

The Ideology of Pakistan – Revisited

Abdul Rauf

University of Peshawar

The creation of Pakistan is justified and criticised enormously in the literature on South Asia. Opposition to the idea continues but in different contours and has wreaked the minds of younger generation in Pakistan. Justification of the idea also needs to come up with the same vigour but with arguments appropriate to the time and place. The demand for Pakistan can be explained as the result of differences primarily political between the two communities and political parties. These differences neither could be dissolved nor arbitrated but assent and elevated to the emergence of new political thinking or ideology among the Indians in Indo-Pak Subcontinent in the first half of the 20th century. At a certain stage advocates of the idea mobilized people and transformed into a coherent political movement for the division of India and creation of Pakistan. Both Hindus and Muslims and their main political representatives; Congress and Muslim League provided enough reasons to formulate this ideology .

Keywords: ideology, ideology of Pakistan, Pakistan, India, freedom struggle

The creation of Pakistan in 1947 is a unique phenomenon in the first half of the 20th century human history. The period witnessed the rise of communist ideology and its transformation into the state structure in the shape of USSR after 1917. The two great world wars resulted enormous human losses unprecedented in the past. Man's scientific and technological advancement superseded man's advancement in the entire human history and did not restrict to geographical boundaries. In this century, the West remained centre of all human activities, leaving little room for others in terms of advancement in the realm of social and scientific scholarship. Amidst the West dominated world, it seems that the division of India and creation of Pakistan is a phenomenon having little indebtedness to western thoughts and practices. The case is unique, as it proclaimed an ideology and sloganeering which were alien not only to the colonial masters i.e. the British, but also novel in the modern socio-political thought. The creation of a state on differences between two communities which were largely influenced by the religious tradition i.e. Hinduism and Islam could hardly appeal to the modern man who almost secluded the role of religion to private life. Pakistan being the first country created after the Second World War is exclusive in the sense that it proclaimed to adopt a political system-expressed in terms of religion to serve the community.

A large number of writings are available to explain the basis of Pakistan. These vast publications provide intellectual grounds for the existing and establishment of Pakistan. However,

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Abdul Rauf, Professor, Department of Political Science

University of Peshawar, Email: abdulrauf@uop.edu.pk

efforts are required to continue the ideas/thoughts explaining the *raison d'être* of Pakistan with a new vigour and sometimes with a variety of arguments engaging the young generation in support of position of the Muslims at the time of creation of Pakistan. An effort has been made in this paper to refresh the ideology of Pakistan's creation beholden to certain principles and avoid any apologetic position on the ideology of Pakistan. It is hoped that it will remove certain misconception in the young generation arisen after looking back to the unappealing history of Pakistan since 1947 and the changing regional and global scenario.

The Creation of Pakistan: Different Views

Regarding the establishment of Pakistan, some asserted that it was the traditional British imperialist 'policy of divide and rule' which finally culminated in the struggle for Pakistan and led by Muslim League and Mohammad Ali Jinnah. Some asserted that it is the religion of Islam, which is responsible for a separate Muslim state, while others opined that it is the Hindu mentality and Congress stubbornness which finally gave way to the creation of Pakistan. A group of scholars also attributed it to the economic deprivation of a class or a struggle to safeguard the interest of a Muslim mercantile class who were behind the division of India. A gist of these views is given along some plausible questions raised after accepting these views.

The British Imperialist Design- 'Divide and Rule'

It is believed that since the arrival of the Europeans, particularly after the arrival of the British in India a 'policy of divide and rule' was adopted to subjugate and colonialize the Indians. The British initially landed as traders on the Indian soil. However, the pathetic socio-political conditions of the sub-continent attracted them to stay for a longer period in India. They found Indian society divided on vertical and horizontal lines. The difference and conflict of interests among various classes and communities were easily exploited in favour of the British colonial interests. The East India Company encouraged one ruler/prince or one community against the other and thus weakened the potential of resistance of the natives against the colonial masters. The British successfully penetrated into the helm of affairs of the entire Indo-Pak Subcontinent. Their first settlement in Bengal after their success in 1757 soon expanded to the Southern India when they defeated Sultan Tipu in 1799 and finally to the Northern India when they arrived in Delhi in 1803 and made the Mughal emperor not more than a puppet. After failure in the 1857 war of independence, the Indians started their political struggle by engaging themselves with the Indian National Congress since its establishment in 1885. This platform was initially raised to get acquaintance with views of educated Indians about India and British Indian administration. However, in the later stage of their political struggle Indian National Congress emerged as the champion of Indian freedom struggle.

It is advocated that at this stage the British encountered the Indian political struggle by dividing Indians on the basis of religion. Muslims who were one fourth of the population, and who later on organized under Muslim League, were implicitly supported in their demand for separate electorate which was then accepted in 1909. This acceptance of separate electorate is proclaimed to have sowed the communal division of Hindus and Muslims in India. This explanation of the creation of Pakistan is forwarded by almost all those leaders and groups-Muslims and Non-Muslims alike who opposed partition of India and the creation of Pakistan on the basis of two-nation theory. However, Mawlana Mohammad Ali Jawhar rebuked the notion and announced at the first Round Table Conference that "we divide and you [the British] rule" (Sayeed, 1978, p. 7).

The phenomenon of demand for Pakistan is unique, intricate and complex while the answer and explanation of 'divide and rule' is very simple. It is complicated in the sense that it involves not only the fate of millions of people, but it also questions their abilities and capabilities, role, position and stature, and the inherent value of freedom in their thought and actions. Presumably the whole community was made a scapegoat to a very small foreign occupier. The Muslims, once rulers of India became so imprudent that they allowed the British to use them for their colonial interests. Though men's actions are influenced by the external environment in which one lives but it is also irrefutable fact that man is created by God as a free entity to carry out his own decisions. If the inherent value of free thinking is correct, then why the struggle for safeguard of Muslim Political interests in 1920s and 1930s and the demand for Pakistan should not be accredited to an independent decision of millions of people in 1940s? Certain steps¹ taken by the British during their rule in British India (as narrated by some writers) apparently support the thesis of British imperialist design behind the establishment of Pakistan. However, it can also be interpreted as the confluence of interests of Muslims and the British on occasions in their struggle for freedom. In the history of Indo-Pak subcontinent there are also occasions when the interests of the British coincided with the interests of Hindus and Congress² and it cannot diminish the role of Indian National Congress in their struggle against the British. No doubt the stature of the British imperial power in India was greater but not to the extent to seize the intrinsic value of freedom in human thought and actions particularly when they are in millions (Muslims).

Religion—Islam As *Raison D'etr* Of Pakistan

A significant number of intellectuals are of the opinion that, ideology of Pakistan is the religion of Islam. And it was the demand of religion that the Muslims of Indo-Pak sub-continent divided India and make Pakistan. It is asserted that after the arrival of Muslims in India and their prolonge rule led to the evaluation of an Indo-Muslim culture, distinct from Hindus in spirit and shape. The emergence of a separate culture had enormous political consequences as well. The Muslims' demand of separate representation and safeguards proved futile and thus developed a conviction among the Muslims that nothing short of political independence could guarantee their existence as a distinct entity (Qureshi, 1995). Thus the whole struggle of the people for Pakistan is interpreted on the notion of religion. Some even uphold the view that both the religions i.e. Hinduism and Islam are so conflicting that they cannot coexists in one territory. And thus, India should be partitioned into two parts; one for Muslims and another for Hindus. This view was supported by some Hindu leaders also (Afzal, 1979). The religious view got impetus when the religious people overwhelmingly upheld it in the post-independence period not only in their intellectual discourse but also popularized it among the masses.³ The view had its leverage because the people in authority were ridiculed by the opposition in the name of religion. They were amply termed as pro-western and anti-religion when their views were not heard.

¹ For example, acceptance of separate electorate system in 1909

² For example the anti-Muslim policies of the British after 1857 war of independence till the end of 19th century, the establishment of Indian National Congress in 1885, the annulment of the Partition of Bengal, refusal to offer the formation of government to the Muslim League after the acceptance of Cabinet Mission Plan which was ensured in the Bill.

³ It can be observed in nearly every intellectual and religious debate that this view is propagated and uphold particularly by the ideologues of Islamic revivalism like Mawlana Sayyed Abul Ala Mawdudi and Mawlana Shabir Ahmad Usmani.

However, by accepting this view there are certain questions which need to be answered. If this view is correct then why certain great religious scholars opposed the idea of Pakistan?⁴ Another question arises that whether the purpose of religion, particularly Islam is to divide lands and create new states? Has Islam come to the world to create new states? A close look at Islam shows that its injunctions are neither confined to a particular people nor to a specific region. Islam is universal, sent by Allah for the entire humanity and not only for the Muslims (Islahi, 1976, p. 8). It cannot only guide the Muslims, but non-Muslims as well. Moreover, the spread of Islam which according to some Muslim scholars is an obligation upon Muslims will be possible only when Muslims have good relations with others and only then, the message of Islam will be received sympathetically.⁵ Otherwise, Islam will be confined only to a certain community i.e. Muslims. It is true that many differences between Muslims and Hindus can be attributed to the religion. The lives of Indian Muslims were greatly influenced when they converted to Islam. But the distinction between Islam as religion and Muslims as a community should not be ignored. Differences between Muslims and Hindus in India other than religion also existed and on the basis of these differences Muslims finally resorted to demand a separate homeland. But at the same time Islam should be kept apart from the Muslims' demand as it will distort the image of a religion which carries a universal message to humanity and not to a particular community (Muslims).

Support and Opposition of Pakistan on Muslim Economic Interests

One view forwarded for the struggle of Pakistan is getting an economic uplift of Muslims which was thought to be impossible in united India. Muslims felt that they are economically far below then the Hindus in India. The statistics of Muslim businessmen, traders, commerce and financial giants, government servants and professionals in pre-Independent India in proportion to their population supported this argument. In the words of Naureen Talha, 'identification of economic backwardness and hold of Hindus on the economic life of India nurtured the feelings of an economic nationalism among the Muslims. The Muslims saw no future for themselves in the face of an economically superior Hindu community, unless they looked after their own class interests' (Talha, 2000). According to her 'the creation of Pakistan, among other things, was the result of the perception of a better future in an independent Muslim country and a reaction to the depressed economic condition of the Muslims in India' (Talha, p. 2). The Muslims' pathetic economic situation was comprehended and the Muslim political leadership particularly Quaid-i-Azam took initiative to persuade Muslim business families and individuals such as Isphahanis, Habib brothers and Adamjees to establish business and financial companies including banks, insurance, shipping, airways and other business ventures (Hayat, 1998, pp. 252-256). These economic interests of the Muslims led to the demand of Muslim separate homeland in India. The economic factor in the political decision has never been ignored by those who opposed Pakistan in 1940s. Mawlana Hussain Ahmad Madani's opposition to Pakistan carries an argument that Pakistan would not be economically viable country and would thus always seek the support of some foreign power (Faruqi, 1980, p. 108). However, the case would have been different had the post-partition Pakistan government been allowed to

⁴ For example Mawlana Abul Kalam Azad, Mawlana Hussain Ahmad Madani and organizations like Jamiat ul Ulama-i-Hind, Majlis-i-Ahrar-i-Islam. Mawlana Mawdudi and Jamaat-i-Islami were also standing separately from the Muslim League.

⁵ This plea was highlighted by Jamiat ul Ulama-i-Hind during their opposition to the demand of Pakistan.

concentrate on building political and administrative structure by the internal and external actors in 1950s and 60s.

Some economic experts affiliated to Indian National Congress also made prediction of the amalgamation of Pakistan with India due to economic impracticality. The economic factor cannot be subsumed but it cannot be made the sole factor for the drive of Muslims for an independent state in the united India. The Muslim entrepreneurs would have a big market in a united India rather than a small part like Pakistan and thus their interests are more coincided with the pro-united India rather than with those separating apart from the bigger India. Moreover, it is not always economic need which drives humans. There are stronger impulses to instigate humans for launching political movements such is the case of Pakistan.

Congress Politics and Jawaharlal Nehru

A group of scholars both in India and Pakistan asserted that the creation of Pakistan is due to the fallacious policies of Congress and particularly that of Jawaharlal Nehru in the last days of united India. If Congress leaders were sagacious, Pakistan would not have been made and the question of Muslims would have been solved as envisaged in the Cabinet Mission Plan (1946) which was accepted by the Muslim League. This view was upheld by Mawlana Abul Kalam Azad (Azad, 1988) who remained president of Congress from 1939 to 1946, H. M. Seervai (Seervai, 2005), a retired advocate general of Maharashtra, India between 1957 and 74 and Jaswant Singh (Singh, 2009), the ex-Foreign Minister of India.

Azad gave an account of the events leading to the revision of decision of Muslim League about the Cabinet Mission Plan. Nehru, president of Congress, expressed his views on the Cabinet Mission Plan as 'the Congress had agreed only to participate in the constituent assembly and regarded itself free to change or modify the Cabinet Mission Plan as it thought best' (Azad, 1988, p. 165). Azad refers to the statement of Nehru as an event which 'changed the course of history' (Azad, p. 164). He termed Nehru's statement as a 'bombshell' (Azad, p. 165). Afterward Muslim League and Jinnah argued that if Congress could change its position on the Plan while British are still in India then what assurances the minority have that once the British left the Congress would not change its policy. Subsequently the last chance of a United India fades away due to Congress and Nehru mishandling of the situation.

Seervai narrated in detail the events of the last days of united India. He pointed out that how Congress and its leaders tried to set aside Muslim League and Jinnah from the political scene despite Muslim League was in winning position in majority Muslim seats in the 1946 elections. The acceptance of Cabinet Mission Plan showed that Muslim League had agreed to work under a constitution for a united India (Seervai, 2005, p. 174). The writer evaluated the role of Nehru towards the League, who showed no magnanimity towards Jinnah, and the League after the 1937 elections, while there was no great difference in policies of Congress and League (Seervai, p. 175). When an appeal to Gandhi (Seervai, pp. 214-15)⁶ for a nationalist solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem failed, only then Jinnah resorted to organise the political power of the Muslim League (Seervai, p. 176). Seervai concluded

⁶ After 1937 elections, Jinnah sent a private message (conveyed by B.G. Kher) suggesting a "Congress-League settlement involving among others, power sharing in the provinces. Gandhi's written reply was 'Kher has given me your message. I wish I could do something, but I am helpless. My faith in unity is bright as ever, only I see no daylight....' See for details, (Seervai, 2005, pp.214-15).

that it is reasonably clear that it was the Congress which wanted partition. It was Jinnah who was against partition but accepted it as the second best (Seervai, p. 178).

The account of Congress politics in thwarting a United India is recently been added by Jaswant Singh, Ex-External Minister of India and a leader of the BJP. He made Nehru and Congress responsible for partition as they stress more on a strong centre while Jinnah was in favour of federation where the federating units enjoyed autonomy. Singh tried to remove the impression that Jinnah was against the Hindus. He supported the opinion that his opposition was not against the Hindus or Hinduism; it was the Congress that he considered as the true political rival of the Muslim League, and that Congress politics and attitudes transformed Jinnah from the championship of Hindu-Muslim unity (Ahmad, n.d., p. 157)⁷ to that of Hindu-Muslim separatism. Jinnah had differences with Congress and not with the Hindus in general (Singh, 2009, p. 485). Singh also blamed Congress leadership of 'always overestimating its strength, its influence, and its leaders were extremely reluctant to accept Jinnah as the leader of not just the Muslim League but eventually of most Muslims of India. The Congress leadership, 'sadly, also lacked a befitting sense of reality' (Singh, 2009, p. 509). Though the argument carries weightage to blame Congress and not Muslim League for the division of India but the overall impression one gets from this school of thought that Jinnah's politics was reactionary politics and thus cannot be acceptable when we look to Jinnah's political life. The case of Muslims' demand for Pakistan is imbued with a constructive thinking to make the people of Muslim majority areas sovereign of their own destiny. Moreover, the reaction of Congress and Nehru can be put together with the last explanation given below.

Political Differences between Communities/ Congress And Muslim League

Looking closely at the relations between Hindus and Muslims since 1857 there are differences among the Hindus and Muslims and Muslim League and Congress which are responsible for the partition of India. The question is what kind of differences/disagreements lead to the parting of ways which ultimately led to the division of a country where both remained united for more than five hundred years? Do all kind of differences lead to such a historic event like the division of India? The answer is certainly not.

Differences/disagreements which are based on erroneous facts and caused misunderstanding between parties can be dissolved by exchange of views and facts. If parties communicate actual facts and data, then there is likelihood of removing of misunderstanding and dissolution of difference. The second kind of differences are based on vested interests e.g. property and land. Such differences cannot be resolved/ removed unless a third party become active. Arbitration by the third party usually follows the 'give and take principle'. However, in this case the mere presence of a third party is not enough; rather the third party should also have the power to implement its decisions. This power cannot be only force but rather it can adopt the policy of persuasion and utility as well. The third kind of differences /disagreements are those which can neither be dissolved nor arbitrated but rather ascent and elevate (Burki, 1977, p. 8) and finally transformed into a full-fledged theoretical framework. When these differences intensified/increased and adopted sacred notion then they manifested themselves in a separate/distinctive thinking which could be named as ideology.

⁷ In 1916 on the conclusion of Lucknow Pact, Jinnah was hailed as 'Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity' by Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, once president of Indian National Congress in 1925.

In the case of Pakistan, the differences between the two communities i.e. Hindus and Muslims were of the third category i.e. which could neither be dissolved nor arbitrated. These were not based on false facts or erroneous knowledge which could be removed through exchange of views. There were many meetings between Congress and Muslim League but all in vein. These differences were also not of the second category which could be arbitrated by a third party, although such a party i.e. the British Indian Government existed. In fact, the third party failed to get recognition of an impartial entity from the two communities i.e. Hindus and Muslims in the beginning of their rule and in the later stage from the two political parties i.e. Muslim League and Indian National Congress. Any step taken by one party for political development in India, was seen sceptically by the other. For example, the formation of Indian National Congress by Mr. A. O. Hume in 1885 ostensibly with the encouragement of some British officials was not welcomed by Sir Sayed Ahmad Khan (Hamid, 1971, p. 31). Though certain Muslims played their role in Indian National Congress, but its participation reached to negligence particularly during the Congress movement against the partition of Bengal in the first decade of 20th century. The British decision of partition of Bengal in 1905 primarily due to administrative reasons was welcomed by the Muslims, but the same decision was not only opposed by the Bengali Hindus but Indian national Congress also launched a vigorous movement and carrying a religious fervour to resist it (Ahmad, n.d., p. 104). This movement, with the passage of time, became violent and finally the British bowed before the Congress' politics of agitation. The annulment of the partition of Bengal in 1911, communicated a different message to Muslims, who thought that the agitation of Hindus and Congress was against the interests of the East Bengal which was dominated by Muslims. Secondly, acceptance of the Hindus and Congress demands by the British and annulment of the partition of Bengal in 1911 was thought to be the success of power politics. The British stepped back from its own commitment that decision of the partition of Bengal taken in 1905 is final. Conversely it helped in the growth of Muslim political consciousness, self-help and self-reliance and Shibli reminded this fact to the Muslim leadership at that time. Throughout the freedom struggle, on many occasions a step taken by the third party i.e. the British was welcomed by one party but resented by the second party. On very few occasions, both the parties had agreements (Rauf, 2008, pp. 71-72).⁸ The Hindu-Muslim differences may be based on religion, social, economic and political perception or all of them may contribute to the increase of differences/disagreements. However, the events in the first half of 20th century show that those were primarily political differences. In such an aggravated situation, to avoid a holocaust, the partition of India and the establishment of a separate Muslim state was seeming to be the only viable political solution to control and prevent human losses.

Thus, the creation of Pakistan can be attributed to the single factor that is the Hindu-Muslim political differences, which were neither possible to dissolve and nor could be settled down by the third party and thus finally culminated into a separate ideology i.e. demand of a separate homeland for the Muslim majority areas. This explanation for the establishment of Pakistan doesn't ignore the role of other factors but make it subservient to the political differences.

⁸ Apart from Luknow Pact in 1916 the other occasion was the Round Table Conference (RTC) in 1930. A Committee was constituted to assess the case of reforms in NWFP. All members of the committee, Muslims or non-Muslims agreed to upgrade the status of NWFP to a Governor's province (Rauf, 2008, pp. 71-72).

The theory of political differences can further be explained and elaborated through dialecticism. Pakistan movement is the result of a dialectic process started after the arrival of Muslims in India and the conversion of Indians to Islam. This newly erected community was distinct in its belief system, outlook of life and ways of living. However, this does not mean to degrade and dishonour other communities of India.

Muslim rulers of the neighbouring countries particularly from the north-west of India on many occasions attacked India, fought wars with the natives and inflicted heavy losses at them. These invaders later on established themselves in India and founded kingdom(s). The political adventures of these Muslim invaders were then associated with the message of Islam. Muslim rule continued for centuries in India. No doubt, Muslim rulers avoided to convert people forcefully. They inducted non-Muslims in administering the affairs of state. Life, property, religious places, honour and dignity of the non-Muslims were preserved throughout this period. However, the Hindus could not forget the idea of the arrival and rule of a non-Hindu ideology/religion in their homeland.

Throughout Indian history, Hinduism treated an alien religion in India with a systematic mechanism; expulsion, absorption and suppression. Hinduism tried to expel any non-Hindu religion as it did with Buddhism, once religion of Indian ruling class (Mauryan Empire 300-200 B.C.). Buddhism had to leave India-the place of its birth and move to China and South East Asia. Jainism another non-Hindu religion was absorbed, while Sikhism was not allowed to get out of the fold of Hinduism. Christianity remained suppressed in India and could not flourish despite the British rulers being Christians. About three thousand years, the Hindus of India successfully carried out this policy. However, with the arrival of Muslims they confronted a totally different situation. Islam arrived and spread in India and it was not only successful in converting a considerable number of people, but it ruled over India for centuries.

Hinduism adopted its traditional policy of expulsion, absorption and suppression to encounter Islam. When they failed to expel Islam and the Muslims from the Indian soil, they adopted the policy of absorption as manifested in the Bakhti cult in the 14th century. The movement apparently adopted certain beliefs influenced from Islam such as unity of God and unity of human being. However, it also tried to weaken the differences between Islam and Hinduism by declaring both the religions as two alternate paths to the same destination. It would have ended the Muslim separate identity if the cult is accepted by the Muslims. This was the most rigorous/forceful and perceptive attack of Hindus on the Muslims.

The response of the Muslims to the Hindus was more energetic and forceful which was a new experience for Hindus in their long history. Muslim leadership in 17th and 18th centuries vigorously stressed on the consciousness of Muslimhood and separate identity. The gap between the two communities further increased when in the middle of 18th century Muslims asked external forces to defend the Muslim rule in India. The arrival of British, the annexation of Delhi (1803), the failure of the 1857 war of independence, and the subsequent annihilation of Muslims (in some parts of India), and the proposition that the Muslims were responsible for the uprising of 1857 by the British till 1880, all are the occasions where both Hindus and Muslims had a divergence of opinion.

During this period, Muslim got the impression that the new rulers are patronizing their sister community and discouraging Muslims in every field of life. In the post 1857 period Sir Sayyid Ahmad

Khan tried his best to realize the Muslims to accept the challenge of new situation by concentrating on achieving modern education. Muslims after the commendable efforts of Sir Sayyed Ahmad Khan started enrolling their children in the modern educational institutions. This became possible only when the gap between Muslims and the British reduced largely due to the efforts of the Sir Sayyed. The political awareness is one of the offshoots of modern education and thus Muslims started thinking in terms of community feelings. The formation of Muslim League in 1906 was a step in this direction. The stress on separate identity and Muslim consciousness of the 17th and 18th centuries had now transformed into efforts for the protection and safeguard of Muslims' interests in the British rule. These feelings were communicated to the British masters in 1906 and got a sympathetic response from the viceroy during their meeting in Simla in October 1906. This move of the Muslims was dramatized by their sister community who accredited all such activities to the British administration (Ambedkar, 1976).⁹ Muslims tried their best to convince the sister community about their separatism and finally succeeded in getting the consent of Congress in the Lucknow Pact in 1916. However, this unionism lasted for a short period and soon both Congress and Muslim League parted their ways, when Congress refused to incorporate the demands of Muslims in the Nehru Report in 1928. Throughout the period from 1880 to 1940 the Muslim struggle in the beginning was for the acceptance of Muslims as a separate entity and in the later stage for recognition as a political entity in the affairs of Indo-Pak sub-continent. On the other hand, Hindus and Congress got the impression that the Muslims and Muslim League struggle is primarily a project of the British imperialists and thus resorted to resist it by every means. When the Muslims finally convinced that their demands are not met by Congress, they resorted to another option i.e. division of India and demand for a separate homeland.

The idea of the division was not new; it goes back to the 19th century. The idea was floated by all the three actors i.e. British, Hindus and Muslims (Pirzada, 1970; Afzal, 1979,). Muslims did not give any attention to the idea of partition till they practically saw the rule of the Congress (1937-39) in 7 out of 11 provinces. Whatever exaggeration is made by the opponents of Congress, but it is also fact that Congress failed to realise the Muslims that the Congress rule was above any communal feelings. It is ironic that Indian National Congress always denounced communal politics, but they failed to realise millions of their fellow countrymen i.e. the Muslims about their non-communal posture in the elections of 1946. The dialectic process culminated on the day when Nehru expressed his view about the acceptance of Cabinet Mission Plan (1946) but declared that they will be free to amend the provisions when they meet in the legislative assembly. Quaid-i-Azam, who emerged as leader of the Muslims, once accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan (thus virtually withdrew from the demand of division of India) again pushed by Nehru to reiterate their demand of Pakistan as the only solution of the Indian problem.

Thus, the centuries old Hindu-Muslim differences, transformed into political in the 19th and 20th centuries, are responsible for the creation of Pakistan. The decision of the partition of India and the establishment of a separate homeland was taken on the universally accepted principle of people being the final decision makers. The Muslims gave their verdict in 1945-46 elections that nothing less than Pakistan comprised the Muslim majority areas of the Indo-Pak Subcontinent is acceptable to

⁹A counter Muslim perspective on the issue along with the Congress view is given and analysed by Hamid. See for details (Hamid, 1971).

them. The actual power i.e. British and the potential power i.e. the Congress had no option but to accept this verdict and thus Pakistan came into being on August 14, 1947.

Conclusion

The case of the creation of Pakistan is exceptional in the sense that first it was opposed in 1940s and then the rationality of the decision in favour of Pakistan in 1947 was contested inside and outside Pakistan despite the claims of accepting democracy as a universal value. The establishment of new state for the Muslims in South Asia was defended well by the proponents. However, the case needs new energy and dynamism to uphold the decision of the Muslims in 1947 with arguments well-suited to the new socio-political and geo-strategic considerations in the 21st century. It is a challenge of the time and it should be responded to tie up to the past struggle of the Muslims of South Asia on one hand and on the other to defend the case of Pakistan with arguments not abhorring to the new generation of Pakistan particularly those getting education in the elite educational institutions. A constant interaction with the new generation, their doubts, aspiration, hopes and fears regarding their homeland should not only be valued sympathetically but should also be addressed in a language, dictum and terminology plausible to them. It is argued that the case of Pakistan should be defended through the political landscape of South Asia in 1940s but not ignoring its implication with the present-day Pakistan.

References

- Afzal, R. (ed.). (1979). *The Case for Pakistan*. Islamabad: *National Commission on Historical and Cultural Research*.
- Ahmad, J. (n.d.). *Early Phase of Muslim Political Struggle*. Lahore: Publishers United.
- Ambedkar, B. R. (1976). *Pakistan or the Partition of India*. Lahore: Book Trader.
- Azad, M.A.Z. (1988). *India Wins Freedom*. Madras: Orient Longman Limited.
- Burki, R. N. (1977). *The History of Political Thought: A Short Introduction* London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd.
- Faruqi, Z. (1980). *The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan*. Lahore: Progressive Books.
- Hamid, A. (1971). *Muslim Separatism in India*. Lahore: Oxford University Press.
- Hayat, S. (1998). *Aspects of the Pakistan Movement*. Islamabad: *National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research*.
- Islahi, M.A.A. (1976). *Da'wat-i-Din awr Uska Tariqa-i-kar (Call to Islam and the mode of preaching)* (3rd Ed.). Lahore: Markazi Anjuman-i-Khuddam-al-Qu'ran.
- Pirzada, S. S. (1970). *Foundations of Pakistan (vol. ii)*. Karachi: National Publishing House Ltd.
- Qureshi, I. H. (1995). 'The Foundations of Pakistani Culture'. V. Grover and R. Arora (eds.), *Political System of Pakistan* (vol. 4, pp. 499-508). Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.
- Rauf, A. (2008). Muslim League and the Question of "Reforms" in the North West Frontier Province (1909-1932). *Pakistan Perspectives*, Vol.13, No.1, pp.71-72.
- Sayeed, K. B. (1978). *Pakistan: The Formative Phase, 1857-1948*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Seervai, H.M. (2005). *Partition of India Legend and Reality*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Singh, J. (2009). *Jinnah: India-Partition-Independence*. New Delhi: Rupa and Co.
- Talha, N. (2000). *Economic factors in the making of Pakistan (1921-1947)*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Received: Jan 2, 2019

Revisions Received: Dec 14, 2019