

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH



INSTITUTE OF POST GRADUATE
AND STUDIES LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF POST-GRADUATE (E) STUDIES
LIBRARY

1. Name _____

2. Age _____

3. Date of issue of the book on or before the last date stamped _____

4. Date of return of the book of 5 (five) (Text-books) will _____

5. Date of return of the book is kept overtime _____

6. Date of return of the book is kept overtime _____

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI



INSTITUTE OF POST GRADUATE
AND STUDIES LIBRARY

Pakistan University Library

THE FOUNDER OF PAKISTAN

THROUGH TRIAL TO TRIUMPH



BY
KHAN A. AHMAD

PRICE 11

PREFACE

We live in dangerous times indeed and daily events warn us that, though here to-day, we may be gone to-morrow.

This consciousness about the insecurity of life has led me to try to discharge a moral duty that I owe to the Pakistan National Movement, which has given me and the Millat a newer sense of our national destiny. Hence this little brochure which may be described as an attempt at an appreciation of the historic work of Choudhary Rahmat Ali, the Founder of Pakistan, and at an examination of the opposition of some vested and some vicious interests both to him and to the Movement.

I wish to add that, in preparing the brochure, I have, naturally, drawn upon the information derived from my close contact for many years with the Movement, and have scrupulously recorded herein only those facts which have come to my personal knowledge; also, that in dealing with the opposition, as in relating the facts pertaining to it, I have erred rather on the side of understatement than of exaggeration. Therefore I feel sure that if, and when, the events, referred to in this connection, come to be fully exposed, they will be found to be far more significant than is apparent from my brief and bald statements.

However, if this survey helps the public to a clearer understanding of the work of the Founder of Pakistan and of the nature of the opposition to him and to the Movement, I shall feel that my duty has been discharged.

KHAN A. AHMAD.

13th September, 1942.

PREFACE

We live in dangerous times indeed and daily events warn us that, though here to-day, we may be gone to-morrow.

This consciousness about the insecurity of life has led me to try to discharge a moral duty that I owe to the Pakistan National Movement, which has given me and the Millat a newer sense of our national destiny. Hence this little brochure which may be described as an attempt at an appreciation of the historic work of Choudhary Rahmat Ali, the Founder of Pakistan, and at an examination of the opposition of some vested and some vicious interests both to him and to the Movement.

I wish to add that, in preparing the brochure, I have, naturally, drawn upon the information derived from my close contact for many years with the Movement, and have scrupulously recorded herein only those facts which have come to my personal knowledge; also, that in dealing with the opposition, as in relating the facts pertaining to it, I have erred rather on the side of understatement than of exaggeration. Therefore I feel sure that if, and when, the events referred to in this connection, come to be fully exposed, they will be found to be far more significant than is apparent from my brief and bald statements.

However, if this survey helps the public to a clearer understanding of the work of the Founder of Pakistan and of the nature of the opposition to him and to the Movement, I shall feel that my duty has been discharged.

KHAN A. AHMAD.

15th September, 1942.

THE FOUNDER OF PAKISTAN

THROUGH TRIAL TO TRIUMPH

IN the recent history of South Asia, the vision of a single individual has seldom transformed the fate of a nation so completely as has been done by Choudhary Rahmat Ali, the Founder of Pakistan.

Though, so far, only a few appreciate fully the significance of the revolution that his inspiration, example, and influence have wrought in Muslim ideology in the Sub-continent of "India," yet none can deny that its repercussions are already being felt far beyond its boundaries. For it is a well-known fact that his dynamic work for the "de-Indianisation" of the hundred million Muslims in the Sub-continent and for their national re-aggregation in South Asia is, throughout the lands of the Crescent, stirring the spirit of Islamic regeneration and strengthening the hope of its realisation. And, what is more, in the perspective of history, the people are seriously comparing his achievement with that of Jamal-ud-Din, the standard-bearer of Pan-Islamism, and of Sidi Mohammad, the Founder of Sanusiya.

Of course, this evaluation is essentially inspired by the fact that Rahmat Ali's contribution to the cause of Islam is as lasting as that of these great men. This means that just as they served the Millat by organising the Muslims in their respective spheres, he has done the same in his field by creating, out of the chaos of Indian Federation, first Pakistan and then Bāng-i-Islam and Usmanistan.

How he accomplished this is explained in the following pages.

LEGACY OF THE PAST.

The whole world knows that, entering the Sub-continent of India as they did in the seventh century, the Muslims have by now been there for over thirteen centuries; that of this long period they were, for more than eleven hundred years, its supreme rulers. Yet, incredible though it may seem, the fact is that, from the first day to the last of their imperial rule, they remained numerically in a minority among the Indians and, therefore, nationally in a precarious position throughout the Sub-continent.

The Grim Sequel.

Naturally this had a grim sequel. First, it left them scattered over the whole of the Indian peninsula; secondly, it exposed them to the dangerous forces working for their "Indianisation"; and, finally, it caused the downfall of their empire in 1857.

Surely after this tragedy one would think they would have built their life anew on sound and secure national foundations. But, thanks to their folly, they still followed the old policy and remained, as before, thinly spread over the vast Sub-continent.

phraseology, you will hardly find in it a trace of Milli political philosophy, of Milli political ideology, or of Milli political language to inspire them as a people.

This shows that, in these years, they were touching the lowest watermark of their history; and that their patricians, their politicians, and their intellectuals, in repeating the doctrines of "communalism" and in reiterating the theories of "Minorityism," were practically passing under the domination of "Indianism."

The Indianisation of Islam.

Worst of all was the fact that all these leading classes had come to believe that, after all, Muslims were Indians; that "India" was their home; and that the Indian majority had the right of rule over the Muslim minority.

This baneful belief, when fostered by the Anglo-Hindoo propagandists, became disastrous. It produced such a degeneration among the Muslims, who numbered nearly 70 millions, that, by 1930, they were politically absorbed by, what Rahmat Ali has rightly called, "the soul-killing cult of Indianism."

THE INDIAN FEDERATION.

Such, in a word, was the state of affairs when, in 1930, the Anglo-Hindoo *entente* started their moves in the direction of federalising the political constitution of the Sub-continent, a constitution that could not but lead to the complete "Indianisation" of Muslims.

To secure that end, they held three Round Table Conferences in London, 1930-33, and invited the delegates of various Indian parties to attend the meetings in order to represent the interests of their peoples. But, as the official records show, while most of the other delegates stood by their peoples, the Muslim delegates appeared to be compromising the very existence of their co-religionists by giving in to the Anglo-Hindoo *entente* on the question of the separate national entity of Muslims.

DEFECTION OF MUSLIM DELEGATES.

This went on until 1932 when it became known that, regardless of its grievous implications to the future of Islam in the Sub-continent, the Muslim delegates had nearly made up their minds to agree to the Federal basis of the Constitution and to forego the inherent right of Muslims to their own distinct nationhood.

Obviously this was suicidal. The delegates knew it as well as did the other leaders. Yet not one of them stood up to oppose it. On the contrary, they all accepted it and expected the Muslims to support it.

The End?

From this the world naturally concluded that the end of Muslims as a people in the Sub-continent had come; that the establishment of the Federation of India would seal their fate for ever; and that, in the process of time, they would disappear altogether as a moral and national force from the vast territories over which their flag had flown for 1200 years.

Ray of Hope

Fortunate

superficial. It confused the leaders with the rank and file of Islam and mistook their failure for that of the people who were sound to the core.

That fact made all the difference in the world; for, before darkness descended, it brought the Millat's moral forces into action—forces which threw up a man to meet the crisis by his vision, bravery, and work.

RISE OF RAHMAT ALI.

This man was Choudhary Rahmat Ali—at the time a post-graduate student at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. The son of a devout father, Haji Choudhary Shah Muhammad of Mohar, and the scion of an old family, distinguished for its devotion to Islam, he was already known to his people as one of the most sincere men and creative minds of his generation. And from his Milli ideals and moral integrity, from his physical courage and iron-will, and from his oratorical gifts and organising ability, they all expected great things in life.

To these qualities must be added his mystic faith in his own destiny. It is said that when he was only five, a Faqeer foretold a brilliant future for him and bade him prepare himself for the great role which was pre-ordained for him by Allah.

His prediction is widely believed to have been the making of Rahmat Ali. As a matter of fact, he himself still admits that ultimately it led to his spiritual re-birth, and gave his life a new meaning which determined him to keep himself free from all worldly-ties, to live and work in the hope of finding his destiny, and to hold himself ready for the supreme call that he felt was sure to come.

Now, in this crisis, nearly 30 years after the Faqeer's prediction, he saw its fulfilment. Fanatically convinced that his hour had struck and that his Allah had at last called upon him to save the Millat's cause in the Sub-continent, he answered the summons with a fervent "*Labbaiḥ*" and gave himself to alter the fundamental course of Muslim political life and to release Islam for ever from the yoke of "Indianism."

In other words, he undertook the all-fateful task of transforming the cult of "Indianism" into the creed of "Islamism," the curse of "minority communalism" into the call of Muslim nationalism, the perilous position of Muslim territories as provinces of India into the safe status of Muslim fatherland of Pakistan, of Bang-i-Islam, and of Usmanistan in South Asia; and, finally, the old sense of frustration into a new hope for the fulfilment of Islamic mission.

And all this he achieved in the course of a few years.

To understand and appreciate this miracle, for one can call it nothing less, let us go back to the time when, in 1932, the Muslim delegates were getting ready to accept the All-India Federation which, as has already been observed, could not but prove fatal to all that the Millat had been, was, or aspired to be.

When the ominous news of this impending disaster reached Rahmat Ali, he at once realised that the supreme testing-hour for his people had arrived; that either it would make or break them for ever. Reacting to it like an inspired man, he immediately rose to the height of the opportunity, made the decision of his destiny, and pledged his all—his fortune, his future, and his life—to their defence both against the defection of Muslim delegates and against the designs of Anglo-Hindoo
 • *entente*.

THE STRUGGLE STARTS.

In pursuance of this decision, he neglected his studies and started the struggle. Coming out into the open, on the one hand, he boldly challenged the Anglo-Hindoo *entente* and warned them of the relentless opposition of Muslims to Indian Federation and, on the other, he cried a halt to the defeatist policy of the delegates, devised the name Pakistan for the predominantly Muslim strongholds of the Punjab, Afghanistan (North-West Frontier Province), Kashmir, Sindh, and Balochistan, created the Pakistani ideology, and called upon them to follow it or else to face the verdict of posterity.

How did they react to it?

The painful truth is that, for all practical purposes, they ignored his appeals, obeyed the orders of their masters, and refused to make a stand for the Millat.

Of this phase of their activities many amazing stories are current but, this being hardly the time to go into details, they must wait for another day. For the present purposes it should be enough to state here that, when pressed hard to reconsider their position, they behaved like the porcupine and, in the most primitive manner, indulged in the usual gestures of their tribe.

However, that did not deter him. Daring them to do their worst, he went ahead with his own plans to meet the crisis facing his people.

So, failing to suppress or silence him by what he called "their mock-heroics," they tried new tactics to attain their old purpose. Though actually persisting in their chosen course leading to the dismemberment of the Millat, they started paying him lip-service with a view to putting him off his guard until they could face him with a *fait accompli*.

But he saw through their tactics, and, refusing to be charmed by their lullabies, prepared himself for all eventualities.

The Crucial Hour.

The event proved him right and amply justified his precautions. For, only a few weeks later, one and all of them, including even Sir Muhammad Iqbal, the poet of Islam, and Mr. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the present President of the All-India Muslim League, formally accepted the Federal Constitution for the whole Sub-continent and, thereby, fundamentally renounced the Muslim right to distinct nationhood and virtually agreed to the "Indianisation" of Muslims.¹

¹ The following delegates "represented" the seventy million Muslims at the Round Table Conferences held in London from 1930-33 and accepted the federal constitution, popularly known as "the All-India Federation," which was ultimately passed under the title of the Government of India Act, 1935:—

His Highness the Agha Khan, Nawab Sir Ahmad Said Khan Chhatari, Sir Abdul Rahim, Nawab Sir Abdul Qayyum Khan, Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi, Sir Syed Ali Imam, Mr. A. K. Fazl-ul-Huq, Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah, Khan Bahadur Hafiz Hidayat Husain, Sir Jamal Muhammad, Maulana Muhammad Ali, Sir Muhammad Shafi, Mr. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Sir Muhammad Iqbal, Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daoodi, Nawab Sir Syed Muhammad Mehr Shah, Syed Muhammad Padsbah Sahib Bahadur, Sir Shah Nawaz Khan Bhutto, Sir Shafaat Ahmad Khan, Begum Shah Nawaz, Raja Sir Sher Muhammad Khan, Sir Syed Sultah Ahmad, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Mr. S. S. Tyabji, and Sir Zafar Ullah Khan.

The Tragedy?

The final enactment of this tragedy moved Rahmat Ali to the depths of his being and made the iron enter his soul. People who saw him in those days say that they never met a man so embittered, yet so inspired; so disappointed, yet so confident; so broken, yet so determined. I can well believe this, because I know from my own experience of him that he is always at his best when facing the heaviest odds and at his strongest when fighting the most hazardous battle. Time and again this supreme quality of his character and creed has served him and saved his cause in crises that might have prostrated a weaker man. And, in the present situation, it prepared and poised him to take one of the most momentous steps of modern times and, thereby, to change the tragedy into a deliverance.

THE DELIVERANCE!

To that end, as soon as he came to know of this defection of the Muslim delegates, he at once wrote, and issued on the 28th January, 1933, his first Declaration entitled, "Now or Never."¹ Putting the whole fervour of his faith into the Declaration, which may well be described as "both theoretical and practical, both theocratical and political," he repudiated the acceptance of Indian Federation by Muslim delegates, condemned the moves of the Anglo-Hindoo *entente* to force Muslims into the Federation and asserted the right of the Muslims in the Sub-continent, both to their own nationhood as a Millat, distinct from the Indians, and to a Federation of Pakistan as separate from a Federation of Hindoostan.

BIRTH OF PAKISTAN.

There is no denying the fact that, in the circumstances, his was indeed a desperate stand. None knew it better than he. All odds were against him and every agency—Muslim and non-Muslim—was opposed to him. But "man's extremity is God's opportunity." When all seemed lost, the miracle happened. His last-minute stand succeeded beyond measure. It stirred the Muslims and steeled them against the Indian Federation, fixed their minds, hearts, and souls on Pakistan, and eventually made it the first and foremost goal of their national policy. From that time onward, a new spirit possessed their being, a noble solemnity marked their bearing, and a nationalistic upsurge distinguished their thought, their word, and their action in the domain of politics.

Naturally they hailed him as "Defender of the Millat" and welcomed his scheme as the message of political salvation.

Eclipse of Indianism.

On the other hand, the Declaration staggered his opponents, upset their plans, and darkened the prospects of Indian Federation. Worse than that. It shattered the artificial unity of the Sub-continent and banished "Indianism" for ever from Muslim councils and countries.

Small wonder then that his opponents dubbed him a dangerous revolutionary, a fiery demagogue, and a fanatical Pan-Islamist; and described his Pakistan as a mortal danger to "Indianism."

¹ To make the Declaration as representative as possible, he asked three other young men, who had accepted his ideology, to sign it. For he thought that, coming as they did from other parts of the Sub-continent, they should speak in the name of those territories and of the people living therein.

DAWN OF NEW AGE.

However, it is a fact that, with the birth of Pakistan, and the foundation of the Pakistan National Movement in 1933, an era in the history of the Millat in the Sub-continent of India had come to an end; that a new age had dawned for its future in South Asia; and that a new force had arisen in the continent of Asia—a force that was destined to leave its mark on the times.

Truly this was an achievement of which any one could be justly proud. It solved for the Muslims the baffling problem, neglected by them throughout the past centuries, and paved the way for the realisation of their Islamic destiny.

Now, having accomplished this preliminary, but pivotal, task, Rahmat Ali watched his message permeate the being of his people and imbue it with the spirit of their new future. No sooner was he satisfied on that than he turned his attention to the other Muslim strongholds in the Sub-continent and devoted himself to finding a solution of their problems. Studying for three years the pros and cons of their individual positions, he formed his conclusions, matured his plans, and prepared the ground by propaganda in Bengal-Assam and in Hyderabad-Deccan.

EVOLUTION OF BANG-I-ISLAM AND USMANISTAN.

In 1937, when the situation was favourable, he announced the name of *Bang-i-Islam* for Bengal and Assam, and that of *Usmanistan* for Hyderabad-Deccan and addressed a message to the Muslims in those lands through his selected men, whom he deputed to launch unofficially his plans for their political re-construction along national lines.

On this occasion, as in 1933, his message was inspired by his dominating passion for the destiny of Islam. By 1937, the menace of "Indianism" had become very acute and made the Muslims outside Pakistan conscious of the perils of their positions. From what he saw and felt, it was clear to him that the situation, having passed the stage of compromise, called imperatively for some drastic step. Always believing that the boldest measures were the safest, he made up his mind and addressed himself to the people in Bang-i-Islam and in Usmanistan, urging them to cut themselves adrift from "Indianism" and to consolidate themselves as a nation in their respective national domains.

To this message they responded with great enthusiasm and set about the task of laying anew the foundations of their national life. Bolder spirits among them came forward to spread the new message and to enlist the sympathy and support of the masses for the work of their national resurrection. The result was that, in a short time, on the one hand, the Millat's youth in Bengal which, since 1756, had been steadily losing ground before "Indianism," found its soul and consecrated itself to the consummation of Bang-i-Islam and, on the other, the leaders of Hyderabad-Deccan who, since the last century, had been shadowed by a feeling of doubt about the fortunes of their homeland, came into their own and braced themselves to secure the integrity of Usmanistan.

THREE MUSLIM NATIONS.

This moral revival went on for three years and, in 1940, on his return to Pakistan to renew contact and take counsel with his followers, he

took the opportunity of officially initiating the second part of the Pakistani programme and, in a memorable speech to a meeting of the Supreme Council of the Pakistan National Movement held at Karachi, on 8th March, 1940, called upon the Muslim leaders in these lands to stand by the people, support their struggle for national life and liberty, and start national organisations to carry the struggle through to final victory.

One of the immediate effects of this speech was that, within three weeks of its delivery, i.e., on 26th March, 1940, the All-India Muslim League in its next session, a session in which the representatives of Bengal and Hyderabad-Deccan played their own part, discarded its old policy, adopted his Pakistani ideology, and followed his lead at least for the creation of Pakistan and of Bang-i-Islam as sovereign states outside India.

Thus, by 1940, three Muslim nations and countries—Pakistan, Bang-i-Islam and Usmanistan—had arisen on the horizon of the Sub-continent. That is to say the Sub-continent which, before 1933, the Hindoos claimed as their exclusive domain, with, of course, the connivance of the British and the acquiescence of the old Muslim leadership.

RAHMAT ALI AND HIS RESOURCES.

This transformation—its method and its magnitude—has made Rahmat Ali into a legend and invested his name with an extraordinary appeal to his people. They have come to look upon him as one of their greatest heroes and have shown their love and loyalty for him in various ways. Some have done so by dedicating their lives to the service of Pakistan, others by devoting themselves to the religious revival among Muslims, and still others—in a touching manner—by giving his name to their children. Nor is that all. Prompted by their feeling of hero-worship towards him, they are keen to know more about the size and strength of the organisation with which he has brought about this momentous change affecting the destinies not only of Islam and Muslims but, also, of all other religions and nations in South Asia.

To satisfy this quest I can reveal that, throughout these years, Rahmat Ali has been Pakistan, and Pakistan, Rahmat Ali. This is to say that only his profound genius, his indomitable faith, and his personal resources have been responsible for the creation of Pakistan as they have been for that of Bang-i-Islam and of Usmanistan.

Let no one be surprised at this. History shows that, down the ages, an individual of inspiration, of devotion, and of execution has worked miracles and, in the moments of their dangers and difficulties, has inspired his people, imparted to them his own creed and courage, and led them to safety and salvation.

From the time in 1932, when he alone foresaw the mortal dangers of "Indianism," until to-day when, in tears and tragedy, all know them, Rahmat Ali has, day in and day out, dedicated his moral, mental, and material assets to the service of the cause, and, year after year, in his Declarations,¹ has renewed his message to his people, urging them to awake and arise, to unite and act for the Millat's future.

Thanks to his unshakable faith in his own mission and in the Millat's destiny, despite the apathy, indifference, and opposition of Muslim

¹ Some of these were published on important political occasions; others circulated among workers of the Pakistan National Movement (K.A.A.).

leaders, he never wavered in his conviction that the day would come when Muslims would finally turn their backs upon "Indianism," firmly set their faces towards "Islamism," and nationally camp where he stood in 1933.

And this they did.

Reward of Devotion.

With the passage of time and the propagation of truth, the seven-century-old spell of "Indianism" broke and the new dawn of "Islamism" became visible. The individuals who had opposed him in the early days of his struggle, one by one accepted his creed; and the associations that had differed from him adopted his cause. The transformation went on from 1933 to 1939. Finally, in 1940, came his greatest triumph. As has already been stated, almost seven years after his first Declaration, came the conversion of the most Indian-ridden institution of Muslims. In other words, the All-India Muslim League at its session held in Lahore, embraced on 26th March, 1940, his Pakistani ideology and, thereby, accepted his lead for the reconstruction of the Millat on a national basis in its strongholds in the Sub-continent.

THE MILLAT'S CONVERSION.

Thus, to-day, his heart-cry of 1933 has become the battle-cry of 100 million Muslims; thus to-day, for the first time in centuries, they have taken their stand for a national ideal; and thus to-day they are marching forward towards its achievement.

Surely it needs no imagination to realise that, at this happy and historic development, his satisfaction must be supreme; for it is not given to everyone to see in his life-time his own dream come true—a dream that promises the final completion of the work of Islam in the Sub-continent and brightens the prospects of its followers throughout South Asia.

THE OPPOSITION.

Here it may be asked first, since the Pakistani ideology is so sound and its demand so just, why have the British and the Hindoo politicians been hostile towards Pakistan and, secondly, seeing that Rahmat Ali's inspiration has illuminated the Millat's mind and his exertions have brightened its future, why have the Muslim princes, politicians, and careerists been inimical towards him and Pakistan? This certainly calls for an explanation because, for one thing, the reasons for the Anglo-Hindoo attitude, though obvious, are not fully understood abroad, and, for another, those for that of the Muslim vested interests remain obscure even in some Muslim quarters.

Reformers and their Contemporaries.

Let us, therefore, try to lift the veil and find out the true reasons for the attitude of each of these parties. But, before we attempt an examination, it would be well to recall a well-known verdict of History which tells us that, before their final triumph, the invariable fate of all great reformers like Rahmat Ali is, first, derision; then, opposition; and, lastly, persecution at the hands of contemporaries.

Why is this so?

Because to provoke opposition is in the very spirit of such men and of their missions. They rise to establish a new order and, in doing so, criticise current philosophies, condemning their props and compromising their interests. Human nature being what it is, this cannot but embitter the contemporaries and excite their antagonism.

How closely the opposition to Pakistan and its Founder conforms to this verdict of History may be judged from an examination of the position, the purposes, and the policies of the parties involved in it.

THE BRITISH POLITICIANS AND PAKISTAN.

To begin with the British politicians. Though the British politicians, in explaining their opposition to Pakistan, attribute it solely to their policy of strengthening the present artificial unity of India, we think that their attitude is primarily prompted by their own imperial interests. For it is an open secret that first, they believe that the solution of the Hindoo-Muslim problem, along the lines advocated by Rahmat Ali, would remove for ever one of the main *raison d'être* of British Imperialism in India, i.e., inter-communal clash; and, secondly, they imagine that the rise of a powerful Muslim nation like Pakistan, possessing a population of over thirty millions, could, by extending the chain of independent Muslim countries from Istanbul to Agra, compromise their position in the East.

That such considerations as these are at the root of the opposition of British politicians is proved by the following excerpts taken from their writings on the subject.

In an article on the Pakistan National Movement, published in the *Journal of the United Service Association of India*, and reproduced in *The Statesman*, Delhi, "Mouse," the well-known authority on military affairs, wrote:—

"EMPIRE'S DANGER-SPOT"

"A 'MOUSE'-EYE VIEW OF THE FRONTIER"

"CRISIS PREDICTED"

"PAKISTAN'S DREAM OF OLD MUGHAL GLORIES"

[The author here outlines four alternative British policies for the North-West Frontier, summing up in favour of, what he calls, the "Progressive Policy," which aims at a gradual penetration of the Tribal Territories, lying between India and the Afghan frontier.]

"This ideal policy can never be achieved until we move to the Durand Line.

"30 YEARS HENCE"

"If we do not now begin some sort of progressive policy, what will be the result in, say, thirty years' time? My outlook is pessimistic because of the cursory reading of Indian History, a petty knowledge of Indian politics and my own prophetic conceit. I visualise a Central Government with an inevitable Hindu majority; a Moslem minority continually in opposition on religious and imaginary grounds; an army cut to the bone so as to make Federation safe for democracy; and, finally, a forward policy such as we have now, only less so.

"Then the Mahsud loots the rich cantonment of Razmak or the Afridi occupies the Hindu bungalows of Pashawar, or the Achakzai raids the Staff College in Quetta. A crisis will develop. The Commander-in-Chief will demand strong action and 50 crores, and will be supported by the Central Government. And then, ladies and gentlemen, the sinister figure of Pakistan will rear its arrogant head.

"It is idle and extremely foolish for anybody in India to shut his eyes to the Islamic movement which dreams of an Indian Moslem Confederation composed of the Punjab, the tribal territory (called Afghanistan), Kashmir and Sind. On . . . a pretext of war against the Mohammedans of the border, an agitation, spreading through Provinces and States, will arise which will make Civil Disobedience look like a dhobi-ghat scuffle. Pakistan will have tremendous backing; it already possesses great resources in fighting men; and it still dreams of the old Mughal glories in Hindustan. It would split Federation from top to bottom."

(*Statesman*, Delhi, August 3, 1933.)

Then, the Duchess of Atholl, M.P., writing on the Indian Problem, thus showed her apprehensions of the Pakistan Scheme:—

"SUGGESTED INDEPENDENT MUSLIM FEDERATION"

"The determination of some Muslims not to submit under any conditions to a Hindu yoke at the Centre is shown by the proposal to set up an independent Federation of the five mainly Muslim areas, *i.e.*, the Punjab, Sind, North-West Frontier, Kashmir, Baluchistan. In view of the fact that such a Federation would include the bulk of the fighting races of India, that it would control her most vulnerable frontier, and that beyond that frontier lies a continuous belt of Muslim states stretching to the Mediterranean, a greater political and military danger to India could hardly be imagined. It might well mean civil war in India and an Afghan invasion with Soviet support.

"Muslim witnesses described this to the Joint Committee as only a student's scheme, but the anxiety shown by a leading Muslim delegate to cut short questions on this matter suggests that the proposal has aroused interest in more responsible quarters. A later witness, an ex-district magistrate, told the Joint Committee that the idea of a great Islamic State, to include not only the area in question, but also Afghanistan, was being discussed in Muslim circles in the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province.¹ It is also being spoken of in Chinese Turkestan, which is rapidly being penetrated by Islamic ideas, though Soviet representatives, since the conclusion of a commercial treaty in 1931 with the Chinese authorities, are said to have become the actual rulers of this huge province²—

¹ Mr. J. C. French, 47th Day, q.s. 16718-20 and 16808-10.

² "In Kashgar," article in the *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, October, 1933.

a fact which incidentally brings Britain and Soviet Russia in direct contact with each other for four hundred miles along the northern border of Kashmir.

"It should not be forgotten that in the middle of the eighteenth century, Kashmir and the four provinces in question, referred to to-day by supporters of the scheme as 'Pakistan,' actually formed part of an Afghan kingdom. The recovery of this great territory, given favourable political conditions, might well be the aim of future Afghan policy, as it was in the war of 1919."

(The Duchess of Atholl, *The Main Facts of the Indian Problem*, London, 1933, pp. 25-26.)

Again, speaking in the House of Commons on 8th May, 1935, on the Government of India Bill, 1935 (All-India Federation Bill), Mr. Vyvyan Adams, M.P., voiced his disapproval of the Pakistan Scheme in the following words:—

"We need the fidelity of the Hindu community no less than we need the fidelity of the Moslems. Some strange evidence was submitted to the Joint Parliamentary Committee suggesting that at some date there would be a federation of Moslems comprising Baluchistan, Sind, the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province and Kashmir, and it was proposed that with them was to be federated Afghanistan. Such an arrangement is not in accordance with our traditional ideas of Moslem loyalty, and would be quite inconsistent with what, during our history, we have grown to expect from the Moslem community."

(*Parliamentary Debates*, 301, H. C., Deb. 5^a, 1935, p. 1034.)

Yet again, discoursing on the effects of Muslim renaissance on the international situation, Professor John Coatman, formerly Professor of Inter-Imperial Relations, London University, expressed himself thus on the Pakistan Scheme:—

"The Islamic renaissance now in progress across the whole Middle East and North of Africa can be a powerfully disruptive factor in international relations and the world order of the future. Although, as we have seen, there is no substance in the talk of Pan-Islamism, there is very material substance in some of the plans, or at any rate possibilities, of the growth of greater Muhammadan States by the union of neighbouring Muhammadan peoples; and further, there is the certainty that such growth will be partly at the expense of non-Muhammadan peoples. One example of the international disorganisation which would be produced by any such development as this would be provided by the amalgamation of Afghanistan and the Muhammadans of North-western India into one state. Such a project as this may be a chimera, but it is discussed seriously enough by some Muhammadans of standing in both the countries concerned. There are enthusiasts who foresee the rise of a great Muhammadan kingdom, stretching from the eastern borders of Persia to Calcutta, and including Kashm~~ir~~

and some of the khanates, or little kingdoms, of Turkestan and Central Asia. It is easy enough to point out the tremendous dislocation which would ensue from the realisation of such dreams as this and the permanent insecurity and the certainty of ultimate disaster from the inclusion in such a new State of millions of Hindus, who would form the Hindustan irredents."

(John Coatman, *Magna Britannia*, London, 1936, pp. 321-2.)

Lastly, commenting on the inauguration by Rahmat Ali of the second part of the Pakistani programme, Sir Alfred Watson, Editorial Director of *Great Britain and the East*, made a personal attack on Rahmat Ali and opposed the Pakistan National Movement in the following words:—

"Let there be no mistake; this new movement is formidable and threatens to hold up all constitutional advance in India and might well lead to chaos in the country. The idea is not that of Mr. Jinnah. He has adopted it, but its principal advocate is C. Rahmat Ali, who uses the language of fanaticism in urging it upon the Muslims of India. To him Indian territorial unity is 'a mischievous myth.' For the Muslims to remain in India is 'for ever to rot in subjection to Indianism.' The Muslim people will be 'coerced and crushed into complete captivity.'

"To argue with this kind of opponent is futility. One can only point out the absurdity of the proposals. Pakistan is to establish itself in the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, Kashmir, Sind, and Baluchistan, which would form a fairly homogeneous group of states in the north; to extend to Bengal, where there is a Muslim majority of the population, and to take in Hyderabad. A glance at the map is sufficient to dispel the idea that these scattered areas could be combined in one nation."

(*Great Britain and the East*, London, September 4, 1941.)

From the last observation of Sir Alfred it is obvious that he had not read through the whole booklet from which he was quoting. Had he done so he would have found that what Rahmat Ali proposed was precisely the reverse of what he (Sir Alfred) alleged. For on p. 16 of his *Millat of Islam and the Menace of Indianism*, Rahmat Ali said:—

"If we really wish to rid ourselves of 'Indianism,' to re-establish our nationhood as distinct from 'India,' and to link our national domains to one another as South Asiatic countries, we must scrap the All-Indian Muslim League as such and create instead an alliance of the nations of Pakistan, Bengal, and Usmanistan."

It is clear from the above quotation that Rahmat Ali plans to create three Muslim nations in the Islamic strongholds of Pakistan, Bengal and Usmanistan and then to bring them together by an *alliance* of mutual solidarity and defence. This is a very different thing from combining scattered areas into *one nation*.

THE HINDOO POLITICIANS AND PAKISTAN

We need hardly add that this opposition of British politicians, prompted as it is by imperial expediency, rather than by any fundamental flaw in the Pakistan Scheme, is foredoomed to failure. For history shows that if an ideal is basically just, as that of Pakistan certainly is, and if it has won the allegiance of the people, as the Pakistani ideal has of the Muslims, no power on earth can prevent its fulfilment.

THE HINDOO POLITICIANS AND PAKISTAN.

So far as the Hindoo politicians are concerned, although they insist that they are hostile to Pakistan because its recognition is inconsistent with their ideal of a "united India," composed of Hindoos, of Muslims, and of others; it cannot be gainsaid that, in reality, their hostility is born of the idea that the whole Sub-continent of India is exclusively a Hindoo domain; that it is their mission to establish Hindoo Raj therein, and that, therefore, the re-emergence of a Muslim nation in Pakistan, and, for that matter, anywhere else in the Sub-continent, is fatal to their future.

That this idea is at the back of their minds is substantiated by the statements of their own responsible men which they have made from time to time on the subject of Pakistan.

For example, forewarning the British against conceding the Pakistan demand, most of the Hindoo leaders, including Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, have often said that, should the British concede the Muslim demand for Pakistan, the Hindoos would regard it as an act of treachery against India.

Secondly, expressing his fear of the Pakistan Scheme, Mr. Ganpat Rai, Secretary, Hindoo Mahasabha, says:—

"We, the Hindus of the Frontier Province, thank God that the promised quota of one lac of volunteers could not materialise to fight the battle of Independence for India, otherwise whether India would have got Independence or not, they [Muslims] would have carved out of India their vision of Pakistan, in the same way as they have assisted their co-religionists of the Kashmir State in obtaining their political rights from the Maharaja."

(*Eastern Times*, Lahore, June 10, 1934.)

Thirdly, in reporting the proceedings of "the Frontier, Punjab, and Sind Hindoos Conference," held at Peshawar, the *Civil and Military Gazette* says:—

"Rai Sahib Mehr Chand Khanna, Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Conference, in the course of his speech expressed grave fears regarding the Pakistan Movement. [And said that] If steps were taken [by Muslims] to turn the dream of Pan-Islamism into a reality, Hindus of the Frontier, the Punjab, and Sind would be the first and foremost to suffer."

(*Civil and Military Gazette*, Lahore, August 19, 1934.)

Fourthly, commenting upon the development of the ideal of Pakistan, the well-known Hindoo publicist, Professor Gulshan Rai, Vice-Principal, Sanatana Dharma College, Lahore, Punjab, writes:—

"Let the Foreign Office and Army Headquarters of the Government at Delhi or Simla express their opinion on this Pakistan scheme. It is well-known that all the strategic positions for the defence of India lie in these five North-Western provinces. Once an enemy crosses the Pabbi Hills near Lalamusa, he has no natural obstacles to face him right up to Calcutta. We know that the Muslims took more than 300 years to conquer the Punjab, but once they had become masters of the land of five rivers, the conquest of the rest of India was an easy job. Within ten years after the defeat of Prithviraj at Taraori, the whole Northern India north of the Vindhya hills was subdued, and became a part of the Muslim Empire. If a Muslim federation for the five North-Western provinces is established as is demanded by some Muslims, the federal government for the rest of India would not be worth the paper on which its constitution may be drawn."

(*Civil and Military Gazette*, Lahore, August 19, 1934.)

Again, in a similar vein, Professor Gulshan Rai writes:—

"The present day mentality of the Muslims is formed by . . . those who want to constitute the entire Indus valley and the lands watered by its tributaries into what they are pleased to call Pakistan, or the land where the holy Muslim Law is to prevail. Unless the Government rigorously enforces the existing British Indian Law, there can be no communal peace in the country. The developments of this . . . Pakistan mentality in the north-west are as dangerous to the Hindus and the Sikhs as they undoubtedly are to the Government."

(*Tribune*, Lahore, October 12, 1935.)

Fifthly, in stressing the danger to Hindoos of Muslim revival, Dr. P. V. Nayudu, President, Hindoo Mahasabha, Madras, is reported to have said that

he strongly opposed the Demand for Pakistan because it implies not only a division of India, but also, in his opinion, a Pan-Islamic Federation which would be a permanent threat to Hindu India.

(*Eastern Times*, Lahore, December 13, 1940.)

Lastly, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, in opposing the demand for Pakistan, observed that

he could not witness alive such a division between Hindus and Muslims.

(*Times*, London, August 10, 1942.)

The only observation that we would like to make on such expressions of Hindoo attitude towards Pakistan is that no amount of hostility or coercion can keep Pakistan within Hindoostan, and that, as Pakistan represents our destiny, we are determined to have it.

THE MUSLIM PRINCES AND PAKISTAN.

Now, we will study the case of the Muslim princes *vis-à-vis* Pakistan and try to discover the *raison d'être* of their opposition.

It is a well-known fact that, with the exception of Bahawalpur, Khairpur, and Malerkotla, all Muslim states are outside Pakistan. Not only that, they lie in those territories of the Sub-continent which are predominantly Hindoo. This geo-political reality gives rise to a feeling with the Princes that, should Pakistan be separated from India, the Muslim element in the remaining territories of the Sub-continent would be so reduced and weakened as to leave their states in the position of helpless islands in the ocean of Hindooism.

Consequently, in order to safeguard the foundations of their dynastic domains, they think it is their duty to discourage the Movement and to encourage the Muslims to remain in India.

Again, with the exception of these three states, all Muslim states have Hindoo majorities among their subjects. The Princes believe that if, despite this, they have so far been tolerated by the Hindoos, it is because the Muslims as a people have been subject to the Hindoo majority rule throughout the Sub-continent. Therefore, it occurs to them that, should the Muslims free themselves from Hindoo domination, the Hindoos, in their turn, would liberate their Hindoo brethren from their (the princes') rule and "liquidate" their states.

But the Princes forget that if the Muslims, as a people, remain within India, they cannot be of any use either to themselves or to their Princes. For "Indianism" will first crush them, then turn upon their Princes, and, ultimately, cage both of them in India. Thus, in the end, all will suffer the fate which the Pakistan National Movement seeks to avoid.

However, such are the considerations in the Muslim Princes' minds which prompt their opposition to Pakistan and its Founder. From this one can only conclude that, as a class, their attitude resembles that of men who seek the security of their personal privileges and family patrimonies by keeping the Muslims within India under the domination of "Indianism."

THE MUSLIM POLITICIANS AND PAKISTAN

After the princes, take the politicians.

The political potentates, like the princes, do not suffer rivals gladly. Hating new ideologies, they frown upon the daring youths who disturb the old order, penalise and punish those of them who criticise or condemn their doings and, at a pinch, make use of their party-machines to cripple or crush those who defy them.

This failing is the bane of politics. It breeds intrigue and corruption, leads to heresy-hunts, and culminates in party-feuds—feuds which the old gang, as we shall see presently, carries on against the new gospels in the vain hope of defeating their ideologies.

In his first Declaration, as in the subsequent ones, Rahmat Ali attacked and smashed the old and antiquated basis of Muslim politics in India. In doing so, he inevitably exposed the follies of leaders who had made their political careers on the philosophies of "Indianism" and had led their co-religionists in the Sub-continent along the dark and dangerous paths of "Indianisation" of Islam.

The leaders read his Declaration with burning cheeks and biting consciences. What is more, seeing in him a menace to their established positions, they decided to smother him and his Pakistan scheme at the very first opportunity that came their way.

For this they had not to wait long. It came to them on 1st August, 1933, when a deputation sent by them appeared before the Joint Parliamentary Select Committee (on which they were already represented by Sir Zafrulla Khan) to give evidence on the proposed All-India Federal Constitution.

Before we quote their evidence (and the remarks thereon of Sir Zafrulla) to show how they tried to strangle the ideal of Pakistan, we must record here that this deputation, consisting of Mr. A. Yusuf Ali, Sir Muhammad Yakub, Mr. H. S. Suharawardy, Dr. Khalifa Shujauddin, and Khan Sahib Haji Rashid Ahmad, represented both the All-India Muslim League, the president of which, at the time, was none other than Sir Muhammad Iqbal, and the All-India Muslim Conference, which had for its supreme head a person of the position of His Highness the Agha Khan.

This is how some of these worthies thought fit to discharge their duty to the future of the Millat and deliver themselves before the Select Committee when asked their opinion of the Pakistan scheme¹:—

Question 9598. Sir REGINALD CRADDOCK:—I will pass on. If any of the Delegates or the witnesses would like to answer, will they tell me whether there is a scheme for Federation of Provinces under the name of Pakistan?

Answer 9598. ABDULLAH YUSUF ALI, C.B.E.:—As far as I know it is only a student's scheme; no responsible people have put it forward.

Sir REGINALD CRADDOCK:—They have not so far, but, as you say, you advance very quickly in India, and it may be, when those students grow up it will be put forward; that scheme must be in the minds of the people, anyhow.

Mr. ZAFRULLA KHAN:—What is the question?

Sir REGINALD CRADDOCK:—I wanted to know whether the witnesses had acquaintance with a scheme which was drawn up for what is called Pakistan.

Mr. ZAFRULLA KHAN:—We have already had the reply that it was a student's scheme and there is nothing in it. What is the further question?

Question 9599. Mr. ISAAC FOOT:—What is Pakistan?

Answer 9599. [Mr. ZAFRULLA KHAN]:—So far as we have considered it, we have considered it chimerical and impracticable. It means the Federation of certain Provinces.

Question 9600. Sir REGINALD CRADDOCK:—I have received communications about the proposal of forming certain Muslim states under the name of Pakistan.

Answer 9600. Dr. KHALIFA SHUJAUDDIN:—Perhaps it will be enough to say that no such scheme has been considered by any representative gentleman or association so far.

Surely Muslim history, heritage, and hopes could hardly wish for more doughty defenders!

¹*Minutes of Evidence* given before the Joint Committee on *Indian Constitutional Reform* [Session 1932–33], Vol. II^a, p. 1496, published, by His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1934.

However, with all deference to them, we would point out that, on the issue of Pakistan, their evidence and Zafrulla's comments were a tissue of evasions and innuendoes, which did more justice to their moral vanity than to their political sagacity. Failing to make out a clear and cogent case against Pakistan, they had to resort to sullen answers and sneering comments that only revealed their animosity towards the Pakistan scheme which they characterised as chimerical, and towards its author whom they dismissed as a mere student.

But, in doing so, they reckoned without the verdict—and the vindication—of Time. For, within the short space of six years, Time, the great teacher of humanity, not only exposed their political madness but, also, proclaimed the "chimera" of Pakistan, a sheet-anchor of Islam, and the "student," a savant of the Millat.

Principles and Personalities.

After the institutional opposition, turn to the personal. It is a common experience that the execution of such a mission as that of Rahmat Ali often compromises social relations and engenders personal conflicts that have serious repercussions even on national struggles. Innumerable illustrations of this come to mind, but we will touch upon only three of those which are well-known in Muslim circles.

The first of these relates to an incident extensively reported in both the Pakistani and the Indian press.

It arose in this way.

The Muslims have deeply felt for a long time that the political leaders, making use of their positions, secure nominations to religious offices and exploit them to advance their personal careers, thus bringing religion itself into general disrepute.

The Pakistan National Movement has throughout sympathised with this deep-rooted feeling and Rahmat Ali has always been ready to take every opportunity of protesting against such encroachments upon religious institutions by the politicians.

Now, it so happened that Sir Abdul Qadir, then a member of the India Council, London, secured a nomination to the *Imamat* of the *Id-ul-Fitar* prayers, held at Woking (England) on 7th January, 1935. When this became known, it caused general dissatisfaction among Muslims; and they looked up to Rahmat Ali to move in the matter and give formal expression to their feeling of disapproval.

So he took steps to have pointed out to Sir Abdul the impropriety of his *Imamat* owing to the public prejudice against him and suggested to him that, in his own interest as in that of the institution, he should himself withdraw from the *Imamat*. Unfortunately, this suggestion was not acceptable to Sir Abdul, who seemed determined to lead the prayers and to establish himself before the British as a leader possessing both spiritual and secular influence over Muslims.

This left no choice for Rahmat Ali but to bring home to Sir Abdul the depth of popular feeling by a public demonstration. Consequently, brushing aside all considerations of personal friendship, he had a demonstration made, and a strong protest registered, against Sir Abdul's *Imamat* before the congregation.¹

¹ *Zamindar*, Lahore, 31st January, 1935.

It is needless to add that he had no personal grudge against Sir Abdul. Nothing of the kind. To him this was solely a question of principle, involving the moral position and prestige of religious institutions; yet the sequel was the severance of his friendship with Sir Abdul and the souring of the latter's attitude towards him and towards Pakistan.

Take another case. On 16th September, 1931, Sir Zafar Ullah Khan, acting in the name of the Muslim Delegation to the Round Table Conference, accepted the principle of "indirect election" of Muslims to the Upper Chamber of the Federal Legislature of India,¹ and, thereby, renounced the 25-year-old Muslim right to "direct election" of their members—the right which, under the system of separate representation, had secured better protection of Islamic position in India.

The news of Sir Zafar's action came as a great shock to Muslims, and as soon as Rahmat Ali heard of it, he wired to the Muslim Delegates individually, warning each one of them of the grave consequences of the blunder committed by their spokesman in their name and in that of the Millat, and called upon them all to take steps to rectify it.

This created a great stir and caused surprise to the Delegates who, until then, were completely unaware both of the acceptance of the principle of "indirect election" and of its grievous implications.

However, when, on receiving his telegrams, they met, under the chairmanship of the Agha Khan, to call Sir Zafar to account for his action and to see if the mistake could still be retrieved, they discovered that the matter, having once been decided, could not be reopened. So the Millat was left to suffer the serious consequence of the blunder of Sir Zafar.

It is obvious that this move on the part of Rahmat Ali was no more than a sincere attempt at discharging a public duty that he owed to himself and to the political future of the Muslims throughout the Sub-continent. If it embarrassed Sir Zafar, that was its inevitable effect, not its original intention. Yet, strange as it may sound, it led to misunderstanding between Sir Zafar and Rahmat Ali and not only cut short their friendship but, also, deepened the antagonism between the Ahmadi Party and the Pakistan National Movement.

Lastly, we come to the question of party-rivalries that cloud personal judgments and compromise political relations. Here perhaps an apt illustration is provided by the All-India Muslim League. Up to 1935—the year when the new Government of India Act was passed—the policy of its president, Mr. M. A. Jinnah, could fairly be described as that of a politician who considered himself "Indian first and everything else afterwards."

Though eternally fatal to the Muslims, this policy was in those days foolishly considered the hall-mark of progressiveness and a passport to popularity. Consequently, while it gravely injured the national cause of Muslims by leading them to look upon the service of "Indianism" as the goal of patriotism, it established Jinnah's political career and made him the darling of Hindoo circles which honoured him with the title of the apostle of united India.

In these circumstances who can doubt that to a politician of his creed Rahmat Ali's message came as a bolt from the blue. Like that of the

¹ Round Table Conference (Second Session), *Proceedings of Federal Structure Committee and Minorities Committee*, 1932, p. 35. H.M. Stationery Office, London.

League, it compromised his past record inspired by "Indianism." More, it endangered his political future both as a politician and as president of the League.

This started a political rivalry between the two most powerful personalities and their parties in Muslim India.

Seeing the growing menace of Pakistan to his party, Jinnah took steps to meet it. He went further than that and, in defending his old policy, decried Rahmat Ali, dubbed him an irresponsible person and characterised his plan as a crazy scheme.

This diatribe, he hoped, would finish both Rahmat Ali and his Movement. But it did not work that way. For Rahmat Ali, the last to take a challenge lying down, retorted with a slashing attack on Jinnah and on the League and forced them on to the defensive.

Describing Jinnah as *the Boozna¹ of Bombay*, who, incapable of creating anything himself, had spent his whole life, partly in opposing, partly in defacing and partly in aping every new idea in the politics of the Sub-continent, he denounced his policy as the product of his English *cum* Indian *cum* Islamic past. Then, pillorying the All-India Muslim League as a crowd of mealy-mouthed careerists and its Council as a clique of manipulators, some of whom owed their political, and others, their material, positions to British patronage, he accused the Leaguers of sticking in the past thirty years to their discredited policies, of reducing the Muslims to the position of a minority community, of "Indianising" them as a people, and of betraying their heritage to the Anglo-Hindoo *entente*.

This certainly was a blow at the very heart of the League. It shook it from head to foot, lowered its prestige, and weakened its hold on popular support.

The League realising that, in Rahmat Ali and in his Pakistani ideology, it was facing a serious danger to its life, decided to fight it out with the Pakistan National Movement. To launch the campaign, it mobilised its "Yes-men" and its paid publicists and thus sent the whole party-machine into action. And, while its agents and underlings turned out their drum-beaters to silence the Pakistani's voice and to scare away their supporters, its big bosses went so far as to issue instructions to their controlled Press not to let Rahmat Ali's name and that of the Pakistan National Movement slip into their columns. The idea being, the less the public hears of them, the less it will think of them.

In this connection the Leaguers adopted such mean tactics that one hates to mention them except to point out that they did everything possible to make the public forget the Pakistan National Movement and its Founder.

However, they did not succeed in their aims. For, Rahmat Ali, not to be daunted by this puerile display of pugnacity, addressed himself to the Muslims and called upon them to choose, once and for all, between the "Islamic future" as envisaged for them by the Movement and the "Indian fate" as accepted for them by the League. Nor did he leave the matter there. Issuing instructions to his followers and supporters to accept the League challenge, he asked them to carry the Movement's message to every town and village, to every mosque and *maktab* in Pakistan and thereby beat the League at its own game. That is to say, make the new ideology the sole and supreme national policy of the people—a policy that will finally seal the doom of the "communal cult"

¹ A baboon.

of the League and herald the consummation of Pakistan as their homeland and the consolidation of Muslims as a Millat throughout the Sub-continent.

For six years, in one form or the other, behind the scenes or in the open, this clash went on between two personalities, Rahmat Ali and Jinnah, representing two principles, two policies, and two parties, i.e. the Movement and the League. But, thanks to his new faith and fervour, throughout this period the initiative in the formulation of Muslim opinion and in its guidance towards Islamic future remained with Rahmat Ali and the Pakistan National Movement. What he said to-day, Jinnah echoed to-morrow. What the Movement did on one day, the League adopted on the next.

To cut a long story short, the clash ended in 1940 in the vindication of, and victory for, Pakistan. For, in that year, as already stated, came the conversion of Jinnah and of the League—a conversion that was both a confession of the defeat of their Indian policy and a profession of their faith in the Pakistani ideology.

But political issues grow with time. Since 1940, the Pakistan National Movement has, consistent with its conception of nationalism, taken a stand against the very existence of an All-India Muslim institution, which it considers inconsistent with the development of distinct nationhood in Pakistan, in Bang-i-Islam, and in Usmanistan. So the result is that, up till now, despite efforts at an understanding, the two leaders, Rahmat Ali and Jinnah, have not been seen on the same platform nor have the Movement and the League been in co-operation with each other.

THE MUSLIM CAREERISTS AND PAKISTAN.

In the preceding paragraphs we have dealt with the leaders' opposition—organisational, personal, and political. Now we will deal with the calumnies of the careerists who came into the Movement to exploit it, but, on being caught, were thrown out of it by Rahmat Ali.

In this connection the most important thing to remember is that men may be attracted to movements by very different motives: some to serve them, others to exploit them, and still others to sabotage them.

As we are concerned here only with the last two, we had better distinguish between them. The exploiters are those who join a movement to grind their own axes. Therefore they want the movement to live, though mainly to serve their own purposes. The saboteurs are those whose sole aim is its destruction, and this they seek to attain through treachery.

But these two classes have one thing in common. Though at the time of joining a movement their purposes differ; yet, at the moment of leaving it, their reactions are indistinguishable. For if, and when, they are removed from its membership, both become its bitter critics and detractors. And to explain away their own expulsion or foul play before the public and to console and comfort their own guilty consciences, they do all they can to discredit it. The truth is that, in Macaulay's words, their feeling towards it is prompted by that peculiar malignity which has, in all ages, been characteristic of apostates.

However, like every other institution, the Pakistan National Movement has had its share of such creatures; but, this being hardly a

chronicle of individual delinquents, we would quote here only three typical cases, calling them X, Y, and Z. For, our only aim is to describe the types and their spiteful behaviour; not to indict individuals for their misdeeds.

The Exploiters.

First let us deal with a case of the most usual type. X joins the Movement, takes its oath of membership, and pledges his whole life to its service. Under the impetus of the new resolve, for some time he goes straight; but, like those people who offer their allegiance in moments of inspiration and forsake it in fits of defeatism, he, later on, succumbs to the temptations of careerism. To come to the point, he is finally discovered exploiting his membership for material benefit and is, therefore, expelled from the Movement.

On this, feeling that he has been branded and punished as an exploiter, X becomes an opponent and retaliates by making persistent attempts to prejudice the mind of the public against the Movement.

Though some time or other all institutions may have to face this type of animosity, yet, thanks to their record of service, they survive the outpourings of such men and, thereby, recall to mind the old Persian saying: "while the dogs bark, the caravan proceeds."

Then take Y, who, as an ardent supporter, wins the confidence of Rahmat Ali and is entrusted by him with an important mission on behalf of the Movement. He accepts the responsibility with every appearance of loyalty, but exceeds his instructions in a manner, compromising not only to his own honour but, also, to the interests of the Movement and of Rahmat Ali.

Now such conduct may be open to more than one interpretation. It may be an error of judgment or a breach of confidence. But, whatever its nature and purpose, the fact remains that it can cause a great deal of misunderstanding, if not mischief; and, therefore, calls for disciplinary action against him.

When such action is taken, Y becomes hostile towards the Movement and towards Rahmat Ali. This deservedly leads to his expulsion from the Movement which, in its turn, deepens his feeling of hostility. But, as the sages say, crime brings its own punishment. His guilty conscience goads him to say and do things that cannot but make him suspect with the public and stultify his own political career.

Here we must add that this reaction to a disciplinary action is not always the same with all people. As a matter of fact, we know of a recent case that provides a happy exception to it.

Dr. Muhammad Afzal Husain Qadri of the Muslim University, Aligarh, a member of the Movement, on being called upon in 1940 to explain an irregularity in the execution of an important task allotted to him in 1938, was straightforward enough to do that frankly and fully in a letter addressed to Rahmat Ali which is reproduced here for his personal vindication.

اور میں نے اس کتاب میں جو چیزیں جو وہی میں اگلیت ان میں نے نہیں تھیں
 جو ان کے والدین نے میری تعلیم کے لیے جو کچھ کیا تھا وہ میری تعلیم کے لیے
 میں نے یہ نہیں کیا تھا کہ میں نے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے
 میں نے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے

میں نے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے
 میں نے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے
 میں نے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے
 میں نے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے
 میں نے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے
 میں نے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے
 میں نے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے ان کے والدین کی تعلیم کے لیے

(Translation follows on p. 24.)

(Translation)

IN THE NAME OF ALLAH, THE BENEFICENT, THE MERCIFUL

8th March, 1940.

"QAID-I-MILLAT!

"Assalam-o-Alaikum! Praise be to Allah that you have looked with approval upon the way I have endeavoured to discharge the duties which you, as Founder-President of the Pakistan National Movement, had, in June, 1938, entrusted to me at the time of my departure from England for the Fatherland and in which the propagation of the ideals of the Movement pertaining to Pakistan, and to the Millat in India, occupied a prominent place.

"Since, for the fulfilment of these duties in the changing conditions of the Sub-continent of India, I had to issue, from time to time, several statements in my own name, and, also, conjointly with other friends, I think it essential that I should, in all fairness and frankness, acknowledge before the Millat, the world, and history, that, in so far as those speeches and statements which I addressed to the Millat, were concerned, they were, in their conception and thought, as in their content and purpose, made by me as your interpreter. Further, they were entirely the creation of your profound mind which you have, from the very inception of the Movement, applied to the future of the Millat in the Sub-continent and from which I, along with brethren Abdussamad Khan, Mahboob Hyder Khan, Abdul Moeed Khan, Akhtar Hamid Khan, Mohd. Mahmud Ahmad, and Mohd. Zaki-ud-Din, had always benefited through our contact with you. Furthermore, you had not only informed me fully about them at the time of my departure but, also, appointed me to propound and publish the proposals on which was based your book which, during my stay in England, you were busy writing and which, Insha Allah, would, on its early publication, give a memorable lead to the Millat.

"And, I must, at the same time, ask your forgiveness for anything I might, in speech or in writing, have left to be desired in the execution and fulfilment of the duties with which I was charged; because, for such shortcoming, the whole responsibility is mine and that of my collaborators.

"You would probably consider this note uncalled for, but it became absolutely essential especially after the publication of the Pamphlet, dated 14th August, 1939,¹ entitled, *The Problem of Indian Muslims and its Solution*; for it might possibly cause some misunderstanding. Therefore, in the interests of truth and for welfare of "Iman", and with a view to removing any possibility of misapprehension, I deemed it imperative to place these few lines before you in such a manner that nobody, either now or in the future, could think that the issuance or the publication of the pamphlet was, in any way, done by me in my personal capacity or that I was responsible for evolving its contents. That is all. "Wassalam!

"Your Sincere Brother and Servant of the Pakistan National Movement. "(Sd.) MUHAMMAD AFZAL HUSAIN QADRI."

¹ To facilitate reference we would call attention to the fact that this date appears only in the printer's colophon and not on the title page. The date of the "covering letter" issued with the Pamphlet being "... September 1939." [K.A.A.]

The Saboteurs.

Last of all we come to the saboteurs who, as already stated, differ in their aims from the deserters and exploiters, with whom we have dealt hitherto.

Known to all movements for their smiling faces, seductive phrases, and scheming minds, they may well be described as the most deceptive wreckers in the world. For, such is their callousness and cunning that, while plausibly professing their allegiance to you, they are actually plotting and preparing your downfall. To advance their own careers, to make those of their kith and kin, and to amass wealth for their families, they sell themselves to the dark and sinister forces, take to sabotage as a trade, and, to make a success of it, follow the treacherous technique of first befriending you, next fraternising with you, then fouling your cause, and, finally, stabbing you in the back.

Whether this propensity originates in their criminal mentality or in their craze for money is for psychologists to say. But what is evident to all is that they are soulless social-climbers who, regardless of their positions, are accustomed to acquire riches by dirty and dishonourable means. From this one can presume that the instinct of self-exaltation of the basest type makes them work against national institutions that aim at purging and purifying the body-politic of a people; because, in the betterment of the people, they sense and see their own exposure, if not extinction.

How they put their technique into effect, the following paragraphs will show.

Take Z, a typical saboteur, who, to get rich quick, sells himself to the enemies of the Millat, settles the price of his treachery, and undertakes to destroy the Movement. He solemnly takes the oath of its membership and professes his devotion to the cause of Pakistan. To cloak his criminal intent and to create a facade of genuineness, he sheds crocodile tears over the plight of the people, indulges in mock-heroics to show his interest in their welfare, and gives a display of "breast-beating" to prove his determination to suffer and sacrifice all in their service. Then, by reciting verses from the Holy Book and by quoting couplets from religious poetry, he tries to work up unsuspecting comrades to a point of admiration for his pretended fervour and fidelity.

By such tactics, the stock-in-trade of the tribe of tricksters, he wins their confidence and worms his way into their councils. Trust opens the way to treachery and gives him the opportunity for sabotaging the national cause.

In this atmosphere he starts his campaign of back-biting and double-crossing. Giving himself to inventing stories to shake causal loyalties and to gossip-mongering to loosen comradely bonds, he sows distrust of one another among the followers of the Movement. Then, armed with the weapons of insinuation and of blackmailing, he goes into action and meets every emergency by downright lying. Should this not suffice to undermine their allegiance to the Movement, he resorts to basest frauds to convince them of its coming decline and downfall—not from his own sabotage but from that of others.

Thus he goes on till he over-reaches himself and is found out by some of the wiser spirits, and exposed by the bolder ones, from among them.

When this happens, he is, of course, summarily expelled from the movement.

To an ordinary mind this might appear to be the end of the matter, but, to the seasoned saboteur, it is only the end of a chapter. For, by nature, he is not only unscrupulous but, also, untiring. The frustration of his foul purpose, the ignominy of his public exposure, and the stigma of his expulsion, infuriate him and intensify his hostility towards the Movement, which, though now unable to ruin from within, he seeks to wreck from without.

The evil spirit, that grips such creatures, goads them to commit all sorts of crimes. In fact, blinded by the lust for money, they stick at nothing, and, to receive their rewards from their masters, attempt even the foul acts of plagiarism, of forgery, and of murder.

This description of a saboteur may seem fantastic to some readers, but it is nothing of the kind. To show that it is very real we will refer to a few of the incidents of which, from time to time, the Pakistan National Movement and its Founder have been the victims.

Here they are.

Since 1933, when he founded the Pakistan National Movement, two attempts are known to have been made on Rahmat Ali's life, presumably by men in the pay of the enemies of the Movement. For obvious reasons it is impossible to give here detailed information about these treacherous attempts or to reveal the identity of the instigators or of their agents. They must wait for a better opportunity, that may still be forthcoming. *V4407x MKAW H2*

For the purpose of this study it is enough to state that, thanks to Allah's deliverance, on both occasions, Rahmat Ali escaped with his life, and that the attempts left him fortified in his belief that no harm could come to him, for Allah was protecting him against his enemies to enable him to carry on the sacred task to which he had pledged himself in 1932.

From the physical turn to the moral sabotage.

Ever since the time when Rahmat Ali devised the name Pakistan for the five Muslim strongholds in the North-West of "India" and founded the Pakistan National Movement to work for their freedom; while the perverters, in order to oblige their masters by depriving him of the devotion of the people, have laboured hard to confuse the public mind about the origin of Pakistan; the poachers, in order to filch for themselves some of the credit for his historic work, have been busy forging documents.

country and as members of one nation, though belonging to two different communities of that nation, i.e. Indian. Not only that. In a famous speech, which is still approvingly quoted by the Hindoos, he described them (Hindoos and Muslims) as "two eyes of one body." This, more than anything else, confounded the perverters and exploded for ever their fraudulent myth about Sir Syed being the sower of the seed of Pakistan.

When nothing else availed, they fell back upon the great poet of Islam, the late Sir Muhammad Iqbal, for whom, despite political differences, none has greater respect and reverence than Rahmat Ali. To build up a case that he had started the Pakistan scheme, they exploited his name and his fame as a poet and made use of the following excerpt from his presidential address to the annual session of the All-India Muslim League, held at Allahabad, on 29th December, 1930:—

"Muslim India within India"

"Personally I would go further than the demands embodied in it [the resolution of the All-Parties Muslim Conference, Delhi, 1928]. I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. . . . The proposal was put forward before the Nehru Committee. They rejected it on the ground that, if carried into effect, it would give a very unwieldy state."

It is on this excerpt that they base their whole case for Iqbal's authorship of the Pakistan Scheme. Let us therefore examine it and see how far it squares with the facts.

But, before doing so, we would, for the sake of accuracy, point out that the phrase used in the Nehru Report (p. 37) is *unwieldy province*, not *unwieldy state*—though, in this connection, the distinction is hardly important because, throughout his address, Iqbal has used the word *state* as a synonym for the proposed amalgamated *province* which was to form a part of the Indian Federation.

To go back to the excerpt. Three salient points emerge from its examination: the first historical, the second moral, and the third practical. The historical point is that the suggestion for the amalgamation of the four provinces into one big province of India was first made to the Nehru Committee in 1928. That is to say, two and a half years before Iqbal himself made it on 29th December, 1930. This, once and for all, exposes the falsehood propagated by the perverters that the idea (such as it was) of amalgamating the four provinces into one province of India originated with Iqbal in 1930.

The moral point is that Iqbal's statement showed his personal desire for the consolidation of Muslim position in India. This is clear enough; but equally clear is the fact that this desire has, since 1857, been common to all Muslims, politicians or laymen. Not only that. As is shown above, it had, even by 1928, assumed the form of a proposal before the Nehru Committee.

But the pivotal point is not the personal desire of an individual or the popular wish of Muslims. The pivotal point is the precise method of translating the age-old Islamic ideal into a positive, political proposition.*

THE FOUNDER OF PAKISTAN

To an ordinary mind this might appear to be the end of the matter, but, to the seasoned saboteur, it is only the end of a chapter. For, by nature, he is not only unscrupulous but, also, untiring. The frustration of his foul purpose, the ignominy of his public exposure, and the stigma of his expulsion, infuriate him and intensify his hostility towards the Movement, which, though now unable to ruin from within, he seeks to wreck from without.

The evil spirit, that grips such creatures, goads them to commit all sorts of crimes. In fact, blinded by the lust for money, they stick at nothing, and, to receive their rewards from their masters, attempt even the foul acts of plagiarism, of forgery, and of murder.

This description of a saboteur may seem fantastic to some readers, but it is nothing of the kind. To show that it is very real we will refer to a few of the incidents of which, from time to time, the Pakistan National Movement and its Founder have been the victims.

Here they are.

Since 1933, when he founded the Pakistan National Movement, two attempts are known to have been made on Rahmat Ali's life, presumably by men in the pay of the enemies of the Movement. For obvious reasons it is impossible to give here detailed information about these treacherous attempts or to reveal the identity of the instigators or of their agents. They must wait for a better opportunity, that may still be forthcoming. V44Q7xNKA W 112

For the purpose of this study it is enough to state that, thanks to Allah's deliverance, on both occasions, Rahmat Ali escaped with his life, and that the attempts left him fortified in his belief that no harm could come to him, for Allah was protecting him against his enemies to enable him to carry on the sacred task to which he had pledged himself in 1932.

From the physical turn to the moral sabotage.

Ever since the time when Rahmat Ali devised the name Pakistan for the five Muslim strongholds in the North-West of "India" and founded the Pakistan National Movement to work for their freedom; while the perverters, in order to oblige their masters by depriving him of the devotion of the people, have laboured hard to confuse the public mind about the origin of Pakistan; the poachers, in order to filch for themselves some of the credit for his historic work, have been busy forging documents.

The former first tried to insinuate that Syed Jamal-ud-Din (died 1896) was the author of the Pakistan scheme. For quite a time they carried on propaganda to this effect and stopped it only when the falsehood of their position was brought home to them by the fact that neither Jamal-ud-Din himself in his own lifetime, nor any of his disciples or biographers since his death, had ever advanced such a claim; secondly, that not a tittle of evidence existed in his speeches or writings to support their statements; and, lastly, that his whole fight, in the nineteenth century, being for the revival of Pan-Islamism to maintain the independence of Muslim countries against Western Imperialism, he could, by no stretch of imagination, be passed as the author of the Pakistan scheme.

Then, they turned to the late Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (died 1898) and attempted to make out that he had sown the seed of the Pakistan scheme. It is significant that this time their theme was not "starting the scheme" but "sowing its seed." They kept at it for a short while but dropped it when they realized that all Muslims knew that Sir Syed had always treated the Hindoos and the Muslims as citizens of one

THE CAREERISTS AND PAKISTAN

country and as members of one nation, though belonging to two different communities of that nation, i.e. Indian. Not only that. In a famous speech, which is still approvingly quoted by the Hindoos, he described them (Hindoos and Muslims) as "two eyes of one body." This, more than anything else, confounded the perverters and exploded for ever their fraudulent myth about Sir Syed being the sower of the seed of Pakistan.

When nothing else availed, they fell back upon the great poet of Islam, the late Sir Muhammad Iqbal, for whom, despite political differences, none has greater respect and reverence than Rahmat Ali. To build up a case that he had started the Pakistan scheme, they exploited his name and his fame as a poet and made use of the following excerpt from his presidential address to the annual session of the All-India Muslim League, held at Allahabad, on 29th December, 1930:—

"Muslim India within India"

"Personally I would go further than the demands embodied in it [the resolution of the All-Parties Muslim Conference, Delhi, 1928]. I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. . . . The proposal was put forward before the Nehru Committee. They rejected it on the ground that, if carried into effect, it would give a very unwieldy state."¹

It is on this excerpt that they base their whole case for Iqbal's authorship of the Pakistan Scheme. Let us therefore examine it and see how far it squares with the facts.

But, before doing so, we would, for the sake of accuracy, point out that the phrase used in the Nehru Report (p. 37) is *unwieldy province*, not *unwieldy state*—though, in this connection, the distinction is hardly important because, throughout his address, Iqbal has used the word *state* as a synonym for the proposed amalgamated *province* which was to form a part of the Indian Federation.

To go back to the excerpt. Three salient points emerge from its examination: the first historical, the second moral, and the third practical. The historical point is that the suggestion for the amalgamation of the four provinces into one big province of India was first made to the Nehru Committee in 1928. That is to say, two and a half years before Iqbal himself made it on 29th December, 1930. This, once and for all, exposes the falsehood propagated by the perverters that the idea (such as it was) of amalgamating the four provinces into one province of India originated with Iqbal in 1930.

The moral point is that Iqbal's statement showed his personal desire for the consolidation of Muslim position in India. This is clear enough; but equally clear is the fact that this desire has, since 1857, been common to all Muslims, politicians or laymen. Not only that. As is shown above, it had, even by 1928, assumed the form of a proposal before the Nehru Committee.

But the pivotal point is not the personal desire of an individual or the popular wish of Muslims. The pivotal point is the precise method of translating the age-old Islamic ideal into a positive, political proposition.²

¹ Mitra, *The Indian Annual Register*, 1930, Vol II, p. 338.

² Commenting on the Pakistani ideal and the rise of the Pakistan National Movement, Mr. Haider Ali Abbasi says that, though illustrious personalities from Muzaddid Sahib of Sarhind to Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal had kept this ideal alive in the bosoms of Muslims, "its political expression and leadership in the field were left to that doughty and dour fighter, Chaudri Rahmat Ali of Cambridge. What that man of destiny, Rahmat Ali, has really done is to have caught on the canvas, so to say, what every Pakistani has cherished and nurtured in his heart from days immemorial." (*Civil and Military Gazette*, Lahore, December 22, 1933).

This brings us to the third point, the practical. On this Iqbal says that personally he would like to see four of the Muslim provinces amalgamated into a single state [within India]. This suggestion is the crux of the matter. To establish whether, and, if so, how far, it is identical with, or different from, the Pakistan scheme, let us compare the two, both fundamentally and factually, and then arrive at a sound judgment.

Such a comparison of one with the other establishes the following points:—

Speaking *fundamentally*, while Iqbal treats¹ India as a country welcomes Indian Federation, finds in it a satisfactory solution of Hindoo-Muslim problem, accepts² the inclusion therein of Muslim people and their territories, and, to create³ a harmonious whole of Hindoos, Muslims, and others, expresses⁴ a personal, though passing, liking for the creation of a "Muslim India" within India; *Ali* treats⁵ India as a collection of several countries, attacks⁶ the conception of Indian territorial unity as not only historically false but, also, politically fatal, describes⁷ Indian Federation as dangerous to Muslims, opposes the incorporation therein of Muslim people and their territories, seeks⁸ the solution of Hindoo-Muslim problem in the creation of

¹ "We have a duty towards India where we are destined to live and die" . . . (Iqbal) *Mitra, The Indian Annual Register*, 1930, Vol. II, p. 345. "The Muslims demand federation because it is pre-eminently a solution of India's most difficult problem, i.e. the communal problem" . . . (Iqbal) (*Ibid.*, p. 339).

² "In your own interest as a [Muslim] political entity among other political entities of India . . ." (Iqbal) (*Ibid.*, p. 345). "Thus possessing full opportunity of development within the body-politic of India, the North-West Indian Muslims will prove the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion" . . . (Iqbal) (*Ibid.*, p. 338).

³ "The unity of Indian nation must be sought not in the negation, but in the mutual harmony and co-operation of the many" . . . (Iqbal) (*Ibid.*, p. 337). "Communalism in its higher aspect then is indispensable to the formation of a harmonious whole in a country like India" . . . (Iqbal) (*Ibid.*, p. 337).

⁴ Iqbal, *Ibid.*, p. 338.

⁵ "India, constituted as it is at the present moment, is not the name of one single country, nor the home of one single nation. It is, in fact, the designation of a State. . . . It includes peoples who have never previously formed part of India at any period of its history; but who have, on the other hand, from the dawn of history till the advent of the British, possessed and retained distinct nationalities of their own" . . . (Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never*, 28th January, 1933).

⁶ "Let us, therefore, hope that at least those people and parties, including the All-India Muslim League, who, at long last, now claim for the *Millat* a nationality distinct from the 'Indians,' but still cling to 'India' and call her their 'Common Motherland,' will re-examine the central issue in the light of the serious implications of their present position. A position which, with all deference to them, is at once foolish, false, and fatal. It is foolish in the name of logic. . . . It is false in the name of history. . . . It is fatal in the name of safety" . . . (Rahmat Ali, *The Millat of Islam and the Menace of Indianism*, 1940, pp. 5-6).

⁷ "If we, the Muslims . . . with our distinct marks of nationality, are deluded into the proposed Indian Federation by friends or foes, we are reduced to a minority of one in four. It is this fact which sounds the death-knell of the Muslim nation in India for ever" . . . (Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never*, *ibid.*).

⁸ "The Pakistan National Movement stands on these eternal truths for the right of Pakistan to equal status and identical position with Hindoostan in the comity of Nations" . . . (Rahmat Ali, *Federation and Fatherland*, 1935). "Our scheme is a plan for an independent and separate Pakistan, composed of the five Muslim provinces in the North, and possessing equality of status with Hindustan, as with other civilised nations, in the comity of Nations. The Movement holds that only this solution can ensure honourable existence to both nations—Muslims in Pakistan and Hindus in Hindustan, and also put an end to the exploitation of both by British Imperialism" . . . (Rahmat Ali cited in Edib's *Inside India*, London, 1937, p. 355).

sovereign states, independent of one another; and, believing¹ the consummation in India of a harmonious whole of various peoples and their countries as not only undesirable but, also, unthinkable, aims² at recognising Hindoos, Muslims and other communities as distinct nationalities, and at consolidating each of them as a sovereign people in its appropriate stronghold.

This shows that in spirit and in scope, *Iqbal's* statement and *Ali's* scheme are poles apart.

Speaking factually, first, whereas *Iqbal* prefers to amalgamate four Muslim provinces into a single state; *Ali* plans to maintain the individuality of each of the five provinces covered by his scheme of Pakistan; secondly, whereas *Iqbal* keeps the amalgamated provinces within India and conceives a state within a state; *Ali* condemns the existing inclusion of Muslim provinces into "India" and calls for their immediate separation from "India", christens the five provinces Pakistan, and demands its recognition as a new country and sovereign state outside India; thirdly, whereas, in face of the then-contemplated All-India Federation, *Iqbal* reduced the number of Muslim majority lands from six to two and, thereby, even for the purposes of the Federation, made the Muslim position worse than before; *Ali*, in view of the dangers of the Federation, strengthened and saved the Muslim position by his scheme, first for the creation of a separate and sovereign Federation of Pakistan and then for the recognition of the independent nationhood of Bengal and of the sovereignty of Usmanistan; and, lastly, whereas, on second thoughts, *Iqbal* himself, describing his idea as dangerous to Muslims, recanted,³ and withdrew it; *Ali*, defining his scheme as the only means of the political salvation of Muslims, defied all opposition—British, Hindoo, and Muslim—devoted himself to its propagation, and succeeded in converting to it the whole Millat, including even *Iqbal*, in 1937, and the All-India Muslim League, in 1940.

Again, this comparison proves that, in design and in definition, *Iqbal's* idea is as different from *Ali's* scheme as chalk is from cheese, and that *Iqbal* was no more responsible for starting the Pakistan scheme than was *Syed Jamal-ud-Din* or *Sir Syed Admad Khan*.

¹ "Our acceptance of Hindoostani nationality and amalgamation with Hindoostan is not only impossible, but unthinkable, and, from the highest interests of humanity, undesirable" (*Rahmat Ali, Federation and Fatherland*, 1935).

² ". . . that, in retrospect, 'India of to-day' is the 'South Asia of yesterday,' but, in prospect, the sphere of the individual solidarity of several nations of to-morrow; that, at present, 'India' is the arbitrary name of the British Empire in South Asia, but, in future, it will be the natural designation of 'Indianism,' confined to its national home in India proper (Hindoostan); that as this Empire is composed of several countries of South Asia, of which India (Hindoostan) is only a minor unit, no system of government, whether inspired by the Gladstonian soul of British Imperialism or by the Gandhian spirit of Indian nationalism, or by the grasping capitalism of both, can ever succeed unless it recognises, and guarantees, the distinct nationhood of the nations living therein; and, finally, that, in so far as we are concerned, we will accept only that political solution which is based upon the aforesaid eternal verities—verities which inspire the Creed of the Movement and ensure the sovereign status of Pakistan, of Bengal, and of Usmanistan" . . . (*Rahmat Ali, The Millat of Islam* . . . pp. 7-8).

³ "I am glad to be able to say that Sir Mohammad Iqbal has since recanted it. . . . Even if Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal had not recanted it as something which could not be put forward by any sane person, I should have emphatically and unhesitatingly repudiated it as something foreign to the genius and the spirit of the rising generation of Islam" . . . (*Barkat Ali cited in Dr. Ambedkar's Thoughts on Pakistan*, Bombay, 1941, p. 326).

For years he used to condemn the acceptance of Government titles and honours by Muslims; but when a Knighthood was conferred upon him by the British Government, he, like others, gratefully accepted it; again, he persistently criticised the legislative councils as traps set by British Imperialism for its dupes; but when he himself got an opportunity of entering one, he contested an election and became, and remained for the full term of 3 years, a member of the Legislative Council of the Punjab; yet again, until 1930, he often ridiculed the official conferences and their participants; but when, in 1931 and in 1932, he himself was nominated by the Government of India to the Round Table Conference in London, he thankfully accepted the nomination and loyally acted there like other Muslim delegates; and, finally, he throughout condemned the people who compromised the future of Islam and the fortunes of the Millat; but when the All-India Federation was proposed by the Anglo-Hindoo *entente*—the Federation which involved the surrender of the national heritage and of the national destiny of 100 million Muslims—he fully co-operated in framing the fatal Federal Constitution and formally accepted it.

All this provides further corroboration of our conclusion and puts Sir Muhammad Iqbal, the politician, on a par with other politicians, though with two reservations: One, while they practised what they preached, he practised what he condemned; two, while they, for their purposes, opposed Pakistan openly, Iqbal, for his own, opposed it secretly.

Ironically enough it is this secret opposition which provides the final confirmation of the above conclusion. Writing to his friend, Dr. Edward Thompson, who, in 1935, was arranging his election to the Rhodes Lectureship at Oxford University, he said that he thought "the Pakistan plan would be disastrous to the British Government, disastrous to the Hindu community, disastrous to the Muslim community."¹

Coming as this does from Iqbal himself, nothing can be more conclusive. It settles the issue. More than that. It indicts Iqbal's apologists as perverters of truth and proves their fraud and falsehood before history.

Now we come to the poachers. They have gone one better and resorted to fabricating evidence and forging documents. To serve their purposes, some of these they have pre-dated and some post-dated the rise of Rahmat Ali, and thereby tried to obscure his creation of Pakistan, in 1932; his foundation of the Pakistan National Movement, in 1933; and his evolution of the Pakistani ideology, which, in 1937, found its further expression in *Bang-i-Islam* and in *Usmanistan*. As it is impossible to give here all that has come to our notice in this connection, we had better content ourselves with the following three typical cases which illustrate the crimes of these creatures.

¹ Edward Thompson, *Enlist India for Freedom*, London, 1940, p. 58.

Through years of most painstaking effort, a poacher is reported to have imitated with amazing success Rahmat Ali's Urdu handwriting and to have used this accomplishment for forging a large number of letters on Rahmat Ali's private stationery—both headed and plain.

Barred by certain considerations from working openly for the ideals of the Movement, this wretch, first with the excuse of using the map of Pakistan for unobtrusive propaganda among potential supporters, managed to get from Rahmat Ali a considerable quantity of his private stationery; and, secondly, with the excuse of making a hobby of collecting various types of stationery, asked Rahmat Ali to send him always an extra sheet or two of any odd note-paper he may use in his travels for writing to him from an hotel or a steamship and, thus obtaining odd stationery, made use of both for the purpose of forging letters.

It is impossible to be sure of the precise nature of the contents of these forged letters except that rumour has it that, to give them the semblance of genuineness, they are couched in Rahmat Ali's style and are interspersed with passages from his original letters, and that they have been inspired partly by the idea of using them after Rahmat Ali's death to establish himself as having been his greatest confidant and partly by the idea of obstructing his work in his life-time by using bogus criticisms by Rahmat Ali of his own friends and followers and, thereby, prejudicing them against him.

The second incident, prompted by an equally low motive, relates to an attempt at plagiarism.

In 1937, Rahmat Ali prepared an abridged edition of his book, *Pakistan: My Faith, Fatherland, and Fraternity*, and had "roneoed" a small number of copies for the private use of his close collaborators. The object was to place in their hands a concise, yet more or less comprehensive, statement on Pakistan, providing answers to various questions and criticisms concerning its feasibility and thus to help them in their propaganda for the Pakistan National Movement. Later on, in 1939, a slightly fuller summary of the book was issued for the same purpose.

With a view to safeguarding his rights of authorship, instructions were issued, both in 1937 and in 1939, that those entrusted with the copies were to treat them as meant only for their personal use and that in no case were they to let them go out of their possession. Yet, despite the fact that they took all possible precautions, the poachers, by hook or by crook, got hold of the copies and made use of them for plagiaristic purposes.

Again, in the early part of 1940, in circumstances into which it is not necessary to go here, Rahmat Ali was forced to entrust to a person for safe-keeping a copy of the full manuscript (including the maps) of this book. The understanding was that he should return it to him at a pre-arranged time and place. . . . But when the time came, this person delayed the return of the MS. until he had had a copy typed, presumably with the aim of having it first "defaced" and then published under his own name or a pseudonym at a suitable opportunity.

In the end, we come to the third incident which relates to one who tried to worm his way even into the authorship of the name Pakistan. This was done by a trick so clever as to merit description in full detail.

Indeed, it is so instructive that it may well serve as a warning to all those who devote themselves to creative work and, during the course of it, come across admirers some of whom may not be above the temptation of playing a similar trick on them.

In 1932 when Rahmat Ali derived the name Pakistan from the names of the five provinces, the Punjab, Afghanistan (N.W. Frontier), Kashmir, Sindh, and Balochistan, a person, who, at that period, was often in his company, professing profound admiration for his epochal work, requested Rahmat Ali to give him the honour of being the first to write the word ~~Pakistan~~ in the ornamental Urdu script, wherein he claimed to have some skill. Rahmat Ali, touched by his request and treating it as a spontaneous expression of his appreciation, not only gladly agreed to it, but also referred to it in correspondence in Urdu, saying that he would always be glad to remember his appreciation and to think of him as the first thus to write (تحریر) the name Pakistan.

Can you imagine what use this creature made of this courtesy and kindness to him. In 1940, it was reported to Rahmat Ali that this reference in a letter (whether the actual letter in question is real or forged is difficult to say) was so altered as to read that he would always be glad to think of his friend as the first to *propose* (تجویز) the name of Pakistan. On enquiry, it was found that this forger had added a dot under the letter *h* in the Urdu word تحریر (meaning to write), making it *ه*, added a little blob to the first *j*, making it *و*, and dotted the second *j*, making it *ز*; thereby, changing the word تحریر (to write) into تجویز (to propose).

How simple the distortion! Yet how devilish the design and how difficult its detection!

Surely more perfidy could hardly be packed into a single act—an act of which only a person born of treachery and bred in trickery can be guilty.

But, after all, such are saboteurs. They belong to the underworld, live on crime and corruption, and rejoice in defilement and destruction. Only, thanks to the Divine law, they never prosper. Degraded by their own misdeeds and hated even by the masters whom they serve, they are condemned by their fellow-men and pass everywhere as vile crooks guilty of crimes for which there is no salvation before Allah.

There, for the time being, must end the unsavoury story of the opposition of the vested interests and of the enmity of their vicious agents towards Pakistan and its Founder. Much more could be added to it; but the time for that is not yet. For the present this should suffice to throw a ray of light on some of the mysterious and malicious activities of the opponents of the Pakistani cause and of its creator.

TRUTH TRIUMPHS.

So far as Rahmat Ali is concerned, he has never attached undue importance to such opposition. And this for good reasons. For one thing, in 1933, when he stood almost alone, he defied and defeated his opponents; for another, to-day, when he has the largest personal following of all Muslim leaders in the Fatherland, his position is unchallengeable. But, above all, his conviction is, and has ever been,

that, though the forces of evil may retard the triumph of truth, they cannot prevent it; that though they may obstruct his mission, they cannot stop its spread and success. This conviction has, more than anything else, sustained him in his fight for the freedom of his people and enabled him to render a memorable service to his Faith, Fatherland, and Fraternity.

As for us, his friends, followers, and comrades, we share his conviction to the full and consider opposition a compliment to his dynamic personality. For, to us, he is both a legend and a faith, both the Founder of Pakistan and the *Qaid* of its cause. We believe that he is blessed; that, whether he succeeds or fails in his life-time, he will go down to history as the first to kindle the flame of faith, to hoist the flag of fight, and to strike the blow for the freedom of the Fatherland. That is to say, a flame that has become a beacon, a flag that has aroused his people, and a fight that has heralded the dawn of Pakistan, of Bang-i-Islam, and of Usmanistan.

So, to us, as to all his people, this achievement is a sufficient token of his ultimate triumph.

*"For Freedom's battle once begun,
Bequeathed by bleeding Sire to Son,
Though dashed off, is ever won."*

Published by the Author.

Sole Agents, for sale

MESSRS. LUZAC & CO.

46, Great Russell Street,
' LONDON, W.C. 1.

