the initiative of Sir Jagdish Prasad, a former member of the Governor-General’s Executive Council

<sup>122</sup> Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 173. Mr. Jinnah had objected to Mr. Gandhi’s proposals in part also because they implied a “redistribution of communal minorities and majorities,” which formed the substance of most of the then suggested solutions. He was not altogether wrong as the subsequent massive Muslim and Hindu exodus from their respective habitats into their specific majority regions during partition showed. He undoubtedly wished to prevent it.

politics.<sup>123</sup> His request for a December meeting with the League President was declined. Mr. Jinnah frankly stated that he could recognise neither the Conference nor any of its committees, because their members mostly were Hindus, including Mahasabhais, while the few Muslims belonging to it were unrepresentative non-Leaguers.

Lord Wavell's four Simla Conferences, held with a select group of communal representatives at the Viceregal Lodge between 25 and 27 June, and on 29 June 1945, too, were fruitless. So were his 27 June evening and 11 July<sup>124</sup> private talks with Mr. Jinnah. The chief stumbling blocks were his refusal to accept the Muslim leader's demands for (a) the inclusion of five Leaguers instead of the Viceroy's insistence upon four plus one independent Punjabi Muslim in the proposed Executive Council ; and (b) safeguards through possibly a three-fourth Council

---

<sup>123</sup> Upon the advice of Mr. Gandhi whose backing he urgently needed to effect his desired cooperation with the League and, more personally, its President.

<sup>124</sup> Mr. Jinnah had convoked the Muslim League Working Committee on 6 July 1945. He informed Lord Wavell on 7 July that a panel—which the Congress Working Committee convening on 3 July had completed on the 6<sup>th</sup>—could not be submitted ; the recommendations must be discussed privately, hence the 11 July meeting with Lord Wavell ; and that Leaguers only could sit in the Executive Council. He furthermore advised the Viceroy on 11 July that the Committee could not compromise its principles.

quorum to protect minority interests. The Britisher furthermore gave Mr. Jinnah to understand that, not as yet having consulted with Congress, he was uncertain whether that organisation would agree to his arrangements, including a double “parity” respectively between League and Congress, Muslims and Hindus in the said Council. During the last 14 July Simla gathering,<sup>125</sup> the Viceroy formally announced the failure of these Conferences. The line had been drawn! Islamic India’s mood can best be gauged from the joint non-League and Congress Muslims’ March 1945 memorandum to the Sapru Committee asserting “that they ‘concede the right of Self-Determination on a territorial basis.’”<sup>126</sup> Additional efforts made toward “the end of August 1945” by the nationalist Abul-Kalam Azad (1888-1950,<sup>127</sup> to effect “a communal settlement”<sup>128</sup> again floundered on the key issues of the composition of the Executive Council and Interim Government—Mr. Jinnah again insisting on Leaguers only—

---

<sup>125</sup> It was decided on 29 June to adjourn until 14 July.

<sup>126</sup> W. Cantwell Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 271, and p. 328, note 56 (a) giving as reference : “Dawn, Delhi, Late Dak edition, 10-6-45.”

<sup>127</sup> He had been Congress President in 1923, 1940, and remained in India after 1947, where he became Minister of Education in January 1947 until his death on 27 February 1958. (See L.S. May Evolution, pp. 185-95, for a brief synopsis. of his life and thought.) Cf. Mahadev Desai, *Mawlana Abul Kalam Azad* (London: 1941) and, amongst his own works, *India Wins Freedom* (Bombay : 1959).

<sup>128</sup> Menon, *op. cit.* , p. 22..

distribution of powers and adequate minority safeguards in these supreme bodies. India's Muslims by fall 1945 were closer than ever to "their goal of a separate State."<sup>129</sup>

The Congress nevertheless still refused to acknowledge that the Union could not be saved.<sup>130</sup> Mr. Azad's attempts timed with Lord Wavell's 21 August 1945 announcement<sup>131</sup> that elections would be held "in the cold weather," in preparation for independence, which the Indian leaders hailed. Mr. Jinnah touring mostly North-West India urged his constituents chiefly concentrated in that part of Hind and in Bengal: "Vote for a Muslim Leaguer even if it be a lamp-post"<sup>132</sup> The results

---

<sup>129</sup> Ikram, op. cit., p. 262, giving 1942 as "the first indication" of this goal's eventual realisation.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. the Congress Working Committee's September 1945 swaraj resolution's elder. The All-India National Congress rejected secession at its plenary session.

<sup>131</sup> He left on 24 August 1945 together with Mr. Menon and Sir Evan Jenkins for consultations in London.

<sup>132</sup> Weekes, op. cit., p. 86. The Punjab League Ministry had been out between 4 February and 14 March 1945. Nazimuddin's Bengal League ministry lost on 28 March 1945, when the Governor under the 1935 Act's Section 93 took over that province; Dr Khan Sahib's Congress coalition party ruled the N.W.F.P. ; and the Punjab's Unionist Party (whose head, Sir Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan had died in 1942 and had been succeeded by Malik Khizr Hayat Khan) had loosened its League association : only in Sind and Assam were League ministries in control at that time. (See below for the July 1946 elections ) For the situation during and after the 1937 elections, also cf. Cantwell Smith, op. cit., pp. 250-

announced by late December 1945 showed League triumphs, for it won all of the thirty Muslim seats in the Central Legislative Assembly,<sup>133</sup> and 427 out of a combined total of 507 such seats in the provincial parliaments.<sup>134</sup> The All-India Muslim League declared 11 January 1946 as its Victory Day. Its President, for whom its sweep was a personal success, undauntedly declared to a (British) Parliamentary Delegation having arrived on 5 January his conditions for entering an Interim Government, namely: its acceptance of (a) Pakistan; (b) “parity” as stated by Lord Wavell during their previous year’s private meetings; and (c) two constituent assemblies (respectively for Pakistan and India). The Viceroy in his 28 January seven-minute address to the newly elected Central Legislature announced his Government’s intention to set up one such body. Mr. Jinnah on 4 April pointed out to the

---

51, also stressing the strength of the provincial parties, and further stating (on p 251) that the League coalition in Assam “broke up in 1938” and was replaced by “A Congress coalition ministry... for a year”.

<sup>133</sup> Weekes, *op. cit.*, stating also: against 25 at outgoing time; cf. Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 226, and W. Cantwell Smith, *op. cit.*, p 271, note.

<sup>134</sup> Weekes. *op. cit.*, pp. 86-87. It failed in the N.W.F.P. ; it won 78 out of the 175 seats in the Punjab resulting in the Unionist Party-Congress-Sikh coalition. The non-Muslim constituencies were won by the All-India National Congress.

Cabinet Mission,<sup>135</sup> which had reached New Delhi on 24 March and would leave on 29 June, that they, the Secretary of State for India and Parliament, ignoring India's composite nature erred in regarding Hind as one indivisible land. He furthermore stood by the 1940 Pakistan Resolution. His stand was re-affirmed by the 8 and 10 April (1946) Delhi-held Muslim Convention—Composed of then recently elected legislators—which passed a resolution moved by the Bengali minister, Mr. Hussain Shaheed Suhrawardy (1893-1963), favouring a v holly independent instead of an autonomous Indian-Union-contained Pakistan. They furthermore agreed that “ ‘the zones comprising Bengal and Asam in the north-east and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan in the north-west of India, namely, Pakistan zones, where the Muslims are in a dominant majority, be constituted into a sovereign independent State.’”<sup>136</sup> Their resolution embodied and further crystallized all previous proposals for Pakistan's geographical composition.<sup>137</sup> It would bear fruit exactly thirteen months after the July 1946 elections to the provincial assembly with this difference that the Punjab and

---

<sup>135</sup> It again was headed by Sir Stafford Cripps ; its other two members were the senior ministers, Lord Pethick-Lawrence and Mr. A.Y. Alexander.

<sup>136</sup> Ikram, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

<sup>137</sup> Cf. Mr. Gandhi's afore-mentioned suggestions. Kashmir was excluded also from the April 1946 Muslim Conference resolution as it was from Dr. Iqbal's proposed plan, which, however, had excluded Bengal.

Bengal would be divided. It consequently could form ministries in Bengal<sup>138</sup> and in Sind,<sup>139</sup> but for lack of a full majority could not do so in the Punjab<sup>140</sup> and in the N.W.F.P.,<sup>141</sup>

Where Hindus out of their numerical proportion and strong provincialism formed obstacles. As future events showed, their Muslim constituents were pro-Pakistan. Yet, the 16 May 1946 Cabinet Mission statement (“Plan”) rejected partition, preferred a “Union of India” with single executive and one legislature, advanced the principle of a Federal and Province-grouping each

---

<sup>138</sup> In Bengal, the League captured 113 out of 119 Muslim seats. Congress won 87. Mr. H.S. Suhrawardy then formed his League ministry.

<sup>139</sup> In Sind, the League won 27 seats and gained another when an independent Muslim joined that organisation. Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah, its League chief, headed that Province’s ministry.

<sup>140</sup> In the Punjab, the League won 79 of the total 86 Muslim seats; Congress captured 51; 42 went to other groups, including 22 to the Panthic Akali Sikhs, with whom the League could not reach an agreement. A Congress-Sikh-Unionist coalition led by Malik Khizr Hayat Khan resulted. He resigned on 2 March 1947, in the wake of Prime Minister Attlee’s 20 February statement making a coalition extremely difficult. On 5 March, the Punjab Governor, Sir Evan Jenkins, took over under Section 93 of the 1935 Government of India Act.

<sup>141</sup> The N.W.F.P. had a Muslim League ministry between 23 May 1943 and 12 March 1945, when it lost by 24 to 18 votes and Dr Khan Sahib upon the provincial Governor’s request set up a new ministry which held office until the July 1946 elections, when the League won 17, Congress, 30, of which 19 were Muslim seats, resulting in another Khan Sahib-led coalition ministry (Note.—cf. Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-32 for further details on the July 1946 provincial elections’ statistics.)

province being allowed to have its own “executives and legislatures”.<sup>142</sup> Communications a foreign affairs and defence were to remain under Central control; while the “group government” would deal with subjects delegated to them by the respective provincial assemblies. Congress already having resolved at its 6 July 1946 Bombay session to enter the new Constituent Assembly--after ratifying its Working Committee Resolution—rejected the grouping principle.<sup>143</sup> Toward the end of that month, elections to the 290-seat Constituent Assembly had taken place. Lord Wavell wrote a letter to Messrs Nehru as Congress<sup>144</sup> and Mr. Jinnah as League President on 22 July asserting that (a) each party will “have an equitable share of the most important portfolios”; (b) once they have submitted names of their respective candidates and entered the Government, such a portfolio distribution would be made; (c) a coalition could work only if both parties assent to iron out the “major communal issues”.<sup>145</sup>

Mr. Nehru, asserting that the Cabinet Plan could be changed as Congress wished and that foreign affairs included currency,

---

<sup>142</sup> Section “A” comprised Hindu provinces ; “B,” the N.W.F P., Sind and Punjab ; “C,” Assam and Bengal. British Baluchistan still was a special problem; see below.

<sup>143</sup> L.S. May, *Evolution*, p. 293.

<sup>144</sup> He took over the Congress presidency from Abul-Kalam Azad during the 6 July 1946 meeting.

<sup>145</sup> Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-86.



customs and even foreign trade, invited criticism from Mr. Azad and put off the League and its President. Its Council, therefore, and because of fear of Hindu control, rejected the Cabinet Plan at its 27 July Bombay meeting when it also decided on direct action and on renouncing the titles of all of its members. Mr. Jinnah replying on 31 July to the Viceroy's 22 July letter formally advised him of the League Council decision. Lord Wavel] answering on 2 August expressed his regret, re-assured his eminent Muslim correspondent once more concerning adequate minority representation and safeguards—although he could not promise a three fourth quorum as one way to effect that no measure would be adopted against the will of any small group - and informed him at the same time that he had asked Congress to initiate steps toward forming an Interim Government. On 16 August, three days after Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru had accepted this request, the League organised "Direct Action Day". Its President nevertheless continued his conferences with the British authority and Hindu leaders. He wrote to the Viceroy on 13 October<sup>146</sup> that since his request for the inclusion of five Leaguers in the Interim Government, installed at New Delhi on 2 December with Mr. Nehru as its President, and it would be contrary to "interests of

---

<sup>146</sup>The Viceroy, after his 4 October conference with Mr. Nehru, still insisted upon the inclusion of one non-Leaguer, but promised Mr. Jinnah that he would nominate a Leaguer as Cabinet president—which post he also held—in his absence ; and that he would consult the All-India Muslim League and Congress before filling any vacancies.

Mussulmans and other communities . . . to leave the entire field of administration of the Central Government in the hands of the Congress... we have decided to nominate” them.<sup>147</sup>

After his ensuing interview, in which Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan (1895-1951)<sup>148</sup> accompanied him, with the Viceroy, Mr. Jinnah appointed the Leaguers<sup>149</sup> on 14 October. A formal press communique publicising the League’s decision to enter the Interim Government—which was reconstituted to accommodate its new members on 15 October was released on that same day. It was welcomed “with relief” and raised the hope that the Union still would be saved. Now the question of portfolios had to be straightened out. The Viceroy suggested that either the Home or External Affairs or Defence portfolio ought to be transferred to the League. The Congress leaders objected.<sup>150</sup> They instead

---

<sup>147</sup> Cf. Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

<sup>148</sup> Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan, serving as Secretary of the A11-India Muslim League between 1930 and 1947, became Mr. Jinnah’s closest associate and acted as Pakistan’s Prim Minister between 1947 and his death in 1951. The Pact that he apparently had made with Mr. Bhulabhai Desai in 1945 and which aimed at preserving the Union, was rejected by Congress and subsequently by Mr. Jinnah because it had been made without that Hindu body’s or the League’s authority.

<sup>149</sup> They were: Messrs Liaqat All Khan, I.I. Chundrigar, Abdur Rab Nishtar, Ghazanfar Ali Khan and Jogendra Nath Mandal; the last-named person was a Bengal Muslim League minister and represented the Scheduled Castes.

<sup>150</sup> Mr. Nehru objecting to giving up External .Affairs ; Sardar Patel, to granting the Home portfolio to the League. Cf. Michael Beecher, *Nehru--A Political Biography* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970), p. 324.

offered Law, Communications, Health and Finance, believing “that the League would not be able to manage Finance and would have to decline the offer”.<sup>151</sup> Mr. Jinnah half-heartedly accepted the Finance portfolio because he was not sure whether anyone in his Cabinet could handle this awesome responsibility. When Chaudhry Muhammad Ali of the Finance Department heard the news, however, he “immediately” called his chief, told him that it was an unexpected “windfall” and promised to assist in these duties. Mr. Jinnah thereupon consulted and appointed Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan as his Finance Minister.<sup>152</sup> Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan not only could scrutinise every single measure, but could control appointments, meaning interference in “every Department,” and, holding the veto, he could dictate Government policy. It thus gave him extraordinary powers.

The new Interim Government, including the Leaguers, formally took office on 26 October. Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan, however, said that it ““consisted of a Congress bloc and a Muslim bloc, each functioning under separate leadership””.<sup>153</sup> The League obviously rejected Mr. Nehru’s presidency. Although it now formed part of the transitional Government, it still had not entered the Constituent Assembly. The Viceroy advised Minister

---

<sup>151</sup> Choudhry Khaliqzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (Lahore : Longmans, Pakistan Branch, 1961), p. 370,

<sup>152</sup> Abul-Kalam Azad, *op. cit.*, p. 167; cf. Ikram, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

<sup>153</sup> . Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 32 I.

Liaqat Ali Khan on 20 November that the League could not stay in the Government without also joining the Assembly. A final London conference<sup>154</sup> held on 2-6 December—attended by him and Mr. Jinnah as League representatives and Messrs Jawaharlal Nehru and Baldev Singh as Congress delegates—Mr. Singh being the Sikh emissary—failed to produce any concrete results. Amongst the chief reasons were the Congress leaders regretting their Finance offer trying to change their previous commitment and Mr. Nehru's said redefinition of foreign affairs. The League rejecting this approach remained insistent on necessary safeguards, so that no law contrary to the well-being of Muslim or other minority, and preference, would be passed, and on an adequate balance of power in the Assembly as at the Centre. The British Government had no choice but to announce the intensive Conferences' failure on 6 December. The problem also was that each party gave its own interpretation<sup>155</sup> to the principles of the Cabinet Mission Plan and that section of the 6 December "statement" referring to "part of the country," which Mr. Nehru understood in terms of "parts of a province". The League consequently was absent from the opening (9 December) and subsequent sessions of the Constituent Assembly.

---

<sup>154</sup> Messrs Liaqat All Khan, Nehru, Baldev Singh were invited to attend that Conference during their 26 November meeting with the Viceroy. Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan transmitted the invitation to Mr. Jinnah.

<sup>155</sup> L.S. May, *Evolution*, asserted by Mr. Nehru in his 21 February 1947 conference with Lord Wavell.

During 1947, two years after the end of the Second World War, the events in India<sup>156</sup> rushed to their conclusion. The Congress-League<sup>157</sup> dissent continued. That Hindu body sent its first demand that the League, because of its refusal to join the constitution-making organ, resign from the Interim Government, to the Viceroy on 5 February. Mr. Nehru repeated this demand in his 13 February letter to Lord Wavell and added the Congress threat that it would leave both unless the League withdrew. He had created an “either/or”<sup>158</sup> situation. The Congress nevertheless did not follow up its threat and the said Assembly proceeded with its constitution-drafting work. It and the British leader(s) admitted, however, that such a Charter “could not be imposed on the unwilling Muslim-majority provinces.”<sup>159</sup> Prime Minister Attlee’s<sup>160</sup> 20 February 1947 statement to Parliament<sup>161</sup> announcing the desire of King George V to grant independence to India not later than by June 1948, and that a new Viceroy, Lord Louis Mountbatten, sympathetic to his cousin’s preference, would

---

<sup>156</sup>

<sup>157</sup> Cf. the 5 January 1947 All-India Congress Committee (meeting in Delhi) resolution (Menon, *op cit.*, pp. 332-33) and Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan’s 25 January statement (*ibid.*, pp. 333-34).

<sup>158</sup> Title of a book by the German existentialist philosopher, Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855).

<sup>159</sup> Menon, *op cit.*, p. 70.

<sup>160</sup> A new Labour Government had come to power after the elections in England.

<sup>161</sup> See Menon, *op. cit.*, Appendix IX, for its full text.

oversee the “peaceful transfer of power,” augured in the last months of hectic negotiations toward that end. Immediately upon his arrival<sup>162</sup> at New Delhi on 22 March, he began his innumerable consultations, including another 8-10 May round of Simla Conferences. He meanwhile had received a new plan<sup>163</sup> replacing the Cabinet Mission Proposals, from London. The “Mountbatten Plan,” as it became known, provided for: partition between Islamic and Hindu India, as well as between the Punjab and Bengal; the right of every province to seek its own destiny; of the States to secede, become fully independent from the Indian Union, and have their own respective constitutions. It further involved the setting up of a new successor Dominion, viz. Pakistan Government, in addition to the existing Indian Dominion Administration; the creation of a second Constituent Assembly; and the development of an interim Charter. Mr. Jinnah and the League objected<sup>164</sup>. The January 1947 unrest in the Punjab provoked by the Government’s forbidding its voluntary Muslim National Guards corps also affected the N.W.F.P. to provincial division on a communal basis; Mr. Nehru and Congress<sup>160</sup> rejected those provisions particularly relating to the options given

---

<sup>162</sup> Lord Wavell left on 23 March.

<sup>163</sup> He first showed this new plan to Mr. Nehru on 10 May.

<sup>164</sup> The Congress Working Committee had passed a resolution on 5 March 1947, recommending the Punjab’s division, which could be extended to Bengal. Copy of this resolution (and two others respectively welcoming the Government’s declaration for India’s independence and requesting the League to cooperate in effecting Dominion Status) were submitted to Lord Wavell on 9 March.

to all provinces and States to secede as they would undermine India's geographical and political unity and endanger some of its strategic areas. He warned that it would arouse enmity between his country and Great Britain. Both leaders, as well as the then Congress President, Mr. J.B. Kripalani, and Mr. Baldev Singh, apart from other notables,<sup>165</sup> not only accepted the Plan after the conference held at the Viceroy's House on 2-3 June, but also Lord Mountbatten's suggestion that the independence date should be predated to 1947 in accordance with the "Statement's" new clause under paragraph 20 headed "Immediate Transfer of Power". Other questions discussed related to "notional partition," to safeguard Sikh interests, referendum inclusive of Calcutta, the tasks of the Boundary Commission, devolution of power on a Dominion basis. The Viceroy then broadcast over India Radio on the evening of 3 June the decisions taken, after a brief review of his consultations; Messrs Jinnah, Nehru and Baldev Singh respectively on behalf of the All-India Muslim League, All-India National Congress, and the Sikh community followed him to publicise their consent to the new proposals. The League Council and Congress ratified the 3 June Plan, as it also became known, respectively on 10 and 14 June. Prime Minister Attlee simultaneously broadcast His Majesty's Government decision<sup>166</sup>

---

<sup>165</sup> Also participating were Mr. Patel representing Congress ; and Messrs Liaqat Ali Khan and Abdur Rab Nishtar, on the League's behalf (Menon, op. cit., p. 371).

<sup>166</sup> See Menon, op. cit., Appendix X for the "Statement Made by His Majesty's Government, 3 June 1947".

that failing any League-Congress agreement, “partition becomes the inevitable alternative”. Its next step was to draft the “Indian Independence Bill”.<sup>167</sup> Having passed the Commons on 15 July and the House of Lords on the next day, it received Crown assent on 18 July. It stipulates “the fifteenth day of August, 1947” as the Day on which “two independent Dominions shall be set up in India, to be known respectively as India and Pakistan”. Meanwhile, a referendum was held in the legislatures of the affected provinces. Its results are well known: the Punjabi<sup>168</sup> and Bengali,<sup>169</sup> Muslims, together with those of and Sind,<sup>170</sup> opted to join Pakistan. And so it came to be that they officially formed the sovereign the N.W.F.P.,<sup>171</sup> Baluchistan<sup>172</sup> Islamic Republic of Pakistan on 14 August. Lord Mountbatten, having appointed Mr.

---

<sup>167</sup> Ibid., Appendix XI. Power was transferred under the 1935 Government of India Act; also pp. 390 if.

<sup>168</sup> 164. The Punjab Legislative Assembly voted by 91 to 77 votes in favour of Pakistan.

<sup>169</sup> The Bengal Legislative Assembly on 26 June opted by 126 to 90 votes to join Pakistan and its new Constituent Assembly. The East Bengali Muslims voted 106 to 35 in favour.

<sup>170</sup> The W.W.F.P. 6-17 July referendum (50% voting) showed 289,244 versus 2874 to join Pakistan and its Constituent Assembly.

<sup>171</sup> . The Shahi Jirga and Quetta Municipality members (seven Parsis and Hindus not attending) unanimously voted likewise.

<sup>172</sup> The Sind Legislative Assembly convening on 26 June similarly opted by 30 to 20 votes. Sylhet’s early July referendum showed 239,619 against 184,041 in favour of joining East Bengal. (For additional particulars, cf. Merlon, op. cit., pp. 387-90).



Jinnah as their country's first native Governor-General (with the King's blessings), had flown from New Delhi to Karachi on 14 August to inaugurate the newly independent country's Constituent Assembly.

The 15<sup>th</sup> of August was the greatest triumph for Mr. Muhammad Ali Jinnah who drove amidst a jubilant crowd through Karachi. It was a personal homecoming for the architect of Pakistan. His grateful people honoured him during his life by bestowing upon him the title of Quaid i-Azam and post-mortem by building his magnificent mausoleum overlooking his native city and by celebrating his birth centennial!

## **Conclusions**

Two diverse currents bore on the Quaid-i-Azam's thought formation. He was born under Islam conceiving of socially concerned and responsible humans being as God's vicegerents on earth. It, therefore, teaches not only obedience to His Revelation, but also active involvement in life. It spawned the zest of the entire free Muslim generations resulting in their attainment of eminence in the sciences as in law and government, in literature as in manuscript illumination, in music as in architectural design.

English education involving politics and law, philosophy and (Western) history, literature and social sciences, stressed independent and critical analysis as well as the individual's worth and rights, and Eulogized a free and moral society. The Muslims,

too, had self-esteem and exercised these faculties. If the Mongol onslaught had undermined their rationalistic spirit, colonialism dampened their creativity and their hope, Western schooling revived the critical faculty and its daring novel reconstruction<sup>173</sup> of the Qur'anic principles. Modernism, in fact, implied a total re-analysis. Although Mr. Jinnah was not a philosopher, he nevertheless was influenced by this Muslim school of thought emerging during the nineteenth century.<sup>174</sup> European training furthermore stirred in him (as in others who experienced it) a strong desire to strive toward selfhood (khudi). Dr Muhammad Iqbal defined it in terms of self-respect, involving also taking a new attitude, and of intensive activity.<sup>175</sup> The Western stream of thought thus released and reinforced the Islamic doctrine and conception of the individual. Mr. Jinnah being a sensitive and brilliant student deeply absorbed the said aspects of his own and foreign tradition. He furthermore belonged to the new Muslim middle-class intelligentsia which began to develop as a result of participating in this novel European training toward the end of the nineteenth century. They took the initiative that led to the first

---

<sup>173</sup> Cf. Dr Muhammad Iqbal's 1926 University Lectures entitled: *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* (Lahore : Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1962), It has gone through many editions. A new annotated one is now being prepared in connection with his birth centennial celebrations.

<sup>174</sup> In Egypt, Turkey, India particularly at first.

<sup>175</sup> Cf. my article, entitled "Iqbal's Doctrine of Khudi," Iqbal (Lahore: Bazm-i Iqbal), XVIII (3), Jan.-Mar. 1971, p. 55 if.

Simla Deputation in 1906, demanding safeguards through separate electorates for their co-religionists, and, by that year's end, to the founding of the All-India Muslim League to give them their own nation-wide representation. Mr. Jinnah's association with Congress, instead of this League, between 1906 and 1913, meant his total acceptance of that Hindu body's platform: swaraj. He joined the League only after it incorporated independence in its resolution. His continued Congress membership (until 1920 reflected his other main desire: to retain Hindu-Muslim cooperation and Indian unity, to which the 1916 Lucknow Pact attests. His resignation from Congress did not mean his abandonment of this aim, which he nourished even after his change of mind in 1940. One facet of his personality must be stressed: his unflinching adherence to a principle once he had embraced it. That was as true of swaraj and unity, as it was, after 1940, of his full dedication to the Pakistan Resolution. He henceforth gave all his talents, energies, efforts, and time to rebuilding the League and in shaping it into the most respectable national Muslim organisation for the purpose of carrying through its new platform. It is furthermore to his credit that he won the confidence of the most eminent and fiercely independent provincial Muslim leaders during the 1940's (and even before). Their willing cooperation helped carry the All-India Muslim League platform to victory in 1947! Nearly thirty years have now passed. Much has been said and written about the Quaid-i-Azam and the many leading—mostly deceased—personalities whom he knew personally. What ultimately caused the Muslim-Hindu

disagreements? Mr. Jinnah as early as 1920 held the British Government intimately responsible for sowing discord. He accused Lord Wavell of changing the balance of power in the Cabinet by adding one more non-Muslim than originally agreed upon, implying that the British did not always keep their promises. Indian notables even today point to the British divide-and-rule policies, including the holding of private interviews with and making contrary promises to one and then another individual.<sup>176</sup> Communalism sparked by colonialism in any case blocked the development of a secular two-party system—possibly

---

<sup>176</sup> Cf. L. Mosley, *The Last Days of the British Raj* (London : Widenfeld and Nicolson, 1961), pp. 101-02; Alan Campbell-Johnson, *Mission with Mountbatten* (London : Robert Hale, 1951), pp. 144, 146, for Lord Mountbatten's special friendship with Mr. Menon, whose draft in (het formed the Plan's basis; cf. Menon, *op cit.*, p. 360 ; cf. *ibid.*, p. 358 for his reference to "a lengthy discussion" which Mr. Menon had "late in December 1946, or early in January 1947 . . . with Vallabhbai Patel. A united India under the Cabinet Mission Plan was I suggested, an illusion...." Cf finally P. Moon, *Divide and Quit* (London: Chatto and Windus. 1961), p. 1334, calling Mr. V.P. Menon "Sardar Patel's right-hand man". The implications are that Messrs Menon and Patel previously settled what Lord Mountbatten later would implement and, hence, that they followed a much earlier analysis made by Dr Muhammad Iqbal and Mr. Lajpat Rai, and the above-mentioned 1933 British Government's Pakistan orientation. Lord Mountbatten originally had preferred the union to remain intact. (Cf. the Cripps Plan !)

desired by Mr. Jinnah—similar to that found hitherto in the United States of America.

The final question: Could partition have been prevented? remains.

If one takes the view of history that no human can oppose, but must swim with, its tide, then what occurred had to happen. If one assumes the opposite view that individuals with leadership qualities play an active role in shaping the events, then the conclusion is that particularly the 1940-1947 years were a kind of chess game in which each player made his moves and tried to overcome his opponent. Mr. Jinnah won, for an independent Pakistan came to be:

“Such glory shall the man of clay

Own far above the angels’ light

That with big star of destiny

He’ll make the earth like heaven bright.”<sup>177</sup>

## NOTES

---

<sup>177</sup> Muhammad Iqbal, Javid Namah, lines 161-64—English translation; Pilgrimage of Eternity by Shaikh Mahmud Ahmad (Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture, 1961), p. 8.

# ISLAMIC UNIVERSALISM AND TERRITORIAL NATIONALISM IN IQBAL'S THOUGHT

Professor S. Qudratullah Fatimi

Director, RCD Cultural Institute (Pakistan Branch), Islamabad

## I

Islamic Universalism and Territorial Nationalism are the two complementary political forces in the present-day Muslim world. Both these trends originated in the Muslim world of today through Jamal al-Din al-Afghani's thinking and interpretation of Islamic teachings and found their most eloquent expression in prose and poetical compositions of Allamah Muhammad Iqbal. It will be opportune to give a very brief survey of Afghani's contributions to modern Muslim thought before an attempt is made to analyze the progress of these two trends in Iqbal's thought.

In the long history of the struggle of the East against Western domination Sayyid Jamal al-Din al-Afghani's name occupies a unique place.<sup>178</sup> His was one man's will and wit pitted against the brute force of the two mightiest powers of his times, the British Empire and the Czarist Russia. Though Afghani had no support of an army, a State, or even a political organization, yet through his indomitable courage, indefatigable labour, astute statesmanship, moving eloquence, charismatic leadership and dynamic personality, he became a terror for the chanceries of the

---

<sup>178</sup> There is a vast literature on Afghani, his life and works. Abdullah Albert Kudsi Zadeh, Sayyid Jamal al-Din al-Afghani: An Annotated Bibliography, and his "A Supplementary Bibliography" in *The Muslim World*, LXV/4 (1975), 79-91, are a good guide to this literature. However, Qadi Muhammad `Abd al-Ghaffar's *Athar-i-Jamal al-Din Afghani* is still a most valuable and balanced biography of Afghani.

West and a hope for the enslaved masses of the East. His programme for their liberation and uplift consisted of three inter-linked reformatory measures:

One, enlightenment through educational reforms;

Two, strengthening the national States of the Muslim World through the promotion of nationalist and populist movements; and Three, the unity of the Muslim world.

Afghani knew that territorial nationalism was the greatest political force of modern times and the most potent weapon in the hands of the downtrodden and enslaved masses of colonial East. So, he became the pioneer of nationalist movements in Muslim East and at the same time exhorted these nationalist forces to join hands against their common enemy, Western Imperialism.

He was the harbinger of Arab nationalism. He inspired 'Arabi Pasha's Egyptian revolt of 1881 and it was under his guidance that Muhammad 'Abduh and Sa'd Zaghlul led the movement for Arab liberation and resurgence. Among his close collaborators for the cause of Arab resurgence were non-Muslim Arab journalists and intellectuals like Adib Ishaq, a Syrian Christian, and Ibn Sanu, an Egyptian Jew.<sup>179</sup> The nationalist ferment and intellectual renaissance kindled by Afghani at the Azhar University of Cairo had its influence as far as the Malayan peninsula and the Indonesian archipelago. Afghani's disciples inspired the powerful reformist Muhammadiyah and Sarekat Islam organisations through whose efforts Islam assumed the role of a pre-nationalism in Indonesia,<sup>180</sup> A similar pre-nationalist lead was given by Sayyid Shaikh al-Hadi of Malaya who also drew his guidance from the Egyptian disciples of Afghani.<sup>181</sup>

---

<sup>179</sup> C. Adams, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*, pp. 4-17; see also, Rashid Ahmad (Jullundhri), "Pan-Islamism and Pakistan: I, Afghani and Nasser," *Scrutiny*, I/2 (1975), 29-30.

<sup>180</sup> . W.F. Wertheim, *Indonesian Society in Transition*, pp. 209-15 ; also Wilfred C. Smith, *Islam in Modern History*, pp. 48-50 and 75.

<sup>181</sup> A selection of al-Hadi's writings has been compiled and translated into English by Mrs Linda ran and recently published by the Malaysian Sociological Research

In Iran, he led the successful campaign of 1890-91 against the British monopoly of the sale and export of tobacco, showed the way how the rich economic resources of Muslim East could be used as a weapon for the political and economic emancipation of the people, and, through his powerful support to the Iranian people's struggle for constitutional monarchy (.....), he became one of the pioneers of Iranian nationalism.<sup>182</sup> Grateful Iranians claim him to be an Iranian by origin being an Asadabadi. They contend that he assumed Afghani nisbah to escape the tyranny of the Qachar despots of Iran, The question is still debated and is, certainly, symbolic of the national pride aroused by him.

In Turkey, Sultan Abdul Hamid II conspired to use him and his movement for Muslim unity as tools for the promotion of his own despotic aims, but he tenaciously resisted those attempts and contributed towards giving a nationalist direction to the movement of the Young Turks. At his urging Mehmed Emin Yurdakul composed poems in simplified Turkish using the syllabic meter of folk poetry<sup>183</sup> and what was still more remarkable, as Professor Bernard Lewis has remarked:

“he adopted a word which, in Turkish usage, had connoted a boorish, ignorant peasant or nomad, and proudly proclaimed himself a Turk I am a Turk, my faith and my race are mighty in another place—We are Turks, with this blood and with this name we live.”<sup>184</sup>

He was put under detention by the Ottoman autocrat and, in March 1897, the pioneer of the movement for Muslim unity died in the “guided” prison of the

---

Institute, Kuala Lumpur. Dr Muhammad Zaki wrote in 1965 a doctoral thesis on this subject for the London University.

<sup>182</sup> E.G. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, has contemporary and the most reliable evidence on Afghani's activities in Iran. One of Afghani's Iranian disciples, Mirza Reza Kirmani, assassinated the Qachar king Nasir al-Din, in 1896, for which Afghani had to suffer.

<sup>183</sup> Kemal H. Karpat, *The Cambridge History of Islam*, 1, 557.

<sup>184</sup> Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 343.



Muslim Caliph who claimed to be the up-holder of Pan-Islamism.<sup>185</sup> What an irony of history it was!

But the still greater irony is that the founder of nationalist movements in Muslim countries is said to be hostile to nationalism. This is, in fact, a very subtle propaganda of the Imperialist forces aimed at the weakening of the anti-Imperialist movement among the Muslim masses on two fronts. On the one hand, attempt is thus made to keep the Muslims aloof from the national liberation movements of their countries in the name of Afghani's so-called Pan-Islamism; and, on the other, doubts are created in the minds of the nationalist forces about the motives of the movement for Muslim solidarity. The former attempt delayed the awakening of Muslim masses but it eventually failed and, though the Muslims could not be the vanguard, which Islam expected them to be, yet they did take an active part in the emancipation of the East. The Pakistan Freedom Movement, the Indonesian struggle for merdeka, the heroic battles fought by the Algerians against the French colonialists and the long and bitter war that the Arabs have been fighting on many fronts for the liberation of Palestine, are some of the most notable triumphs of the nationalist upsurge in modern world. But we have yet to guard ourselves against the dangers posed by Pan-Islamism to the movement for Muslim. We must differentiate between Pan-Islamism and Islamic Universalism. Islam being a universal religion does not have a nationalism of its own. As Iqbal has so well put it, "Islam is neither Nationalism nor Imperialism but a League of Nations."<sup>186</sup> To talk of Muslim National-ism is to equate Islam with the national religions of the Jews and the Hindus.<sup>187</sup> Islam does not have a Zion or any Aryavarta.<sup>188</sup> The whole world is its

---

<sup>185</sup> Afghani died in mysterious circumstances and it is suspected that he was poisoned by Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid. Like his origin Afghani's end too remains a debated question

<sup>186</sup> Sir Muhammad Iqbal, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, p. 159.

<sup>187</sup> See Gunnar Myrdal's observation in his *Asian Drama : An Enquiry into the Poverty of Nations*, I, 306. Myrdal has confined his comparison of Islam and Christianity with Hinduism alone but still more apt would have been their comparison with Judaism. Lenin had to fight a crusade against the Jewish nationalists of the Bund, see his *The Right of Nations to Self-determination* ; also, J. Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*. But the religious nationalism of the Jews in its most aggressive form, Zionism, succeeded in carving out the State of Israel from the

homeland and not a particular country, for the Blessed Prophet declared: جعلت لي [The whole earth is made a mosque for me and pure]<sup>189</sup> For this reason Islamic universalism does not reject; rather, it affirms the nationalist idea; and the territorial nationalism of the Muslim countries and the movement for Muslim solidarity are complementary to each other. On the one hand, Muslim solidarity is the surest guarantee for the safeguard of the territorial integrity of the Muslim countries; and, on the other, it is only a strong, nationally coherent, self-confident and self-reliant Muslim country that can play a meaningful role in promoting Muslim unity. Afghani lived and laid down his life for the achievement of these ideals.

Afghani was a radical. He was not an obscurantist. He visualized the resurgent nationalisms of the Muslim countries in the context of the struggle of the East against the colonial exploitation of the I West.

AI-'Urwat al-Wuthqa (العروة الوثقى), a weekly periodical clandestinely circulated by Afghani and Muhammad 'Abduh throughout the Muslim world, was one of the most powerful weapons that they had forged for the anti-Imperialist freedom fight. In its issue dated 15 May 1884, Afghani unequivocally declared:

لا يظن احد من الناس ان جريدتنا هذه بتخصيصها للمسلمين بالذكر احيانا و مدافعتها عن حقرهم  
نقصد الشقاق بينهم و بين من يجاورهم في اوطانهم و يتفق معهم في مصالح بلادهم و يشاركونهم في  
المنافع من اجيال طويلة فليس هذا من شاننا و لا مما نميل اليه و لا يبيحه ديننا و لا تسمح بد شريعتنا و

---

British Mandate of Palestine on 14 May 1948. It is amazing how some "Muslim nationalists" present the establishment of Israel nine months after the independence of Pakistan as the strongest argument justifying Pakistan's so-called *raison d'etre*. (As if this ancient land with a six-thousand-year-old continuous history of civilization needs some argument that may account for, or justify, its existence!)

<sup>188</sup> For the Hindu Aryavarta concept, see this writer's *Pakistani Qawmiyat*, pp. 74-86.

<sup>189</sup> Bukhari, *Sahih*, I, 91 and 119.

لكن الغرض تعذير الشرقيين عموما و المسلمين خصوصا من تطاول الا جانب عليهم و الافساد في بلادهم و قد نخص المسلمين بالخطاب لانهم العنصر الغالب في الاقطار التي غدر بها الا جنبيون و اذلوا اهلها اجمعين و استاثروا بجميع خيراتها-

[In this Journal we have been specifically mentioning Muslims very often and have been fighting to defend their rights, but this must not make anyone believe that we intend to sow enmity between the Muslims and their non-Muslim compatriots who have common territorial interest with them and who have been sharing with them mutual benefits since long millenniums. This does not behove us. It is against our natural disposition. It is also against the tenets of our Faith and is not permitted by our Religious Law. Our aim is to warn the Easterners, in general, and the Muslims, in particular, against becoming victims of the tyranny of the aliens and against letting their lands being corrupted by these foreigners. We do often address the Muslims particularly but only because they are the dominant element in that part of the world where the aliens have spread corruption, subjected the people and destroyed all that was good.]<sup>190</sup>

In the last letter that he wrote from the prison of the Pan-Islamist Caliph, Sultan ‘Abd al-Hamid, Afghani said:

خوشم به حبس و خوشم بر اين كشته شدن- محبوسم برائے آزادی نوع- كشته می شوم برائے زندگی قوم- ولے افسوس می خورم ازین كه آرزوئے كه داشتم كاملا نائل نه گردیدم و شمشیر شقاوت نه گزاشت كه عمل بیداری مشرق را بینم-

[I am happy over my internment. I am jubilant over my impending death. I am imprisoned so that humanity may be freed. I am being killed so that nation may live. But I regret that my wishes have not been completely fulfilled. Misfortune did not allow me to see the full process of the awakening of the activism of the East.]<sup>191</sup>

---

<sup>190</sup> Husayn Muhiy al-Din al-Hibal, Ed., *AI-'Urwat al-Wuthqa*, p. 190,

<sup>191</sup> Qadi Muhammad ‘Abd al-Ghaffar, op. cit., pp. 296-97.

Afghani's call for Muslim unity and Asian solidarity did not fall on deaf ears. It took roots, developed and finally emerged as the power of the Third World in which Muslim national States have a prominent place. His soul must have rejoiced at the sight of the Lahore Summit of 1974 when, all the Muslim national States joined hands together to remove one of the last bases of Western Imperialism in the East. He regretted that he would not live to see "the process of the awakening of the activism of the East". Better late than never: that process is now in full swing. It reached one of its triumphant moments when the Chairman of the Summit Conference, Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, delivered his Presidential Address. The wisdom of Islamic universalism and its relationship with territorial nationalism, on the one hand, and with the solidarity of the Third World, on the other, were incisively perceived and succinctly presented in this historic address. Elucidating the aim and purpose of the Conference he stated:

"...it is inherent in our purpose that we promote, rather than subvert, the solidarity of the Third World. This solidarity is based on human and not on ethnic factors. The distinctions of race are anathema to Islam but a kinship of suffering and struggle appeals to a religion which has always battled against oppression and sought to establish justice... It may well be that, in the cause of the Third World, and in humanity's struggle towards a balanced world order, we, the Muslims, are now being called upon to play a central role.

"I must, in this context, refer to a certain ambivalence in our Muslim minds about the role of nationalism in Islam and its compatibility with the establishment of an Islamic community. Let us face it that there has been some uncertainty on this issue. We have several nationalisms among us, Arab and non-Arab, all equally vigorous and vibrant with aspiration. All these nationalisms constitute our responses to the historic situation that we have confronted in our different geographical locations. Nationalism as the motive force of a people's liberation, nationalism as an agent of a people's consolidation, nationalism as a propeller of social and economic progress is a powerful force which we will do nothing to weaken. Furthermore, nationalism is a necessary tributary to the broad stream of human culture. It takes a full understanding of one's own country, of its history and language and traditions to develop an understanding of other countries, of their inner life and of our relations with them. Islam provides both the spirit and the technique of such a mutuality. Patriotism and loyalty to Islam can thus be fused into a transcendent

harmony. As Muslims, we can rise higher than our nationalism, without damaging or destroying it.”<sup>192</sup>

‘Allamah Muhammad Iqbal was a spiritual disciple of Sayyid Jamal al-Din Afghani. He rendered the most notable service towards accelerating the pace of the process “of the awakening of the activism” in the South Asian subcontinent and in welding the two complementary political forces of Islamic universalism and territorial nationalism. The holding of the Islamic Summit at Lahore where he lies buried was a homage to his services paid by the grateful Muslim world.

While Afghani was a man of action, Iqbal was a man of thought. His views on the subject are very complex and we feel that they have suffered through oversimplification at the hands of his hostile critics as well as those of his admirers. In the next few pages an attempt is made to present them unshorn of their complexities.

Among all the poetic and prose writings of ‘Allamah Muhammad Iqbal the Presidential Address that he delivered at the Annual Session Of the All-India Muslim League held at Allahabad in 1930 stands unique for the profound impact that it made on the destinies of the people of this part of the world. The truth of the prophetic words that he spoke on this occasion is slowly but surely unfolding itself on the pages of history. Take, for instance, the history-making declaration that he made, when he said:

“I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single State. Self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India... The exclusion of Ambala Division and perhaps of some districts where non-Muslims predominate, will make it less extensive and more Muslim in population so that the exclusion suggested will enable this consolidated

---

<sup>192</sup> Government of Pakistan, Report on. Islamic Summit, 1974, Pakistan, Pp. 51-52.

State to give a more effective protection to non-Muslim minorities within its area.”<sup>193</sup>

But Iqbal not only visualised the destined geographical boundaries of the State of his dreams, he also laid down broad guidelines for the future leaders of this State in the same Presidential Address. What he repeatedly emphasised was his wish that the establishment of this new State “will intensify their the Muslims’] sense of responsibility and deepen their patriotic feeling”.<sup>194</sup> And what is most remarkable is the fact that in this respect he asked the leaders of the country that came to be known as Pakistan, to follow the example set by the founders of Modern Turkey and of Modern Iran, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Reza Shah Kabir. He said:

“Nor should the Muslim leaders and politicians allow themselves to be carried away by the subtle but placid argument that Turkey and Iran and other Muslim countries are progressing on national, i.e., territorial lines. The Muslims of India are differently situated. The countries of Islam outside India are practically wholly Muslim in population. The minorities there belong, in the language of the Quran, ‘to the people of the Book’. There are no social barriers between Muslims and the ‘people of the Book’... Indeed the first practical step that Islam took towards the realization of a final combination of humanity was to call upon peoples possessing practically the same ethical ideal to come forward and combine. The Quran declares: ‘O people of the Book! Come, let us join together on the word (Unity of God), that

---

<sup>193</sup> S.A. Vahid, Ed., *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal*, pp. 170-71.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171; also p, 183. But compare these statements with the following pronouncement of Iqbal in the second phase of his thought:

"Islam appeared as a protest against idolatry. And what is patriotism but a subtle form of idolatry; a deification of a material object. The patriotic sons of various nations will bear me out in my calling patriotism a deification of a material object. Islam could not tolerate idolatry in any form. It is our eternal mission to protest against idolatry in all its forms. What was to be demolished by Islam could not be made the very principle of its structure as a political community. The fact that the Prophet prospered and died in a place not his birthplace is perhaps a mystic hint to the same effect" (Javid Iqbal, Ed., *Stray Reflections : A Note-Book of Allama Iqbal* [1910], pp. 26-27).

is common to us all.<sup>195</sup> The wars of Islam and Christianity, and later, European aggression in its various forms, could not allow the infinite meaning of this verse to work itself out in the world of Islam. To-day it is being gradually realized in the countries of Islam in the shape of what is called Muslim Nationalism.”<sup>196</sup>

No doubt, these words were spoken in the context of the political, social and economic conditions that prevailed in what was in the year 1930 known as British India. Iqbal was delivering the Presidential Address of a political party and for that reason his observations had to be primarily of topical interest. But he was first a poet-philosopher and then a politician-statesman. It is not just a coincidence that among all the Muslim countries only Turkey and Iran—or Persia as it was called at that time—were specifically mentioned by Iqbal, for the leaders of these two brotherly countries, Kemal Ataturk and Reza Shah Kabir, were the foremost upholders of the Nationalist ideal in the Islamic world. Iqbal gave a new and profound interpretation to the idea of “what is called Muslim nationalism” by identifying it with the Nationalist movements of Turkey and Iran: “what is called Muslim Nationalism,” the italicised words are very meaningful. In the first sentence of the passage under discussion he stated, “National, i.e. territorial lines”. These statements show that Iqbal was not only well aware of the territorial basis of modern nationalism but had also accepted it as an established fact which needed no elaboration.

In one of his last writings while commenting on Leibniz’s monad-ism Iqbal states that according to Leibniz the monad, i.e. the mind of man, “is a closed window incapable of absorbing external forces. My view is that the monad is essentially assimilative in its nature. Time is a great blessing. While it kills and

---

<sup>195</sup> Al-Qur’an, iii. 64. How well our Blessed Master who was the Qur’an personified acted on this divine precept is illustrated by the clauses of the Charter of Medina! For details, see Hamidullah, *Majmu’at al-Watha’iq al-Siyasiyah*, pp. 15-21. Also, this writer’s Urdu monograph, *Pakistan Qawmiyat: Jughrafiya’i wa Tarikhi Tajziyah*, pp 174-82.

<sup>196</sup> S.A. Vahid, Ed., op. cit., p. 190.

destroys it also expands and brings out the hidden possibilities of things. The possibility of change is the greatest asset of man in his present surroundings.”<sup>197</sup>

Change is certainly the greatest asset of Iqbal’s thought-processes but is at the same time the greatest liability of his admirers and critics who in the name of consistency would like to seek constancy in his concepts. Iqbal’s mind was highly assimilative in its nature and quickly imbibed the impact of his political surroundings. He was very sensitive to the fast moving changes in his milieu. In this constant flux one can discern a broad division of three main phases of Iqbal’s thought on the subject under discussion.

First, the Pan-Indian nationalist phase, which ended with his travel to Europe in 1915. This comprises the first part of the *Bang-i-Dara*, and the poems rejected by Iqbal but posthumously collected in different anthologies, like S. A. Vahid, *Baqiyat-i-Iqbal*, Muhammad Anwar Harith, *Rakht-i-Safar*, and Ghulam Rasul Mihr, *Sarud-i-Rafta*. The small collection of poems in the second part of the *Bang-i-Dara*, which were composed during Iqbal’s stay in Europe, belong to the transitional period between the first and the second phase of his thought: the first portion of this part still reflects the first phase and the second portion presages the second period.

Second, the Pan-Islamist phase, which started sometime during his sojourn in Europe and ended in April 1926, when he successfully contested for the membership of the Punjab Legislative Council and having faced the realities of the political life, could no longer remain a romantic visionary. The whole of the third part of the *Bang-i-Dara* (1924), the *Asrar-i-Khudi* (1914), the *Rumuz-i-Bekhudi* (1918), *Payam-i-Mashriq* (1922), and his Urdu and English letters, speeches and statements of the period 1908 to 1926, represent the second phase of his thought.

Third, and the last, which may be termed the Pakistani nationalist phase in which he synthesized his religious pre-nationalism of the second phase with the modern territorial nationalism. The most mature and the last phase of the development of Iqbal’s genius was also his most productive one. Most of the works of this period are discussed here.

---

<sup>197</sup> B.A. Dar, Ed., *Letters and Writings of Iqbal*, Iqbal’s letter to Mr K.G. Sayyidain dated 21 June 1936, pp. 12-13.



In the first anthology of his Urdu poems, *Bang-i-Dara*, Iqbal had divided his Urdu poetry in three parts: one, from the beginning to the year 1905; two, from 1905 to 1908; and, three, from 1908 onwards. This was a correct chronological delineation of the growth of Iqbal's poetical genius up to the year 1924, when the *Bang-i-Dara* was first published. But for the critics of Iqbal time seems to have come to a stop in September 1924: the three phases of Iqbal's poetry as defined above is taken by them as final and they fail to appreciate that the last, most productive and maturest phase of his work started after that date. This anachronism has inevitably led to much confusion, the blame for which is laid at the doors of the poet's Muse by his Western critics like Gibb, Smith, and—the latest in the field—Gordo Polonskaya. His Pakistani admirers, on the other hand, revel in this confusion, for it provides them ample opportunities for their own tentatively selective reading and paraphrasing of the Poet. We believe that for a correct and judicious appraisal of Iqbal's thought a solid historical analysis of his works based on a firm chronology is the first prerequisite.

Iqbal's dynamic genius also provided different religious philosophical frameworks for the political ideas of each of the three phases of his thought. It may also be—perhaps, more validly—argued that the three stages in the development of his religious philosophy led inevitably to those different political attitudes. However, during the period when he preached the political ideology of Pan-Indian territorial nationalism he upheld the traditional concept of *wahdat al-Wujud* ("Unity of Existence"), but when he repudiated this political standpoint he at the same time rejected Ibn 'Arabi and his sun doctrine of the Unity of Existence. But in the last phase when he assimilated the political concept of territorial nationalism with Islam, the same process manifested itself in the modified form of the Unity of Existence, viz. that of Rumi.<sup>198</sup>

---

<sup>198</sup> This fundamental problem of the study of Iqbal was briefly discussed by this author in his above-mentioned Urdu monograph 'on Pakistani Qawmiyat, pp. 151-77. There is also, in that monograph, a critique of Iqbal's doctrine of *Hijrah* as propounded by him in his poetical writings of the second phase, and which he himself repudiated early in his last phase. See *Zubur-i-'Ajam* (1927) (*Kulliyat-i-Iqbal: Farsi*, p.487).

The long passage of his historic Presidential Address which we quoted above shows the subtle way in which the transition from Pan-Islamism to Pakistani Nationalism took place in Iqbal's thinking and the role that contemporary trends in Muslim countries, especially those in Iran and Turkey, played in this process. However, the dialectics of South Asian politics sometime led also to its antithesis especially when the Pakistani nationalist movement faced fierce opposition at the hands of Indian nationalist and Hindu pre-nationalist forces.

Iqbal was himself very conscious of this conflict. Presiding over the Second Session of the All-Parties Muslim Conference held at Lahore in March 1932, he stated:

“To reveal an ideal freed from its temporal limitations is one function; to show the way how ideals can be transformed into living actualities is quite another. If a man is temperamentally fit for the former function his task is comparatively easy, for it involves clean jump over temporal limitations which waylay the practical politician at every step. The man who has got the courage to migrate from the former to the latter function has constantly to take stock of, and often yield to, the force of those very limitations which he has been in the habit of ignoring. Such a man has the misfortune of living in the midst of perpetual mental conflict and can be easily accused of self contradiction.”<sup>199</sup>

Iqbal's perceptive genius must be fully aware of the fact that some of the observations made by him at this Conference might not appear compatible with the fundamental propositions made by him two years back at the epoch-making Twenty-First Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad. But “the time was out of joint”; the long-drawn-out peace parleys between political leaders of the Hindu and Muslim communities had broken down; the Hindu leaders of the Congress, in spite of their loud protestations of having the monopoly of nationalist convictions, preferred to look forward to favours from the British Labour Prime Minister to the making of peace with their Muslim compatriots; and the Communal Award of His Britannic Majesty was eagerly awaited not only by the “communalists” but also by the so-called nationalists of “British India”.

---

<sup>199</sup> S.A. Vahid, Ed., op, cit., p. 196

The two seemingly conflicting, but really complementary, facets of the last stage of the development of Iqbal's thoughts on nationalism appear to be portrayed in the two short poems of the last collection of his verses, which was posthumously published. On the one hand, in a quatrain he exhorts his millat (nation) to follow in the footsteps of the Turkish and Egyptian nationalists and says:

به ترکان بسته در با را کشادند  
بنائے مصریان محکم نهادند  
تو ہم دستے به دامن خودی زن  
که ہے او ملک و دیں کس را نہ دادند<sup>200</sup>

[Unto the Turks the closed doors were opened;

The Egyptians got their national foundations strengthened;

You, too, grasp the skirt of your identity;

For, a nation without its identity possesses neither Faith nor Fatherland.]

But, at the same time, he enters into a bitter controversy with Mawlana Husayn Ahmad Madani, who headed the premier madrasah of the South Asian subcontinent located at Deoband, and opposed the Pakistani movement for national self-determination on the supposedly nationalistic ground.<sup>201</sup> Iqbal poetically summed up this polemic in a short satirical poem entitled "Husayn Ahmad," which had been put towards the end of the *Armaghan-i-Hijaz* by its compilers. It reads as follows:

عجم هنوز نداند رموز دیں ورنہ

---

<sup>200</sup> *Kulliyat-i-Iqbal: Farsi*, compiled by Dr Javid Iqbal (henceforth, *Kulliyat: Farsi*), p. 950. Iqbal's Persian and Urdu anthologies have been collected in two handy volumes by his son, Dr Javid Iqbal ; all references to his poetical works in this essay are to these volumes.

<sup>201</sup> Z.H. Faruqi's well-documented monograph, *The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan*, has only partly—and rather partially—succeeded in unravelling the complexities and anomalies of South Asian politics and their impact on the Muslim divines ('ulama).

ز دیوبند حسین احمد این چه بو العجیبی  
است

سرود بر سر منبر که ملت از وطن است  
چه بے خبر ز مقام محمد عربی است  
بمصطفی برساں خویش راکه دیں ہمہ اوست  
اگر به او نرسیدی تمام بولہبی است<sup>202</sup>

[fhe'Ajam has not yet mastered the secrets of the Faith, otherwise

We would not have seen the strange spectacle of (the madrasah of) Deoband producing a Husayn Ahmad.

He sermonised from the top of the pulpit that it is the territory that makes a nation;

How ignorant he is of the standpoint of Muhammad of Arabia!

You must reach out to Muhammad, the Chosen One, for he personifies the Religion;

If you do not reach out to him, you follow the Father of the Flame]

There was no contradiction in Iqbal's own thought, but certainly was much confusion in the political situation of South Asia on eve of the promulgation of the Government of India Act, 1935, on ant of the conflicting aims and ambitions of the contending parties. his famous Allahabad Presidential Address which contains the leitmotive of the last phase of his political thought he unequivocally his demand for the formation of "autonomous States" on the universally accepted postulates of

---

<sup>202</sup> Kulliyat: Urdu, p. 691. This controversial quatrain which is in Persian to be inadvertently misplaced in the collection of Urdu poetical works. 'Ajam the non-Arab world. In Iqbal's poetry it signified the foreign accretions to the tenets and practices of pristine Islam. Abu Lahab "the Father of the Flame," the title of 'Utbah 'Abd al-'Uzza, a other of the Blessed Prophet's father, and a bitter enemy of Islam.

nationhood, that is, “the unity of page, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests”<sup>203</sup> viewpoint on the question of nationhood was thus radically differ-from that of the “Iqbalist” theo-bureaucrats and their publicists the same history-making address he re-affirmed his essentially non-communal, secular and nationalist approach towards the vital question the electorates when he declared:

“The Muslims of India can have no objection to purely territorial ‘orates if provinces are demarcated so as to secure comparatively homogeneous communities possessing linguistic, radical, cultural and religious unity.”<sup>204</sup>

In the controversy that he had with Jawaharlal Nehru during the years 1934-36 on the Ahmadiyah question, he again elucidated what he considered to be "the attitude of Islam towards nation ' ideals". "Nationalism," he stated, "in the sense of love of one's country and even readiness to die for its honour is a part of the Muslim faith." He further explained: on "In Turkey, Iran, Egypt and other Muslim countries it will never become a problem. In these countries Muslims constitute an o M whelming majority and their minorities, i.e., Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians, according to the law of Islam, are either 'People of Book' or 'like the People of the Book' with whom the law of Is Pallows free social relations including matrimonial alliances. It becomes a problem for Muslims only in countries where they happen to be in a minority, and nationalism demands their complete self-effacement majority countries Islam accommodates nationalism; for there Islamabad nationalism are practically identical ; in minority countries it is justified c in seeking self-determination as a cultural unit. In either case, it is thoroughly consistent with itself."<sup>205</sup>

Commenting on the above-quoted passage of his father's writings, Justice Dr. Javid Iqbal made the following judicious remarks:

"If Iqbal had lived to see the establishment of Pakistan (the realization in a concrete form of his abstract and nebulous political id it is certain that he would have developed Into yet another phase, laid the foundations of what may be termed 'Pakistani nationalism' But he died at a stage when Indian Islam was still struggling to

---

<sup>203</sup> . S.A. Vahid, Ed., op. cit., p. 173.

<sup>204</sup> Ibid., pp. 174-75.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., pp. 287-88..

gain independence from the British and, at the same time, emancipation from the Hindus. Those were the times when supporting the cause territorial nationalism or patriotism in the Indian subcontinent meant the submergence of the Muslims into the majority community and their extinction as a distinct political entity. Iqbal, therefore, took pains' providing a religio-philosophical justification for the rejection of territorial nationalism and patriotism, although he approved of the growth of territorial nationalism and patriotism in the countries of the Middle East."<sup>206</sup>

With all deference to the illustrious son of the 'Allamah, we would like to submit that by December 1928 when Iqbal delivered his lecture on "The Principle of Movement in the Structure of Islam" at Madras he had definitely forsaken the pan-Islamist views of the second phase of his thought as is evident from the passages of that lecture that we have quoted in this essay elsewhere.<sup>207</sup> Two years later when he presided over the Twenty-First Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad, the Pakistani phase of his thought had reached its culminating point. Now he not only "approved of the path of territorial nationalism and patriotism in the countries of the Middle East" as claimed by Dr. Javid Iqbal, but also pleaded for the creation of autonomous States in the South Asian subcontinent based on the universally accepted ingredients of nationhood for, he argued that, such a measure would deepen "the patriotic feeling" of the Indian Muslims.<sup>208</sup> It is remarkable that at a time when the ascendancy of the revanchist Hindu Nationalism and the introduction of religion into politics by Mahatma Gandhi<sup>209</sup> had paved the way for the religious problem to monopolise the political scene of the subcontinent, the 'Allamah was not at all oblivious of the socio-economic and pa-historical *raison d'être* of the liberation of Pakistan. In the Pakistan Address to which we are repeatedly referring be made it dear that "Nor

---

<sup>206</sup> Dr. Javid Iqbal, Ed., op. cit., Introduction, pp. xxi-xxi

<sup>207</sup> . See *infra*, p. 62 and note 66.

<sup>208</sup> See *supra*, p. 46 and note 17.

<sup>209</sup> There are very respected Pakistani historians who propound the thesis of Muslim separatism in India and Dr Abdul Hamid is one of them his scholarly work under this very title was published in 1967 by the Oxford University Press. But there is another side of the picture as well which was presented by the Quaid-i-Azam in the Presidential Address that he delivered at the Delhi, April 1943, Session of the Muslim League ; vide, Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, Ed., *Speeches and Writings of Mr, Jinnah, I*, 495-505.33..

should the Hindus fear that the creation of autonomous Muslim States will mean the introduction of a kind of religious rule in such States.”<sup>210</sup>

He further emphasized, as we have partly quoted earlier, that “in view of India’s infinite variety in climates, races, languages, creeds and social systems, the creation of autonomous States based on the unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests, is the only possible way to secure a stable constitutional structure in India.”<sup>211</sup>

In the same Address he had earlier argued that “India is Asia in miniature. Part of her people have cultural affinities with nations in the east and part with nations in the middle and west of Asia.”<sup>212</sup>

To illustrate how the broader geo-historical, cultural and economic, and not the narrow “communal,” considerations dominated Iqbal’s mind, we would like to quote extensively from that portion of his Pakistan Address in which he put forward the case for the separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency. He stated:

“I see no reason why Sind should not be united with Baluchistan and turned into a separate province. It has nothing in common with Bombay Presidency. In point of life and civilization the Royal Commissioners find it more akin to Mesopotamia and Arabia than India. The Muslim geographer Mas’udi noticed this kinship long ago when he said: ‘Sind is a country nearer to the dominions of Islam.’ The first Omayyad ruler is reported to have said of Egypt: ‘Egypt has her back towards Africa and face towards Arabia.’ With necessary alterations the same remark describes the exact situation of Sind. She has her back towards India and face towards Central Asia. Considering further the nature of her agricultural problems which can invoke no sympathy from the Bombay Government, and her infinite commercial possibilities, dependent on the inevitable growth of Karachi into a second metropolis of India, I think it unwise to keep her attached to a presidency which, though friendly today, is likely to become a rival at no distant period.”<sup>213</sup>

---

<sup>210</sup> S.A. Vahid, Ed., op. cit., p. 172

<sup>211</sup> Ibid., p. 173.35.

<sup>212</sup> Ibid., p. 168.

<sup>213</sup> Ibid., p. 186.

In his *magnum* opus which was dedicated to the child who grew up into Justice Dr. Javid Iqbal and was composed soon after the Pakistan Address he welded the two complementary political forces of the present-day Muslim world, i.e. Islamic universalism and territorial nationalism, not in the context of the Middle East but in that of the South Asian subcontinent. To project his ideals of Islamic universalism he chose to depict an impressionistic and not at all a historically factual and photographic– portrait of Jamal al-Din Afghani. It was a happy choice of Iqbal, for, as we have shown in the first part of this essay, Afghani’s movement for Muslim solidarity was entirely based on forceful nationalistic impulses. It is significant that Iqbal has put in Afghani’s mouth such sentiments as

لرد مغرب آن سراپا مکر و فن  
اہل دین را داد تعلیم وطن  
او بفکر مرکز و تو در نفاق  
بگذر از شام و فلسطین و عراق<sup>214</sup>

36. Ibid., p. 186.

37. *Kulliyat: Farsi*, p. 650; Shaikh Mahmud Ahmad, Tr., *Pilgrimage of Eternity*, Versified English Translation of Iqbal’s *Javid Namah* (henceforth *Pilgrimage*), pp. 50-51.

[The Western lords, in their deceit, have taught The cult of nation-worship, have thus lured The faithful from their creed. A centre they Themselves do seek, while riven ye remain: Pray now bypass this Syria, Palestine, Iraq.]

The above lines seem to demonstrate that Iqbal was against those parochial, provincialist movements which served the interests of “the Western lords” and weakened the anti-Imperialist forces, as the particularist nationalism of “Syria, Palestine and Iraq” has been a great hindrance in the march of the resurgent Arab nationalism, it is also significant that Iqbal had foreseen that trend of Europeanism which culminated in the formation of the European Economic Community based

---

<sup>214</sup> *Pilgrimage*, p. 75



on the Gaullist ideal of the preservation of national sovereignty and he wanted the Muslim national States to emulate it and defeat the machinations of “the deceitful Western lords” (رد مغرب آن سراپا مکر و فن) by their own weapons. While establishing the larger framework of Islamic universalism, Iqbal’s Muse transcends all earthly bounds, for “The word of God doth not depend on time Or place or nations; no, it far transcends The words of even those who utter it.

It is above, apart; it needs no land, No Rum or Syria, for its home.”<sup>215</sup>

ذکر حق از امتاں آمد غنی  
 از زمان و از مکان آمد غنی  
 ذکر حق از ذکر پر ذاکر جدا  
 است  
 احتیاج روم و شام او را کجاست

But Iqbal’s Muse was not like the skylark of Shelley, a “scorner of the ground,” but was “the daring warbler” of whom Wordsworth sang:

“While the wings aspire, are heart and eye  
 Both with thy nest upon the dewy ground  
 The nest which thou canst drop into at will,  
 Those quivering wings composed, that music still!”

Coming back to its “nest” Iqbal’s skylark passes through the “firmament of Saturn” where were “the condemned spirits of those who were treacherous to their nation and whom Hell refused to accept.”

“... Of them  
 There are two evil ones who for their flesh  
 All stifled a nation’s soul. They are a shame

---

<sup>215</sup>; Kulliyat : Farsi, p. 680.

To fatherland, to faith, to all mankind. From Deccan Sadiq, Ja'far from Bengal!"<sup>216</sup>

اندرون او دو طاغوت کهن  
روح قومے گشته از بهر دو تن  
جعفر از بنگال و صادق از دکن  
ننگ آدم، ننگ دین، ننگ وطن

Iqbal here introduces us to "the Spirit of India," "a noble hourie" "Eternity beamed from her brow, her eyes Did sparkle with the wine of endless bliss."<sup>217</sup>

در جنینش نار و نور لا یزال  
در دو چشم او سرور لایزال

"The Wail of the Soul of India"<sup>218</sup> reminds us of the ("Plaint of Pain") and J.), "Portrait of Pain") of the first phase of Iqbal's thought.<sup>219</sup> "Beyond the firmaments" we meet Ghani, the minstrel of Kashmir. Here the patriotic soul of Iqbal soars high above the petty politics of the Hindu and the Muslim "National-isms". He sings in praise of the Nehru family—the father and the son

پند را این ذوق آزادی که داد؟  
صید را سودائے صیادی که داد؟  
آن برہمن زادگان زندہ دل!  
لالۂ احمر ز روئے شان خجل!  
تیزبین و پختہ کار و سخت کوش  
از نگاہ شان فرنگ اندر خروش  
اصل شان از خاک دامن گیر

---

<sup>216</sup> Pilgrimage, pp. 131-32 ; Kulliyat : Farsi, pp. 729-30.

<sup>217</sup> Pilgrimage, p. 133 ; Kulliyat : Farsi, p. 731.

<sup>218</sup> . Kulliyat : Farsi, pp 732-35 ; Pilgrimage, pp. 133-37.

<sup>219</sup> Kulliyat : Urdu, pp. 42 and 68-76-

[Who gave to and desire of liberty?

Who taught the prey to hunt? They were those sons Of Brahmins, with alive  
and vibrant hearts, whose faces put the tulip and the rose to shame Mature at work  
and diligent

And keen of eye, their very glance commoves The West. Their origin is this  
our soil, Our catching earth; in Kashmir's sky, these stars Arose.]

What a tragic irony it is that the selfsame Nehru family is denying Kashmir's  
yearning for liberty! But the true understanding of Iqbal's message will one day and  
sooner rather than later—remove the cruel anomalies of the recent politics of “this  
ancient land which has suffered so long, more because of her situation in historic  
space than because of any inherent incapacity of her people.”<sup>221</sup> We can hear voices

coming from the future—and not a distant future, In-sha' Allah:

“...Shouldst thou think that our dust contains Not e'en a single spark, inside  
thyslf

Look thou awhile. Whence all this fire thou hast? Whence came this breath of  
spring? 'Tis from the wind That lends our hills their fragrance and their hue.”<sup>222</sup>

خاک ما را بے شرر دانی اگر  
یر درون خود پیکرے بکشا نظر  
ایں ہمہ سوزے کہ داری از  
کجاست؟

---

<sup>220</sup> Kulliyat: Farsi, p. 753; Pilgrimage, p. 154.

<sup>221</sup> S.A. Vahid, Ed., op. cit., p. 168.

<sup>222</sup> Pilgrimage, p. 154 ; Kulliyat : Farsi, p. 753.

ایں دم باد بهاری از کجاست؟  
ایں همان باد است کز تاثیر او  
کوہسار ما بگیری رنگ و بو!

Iqbal once again gives vent to his intense patriotic fervour when he meets “the martyred king,” Sultan Tipu:

باز گو از بند و از ہندوستان  
آن کہ با کاپش نیرزد بوستان  
آن کہ اندر مسجدش ہنگامہ مرد  
آن کہ اندر دیر او آتش فسرد  
آن کہ دل از بہر او خون کردہ ایم  
آن کہ یادش را بجاں پروردہ ایم  
آز غم ما کن غم او را قیاس  
آہ ازان معشوق عاشق ناشناس<sup>223</sup>

[Tell me of India, with whose blades of grass E'en gardens cannot match. Tell me of her,

Dead is the passion in whose mosques and quenched Whose temples' fire. I gave my blood for her, I nursed her image in my memory,

From my grief canst thou guess her grief; alas! For the beloved who forgot her love.]

In the answer that is given to “the martyred king” by “Living Stream” (09j o a3 j)—an apt epithet for the poet himself—there is a large-hearted recognition of the liberating role of the Civil Disobedience Movement launched by the Congress:

ہندیان منکر ز قانون فرنگ  
درنگیرد سحر و افسون فرنگ

---

<sup>223</sup> Kulliyat : Farsi, p. 768; Pilgrimage, p. 170.

روح را بار گران آئین غیر  
گرچه آید ز آسمان آئین غیر<sup>224</sup>

[The people of this land defy the law

The West has given to them ; they spurn its charms. A burden on the soul is  
alien law

A sorrow e'en though it be heaven-sent.]

But almost at the same moment the politician in Iqbal was reacting strongly  
against the very same Civil Disobedience Movement. In his

Presidential Address to the Second Session of the All-Parties Muslim  
Conference held at Lahore on 21 March 1932, to which we have already referred  
above, he stated:

“The Congress leaders fear that the British Government in their provisional  
settlement of the communal problem may concede to the minorities what they  
demand. They have, therefore, started the pre-sent campaign to bolster up a claim  
which has no foundation in fact, to defeat a pact which, they fear, may find a place  
in the coming constitution, and to force Government to settle the matter of  
minorities with the Congress alone. The Congress resolution in pursuance of which  
the civil disobedience campaign was launched made it perfectly clear that since  
Government had refused to regard Mahatma Gandhi as the sole representative of  
the country, the Congress decided on civil disobedience. How can then a minority  
join a campaign which is directed as much against itself as against the Government  
?”<sup>225</sup>

Truly it is dangerous to be honest to one's convictions and at the same time to  
the dialectics of historical forces ! But Iqbal was a brave man. He, with the  
disarming candour that was one of the most prominent characteristics of his  
character, confessed “the misfortune of living in the midst of perpetual mental

---

<sup>224</sup> Kulliyat : Fars!, p. 769 ; Pilgrimage, p. 170,

<sup>225</sup> S-A. Vahid, Ed., op. cit., pp. 203-0450.

conflict.”<sup>226</sup> In Javid Namah the “Living Stream” took the longer historical view that the Civil Disobedience Movement of the Congress was an anti-Imperialist move and was, therefore, bound to hasten Pakistan’s liberation despite the Congress leaders’ own narrow communalist motivation. But in his Presidential Address Iqbal had to take the immediate political view and condemn Congress communalism.

Symbolic of Iqbal’s journey from Pan-Islamism to Pakistani Nationalism is the replacement of Aurangzib by his arch-enemy, the poet-warrior-patriot Khushhal Khan Khattak, in the niche of the poet’s heroes. The “Living Stream” of Javid Namah sings:

خوش سرود آن شاعر افغان شناس  
 آن کہ بیند باز گوید بے ہراس  
 آن حکیم ملت افغانیاں  
 آن طبیب علت افغانیاں  
 راز قومے دید و بے باکانہ گفت  
 حرف حق باشوخی رندانہ  
 گفت<sup>227</sup>

[...The poet who the Afghans knew, Who uttered fearlessly what he beheld,  
 The wise man of the Afghan nation,

Their doctor who could physic all their ills, He saw a people’s secret, ventured  
 forth To tell the hidden truth in dauntless words.]

Iqbal found in Khushhal Khan a kindred soul and fell in love with him. Quite early in the third—and the last—phase of his thought, in May 1928, he wrote an article on “Khushhal Khan Khattak (The Afghan Warrior-Poet)” for the Islamic Culture of Hyderabad-Deccan, in which he inter alia stated:

---

<sup>226</sup> . Ibid., 196.

<sup>227</sup> Kulliyat : Farsi, p. 765; Pilgrimage, p. 166.

“His was a versatile mind and he wrote on various subjects, such as poetry, philosophy, ethics, medicine and his own autobiography which is unfortunately lost. Throughout his poetry, the major portion of which was written in India, and during his struggles with the Mughals, breathes the spirit of early Arabian poetry- We find in it the same love of freedom and war, the same criticism of life.”<sup>228</sup>

Among the specimens that Iqbal gives of Khushhal’s poetry to show his “passionate patriotism, his aspirations, and the keenness of his observation of man” are included the following lines-albeit apologetically:

“Still Aurangzeb’s malevolence bath not a whit diminished

Though the curse of his father it before drew down.

For this reason, also, no one can place dependence on him: He is malignant and perfidious; a breaker of his word.”<sup>229</sup>

Certainly it is a far cry from the Pan-Islamist phase of Rumuz-i-Bekhudi (1918) when Iqbal sang an eulogy of “Shahanshah Alamgir, May Allah’s mercy be upon him,” for he was

درمیان کارزار کفر و دین  
ترکش ما را خدنگ آخریں<sup>230</sup>

[He the last arrow in our quiver left in the affray of Faith with unbelief.]

Iqbal’s admiration for Khushhal’s “passionate patriotism” remained undiminished throughout his Pakistani nationalist phase. In the Bal-i-Jibril (1935) we find a short and sadly sweet poem “The Last Will of Khushhal Khan” (خوشحال خان)

---

<sup>228</sup> S.A. Vahid, Ed., op. cit., p. 129.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid., p. 130. Cf. an incisive study of “Khushal Khan and Aurangzeb” in Olaf Caroe, *The Pathans*, pp. 221-46.

<sup>230</sup> *Kulliyat: Farsi*, p. 98; Arthur J. Arberry, *The Mysteries of Selflessness*, P. 17.

(in which Iqbal sang of the Warrior-Poet's testament that he must be buried in that "hallowed spot which was not polluted by the dust raised by the hoofs of the horses of the Mughul hordes."<sup>231</sup> In the *Darb-i-Kalim* (1936) Khushhal gets a unique place in the heroes' gallery built by Iqbal: he is etherealised as Mihrab Gul Afghan. The ideas and impressions that Iqbal received through a deep study of the selections of Khushhal's poems literally translated by Raverty into English were rendered by him in that beautiful collection of poems which are entitled ("Thoughts of Mihrab Gul Afghan"),<sup>232</sup>

Iqbal's own patriotic passion continued to express itself through-out the last phase of his thought in such outpourings "A Few Tears چند بر افتراق ہندیاں" (on the Dissensions of the Indians") in *Pas Chi Bayad Kard* (1936)<sup>233</sup> and "شعاع امید" ("A Ray of Hope") in *Darb-i Kalim* (1936),<sup>234</sup> till he himself felt that he was relapsing into the old days of his Pan-Indian Nationalism when he vainly tried to build "a new Temple".<sup>58</sup> In a quatrain included in the posthumously published anthology of his last poems, *Armaghan-i-Hijaz*, he sings in "The Presence of God, the Truth" (بہ حضور حق)

چہ گویم قصہ دین و وطن را  
کہ نتوان فاش گفتن این سخن را  
مرنج از من کہ از بے مہرئ تو  
بنا کردم ہماں دیر کہن را<sup>235</sup>

[How may I say to Thee the story of Faith versus Fatherland? For I cannot speak out the bare truth about this episode. Don't Thou be angry with me, if because of Thy indifference to me I built up the same old Temple.]

<sup>231</sup> *Kulliyat* : Urdu, p. 446.

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 164-80.

<sup>233</sup> *Kulliyat*: Farsi, pp. 829-30.

<sup>234</sup> *Kulliyat* : Urdu, pp. 569-71.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88 ; V.G. Kiernan, *Poems from Iqbal*, p. 8 ("A New Altar").



How pathetic is the pain that the poet felt over his mental conflict! He was tortured by the dilemma faced by the Muslims in the subcontinent. <sup>236</sup>The solution that he proposed seemed very remote at that time. Pan-Indian nationalism which he had very rightly rejected at the time when he entered the Pan-Islamist phase was not the answer to the call of the country which every conscientious human being receives in his lifetime. But, maybe, he had to live with it till his dream of “the creation of autonomous states based on the unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests” —my repetition may please be condoned—was fulfilled. He placed his acute problem before his spiritual mentor, the Pir of Rum, and the answer that he received is as follows:

قلب پہلو می زند با زر بشب  
انتظار روز می دارد ذہب<sup>237</sup>

[In the darkness of night the base coins and the golden ones get mixed up ; Let the day dawn for the glittering gold!]

He was sure that the Dawn will come and

کریں گے اہل نظر تازہ بستیاں  
آباد  
سری نگاہ نہیں سوئے کوفہ و  
بغداد<sup>238</sup>

[The people-with-vision will build a new Homeland;

I do not look up to the Kufah and Baghdad of yester-years !]

The Day of Deliverance dawned, but its herald had then left for his Eternal Home.

---

<sup>236</sup> Kulliyat : Farsi, p. 892

<sup>237</sup> Kulliyat : Urdu, p. 428.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid., p. 362.

A new Homeland was built, but it is still waiting for its “people with-vision” (اہل نظر) to make it prosper. They are still looking towards “the Kufah and Baghdad” of yester-years, oblivious of their own Karachi and Islamabad.

“National, i.e. territorial, lines” of Iqbal’s thinking in the final phase of his political philosophy are also evident in the stand that he took vis-a-vis Pan Islamism.

In September 1931, on the eve of his departure for London to attend the Second Round Table Conference, Iqbal gave an interview to *The Bombay Chronicle* in which he was asked to propound his views on what the questioner termed as “Pan-Islamism”. Iqbal, in the first instance, deprecated the use of this term as according to him it “was invented after the fashion of the expression ‘Yellow Peril,’ in order to justify European aggression in Islamic countries.”<sup>239</sup> “Then, supporting Afghani’s movement for Muslim solidarity he explained that Afghani’s was “purely a defensive measure” and that “he actually advised Afghanistan, Persia and Turkey to unite against the aggression of Europe”. Iqbal concluded his views on the subject by declaring that:

“Islam does not recognize caste or race or colour. In fact Islam is the only outlook on life which has already solved the colour question, at least in the Muslim world, a question which modern European civilization, with all its achievements in science and philosophy, has not been able to solve. Pan-Islamism, thus interpreted, was taught by the Prophet and will live for ever. In this sense Pan-Islamism is only Pan-Humanism. In this sense every Muslim is a Pan-Islamist and ought to be so.”<sup>240</sup>

Two years after this interview Sir Fazl-i-Husain made certain observations regarding the so-called Pan-Islamic movement on which Iqbal issued the following press statement:

“Sir Fazl-i-Husain is perfectly correct when he says that political Pan-Islamism never existed. It has existed, if at all, only in the imagination of those who invented the phrase or possibly as a diplomatic weapon in the hands of Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan of Turkey.

---

<sup>239</sup> B.A. Dar, Ed., op. cit., p. 55.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid., p. 56.

Even Jamal-ud-Din Afghani, whose name is closely associated with what is called Pan-Islamic movement, never dreamed of a unification of Muslims into a political State.

“It is significant that in no Islamic language—Arabic, Persian or Turkish does there exist a phrase corresponding to Pan-Islamism.”<sup>241</sup>

Further elaborating this theme he advised the Indian Muslims that they “should sink in their own deeper self like other Muslim nations of Asia, in order to gather up their scattered sources of life and, according to Sir Fazl’s advice, stand on their own legs”.<sup>242</sup>

“Every Muslim nation must sink into her own deeper self” was a favourite topic of Iqbal in the third and last phase of his thought, viz.

of Pakistani Nationalism. He has expounded it philosophically in his Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, as follows:

... For the present every Muslim nation must sink into her own deeper self, temporarily focus her vision on herself alone, until all are strong and powerful to form a living family of republics. A true and living unity, according to the nationalist thinkers, is not so easy as to be achieved by a merely symbolical overlordship. It is truly manifested in a multiplicity of free independent units where racial rivalries are adjusted and harmonized by the unifying bond of a common spiritual aspiration.”<sup>243</sup>

But Allah is not the god of a Chosen Ummah. He is the Lord of the worlds. (رب العالمين) His Blessed Messenger is Mercy for the worlds (رحمة للعالمين). His Book is the guidance for the worlds (هدى للعالمين) Islamic universalism must, therefore, be a prelude to what Iqbal so happily phrased “Pan-Humanism”. Conversely, the “noble ideal” in the words of Iqbal’s Pakistan Address of 1930 must be “a harmonious whole which, instead of stifling the respective individualities of its component

---

<sup>241</sup> A.R. Tariq, Speeches and Statements of Iqbal, pp. 207-C8.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid.

<sup>243</sup> . Reconstruction, p. 159

wholes, affords them chances of fully working out the possibilities that may be latent in them”.<sup>244</sup>

In short, Iqbal’s political philosophy with all its complexities, phases of development and shifts of emphasis can be described by three concentric circles: first, the circle of territorial nationalism; second, that of Muslim unity; and, third, the one encompassing the whole of oppressed humanity. In the message for the New Year’s Day of 1918 that he gave to the All-India Radio from his death-bed, he pleaded for “the brotherhood of man, which is above race, nationality, colour or language”. There is a cry of anguish in his broadcast message for the suffering humanity of Abyssinia (Ethiopia), China, Palestine and Spain. He lamented:

... Engines of destruction created by science are wiping out the great landmarks of man’s cultural achievements. The governments which are not themselves engaged in this drama of fire and blood are sucking the blood of the weaker peoples economically. It is as if the day of doom had come upon the earth, in which each looks after the safety of his own skin, and in which no voice of human sympathy or fellowship is audible.<sup>245</sup>

“The world’s thinkers are stricken dumb. Is this going to be the end of all the progress and evolution of civilization, they ask, that men should destroy one another in mutual hatred and make human habitation impossible on this earth? Remember, man can be maintained on this earth only by honouring mankind, and this world will remain a battle-ground of ferocious beasts of prey unless and until the educational forces of the whole world are directed to inculcating in man respect for mankind.”<sup>246</sup>

[It is evil to speak ill of others,

---

<sup>244</sup> S.A. Vahid, Ed., op. cit., p. 170.

<sup>245</sup> Ibid., pp. 374-75.

<sup>246</sup> Kulliyat Farsi, p. 793.

For Muslims and non-Muslims all are the creatures of God; To be human is to have respect for all mankind:

So, be thou aware of the station of Man!]

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Full titles of the works cited)

Qadi Muhammad ‘Abd al-Ghaffar, *Athar-i-Jamal al-Din Afghani*, Delhi: Anjuman-i-Taraqqi-i-Urdu, 1940

Charles Adams, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*, London: O.U.P., 1933 Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, *Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, Vol. I (1942), Vol. II (1947)

Shaikh Mahmud Ahmad, *Pilgrimage of Eternity: Versified English Translation of Iqbal’s Javid Namah*, Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture, 1961

Arthur J. Arberry, *The Mysteries of Selflessness*, London: John Murray, 1953  
Edward G. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, Cambridge: University Press, 1919

Imam Isma’il al-Bukhari, *al-Jami’ al-Sahih*, Cairo: Mustafa al-Babi, 1377 H.  
Olaf Caroe, *The Pathans: 650 B.O -A.D. 1957*, London: MacMillan, 1962 B.A. Dar, Ed., *Letters and Writings of Iqbal*, Karachi: Iqbal Academy, 1967

Sayyid Qudratullah Fatimi, *Pakistani Qawmiyat: Jughrafiya’i wa Tarikhi Tajziyah*, Lahore: A’inah-i-Adab, 1972

Government of Pakistan, *Report on Islamic Summit, 1974*, Pakistan, Islamabad

M. Hamidullah, *Majrnu'at al-Watha'iq al Siyasyiyah*, Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta'lif wa'l-Nashr, 1956

Muhammad Anwar Harith, *Rakht-i-Safar*, Lahore: Taj Company, 1952

Husayn Muhiy al-Din al-Hibal, Ed., *Al-'Urwat al-Wuthqa*, Beirut: Matba' al-Tawfiq, 1338 H.) Javid Iqbal, Ed., *Stray Reflections: A Note-Book of Allama Iqbal* (1910), Lahore:

Sh. Ghulam Ali & Sons, 1961

Sir Muhammad Iqbal, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1954

--, *Kulliyat-i-Iqbal*, Farsi, Lahore: Sh. Ghulam All & Sons, 1973

--, *Kulliyat-i-Iqbal*, Urdu, Lahore (Sh. Ghulam Ali & Sons), 1973

Rashid Ahmad Jullundhri, "Pan-Islamism and Pakistan: I—Afghani and Nasser," *Scrutiny*, University of Islamabad, Islamabad, 1/2 (1975), 27-42

Kemal H. Karpat, "Modern Turkey," in P.M Holt, Ann K.S. Lambton and Bernard Lewis, Eds., *The Cambridge History of Islam*, Cambridge: University Press, 1970, Vol. I

Detlev H. Khalid, "A Study of Ataturk's Laicism in the Light of Muslim History," *The Reforms of Ataturk*, Istanbul: RCD Cultural Institute, 1974

V.G. Kiernan, *Poems from Iqbal*, London: John Murray, 1955

Abdullah Albert Kudsi Zadeh, *Sayyid Jamal al-Din al-Afghani: An Annotated Bibliography*, Leiden: Brill, 1970

V.I. Lenin, *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1951

Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, Oxford Paperbacks, 1968  
Ghulam Rasul Mihr, *Sarud-i-Rafrah*, Lahore: Sh. Ghulam Ali & Sons, 1954  
Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Islam in Modern History*, Princeton and London, O.U.P., 1957

Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1950

A.R. Tariq, Ed., *Speeches and Statements of Iqbal*, Lahore: Sh. Ghulam Ali & Sons, 1973

S.A. Vahid, Ed., *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal*, Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1964

---, *Baqiyat-i-Iqbal*, Karachi: Majlis-i-Iqbal, 1952

W.F. Wertheim, *Indonesian Society in Transition*, The Hague and Bandung: Van Hoeve, 1959

# IQBAL AND QUAID-I-AZAM

Dr M. Moizuddin

Director, Iqbal Academy, Lahore

The achievement of Pakistan is a great tribute to the farsighted-of Allamah Iqbal and the unfailing statesmanship of the Quaid-i-. Both were motivated by patriotic spirit. How splendid that ammad Ali Jinnah and Muhammad Iqbal had the name of our Holy het, the benefactor of humanity, common in their names! In this text, it is interesting to note that both the Quaid-i-Azam and Allamah Iqbal were ardent lovers of the Prophet (peace be on him). The Quaid i-Azam once said that he joined the Lincoln's Inn because on the entrance of that institution the name of the Prophet Muhammad peace be on him) was included among the names of great law-givers the world. The Allamah's intense love for the Prophet is proverbial. is emotional attachment is evident from these lines:

معنی حرفم کنی تحقیق اگر  
بنگری بادیدہ صدیق اگر  
قوت قلب و جگر گردد نبی  
او خدا محبوب تر گردد



[If you go deep into the meaning of my verse, If you have the eyes of Siddiq (Abu Bakr),

The strength of our heart and soul is our Prophet; To us our Prophet is dearer than God.]

In the context of Pakistan today Iqbal and Jinnah are synonyms. They are two sides of the same coin.

The greatness of their achievement can be realised only when the ' I, economic, political and cultural conditions of the time in which lived are studied.

Iqbal had to fight on many fronts. The British, the Hindus and nationalist Muslims, particularly the Punjab Unionist Party—all formidable opponents, Man Sir Fazle Hussain, the champion of cost Party of Hindu and Muslim landlords, being one of them. But he, through his poetry, speeches and writings impressed upon the Muslims of India that their salvation was not in United India.

They must have their separate homeland. He had to incur the displeasure of many in the beginning which has been aptly described in the following lines:

اپنے بھی خفا مجھے سے

بیگانے بھی ناخوش  
میں زہر ہلال کو کبھی  
کہ نہ سکا قند<sup>248</sup>

[My friends and foes—all are angry, But I had to say the truth.]

Both the Quaid-i-Azam and Iqbal had their political conviction. They stood like a rock against all odds and oddities.

Iqbal has composed a poem titled Mard-i-Buzurg (“A Great Man”) which aptly describes both these great personalities, Quaid-i-Azam and Iqbal:

اس کا انداز نظر اپنے زمانے  
سے جدا  
اس کے احوال سے محروم ہیں  
پیران طریق!<sup>249</sup>

[His vision is different from that of his age ; Even the saints are not aware of his qualities.]

Honesty, sincerity, selflessness and straightforwardness are the qualities of a true Muslim. These virtues were inherent in abundance in both:

---

<sup>248</sup> Bal-i-Jibril, p. 34.

<sup>249</sup> Darb-i-Kalim, p. 129.

نگہ بلند، سخن دل نواز،  
جان پرسوز  
یہی ہے رخت سفر میر  
کارواں کے لیے<sup>250</sup>

[Loftiness of idea, soft-spokenness and vigour of life, Are the property of the leader of the caravan.]

The Quaid-i-Azam and Iqbal both are the true emblem of these qualities of Mard-i-Mu'min as described by Iqbal in these lines:

ہو حلقہٴ یاراں تو بریشم  
کی طرح نرم  
رزم حق و باطل ہو تو  
فولاد ہے مومن!<sup>251</sup>

[In the company of friends he (Mu'min) is as soft as silk;

If there is a fight for truth and falsehood he is as hard as iron.]

جس سے جگر لالہ میں ٹھنڈک  
ہو ہو شبنم!

---

<sup>250</sup> Bal i-Jibril, p. 74.

<sup>251</sup> Darb-i-Kalim, p. 41.

دریائوں کے دل جس سے دہل  
جائیں وہ طوفان! <sup>252</sup>

[Like dew drops which refresh the heart of tulip,

The storm which brings uproar in the heart of rivers]

Their love for truth, their fearlessness and devotion to the Holy Prophet go a long way to make them successful in their fight for Pakistan.

We are indebted to Iqbal, not only for his beautiful poetry and wonderful dynamic philosophy of life, but for upholding the rights of G e Muslims of India. Concrete idea of Pakistan was brought into existence by Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah.

Allamah Iqbal entered politics, not for the lust of power and position, but for establishing the right of self-determination of the Indian Muslims and secure a homeland for them where they could live honour-ably with their Islamic way of life, culture and their own heritage. The basis for demanding Pakistan was not only the fear of Hindus, or merely economic emancipation, but it was demanded on ideological grounds, i.e. on the basis of the two-nation theory. Muslims are Muslims, Hindus are Hindus, like Rudyard Kipling's "West is West and East is East."

---

<sup>252</sup> Ibid., p. 57.

While delivering the historic Presidential Address at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League, Allahabad, in 1930, Iqbal in unequivocal words said:

“I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religious and social institutions of other communities... Yet I love the communal group which is the source of my life and behaviour and which has formed me what I am by giving me its religion, its literature, its thought, its culture, and thereby recreating its whole part as a living operative factor in my present circumstances.”<sup>253</sup>

We hear the same echo so beautifully phrased in Jinnah's retort to Gandhi:

“We are a nation, with our own distinctive culture and civilization, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and calendar, history and tradition, aptitudes and emotions in short we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of international law we are a nation.”

This is, in fact, the same concept of the separate identity of which Iqbal had been giving to the Muslims through his writings and poetry.

It is interesting to note that in the early part of their lives both Iqbal and Jinnah were champions of Hindu-Muslim unity. But

---

<sup>253</sup> "Shamloo," Ed., Speeches and Statements of Iqbal.

both were disillusioned by the sinister designs of the Congress and Hindus in India. Muhammad Ali Jinnah was so much depressed and dejected by the petty-mindedness and fanaticism of Hindus that he left India and sought a sort of asylum in London. He was not hopeful of the bright 'future for Muslims in India,

In December 1928, when Mr. Jinnah as a leader of Muslim League suggested some amendment in the Nehru Report which was accepted by the All. Parties Conference at Lucknow, it was outright rejected by the All-Parties Convention at Calcutta, although Mr. Jinnah had joined hands with Hindus against the British and boycotted the Simon Commission. This shocked Mr. Jinnah and he understood the evil designs of Hindus in India. How Mr. Jinnah reacted is described by his friend Mr. Jamshed Nausherwanji:

‘One man said that Mr. Jinnah had no right to speak on behalf of the Muslims, that he did not represent them. He was humbled and he went back to his hotel.

“About half past eight next morning, Mr. Jinnah left Calcutta by train, and I went to see him off at the railway station. He was standing at the door of his first-class compartment; and he took my hand. He had tears in his eyes and said, Jamshed, this is the parting of the ways.”

Iqbal had already visualised the parting of the ways. As early as 1909, in a letter to Ghulam Qadir Farrukh of Amritsar, he rejected the idea of Hindu-Muslim unity. In 1927, Maulana

Qarshi, one of his compatriots, wanted Muslims to join hands with Hindus against the British in their own interest. Iqbal wrote to him that

Hindus wanted only internal autonomy and they did not want the British to quit India.

Allamah Iqbal, who dominated the Muslim political thought, becomes more vocal for political safeguard of the Muslims of India. While presiding over the annual session of the Muslim League at Allahabad in 1930, he strongly advocated the establishment of an autonomous State of North-Western Muslim majority provinces, I quote his words:

“I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single State. Self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India.”<sup>254</sup>

Late Mr Mumtaz Hasan has given us interesting information about it in his article “Iqbal As A Seer”; “Speaking of the 1930 address, I am reminded of a personal anecdote. When Iqbal returned to Lahore from Allahabad, I went to see him. I was still a student at College and felt greatly perturbed at his reference to self-government for the new Muslim state, ‘within the British

---

<sup>254</sup> S.A. Vahid, Ed., Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal (Lahore : Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1964), pp. 170-71.

Empire'. 'Why did you say that, Sir,' said I ; 'why must our Muslims state remain within the British Empire?' His first response was a smile. 'You will notice,' said he, 'that I have said, "self-government within or without the British Empire". You are worried about "within," but there are so many others who told me they are worried about "without". "But why did you have to say that at all, Sir?' I insisted. 'Because,' said he, 'while I see the establishment of a Muslim state as inevitable in the process of history, I cannot see clearly, at least at present, whether it will be within or without the British Empire.' I had to keep quiet. Here was a man who was utterly loyal to his vision, who told you what he saw clearly and what he did not.'<sup>255</sup>

Allamah Iqbal further said:

“ The life of Islam as a cultural force in this country very largely depends on its centralisation in a specific territory. This centralisation of the most living portion of the Muslims of India . . . will eventually solve the problem of India as well as of Asia.”<sup>256</sup>

His interest in politics and demand for a separate State were motivated by his inner commitment to his own ideals for the preservation of the cultural heritage of the Musalmans of the subcontinent. By preaching and propagating this ideal ceaselessly he laid the foundation of Pakistan. He wrote letters to the Quaid-

---

<sup>255</sup> Mumtaz Hasan, "Iqbal As a Seer," Iqbal Review (Iqbal Academy, Karachi), April 1966.

<sup>256</sup> "Shamloo," Ed., op. cit.



i-Azam stating the necessity of Pakistan and persuaded him to fight for the cause of the Muslims of India. These letters written during the period May 1936 to November 1937 were published<sup>257</sup> with a Foreword by the Quaid-i-Azam himself which shows his invaluable contribution towards the making of Pakistan. In this brief Foreword the Quaid-i-Azam says:

“I think these letters are of very great historical importance, particularly those which explain his views in clear and unambiguous terms on the political future of Muslim India. His views were substantially in consonance with my own and had finally led me to the same conclusions as a result of careful examination and study of the constitutional problems facing India, and found expression in due course in the united will of Muslim India as adumbrated in the Lahore resolution of the All-India Muslim League, popularly known as the 'Pakistan Resolution,' passed on 23 March 1940.”<sup>258</sup>

The poetry of Iqbal is a definite contribution to human thought and knowledge and his message is at once noble, sublime and invigorating. His views are not only identical to those of the Quaid-i-Azam in poetical thoughts but are also in consonance with his message of hope, unity, faith and action. Unity, Faith and Discipline, the motto of the Quaid-i-Azam, also forms the guiding principles for human struggle in Iqbal:

---

<sup>257</sup> Letters of Jabal to Jinnah, Lahore : Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1974 reprint.

<sup>258</sup> Ibid., pp. 6-7.

یقین محکم، عمل پیہم، محبت فاتح

عالم

جہاد زندگانی میں ہیں یہ مردوں کی

شمشیریں  
259

[Faith, constant struggle and intense love are the conqueror of the world. In the struggle of life for men of valour, these qualities are like swords.]

The Quaid i-Azam described Iqbal as a friend, guide and philosopher and added, “during the darkest moments through which the

Muslim League had to go, he stood like a rock and never flinched for one single moment.”

It is refreshing to note that the present Government is alive to the teachings of the Quaid-i-Azam and Allamah Iqbal. While speaking on the occasion of the Foundation Ceremony of the Staff College, Quetta, our Prime Minister, Mr Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, reiterated the same guiding principles in these words: “We have repledged to strive with unity, faith and discipline to elevate the status of Pakistan as envisaged by the Quaid-i-Azam”.<sup>260</sup>

---

<sup>259</sup> Bang-i-Dara, p. 310.

<sup>260</sup> The Daily Dawn, Karachi, 8 April 1976.

In his Presidential Address of Allahbad in 1930, Iqbal advocated for a separate homeland for Muslims of India. He said:

“Islam can remain alive as a cultural force only if it is concentrated in a territory. Indeed, Islam does not mean a private relation-ship between man and God. It is a system of Government and this system had been determined before any Rousseau had even thought of any.”<sup>261</sup>

In August 1941, in Hyderabad (Deccan), the Quaid-i-Azam answering a question summarized the concept of the Islamic State in the following lines which are very near to Iqbal's concept as explained in his Allahabad address:

“It must always be borne in mind that the distinguishing characteristics of the Islamic state is that in it God is the source of all obedience and allegiance. The practical way of doing this is the establishment of the supremacy of the Quran. In Islam there is no obedience to any king, parliament, person or institution. The laws of the Quran alone determine the boundaries of our limits and freedom in politics and society. Islamic state, in other words, is the supremacy of and government by the Quranic laws and principles. And for government you need territory and a state.”

---

<sup>261</sup> “Shamloo,” Ed., op. cit.

After 1930 theoretically the conception of Pakistan was accepted. It was now the choice of a leader. Iqbal defines the qualification and attributes of a leader in these words:

“By leader I mean one who by divine gift or experience possesses a keen perception of the spirit and as destiny of Islam along with the equally deep perception of the trend of modern history. Such men are really the divine forces of a people, but they are God's gift and can-not be made to order.”

And definitely he found such a leader in the Quaid-i-Azam.

His famous line, as a matter of fact, is applicable to both these luminaries:

ہزاروں سال نرگس اپنی بے نوری پہ روتی  
ہے  
بڑی مشکل سے ہوتا ہے چمن میں دیدہ  
ور  
پیدا! 262

[For thousands of years the Narcissus sheds tears over its lack of sight or visionary power;

A man with powerful vision is rarely born in the garden of life.]

The fundamental values of Islam were strong forces for both Iqbal

and the Quaid-i-Azam. Iqbal believed that “Islam” is itself a destiny and will not suffer a “destiny”.

When the Quaid-i-Azam returned to India in 1934, Iqbal influenced his thought. Between 1932 and 1937 Iqbal worked towards two ends:

First, to convert the Quaid-i-Azam towards the idea of Pakistan, and, secondly, to make the Muslim League the acknowledged voice of the Indian Muslims.

Subsequently, Muslim League as a mouthpiece of Indian Muslims organized itself to the extent that the movement culminated into direct action. Iqbal wrote to the Quaid-i-Azam on 28 May 1937:

“I have no doubt that you fully realize the gravity of the situation as far as Muslim India is concerned. The League will have to finally decide whether it will remain a body representing the upper classes of Indian Muslims or Muslim masses who have so far, with good reason, taken no interest in it.”<sup>263</sup>

Thus on 21 June 1937, Iqbal wrote to the Quaid-i-Azam:

“...you are the only Muslim in India today to whom the community has a right to look up for safe guidance through the

---

<sup>263</sup> Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah, pp. 16-17,

storm which is coming to North-West India, and perhaps to the whole of India.”<sup>264</sup>

In 1940, two years after Iqbal's death, the Quaid-i-Azam said: “Pakistan is inevitable.”

Iqbal held the Quaid-i-Azam in great reverence. He replied curtly to a questioner: “He is incorruptible and unpurchaseable.” Pakistan will always remember Iqbal and Jinnah as its benefactors and their message is an eternal guideline for us.

Between May 1936 and June 1937 Iqbal wrote several confidential letters to the Quaid-i-Azam giving an outline of the type of State he envisaged for the Muslims of India. By 1940 the movement was complete. The federation of Muslim majority provinces was made in Pakistan. In such a State the Islamic principles will be the guidelines of the constitution, in which every individual has his economic safeguard.

Pakistan was created, not on geographical demarcation, but as an ideological State.

The Quaid-i-Azam and Iqbal dreamt of Pakistan to be a home-land of Islamic principles, social justice and economic emancipation.

We are grateful to both of them that they gave us a sense of direction. Muslims all over the world are brothers. We have friendly relations, not only with the Arab world, but almost all the

---

<sup>264</sup> Ibid., pp. 20-21.

Muslim States of Africa, Iran, Turkey, Egypt, Malaysia, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Bangla Desh, etc., are our friends and well-wishers.

In the words of Professor Rush brook-Williams: “It is true that Iqbal influenced the Quaid-i-Azam, but it is also true that the Quaid-i-Azam and his great nation-building work exercised a profound influence upon Iqbal, and illuminated the last years of his life with a new hope.”

The Quaid-i-Azam's sagacity and great faith in negotiations were two permanent factors which helped the Quaid-i-Azam in getting Pakistan. Iqbal took more radiant views about the future of India because of his study in Islam and the Quran.

“He [Iqbal] firmly believed that it was not for the Muslims to save Islam but for Islam to save the Muslims” (Rushbrook-Williams).

He exhorted Muslims to get back to the Quran and the fundamentals of Islam. He wanted the homeland in which Islam could be practised. That is why Iqbal depreciated the concept of Nehru's Secularism or Socialism.

In the words of the Quaid-i-Azam, “Optimism, industry, faith, self-confidence and courage are the principles on which Iqbal backs his philosophy “ These attributes are equally applicable to the Quaid-i-Azam himself. That is why their views were identical with regard to a separate State for Muslims.

The Quaid-i-Azam derived inspiration from Iqbal's writings both in prose and poetry and was convinced of his revolutionary idea of "Islamic Polity".

After the Quaid-i-Azam's return from England he continued his efforts with strong zeal and optimism.

نہ ہو نومید، نومیدی زوال  
علم و عرفان ہے  
امید مرد مومن ہے خدا کے  
رازدانوں میں

Now I quoted from the Quaid-i-Azam's Foreword which he wrote to Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah:

"It was a great achievement for Muslim League that its lead came to be acknowledged by both the majority and the minority Provinces. Sir Muhammad Iqbal played a very conspicuous part, though at the time not revealed to public, in bringing about this consummation."<sup>265</sup>

They had different likes and dislikes in their personal life, but their views in relation to national interests were identical. Iqbal was the Qalandar, the Quaid-i-Azam, an aristocrat. Iqbal's simplicity in dress and living is well known. The Quaid-i-Azam was an immaculately dressed person. This is a unique combination

---

<sup>265</sup> Ibid., p. 5.



of two personalities having different approaches, but both worked together for achieving our great Pakistan.

Iqbal wrote thirteen letters to the Quaid-i-Azam during the last two years of his life. They reflect his attitude, his confidence in the Quaid-i-Azam to marshal the cause of Muslims and his endeavours to see that the Muslim League emerged as a party of people's representatives, not of landlords like the Unionist Party in the Punjab. The Quaid-i-Azam was deeply moved by Iqbal's untimely death when he needed his counsel and support.

A philosopher and guide died when politics in India was at a crucial stage. How emotionally was the Quaid-i-Azam attached to Iqbal is evident from his speech on Iqbal Day in 1940 which was being observed on 21<sup>st</sup> April, in Lahore paying high tributes to Iqbal the Quaid-i-Azam said:

“Iqbal was not only a philosopher but also a practical politician. He was one of the first to conceive of the feasibility of the division of India on national lines as the only solution of India's political problem. He was one of the most powerful thinkers, tacit precursors and heralds of modern political evolution of Muslim India.”

## **THE QUAID-I-AZAM'S “IQBAL DAY” MESSAGE\***

“...his [Iqbal's] verse, immortal as it is, is always there to guide us and to inspire us. His poetry, besides being beautiful in form and sweet in language, presents to us a picture of the mind and heart of this great poet, and we find how deeply he was devoted to the teachings of Islam. He was a true and faithful follower of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him),—a Muslim first and a Muslim last. He was the interpreter and voice of Islam.

“Iqbal was not merely a preacher and a philosopher. He stood for courage and action, perseverance and self-reliance, and above all faith in God and devotion to Islam...

“...With his firm conviction of and faith in the ideals of Islam, he was one of the few who originally thought over the feasibility of carving out of India such an Islamic State in the North-West and North-East zones which are historical homelands of Muslims.”

On the occasion of the celebration of “Iqbal Day” at Lahore, 9 December 1944.

# **SOME IMPORTANT FACTORS IN THE POLITICS OF SAYYID AHMAD KHAN**

Dr. Abdul Hamid

Formerly Director, Punjab Text-Book Board, Lahore

Sayyid Ahmad Khan still remains one of the controversial figures in the history of this subcontinent. He loved to call himself a radical and his opponents fiercely attacked his religious opinions and social ideas. Criticism of his politics, subdued at first, became vociferous in the succeeding generation. Some non-Muslim journals of influence went so far as to denounce him as a traitor to the country. It is still customary for some persons to make oblique references to his work and opinions. It is, however, very difficult to understand the man if we disregard the circumstances of his times. Nor should we mistake the essence of his argument for the trappings in which it was presented.

That Sayyid Ahmad Khan was an exceptionally talented man who wielded an overwhelming influence in shaping the course of events, will not be seriously denied. As a seeker after knowledge, he was curious about many things under the sun and looked far ahead than most of his contemporaries. He had practically no knowledge of English, yet the dissemination of Western education among the Muslims became his mission in life and he continued to wage a determined fight against the inertia and opposition of

his own community. History and religion were his favourite studies. Both went a long way in giving him his perspective and aims. As a social reformer, he was impatient of outmoded conventions and effete institutions. In a very real sense he can be described as the Bentham of Muslim society who freely questioned the utility of inherited usages. He was also a journalist who used his pen for indoctrination. His speeches and writings show him as a preacher par excellence.

To begin with, Sayyid Ahmad Khan was very well adjusted to the Muslim society of the day. He had received the traditional Muslim education in his younger days and was a learner and a researcher in the fields of history and theology on traditional lines. It was the War of 1857 that brought out the rebel and the reformer in him. The stresses and strains of post-1857 years rapidly aided his intellectual development. In the course of his studies he acquired familiarity with the doctrines of English Utilitarians and gave much thought to political theories of John Stuart Mill on liberty and representative government. That he accepted some of his ideas and rejected others is dear from his writings. His thinking was also coloured by the provocative advances of contemporary biological sciences. As a man of action, he developed strong opinions and held them with tenacity. Towards the end he grew self-opinionated and could not stand any interference with his plans.

One of the factors consciously shaping Sayyid Ahmad's political views was that Britain, the ruling power in the

subcontinent, stood at the height of its destiny in the later half of the nineteenth century. Its industrial might was unchallenged. Politically, it was on the top of the world, and militarily it was held to be invincible. The freedom of thought and expression allowed to the Queen's subjects in England did not probably exist elsewhere. The political framework of British democracy, as we know it today, was incomplete. Universal adult franchise was far off and the "multitude" could still be described as "swinish" in the course of debates on the Second Reform Bill.

Great Britain's hold over the subcontinent had been strengthened with time and improvement of communications. The structure of government evolved after trial and error appeared to meet the requirements of governing an Asian dependency for an indefinite period. Political movements in the subcontinent were sporadic and did not attract much popular attention. The rulers practised racialism in its crudest form. "Natives" were denied access to clubs, restaurants and public parks frequented by men and women of the ruling tribe, who seldom cared to hide their contempt for the subjects. They were even demonstrative about it.

The Muslims had been rapidly losing ground in trade, professions and administration even under the East India Company. They suffered heavily in the War of 1857 and were subjected to ruthless suppression after it had ended. On their own part, they were unreconciled to the new order. In sheer sullenness,

they chose to stand away from the rulers, from their schools and from other Western cultural influences.

The suggestion confidently advanced by P.J. Griffiths that the Muslims themselves were responsible for their sufferings is too naive to be accepted. It ignores the vast influence that an economically powerful ruling community can exercise over the lives of poor and backward subject people.

The rampant racialism of the day, the gravely provocative and aggressive policies of the British rulers towards their Muslim subjects and Muslim refusal to see anything good in the Western way of life, left little hope for conciliation between them and the rulers. Sayyid Ahmad Khan became the spokesman of the Indian Muslim community after 1858, but his freedom of initiative was severely restricted. His job can be compared to that of the leader of a defeated army. It fell to him to chart a feasible course for his community within the limits imposed by the situation. A successful rebellion against Britain or a continued boycott of everything British would lead nowhere. The Muslim community must adjust itself to the changed environment created by British conquest. Its political rehabilitation should begin with loyal acceptance of British rule. Sayyid Ahmad Khan himself, at times, exaggerated, to the point of crudity, in professing loyalty to the British. Some of his public utterances would appear to be strange and undignified today, but it has to be pointed out that the creed of loyalty for him was a means and not an end in itself. This was

the only way of saving his community from disaster at the hands of a revengeful Caesar.

It is also pertinent to bear in mind that Sayyid Ahmad Khan took a sustained interest in the affairs of the Muslim world and was familiar with the intellectual and reform movements in Turkey and Egypt. Yet he was careful not to show excessive interest in outside Muslim communities. Muslim India alone was his constituency and his frame of reference.

Sayyid Ahmad Khan's ingrained conservatism is largely explained by early conditions around him. Coming from an aristocratic family, he had been a frequent visitor to the royal residence at the Red Fort and had even received a high-sounding title from the last Mughul king. He was proud of his high pedigree and reproduced, in one of his books, his genealogical table connecting his own family with the Prophet. In his speeches and writings, he lamented the sad plight of the Muslim families that had once rolled in luxury. He did not feel happy at the children of the well-born families mixing and slanging with street urchins. He condemned the racial arrogance of the British rulers as it was mostly visited on the well-born. He appears to mention with no small pride how in England he felt exalted at meeting the highest in British society, "Lords and Dukes including".

His attitude towards female education provides another example of his innate conservatism. He gave no importance to the education of women, which, he said, could very well wait till men had been educated. True, he changed many of his opinions in the

course of a long life, But in this sphere he remained prisoner of his early ideas.

The terrible experience of the War of 1857 left a permanent scar on his soul. It also gave him a purpose and sense of direction in life. He was deeply agonized by the sufferings of Muslim aristocracy, and, at one time, decided to quit the land of his birth. But he soon abandoned this idea and decided to share the difficulties and trials of his community. He was a practical man with an unflinching eye for the essentials of a problem. He was persuaded that it was not a practical proposition to challenge the new order. The Muslim community must bow to the logic of the situation and accept the inevitable. The Muslims had better devote themselves to the study of Western sciences, try to understand the British mind and proclaim unreserved acceptance of British rule. This was a bitter pill for most of his co-religionists to swallow, but he persevered with his mission. In order to overcome Muslim prejudice against Christians or Christian prejudice against Muslims, he wrote a commentary on the Book of Genesis to bring out the basic identity of Islam and Christianity. He wrote a pamphlet citing respectable authorities to show that Islam did not prevent the Muslims from dining with Christians in India's caste-ridden society.

Sayyid Ahmad's judgments on questions of religion and theology proceeded more from political considerations than from an unbiased study of the subject itself. Some points that emerged from his studies in this field were as follows.



The Muslim and Christian faiths are very close to one another. They have a common background and hallow a long line of Prophets mentioned in their respective scriptures. The doctrine of Jihad is the most misunderstood doctrine of Islam. The Muslims can engage in Jihad only in exceptional circumstances. The circumstances of British rule in India do not permit the Muslims to take up arms against their rulers. Islam teaches its followers to be faithful to those who bear rule over them. The cynic, who brands it as political theology, is not wholly wrong.

A constitutionalist by temper, Sayyid Ahmad Khan condemned the racialism of the rulers, pleaded for equality before law for all classes of British subjects and emphasised the need for amicable relations between different religious communities. The anti-Urdu campaign of some Hindu leaders of Benares started in 1867 came as a shock to him. The object of the Hindu attack was to dislodge the Urdu language from its established place as a medium of instruction in schools and as the language of law courts in upper India. Sayyid Ahmad Khan reacted immediately and took a decisive stand. It was at this stage that he was filled with despair about the future of Hindu-Muslim relations at the persistent Hindu belligerency on this front. He even spoke of Hindus and Muslims parting company "for ever" without, perhaps, being clear about the implication of his own words.

Another great influence in the life of Sayyid Ahmad Khan was his visit to England during 1869-70. Here he divided his time between meeting persons of importance and preparing his

refutation of Sir William Muir's *Life of Mahomet*. He was overwhelmed by the immensity of Britain's wealth, by the courtesy and dignity of the man in the street and by the system of education at Cambridge. Education, he saw, was a wider proposition than he had thought before. He was greatly impressed by the corporate student life at Cambridge with its immense potentialities for character-building. He expressed his admiration of the civilised life in England in phrases that were often irritating to readers at home.

It was in England that he conceived of a movement of social reform and of a plan for Muslim education. The Mohammadan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh, was started after a full-fledged inquiry into the existing state of education and an appraisal of Muslim attitude towards the school system established by the British. The report of the inquiry is a powerful indictment of a merely imported education.

Started in 1875, the Mohammadan Anglo-Oriental College became the centre of a vigorous community life in which games, debates and other extra-curricular activities figured prominently. Rules required the management to employ a number of Englishmen on the teaching staff. Sayyid Ahmad Khan thought that the presence of Englishmen was essential to the running of this residential institution which was one of its kind in the country. The association of Englishmen with the College was a decided advantage in some respects, but it also produced a crop

of difficulties in the long run. These difficulties were intensified as political consciousness grew.

The principal factor that gave a political complexion to the Aligarh movement was the creed of the Indian National Congress. The founder of the Indian National Congress, A.O. Hume, and its early leaders were full of the British Liberal philosophy of the day. They demanded representative government for the country and claimed to speak even for those who did not share their ideas. However, the application of British Liberal ideas to the Indian society of 1885 was premature. A homogeneous society is the first requisite of success-full representative government. Social contrasts, religious differences and cultural disparities do not provide a congenial soil for the democratic experiment. Sayyid Ahmad Khan understood all this clearly and expressed his views incisively. He argued that the factors making for the success of representative government in England were absent from India. Representative government of the Western pattern would be fatal to Muslim interests as it would inevitably lead to majority rule. Majority rule is dangerous in a country where majorities and minorities are separated by social and cultural barriers. The hostility of the Hindu majority towards the Muslim minority was based on historical reasons. The very memory of Muslim rule was irritating to the politically-conscious sections of the Hindus. A majority conscious of its power and embittered against the minority is not likely to use its authority with wisdom or restraint. Majority rule will be indistinguishable from tyranny in the Indian situation.

Sayyid Ahmad Khan stated all this with his characteristic vigour and the political philosophy of the Aligarh movement was founded on these propositions.

To sum up: Aligarh has been criticized for a multitude of sins. It failed to produce a genuine academic atmosphere.

For its emphasis on games, it came to be looked upon as a nursery of gamesters. The religious instruction that it gave was mechanical, lifeless, rooted in the past and unadapted to the times. Administrative framework left room for clash of personalities. There is substance in all this. But, above all, Aligarh was a leveling agency. It was here that young men with a variety of backgrounds, social, economic and geographical, from all over the subcontinent, developed a common outlook and a habit of looking at the Muslim problem of the subcontinent as a whole. This laid the foundation of a way of thinking that ultimately led to the emergence of Pakistan.

# SOME REMINISCENCES OF QUAID-I-AZAM

Mir H. Shaukat Kazmi

The centenary of the Quaid-i-Azam is being celebrated this year and some of the intellectuals are fully engrossed in describing their association with him on Radio, TV and Press so that the same be recorded in his biography. The undersigned was also prompted and encouraged by this general trend to state some of his reminiscences of that unique personality.

Before I pen down anything on this subject, it would be quite appropriate to acquaint the readers with my antecedents very briefly. Having been born in Quetta (Baluchistan), I received my primary education in Iran, then at Quetta, thereafter at Aligarh and Lahore, and acquired business education in Banking Secretariat training, Business Organisation, etc., in London. I joined Ali Brothers during Khilafat Movement in A 1921 which at that time was linked with the Indian National Congress for the common cause. My father made me join Afghan Service. To begin with I was posted as Tarjuman (Translator) in Afghan Consulate at Bombay. After appreciating my qualifications, they designated me Commercial and Press Attache. Having an urge for independence from early days and also influenced by association with Muslim and Hindu leaders of that time, I wanted to keep in touch with some of them. The Afghan Government as their set

policy were very careful to have anything to do with Indian leaders, so I had to stick to that policy, lest the British rulers of India may make it a big issue. Thus I have served Afghanistan in various capacities for nearly thirty-six years.

It was round about 1939 that Mr. . Jinnah (not known as Quaid-i-Azam at that time) came into prominence. With the permission of my Consul, I issued him an invitation card on our Independence Day, least expecting that it would even be acknowledged. Much to our surprise and that of the invitees present on the occasion and shock to our Parsi friends, Mr. . Jinnah came along with his venerable sister. Many present could not believe their eyes that it could be Mr. . Jinnah. They questioned me whether that was really Mr. . Jinnah.

In the Consulate, we occasionally used to have selected standing luncheons. We often used to invite Mr. Jinnah on short notice on telephone. He always came. Mr. Jinnah was known to be curt, unbending and not prepared to listen to anyone against his independent views. I was surprised while dealing with him that he was quite different from what the people thought of him. He was courteous, listening smilingly even to nonsense talk. He weighed all advice given to him in his own logical trend and did not feel shy in adopting it if it were correct. I had the natural tendency of putting odd questions to my elders for which very often I was admonished by my father. On one occasion, in these selected parties, I put a straight question to Mr. Jinnah taking the risk of his being offended. "Is Pakistan a reality or a political

stunt?” Mr. Jinnah put his plate on a side table and addressed me thus: “Shaukat, it is a reality. We are just like two birds of different species locked in a cage. Our aim at present is to get out of the cage. The moment we succeed—just as birds of same feather flock together, we never meet outside. Our aim is Pakistan; God willing, we will succeed.” As Mr. Jinnah was speaking these words, I could feel that they were the true reflection of his heart and he had full faith in them, and there was nothing camouflaged.

To quote an important incident, I must first mention the background connected with it, to make matter more lucid. I had a friend, now deceased, Zikria Maniar by name. In Bombay, due to lack of space in masjids, the Eid prayers were conducted in many masjids and even then they had to spread carpets on roadsides to accommodate namazis. Mr. Zikria Maniar with a few (llama started arranging Eid prayers in Azad Maidan. In the beginning, only a few people gathered, but as the Azad Maidan had a central position being at the terminus of two rail-ways and was well connected with bus and tram services, the multitude increased every year by leaps and bounds, so such so that it reached fifty thousand. There was another unique thing about this gathering. Muslims of every school of thought attended the prayer, Sunnis, Shiahs, Wahabis, etc. His Holiness the Mulla Sahib of Bohris used to send his ten representatives. Some used to pray with folded arms and some with open arms, but behind one Pesh Imam. Maulana Khujandi, a well-known theologian, poet, writer and khatib, the Afghan Consul with his staff and Persian Consul with his staff were always present there. Undoubtedly, it was a great

achievement of the late Zikria Maniar to get together Muslims of various schools of thought. May Almighty God bless him and may his soul rest in eternal peace. Amin! Now, reverting to the main issue, I must state that Mr. Jinnah was I very much interested in the Muslim world. He used to question me about Afghanistan. Iran and the Tribal Areas and I used to tell whatever I knew. Emboldened by my talks with Mr. Jinnah I once told him: “Mr. Jinnah, the masses do not know you. Your meetings are conducted tables occupied by Nawabs, Knights and aristocrats. Your voice does not reach the ears of the common man who is the real strength of the nation.” He asked me then what should he do. I said, “I have a plan.” “What is your plan?” he questioned me. “My plan is simple. After a week or so, Eid prayer will be offered in Azad Maidan, which is a gathering of almost all sects of Muslims. You should offer your prayer there.” Quick came the query: “Who is going to invite me.” I replied: “A deputation will call on you for this purpose.”

I got in touch with Mr. Zikria Maniar and suggested to him that he along with Maulana Khujandi and a few others should call on Mr. Jinnah and invite him for Eid prayer. Mr. Zikria Maniar was reluctant. He said: “Mr. Jinnah will not meet them.” I informed him about the background. He consented. The deputation called on Mr. Jinnah and was well received by him and he agreed to attend the prayer.

On the Eid gathering at Azad Maidan, exactly at 9 a.m. Mr. Jinnah’s car appeared. He was received by Mr. Zikria Maniar and a



few others and, as previously arranged, he was conducted to the first row and seated at my right. The majority of people could see that some big personality had been received and conducted to the first row. They had no knowledge who that important personality could be. After some time the prayer started. All stood up Mr. Jinnah asked me: "Shaukat, now tell me what to do." I replied: "Mr. Jinnah, while praying I cannot talk. You should copy me. When I raise my hands, you too raise your hands, when I bow down, you also bow down. When I kneel, you do the same and when I go down for Sijdah you also do the same." When the prayer was over, it was announced from the pulpit that Mr. Jinnah will address the gathering. Majority of people did not bother, they knew not who Mr. Jinnah was. Mr. Jinnah asked me what he should say. I said he knew better—the Muslims of India. But I told him he should start addressing in Urdu. He replied: "But I do not know Urdu." I said he knew Urdu very well; what he spoke with his sister, khansama, bearer, driver and others is real Urdu—Urdu means language of soldiers, spoken in streets and bazars and understood by all. Urdu spoken by Nawabs and big folks in their household is not the real Urdu; it is a dialect restricted in their limited circles. Mr. Jinnah started addressing them in Urdu, then after some time he asked their permission to continue his address in English as there were some foreign correspondents who did not know Urdu. The crowd smilingly shouted that he was at liberty to do so. He continued his address in English for some time. When Mr. Jinnah departed, his car was encircled by a huge crowd all shouting, "Jinnah Zindabad".

Thereafter, Mr. Jinnah started a tour of Surat and Ahmedabad and addressed huge gatherings in Urdu. Masses gave large sums as donations, even women joined them and offered their valuable ornaments as their humble contribution.