CHAPTER 1

THE INDIAN YEARS: 1897-1930

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, in a small village called Balachaur, situated in the Tahsil of Garhshankar in district Hoshiarpur in the Punjab[1], lived a small landholder named Haji Shah Muhammad. He belonged to the Gujjar caste or *qawm*[2], but we do not know for how long his forefathers had made it their abode. For at least three generations, however, the family had been engaged in free-hold farming. Shah Muhammad was the only son of his father, and his father was the only son of his father. Farmers by heritage and profession, they tilled the land themselves and rarely visited the outside world.[3]

Shah Muhammad was a man of modest means[4], and the family enjoyed the conveniences and comforts of a middle-class village life. From the honorific placed before his name, it appears that he had performed the religious duty of pilgrimage to Mecca. He was deeply religious, regardful of the rites of his creed, a man of principle, of upright character and good reputation. His spiritual and worldly outlook was broader than one would expect in a person of his humble origin and conservative environment.

Shah Muhammad married twice. From his first wife he had two daughters, but no son. As is not uncommon among Indians, particularly in the rural areas where a son is not only a great help in the field but also indispensable for carrying on the family's hereditary profession and position, the hope of a male issue persuaded him to knot a new nuptial tie. It is reported that the first wife herself had suggested that he contract a second marriage; again, not an unheard of sacrifice in India. The new union produced two sons and one daughter.[5] The elder son was named Rahmat Ali, the younger Muhammad Ali, the daughter died young. The second wife died soon after giving birth to the girl, and the two brothers were brought up by their stepmother. This woman, the first wife, lavi-

shed so much affection and care on the boys that it was several years later that they discovered their real relationship. She was particularly devoted to Rahmat Ali, and he to her. He also loved his two stepsisters as if they were born of his own mother; they were equally attached to him. Later, when he moved to Lahore and settled down there, whenever he visited the village, which happened quite often, his first call was at the houses of the stepsisters (who were by now married and had their own households) where he spent some time before going to his father's residence. The stepmother died when Rahmat Ali was studying at Islamia College, Lahore, that is, sometime between 1912 and 1918. Shah Muhammad, whom Rahmat Ali always addressed as *Mianji*, passed away when Rahmat Ali was in England, which must have been after October 1930[6]

Birth and Education

Rahmat Ali was born in Balachaur on 16 November 1897[7], and spent his early years in the village. As a baby he was cared for by two mothers and two loving sisters. When his real mother breathed her last he was too young to realize the loss, and the generous affection of the other mother and the sisters kept his emotional life on an even keel. He played with friends and neighbours of his age, roamed the lanes and the fields, and the years passed over him as they did over all village boys.

His spiritual fibre was strengthened early by the poised rectitude of his father and the religious *milieu* of the household. He was scarcely three years old when Shah Muhammad made it a practice to take him to the village mosque at prayer-hours five times a day. With morning sleep still not vanquished by wakefulness in his young, large eyes, he left the repose and warmth of the bed he shared with his stepmother or one of the sisters, washed himself and trudged to the little mosque hand-in-hand with his father. Of course he did not follow what the *imam* recited, but he stood by the side of his father and imitated him in all the required movements of standing, bowing, prostrating and squatting. This precocious training drilled into him the virtues of early rising, punctuality, alacrity, briskness, regularity and discipline. All his life he prayed with clock-like precision, and with a devotion which neither Punjabi summers nor English winters could weaken.

As soon as he was able to read he began to study and recite the *Quran*, tutored at home by a teacher named Abda. After the age of six, he continued his religious studies under the guidance and supervision of one Sayyid Tab' Husain.[8]

A story is told about a *dervish* forecasting a great future for Rahmat Ali when he was still a child. He was five or six years old when a mendicant wandered into the village and stopped at Shah Muhammad's house. As is usual on such occasions, the host made the visitor sit on a cot, offered him a bowl of milk, and sat next to him talking and asking questions. Rahmat Ali was sitting beside his father, and the holy man seemed to give as much attention to the talk and the drink as to the demeanour and movements of the young boy who sat sedately, looking at the guest and his father by turns. After observing the child for some time, the *faqir* said to Shah Muhammad, "Shahji, your child will become famous one day. He is full of potentialities." Then he addressed some words of wise counsel to Rahmat Ali: "My son, one day you will be a big man. Make it a habit to sit among the elders and to listen attentively to their words." Soon the itinerant got up, thanked Shah Muhammad for his hospitality, placed his hand on Rahmat Ali's head as a gesture of affection and prayer for him and walked away.[9]

In all ages and in widely separated parts of the world such stories have been recorded about favourite heroes, most often long after the event. Perhaps too much credence should not be put into the one reported here, although it might well have come to pass.

Rahmat Ali's schooling could not be completed in Balachaur. The village boasted only a primary school, and once he had passed out of this, he had to go to a small town in the neighbourhood, Rahon, which had a middle school. After taking his Anglo-vernacular middle school certificate from the Municipal Board Middle School of Rahon, probably in 1910, he was forced to make an important decision. Hardly any one in the village had gone further than the eighth standard in his education; none in his family had even come so far. There were no facilities for higher instruction in the surrounding villages and towns. Another boy might have been content with what he had already done and taken willingly to the plough under the watchful eye of his father. However, Rahmat Ali had shown an extraordinary devotion to his studies, and he was very keen on continuing with his schooling. Probably

he was born with an ambition, and wanted to achieve more than the bumpkins of Balachaur. Ordinarily, a farmer-father of Shah Muhammad's means and upbringing would have been justified in telling his son that enough was enough, and that he was now needed in the fields. However, it speaks much for his own love of learning and his desire to see his son make a mark in the world that he not only encouraged Rahmat Ali to continue his studies but also agreed to finance them and, above all, to part from his favourite boy. So it was decided that the young seeker of knowledge should go to Jullundher, an important city and district headquarters several miles away from Balachaur and outside the boundaries of Hoshiarpur District. Though Rahmat Ali did not know it, this was to be the end of his village life. In future years, until his departure for England in 1930, he would often visit his father and his home and stay for a few days or weeks with the family; but he was destined to spend the rest of his life in distant places, almost exactly half of it in a very distant place indeed. However, that was yet in the womb of time.

In about 1910, since no firm dates are available for this period, he arrived at Jullundher city, enrolled himself at the Saindas Anglo-Sanskrit High School, and began to prepare himself for the matriculation examination–an important milestone in an Indian boy's academic career. He studied English, mathematics, history, geography, Persian and Urdu, and passed the Finals, which were then conducted by the University of the Punjab, in 1912.[10] We do not know which division the examiners gave him.

Here a general misunderstanding of dates ought to be cleared up. As in the case of his date of birth, so also in the matter of his college career, all Pakistani sources give wrong dates with incredible unanimity. Even those who claim to have been his contemporaries or class fellows at the college mislead us. Generally, he is said to have joined the college in 1914 and graduated in 1918 or 1919.[11]

The facts are as follows: He matriculated in 1912 and joined Islamia College, Lahore, the same year. He passed the intermediate examination in 1915, in the second division, with English, history, mathematics and Persian as his subjects of study. He took the B.A. degree from the same college in 1918, in the second division, reading English, economics and Persian. He won several prizes for high proficiency in "almost all the subjects". He was secretary of the College Debating Union, and also secretary and vice-president of

his tutorial group. He also served as secretary of the Punjab University Recruitment Committee for the Double Company, of the Our Day Fund Committee, and of the Inter-Collegiate Association, Lahore.[12]

In addition, as we are informed by one of his contemporaries, he was editor of the college magazine, *Crescent*. He lived in the hostel within the college campus on Railway Road, and throughout his stay occupied room No. 12 of the Rivaz Hostel.[13] According to another report, during his student days he used to call himself "Rahmat Ali Azad".[14] The "Azad" might have been a *takhallus* (an additional name adopted by poets and generally brought into the last verse of a *ghazal*) when Rahmat Ali tried his hand at versifying, as so many Indian Muslim undergradutes have done in their early youth. Or, he might have used this as a *nom de plume* while contributing to certain Urdu newspapers and journals during his college days (of this more later). Or, he might have added the word (which means "free") simply as a gesture of concession to the nationalist sentiment which was then sweeping over the Indian educated class. In any case, this temporary addition to his name has no significance. No other report mentions it, and Rahmat Ali himself never referred to it. What we are told by him is that in 1915 he founded the Bazm-i-Shibli in the college and made some very important statements in his inaugural address before it. We will look at this in detail when we come to discuss his ideas.

During his student days, either to supplement his income or to train his pen, he worked as a journalist. He is said to have been a part-time writer on the staff of the *Paisa Akhbar*, earning Rs. 25-30 per month. But even this did not suffice to meet his expenses, and he had to suspend his studies "several times".[15] If this report is true, it explains why he spent six years to cover a four-year course. However, no other source corroborates the fact of his having worked for this particular paper.

What is generally known, and was later confirmed by Rahmat Ali himself, is that for some time he served as assistant editor of *Kashmir*, a well-known paper of that time founded and edited by Munshi Muhammad Din Fauq Kashmiri.[16] For it he wrote several articles on Indian history and politics, arguing that northern or north-western India was the homeland of the Muslims and that they had the right to rule over it.[17] One of these articles cost him his job. Entitled "Maghrib ky Korana Taqlid" (Blind Imitation of

the West), it must have been very critical of the British or their rule (or "seditious" in the colonial and post-colonial parlance), because the Deputy Commissioner of Lahore, Mr. Tollinton, summoned Fauq to his office, reprimanded him for publishing subversive matter, and warned him that a repetition of such "disloyalty" would incur greater punishment. The editor promised to behave in future, returned to his office, and sacked Rahmat Ali.[18]

Making His Mark

After taking his degree in 1918 Rahmat Ali lived in Lahore up to 1930. Beyond this fact, much is unclear. We have a rough idea of the various things he did, but the dates and the order in which he did them are uncertain. On a few aspects of his life during this period we have some documentary evidence; on most others there is some second-hand information, much misinformation and a plethora of contradictory reports. The bits and pieces of information we can gather from these variegated sources only provide a series of glimpses into these years.

It appears that after graduating Rahmat Ali wanted to study law, but for some reason (possibly his limited funds) he could not join the law college immediately. Postponing his plans, he looked around for a likely and congenial opening and discovered that a tutorship was vacant at the Aitchison College, a public school of Lahore specially established by the British for the education of the sons of the rulers and chiefs of the province, and commonly known as the Chiefs' College. He went to the principal of the Islamia College, Henry Martyn, told him of the job at the Aitchison College, and solicited his help. Martyn wrote out a letter of recommendation and sent Rahmat Ali with it to the principal of Aitchison College. The latter interviewed him, found him satisfactory, and appointed him tutor to the son of the Nawab of Bahawalpur. A year later, in 1919, the Bahawalpur princeling left for England and Rahmat Ali was asked to take in hand the sons of the Mazari family.[19] This association proved a turning point in his life and ultimately enabled him to fulfil his great desire to go to England for studies.

Rahmat Ali remained on the staff of the Chiefs' College from 1918 to 1923.[20] It is not known why he left the job. Perhaps he had saved enough money to go to the law college, or his contact

with the Mazaris bade fair to bear more fruit.

Definite information on the dates of his joining and leaving the Punjab University Law College are not available. In the admission form preserved at Emmanuel College, he only wrote "studied Law in the Punjab University College for two years, but without taking the final degree owing to illness". Since he served the Nawab of Mazari as his legal adviser from 1923 to 1930[21], it is probable that he joined the law college either in 1920 or in 1921, attending classes concurrently with his tutorship at the Chiefs' College; or in 1923 on his resignation from the Chiefs' College, thus reading law and helping the Mazari chief simultaneously. The only report we have says that he was in the law college in 1923.[22] At the law college, his teachers included Zafrulla Khan, later Foreign Minister of Pakistan and a judge of the International Court of Justice, Muhammad Munir, later Chief Justice of Pakistan, Mukand Lal Puri, and C.L. Anand–a brilliant array of jurists for any young man anxious to learn and able to absorb what he heard.

It appears that it was at some time before December 1923 that Rahmat Ali was appointed private secretary to Sardar Mir Dost Muhammad Khan, the Mazari *tamundar*, of Rojhan, Dera Ghazi Khan District of the Punjab, and the successor of Nawab Sir Bahram Khan Mazari.[23] While he was tutoring the Mazari children at the Aitchison College, Bahram Khan died. As he had left no issue, his property was put into the care of a court of wards while several of his relatives and descendants began a long, drawn-out process of litigation for the ownership of the property and the inheritance of the title of Chieftainship of the clan. One of the Mazari boys, who had left the college after having been coached by Rahmat Ali and had evidently been impressed by his abilities and sincerity, told Dost Muhammad Khan about him. After making some inquiries and probably interviewing the young graduate, Dost Muhammad asked Rahmat Ali to act as the family's authorized representative in Lahore, in order to look after its interests in the various law courts. A little later he was promoted to the rank of private secretary, with headquarters in Lahore, at a good salary and with all expenses paid.[24] It may be inferred from this that Rahmat Ali gave up his Chiefs' College appointment and joined the law college on the encouragement or even the instructions of Dost Muhammad Khan. Obviously, the Mazaris needed somebody who knew law, and a mere graduate in economics and Persian would not

have served their purpose. Whatever the case may be, this offer established close, almost intimate, links between the young and ambitious Rahmat Ali and an influential and wealthy branch of Punjabi aristocracy. The contact elevated his social status, improved his financial position, put him in touch with several prominent persons of the province, and ultimately smoothed his way to Cambridge. The case was finally settled towards the end of 1929, probably in December, in favour of Dost Muhammad Khan, who now inherited most of the agricultural lands and other property left by Bahram Khan and was officially recognized as the leader of the Mazari clan with the title of Nawab.[25]

Thus the available evidence shows that Rahmat Ali taught at the Aitchison College from 1918 to 1923, attended the law college (probably) from 1923 to 1925, and worked as Mir Dost Muhammad's private secretary, legal adviser and general factotum from 1923 to 1929 or early 1930.

Life in Lahore

What sort of life did Rahmat Ali lead in Lahore? From a few items in his private papers and interviews with his contemporaries it is possible to draw a picture, however incomplete, of those days.

He lived at various places between 1912 and 1930. Between 1912 and 1918 when he was studying at Islamia College he stayed in its hall of residence called the Rivaz Hostel.[26] During the five years of tutorship at Aitchison College, 1918-1923, he was provided with official accommodation by the college. On entering the service of the Mazaris he shifted to a house on Rattan Chand Road located between Bharat Building proper and the Mai Lado Mosque. It formed a part of the Bharat Building, which was the property of the Bharat Insurance Company (since 1947 it has been occupied by *The Pakistan Times* newspaper). The two-storeyed house cost him Rs. 75 in rent and a fixed water tax of Rs. 3-12-0 monthly.[27] The rent stayed unchanged until he left for England. Most payments were made every month, although occasionally he paid two months' rent together, and at least on one occasion he cleared five months' arrears.[28] His electricity supply bill ranged between Rs. 6-8-0 and Rs. 20. The bills of 1927-30 (the only available to us) indicate that he went away from Lahore during the summer

months: the charges then are appreciably lower, although with fans working in the hot season they should have been higher. This seems to confirm the report that he spent a part of the summer season in Simla in attendance on Mir Dost Muhammad Khan who usually went there to avoid the extreme heat of Dera Ghazi Khan.[29] He spent a good part of his last years at Lahore in one of the bungalows, known as Ayub Khan ky Kothian, on Multan Road opposite the Poonch House. This move was ordered by Mir Dost Muhammad Khan, presumably because the Mir stayed somewhere nearby on his visits to Lahore and wanted Rahmat Ali within quick call.

We have no certain information on Rahmat Ali's income in those years. The tutorship at Chiefs' College brought in a very modest salary, although the princelings under his charge would almost certainly have supplemented it with occasional allowances and gifts. Once he joined the service of the Mazaris his salary was fixed at Rs. 700 a month, a handsome amount in those days. In addition, he was paid house rent (and later provided with a free bungalow) and all travelling and other expenses. Occasionally, he earned extra money by marking examination scripts[30] and doing some legal job for a landlord.[31] In 1928 he inherited £ 80 from an uncle of his, Mawla Bakhsh, who had died in Australia.[32] He had invested some money in the Batala Co-operative Union, which was earning him a dividend.[33] There may have been otner sources of income of which we are unaware. He was well known to a number of Punjabi landlords and members of the minor aristocracy, and it could have been quite in order if they had entrusted him from time to time with missions concerning litigation, reconciliation or out-of-court agreements. The feudal class was addicted to suing relatives and neighbouring landlords with a frequency which was as ruinous to itself as it was gainful to lawyers, legal advisers, touts and (corrupt) judges and magistrates. Thus it can be safely assumed that from 1923 onwards Rahmat Ali enjoyed the means of leading a respectable, even well-off, existence.

The village lad of a modest background had made excellent use of his native ability and the generous opportunities offered by time and tide. The journey from a Balachaur homestead to a free bungalow on Multan Road in Lahore was made without the help of high connections, official patronage or underhand dealings. He knew full well that he would have to fight every mile in his mar-

ches, but he never left the idea of failure lodge in his mind. He had the inborn ambition to be somebody, the perseverance to work for this goal, the insight to distinguish between a *cul-de-sac* and a highway, the charm and bearing to cultivate people who were his social superiors and the integrity and mettle to compel them to treat him as an equal, even to respect him, as well as the good fortune to start his career at an institution which immediately brought him into close contact with the richest and most powerful sector of the native population. The Chiefs' College must have employed a few hundred young tutors since its foundation, but we know of only one who wrote his name on the page of history.

Rahmat Ali was a deeply religious man and practised the tenets of his creed with regularity and a devotion rare among young men. He believed in the sovereignty of moral law and in the shining certainty of virtue. Nevertheless, he was neither a puritan nor an ascetic. In accordance with the teachings of Islam, he enjoyed the good things of life and thanked his Creator for them. Self-abnegation was neither necessary nor to his taste. He lived well, moved in polite society, entertained his visitors and friends with good food and impeccable manners, and helped his family and friends financially and in other ways. His lifestyle was that of an upper middle-class bachelor who spends well and lends money, but also knows the value of money. He became a member of the Lahore Association Club,[34] and made expensive purchases: a new Humber bicycle, an eighteen-carat gold wristwatch, biscuits, cigarettes, and other good things of life.[35]

His house at Bharat Building was not large but was well appointed. The furniture was elegant and comfortable. The sitting room was often crowded with visitors from all walks of life: a small-time politician, a rich landholder, a prominent journalist, a successful lawyer, a villager clad in *khaddar* from Balachaur, an old schoolmate from Jullundher, and so on. He knew no social distinctions and practised no class discrimination. He was fond of intellectual company in which he could discuss politics and Islam and everything that went on in Lahore, but he was equally pleased to receive and entertain an illiterate relative or fellow-villager bringing the tidings and gossip of his home, of the *milieu* so familiar and yet so far away in time and space, of the rustic, starry-eyed friends of his childhood with whom he had played the little innocent games on the village common, who had given him so much

companionship and affection and whom he treasured in his memory, of his father who was getting on in years and suffering from ill health, of his brother who was growing up and filling out into a sturdy peasant and keeping the ancestral acres in blossom, of his loving and lovable sisters in whose arms he had tasted the joy of kings and who were now married and had their own children to keep those arms warm and occupied, and of other folk in Balachaur who had seen him as a baby and a child and a youth and then lost him to the glamour and tumult of the metropolis, but had not forgotten him.

The house was maintained by three servants, including a cook, Nazar Muhammad, who was a former domestic of the Nawab of Kunjpura. This was a proof of Rahmat Ali's discriminating taste in food. At the table he preferred quality to quantity and served his guests according to his own standard. He was very fond of fruits and of a *pan* (betel leaf) after the meal, although sometimes he had more of it during the day. He smoked cigarettes while away from the house, and a *pechwan* hubble-bubble at home. The *huqqa* was so dear to him that in the evening when he visited Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan, his closest friend in Lahore, he had it carried by a servant to Dr. Khan's residence on McLeod Road. On most evenings he dined there, often bringing his own cooked food. Almost obsessed with personal cleanliness, he made it a practice to brush his teeth after every meal. When he was eating out or at a friend's place he carried his brush and toothpaste in his pocket and used them wherever he was having a meal.

He did not like to use public transport and kept a buggy (a smart, well-fitted carriage drawn by one horse and more comfortable than a victoria) for his private use. Silent films, then a novelty in Lahore, did not interest him, but he liked to visit the theatres. In the late 1920's, some Lahore theatre houses performed plays based on Abdul Halim Sharar's historical and social novels, and the role of the hero who sang out his dialogue was often given to one Master Rahmat, who was the idol of the theatre-going public. The actor came from Jullundher, which was another link between him and Rahmat Ali. The two became intimate friends, and whenever Master Rahmat was appearing in a play he insisted that Rahmat Ali should attend and sent him a dozen free passes so that he could come in company. It seems that the two Rahmats developed a relationship that approached genuine brotherliness.

Rahmat Ali was fond of reading and relished the companionship of the learned and the well-informed. The scholarly taste, the sedate circle in which he moved, the disciplined life that his father had instilled into him, the knowledge that he was now spending much of his time with people alien to his origin and background, the feeling that he ought to justify the trust and esteem placed in him by people senior in age and superior in public standing–all this brought to his character a measure of sobriety, prudence, astuteness, composure and imperturbability beyond his age. Generally he behaved with a seriousness in advance of his generation. Outside the small circle of his close friends, he rarely laughed aloud or told funny jokes. The hint of a smile and a glint in the eyes did work for guffaws and loud talk. He spoke when it was necessary or when a direct question was asked. He remained quiet but gave his visitors the impression of a keen interest in their problems and in the subject being discussed. It is a matter of some wonder that despite such a deportment he had a surprisingly large number of acquaintances, visitors, guests and other people of undefined relationship who thronged around him. The secret lay in his sincerity and in the self-sacrificing willingness with which he accompanied anyone with a difficulty or a problem to someone who could be helpful for Rahmat Ali's sake. This wide circle included a variety of people: high court judges, lawyers, literary figures, journalists, politicians, prominent public men, civil servants of the Punjab secretariat, and many villagers from Hoshiarpur and Jullundher.

Thanks to his tutorial assignment at the Aitchison College and the doors that had opened to him by his service with the Mazaris, his reputation as a sane counsellor and a dependable consultant spread far and near. More and more Muslim landholders and chief ministers and administrators of native states came to him for advice–sometimes even in their personal and family affairs. Malik Muhammad Khan, who knew Rahmat Ali well from 1925 onwards, met him every week and for some time lived with him, gives an incomplete list of such dignitaries which reads like a roll-call from the Punjab *Who's Who* of those years: Major Mawlawi Shamsuddin, Prime Minister of Bahawalpur; Nawab Liaquat Hayat, Prime Minister of Patiala; Diwan Abdul Hamid of Kapurthala; Nawab Sir Umar Hayat Tiwana of Sargodha; Chaudhri Ghulam Abbas of Kashmir; Mian Ahmad Yar Khan Daultana, Sayyid

Wilayet Husain Gilani and Nawab Ashiq Husain Qureshi of Multan; Nawab Muhammad Hayat Noon and Malik Sherbaz Khan Awan of Sargodha; Sardar Husain Shah Rajuya of Jhang; Nawab Sir Muhammad Nawaz Khan of Campbellpur; Raja Ghazanfar Ali of Jhelum; Nawab Fazal Ali of Gujerat; Shaikh Muhammad Din of Gujranwala; Sir Shahabuddin of Sialkot; Mian Abdul Hayee of Ludhiana; Nawab Mamdot of Firozepur; Sardar Jamal Khan Leghari of Dera Ghazi Khan; Muzaffar Khan Bhachar of Mianwali; Sir Maratab Ali and Sardar Habibullah of Lahore. And, what is important, these proud patricians needed Rahmat Ali badly enough to come to his relatively modest house, sometimes waiting for him if he was not in, to pour out to him their worries and ambitions and problems and thanks. These were people for whom no flattery was too fulsome and no homage too servile. They believed in their rights and in their virtuous faith in the exaction of those rights. They were all men of substantial public standing and even greater material riches. Rahmat Ali neither attached himself to their retinue, nor danced attendance upon them, nor wrote flattering letters to them, nor begged any assistance. It was they who solicited his help. In storming this citadel of privilege without stooping, Rahmat Ali had vanquished the greatest handicap of life.

Then there was an inner circle of close friends before whom Rahmat Ali opened his heart, gossipped, laughed aloud, told amusing stories, talked long and well, disclosed his ambitions and plans, expressed his opinions and ideas with abandon, and gave rein to his irrepressible sense of humour–in short, behaved like a normal human being sitting among his intimates. This select company consisted of Chaudhri Shahabuddin, Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan, Malik Ghulam Muhammad of Kalabagh, Muhammad Din Tasir, Khwaja Dil Muhammad, Sardar Diwan Singh Maftun, Master Rahmat, Nawab Muzaffar Khan and Malik Zaman Mehdi.

A man is known by his friends, and a few words about this group will tell us a little more about Rahmat Ali's inclinations, tastes and sensibilities. Shahabuddin was a lawyer, landholder, legislator, a Punjabi poet, and the owner of one of the finest private libraries in India. A tall, dark-complexioned man with the size and looks of a peasant, he combined a native shrewdness with much worldly wisdom. He extended a helping hand to several young legal practitioners of promise, Zafrulla Khan being one of

them, did a great deal to protect the interest of Punjabi Muslim agriculturists, ended up as the Speaker of the Punjab Legislative Assembly, translated Shakespeare into Punjabi verse, and read Waris Shah's *Hir*, the greatest Punjabi classic, every morning as if it were the scriptures. Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan was a professor of medicine at King Edward's Medical College, the unadvertised patron of many in need, a healthy, fair-complexioned Pathan from Jullundher who had won the respect of the citizens of Lahore by his medical skill, public service and integrity of character. When Rahmat Ali was teaching at Chiefs' College and his wards fell ill, he used to call in Dr. Khan. This professional relationship soon blossomed into a close freindship. When Rahmat Ali left the college and began to live in Bharat Building, they became almost neighbours. Rahmat Ali made it a practice to eat with him every evening at the latter's residence at 3 McLeod Road, which was within walking distance. Dr. Khan decided to buy his first motor car because Rahmat Ali insisted on it. Once or twice a week Rahmat Ali collected Dr. Khan's children in the afternoon and drove them in his carriage to the Kailash Restaurant (near Karnal Boot House) in Anarkali or to the famous Swiss establishment, the Lorang's on the Mall, and gave them a treat of pastries, cakes and ice cream. In temperament and general outlook on life no two persons could be more different than were Rahmat Ali and Dr. Khan. However, as Plato remarked about marriages, sometimes the opposites mix better than the similars. There must have been some mystic, invisible attraction that kept this friendship on an even keel even when long years of separation intervened. There is hardly any doubt that at this time Dr. Khan was Rahmat Ali's best friend. When Rahmat Ali left for Cambridge it was Dr. Khan whom he trusted with a very large amount of money on the income of which he lived for so many years in England. According to Dr. Khan's son, when these funds were exhausted, Dr. Khan supported Rahmat Ali from his own pocket. When Rahmat Ali came to Lahore in 1948, he stayed at Dr. Khan's house, and was attended by his domestic staff even after the host had gone away to the hills. In his will Rahmat Ali made Dr. Khan one of his executors (the other being his brother, Muhammad Ali) and bequeathed to him the copyright of all his writings.

The other friends can be mentioned more quickly. Malik Ghulam Muhammad was the general manager of the estate of the

Nawab of Kalabagh. Through this connection he knew all the bigwigs of the province and exerted some influence on provincial, especially Muslim, politics. Tasir was an academic, taught English literature, and wrote Urdu poetry. Dil Muhammad was professor of mathematics at the Islamia College and one whole generation of Punjabi high school students was brought up on his textbooks on arithmetic, algebra and geometry; he was also a minor Urdu poet. Diwan Singh Maftun was a teacher and scholar of Punjabi, a journalist, a poet, and an important member of the Lahore literary brotherhood. Master Rahmat has already been mentioned. Nawab Muzaffar Khan was a civil servant of outstanding ability and loyalty, one of the founders of the Unionist Party and on intimate terms with the British administrators of the province. Zaman Mehdi was a Punjab Civil Service official who retired as a deputy commissioner; sometimes he annoyed his British and Hindu colleagues and superiors by going out of his way to help the Muslims.

How Rahmat Ali managed to make friends with public men through his political shrewdness is well demonstrated by his success in getting Shahabuddin elected to the Punjab legislature in 1926. We must keep in mind that at this time he was only a twenty-nine year old ex-tutor of Chiefs' College with no political training and no proficiency in calculating worldly chances. The province was preparing itself for the general election and there was much intrigue, rivalry and jealousy among the Muslim land-holding candidates. One day Shahabuddin came to visit Rahmat Ali and the young man noticed his friend's ill humour and low spirits. At first he joked with him about his dumps, saying, "Why so sad a visage? Are you trying to cry, or is that your natural expression?" Shahabuddin replied with rare seriousness that it was not a matter for ragging and that he was in no mood for jokes. Hearing these sombre words, Rahmat Ali asked what had gone wrong. Then Shahabuddin related his story. The election was approaching and he wanted to contest it from Sialkot where a major portion of his *baradari* lived. His people had asked him to stand from there, had promised him all their support and told him not to worry about funds. Everything had been going well, but then Chaudhri Zafrulla Khan had decided to oppose him. The situation was now serious. Zafrulla, too, had the backing of his *baradari* (who lived in Sialkot), and could, in addition, count on

the votes of all the Ahmadis in the city. This combination was bound to produce a majority for Zafrulla. "Now I am in a fix", he concluded. "If I withdraw from the election my people will be angry with me and my standing in the constituency will suffer. But if I fight, there is little chance of beating Zafrulla. Whatever I choose to do, failure and humiliation will be my lot. Well, that is the cause of my dejection. Do you understand now?"

When Shahabuddin stopped talking, Rahmat Ali asked just one question, "Do you insist on fighting from Sialkot, or do you want to get elected to the Assembly?" Shahabuddin, not understanding the drift of the inquiry, replied sharply, "Will you stop laughing at me, and tell me how I can avoid defeat?" Rahmat Ali explained a little. "I am not joking. My sympathies lie with you. I want to help. What I want to know is if you have any objection to getting elected from a constituency other than Sialkot. I want you to win the election without souring your relations with Zafrulla." Shahabuddin riposted, "It is in Sialkot that my name counts for something and it is there that most of my people live. Now that I have lost all hope in my own city, who is going to vote for me in another constituency? Do you want me to lose my deposit?" Rahmat Ali replied, "I can guarantee your success if you decide to stand from some other place. If you agree, I assure you that you will not have to spend anything on the election campaign." Shahabuddin laughed at the young man's naivete and rose to go. Rahmat Ali detained him and asked about the last date for sending in the papers. It so happened that the deadline fell on the following day. Rahmat Ali persuaded the sullen Chaudhri to leave for Hoshiarpur the same evening with him.

The two Chaudhris caught the last train from the Lahore station and arrived in Hoshiarpur the next morning. Immediately Rahmat Ali went into conclave with his friends and relatives. They told him that Shahabuddin's election from there was out of the question. He was a stranger, and each of the two candidates already in the field not only belonged to the place but was confident of victory. They promised that every Gujjar would vote for Shahabuddin if Rahmat Ali asked him to, but nobody else would, and the Sialkoti was fated to lose. Undeterred by such fell prognostications, Rahmat Ali forced Shahabuddin to lodge his papers with the election officer. Thus there came to be three candidates in the field. Rahmat Ali now contacted the opposition, and discovered

that the real brother of one of the local candidates had, a little while before, been found innocent of a serious murder charge by a court of law, mainly because of his own (Rahmat Ali's) efforts. Exploiting this obligation, he persuaded this candidate to withdraw in favour of Shahabuddin. Now only one man stood in the way. Rahmat Ali did not meet him. Instead he arranged for a big reception, invited all the influential persons of the constituency, and then introduced Shahabuddin to the audience as his brother and close friend, and said that it was his life's desire to get him elected from Hoshiarpur. His speech was charged with so much emotion and confidence that most of the assemblage declared their support for Shahabuddin. Sensing the change in public opinion, or at least in the opinion of those who mattered (there was no universal suffrage in 1926, and only the well-to-do could vote), the other candidate also withdrew from the contest. Thus it came to pass that in three days Rahmat Ali was able to get Shahabuddin, a total stranger to the voters of Hoshiarpur, elected unopposed to the legislature. Shahabuddin went wild with joy and swore eternal loyalty to Rahmat Ali.

Were the Punjab feudal aristocracy of that time given to write and leave behind some record of its life and activities, posterity would have heard much more of Rahmat Ali. However, there is little doubt that there must have been several such incidents in the public and private life of this class in which he played a momentous, sometimes crucial, role. The grateful recipients of these benefits paid their debt by accepting him as one of themselves. This was no less than a triumph for a person of his modest origins, especially in an age when the feudal lords erected high social fences, practised an icy arrogance, and were drunk with their proud sovereignty.

In spite of such a busy social life and a congenial circle of friends, some aspects of Rahmat Ali's existence remained a mystery even to those closest to him. One of his contemporaries who knew him since his Chiefs' College days and lived with him on the campus says that he had "a secretive private life of his own" from which his friends were excluded, and elaborates this by adding that it was often difficult to see him without a notice or an appointment. For one who never met Rahmat Ali it is hard to say what this means. If the report is true, two or three possibilities may be explored.

Was Rahmat Ali an introvert? Did he withdraw within himself? Well, most of us do so at times, and those who do not pay the price of not knowing themselves. Perhaps he liked to look inwards, into his soul, more often than the people around him. Perhaps the contrast, never far from his awareness, between his own origins, background and values and those of his social circle sometimes made him ponder over what he was doing and where he had arrived. He needed to look into the "flamed mirror" of introspection. His later contemporaries in Cambridge often spoke of his sensitivity. Possibly he was born sensitive. Only the sensitive, or the most unscrupulous, have high ambitions–it depends on the kind of ambition. His sensitiveness may explain his career. He wanted to educate himself more than any of his village boys had done. He wanted to be someone, to distinguish himself, to make a mark. An unfeeling human automaton is incapable of thinking or planning on these lines. He accepts what comes his way; he does not realize that he can be different if he tries. Exertion is the child of self-awareness. Those who have no ideals cannot labour for their achievement. And ideals are born only in sensitive minds and hearts. In this sense Rahmat Ali may be called an introvert, but not in the psychological jargon of today's fashion. Amidst his friends, at his family hearth, in his mad love for his sisters, in the simple joys of life, he was certainly not an introvert.

If his occasional reticence meant that he was slow to reveal emotions or opinions, this is easier to explain than his "introversion". Two facets of his life combined to produce this reserve. One was his early schooling in self-discipline, which had begun at the tender age of three with the regular rising at dawn and the carrying out of his father's commands without demur. The other was his sharp perception that circumstances and his wish to rise in life were compelling him to live in an alien society, whose values were not his own, whose ambitions were purely political or material, and whose urban mentality and standards clashed with his own rural simplicity and attachment to the fundamentals of life. In the pursuit of his ambition to save enough money to go abroad he had made a compromise with life. He would move and have his being among these foreign city people just so long as it was absolutely necessary, but not at the cost of losing his integrity. In the meantime, as far as possible, he would reserve his opinions for himself. He had come to believe in the inwardness and sanctity of

feeling.

This particular friend's complaint about the difficulty in meeting Rahmat Ali has an even simpler explanation. All reports speak of the great value he attached to time. Every busy man has this attitude towards the clock. Time is precious, it waits not for high or low, past moments are beyond recall or recapture—these may be platitudes and cliches, but they are also crystal truths. For one who wants to attain much, to live for something, to squeeze a throng of activities into the diurnal round, time is neither a metaphysical construction nor a sacred eternity, but a precious commodity. For such a man the torches of time burn fast. Given his multifarious duties and activities—connected with his service to the Mazaris, his obligations to his political acquaintances, his miscellaneous chores for his feudal clients and associates, his frequent visits to the village and to Jullundher, his prolific letter-writing, his regular theatre-going, and his social life—he dared not waste a moment on a useless visit or a stray meeting. The unforgiving time dictated its own imperatives. To read more than that into his punctuality is to misunderstand the man. All contemporary reports agree that he kept an open house, welcomed every visitor, entertained well and often, and accompanied the needy to wherever their problems could be solved. Punctuality is a great vitue, and rare in the Orient where time hangs heavy, life is often a burden, and all things are taken lightly. Rahmat Ali's respect for time was therefore an exceptional trait, setting him apart from his society which lived a life of resignation, patience, langour and placidity.

Another agreeable trait of Rahmat Ali's character was his love for children. During his visits to the village he cossetted and pampered the children of his sisters so mcuh that the women complained that he was spoiling them. His cousins and cousins' wives, in their letters to him, never omitted the smallest details about the appearances, frolicks and chatter of their babies and children. Yar Muhammad's sons still remember with pleasure the treats he gave them in the restaurants of Lahore. He had schooled himself not to forget the birthdays of his friends' children, and on the appointed happy morning a card and a present never failed to arrive. He was the most popular uncle of the new generation.

The affection and admiration with which his contemporaries recall him impart a charismatic dimension to his personality. All

sing his praises and speak of his grace, urbanity, refined tastes, imposing presence, consummate mien, and suave manners. He comported himself with distinction. Even his gestures were immaculate. Some mention the extraordinary luminosity of his eyes, clear windows opening into his soul. Even at this age he was exceptionally persuasive in conversation and impressive in discussion. People came under the spell of his influence as if by magic. (Later, those who came in touch with him at Cambridge said the same thing). With this natural advantage he combined an old-world dignity, a rare self-confidence (of the exceptional self-made man), and faultless courtesy to his interlocuters. His voice was mellow, well modulated in tone and pitch and of a fine texture. There was no trace of stridence or loud insistence. He spoke in soft syllables, in a gentle, conciliatory, quiet, fair manner. No one ever heard him ranting, declaiming or indulging in like theatricals. He was a brilliant conversationalist, with a fund of good stories to tell, the skill to summarize an argument or describe an incident, the courtesy and patience to be a good listener, and the courage and the presence of mind to repel a silly or rude remark with a quick, gentle riposte. (In later life an element of preaching crept into his talk).

In appearance he was tall and well proportioned, with a wide forehead, large, well-lit, moist eyes, and an intelligent brow. In complexion he was wheatish. About his moustaches and beard at this time there is some uncertainty. Some say he was clean shaven, and some report that he had big moustaches which curled at the extremities, some adding that he sported a short, elegant beard. We have no likeness of him of his Lahore years; it is possible that he gave an hirsute covering to his face to maintain a Muslim tradition or to add years and sobriety to his strikingly youthful visage (traditionally a beard commands respect and trust in the East). He was certainly without any beard or moustache in his early years in Cambridge, but in later life he did grow a beard, since photographs confirm both facts.

His dress followed the mode of the day among the educated, traditional-minded Punjabi Muslims. He wore *salwar*, *qamis* and a waistcoat, with a Turkish coat on top of them. His feet were encased in a pair of *gurgabis*, the forerunners of the modern moccasins or loafers. With this went a red *fez* cap with a black tassel for his head, and a delicate, slim, well-moulded stick in his hand. At home he wore the standard village male clothes: a *kurta* (long,

loose, collar-less shirt), and a *lacha* (a brightly-coloured, generally striped piece of ankle-length cloth tightened around the waist with a knot of the loose top ends); a most comfortable dress invented centuries ago to meet the requirements of the north Indian climate. Occasionally he donned an English suit with the essential refinements of a stiff collar and a well-knotted necktie.

Like most educated Indians, he was a polyglot. Punjabi was his mother tongue, and he used it the most in business and social communication. He spoke fluent Urdu and even wrote some poetry in it in earlier years. Almost all his available correspondence is in Urdu. The surprising thing is that his English was reasonably good by Indian standards. It was a rare achievement for a man educated in ordinary village and small-town schools and in the Islamia College (the poor Muslim's college, as it was and still is). He must have worked doubly hard to gain this proficiency. There was no help from the family. One can safely assume that his schoolmasters and college teachers spoke and wrote the usual, nondescript Indian English, and could not have been his model. He is said to have been fluent in the language, with an accent not as bad as his colleagues', and with a fair command of the right words and phrases. He was so anxious to make it even better that in Cambrige he arranged for private coaching.

Mr. Niaz Muhammad Khan summed up Rahmat Ali's person and life in eight eloquent words: *khush-posh, khush-kalam, khush-khor, khush-atwar, jahandidah, mudabbar, matin,* and *mardum-shanas*: well dressed, a joy to listen to, with a discriminating taste in cuisine, with impeccable manners and habits, experienced in the ways of the world, a wise counsellor, serious minded, and a judge of men. Dr. Rafique Khan, the eldest son of Yar Muhammad, described him in one pregnant word: *banka,* for which there is no equivalent in English; it means a paragon possessing such qualities as good looks, excellent taste in dress and food, polished manners, an admirable bearing, good breeding, and a magnetic personality. By all accounts his character was a right-angle, without any contours, rough edges or compromises.[36]

There were a few places which Rahmat Ali visited regularly from Lahore. Every month or every second month he went to Rojhan to meet Mir Dost Muhammad Khan, report the progress of the case, discuss the latest developments and problems, and receive instructions. In the summers, whenever the Mir went to

Simla, Rahmat Ali either accompanied him or visited him for prolonged stays. Occasionally he had to go to Quetta, where the court of wards controlled the Mazari estates. Sometimes he visited Kunjpura, in the Karnal District, whose Nawab was his legal client and a close friend.

Jullundher drew him like a magnet. He had spent two years of high school in the city and made several friends. Many from his clan had made it their home. Two of his favourite cousins, married to each other, were perhaps the main attraction: Rahmatullah, the drawing master at the Islamia High School, and his wife, Saida. The master was not used to writing letters (or they have not survived), but Saida wrote to Rahmat Ali with the respectful abandon of a younger sister. Her letters phrased in chaste Urdu, conveyed some family gossip, some news of her growing baby daughter, some requests for drawing paper and paint tubes, and much regret that he did not visit them as often as he promised and did not stay as long as they wished. Whenever he went to see them they welcomed him with joyous things in their hearts. Once Saida had borrowed some money from Rahmat Ali and he was pressing for repayment. The graceful language in which she expresses her inability to pay off the debt on demand and makes her apologies reflects the mind of a well-educated person and the heart of a beloved cousin who enjoys the privilege of intimate teasing and exercises it without going beyond the bounds of deferential esteem. To be with such a couple must have given Rahmat Ali much pleasure.

However, his most regular, frequent and joyful travel was to his home village. Though he lived in Lahore to make his career, he used to say, he was village born and village bred. The throb and thrill of the city was all right for a while, but the peace of mind that engulfed him in the village was beyond any price. This tranquillity was brought on by four things: nature, simplicity of life, upright people, and the lure of the family. His poetic heart yearned for the natural beauty of the wild, unspoiled place: the silver twilights and rose-pink dawns, the multi-complexioned sunset, the aroma of wet earth when dew fell generously on the furrowed field, the mild, balmy touch of the breeze, the mustard flowers dancing in the wind, and the trees and grass and rivulets and the song of the first bird at dawn. The air was keen and quick to the blood. The people of Balachaur were as simple as their surroundings. Free from the lure of power and the longing for gold, they

were content with the well-trodden ways of obligation, rectitude, honour and good faith. An uncomplicated creed ordered and enriched their austere lives. Poverty did not rob them of dignity. They respected themselves and walked erect. They were the real salt of the earth, thriving on their homely wisdom, coveting less, achieving more, glad in the even tenor of their existence.

Whenever he was free he came to Balachaur, sometimes without intimation. At home he received and took delight in the love that his family poured over him. What a change it was from the hectic, artificial, business-like life of Lahore! Here was his father, proudly pleased with his son's success, seeing his own lineaments in the features and contours of his first-born's face, asking a hundred questions about his life in that distant, alien, much-praised Lahore, and insisting with increasing vehemence that the not-so-young-man should now get married and settle down. There sat Muhammad Ali, the sturdy, tall peasant, clad in village coarse, a few years younger, uneducated, simple, living in a world of cattle and crops, so different in his life, and yet so dear to him, the blood of his blood, the son of his father, his only brother. Above all, there were the two older sisters, the mystic joy of whose presence and the sweet passionless content of whose propinquity were a perennial source of wonderment to him. They, too, loved him beyond reckoning. The gladness rose in them at the thought of seeing him once again. When he was away they missed him wih a pain in their hearts. When he was with them they feasted their eyes upon him. They were now leading independent, honourable lives in their own homes, almost matrons now, happy with their farmer husbands, happier still with their children, and yet still happier to see Rahmat Ali, their darling of many years, once a joyful weight in their arms, then a warm presence in their laps, then the fast (alas! too fast) growing boy who left them to study in other places, then the prosperous, man-looking brother who came from afar to see them, still their best loved, for them still the wide-eyed child whom they gave the love of a mother and all else that was theirs to give and his to ask, their idol and infatuation. He visited them before going to his father's place, and they were mighty proud of it. They and he laughed together like children, remembering old days, the beloved mother who was now with God, the neighbours and the friends, some dead, some alive, dreamlike memories of childhood, and now here were his own nephews and nieces, little and not-so-

little brats, as cheerful as larks, this boy slim as a pillar, that girl plump as a cushion, all climbing over this precious uncle, ruffling his hair, poking into his numerous pockets (how strange! *their* fathers had only one pocket), receiving their gifts and presents with seraphic glee and howls of gurgling laughter, kissing the giver of bounties, and once again clambering over him or crowding into his arms and lap, agog at the stories he told them of the big place where he lived. Not for a moment did he give his folk the slightest impression that he felt superior to his bucolic family or that he now belonged to a different world. He was one of them, made of this soil and earth of Balachaur. On every visit his father and his sisters asked him what he liked best for his meal, his favourite vegetable or his particular way of cooking it. That was the only time for Rahmat Ali to get angry. Why did they treat him as a special guest? A guest? He belonged here and to them. He will eat what they ate every day. No special dishes. No such inquiries. No insistence. Yet the ritual was played out every time he was among them. Inquiries, sharp words, more inquiries, simulated anger; insistence, I will eat what you cook; more insistence, real anger. Thus it went on around the homely hearth. The friendly debate, the loving quarrel. He enjoyed it all. These days and nights passed so quickly, so rapturously. He left amid sighs, sobs, cries and the parting warning that he must come again soon or they would be in a real rage.[37]

During these homecomings one subject became a regular point of debate and much sadness. Why didn't he marry? Why was he always procrastinating and offering silly excuses? Shah Muhammad, like all fathers, insisted on marriage. He wanted to see his eldest son settled in life, to welcome his bride into this house where he was born, and to play with his grandchildren. The sisters insisted even more and returned to the topic on the slightest opportunity. They did not want an old bachelor brother. They were pining for the happy day, for a beautiful *bhabi* (brother's wife), for their own nephews and nieces, whom they vowed to adore even more than they had adored Rahmat Ali when he was a baby. Rahmat Ali listened to all of this, realized what anguish he was causing to those dearest to him, felt particularly sorry for his ageing father, and yet, how could he marry? He had still to complete his education, to start his proper life. He said so, but the replies sounded hollow and evasive to the father and the sisters.

Sometimes they suspected that he was in love with some girl in Lahore and did not want to divulge this to his family lest they withhold their assent. The debate went on endlessly, but his answer was always the same: that he had a prior mission to perform. Probably it hurt Shah Muhammad very much. However, the son did not relent.[38] He never married, in India or outside.

Preparations for a Journey

In many ways Rahmat Ali's twelve years in Lahore were a preparation for going abroad. He did not marry or settle down or join a profession because he was waiting to collect enough money to finance his education in England. Probably this was what he called his "mission" in life.

By the late 'twenties his prospects had brightened. His salary from Mazari was high enough to guarantee some savings. He was also earning money from other sources. In 1926 or 1927 he made it known to his relatives and friends that he would be leaving India in the near future. (However, he could not, or did not, either because Mir Dost Muhammad did not let him go before his case was decided, or for some other reason). Master Amanat wrote to him on 1 September 1926, wishing him well in this venture, but advising him to spend another year in his current employment before proceeding abroad.[39] Apparently Rahmat Ali accepted this advice and stayed on in Lahore. In the November of the following year Saida asked him in a letter when he planned to go to Europe.[40] In early 1928 he began to make serious inquiries about the living and educational expenses in England, particularly at Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin.[41] In July 1929, when the Mazari case had yet not been decided, he got his passport made.[42] Once the case was over, the grateful Mazari chief paid Rahmat Ali a very large amount of money as an expression of appreciation for his services.[43] Now nothing stood between him and his lifelong ambition. He handed over the bulk of his savings and the Mazari largesse to Yar Muhammad for safe-keeping or investment, asking him to send to England whatever he needed from time to time for his fees and living expenses.[44]

But one hurdle still remained to be crossed. Shah Muhammad was extremely reluctant to let his eldest son go abroad. He had already made a great sacrifice in allowing him to go to Jullundher

as a schoolboy and then to Lahore as an undergraduate, and later to permit him to stay away in Lahore. We must understand the thinking and emotional links of a village farmer of the 1920's to realize what it meant for him to see Rahmat Ali leave India for a distant land. There were a lot of arguments and long debates in Balachaur, and it was after several months of contention that permission was granted.[45] Rahmat Ali's departure became an even more painful occasion because in 1930 Shah Muhammad fell ill and took long to recover.[46] In a way, he never recovered; he died one or two years after Rahmat Ali's departure from Lahore.[47]

The summer months of 1930 were spent in winding up his affairs in Lahore, making inquiries about the boat journey and life in England, saying farewell to his family and friends, and arranging for letters of introduction that would help him in finding a seat at Oxford or Cambridge. In July he wrote to the Delhi office of Messrs. Thomas Cook and Son, and received the firm's *Oriental Traveller's Gazette.*[48] Chaudhri Shahabuddin gave a grand party at the Lorang's restaurant on 25 October to bid him farewell and invited all his friends.[49]

With the connections cultivated by him in Lahore during more than ten years, Rahmat Ali did not find it difficult to get his prominent Punjabi friends to write on his behalf to men of influence in England. Nawab Muhammad Nawaz Khan of Kot Fateh Khan gave him a letter for John Coatman who now lived in Oxford.[50] Shahabuddin, who was at this time President of the Punjab Legislative Council, wrote to Sir Denys Bray of the India Office,[51] and to Sir Atul Chandra Chatterjee, the Indian High Commissioner in London.[52] Sir Alexander Wilson, principal of the Islamia College, Lahore, gave him a handsome testimonial.[53] Armed with such warm and powerful recommendations, Rahmat Ali left for England on 30 or 31 October 1930.[54]

When his train steamed out of the Lahore railway station, who knows what thoughts crossed his mind? He must have been much elated at the prospect of going to England, his ambition of so many years. Perhaps he had already planned his career: a degree in law from one of the ancient seats of learning in Britain, the call to the Bar, return to India, and a successful legal practice, most likely to be combined with politics. A pleasing avenue of hope and accomplishment seemed to be opening before him. Nearly every top-ranking Indian leader had trodden the same path to public

status and acclaim: graduation at home, some worldly experience, a degree from Britain, admittance as a barrister at one of the Inns of the Courts, back to one's home town to practice law, make a name first in the courts and then among the public, and up the slippery pole which leads to dizzying heights of greatness and glory, public service and private satisfaction, exceptional opportunities and a name in the history books. None of these things, bar the last, was to be his portion. It was not given to him to be a lawyer or a politician or a national leader. Yet he was destined to leave a mark on modern Indian history and on the world development of Islam which posterity would remember and honour.

On the personal level again his expectations were not to be fulfilled. Had he but known, he was doomed never again to see his village or his father, and to set eyes on the darling faces of his sisters only for a few brief, agonizing days. Nor was Lahore to be his home again, except for a few heart-breaking months in 1948. Without knowing any of these things, he now started on his journey to his last resting-place–Cambridge–where he was to study law, to write all his works, to invent a striking name for a country yet in the womb of time, to establish a movement for the achievement of this country of his dreams and christening, to live his happiest days, to lead a band of young men who were devoted to him (but some of whom were soon to betray him for a riband to stick in their coat), then to experience neglect, humiliation, poverty and ill health, to die in a hospital, with not a single friend or countryman at his bedside, and finally to be buried in a foreign land by foreign hands among the foreign dead, with no tombstone to mark the grave, no name to identify the departed, a mere serial number in the register of a British cemetery.

But all this was yet in the wind. The glory and the tragedy, the ecstasy and the anguish, were still beyond the veil with which fate hides the future of man from him. Mercifully Rahmat Ali could not see his last days as he gazed through the window at the telegraph poles and trees running past the track. Let us leave him thinking pleasant thoughts as the train pounded out the miles to the port city of Bombay.

Rahmat Ali's trek into history had begun.

NOTES

1. Some writers have attributed a wrong origin to him: Rahmat Ali was a "sarhaddi talib ilm", *i.e.*, he came from the north-west frontier (Arif Batalawi, *Tarikh-i-Muslim League*, Lahore, 1969, p. 300); he belonged to Lyallpur (Akhtar Begum, "Allama Iqbal awr tahrik-i-Pakistan ki ibtida", *Musawat*, 22 April 1976); he was a Bengali (Subhash C. Kashyap (ed.), *Bangla Desh*, New Delhi, 1971, "Bangla Desh: An Introduction and a Study in Background" by the editor, p. 6).

   Garhshankar was the second largest tahsil of district Hoshiarpur. With an area of 509 sq. miles and a population of 261,468, it had only one town (Garhshankar itself) and 472 villages. In 1901, only 8,360 of its inhabitants were literate. In 1903-04, the total cultivated area was 291 sq. miles, of which only 40 were irrigated and the rest depended on the monsoons for water. Wheat, maize and gram were the chief crops; maize was the staple food of the people. The hills were steeper than in Hoshiarpur tahsil. The town of Garhshankar was situated in the extreme south of the district, about 12 miles west of the Sutlej and hardly 2 miles from the boundary of Jullundher district. The tahsil formed the south-east end of the district, bounded by Jullundher district on the west, Hoshiarpur tahsil on the north, and the Sutlej on the east and the south. In the whole district of Hoshiarpur there were, in 1903-04, 10,772 pupils under instruction in 13 secondary, 146 primary, 3 unaided Anglo-Vernacular High, 1 Vernacular High, and 8 middle, schools. (*Imperial Gazetteer of India: Provincial Series: Punjab*, Calcutta, 1909, Vol. I).

2. In the Gujjar caste his sub-caste or *got* was Gorsi (Gujjar Ali Hasan Chohan, "Chaudhari Rahmat Ali", *Gujjar Gazette*, 18 February 1964, p. 3).

   The Gujjars were once an important race and gave their name to the province of Gujerat on the west coast and to several towns in north India. Some take them to have been the pre-Aryan occupiers of India. Tod considers them a tribe of Rajputs. They are found in Kashmir, Punjab, Delhi and upper Rohilkhand. A great part of the district of Saharanpur was called Gujerat during the eighteenth century. The

Gujjars prefer pasturage to the plough. They are said to have preceded the Swat tribe as inhabitants and owners of the Hazara district. They are a handsome people, and "both men and women are remarkable for their powerful figures and fair complexion. The women, in particular, are remarkably good-looking, and have a bold, free carriage and demeanour. Widows can re-marry". (Edward G. Balfour, *Encyclopaedia Asiatica*, 1876, rep. 1976, New Delhi, Vol. III, p. 1261).

There are various theories about their origin. One is that when the Huns invaded north-western India in early sixth century A.D. a number of Central Asian tribes and peoples came with them. Among these were the Gurjaras, the forefathers of the modern Gujjars and of the medieval Rajputs (R. Thapar, *A History of India*, Vol. I, London, 1966, p. 142).

Cunningham, an authority on Indian castes and tribes, thinks that the Gujjars are descended from the Scythians (Saka) and Yue-chi (Kushan) tribes who invaded north-west India in the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. Since the tribe migrated from the Caspian Sea, which is called Bahr-i-Khizr in the oriental lore, it was named Khizr, Guzar, Gurjar, Gurjara or Gujjar. According to another version, the word Gujjar is derived from the words *gau* (cow) and *char* (graze), meaning cattle grazers.

"The Gujars are the eighth largest caste in the Punjab. . . . They are identified by General Cunningham with the Kushan or Yuchi or Tochari, a tribe of eastern Tartars. About a century before Christ their Chief conquered Kabul and the Peshawar country; while his son, Hima Kadphises, so well known to the Punjab Numismatologists,extended his sway over the whole of Upper Panjab and the banks of the Jamna as far down as Mathra and the Vinchyas, and his successor the no less familiar King Kanishka, the first Buddhist Indo-Scythian prince, annexed Kashmir to the Kingdom of the Tochari. These Tochari or Kushan are the Kaspeira of Ptolemy; and in the middle of the second century of our era, Kaspeira, Kasyapapura, or Multan, was one of their chief cities. Probably about the beginning of the 3rd century after Christ, the attacks of the White Huns recalled the last King of

the united Yuchi to the west, and he left his son in charge of an independent province whose capital was fixed at Peshawar; and from that time the Yuchi of Kabul are known as the Great Yuchi, and those of the Punjab as the Kator or Little Yuchi. Before the end of the 3rd century a portion of the Gujars had begun to move southwards down the Indus, and were shortly afterwards separated from their northern brethren by Indo-Scythian wave from the north. In the middle of the 5th century there was a Gujar kingdom in the south-western Rajputana, whence they were driven by the Balas into Gujarat of the Bombay Presidency; and about the end of the 9th century, Ala Khana, the Gujar King of Jammu, ceded the present Gujar-des, correspondingly very nearly with the Gujarat district, to the King of Kashmir. The town of Gujarat is said to have been built or restored by Ali Khan Gujar in the time of Akbar. . . . The present distribution of the Gujars in India is thus described by General Cunningham: 'At the present day the Gujars are found in great number in every part of the North-West of India, from the Indus to the Ganges, and from the Hazara mountains to the Peninsula of Gujarat. They are specially numerous along the banks of the Upper Jamna, near Jagadri and Buriya, and in the Saharanpur district, which during the last century was actually called Gujarat. To the east they occupy the petty State of Samptar in Bandelkhand, and one of the northern districts of Gwalior, which is still called Gujargar. They are found only in small bodies and much scattered throughout Eastern Rajputana and Gwalior; but they are more numerous in the Western States, and specially towards Gujarat, where they form a large part of the population. The Rajas of Rewari to the south of Delhi are Gujars. In the Southern Punjab they are thinly scattered, but their numbers increase rapidly towards the north, where they have given their name to several important places, such as Gujranwala in the Rachna-Doab, Gujarat in the Chaj Doab, and Gujar Khan in the Sindh Sager Doab. They are numerous about Jahlam and Hassan Abdal, and throughout the Hazara districts; and they are also found in considerable numbers in the Dardu districts of Chilas, Kohli, and Palas, to the east of the Indus, and in the contiguous districts to the west of the river.

In the Punjab they essentially belong to the lower ranges and sub-montane tracts. . . . Gujarat is still their stronghold . . . throughout the hill country of Jammu, Chibhal, and Hazara and away in the Independent Territory lying to the north of Peshawar as far as the Swat river, true Gujar herdsmen are found in great numbers, all possessing a common speech, which is a Hindi dialect quite distinct from the Punjabi or Pashtu current in those parts, there they are a purely pastoral and almost nomad race, taking their herds up into the higher ranges in summer and descending with them into the valleys during the cold weather; and it may be said that the Gujar is a cultivator only in the plains. Even there he is a bad cultivator, and more given to keeping cattle than to following the plough.

. . . The Jalandhar Gujars date their conversion from the time of Aurangzeb, a very probable date. . . . The Musalman Gujars of all the eastern half of the Province still retain more of their Hindu customs than do the majority of their converted neighbours, their women, for instance, wearing petticoats instead of drawers, and red instead of blue . . .

The Gujar is a fine stalwart fellow, of precisely the same physical type as the Jat; and the theory of aboriginal descent, which has sometimes been propounded, is to my mind conclusively negatived by his cast of countenance. He is of the same social standing as the Jat, or perhaps slightly inferior; but the two eat and drink in common without any scruple and the proverb says: 'The Jat, Gujar, Ahir, and Gola are all four hail fellows well met'. But he is far inferior in both personal character and repute to the Jat. He is lazy to a degree, and a wretched cultivator; his women, though not secluded, will not do field-work save of the lightest kind; while his fondness for cattle extends to those of other people. . . . The Gujars have been turbulent throughout the history of the Punjab, they were a constant thorn in the side of the Delhi Emperors and are still ever ready to take advantage of any loosening of the bonds of discipline to attack and plunder their neighbours.

. . . the Gujars of Hushyarpur are said to be 'a quiet and well-behaved set," (Denzil Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Punjab*, Lahore, 1883, pp. 262-266; see also

Henry M. Elliot, *Memoirs of the History, Folk-lore and Distribution of the Races of the North-Western Provinces of India*, London, 1859 ed., Vol. I, pp. 99-102).

The Gujjars have 19 *gots*: Tunwar, Chokhar, Rawal, Kalsan, Kathana, Kasanah, Kalas, Gorsi, Chechi, Dhedar, Poswal, Lawi, Bijar, Khaindar, Melu, Thakaria, Chauhan, Monan, Bhumla. Rahmat Ali was a Gorsi. In 1883, there were 3,301 Gorsi Gujjars in district Hoshiarpur, 1,594 in Ambala, 422 in Karnal, 3,462 in Ludhiana, 1,457 in Jullundher, 180 in Amritsar, 1,772 in Gurdaspur, 277 in Sialkot, 290 in Lahore, 38 in Gujranwala, 870 in Firozepur, 1,232 in Rawalpindi, 309 in Jhelum, 3,312 in Gujerat, and 2,036 in the native states of eastern Punjab (plains). Their total strength in the province (as constituted in 1883, *i.e.*, including the NWFP) was 22,103, of which only 438 lived in the frontier province. The other *gots* inhabiting district Hoshiarpur were: Kathana (546), Kasanah (2,299), Kalas (1,111), Chechi (3,171), Poswal (6,910), Lawi (2,825), Bijar (3,230), Khaindar (1,172), Melu (2,357), Thakaria (1,200), Chauhan (4,530), and Monan (2,585). The total population of Gujjars in the district was 35,147 (*ibid.*, Abstract no. 84, p. 264).

Gujjars or cowherds were "essentially pastoral tribes", found mainly in the lower Himalayas in the Punjab. In 1901 they numbered 632,000 in the Punjab province (*Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. I, p. 49), and 78,000 in district Hoshiarpur, mostly in the Siwalik hills (*ibid.*).

Three well-known Punjabi towns are named after the Gujjars: Gujerat, Gujranwala and Gujjar Khan. The migrant groups among them still move with the seasons from the Kaghan Valley to the central Punjab and back.

3. Interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, Rahmat Ali's younger brother. Neither Rahmat Ali nor his brother saw the grandfather, who had died before their birth.

4. According to Mian Abdul Haq (not a reliable informer at all, as we will see later), Shah Muhammad's total cultivable land amounted to 15 acres, and he was not well-off materially (his article published in the *Nawa-i-Waqt* on 25 June 1964, also rep. in *Gujjar Gazette*, 11 March 1966, p. 13). It has been claimed that Shah Muhammad was a *patwari*

(A.T. Chaudhri, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: Time to Honour Him", *Pakistan Monitor*, 14 August 1970), but I have not been able to get a confirmation of it.

5. In my introduction to the 2-volume edition of Rahmat Ali's collected works, I am supposed to have written that Rahmat Ali was borne by the first wife and Muhammad Ali by the second (K.K. Aziz (ed.), *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali*, Vol. I, Islamabad, 1978, p. xi). Parts of my introduction were garbled by the publisher, and I was denied the opportunity to correct the distortion. Reasons for this are explained in "A Survey of the Sources" at the beginning of the present work.
6. Interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali.
7. With one exception, every writer on Rahmat Ali has given the year of his birth inaccurately. The exception is Muhammad Anwar Amin ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Satluj*, 12 February 1976).

   The year 1890 is mentioned by Gujjar Ali Hasan Chauhan ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Gujjar Gazette*, 18 February 1964, p. 3). The year 1892 is given by Akhtar Chaudhri (in *Gujjar Gazette*, 4-18 March 1954, p. 10, and in "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum: Islamia college ka tabinda sitara", *Hamayat-i-Islam*, 2 April 1954), Mian Abdul Haq ("Tahrik-i-Pakistan awr Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: I", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 25 June 1964), an anonymous writer ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: unhon nay sab say pahlay Pakistan ka nam tajwiz kiya", *Kohistan*, 13 February 1967), and Chaudhri Bashir Ahmad ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 3 February 1978). The year 1893 is quoted by several persons and journals: *The Pakistan Times* (20 May 1948), *Ehsan* ("Bany-i-Pakistan–Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", 8 June 1948), Yad Malik ("Khaliq-i-Pakistan", *Gujjar Gazette*, 4-18 March 1954, p. 24), Muhammad Shafi ("Pakistan ka lafz Chaudhri Rahmat Ali nay diya", *Kohistan*, 30 January 1968), *Gujjar Gazette* ("Bany-i-tahrik-i-Pakistan janab Chaudhri Rahmat Ali sahib marhum", 18 March 1968, p. 5), Abdur Rashid ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Nida-i-Millat*, 12 February 1970), Muhammad Anwar Amin ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Mashriq*, 12 February 1971, who says "probably born in 1893"), Hafiz Muhammad Islam ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali nay tanha Pakistan ky tahrik chalayi", *Jang*,

15 August 1971), *Imroz* ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", 12 February 1975), Hidayatullah Khan ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Mashriq*, 11 February 1976), *Imroz* (11 February 1977), Muhammad Husain Zuberi ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Musawat*, 14 August 1977), Abdul Qayyum and S.R. Wasti ("Struggle for Independence", in Hamid Jalal, *et. al.* (eds.), *Pakistan*, London, 1977, p. 114), Muhammad Sulaiman Tahir ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 13 February 1978), Munzur-ul-Haq Siddiqui ("Batayan Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky", *Sayyara Digest*, March 1978, p. 41), and Malik Muhammad Khan ("Tahrik-i-Pakistan ky faramosh kary", *ibid.*, April 1978, p. 106). The year 1895 is cited by Abdur Rashid Noon ("Gumnam hero", *Gujjar Gazette*, 18 February 1964, p. 7, repeated in the issue of 11 October 1969, p. 1), G. Allana (*Our Freedom Fighters, 1526-1947*, Karachi, 1969, p. 296, citing Ahsan Chaudhry, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, no date given), A.T. Chaudhri ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: Time to Honour Him", *Pakistan Monitor*, 14 August 1970, p. 7), *Hurryat* ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", 13 February 1975), Fida Ahmad Abbasi ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali awr tahrik-i-Pakistan", *ibid.*, 13 February 1976), and Salahuddin Nasik (*Tahrik-i-azadi*, Lahore, n.d., p. 240). The year 1898 was suggested by the late Muhammad Anwar in an interview with me.

None of these cite any source. I have taken the exact date from the information supplied by Rahmat Ali himself in the application form for admission to the University of Cambridge (copy kindly supplied by the Senior Tutor of Emmanuel College, Cambridge; *RAA*).

8. Interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali; *Gujjar Gazette*, 18 March 1968, p. 5; M. Sharif Salomber, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Jang*, 3 February 1981.
9. Muhammad Anwar Amin, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Satluj*, 12 February 1976.
10. This account of his school education is based on the interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali; Rahmat Ali's own interview with the *Ehsan* of Lahore, 8 June 1948; and Emmanuel College archives.

Balachaur was situated about 8 miles from Garhshankar tahsil and about 50 from the Simla town. It lay probably in

the extreme south of the tahsil, very close to the Jullundher boundary, otherwise Rahmat Ali should have gone to the town of Nawanshahr which was only 2 miles away from the boundary but up north by nearly 8 miles.

Rahon was a small town in the Nawanshahr tahsil of district Jullundher, with a population of 8,651 in 1901. It was founded before the Christian era by Raja Ragheb, who gave it the name of Raghupur. It was captured by the Ghorewaha Rajputs in the time of Muhammad of Ghor, whose leaders renamed it Rahon after a lady called Raho. In early twentieth century it was still considered unlucky to use the name Rahon before breakfast; till the hour it was called Zanana Shahr or "woman town". It had one Anglo-Vernacular Middle School maintained by the municipality.

Jullundher is an ancient town. When Hiuen Tsiang visited it, it was a large city, 2 miles in circuit, and the capital of a Rajput kingdom. It was conquered by Ibrahim Shah of Ghor in about 1088. Under the Mughals it was the capital of a *sarkar*. The Sikhs burnt it to the ground in 1757; the Faizullah confederacy captured it in 1766; Ranjit Singh annexed it to his Kingdom in 1811; the British made it the headquarters of the territory they acquired after the first Sikh War. The town was surrounded by several suburbs known as *bastis*, the most important being Basti Danishmandan with 2,770 persons (to which belonged Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan) and Basti Shaikh Darwesh with 7,109 inhabitants. In 1901 its population stood at 67,735, 40,081 being Muslim. There were 4 Anglo-Vernacular high schools, one maintained by the municipality, one by the Presbyterian Mission, and two rival institutions by the Arya Samaj. (Information on all these places derived from the *Imperial Gazetter of India, op. cit.*).

11. See Malik Muhammad Khan, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan ky faramosh kary", *Sayyara Digest*, April 1978, p. 106; Hafiz Muhammad Islam, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali nayn tanha Pakistan ky tahrik chalayi", *Jang*, 15 August 1971; Akhtar Chaudhri, "Rahmat Ali marhum: Islamia college ka tabinda sitara", *Hamayat-i-Islam*, 2 April 1954; Iqbal Asad, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Imroz*, 14 August 1963; Muhammad Husain Zuberi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Musawat*, 14 August 1977; and

Muhammad Hanif Shahid, *Iqbal awr anjuman-i-hamayat-i-Islam*, Lahore, 1976, p. 41. On the quality of his graduation result, too, extravagant claims have been made. Zuberi, *op. cit.*, says that he passed his B.A. "with distinction"; Malik Muhammad Khan, *op. cit.*, that he got a first division in his B.A.; Gujjar Ali Hasan Chauhan makes him a graduate with honours ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Gujjar Gazette*, 18 February 1964, p. 3); and Hidayatullah Khan gives the correct date but asserts that he graduated "with high marks" ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali murhum", *Mashriq*, 11 February 1976). The writer of Rahmat Ali's obituary notice in the *Cambridge Daily News* ("Creator of Pakistan Ideal", 21 February 1951) makes him "a graduate of the Osmania University, Lahore". Dr. Jahangir Khan, a contemporary of Rahmat Ali's at Cambridge who claimed to be one of his closest friends and a worker of the Pakistan National Movement, states that Rahmat Ali failed in his B.A. examination "two or three times" (Jahangir Khan, interviewed in Manzurul Haq Siddiqui, "Batayan Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky", *Sayyara Digest*, March 1978, p. 42). One reason for this ignorance is sheer carelessness; another is the failure of the Islamia College office to answer repeated inquiries.

12. Emmanuel College archives.
13. Malik Muhammad Khan, *op. cit;* Akhtar Chaudhri, *op. cit.*, gives the dates of his editorship of the *Crescent* as 1915-18.
14. "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1975, who adds that it was his father who had made this addition to Rahmat Ali's name. Another report states that he was a poet, using Azad as his *takhallus*, till his law college days, when Zafrulla Khan reprimanded him for wasting his time on versifying, and that was the end of the young poet's endeavours, Iqbal Asad, *op. cit.*
15. Mian Abdul Haq, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan awr Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 25 June 1964.
16. See Muhammad Anwar Amin, *op. cit.*, p. 12; Hafiz Muhammad Aslam, *op. cit.*, who mentions the year 1919, *i.e.*, after Rahmat Ali's graduation; and Iqbal Asad, *op. cit.*, who says that he was on the staff of the paper for three years.
17. Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali awr tahrik-i-Pakistan", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1976, who says that he was

dismissed for expressing such opinions.

18. Rahmat Ali's interview in *Ehsan*, 8 June 1948. Unfortunately, the file of *Kashmir* is not available.

19. Malik Muhammad Khan, *op. cit.*, p. 106. It appears from certain papers in the *RAR* collection that, at some time before 1923, Rahmat Ali served the family of the Nawab of Kunjpura as tutor to the sons of the Nawab and also perhaps in other capacities. A hand-written letter by J. Kelly addressed to one Wilson (without initials, but most probably Sir Alexander Wilson, Bart., principal of the Islamia College, Lahore, who succeeded Henry Martyn) and dated December 1923 mentions Rahmat Ali's service at Kunjpura and praises him for his ability and manners.

Kunjpura, meaning "the heron's nest", was an estate in the tahsil and district of Karnal, founded by Najabat Khan, a Ghorgasht Pathan and soldier of fortune under the Mughal emperors. He built a stronghold in the marshes of the Jumna in early eighteenth century and then revolted against the imperial government. He sided with Nadir Shah in 1739, and as a reward was recognized by the invader as chief of Kunjpura. In 1760 he was killed when the Marathas destroyed his fortress. His son, Daler Khan, received large grants of territory from the Durranis, but he and his successors were driven out of their lands west of the Jumna by the Raja of Jind and other Sikh chiefs. In 1787 Sindhia expelled the Raja of Jind from Karnal, and in 1797 General Perron recognized Gulsher as Nawab of Kunjpura. His son, Rahmat Khan, allied himself with Lord Lake in 1801, and in 1811 was recognized as a protected chief by the British. In 1846 the Nawab lost his sovereign power, and from then onwards the history of the family was one of incessant litigation. The *jagir* consisted of 38 villages and an equally valuable personal estate. (*Imperial Gazetteer of India, op. cit.*, Vol. I).

The Mazaris "are practically found only in Derah Ghazi Khan, of which they occupy the southernmost portion, their western boundary being the hills and their eastern the river. Their country extends over the Sindh frontier into Jacobabad, and stretches northwards as far as Umrkot and the Pitok pass. Rojhan is their headquarter. They say that about the 17th century they quarrelled with the Chandia of Sindh,

and moved into the Siahaf valley and Marao plain, and the hill country to the west now occupied by the Bugti; but obtaining grants of land in the lowlands gradually shifted eastwards towards the river . . . our returns show only 9,000 souls in the Province . . .. The tribe traces its descent from Hot, son of Jalal, and is divided into four clans, Rustamani, Masidani, Balachani, and Sargani; of which the first two are the more numerous, though the chief is a Balachani". (Denzil Ibbetson, *op. cit.*, p. 197).

20. Rahmat Ali's own statement, *Ehsan*, 8 June 1948; also his admission form at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. The dates 1920-22, given by Muhammad Anwar Amin, *op. cit.*, are incorrect. Aitchison College authorities do not answer letters seeking information.
21. Rahmat Ali's interview, *Ehsan*, 8 June 1948.
22. Riaz A. Kureishy, Letter, *The Pakistan Times*, 3 May 1964, who says that he was a classmate of Rahmat Ali's at the law college in 1923, He continues that in that year Rahmat Ali "used to expound his theory of 'Indianism' and a separate homeland for the minorities". When some Hindu students approached the principal, Chatterjee, and complained of such activities, he advised them to attach no importance to Rahmat Ali "as he was a mere dreamer and a 'mad mullah' ". There is no truth in the statement ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1975) that he took his law degree.
23. Rahmat Ali "has been appointed Private Secretary to the successor of Sir Bahram Khan", J. Kelly to Wilson, *op. cit.*, *RAR*. Nawab Dost Muhammad Khan died on 5 May 1932, leaving behind two wives: Mai Sahib Khatun and Mai Sardar Kahtun; the latter was married six months before his death (information sent to Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan by one Shafi on 26 May 1933, *RAR*). Rahmat Ali's appointment in 1923 is also confirmed by his own word, interview in *Ehsan*, 8 June 1948.

Nawab Sir Behram Khan, the eldest son of Nawab Sir Imam Bakhsh, was born in 1851 and succeeded to the chieftainship of the Mazari tribe and the entire *jagir* of his father on the latter's death in 1903. He was President of the Punjab Chief Association in 1908 and a member of

the Punjab Legislative Council in 1910. He was married to the widow of his brother Sobhdar Khan. Of his four brothers, Sobhdar Khan died in 1883, Ghulam Haider Khan was in the provincial civil service, Ata Muhammad Khan in the provincial police service, and Khair Muhammad Khan had died in 1883. Behram Khan's income was about Rs. 70,000 a year.

Amir Dost Muhammad Khan (born 1876) was the eldest son of Sher Muhammad Khan (died 1883), son of Dost Ali Khan (died 1862), son of Mir Behram Khan (died 1837, father of Sir Imam Bakhsh and grandfather of Nawab Behram Khan), Sardar Dost Ali Khan was the nominal *tamundar*, while Imam Bakhsh exercized all powers. On Sher Muhammad's death in November 1883, Nawab Imam Bakhsh had recognized Dost Muhammad Khan as successor in the *tamundari*, and the boy had been invested with the *dastar* (the traditional turban, the symbol of headship) by Sir James Lyall, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, at Dera Ghazi Khan in March 1888. Dost Muhammad Khan continued to be the nominal *tamundar* during Behram Khan's *de facto* chieftainship of the tribe. It was on the latter's death that he claimed the chieftainship and the *jagir*. Amir Dost Muhammad Khan should not be confused with Dost Muhammad Khan (born 1892), who was the second son of Ghulam Haider Khan. (For details of the origin and history of the family see Sir Lepel H. Griffin, *The Punjab Chiefs* and C.F. Massy, *Chiefs and Families of Note in the Punjab*. These two books were revised and corrected by W.L. Conran and H.D. Craik and published in 2 volumes from Lahore in 1910 under the title *Chiefs and Families of Note in the Punjab*. The Mazari family is described on pp. 331-340 of Vol. II).

24. Malik Muhammad Khan, *op. cit.*, p. 106. There is documentary evidence in the *RAR* collection to prove that Rahmat Ali's designation was that of private secretary. For example, on 17 December 1929, he wrote to the headquaters of the North Western Railway, requesting the change of name of the "Mir Dostali" station to "Mir Dost Muhammad Khan" station, signing himself as "Private Secretary to Mazari Chief of Rojhan, District Dera Ghazi Khan". The railway

authorities turned down the plea on 21 January 1930; letter No. 744/R/317. Rahmat Ali's letter is not available; the reply is.

25. I infer this from the dates of two letters written on 3 January 1930 by some persons of Multan (signatures illegible) to Rahmat Ali, congratulating him on his ability, hard work and success.Unfortunately, Rahmat Ali did not keep copies of his own letters, sent to Dost Muhammad Khan or others among his friends and relatives. What we have is a thick wad of postal receipts for the years 1928-30, showing that he dispatched hundreds of telegrams and scores of registered letters to Rojhan. A few dozen communications from Rojhan are preserved; all written in traditional Urdu prose on the Mir's crested notepaper and signed by him, though some were dictated to a *munshi*. The style maintains all courtesies of oriental epistolary art; Rahmat Ali is addressed in respectful terms and *requested* to do this or that. There is not a single letter from Rahmat Ali to his employer.
26. Named after a former Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, Sir Charles Umpherston Aitchison (1832-1896), who entered the ICS in 1855 and was in charge of the Punjab from 1882 to 1887.
27. *RAR*. The receipt of the rent for June 1927 gives his address as "Kapurthala House", which was a collection of blocks of flats on Lake Road, about two miles away from Bharat Building. Did he live there before 1927? Was it merely an accommodation address for receiving the mail? We don't know.
28. All receipts from January 1927 to June 1930 are in *RAR*. His exact address as given on the electric supply bills was: Bharat Buildings, Block No. IX, Quarter No. 1, 14 Jhind Road, Lahore. But all his other mail was addressed to 14 Bharat Building, Lahore.
29. Iqbal Asad, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Imroz*, 14 August 1963, who knew Rahmat Ali at this time. The electric bills' receipts for January 1927-June 1930 are in *RAR*. At that time the Lahore Electric Supply Company provided electricity at the rate of 8 anas per unit, and charged meter rent at one rupee per month. Rahmat Ali's consumer No. was 21053.
30. For example, he acted as an examiner for Paper A in Urdu

in the matriculation examination held by the University of the Punjab in March 1928. Letter from the university, dated 3 April 1928, enclosing 61 answer-books, in *RAR*.

31. We have the record of at least one such transaction. Rahmat Ali was of some use to Muhammad Zulfiqar Ali Khan of Shamsher Manzil, Karnal, in 1927-30, and was paid for it. Letters from Zulfiqar Ali Khan to Rahmat Ali, dated 6 January 1928 from Karnal and 13 September 1930 from Mussourie, *RAR*.
32. Letter to Rahmat Ali from Harold Manion, solicitor, Kinghorn Street, Nowra, New South Wales, Australia, dated 10 October 1928, *RAR*.
33. Letter to Rahmat Ali from the Secretary (Muhammad Ali), Batala Co-operative Union, Ltd., of 5 May 1930, reminding him that "your fixed deposits have earned Rs. 812 interest up to 31.1.1930", and asking for instructions about where to credit this amount (in fixed deposit, savings bank, or floating account). Batala postmark 6 May, Lahore postmark 7 May, 8 A.M., *RAR*.
34. On 1 October 1929. Letter from the Club, of the same date, *RAR*.
35. Cash memos in *RAR*. The biscuits and cigarettes were bought from the American Stores on the Mall; the wrist watch, costing Rs. 110, from Sikandar Bakhsh and Co.; and the bicycle for Rs. 131-8-0 from Moosa and Sons of Nila Gunbad.
36. Besides the sources cited above in notes 26-35, this composite picture of the personality and life style of Rahmat Ali is drawn from the following: interviews with Dr. Rafique Khan, Khan Niaz Muhammad Khan, Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, and Master Allah Ditta and Jamadar Nur Muhammad; the Rahmat Ali papers in the Rafique Collection; and Malik Muhammad Khan, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-112.
37. The facts are from the interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali; the description is mine. The Saida-Rahmat Ali correspondence, in the original, in *RAA*.
38. *Ibid.*
39. Letter from Master Amanat to Rahmat Ali, from Begampur Jandiala, district Hoshiarpur, 1 September 1926, *RAR*.
40. Saida (Mrs. Rahmatullah) to Rahmat Ali, from Jullundher,

6 November 1927, *RAA*. As far as I have been able to ascertain from Rahmat Ali's papers and other sources, there is no truth in the statement that in 1927 he accompanied the Mazari chief to England (as asserted in A.T. Chaudhri, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: Time to Honour Him", *Pakistan Monitor*, 14 August 1970).

41. In June 1928 one R.D. Minhas wrote a long letter from Central Hotel, Simla, to Rahmat Ali, telling him that after a long talk with one Tek Chand Dhanda of Ambala, who had taken his B.C.L. from Oxford and had been called to the Bar, he was sending him full information on legal studies in England. The letter contains the requirements for admission at Oxford, a list of papers to be taken and passed, and a rough estimate of expenses: £ 25 per month at Oxford and £ 210 for becoming a barrister. Letter from R.D. Minhas to Rahmat Ali, from Simla, dated 21 June 1928, *RAR*. It was addressed to Rahmat Ali, care of Mahmood Ahmad, Bait-ul-Mahmood, Mozang, Lahore.

42. I infer this from the fact that he had his passport made or renewed on 13 July 1934 in England. As the document required renewal every five years, he would have obtained it in Lahore on 14 July 1929.

43. Precise information on the honorarium paid by Mazari is not available. Some reports put the amount at Rs. 67,000. Anwar, in his unfinished biography of Rahmat Ali, makes it Rs. 2 lakhs (typescript made available to me by Dr. Rafique Khan and Mrs. Jamila Anwar). One of his friends asserts that he had "collected a couple of hundred-thousand rupees as his legal fees in connection with some litigation between certain landlords of Dera Ghazi Khan" (M. Masud, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali as I Knew Him", *Dawn*, 13 June 1976).

44. Interview with Dr. Rafique Khan.

45. Interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali.

46. Letter from one Nabi Bakhsh (a member of Mazari's personal staff) to Rahmat Ali, from Rojhan, 4 February 1930; and from Muhammad Zulfiqar Ali Kan of Karnal to Rahmat Ali, from Mussourie, 13 September 1930, *RAR*.

47. Interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali. He could not recall the exact date or year of Shah Muhammad's demise; it was "some time after Rahmat Ali had gone away", he told

me.

48. Rahmat Ali wrote on 22 July 1930, asking about the cost of travelling to England and the schedule of sailings. The firm replied from 4 Kashmir Gate, Delhi, on 24 July; letter No. RL. 900/30. Rahmat Ali's letter is not available; Thomas Cook's is. *RAR.*

49. Malik Muhammad Khan, *op. cit.*, p. 109, who says he was present at this party.

50. The letter read: "Now that you have settled in Oxford, I hope you would do me a favour by securing a nomination for the bearer of this letter, Mr. Rahmat Ali, who is a great friend of mine; I shall be grateful if you would help him to get into one of the colleges", Nawab Muhammad Nawaz Khan of Kot Fateh Khan, district Attock, to John Coatman, CIE, dated 25 October 1930, *RAR.* John Coatman (1889-1963), joined Indian Police Service in 1910; Director of Public Information, Government of India, 1926, and member of the Indian Legislative Assembly, 1926-30; Professor of Imperial Economic Relations, London University, 1930-34; a BBC executive, 1934-49; and Director of Research in Social Sciences, St. Andrews University, 1949-54; author of several books on India.

51. Shahabuddin wrote: "The bearer of this, Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, B.A., is one of the most promising zamindar youngmen of the Punjab. He is going to England to qualify himself for the Bar, and if possible, to obtain a University Degree as well. Should he need your help for securing a seat in Oxford or Cambridge, kindly do all you can for him", Chaudhri Shahabuddin to Sir Denys Bray, dated 29 October 1930, *RAR.* Sir Denys de S. Bray, KCIE, CSI, CBE (1875-1951), entered the ICS, 1898; Foreign Secretary, Government of India, 1920-30; member, India Council, 1930-37. Author of several books on Baluchistan and the Brahui language.

52. The letter to Sir Atul Chandra used exactly the same words that were written to Sir Denys Bray; Chaudhri Shahabuddin to Sir Atul Chandra Chatterjee, dated 29 October 1930, *RAR.*

Sir Atul Chandra Chatterjee (1874-1955) entered the ICS, 1896; Chief Secretary, United Provinces, 1919; Indus-

tries Secretary, Government of India, 1921; Industries Member, Viceroy's Executive Council, 1923-24; Indian High Commissioner in London, 1925-31; Member, India Council, 1931-36; Adviser to the Secretary of State for India, 1942-47; joint author of *A Short History of India*.

Chaudhri Sir Shahabuddin (d. 1949), a brother-in-law of Mian Ahmad Yar Khan Daultana; Member, Punjab Legislative Council, 1924, President, 1925; Minister of Education, Punjab, 1936-37; founder-editor, *Criminal Law Journal of India*.

53. The testimonial ran as follows (*RAR*):

Islamia College,
Lahore
29th October, 1930.

This is to certify that Chaudhri Rahmat Ali was a student of this College for four years and graduated with a degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1918.

During his student career he won golden opinions from his tutor and professors for his hard work, conscientious endeavour and keen interest in his studies. He was uniformly successful in his examinations and was to the forefront in all his classes. Socially he proved himself an exceptionally fine organizer and was always ready to do whatever duties he was called upon to perform. He was sub-editor of the College magazine and started it on its career of modern popularity.

Altogether he proved himself an exceptional all-round man and quite ahead, in intellect and enthusiasm, of the general run of students. He was always reliable, had a high sense of responsibility and honour and a fine moral character. In personality, too, he outshone his fellows and I feel a real pleasure in recommending him.

Sir Alexander Wilson, Bart.
Principal,
M.A. Oxon.

54. Rahmat Ali himself later said that he had gone to England in "October 1930", interview in *Ehsan*, 8 June 1948. As Wilson's certificate is dated 29 October, he was still in Lahore on that date. At the earliest he might have left Lahore for Bombay on the same day, more probably on

30 or perhaps 31 October. I have no information on the date of his sailing from India, the ship by which he left, and the date of arrival in England. The delay in his departure, which made him miss the first term, might have been due to his father's illness.

CHAPTER 2

THE BIRTH OF AN IDEA : 1933

Rahmat Ali arrived in England in the middle of November 1930 and immediately set his academic plans moving. He joined one of the Inns of Court, the Middle Temple, on 18 November, although his later pre-occupations delayed the fulfilment of the requirements at the Inn, and he could not be called to the Bar until 26 January 1943.[1]

Nawab Sir Umar Hayat Khan Tiwana, a distinguished member of the Punjab landed aristocracy, was at this time a member of the India Council.[2] He lived at 10 Albert Road (now Prince Albert Road), opposite the Regent's Park,[3] and kept an open house for anyone arriving from the Punjab. He had known Rahmat Ali back home, and possibly now invited him to stay at his opulent house. From there, on 22 November, Rahmat Ali sent in his application form to Emmanuel College, Cambridge.[4] On 24 November, Tiwana wrote out a testimonial in favour of Rahmat Ali, presumably to be used by him in gaining admission to Cambridge. In it he stated that he had known the young man "personally from [*sic*] a long time" and that he came "of a very respectable family".[5] With the help of the letters he had brought from India and the influence of Tiwana, Rahmat Ali was admitted to Emmanuel College,[6] Cambridge, on 26 January 1931.

New Life in Cambridge

His academic career in Cambridge should be summarized here from original and authentic sources, because a large majority of writers has given incorrect information about it.[7] Joining the College on 26 January 1931, he passed the Law Tripos examination in June 1932 with third class honours (perhaps he was not a particularly good scholar—a far from unusual phenomenon among

outstanding personalities); but he had to wait for his B.A. degree until 29 April 1933, in order to complete two years' residence at the university. He took his M.A. degree on 18 October 1940.[8]

Normally all undergraduates were required to live within the college at Cambridge. However, an exception was made of Rahmat Ali on two grounds: advanced age and limited funds. He was allowed to stay in digs.[9] His tutor was Edward Welbourne,[10] who later became Senior Tutor and still later the Master of the College.[11] It was he who wrote the unsigned obituary notice on Rahmat Ali in the College Magazine of 1950-51,[12] and arranged and paid for his burial.[13]

It appears from two letters in the Rahmat Ali papers that he planned to go to Oxford for post-graduate work(?) after taking his degree from Cambridge. In June 1931, Tiwana wrote to Sir Charles Oman,[14] recommending Rahmat Ali and saying that he (Rahmat Ali) would meet Oman and explain what he wanted.[15] This is vague; but there is a letter from T.H. Tylor of Balliol College, Oxford, to Rahmat Ali, which makes it clear that he was seeking admission into Oxford for the academic year begining in 1932.[16] We can only infer that, having been told by Emmanuel College that he would be taking his Law Tripos examination in June 1932, Rahmat Ali planned to leave Cambridge in 1932 and join Oxford to read for some degree. He might have wanted to pursue a post-graduate course or to work for another degree in law. The latter is more probable, because after Cambridge he went to Trinity College, Dublin, from where he got the LL.B. degree.[17] In October 1932 Rahmat Ali was also studying for some Diploma in Journalism in London.[18] His interest in journalism is understandable; he had worked for a few years on the editorial staff of more than one newspaper in Lahore. He might also have thought that it would improve his writing ability. However, no further reference to it is available, and it is hard to say if he got the diploma.

At some time during his stay in Cambridge, most probably after he had taken the degree and started producing his pamphlets, Rahmat Ali suspected that the quality of his written English was not good enough. He inquired about the facilities available for coaching in the language, and, on the recommendation of the secretary of the Cambridgeshire High School, arranged with one Leonard Hollingworth to correct his written work and guide him in the intricacies of grammar and syntax. Barring two occasions,

it was Hollingworth who always called on him, corrected his manuscripts and initiated him into the mysteries of good English. For these labours Rahmat Ali paid him one pound an hour. The tuition continued for a few years. Hollingworth's impressions of Rahmat Ali's work and ability should better be recalled in his own words: ". . . it did not take me many minutes to discover that Mr. Ali's knowledge of the English language was far better than mine. He paid me a nominal pound an hour to criticize his English, not because it needed criticizing—except when he insisted on writing in the English of the people he was addressing—but to quieten his own distrust of his English or (I imagine) to see his writing through the eyes of another. . . . I had to be prepared to justify every judgement about English that I made. . . . May I stress that I can hardly have been wrong for five years in assuming that he was a Cambridge M.A. when I first met him and in stating that his mastery of English was perfect. He carried from lodging to lodging the big Oxford Dictionary and every book on standard English he could buy. Any comment of mine was immediately checked up if he did not feel satisfied."[19] Other Cambridge contemporaries confirm this, and add that he was a perfectionist in his own way and never tired of checking and double-checking every fact, date, phrase or quotation he used in his writings. He had a natural distrust of everything into which he had not made a full inquiry.

In Cambridge Rahmat Ali changed his residences so often that it has not been possible to trace all addresses. He might have lived in some digs in his undergraduate days: we have no record of them. However, in late 1932 he moved to, or had already been living in, house No. 3 on Humberstone Road. As it was from this address that he issued his first leaflet, a short description of the historic residence is in order. It was a small house, second on the left as one entered the street, with a one-room-and-passage frontage and a tiny garden in the front.[20] The locality was quiet, even in 1971 when I visited it; it must have been much quieter in 1932-33.

The Birth of the Idea

It was in the bed-sitter of this house that Rahmat Ali wrote his first circular in which the word PAKSTAN saw the light of day.

However, it is difficult to believe that he had given no thought to the future of Indian Muslims before 1932. He had lived in Lahore between 1912 and 1930, and must have been familiar with the trend of Muslim thinking and more particularly with the various proposals made in these years to solve the Muslim problem (see Table 1). There is no direct evidence to show that he personally knew people like F.K. Khan Durrani, Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash, Nawab Zulfiqar Ali Khan and Iqbal. But he must have acquainted himself with their schemes and heard the public talking about them. Quite possibly he had discussed current issues with his friends, of which we have no written record.

His own first suggestion, according to him, was made in 1915 in the course of the inaugural address he delivered before the Bazm-i-Shibli, a society which he had established in that year in Islamia College, Lahore. This was for a Muslim state in the north of India. "North of India is Muslim", he declared, "and we will keep it Muslim. Not only that. We will make it a Muslim State. But this we can do only if and when we and our North cease to be Indian. For that is a prerequisite to it. So the sooner we shed 'Indianism' the better for us all and for Islam." He tells us that "the immediate occasion for this statement was the negotiations which were then afoot between Hindoo and Muslim leaders for an understanding on the basis of the national unity of India, and which culminated in the perilous Lucknow Pact of 1916". And he goes on to say that "one of the immediate consequences of that statement was the severance of my connection with a revolutionary society of Hindoo and Muslim young 'intellectuals', most of whom supported the aim of the negotiations. In the discussions with them it became clear to me that we could not work together; for, apart from our opposition to Imperialism, our ideals differed". So he left them with these words: "Friends! If my views are unacceptable to you, we had better part. In doing that, let every one of us keep true to his pledge, to the ideals of revolution; let every one of us serve the cause of freedom according to his faith. You will go your way and I will go my way. You work for your Indian revolution but I will work for my Islamic revolution. At the end, we shall see who creates the most dynamic and creative revolution in India." Many years later he felt that this episode had been a blessing because it "gave an exclusive, Islamic direction to my idealism—a direction which ultimately led to the Pak Plan, of

TABLE 1

LANDMARKS IN THE HISTORY OF THE IDEA

Sr. No.	Date	Author	Proposal or Report	Nature of evidence
1.	1858 (24 June)	John Bright	5 or 6 large presidencies with complete autonomy, ultimately becoming independent states.	Clear
2.	1867	Sayyid Ahmad Khan	Hindus and Muslims are two nations; they will never join together in anything.	Quoted by Hali
3.	1877 (11 December)	John Bright	After British withdrawal India will have 5 ot 6 great independent and sovereign states like those of Europe.	Clear
4.	1879	Jamaluddin "Afghani"	A Muslim Republic comprising Muslim Central Asia, Afghanistan, and Muslim-majority areas in north-west India.	No direct evidence
5.	1883	Sayyid Ahmad Khan	One of the two nations, Hindus and Muslims, must conquer the other; the two cannot remain equal.	Clear
6.	1883	Sayyid Ahmad Khan	India contains many nationalities and is, therefore, unfit to have representative institutions.	Quoted by Khali-quzzaman

7.	1883 (December)	W.S. Blunt	Divide India into 2 parts: the north under a Muslim government and the south under a Hindu government.	Clear
8.	1887	Theodore Beck	Muslims are a separate nation; majority rule is impossible; Muslims will never agree to be ruled by the Hindu majority.	Clear
9.	1887 (28 December)	Sayyid Ahmad Khan	Muslims will always be outvoted by the Hindus in the proportion of 1 to 4.	Clear
10.	1888	Sayyid Ahmad Khan	India is not a nation and can never become one.	Clear
11.	1888 (14 March)	Sayyid Ahmad Khan	The Congress has no right to speak on behalf of the Muslims.	Clear
12.	1888 (April)	Sayyid Ahmad Khan	Muslims, by joining the Congress, will become the slaves of another nation.	Clear
13.	1888 (19 May)	Muharram Ali Chishti	Muslims are a nation by themselves, and will not allow themselves to be dominated by another nation, the Hindus.	Clear
14.	1890 (23 August)	Abdul Halim Sharar	Rearrange India into Hindu and Muslim districts to avoid communal riots.	Quoted by A.S. Khurshid
15.	1899	Theodore Morison	Muslims do not regard themselves as Indians; the establishment of an independent united Indian Government is impossible; Muslims have all the makings of a nation except a territory.	Clear

16.	1904	Bhai Parmanand	Divide India on Hindu–Muslim lines.	Humayun Kabir, cited by Waheeduz-zaman.
17.	1905	Akbar Allahabadi	India north of Jumna to be given to the Muslims.	Quoted by Naqi Muhammad Khan
18.	1907	Two Turkish Statesmen	Sub-divide India into a Hindu India and a Muslim India.	Mentioned by S.A. Vahid
19.	1911 (14 January)	Muhammad Ali	No faith in a united India, but a marriage of convenience should be tried.	Clear
20.	1911 (28 January)	Muhammad Ali	The problems of India are international, not national; Muslims could claim equality with the Hindus.	Clear
21.	1911 (2 September)	Shaikh Zahur Ahmad	Hindu–Muslim parity in all legislatures.	Clear
22.	1912 (6 January)	Muhammad Ali	A united India does not exist, but we have to create it.	Clear
23.	1912	Joseph Stalin	India will, with the further course of bourgeois development, split up into innumerable nationalities.	Quoted by R. Palme Dutt

24.	1912	Bhai Parmanand	In a free India Muslims will be pushed across the Indus river.	Quoted by Abdul Hamid.
25.	1913 (10 May)	Bambooque	Hindus and Muslims should be segregated: northern India to be assigned to the Muslims and the rest to the Hindus.	Clear
26.	1914	Lovat Fraser	Muslim north India may join with the rest of the Muslim world in the middle east.	Quoted by I.H. Qureshi
27.	1915	Rahmat Ali	The north of India should be made into a Muslim State.	His own word
28.	1916	F.K. Khan Durrani	The Muslim youth dream of a division of India on Hindu–Muslim lines and exchange of population.	His own word
29.	1917 (2 June)	Lord Curzon	India will never be a single autonomous unit, or even a federation of autonomous states; disintegration is a good possibility.	Clear
30.	1917 (June)	E.S. Montagu	India may end up as a commonwealth of self-governing provinces or countries.	Clear
31.	1917 (September–October)	Kheiri Brothers	Partition India into a Hindu India and a Muslim India.	Clear

32.	1918	The Aga Khan	A United States of India with fully autonomous provinces or self-governing states of the size of medium European states; the Punjab to be enlarged; Sind, Baluchistan and NWFP to make up one large Indus Province with Quetta as its capital; this Indian federation to be gradually expanded into a huge South Asian Federation.	Clear
33.	1919	A.B. Keith	Muslims are thinking about a Muslim state based on Afghanistan and embracing all north-western areas of Muslim majority.	Personal observation
34.	1919	Beni Prasad	Some Muslims entertain an idea of an Islamic State in the north-west.	Personal observation
35.	1920 (March–April)	M.A.Q. Bilgrami	A division of India into a Hindu State and a Muslim State in order to safeguard religious ritual of cow-killing. (Demarcation foresees the 1947 boundries).	Clear
36.	1921	Nadir Ali	A partition of India as a method of settling the Hindu-Muslim problem.	Quoted by Khaliquzzaman
37.	1921 (December)	Hasrat Mohani	A federal republic in which a set of Muslim provinces will balance another set of Hindu provinces.	Clear
38.	1923	Wahabuddin Kamboh	North-west India minus Kashmir to be an independent state called Nuristan.	Related in *Sayyara Digest*

39.	1923	Bhai Parmanand	Hindu-Muslim unity is unthinkable; there should be a complete severance between the two peoples; India to be partitioned so that Islam and Hinduism become supreme in separate zones.	Quoted by S.S. Pirzada
40.	1923	Sardar Gul Khan	The area from Raskumari to Agra to be given to the Hindus, and that from Agra to Peshawar to the Muslims; the population to be exchanged.	Clear
41.	1924	Obaidullah Sindhi	India to be a federation of republics.	Reported by Muhammad Sarwar
42.	1924	Joseph Stalin	In the case of a revelutionary upheaval in India, many hitherto unknown nationalities will emerge on the scene.	Quoted by S.S. Pirzada
43.	1924	Hasrat Mohani	India to be a bi-communal federal state in which Hindu states and Muslim states will join under a Supreme National Government.	Quoted by Rahmat Ali
44.	1924 (14 December)	Lajpat Rai	Continuation of separate electorates is irreconcilable with Indian nationalism; Muslims are not prepared to give them up; a civil war will again mean the domination of one community; the solution: give the Muslims four States of their own—NWFP, Wester Punjab, Sind and eastern Bengal.	Clear

45.	1924 (December)	Muhammad Ali	Musims are in a majority in an area stretching from Constantinople to Saharanpur (repeating Lovat Fraser).	Clear
46.	1925 (22 May)	Muhammad Ali	Muslims have no desire to rule over Hindu areas.	Clear
47.	1925 (5 June)	Muhammad Ali	Give the right of self-determination to various provinces and areas; no portion to be forced to join the future Indian state; separation is justified on economic, strategic, religious and cultural grounds.	Clear
48.	1925 (July)	Patrick Fagan	Muslims will fight for their domination in north India.	Clear
49.	1925 (July)	W.A.J. Archbold	There will be a powerful Muslim combination in the north-west in alliance with Afghanistan.	Clear
50.	1925	"Cheiro"	One day India will be divided equally between the Muslims and the followers of Buddha.	Clear
51.	1925	Some teachers of Aligarh University	Muslim-ruled provinces to be a part of an Indian federation; special centres for religious communities to be created.	Unclear and doubtful

52.	1928 (14 March)	*The Times* (J.M. Ewart)	Muslims want effective Muslim rule in the north-west, with a partition of the Punjab; this will secure the interests of the Muslim majority and also protect the Muslims left in Hindu India.	Clear
53.	1928 (June)	Ashraf Ali Thanawi	A separate Muslim state should be created in India.	Quoted by M.A. Rahman Khan
54.	1928 (13 October)	The Aga Khan	India to be a loose alliance of Free States demarcated on the basis of religion, nationality, race and language; Muslim provinces of north and west may join together to make one free state.	Clear
55.	1928 (December)	M.A.K. Maikash	A Muslim national homeland should be created, consisting of the Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and NWFP; this demand is sanctioned by the internationally recognized right of self-determination.	Quoted by A.S. Khurshid
56.	1928 (December)	Citizens of Delhi	Create a new Delhi province consisting of Delhi, and Agra, Rohilkhand and Meerut divisions of the United Provinces and Ambala Division of the Punjab.	Clear
57.	1928 (December)	All India Khilafat Conference	Create a federation of free and united states of India with the centre enjoying only those powers which have been given to it by the constituent units.	Clear

58.	1928	Sayyid Sardar Ali Khan	Every concession to the Hindus must be matched by an equal one to the Muslims; Muslims should be placed on an absolute equality with the Hindus.	Clear
59.	1928	Srinivasa Sastri	Muslims are demanding the creation of autonomous Muslim States along the north-west border of India.	Quoted by S.S. Pirzada
60.	1929 (1 January)	All India Muslim Conference	Create a federation with residuary powers vested in the provinces.	Clear
61.	1929 (February)	F.K. Khan Durrani	Hindu-Muslim unity is impossible; either the Hindus should convert all Muslims to Hinduism or all Hindus should become Muslims; States are based on power, not on pacts; elimination, not assimilation, is the solution; Muslims should make a bid for an empire in India and establish a Muslim India.	Clear
62.	1929 (probably middle of the year)	Zulifqar Ali Khan and Abdullah Suhrawardy	All Muslim provinces should have Muslim governments and the rest of the Indian provinces Hindu governments, thus creating a balance of power in India.	Clear
63.	1929 (late)	Ross Masud	Muslims are contemplating a federation of Afghanistan, Persia and north-west tribal areas, and a union of northern Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and Afghanistan.	Clear

64.	1929 (31 December)	Zulfiqar Ali Khan	Nationalism is based on religion; India cannot become one nation until all Indians belong to one religion, which is impossible; the Punjab and Bengal should be divided on religious lines; Muslims should be given an area in the north where they are 80% of the population, and another in the east with similar preponderance; this is a demand for a separate country and homeland.	Clear
65.	1930 (29 December)	Muhammad Iqbal	The Punjab, NWFP, Sind and Baluchistan to be amalgamated into a single state; this will bring to India an internal balance of power; the creation of autonomous states is the only possible way to secure a stable constitutional structure for India.	Clear
66.	1931 (12 February)	Anonymous	Divide India into a Hindu state, a Muslims state and a tiny state for Europeans and Aglo-Indians.	Clear
67.	1931 (March)	*Round Table*	It is certainly possible that India might break up, first into a Muslim and a Hindu India, and later into a number of national states, as Europe did after the Renaissance and the Reformation.	Clear
68.	1931 (June)	Theodore Morison	A Muslim national state in the north of India is possible, even probable.	Clear

69.	1931 (June)	*Manchester Guardian* correspondent in India	There is a strong tendency among the Muslims to form a large northern block of provinces; many Muslims foresee a Muslim state in the north stretching from Karachi to north Bengal.	Clear
70.	1931 (July)	Lord Zetland	A chain of Muslim provinces stretching across the north-west of India will be a basis of great strength and influence to the Muslims generally.	Clear
71.	1931 (25 September)	British Cabinet Paper	Muslims' primary object is to create a Muslim India, and then secure Muslim interests elsewhere by the operation of the hostage theory.	Clear
72.	1931 (8 October)	The Punjab Sikhs	Divisions of Rawalpindi and Multan (minus Lyallpur and Montgomery districts) to be joined with NWFP, which can then be made a governor's province.	Clear
73.	1931 (12 October)	Geoffrey Corbett	Ambala division (minus Simla district) to be separated from the Punjab, the United Provinces to be divided into a Western Province of Agra (which will take up Ambala division) and an Eastern Province of Oudh.	Clear
74.	1931 (30 October)	Muhammad Yaqub	Redistribute India into small homogeneous provinces with full autonomous powers, leaving only defined and limited powers with the centre.	Clear

75.	1931 (7 November)	*Economist*	Muslims want effective control of the entire Indus basin and of Eastern Bengal and a corridor linking the Punjab with Bengal.	Clear
76.	1931 (3 December)	Alfred Knox	There is no hope of the Hindus and Muslims ever coming into one organic whole.	Clear
77.	1932 (16 April)	Lord Irwin (Viceroy)	Foresees some division of India to settle the communal difficulty.	Clear
78.	1932 (29 April)	Walter Lawrence	There are great and well-defined nationalities in India; the only hope of natural and healthy growth lies in recognizing them.	Clear
79.	1932 (19 May)	H.T. Lambrick	India may be divided on religious lines.	Clear
80.	1932 (8 August)	*Manchester Guardian*	Hindu and Muslim attitudes to life are so utterly opposed that such remedies as Pax Britannica, education and self-government are useless.	Clear
81.	1932	A.R. Banerji	Indian Muslim nationalism, if encouraged or allowed to develop unhindered, will one day result in a feeling of Pan-Islamism and Islamic empire.	Clear
82.	1932	John Coatman	Foresees a powerful Muslim state in the north and west.	Quoted by Shaukat Ullah Ansari and Rajendra Prasad

83.	1932	John Coatman	Muslims want to control north or at least north-western India.	Clear
84.	1932	John Coatman	It may be that Muslim India in the north and north-west is destined to become a separate Muslim State or part of a Muslim Empire.	Clear
85.	1932	Reginald Craddock	With European history before us, how can we expect that the great diversities and divergent racial elements to be found in India can be welded into one self-governing and democratic whole?	Clear
86.	1933 (28 January)	Rahmat Ali	A homeland for the 30 million Muslims of the north-west should be an independent Muslim state, consisting of the Punjab, NWFP, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan, to be called PAKSTAN.	Clear
87.	1933 (February)	G.T. Garratt	Within a short period the projected federal government will be faced with a strong separatist movement.	Clear
88.	1933 (May)	Elliott Colvin	The creation of a feeling of national union between Hindus and Muslims is likely to be a matter of a century's duration.	Clear
89.	1933 (15 June)	Haji Rahim Bakhsh	India must be divided into Muslim and Hindu states; but partition not demanded.	Clear

90.	1933 (September)	F.E. Holsinger	Split up India into several independent dominions; Muslim districts of the United Provinces with Lucknow as the capital to be one dominion; NWFP and Muslim districts of the Punjab to be another; the Muslim part of Bengal to be still another; 13 dominions in all to cover British India; 12 of the bigger native states to become kingdoms.	Clear
91.	1934	Henry Gidney	The Anglo-Indians must have their own separate state.	Reported by V.R. Gaikawad
92.	1934–1935	Fazli Husain	Create Muslim-majority zones as a counterpoise to Hindu majority areas.	Quoted by Durga Das
93.	1935 (29 January)	Gulshan Rai	Divide the Punjab on communal lines.	Clear
94.	1936 (June–July)	Calvert	Create a new federation of the Punjab, Sind, NWFP, Baluchistan and Kashmir.	Quoted by Gulshan Rai
95.	1936	John Coatman	A large Muslim state in the north-west of India and parts of Central Asia may materialise.	Clear
96.	1937 (20 March)	Muhammad Iqbal	Muslims are a distinct political unit in India.	Clear
97.	1937 (28 May)	Muhammad Iqbal	Redistribute the country, and provide one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities.	Clear

98.	1937 (21 June)	Muhammad Iqbal	Muslims of north-west and Bengal are nations entitled to self-determination; a separate federation of Muslim provinces should be created.	Clear
99.	1937 (10 July)	M.H. Gazdar	Make a separate federation of the Punjab, Sind, NWFP and Baluchistan.	Clear
100.	1937 (7 August)	Ahmad Yar Daultana	Congress policy may result in the creation of Pakistan.	Clear
101.	1937 (26 September)	Calcutta Muslim League Conference	Create a free Islam within a free India.	Clear
102.	1937 (September)	Punjab Muslim Students Federation and Inter-collegiate Brotherhood of Lahore	Muslim students shall struggle for the creation of Pakistan in the north-west.	Mentioned by A.S. Khurshid
103.	1937 (October)	Ali Jawwad	Partition India on Hindu-Muslim lines.	Quoted by S.S. Pirzada
104.	1937	F.K. Khan Durrani	Muslims are a nation; co-operation with the Congress is impossible.	Clear

105.	1937	Rahmat Ali	Bengal and Assam to constitute a separate Muslim state under the name of Bang-i-Islam.	Not clear
106.	1938 (13 October)	Sind Muslim League Conference	Divide India into a Muslim federation and a Hindu federation. (Disallowed by Jinnah).	Clear
107.	1938 (4 November)	Abdus Samad Rajisthani	NWFP, Sind, Baluchistan, Punjab, United Provinces, Bihar, Bengal and Assam should form a Muslim state.	Clear
108.	1938 (end)	Jamiluddin Ahmad	Divide India into a Muslim and a Hindu federation	Clear
109.	1938 (October–December)	Abul Ala Mawdudi	Three alternatives: (a) India to be an international federation of States of Federated Nations. (b) Latif's cultural zones to be converted into autonomous states under a weak centre; exchange of population within 25 years. (c) Two separate National Federal States of Hindus and Muslims joined in a confederation.	Clear
110.	1938 (November–December)	Abdullah Haroon	Muslim League is beginning to drift towards demanding a separate federation of Muslim provinces and states.	Quoted by K.B. Sayeed

111.	1938 (5 December)	*The Times*	Muslims want a Pakistan.	Clear
112.	1938 (21 December)	*The Times*	Muslims are aiming at a Pakistan.	Clear
113.	1938	M.Y.Y. Khairati	North-west to be a Muslim state called Islamabad.	Clear
114.	1938	Majlis-i-Pakistan	Founded by the young Muslims of Lahore to propagate and struggle for the fulfilment of the idea of a Muslim state in the north-west. (The Majlis had branches in several towns of the Punjab).	Clear
115.	1938	Silsila-i-Jamiat-i-Vahdat Umam Islam (Turkey)	Three independent Muslim states to be created in India: Hyderabad, Bengal and north-west India.	Mentioned by Punjabi
116.	1938	S.A. Latif	India to have 15 cultural zones, 11 for the Hindus and 4 for the Muslims; each zone to be a state within a loose Indian federation; large-scale transfer of population.	Clear
117.	1938	M.A. Jinnah	We must have a state of our own.	Quoted by Sir Francis Low

118.	1938	Harry Hodgson	The north-west Muslim India may split off and associate itself with other Muslim countries.	Qutoed by Kanji Dwarkadas
119.	1939 (29 January)	Abdullah Haroon	We want Pakistan	Clear
120.	1939 (29 January)	A.M. Rashdi	We want Pakistan.	Clear
121.	1939 (10 February)	M.S. Toosi	Create a Muslim state in the north-west and another in Bengal and Assam.	Clear
122.	1939 (21 February)	"Baybak"	Muslims are a nation and should demand their own state.	Quoted by Waheed Qureshi
123.	1939 (22 February)	Gulshan Rai	Create a small Eastern Bengal plus Sylhet; join some parts of the Punjab with NWFP to make a Muslim province.	Clear
124.	1939 (25 February)	A.S. Kheiri	Muslim-majority provinces and states should form a separate federation.	Clear
125.	1939 (early March)	S.A. Latif	A slightly revised version of No. 116.	Clear
126.	1939 (14 & 20 March)	Khaliquzzaman and A.R. Siddiqui	Separate Muslim areas from India and reconstitute them into two federations.	Clear

127.	1939 (22 March & 4 April)	Asadullah	Create a range of Muslim blocks from the north-west to the north-east; whole of the United Provinces and Bihar to belong to Muslims; Nizam to become ruler of Kashmir and Maharaja of Kashmir to take over Hyderabad; all Muslims from the rest of India to migrate to this Muslim north.	Clear
128.	1939 (24 March)	M.S. Toosi	If Pakistan and Eastern Bengal and Assam are given full autonomous powers and the right of secession they may agree to join an Indian federation for a transitional period.	Clear
129.	1939 (25 March)	Liaquat Ali Khan	Division of India is probable.	Clear
130.	1939 (17 April)	M. Nasim	A division of India is the only solution of the Muslim problem.	Clear
131.	1939 (10 May)	A.M. Rashdi	Muslims want a zone and homeland of their own.	Clear
132.	1939 (20–21 May)	Bindiki Muslim League Conference	Muslims want Pakistan.	Clear
133.	1939 (22 May)	Pakistan Association, Lahore	We want a separate Muslim federation.	Clear

134.	1939 (May)	H.V. Hodson	The north-west will possibly split off after British withdrawal.	Clear
135.	1939 (2 July)	"A Punjabi"	India to be a confederation of three federations: Bengal, Indusstan (the north-west) and Hindu India; no exchange of population; the Punjab to be divided.	Clear
136.	1939 (2 July)	Nawab Sir Shah Nawaz Khan of Mamdot	India to be a confederation of five federations: Bengal, Indusstan, Hindu India, Hyderabad states, and Rajistan states. (Doubtful if Mamdot suggested this; most probably Punjabi's own amended version of his above scheme).	Clear
137.	1939 (16 July)	Punjab Muslim Students Federation	A Muslim state, called "Pakistan Caliphate", to cover Sind, Baluchistan, the Punjab, NWFP, Kashmir and parts of the United Provinces, the Central Provinces and Bihar.	Clear
138.	1939 (29 July)	Sikandar Hayat Khan	India to have seven zones, each zone with its own legislature but not executive; the centre to be weak; one-third Muslim share in the federal council of Ministers; native states to enter the federation on an equal footing with the provinces, but the rulers to nominate a portion of state representatives in the zonal legislature; British rule to continue idefinitely.	Clear

139.	1939 (July)	Abdul Wadud	Create an independent Muslim state to be called "Eastern Afghanistan".	Reported in the press
140.	1939 (July)	William Barton	Muslim League wants a partition; gives details.	His own observation
141.	1939 (9 August)	Faqir of Ipi	Create an independent Muslim state in north India.	Reported at second hand in the press
142.	1939 (15 August)	Two Aligarh Dons	Muslims are a separate nation; divide India into three sovereign states: north-west India (or Pakistan), containing the Punjab, NWFP, Sind and Baluchistan; Bengal with the district of Purnea from Bihar and the division of Sylhet from Assam, but excluding the districts of Howrah, Midnapore and Darjeeling; and Hindustan, covering the rest of India; Hyderabad to be a sovereign state; other native states to join the state contiguous to or surrounding them.	Clear
143.	1939 (25 August)	*Star of India*	Divide India on religious lines.	Clear
144.	1939 (30 August)	Anwar Bakhshi	Muslims want their own home.	Clear
145.	1939 (August – September)	Lord Linlithgow	If Congress does not behave, Jinnah will break India into two.	Quoted by K.M. Munshi

146.	1939 (28 September)	M.A. Jinnah	Muslim League stands for a "free and independent Islam".	Clear
147.	1939 (September)	M.A. Jinnah	I am coming round to the idea of Pakistan "in spite of myself".	Quoted by I.H. Qureshi
148.	1939 (18 November)	Raja of Mahmudabad	We want Pakistan.	Clear
149.	1939 (24 November)	Liaquat Ali Khan	A division of India is a probability.	Clear
150.	1939 (12 December)	Five Aligarh Dons	Our ideal is free sovereign Muslim states.	Clear
151.	1939 (December)	*Round Table*	Muslims are moving more and more towards the creation of a Muslim Ulster in India.	Clear
152.	1939 (December)	Stafford Cripps	Some separation of Hindu and Muslim dominions may be necessary; partition would be a necessary part of a new Indian constitution.	Reported by his biographer, Colin Cooke
153.	1939 (December)	N. Mitchell	Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan, NWFP, Bengal and Assam would be separate units in direct relation with the British Crown.	His own observation
154.	1939	Ranjee Shahani	Solve the Indian problem through regionalism.	Clear

155.	1940 (5 January)	M.S. Toosi	Create independent states in north-east (with a divided Bengal) and north-west (with a divided Punjab).	Clear
156.	1940 (10 January)	Zakaullah Khan	Hindu and Muslim parity at the centre; no division.	Clear
157.	1940 (early)	Azad Subhani	Create a Muslim state under a government to be called Hakumat-i-Rabbani.	Cited by S.S. Pirzada
158.	1940 (early)	Afzal Huq Kashmiri	Create a Muslim state under a government to be called Hakumat-i-Ilahiyya.	Cited by S.S. Pirzada
159.	1940 (early)	Sayyid Rizwanullah	Divide India into several states with some sort of a federal centre.	Cited by S.S. Pirzada
160.	1940 (2 February)	S.M. Akhtar	Territorial separation is the last resort.	Clear
161.	1940 (3 February)	C.R. Reddy	Create a confederation of sovereign provinces and states with a composite confederal executive.	Clear
162.	1940 (3-4 February)	All India Muslim League	The Working Committee opts for a partition of India.	Clear
163.	1940 (February)	Abdullah Haroon	Divide India into two separate federations; the Muslim Federation to comprise the north-western Muslim provinces and Kashmir.	Cited by K.B. Sayeed

164.	1940 (3 March)	Abdullah Haroon	Muslims want partition and their own homelands.	Clear
165.	1940 (8 March)	Zafar Ali Khan	Create a buffer state in the north-west.	Clear
166.	1940 (13 March)	M.A. Jinnah	Informs the Viceroy that the Muslim League will demand a partition if Britain cannot produce an acceptable constitutional solution.	Clear
167.	1940 (March)	Abdullah Yusuf Ali	Establish a new two-party system, with all parties (including the Muslim League) opposed to the Congress forming one grand coalition.	Clear
168.	1940 (22 March)	Rahmat Ali	A sovereign Hyderabad, to be called Osmanistan, to be added to the Muslim states already suggested by him.	Clear
169.	1940 (23 March)	All India Muslim League	The Lahore Resolution is introduced at the Lahore annual session.	Clear
170.	1940 (24 March)	All India Muslim League	The Lahore Resolution is adopted at the Lahore annual session.	Clear

which Pakistan is the first part".[21]

So far it has not been possible to trace the original of this inaugural address, nor has any contemporary witness come forward to confirm the substance of Rahmat Ali's claim. On the other hand, none has denied it or contradicted him from personal knowledge. The important point here is that there is nothing inherently improbable in it. In the thinking about Muslim separatism prior to Rahmat Ali, one suggestion common to several proposed solutions was the separation of the north from the rest of India and the establishment of Muslim control therein. Admittedly this was a vague scheme and we still cannot determine the precise intentions of its authors. Was it to be a re-arrangement of provincial boundaries with a view to the creation of a purely Muslim group of provinces in the north? Or, was it to be a clear division of India on geographic and religious grounds so that the result would be the establishment of a Muslim state in the sub-continent? There is no answer to these questions because those who suggested this solution did not go into details. What is significant from our present point of view is that such a scheme was in the air and it was not difficult to develop it into what Rahmat Ali announced in 1915. F.K. Khan Durrani, whose college days coincided with those of Rahmat Ali, tells us that at that time Muslim students often used to talk of a division of India and the creation of a Muslim state. Though this was no more than a dream and no one, not even the students themselves, whose optimism was unlimited, gave serious thought to it, yet the idea was there and might well have impelled Rahmat Ali towards demanding a Muslim state in the north. On the other hand, it could also have been a process in the reverse direction: Rahmat Ali's ideas and his inaugural address might have appealed to the youthful imagination of his contemporaries and set them thinking on separatist lines.

However it came about, and we can say that there is some circumstantial evidence to support Rahmat Ali's reference to his activities of 1915, the curious thing is his long silence on the issue after this date. If he felt so strongly about it that he went to the extent of founding a society and giving it the benefit of his thoughts, he should have continued his interest in the idea and spoken or written about it when he was living in Lahore. If he did, we have no record of it. Was the Bazm-i-Shibli address a flash of inspiration which did not recur? Did the idea lose its way in the

bustle of hi

bustle of his diligent and energetic existence in Lahore? Unless we come across more information on his Lahore years we must accept the broken strand of his argument.

In this period of scanty information the only thing we have to go by is Rahmat Ali's comments on some of the proposals, made between 1923 and 1930, aimed at securing Muslim control over parts of India. But it must be kept in mind that these remarks were made much later and might owe something to hindsight, though there is a thread of consistency running through all of them.

When Sardar Muhammad Gul Khan's testimony given before the North-West Frontier Enquiry Committee was released, it pleased Rahmat Ali to see that by making a demand for separation the Sardar had "repudiated all Muslim politicians and organizations working for the common nationhood of Muslims and Hindoos, asserted our distinct nationhood, and asked for a clear-cut division of India between Hindoos and Muslims". In an obvious dig at the Muslim League, he deplored that, although this demand had been made one year before Mawlana Hasrat Mohani's attempt to achieve some security for the Muslims, and seven years before Iqbal's Allahabad address, and though this had been known to the Muslim leaders at least since 1941 when Dr. Ambedkar mentioned it in his book, yet no Muslim writer had referred to it. "I do hope", he wrote, "this omission has not been due to any feeling that a reference to his demand may compromise their personal 'heroes' or discredit their pet theories about the evolution of the Muslim demand for the division of India. For that would be un-Islamic and unworthy of us Muslims, who are the standard-bearers of truth in the world."[22]

To Hasrat Mohani's proposals of 1924 he gave a qualified approval. He had kind words for Mohani: "that selfless revolutionary and poet-politician who has devoted his life to the cause of freedom and who by his service and sacrifice has raised the standard of our public life". But he realized that his scheme was not for a partition, but for an Indian federation in which Mawlana's "states" would be nothing better than provinces. Without impugning Mohani's sincerity in hoping for a free Islam in a free federal India, he was convinced that such a federation "could not but fetter Islam". For this conclusion he gave four reasons. First, the conversion of Muslim "provinces" into Muslim

"states" could "not make any difference to our fundamental status". Secondly, "the creation of a federation of six Muslim states and sixteen Hindoo states could only perpetuate our subordinate position in India". Thirdly, it failed to acknowledge or pronounce the Muslims to be a separate nation: "The common nationhood of Hindoos and Muslims could only mean Hindoo nationhood for us Muslims". Finally, owing to the numerical disparity between Muslims and Hindus, the composition of the supreme national government would be overwhelmingly Hindu. In spite of these "serious flaws", the proposal could claim three advantages. In the first place, by rejecting dominion status in favour of complete independence it had "demonstrated Muslim love for the freedom of all peoples of India and contributed to the development of political thought among our people". In the second place, by demanding a Hindu-Muslim basis for the Indian federation, it "damped Hindoo hopes of unlimited exclusive hegemony". Lastly, it had succeeded in persuading certain Hindu politicians of the need for considering the Muslim problem from a completely new angle.[23]

The foremost among such Hindu politicians was Lala Lajpat Rai who published his own solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem at the end of the same year, 1924. This was for a clean partition of India between Hindus and Muslims in which Muslims would get the North-West Frontier Province, Western Punjab, Sind, Eastern Bengal, and other areas inhabited by "compact Muslim communities" which Rahmat Ali took to mean "at least Jammun and Kashmir and Malabar". This to Rahmat Ali indicated "a fundamental change in the attitude of an influential section of Caste Hindoos". For the first time in history, some Hindus had come out openly to endorse the Muslim belief and "to admit the impossibility of Muslim absorption by them and the inevitability of the recognition by them of Muslim nationhood". More than that, "they had come to agree to divide India into Hindoo India and Muslim India, and to recognize Muslim sovereignty in Muslim strongholds". In spite of the exclusion of Eastern Punjab and Western Bengal from the areas allotted to the Muslims, Rahmat Ali believed that Lajpat Rai's scheme was "a decisive step in the right direction", and that "had it been followed by an immediate demand for a more appropriate division of India, the history of India and of the Millat during the past quarter of a

century would have been written differently". He could see why the Hindu politicians had not done this; their reasons were perfectly understandable. But what he failed to understand, and for which he demanded an explanation, was the failure of Muslim leadership to stake a claim directly after Lajpat Rai had indicated Hindu willingness to consider and perhaps also to concede such a demand.

In spite of the incomprehensible Muslim silence, the Lala's proposal had serious repercussions in both camps. "In our case, it reinforced our old belief in the distinct entity of our people and our lands, refixed our eyes on our homelands, and sharpened our urge for the division of India. In the case of Caste Hindoos, it intensified their efforts to keep us confined in India, changed their old subtle appeals for 'Hindoo-Muslim Union' to new, stern demands for 'Hindoo-Muslim Unity', and turned their sophisticated talk of Hindoo-Muslim co-operation into sharp threats of coercing us into 'Indian Unity'–a Unity which could only mean our funeral." In consequence, "the tide of Indianism began to flow faster after 1924; and, as time passed, it rose to flood level and swept all before it". Muslim leaders did nothing to check this current. In Rahmat Ali's apt imagery, they just looked at it as a cow looks at a passing train.[24]

This lull continued in Muslim affairs until the Allahabad address of Iqbal, "that immortal poet of Islam, whose poetry served as a beaconlight in the darkest period of our history and whose message will ever help us on the way to our destiny".[25] As several Iqbal scholars have tried to prove that Rahmat Ali's proposals amounted to no more than an exaggerated echo of Iqbal's 1930 suggestion, it is important to examine with care what Rahmat Ali wrote about the Allahabad speech.

At the outset he noted that Iqbal was "specifically supporting the Muslim politicians' demand for Indian Federation, comprising all the provinces of India, including our own". He was also using the word "state" not in the sense of a separate, sovereign state, but in that of "a big province within and as part of the proposed Indian Federation". Rahmat Ali compared the wording of the Nehru Report and Iqbal's reference to its rejection of his proposal, and discovered that while the Report had declined to accept the scheme of an amalgamated north-western area on the ground that this would produce an "unwieldly province", Iqbal, in his address,

had paraphrased this objection by saying that it would create "a very unwieldly state".

Secondly, Iqbal had, throughout his address, spoken of India as one country, of the Indians as one nation, and of the Muslims as one of the communities of that nation. Thirdly, his suggestion for the amalgamation of four Muslim provinces on the north-west was "limited in nature and restricted in range" in comparison to other suggestions made by Hindus and Muslims prior to 1930. Finally, his demand for an Indian federation, if conceded, would "complicate our problems and aggravate our perils". Rahmat Ali based this objection on the political nature of federalism. "In Constitutional Law, federalism springs from the conception of the common nationality of a people. It is founded and built upon the voluntary and permanent renunciation of their distinct nationhood by all partners in favour of a common nationhood, which invariably means the nationhood of the major partner in a federation. This being the linchpin of federalism, it is obvious that the Federal Constitution asked for involved our renunciation of Pak nationhood and our acceptance of Indian nationhood. In other words, it made our absorption by the Caste Hindoos a certainty, and its acceptance by us an act of self-immolation."

But Rahmat Ali did not believe that these defects of Iqbal's plan had rendered it completely useless. It had made "a profound contribution" to the Muslim cause. It had "re-inspired our people to think in terms of the consolidation of our nation, revived the issue of our future, and riveted our gaze on our homelands in the north-west of 'India' ".

Yet, the plan came to nothing. Muslim politicians opposed it and Iqbal himself repudiated it. "No wonder, therefore, that Iqbal participated in framing the official Federal Constitution for India, in which not only were our people treated as a minority community of the Indian nation, but also each of the provinces he had wished to see amalgamated was treated as a mere administrative district of the Country of India."[26]

Then came the Round Table Conference (RTC) where Muslim delegates joined with the Hindu in helping the British to hammer out a federal arrangement for India, in which all Indians would be integrated as one people and one nation and the Indianization of the Muslims would be completed with tragic finality. Rahmat Ali was witnessing this spectacle with "piognant anxiety". He met the

Muslim delegates and tried to warn them of the outcome of the policy they were pursuing. "I knew that their action had obliterated the twelve centuries of our history, destroyed the very foundations of our heritage, and crippled all hopes of the fulfilment of our mission. I begged them to realize their responsibility before Allah and His Rasool, and to withdraw their demand for the Indian Federation, withhold their participation in framing the Indian Federal Constitution, and ask for a separate federation of our north-western homelands." He failed to convince them and to divert them from their perilous course. "There was no realization, no response."

Like all men whom events disappoint, Rahmat Ali then turned to hope. "I hoped against hope that at least some prominent Muslim, not connected with the delegates, would still disown them, denounce their inclusion in the Indian Federation, and declare for our distinct nationhood in our homelands." Once again his hopes were dupes and his fears were not liars. "But time passed by, the Second RTC ended, and none came forward. Yet every day saw the federal fetters grow stronger and the possibility of our escape from them grow fainter. It was incredible to me that there was such a noble task and yet no one to do it! No patrician or politician to attempt it!"[27]

Here we must break the continuity of Rahmat Ali's account to take note of the difficulties of a historian who attempts to build up a story out of inter-locking facts garnered from different but reliable sources. We have no evidence to contradict Rahmat Ali's statement that he met the Muslim delegates to the first two sessions of the RTC and tried to dissuade them from committing their people to an Indian federation. He held strong views on this matter, which looked to him as a fateful choice between life and death. But we hear no mention of these discussions from the lips of these delegates. They don't even refer to his name or existence. This could be explained in two ways. First, none of the Muslim delegates to the first two Conferences, except the Aga Khan, has left any memoir, journal, diary or autobiography in which one could have hoped to find a first-hand account of private conversations and meetings in London. The Aga Khan's references to the London discussions are brief and on the whole unrevealing: he took the Conference as one of several episodes in so eventful a career and did not give it much importance in his autobiography.

The other delegates would have recalled the Conference more fully, but to the misfortune of Muslim India they, in common with other Muslim leaders, suffered from an inability to leave behind them any account of their life. Nor has this gap been so far filled by the discovery, publication or use of their private papers or letters. The other reason for their failure to mention Rahmat Ali could be their dismissal of him as a mere student who bothered them with his fancy ideas and was scarcely worth a second thought.

Sharifuddin Pirzada, who has made a study of the development of the idea of Pakistan, records in passing that Rahmat Ali "approached the Muslim delegates and discussed with them the political and constitutional situation from Muslim point of view".[28] He does not, however, quote any authority. I.H. Qureshi goes a little further when he writes that Rahmat Ali "tried to canvass the members of the [Muslim] delegation, who dismissed his ideas as the fantasy of the mind of a student".[29] He, too, does not cite his evidence for this statement. Rahmat Ali did not declare that his suggestions were rebuffed by the Muslim delegates because they were fantastic or because they came from a student. It seems probable from Qureshi's words that he is confusing the delegates' reaction to Rahmat Ali's proposal with the opinions expressed by the Muslim members of and the Muslim witnesses before the later Joint Select Committee which considered the final shape of the Indian reform. It was here that Muslim leaders told the Committee that the scheme for a Pakistan had no support in Muslim India and was merely the dream of some students.

To come back to Rahmat Ali, he was in despair at seeing the Muslim delegates advancing deeper into what he considered a political quagmire of inestimable dangers, and at finding them taking no notice of his warning. He realized that if Muslims were to be pulled back from the brink of a disaster to which their leaders had taken them, he would have to do it by his own initiative and resources. "The feeling gripped me that, on the failure of them all, Allah had assigned that fateful task to me; that He commanded me to do it; that He wanted me to challenge the mighty, to oppose the Indian Federation, to propose the Islamic Federation . . . . Once that feeling came, it possessed me; it governed my life; it directed my activities."[30]

The final conclusion was inevitable. "Inspired by the sense of a

divine mission, I reviewed the situation most solemnly and came to the conclusion that it was now or never; that any further silence would be fatal. For that would mean our general acquiescence in the policies of our 'delegates'. More than that. It would mean our approval both of their renunciation of our nationhood in our homelands and of their demand for and acceptance of the Indian Federation. In that realization I decided to take immediate action to save our honour and existence, and to ensure the ultimate security and destiny of our nation in Pakistan and of our Millat in Dinia and its Dependencies."[31]

The hour of action had arrived, and Rahmat Ali fired the first shot of the campaign by issuing a declaration with the dramatic title of *Now or Never*, which might have been taken from a sentence in Leo Pinsker's *Auto-Emancipation*, published in 1882: "Let 'now or never' be our watchword. . .".[32]

Now or Never

Bearing the sub-title, "Are we to Live or Perish forever?", the declaration was addressed to the world on behalf of the thirty million Muslims of north-west India. It appealed for "sympathy and support in our grim and fateful struggle againt political crucifixion and complete annihilation". The homeland of these thirty million Muslims was defined in the first sentence as Pakstan, "by which we mean the five Northern units of India, viz.: *P*unjab, North-West Frontier Province (*A*fghan), *K*ashmir, *S*ind and Baluchis*TAN*".[33]

Then came a stinging attack on Muslim delegates to the RTC. The nation was being sacrificed, "to the lasting disgrace of Islam", by these so-called leaders, "with reckless disregard to our future and in utter contempt of the teachings of history". They had committed "an inexcusable and prodigious" blunder. "They had committed "an inexcusable and prodigious" blunder. "They have submitted, in the name of Hindu nationalism, to the perpetual subjection of the ill-starred Muslim nation." By agreeing to a federal constitution for India they had signed the death-warrant of Islam and its future in India. "In doing so, they have taken shelter behind the so-called Mandate from the community. But they forgot that that suicidal Mandate was framed and formulated by their own hands. That Mandate was not the Mandate of the

Muslims of India. Nations never give Mandates to their representatives to barter away their very souls; and men of conscience never accept such self-annihilating Mandates, if given–much less execute them."[34]

Turning his gaze from the present to the past Rahmat Ali found similar confusion and lack of courage. The previous seventy-five years had shown no statesmanship among Muslim leaders. "These have been the years of false issues, of lost opportunities and of utter blindness to the most essential and urgent needs of the Muslim interests. Their policy has throughout been nerveless in action and subservient in attitude. They have all along been paralyzed with fear and doubt, and have deliberately, time and again, sacrificed their political principles for the sake of opportunism and expediency."[35]

India was neither a country nor a nation. "It is, in fact, the designation of a State created for the first time in history, by the British." The heterogeneity of its peoples was a proven fact. "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."[36]

Next, he argued for the separate identity and character of the Muslims of the five northern provinces (in his "Pakstan" of this declaration Kashmir was included along with the four provinces proper) in words which Jinnah must have read and re-read with much care, for he repeated them unconsciously while propounding the two-nation theory in his extempore address before the 1940 Lahore session of the Muslim League. "Our religion, culture, history, tradition, economic system, laws of inheritance, succession and marriage", said Rahmat Ali, "are basically and fundamentally different from those of the people living in the rest of India. The ideals which move our thirty million brethren-in-faith living in these Provinces to make the highest sacrifices are fundamentally different from those which inspire the Hindoos. These differences are not confined to the broad basic principles–far from it. They extend to the minutest details of our lives. We do not inter-dine; we do not inter-marry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different."[37]

He asked those British and European observers of the Indian scene who were fond of likening Hindu-Muslim differences to

Catholic-Protestant rivalry in Christian countries to disabuse their mind of such false analogies. The two Christian sects were part and parcel of the same religion, while Hindus and Muslims belonged to two totally different religious systems, in which religion was not a matter of private opinion as it was in the case of Christianity, but constituted a civic Church governing the conduct of their adherents from birth to death.[38]

Once these Muslims were forced into an Indian federation they would be reduced to a minority of one to four. This would surely sound "the death-knell of the Muslim nation in India forever". The magnitude of the impending disaster could be measured by recalling to mind that the thirty million Muslims of "Pakstan" counted for about one-tenth of the entire Muslim world. Their homelands constituted an area four times that of Italy, three times that of Germany and twice that of France. In population, they were seven times as large as Australia, four times as Canada, twice as Spain, and as large as France or Italy.[39]

These facts demonstrated that the Muslims of "Pakstan" possessed "a separate and distinct nationality from the rest of India, where the Hindoo nation lives and has every right to live". Therefore, they "deserve and must demand the recognition of a separate national status by the grant of a separate Federal Constitution from the rest of India".[40]

To enable the two nations of India to develop themselves "without one being subject to another", a separate federation of the five predominantly Muslim units in the north should be created. This would have several advantages. It would "provide the bulwark of a buffer state against any invasion either of ideas or of arms from outside". It would not materially disturb the ratio of the Muslim and Hindu population in the rest of India. It would be "to the interest of British and Hindoo statesmanship to have as an ally a free, powerful and contented Muslim nation having a similar but separate Constitution to that which is being enacted for the rest of India". Rahmat Ali wanted his readers to remember that this demand was "basically different" from that of Iqbal. Iqbal wanted an amalgamation of these provinces into a single province forming a unit of an Indian federation. His own plan was for these provinces to have a separate federation of their own.[41]

An Indian federation would not do, because it would be based on the rickety principle of "safeguards" which was no substitute

for the loss of nationality and independence. "What safeguards can be devised to prevent our minority of one in four in All-India Federation from being sacrificed on every vital issue to the aims and interests of the majority race, which differs from us in every essential of individual and corporate life? What safeguards can prevent the catastrophe of the Muslim nation smarting and suffering eternally at the frustration of its every social and religious ideal? What safeguards can compensate our nation awakened to its national consciousness for the destruction of its distinct national status? However effective and extensive the safeguards may be, the vital organs and proud symbols of our national life, such as army and navy, foreign relations, trade and commerce, communications, posts and telegraphs, taxation and customs, will not be under our control, but will be in the hands of a Federal Government, which is bound to be overwhelmingly Hindoo."[42] Muslim League leaders were later to use identical arguments in favour of separation when their disillusionment with safeguards had left them no alternative to a claim for partition.

Rahmat Ali could not understand why, in the face of such facts, Muslim leaders were still prepared to go into an Indian federation. "Are we to be crucified just to save the faces of our leaders, or to bolster up the preposterous falsehood that India can be a single nation? Is it with a view to achieve [*sic.*] a compromise at all costs, or is it to support the illusion that Hindoo nationalism is working in the interests of Muslims as well as Hindoos? Irony is flattered to death by a mental muddle of such a nature and on such a scale. We have suffered in the past without a murmur and faced dangers without demur. The one thing we would never suffer is our own self-strangulation. We will not crucify ourselves upon the cross of Hindoo nationalism in order to make a Hindoo holiday."[43]

If in Europe-minus-Russia, which had about the same area as India had and about the same population, twenty-six different nations could live and prosper, with one religion, civilization and economic system, "surely it is not only possible but highly desirable for two fundamentally different and distinct nations, i.e., Muslim and Hindoo, to live as friendly neighbours in peace and prosperity in that vast sub-continent".[44]

The declaration concluded with a ringing appeal to the forces and future of Islam. "We are face to face with a first-rate tragedy,

the like of which has not been seen even in the long and eventful history of Islam. It is not the question of a sect or a community going down; but it is the supreme problem which affects the destiny of the whole of Islam and the millions of human beings who, till quite recently, were the custodians of the glory of Islam in India and the defenders of its frontiers. We have a still greater future before us, if only our soul can be saved from the perpetual bondage of slavery forged in an All-India Federation. Let us make no mistake about it. The issue is now or never. Either we live or perish for ever. The future is ours only if we live up to our faith. It does not lie in the lap of the gods, but it rests in our own hands. We can make or mar it. The history of the last century is full of open warnings, and they are as plain as were ever given to any nation. Shall it be said of us that we ignored all these warnings and allowed our ancient heritage to perish in our own hands?"[45]

Rahmat Ali alone drafted this declaration, but in order to make it "representative" he began to look around for people who would sign it along with him. This search did not prove easy for "so firm was the grip of 'Indianism' on our young intellectuals at English universities that it took me more than a month to find three young men in London who, after reading and discussing the Declaration, offered to support and sign it".[46] None of the three co-signatories was a Cambridge man. Khan Muhammad Aslam Khan Khattak was at Oxford. Sahibzada Sheikh Muhammad Sadiq was reading for the Bar at one of the Inns of Court in London. Khan Inayatullah Khan was studying at a "veterinary" college in England.[47] Khattak signed himself as president of the Khyber Union, and Inayatullah Khan as its secretary.

First, a few words about the signatories. We know nothing about Sahibzada Muhammad Sadiq; it is said by some that he belonged to the ruling family of Junagarh State. Aslam Khattak, who came from the NWFP, was an Oxford undergraduate, who later joined the provincial education service, and still later transferred himself to the Pakistan diplomatic service. Inayatullah Khan was not at a veterinary college, as Rahmat Ali recalled in 1947, but at an engineering institution. (This mistaken memory of Rahmat Ali and the fact that he and Rahmat Ali never met again after signing the declaration, show that the other signatories were mere figure-heads and played no part in the origin or circulation

of the concept of Pakistan. In fact, as we will see shortly, both Inayatullah and Khattak disowned the leaflet in March.) Born in Charsadda, Peshawar District, in 1909, Inayatullah was educated at the Central Model High School at Lahore (1923-25), Islamia College, Peshawar (1925-27), and the universities of Edinburgh, Nottingham and London. He took his degree in civil engineering from London in 1934. On his return to India, he first worked as a municipal engineer in Peshawar (1934-39), and then joined the provincial Public Works Department, from which he took premature retirement in 1966. He married in 1938. Since 1966 he has been looking after his ancestral property in Charsadda and living in University Town, Peshawar.[48]

Inayatullah also recalled that one day in January 1933, when he was living in a furnished flat on Putney Embankment, Khattak brought in Rahmat Ali to see him, and after some discussion the three of them signed the declaration. "I never met him after the pamphlet 'Now or Never' was signed", he wrote.[49]

The three signatories soon repented of their commitment. Apparently they had been converted by Rahmat Ali's forceful and convincing arguments and awed by his personality. Now they gave it a second thought and decided to withdraw their signatures. On 17 March 1933, Khattak wrote to Rahmat Ali: "I am sorry to say that today the executive of the Khyber Union decided to issue a declaimer about the Pakistan Association. The following was passed against opposition we must thank a [illegible] Muslim for it [*sic.*]: 'The President of the Khyber Union wishes it to be known that this Union has no connection with a pamphlet issued [as] "Now or Never" dealing with the federal constitution of India issued by [the] Pakistan Association. The President and the Secretary of the K.U. signed their names in their personal capacity and not as officials of the K.U. which is strictly a social body with no political obligations whatever.

M.A. Khattak, Pres.,
I. Khan, Secry.,

So many enquiries were made about it from the Union that the executive had to do it. It is a sad mistake that you never mentioned Pakistan association at all. Everybody thought that the name of the K.U. was exploited which is a social body. Prince [Sadiq] and

I. Khan also took exception to the manifesto. No doubt Chaudhri Sb., it does [look] like a manifesto of the K.U. Please let me know your opinion. I am sorry you could not come the other day."[50]

The "Pakistan Association" to which Khattak refers did not appear anywhere in the declaration. It is possible that Rahmat Ali had told him that after the declaration's publication and circulation they would form such a body. Khattak's charge that the declaration looked like the manifesto of the Khyber Union is not tenable. The Union does not figure in the text, and at most two of the four signatories belonged to it. The declaration nowhere committed the Union. Throughout, the claim is made on behalf of and in the name of "we, the Muslims of Pakstan", and it is addressed to "the Muslims of India".

Why did the two Pathan students dissociate themselves from the leaflet? (Sadiq is only indirectly mentioned by Khattak.) Letters of inquiry on this point, and on others, addressed to Khattak evoked no reply. But Inayatullah told me that the Pathan delegates to the RTC did not want to alienate the sympathies of the British, or provide the British with an occasion to suspect their loyalty by showing the slightest opposition to the proposed Indian federation. It was on the frontier politicians' instructions that Khattak and Inayatullah backed out. I was also told that after joining government service Inayatullah had to go through a bad spell of time and his promotion was put off because he had associated himself with Rahmat Ali.[51]

Khattak's letter was not well worded, nor was the resolution of the Khyber Union clearly phrased. Both objected to the use of the name of the Khyber Union, not to the signatures of the two Pathans. Rahmat Ali, with his legal training and sharp mind, saw the loophole. When the declaration was reprinted in 1934 as a pamphlet on a smaller format, the four signatories were still there, with Khattak's and Inayatullah's official positions in the Khyber Union omitted. On the title page only, Rahmat Ali's name appeared as the author, and he announced himself as "Founder, Pakistan National Movement".[52]

Thus there is no doubt that Rahmat Ali alone was the author of the declaration. But the four signatures at its bottom seem to have produced a permanent impression that the whole idea was the creation of a band of Muslim students. This mistake may be justified by the four signatures. But almost every historian, writer

and journalist (Pakistani, Indian, British, American and other) has stretched the error to a gross misrepresentation by asserting that the idea and word of Pakistan were the work of a group of "Cambridge students".[53] As we have seen, Rahmat Ali alone was at Cambridge; but it has been assumed that all his co-signatories were also studying at the same university. A small effort and a few inquiries would have cleared the misunderstanding.

However, that does not exhaust the misinformation on which the reading public has been fed. On almost every point concerning the declaration inaccuracies far outnumber the facts. The circular was dated 28 January 1933, but dates ranging from 1922 to 1935 are given by several people, including some reputable historians.[54] No publisher was mentioned on the first issue of the circular. But this has not stopped some authors from inventing a publisher; one well-known Pakistani writer has asserted that it was "published" by Messrs. Foister and Jagg of Cambridge.[55] The circular, in fact, bears no printers' name; Foister and Jagg printed most of Rahmat Ali's later pamphlets, but not this one. Even the title of the declaration (and the later pamphlet version) is cited wrongly by at least one very well-known American historian.[56] In historical accuracy the most serious mistake committed by trained and experienced historians is the statement that the word "Pakistan" was used for the first time in this declaration.[57] On the contrary, the most interesting and outstanding feature of the circular is that it used the word "Pakstan", without the "i". Again, Rahmat Ali's demand for a Pakstan (later Pakistan) included only the areas covered by the Punjab, NWFP, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan; it was much later that he demanded more Muslim states in east and south India. Even then Bengal and Assam and Hyderabad Deccan were never included in Pakistan; they were to be separate states. Nor was Afghanistan or any portion of it made a part of the projected Pakistan. Yet several writers place some or all of these territories in the Pakstan of 1933, including one Oxford graduate who insists that he personally received the declaration from Rahmat Ali in 1933 and went through it carefully.[58]

It is evident from this long list of distortions and misrepresentations perpetrated on Rahmat Ali and his first declaration that the original circular did not come to the notice of these commentators. Had they actually handled and read the text, it is

inconceivable that such fairy tales would have been attributed to him or to it.

When, why and how did Rahmat Ali hit upon the word Pakstan? This is certainly the most important question to ask. But, alas!, there is no definite answer. The etymology of the word will be discussed later at some length. Here the only concrete fact communicated to us is that in December 1932, or a little earlier, Rahmat Ali, while travelling on top of a bus in London (route 11), had a moment of inspiration and the word flashed on the screen of his mind. This is his own statement.[59] The rest is speculation. One story goes like this. One day Rahmat Ali noticed in an atlas of Central Asia the name of a town or a village called Paku, and then noticed such other names as Uzbegistan, Turkistan, etc. By combining Paku with the ending "stan" he formed the word Pakstan.[60] Rahmat Ali did not mention any such external inspiration; nor can any of his Cambridge contemporaries produce the slightest evidence for the claim.

The declaration was circulated with a covering letter signed by Rahmat Ali alone, dated the 28th January 1933 (the date is very significant for another reason too; it was the Eid-ul-Fitr and a Saturday; was it a mere chance or an example of Rahmat Ali's superb timing?), and addressed from 3 Humberstone Road. It read: "I am enclosing herewith an appeal on behalf of the thirty million Muslims of PAKSTAN, who live in the five Northern Units of India—*P*unjab, NWFP (*A*fghan Province), *K*ashmir, *S*indh and Baluchis*TAN*, embodying their inexorable demand for the recognition of their separate national status, as distinct from the rest of India, by the grant of a separate Federal Constitution on social, religious, political and historical grounds. May I venture to request you to acquaint me please with your valuable opinion as to the proposed solution of this great Indian problem as explained herein. I do hope and trust that, vitally interested as you are in the permanent solution of this problem, the objects outlined in the appeal will meet with your fullest approval and active support."[61]

Evidently the declaration was sent to all the delegates to the RTC, but Ambedkar's statement that it was "never officially put forth"[62] is vague. It is difficult to judge from his reference whether he meant that the delegates did not put it on the Conference table as a working paper or he thought that Rahmat Ali did not present it officially to the delegates or to the Conference—

if the latter, it is meaningless for Rahmat Ali was not putting it forth on behalf of any organization. Allana has a different version. According to him, "it appears" that after Rahmat Ali and his friends (perhaps he means the co-signatories, because the Pakistan National Movement had yet not been established) had distributed the declaration among the delegates, they "followed it up by personally explaining their point of view to some delegates". This is quite possible, but, he goes on, "this lobbying resulted in the contents and the scheme propounded by them to come under discussion and investigation".[63] Where did this discussion take place? Who investigated the scheme? Allana has no more details to give and no sources to guide us. Probably he too, like I.H. Qureshi, is confusing the Round Table Conference with the Joint Select Committee. It was the latter which discussed Rahmat Ali's proposal during the interrogation of some of the witnesses who appeared on behalf of the All India Muslim League and the All India Muslim Conference. The same mistake has been made by Muhammad Anwar, who makes Sir Reginald Craddock inquire about the Pakistan scheme "at the conference table".[64] Craddock did this during the deliberations of the Joint Select Committee.

One noticeable thing about the proposal contained in this declaration is its narrow scope. Like Iqbal and several other Muslims who had confined their interest to the Muslims of the north-west, Rahmat Ali, too, ignored Bengal. He clearly stated that there were eighty million Muslims in India and his "Pakstan" would contain thirty million of them. But the significance of these figures seems to have escaped him. His scheme, expressly propounded in the name of Islam and with a view to saving the Muslims of India from Hindu rule, would still leave a clear majority of Indian Muslims in Hindu hands. It was much later that he rectified this omission by suggesting another separate state for Bengal and Assam.

Another feature of Rahmat Ali's demand is the unmistakable terms in which he proclaimed the Muslims to be a separate nation. None before him had pronounced this so clearly, so insistently and so rationally. When later the Msulim League came to advocate its own Pakistan plan, it could not think of any new arguments and repeated and elaborated his points. That is a measure of Rahmat Ali's understanding, percipience and foresight. But he ignored logic in claiming a separate nationhood for the north-

western Muslims on the basis of Islam, and forgetting the Muslims of Bengal who were also among the faithful. Iqbal had also dismissed the Bengali Muslim from the horizon of his thought, but two points can be entered in his defence. He did not believe in the two-nation theory; on the contrary, he had set out to create an Indian nation and an Indian unity with his principle of "internal harmony". He was also making a case for an Indian federation in which, anyway, Bengal would have been a Muslim-majority unit. Therefore he was not obliged to fight the battle of the Bengali Muslim. Rahmat Ali could not use this defence. He stood for a partition of India on the basis of a separate Muslim nationhood, and yet he excluded a majority of this nation from his view. No justification can be found for this.

The most remarkable thing in this declaration is the first appearance of the word "Pakstan". He gave this name to the sovereign Muslim state demanded on behalf of the Muslims of the five north-western areas. It must be noticed that here he spelt the word without an "i", in the Persian fashion, as it is still written in Urdu, though the pronounciation follows the English spelling. In meaning, origin, or terminology the two versions are the same, but it is of some historical importance to notice that the first time that the word was used, printed and proclaimed, it was spelt as "Pakstan", not as "Pakistan".

According to some reports, Rahmat Ali had coined this word some months before the leaflet *Now or Never* was published.[65] This is probably true. He does not tell us how long he took in drafting this declaration or at what precise date he began to think about it. It took him more than a month to find his co-signatories, and allowing for at least another two weeks to the printers, the actual writing should have been finished by the early part of December 1932. That puts the writing of it in November, and the thinking about it a little earlier. So it is quite probable that the name of his projected state occurred to him, say, during August-October 1932. Whatever the exact time of this flash of inspiration, it seems that he kept the precious word secret from his friends, for none of those who knew him in England or worked with him have been able to put a date to the birth of the new name.

Rahmat Ali is said to have "kept the map of India before him and, with different coloured pencils in his hand, he drew lines across the subcontinent, in order to show what was in his mind,

when he demanded the creation of Pakistan, as a separate and sovereign State". He drew three maps in 1933 illustrating his conception of the evolution of the State of Pakistan; the first is called "Pakistan in 1700 A.D.", the second "Pakistan in 1857", and the third bears no title.[66] Rahmat Ali also reproduced a map on the front cover of each of his pamphlets showing the scheme propounded in each pamphlet. Further, he printed twenty black-and-white maps in his *Pakistan: The Fatherland of the Pak Nation,* four of which represent Pakistan's physical divisions, rivers, earthquake zones and rainfall, and the rest trace the historical growth of the Pakistan areas from geological times up to 1942.[67]

The Impact of the Declaration

Rahmat Ali was conscious of the significance of his 1933 declaration. "This Declaration and this date will be memorable in history. For, the Declaration symbolized the proclamation of our freedom from the British-Bania domination; the release of our nation from the bonds of 'Minorityism', and the resumption by our Millat of her march towards her goal; and the date marked the birthday of Pakistan, the death-day of India, and the dissolution-day of British Imperialism in India. Not only that. This Declaration on that date started an ideological revolution in the life of one-fifth of mankind living in India, a revolution the repercussions of which will be felt throughout Asia and the world."[68] He denied that the declaration failed to create an impression at the time of its appearance. He claimed that a glance at the press would show the "profound effect" it had. The Muslims hailed it as a "message of deliverance"; Muslim politicians condemned it as "only a students' scheme, chimerical and impractical"; the Hindus castigated it as "communalism at its worst"; and the British attacked it as "unrepresentative and irresponsible, and aiming at the revival of the Mughal Empire". This was hostility, but hardly indifference. It had made an impact and evoked reaction.[69]

It is not necessary to share Rahmat Ali's enthusiastic optimism or to subscribe to the exaggerated glow of his words to realize the inherent significance of the declaration. It proclaimed the Muslims of north-west India as a separate nation. It declared a war against the concept of an Indian federation. It staked a claim to a sovereign and independent Muslim state in the north-west. It gave this

state a name. On all these points Rahmat Ali was far in advance of his time. These aspirations and sentiments had been in the air for some years and had propelled the Muslim mind in a certain direction. But they had remained half-felt, half-utterred wishes. It was Rahmat Ali's achievement to draw all the threads together, to make a coherent philosophy of them, to expound the final idea in words which were at once rational and passionate, and to present the world with a new name for the state of freedom which his people would one day attain. Every idea is partly original and partly a result of prevailing concepts. To dismiss Rahmat Ali's contribution as nothing but the invention of a beautiful name is to damn history with malice.

The impact of *Now or Never* on public opinion in Britain and India was not as considerable as Rahmat Ali had hoped. But new ideas and messages, even those broadcast by prophets and the greatest philosophers, require time to find a place in the minds of men. The idea of dividing India between Hindus and Muslims was first hinted at in the middle of the nineteenth century. But it took the Indian Muslims over eighty years to make up their mind and demand a partition. Rahmat Ali's idea had a more immediate and direct effect on British and Indian opinion. The declaration's publication and circulation started a debate which grew in proportions until the Muslim League adopted its central idea as its official policy and demand in March 1940.

Let us take Britain first. Copies of the circular were sent to the British and Indian politicians who were participating in the deliberations of the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform during 1933-34. Lord Reading preserved some copies, and they are to be found in his private papers at the India Office Library.[70]

In the Joint Select Committee itself Rahmat Ali's demand was discussed on 1 August and 13 November 1933. The questions and answers ran as follows:

"1 August 1933

Sir Reginald Craddock: 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?

Yusuf Ali: As far as I know, it is only a students' 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.

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.

Zafrulla Khan: We have already had the reply that it was a students' scheme and there is nothing in it. What is the further question?

Isaac Foot: What is Pakistan?

Yusuf Ali: So far as we have considered it, we have considered it chimerical and impracticable. It means the Federation of certain Provinces.

Sir Reginald Craddock: I have received communications about the proposal of forming a Federation of certain Muslim States under the name of Pakistan.

Khalifa Shujauddin: Perhaps it will be enough to say that no such scheme has been considered by any representative gentlemen or association so far."[71]

"13 November 1933

Sir Reginald Craddock: Then there is one question I propose to put to Mr. French, because it is suggested to me by the fact that he has travelled in other countries in the East and so on. Mr. French, in your travels did you stay in Peshawar on the North West Frontier Province at all?

J.C. French: Yes.

Sir Reginald Craddock: I should just like to know whether you ever heard of any talk about a Federation of these Provinces under the name of Pakistan?

J.C. French: I have not heard the name Pakistan, but the idea is in the air.

Sir Reginald Craddock: In the air where?

J.C. French: In India, in the Punjab, in the North West Frontier Province.

Sir Reginald Craddock: You can say that really from having

heard about it, can you?

J.C. French: Yes, I have heard hints of it, but I have not heard the actual name Pakistan in India. I have hints of the thing; the idea of a great Muhammadan State, including the Punjab, the North West Frontier, Sind, Baluchistan and Kashmir, and also Afghanistan."[72]

"*Zafrulla Khan:* Now you said with regard to a scheme to which reference was made by Sir Reginald Craddock that you had heard mention of it in the Punjab among other places.

J.C. French: I have not heard mention of it, I have just heard hints.

Zafrulla Khan: When were you in the Punjab last?

J.C. French: I was in the Punjab last in May of last year—May, 1932.

Zafrulla Khan: You have said that you heard hints of a great Muhammadan State including some Provinces of British India and also of Afghanistan?

J.C. French: Yes.

Zafrulla Khan: The hints must have been that this large and powerful Muhammadan State should be outside the British Empire if it was to include Afghanistan?

J.C. French: Well, they were only envisaging that as a possibility of the future.

Zafrulla Khan: But did the hints that you succeeded in hearing convey anything to your mind with regard to the possibility being that the Muhammadans of Northern India desired Afghanistan to be included within a British Federation of Muslim States, or did you think they desire that these British Provinces should go outside the British Empire if it was to include Afghanistan?

J.C. French: I do not think there is an active desire at present to set up any such State, but it is a possibility that is in men's minds for some future time if necessary.

Zafrulla Khan: Did you hear hints directly or indirectly from any Muslim sources?

J.C. French: I heard them from Muslim sources.

Zafrulla Khan: But it did not occur to you to inquire whether it was envisaged that this Federation would be within the British Empire or ourside it?

J.C. French: I only heard it as a very vague idea."[73]

Why was Zafrulla harping on "inside or outside the British

Empire"? Why didn't he ask directly about Rahmat Ali or Iqbal? Why did no Hindu or Sikh or Parsi representative interrogate French on his remarks? Why did the British members of the Committee fail to pursue the subject and ask French about the sources of his information? These are intriguing inquiries, but we have no answers.

When questioned on his attitude in the Committee, Zafrulla Khan explained his failure to support the Pakistan idea in three ways. First, "although bitterness between Hindus and Muslims was intense at the time when this [*Now or Never*] was written, expressions like 'grim and fateful struggle', 'political crucifixion', and 'complete annihilation' could not be used even by the staunch champions of Muslim rights to describe the fate of Indian Muslims inside Indian constitutional framework. The British were still in firm control in India and, even to the most fore-sighted, a withdrawal of British authority from India in the near future did not appear likely".[74] Secondly, though Zafrulla knew Rahmat Ali "intimately", at that time even Jinnah's objective was national unity. Lastly, Iqbal had not wanted a separate state but the grouping of a large Muslim population into one province.[75]

Yusuf Ali had presided over the special session of the All India Muslim Conference held in Calcutta in December 1932, and his rejection of the Pakistan idea came as a surprise to Rahmat Ali. The latter had sent his declaration to Yusuf Ali and in reply received some unfavourable comments. On this, Rahmat Ali wrote to Yusuf Ali that he wanted to discuss the point further and would like to come down to London for a talk with him. Yusuf Ali agreed, and they met in a restaurant near the India Office. Rahmat Ali presented his point of view and argued for it ably and vigorously. But Yusuf Ali's ideas tended to support the Congress stand, and, though unable to offer a satisfactory rebuttal of Rahmat Ali's points, he remained unconvinced, and left with the promise of another meeting. Later Rahmat Ali wrote two or three letters to him, but Yusuf Ali avoided a face-to-face discussion.[76]

Some British commentators reacted unfavourably to Rahmat Ali's suggestion as soon as it was made. The Duchess of Atholl, a member of Parliament, saw in it "the determination of some Muslims not to submit under any conditions to a Hindu yoke at the Centre". But it also posed a great danger to the British empire in India. "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 students' 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."[77]

A British authority on military affairs, after favouring a "progressive policy" of gradual penetration of the tribal areas and moving to the Durand Line, imagined the following scenario in 1983 (that is, 50 years hence from the time of writing): "If we do not now begin some sort of progressive policy, what will be the result in, say, thirty years' time? . . . 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. . . . Then the Mahsud loots the rich cantonment of Razmak or the Afridi occupies the Hindu bungalows of Peshawar, or the Achakzai raids the Staff College in Quetta. A crisis will develop. The Commander-in-Chief will demand strong action and fifty 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 Afghania), Kashmir and Sind . . . 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."[78]

Lord Eustace Percy has made an astonishing statement. He was a member of the Joint Select Committee and wrote parts of its report. In his reminiscences he recalled that the word Pakistan "was never mentioned in the deliberations of the Joint Select Committee; privately, the Indian delegates, not least the Moslems, dismissed it as the rather disreputable dream of a single agitator, Jinnah".[79] Both statements are inaccurate, an obvious case of a failing memory.

On the Continent, too, the declaration was taken notice of. It was reproduced in *Die Welt des Islams* of Berlin in 1933.[80] A well-known German writer on Islam and a Privatdozent of Heidelberg, Dr. Rudi Paret, did not agree with Rahmat Ali's idea of dividing India and creating a Muslim state, but he complimented him for explaining "the fundamental differences between the Islamic worldly and social life on the one hand and the programme of pan-India nationalism" on the other "in impressive and earnest words".[81]

Indian public opinion, both Muslim and Hindu, was certainly agitated by Rahmat Ali's circular. There is considerable evidence in support of this.

The Unionist Party of the Punjab is reported to have reprinted at Lahore in 1933 under Sir Fazl-i-Husain's signature "a broad-sheet giving the detailed explanation of the composition of the word" Pakistan.[82] In view of the Unionist Party's later opposition to the Pakistan idea (notwithstanding Sikandar Hayat's and Khizr Hayat's temporary and expedient support of it), this report may look unlikely. But we must remember that in his Lahore days Rahmat Ali had moved amid the inner circle of several politicians who were ranking leaders of the Unionist Party: Chaudhri Shahabuddin, Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Mian Ahmad Yar Khan Daultana, Sir Umar Hayat Tiwana, Mir Dost Muhammad Khan Mazari, Nawab Muzaffar Khan, Malik Ghulam Muhammad of Kalabagh, and others. He had done them many good turns, and it is not impossible that he now prevailed upon the party's leading lights to publish his declaration, even if without endorsing its contents.

The *Star of India*, an evening paper of Calcutta and throughout the 'thirties the most powerful English mouthpiece of Indian Muslim opinion and often of the Muslim League, carried an interesting editorial on 14 April 1933. Neither Rahmat Ali's name nor his circular was mentioned in the lengthy two-column comment, but the entire piece was devoted to an analysis of *Now or Never* and an unqualified endorsement of it. "Considerable Muslim interest is being taken in a scheme which, however far-fetched it may seem at the present moment, may one day become a reality out of sheer force of circumstances." Some quarters are contending that the best solution of the Indian problem is to split up the sub-continent into two or three separate federal entities. "But perhaps the most interesting proposal for a separate Federal Constitution,

similar to the one that is going to be granted to India, is that which has been made out by some constitutional thinkers to be called Pakstan." Then follows a quick summary of the facts and figures contained in *Now or Never*. "These hard facts and realities are beyond contradiction, and on them the claim of the Muslims of these Provinces to possess a separate and distinct nationality and a separate national status by having a separate Federal Constitution . . . is, indeed, one which cannot be brushed aside as something not deserving of any consideration. However much it may appear today to be an idea impossible of realization, in course of time it is quite conceivable that it will become a definite problem to be solved for the good of all concerned." Probably referring to Iqbal, the editor says that there was already a school of Muslim politicians who favoured the idea of amalgamating these provinces into a single province within the proposed all-India federation. "To carry the proposal a step further, by forming a separate Federation of these Provinces, appears rather more practical and fruitful of better results than forming them into a single unit of the All-India Federation." Such a separate federation "would not only provide better opportunities for the progress and development of these States, but could also prove to be a buffer State against any invasion either of ideas or of arms from beyond the Himalaya and the Hindukush mountains. Further, the creation of such a Federation would not materially worsen the condition of the Muslims of other parts of India". There are other arguments favouring separation. The administration of the all-India federation would be "an unwieldy proposition" and future viceroys of India would have to be supermen to perform all that would be required of them. With the separation of the five north-western provinces, the rest of India would be better able to manage its affairs smoothly and efficiently. Besides, however much the idealist might aspire to evolve one nationality "out of the conglomeration of innumerable divergent and distinct races, creeds, classes and castes, with fundamentally different religion, culture, tradition, manners and customs, it is still a far more distant possibility than, for example, evolving one nationality in Europe or America". All in all, therefore, the Pakstan scheme, though a novel one, "seems to contain in it a potentiality which might easily manifest itself in due course". The editorial concluded with a hope and a prophecy whose time-span was to be severely shortened by history: ". . . whilst it is true that the present

generation, and even the present century, might not see the establishment of Pakstan, those who delight in picturing the India of a century hence might well give attention to this interesting and not-too-unlikely eventuality".[83]

It speaks well of the spirit of Muslim nationhood that even in 1933, when the Muslim League had not yet brought the majority of Muslims to one platform and the feeling of nationalism was still in its infancy, the Bengali editor of a Calcutta newspaper did not consider it worth mentioning that Rahmat Ali's scheme left out the largest single Muslim group in the sub-continent, *viz.*, the Muslims of Bengal. It is also a compliment to Rahmat Ali's arguments and persuasive ability that his case, merely summarized in four pages, won the support of and was widely publicized in a far-flung province where he had no personal contacts and whose language he did not know. As the *Star of India* was read throughout the country, this editorial must have helped to propagate Rahmat Ali's idea far beyond the frontiers of the five provinces he claimed for his Pakstan.

Curiously, the news about *Now or Never* appeared in the *Star of India* two weeks after the editorial of 14 April. Reporting from Lahore on 30 April, the Associated Press of India said that the declaration (which it called a "manifesto") had been circulated "among the educated Muslims in Northern India". Then followed a short summary of the circular. The paper published it under a two-column headline of "Frontier Muslims' Demand: Separate Federation for Five Provinces of North-West India".[84]

At this time the Muslims had no news agency of their own, and their press was limited to about a score of daily papers in Urdu and other provincial languages with a respectable circulation, and about the same number of weeklies and fortnightlies (they had a large number of literary monthlies, but they ignored political developments). Since the *Star of India* had an efficient news coverage system, most other Muslim papers reproduced its news items, eidtorials and articles in translation. Therefore, the two items in the Calcutta evening paper may safely be said to have helped a great deal in propagating the message of *Now or Never* throughout the sub-continent.

But Muslim leadership maintained a complete silence. Apart from the rejection voiced by its representatives on the Joint Select Committee, no other politician of any standing commented

upon the new scheme. Iqbal, to whom most people attributed the origin of the idea, kept quiet. Jinnah, who was in England and knew Rahmat Ali, did not say a word. The one exception was Seth Abdullah Haroon of Sind, who was later to have the unique courage and foresight to force the Sind Muslim League to resolve in its open session in favour of Pakistan, in the teeth of sustained opposition from Jinnah. Interviewed by the Associated Press at Karachi on 5 May, he said he knew that "on account of communal feelings all over India, there are many who are appreciating this idea because the leaders of the majority community are not willing to give necessary safeguards to the Muslim community in the future constitution. . . . Therefore, the idea is growing in the Muslim community that we should establish a separate Federation of North-Western India". But he still hoped that the Muslims would get their grievances redressed, and he would "try my level best to keep intact the scheme of All-India Federation". Yet, if the Hindus continued to show the same mentality "time might soon come when the idea of a North-Western Indian Federation might get a strong footing in the Muslim community".[85] For him and his Sindhi colleagues this time came in October 1938.

Leaders of the Muslim League and the Muslim Conference, the two most important Muslim parties of this period, might have held their tongue for a number of reasons: sheer ignorance, expediency, political caution, jealousy because the idea had come from a non-politician, lack of foresight, failure to know the mind of their own people, etc. But this did not stop the Muslim intellectuals of the Punjab, where Rahmat Ali's influence was the greatest and the daily press one of the healthiest in India, from expressing their opinions on the subject. Soon the Hindus began to take part in the discussions, and the issue became a popular public topic. Between 1936 and 1939 hundreds of articles on Pakistan appeared in the Urdu and English Muslim papers of Lahore—this was the period when the Muslim League was dithering and thus letting public opinion run ahead of it. But we will come to this later.

It was in the early summer of 1933 that a grand debate on Pakistan started in the correspondence columns of the *Civil and Military Gazette,* a British-owned-and-edited daily newspaper of repute issued from Lahore, and continued intermittently till April 1935. Apparently some Hindu newspapers had been attacking Rahmat Ali's idea (these papers are not available to me at the time

of writing), and one K.G. Ahmad fired the first Muslim shot in retaliation.

In his long letter, Ahmad first dismissed the Hindu accusation that Rahmat Ali had evolved his scheme under the inspiration of the British diehards as a "chimerical untruth". He added that the fact was that whatever was unpalatable to those who dreamed of establishing Hindu supremacy in the whole of India was always attributed by them to the influence of British Conservatives. The Hindus saw in "Pakastan" a sign of a resurgent pan-Islamism, but " the myth of Pan-Islamism is the product of the disturbed imagination of non-Muslims". In reply to the Hindu charge that the creation of "Pakstan" would mean the birth of a religious state and religion and state should be kept separate, he denied that "Pakastan" would be a religious state. It would be a cultural state, and "culture makes a man what he is". Besides, Islam and Hinduism were really civic churches which governed the secular and spiritual lives of their adherents. In both Hinduism and Islam religion and politics were inseparable, and Gandhi's politics were the best proof of this fact. To the criticism that the creation of "Pakastan" would harm the interests of the Muslims left behind in India, Ahmad asserted that the creation of "Pakastan" would "save the soul of Islamic India. Is it not selfish and foolish on the part of Muslims of Muslim-minority provinces to expect of Muslims of Muslim-majority provinces to sink with them in the mire of an All-India that is a Hindu-ridden Federation? It is certainly wise to save as many Muslims as possible by keeping them out of an All-India Federation". The creation of "Pakastan" would not change the ratio of Muslim population to non-Muslim population in India. Then, how would the change worsen their position? They were a minority now and would remain one in future. The Muslims wanted "Pakastan" because "they want to have full opportunity for their development along their own lines. History teaches us that slowly and gradually the ever-spreading tentacles of Hinduism have always succeeded in engulfing all foreign elements that came in its proximity. Not even a trace was left of them. Shall we not heed this warning held out to us by hoary centuries?"[86] The reader will note that in the 'forties Jinnah used the last two arguments in the very same words.

From Jullundher wrote Muhammad Anwar, a barrister, contrasting Rahmat Ali's proposal with that of Iqbal, and asserting that

"Pakastan" was the only area in India where "national frontiers could be so drawn as the principle of nationalism demands". The minority problem had baffled even the League of Nations, and we should be grateful to Rahmat Ali for "advancing such a useful and workable solution to the Indian riddles". This partition would "allow the national culture of Hindus and Muslims to fructify instead of getting autumn blown, and the highest development of each of these two people would be possible without one being subject to another". However, he concluded by sounding a note of doubt and warning. "But 'Pakastan' is like a two-edged sword and is nothing short of a pious aspiration. If one edge is sharp enough to cut out some of the evils suggested, there is every reason to fear that the other edge might blind the Indian people."[87] He did not elaborate the last point.

Khalid Saifullah explained how "Pakstan" and "Pakistan" were really the same words; but in defining the scope of the proposed state, he used "confederation" and "federation" as interchangeable terms, calling Pakistan "the Northern Confederation". Explaining the sentiment lying behind the demand, he wrote: "Its springs lie deep in the soul of the Musalman people. It is simply and purely an expression of their will to live their own life." He chided Anwar for having overlooked the fact that Pakistan would be a very effective barrier to any invasion of India through north-western passes. "I agree that Pakistan is a two-edged sword; with one edge it cuts forever the knot of the Hindu-Muslim problem and with the other shall ever scare the godless Bolshies away."[88]

Anwar wrote two more letters. The first appeared along with Saifullah's, and apologized for spelling "Pakstan" as "Pakastan", holding his clerk responsible for the typing error. The promoters of the proposal—"and I am also a passive agent"—had a very bright idea when they christened it like this.[89]

In his second letter Anwar explained what he had meant by Pakistan being a "two-edged sword", and took Saifullah to task on a number of points. First, the military forces of the five northern units would not be an effective barrier against an invasion from that direction. "If there is anything which, in my opinion, is stopping any foreign nation from invading India through the Khyber, or the like, it is the unity of India under one executive head, His Excellency Lord Willingdon." Secondly, if this area was

to separate, there would be no free trade within the whole of India. Thirdly, the laws made by Pakistan would not be acceptable to its non-Muslim inhabitants. Finally, had the Pakistan idea been such a workable solution of the Indian problem, "I fail to see why the Imperial Parliament and the greatest of all the statesmen, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, should not have dealt with this topic in his untiring attempts to draft the new Indian Constitution". Such Western institutions as federation can only work best in the West–"a western country can form a federation within a federation, for an American State is, for all intents and purposes, a federation within a federation"–and it is not necessary that it would also prove a success in India. "Would an English holly tree grow in Jullundher? Would a mango tree grow in Hyde Park? No!"[90]

Evidently, Saifullah had invited this criticism by his statement of 19 September that Pakistan was going to be a federation in confederal union with the rest of India. This was a gross misconstruction of Rahmat Ali's proposal. Probably, he was confusing the Pakistan plan with Iqbal's suggestion of amalgamating these five units into one state and making that state a part of the Indian federation. But if Saifullah's mind was muddled, Anwar's was empty. The Jullundher barrister had forgotten all the constitutional law he had studied. Even a first year student of law or political science would have told him that an American state was *not* "for all intents and purposes, a federation within a federation". Further, his fulsome references to Lord Willingdon and Ramsay MacDonald showed the way his mind was working. Saifullah answered Anwar's "ill-informed and in parts misconceived" letter on 23 October. First, he made it clear that Pakistan was going to be a separate federation and in no sense a part of the Indian federation. Secondly, he pointed out the confused thinking of Anwar on federalism. Thirdly, he was of the opinion that if Pakistanis would not be able to defend their country against an invasion from the north-west, "then Mr. Anwar should forever despair of finding a defence force for his pet 'united India' ". Lastly, he rebutted Anwar's point about a tariff war between Pakistan and India with the well-known national argument that "economic convenience can never justify the extinction of a whole people". "The distinct and separate life of a people is a far more precious thing than the filthy lucre staked by a few unscrupulous millionaires

or Mammon worshippers."[91]

To this Anwar replied on 1 November, that "it would be in the interest of Pakistanis that the Pakstan Federation remained within the All-India Federation". The idea that Pakistan should have nothing to do with the rest of India was "little short of an idle fancy". The whole letter was harshly worded, bordering on the vulgar.[92]

On 11 December the Muslim Correspondent of the paper, in his weekly column on "What Muslim India Thinks", criticized the Pakistan idea. This prompted one Haider Ali Abbasi of Baghbanpura to protest. The material developments of the entity called India were "dust in the pan as weighed against the distinct and separate life of the great Pakistani nation. . . it is madness indeed to maintain that a nation of 40 million should be annihilated on the altar of postal and telegraphic arrangements that have sprung up during the last one hundred years". Nor was it true that the "Pakistan movement" was one of pessimism. "It is a positive, spontaneous and independent movement and its rise has nothing to do with such a poisonous and narrow-minded thing as Hindu communalism. The springs of the movement lie deep, in the soul of the Muslim people, and its roots spread far back to history. . . . What the 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."[93]

The debate went on in 1934. A member of the NWFP Legislative Council spoke from Peshawar.[94] Another correspondent, Niaz Mahmoud, claimed that the demand of the Pakistanis was "based upon religious, social, cultural, linguistic and historical grounds—factors which go to form nations and hold them together".[95]

In 1935, Sayyid Shaukat Ali from Lahore pointed out that the "basis of Pakistan is not only cultural, but territorial and therefore in one important respect it mirrors the most up-to-date political development in the world". The movement "merely aims at giving political expression to the cultural and economic homogeneity of the peoples inhabiting the five northern units of India". He assured the Hindus that they had nothing to fear from Pakistan. On the contrary, it would act as a buffer state between the rest of India and the states to the north or west of Pakistan.[96] Only one Muslim correspondent, Malik Ataullah Khan of Peshawar,

did not favour Pakistan; or rather, more accurately, he believed that the proposal "has been suggested and renounced and it is now as remote as the Nehru Report. It is futile to discuss either of them after they have been finally rejected".[97]

It is a matter of surprise that while the correspondence columns of the *Civil and Military Gazette* were thus explaining and debating the Pakistan issue, the two Muslim regular contributors to the newspaper continued to send in their pieces without referring to the proposal. In 1933, "A Muslim Correspondent" published fifteen articles, dealing with such themes as the Communal Award, rival Muslim groups, the Kashmir problem, grievances of Lyallpur Muslims, Sikh politics, Muslims and the Lahore high court judgeship, Palestine and Indian Muslims, Muslims and control over the police, Colonel Josiah Wedgwood's defence of the Hindus, the Aga Khan's visit to India, Muslims and public services, and the franchise problem; but only once, on 11 December, did he touch the "Pakistan theory", only to dismiss it as a reaction to Hindu communalism.[98] In the same year, "Muslim Political Correspondent" contributed nineteen articles, discussing topics like the White Paper, Muslim education, the Executive Officers' Act, Gandhi's motives, the tussle over Muslim League leadership, the death of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, dissensions in Kashmir, democracy and India, Palestine and Indian Muslims, Bahawalpur affairs, and Muslim representation in the public services; Pakistan was not mentioned.[99]

In 1934, A Muslim Correspondent sent in thirty-eight articles concerning the Urdu language, the Land Alienation Act, Muslim representation in the Lahore municipal committee, Kashmir franchise report, Hindus and Kapurthala, Calcutta corporation and terrorism, the Aga Khan as dictator, Jinnah and the Muslim League, Punjab University inquiry committee, the Communal Award, firing in Sultanpur, Congress and the Red Shirts, the rural debt problem, the Congress scheme of a constituent assembly, the Khilafat Movement and Pan-Islamism, and the Joint Select Committee Report; there was no reference to Pakistan.[100] The Muslim Political Correspondent had disappeared.

In 1935, A Muslim Correspondent received space for forty-four contributions, discussing the topics of Muslim representation in the Punjab cabinet, the death of Sir Abdullah Suhrawardy, Jinnah's success in the Assembly's debate on reforms, communal

representation on the Punjab University Senate, Sir Fazl-i-Husain's services, Jinnah-Congress talks, rural reconstruction, T.E. Lawrence and Arabs, future of the Rural Unionist Party, the Shahidganj controversy, the "buy-Muslim" movement, vernacular as the medium of instruction, and the Punjab Relief of Indebtedness Bill.[101] He had no time or inclination to give thought to the Pakistan plan.

These anonymous contributors had a moral responsibility to reflect and register the thinking of Muslim India. They failed in this duty by ignoring the most important issue that had now begun to agitate the Muslim mind. How can we explain this failure? It is unlikely that the editor of the paper had instructed them not to refer to Pakistan. He had accepted and published several letters on the topic, mostly supporting the idea of division. Had he been inclined to black out all references to it, he would have exercised his privilege and refused to print this correspondence. That leaves three possibilities. The contributors were in the pay or under the influence of the Punjab Unionist Party (which the newspaper supported stoutly), or of the Muslim League (which frowned upon the Pakistan idea at this time). Or, finally, it is quite possible that the writers were either out of touch with Muslim public opinion, or personally disapproved of Rahmat Ali's movement. In view of lack of definite information on their identities, further speculation is futile.

In spite of this neglect, the idea was slowly catching on and winning the attention and often the sympathy of Muslim educated classes, particularly in the north, and especially in the Punjab. Punjabi Urdu newspapers of 1933-35 are not available, but it is likely that they published something on the topic.

Hindu opposition was as unanimous as it was virulent. Even a balanced liberal like Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru warned that should the British concede Pakistan the Hindus would regard it as an act of treachery against India.[102] The secretary of the NWFP Hindu Mahasabha, Ganpat Rai, thanked God "that the promised quota of one lakh of volunteers could not materialize to fight the battle of independence for India, otherwise whether India would have got its independence or not, they [Muslims] would have carved out of India their vision of Pakistan".[103] Mehr Chand Khanna, speaking to the Frontier, Punjab and Sind Hindu Conference held at Peshawar, "expressed grave fears regarding the Pakistan Move-

ment".[104] Professor Gulshan Rai of Lahore believed that "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".[105]

The currency of the idea and the word is borne out by the fact that in the spring of 1935 such regular Hindu columnists as Professor Gulshan Rai were not only castigating the idea of Pakistan but also using its adjectival formation to summarize Muslim separatist sentiment. Those who looked upon the five northern provinces as a Muslim country possessed "a Pakistani mentality", and the Punjabi Muslims who insisted on their natural rights in the province were discussed under the title of "Pakistan Mentality of the Punjab Muslims".[106] In the same year, the Aga Khan, in a letter to Sir Fazl-i-Husain, used the word "Pakestan" *en passant*, as if it needed no explanation or annotation and was known to his correspondent, and by implication to everyone else.[107] In conclusion, it may be confirmed that the term Pakistan "had caught on prior to Jinnah's return to India from England in 1935".[108] Were the Indian vernacular newspapers and magazines extant and available at one place, and had one the time, patience and linguistic accomplishment to read all of them, I think it could be demonstrated beyond doubt that Rahmat Ali's idea was widely commented upon. But even the above incomplete survey suffices to show that it had moved Indian, particularly Muslim, public opinion to no small extent.

By any measure this was an unparalleled achievement. Never before in the history of Indian politics had a mere four pages written and posted by an unknown student from a foreign country ruffled the waves of public thinking so violently and with such far-reaching consequences. A comparison with Iqbal's Allahabad address of 1930 brings out the contrast even more starkly. A great poet–adored by the Muslims, respected by many non-Muslims, read by a great majority of Indians, Knighted by the British, acknowledged as a philosopher of eminence, the president of the All India Muslim League–had put forth a proposal in the course of his presidential address at the annual session of the oldest and the largest Muslim political party. But with what results? Some newspapers printed a two-paragraph summary of the speech. Hardly anyone took notice. The press did not comment. Readers

did not write to their favourite newspapers about it. The party from whose elevated platform the message had been broadcast snubbed its president by failing to move a resolution embodying (not to speak of endorsing) his proposal. Iqbal learned a salutary lesson. He never referred to his Allahabad proposal again. It was only two years after his death that his name was mentioned as one who had sown the seed of the Lahore Resolution (and that chiefly because the Muslim League leadership did not want to acknowledge Rahmat Ali's parentage of the idea of Pakistan or to use the word coined by him).

Though ultimately Rahmat Ali's fate was to be much worse than Iqbal's, at this point of time he was far more successful than the illustrious poet-philosopher. Within less than a year of the circulation of *Now or Never*, its message was known to a majority of politically knowledgeable Britons and Indians. The Joint Select Committee interrogated its witnesses about it. Indian newspapers of repute wrote editorials on it. Correspondence columns debated it. The Hindus opposed it. The Muslim leadership rejected it. A German journal reproduced it in translation, and a German scholar deemed it worth reviewing. It is doubtful if Rahmat Ali, his unlimited optimism notwithstanding, had entertained any idea of such a complete fulfilment of his hopes. To deny the phenomenon of this fulfilment is to rebut a reality with a foolish fancy. To dismiss it as insignificant is to close one's eyes to the historic developments which flowed from it.

The Pakistan National Movement

The declaration contained in *Now or Never* was Rahmat Ali's single-handed achievement. An idea had come to his mind and he had expressed it in his own style, uninspired by any mentor, unaided by any friend. But ideas alone are not enough to move this imperfect world. They may be individual; the efforts to propagate them are not. Men have in all ages banded themselves together to achieve their ideas. A single mind provides the ideal; a group is necessary to fight for it.

Therefore, once Rahmat Ali had declared the truth as he saw it, he felt the need of putting up a co-operative effort to publicize and promote the ideal. He was not a politician and therefore in no position to take his message to the masses through political means.

Nor could he, living in a foreign country as he was, found a new political party to advance his cause. He was a thinker, not an organizer; a man of ideas, not of deeds; a mere student with a pen in his hand, not a politician with public resources at his command. So he decided to establish a movement rather than a proper organization.

This was to be, in his words, "a centre of members to work for Pakistan, for the Pak Plan, and for the Pak Ideology".[109] Thus in 1933 he founded the Pakistan National Movement, and directly published an eight-page pamphlet, *What Does the Pakistan National Movement Stand For?* stating "the fundamentals of the political ideology" of the movement.

He began by defining "Indianism" as the force which had dominated all the countries of South Asia and defeated the efforts of their peoples to improve their lot. This was a destructive power, victimising men and nations, crippling religions and states, enslaving at least half of the continent of Asia. It was an irony of history that, in spite of its black record, its victims had always played into its hands, subordinating their heritages to its dominion, surrendering their destinies to its supremacy. Recent events had confirmed, not challenged, the absorptive power of "Indianism". With the coming of the British it had manifested itself in the establishment of the Indian National Congress. In this clever way it had designated all British possessions in South Asia as India, denied to the non-Indian nations the right to their own nationhood, and, by making pretentious claims, stamped Indian nationality on the peoples of this area. The non-Indians allowed themselves to be trapped in this cunning nomenclature, so much so that when they came to form their separate organizations they called them the All India Muslim League, the All India Muslim Conference, the All India Sikh Conference, the All India Rajput Conference, and so on. The "preposterous prefix of All India" suggested that all these diverse peoples were Indians, and meant that, in succumbing to the temptation of using a high sounding title, their leaders had fastened fetters of "Indianism" on them, and handed over their lands to its political hegemony. Heartened by this and encouraged by British imperialism, the apostles of "Indianism" used every trick from bribery to bullying in playing off the Muslims against the Sikhs, the Sikhs against the Rajputs, the Rajputs against the Marhattas, each non-Indian group against

another. The latest move in this plan of perpetuating "Indianism" was the campaign for establishing an all-India federation. The federal device was chosen because, of all constitutional arrangements known to law, it alone could enslave forever the non-Indian peoples, extract from them a permanent renunciation of their claim to nationhood, and demand from them a formal acceptance of a single Indian nationality. This was the central idea underlying the proposal for an all-India federal constitution.[110]

The Pakistan National Movement (PNM) was formed to fight against this federation. This it was to do by adhering to seven principles, which might be called its aims and objects.

First, the Movement stood for "the *spiritual liberation* of the nations of South Asia from the *secular thraldom* of 'Indianism' ". During the previous 3,500 years "Indianism" had opposed all religions and worked for their disintegration: thus banishing Buddhism, absorbing Jainism, menacing Islam and stifling Sikhism. As religion was "the anchor of life–both individual and national", this anti-religious process had "grievously retarded the spiritual emancipation of mankind and dwarfed the moral development of half the population of the continent of Asia". The Movement would, therefore, strive to remove the stranglehold of "Indianism" and liberate the nations of South Asia from its secular thraldom to enable them to recover their spiritual freedom.[111]

Secondly, the Movement stood for "the *cultural liberation* of the nations of South Asia from the *barbarian influence* of 'Indianism' ". Throughout its history, "Indianism" had corrupted the cultures of the non-Indian nations without contributing anything to the intellectual, artistic and moral fabric. It had "debased the Saracenic civilization of the Muslims, the chivalrous code of the Rajpoots, the knightly creed of the Sikhs, and the martial tradition of the Marhattas". It had tried to "Indianise" their body, soul and mind. Self-defence against such a record of barbarism was essential, so that these nations could "revert to their original conception of life and regenerate their respective cultures in their national strongholds". The Movement would, therefore, confine "Indianism" to its historical and national sphere–India (Hindustan)–, thereby affording the other nations an opportunity to liberate themselves culturally from its barbarian environment.[112]

Thirdly, the Movement stood for "the *social liberation* of nations of South Asia from the *caste tyranny* of 'Indianism' ". In

every faith and in every philosophy the brotherhood of man was the cardinal principle. "Indianism" stood alone against this universal belief, preaching and practising the inequality of man before man and God. In this way it created perpetual divisions among the people and stopped their integration into one nation. The Movement believed that this caste tyranny was a curse which must be removed. It was, therefore, determined to sweep away all disabilities imposed and sanctioned by "Indianism", so that the people of South Asia regain the social status which was theirs to claim and once again become full human beings.[113]

Fourthly, the Movement stood for "the *economic liberation* of the nations of South Asia from the *impoverishing capitalism* of 'Indianism' ". For countless years "Indianism" had been exploiting men, women and children of South Asia for its own material gain, surpassing even the plunder and loot of despotic kings, corrupt dynasties and foreign rulers. The poor and landless farmers had been pitilessly treated by the money-lender and the *bania*. The Movement was determined to save these groaning masses of people from the "Indian" greed of gold, so that the poor and the miserable break the shackles of capitalism which had imprisoned them for generations.[114]

Fifthly, the Movement stood for "the *national liberation* of the peoples of South Asia from the *destructive domination* of 'Indianism' ". During its long rule "Indianism" had physically exterminated the ancient race of the Dravidians, reduced to helotism the depressed classes, politically ruined the Muslims, the Rajputs, the Sikhs and the Marhattas, and finally "dragooned them all into subjection to British Imperialism". This was how South Asia had reached its present position of degradation. To put an end to this state of affairs, the Movement admitted "the birthright of each and every nation which is under Indian domination to a nationhood of its own in the territory wherein it may form a majority of the population". It further promised "to support by all legitimate means the actual realisation of this right by all such nations", and "to acknowledge this right even in the case of the Sikhs, of the Christians, of the Dravidians, and of the Depressed Classes, who, though morally and numerically qualified to form distinct nations of their own, cannot at present do that because they are so scattered that they can neither possess a majority in any province nor claim a part of a province as exclusively their own".

In each of these cases, the Movement "concedes their right to as much of the area of the land of their birth as may correspond to the numerical ratio of their people to the total population of the province concerned". In thus enunciating the principle of self-determination (the word was not used) in such generous dimensions and in undertaking to strive for its fulfilment, the Movement stood "for the birthright of all nations to their national existence, even if that birthright may have to be satisfied, as in the case of the Sikhs, at the expense of Pakistan itself".[115] There is no doubt that this was going to be a united front against Brahmanism.

Sixthly, the Movement stood for "the *inter-national consolidation* of the nations of South Asia against the *de-nationalising dangers* of 'Indianism' ". This was the more positive aspect of the campaign. Not only was the demon of "Indianism" to be exorcised, but the freed nations were to be "Asianised" by the creation of a spirit of inter-national solidarity among them. To achieve this, they were to be asked to "recognise and guarantee the integrity of one another in such a manner that, without let or hindrance, they can all develop along their own lines and achieve their national ideals in their own ways". In the next place, and on a basis of voluntary and mutual co-operation, they "must consolidate themselves inter-nationally by entering into alliances with their neighbours so that they can for ever offer a united front against the de-nationalising dangers of 'Indianism' ". This was bound to open a new chapter in the history of South Asia.[116]

Finally, the Movement stood for "the creation of a *new order of 'Asianism'* to take the place of the *old order of 'Indianism'* in South Asia". History was not to be allowed to repeat itself, nor "Indianism" to be permitted to reappear in a different shape or form. Therefore, the Movement appealed to all nations in South Asia to evolve a new order based on the principle of "Asianism" to replace the old order of "Indianism", so that their national life and liberty be protected and the moral entity and political integrity of South Asia live for ever.[117]

This catalogue of the aims of the PNM has the immense virtue of clarity, and tells us much about the working of Rahmat Ali's mind. No aspect of a nation's life was ignored. Cultural and economic autonomy was recognized as a vital characteristic of modern nationalism. The spiritual basis of a people's life was to be strengthened. The ultimate aim was to destroy Hinduism, and eliminate

all chances of its imperial resurgence. His outlook was, however, not limited to the narrow horizon of nationalism. He looked forward to the day when a supra-national spirit would take these nations into the broader field of an Asian comity inspired by mutual co-operation.

Rahmat Ali did not disguise his hatred for what he called "Indianism", and which may roughly be translated as Hindu imperialism without doing any violence to his meaning. All his efforts were directed to breaking its power, and he was anxious to enlist the help and support of all Indian minorities, including even some Hindu groups. This led him to the idea of self-determination which he believed to be the right of all oppressed and disinherited peoples of India. The sincerity of his promises is not questionable, for he was prepared to see the Sikhs win their freedom, though this would be at the cost of Pakistan. His repeated references to India as South Asia have a prophetic quality, for after 1947 this name has been adopted by everyone to designate the countries which once made up the British Indian empire.

A minor but significant point in this pamphlet was the change in the spellings of the word Pakistan. In its first manifestation in *Now or Never* it had been written as "Pakstan"; in this second elaboration, it became "Pakistan". The addition of the letter "i" did not make any alteration in the meaning or formation of the word, but it did make it easier to pronounce it and, more importantly, gave it the final shape that was to be adopted by him, his Movement, the people in India, and, finally but very reluctantly, by the All India Muslim League. According to one report, this change was effected on the suggestion of one Dr. L.R. Khan.[118] Whoever or whatever was responsible for the change, from now onwards the accepted and in fact the only known word was to be Pakistan.

Like most other events of Rahmat Ali's life, the foundation of the PNM has also been given widely incorrect dates by many writers, popular[119] as well as scholarly.[120] Surprisingly, even Muhammad Anwar, who served as Rahmat Ali's private secretary in the late 'thirties, insists that the Movement was established in 1930, and adds that "when I went to London in 1937 I found that Rahmat Ali had been working alone for the Movement in London for seven or eight years".[121]

In conclusion, a few words about the name of the Movement

are relevant. Till 1942 all the pamphlets by Rahmat Ali were published by the PNM from its Cambridge address, 16 Montague Road. Then in 1943 and 1944 a few phamphlets came out from the same address, but they bore the names of different movements. The demand for Haideristan (an independent Hyderabad) was made by the Haideristan National Movement; that for Maplistan (for South Indian Muslims) by the Maplistan National Movement; that for Siddiqistan (for Muslims of Central India) by the Siddiqistan National Movement; and so on. In the summer of 1944, Rahmat Ali founded a new movement, the All-Dinia Milli Movement, which published its first pamphlet on 10 June. A year later came the Dinia Continental Movement. But in 1946 and 1947 two pamphlets came out under the imprint of the old PNM. The first two editions of *Pakistan: My Faith, Fatherland, and Fraternity* (put forth in cyclostyled form in 1935 and 1939) were issued by the PNM;[122] but its third, printed edition, dated June 1947, carried as the publisher's name a new organization, the Pakistan National Liberation Movement.

It is clear, however, that the movements proliferated at Rahmat Ali's whim, and their number and titles have no significance. By whatever name they were called, all of them were the work of one man and all their demands emanated from one mind. Further, there is no warrant to be misled by the word "movement". Rahmat Ali had a few friends, very few indeed, who helped him in various ways. The PNM might have had some kind of an organization. Rahmat Ali was the founder-president of all the movements. But in reality he ran the whole thing himself, and every idea, proposal, suggestion, statement, leaflet, declaration or pamphlet came from one individual. The organization and its variants notwithstanding, the man and the movement were literally the same thing.

As far as is known, Rahmat Ali did not publish anything in 1934; nor has his correspondence of this period survived. Probably he spent most of his time in sending his two pamphlets (*Now or Never* and *What Does the Pakistan National Movement Stand For?*) to as many people as possible in India and Britain, writing to men of influence, and meeting the British and Indian politicians in London and trying to convince them that his proposal was both desirable and practicable.

At some time in 1933 or 1934 he began a recruitment campaign for his PNM. Membership forms were typed on quarto-size paper,

and they carried the aims and objects of the movement. The membership fee was one shilling per year. The form ran as follows:

"The AIMS and IDEALS of the MOVEMENT are as follows:–

(1) To fight for a National Home in PAKISTAN for the Muslim Millet.

(2) To put an end, once and for all, to the age-old Muslim-Hindoo problem by solving it on an international basis, fully recognizing the fundamentally inter-national character of the problem, and bearing in mind that the one permanent solution which the problem lends itself to, is the one launched and guarded by the PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT.

(3) To instill new life into our Millet, through an IDEAL, a towering national ideal, worthy of the highest dedication.

(4) To redress the injustices, wrongs, and misfortunes which have come our way since 1857.

(5) To work for the liberation of our people from all foreign influences.

(6) To fight for complete independence and freedom in our historic Fatherland, and to work for its greatness and glory.

(7) To uphold the cause of all persecuted minorities, in sympathy with our IDEAL, in their demand for self-preservation and an honourable existence.

(8) To fight for the destitute widows and orphans of our Millet, and to take them in our fold in order to protect them against want and misery.

(9) To defend the Fatherland against all invasions, whether of arms or of ideas, and to guard the inviolability and sanctity of our national treasures and consecrated places.

(10) To lay down our lives in defence of our Fatherland, every inch of whose sacred soil holds in treasured trust the memory of some imperishable deed of patriotism and sacrifice, and every blade of grass whose noble surface has been watered by the blood of some valiant soul.

I declare that I am a servant of PAKISTAN, our historic FATHERLAND. I subscribe to the AIMS and IDEALS of the PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT, and I hereby make application to be enrolled as a MEMBER.

SIGNATURE . . . . . .

NAME. . . . . .

(Block letters)

ADDRESS . . . . . .

All communications, with subscriptions to 'The Treasurer, Pakistan National Movement, 16, Montagu [*sic.*] Road, Cambridge, England.'

PLEASE ASK YOUR FRIENDS TO JOIN THE PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT."[123]

NOTES

1. Letter from the Keeper of the Records, The Honourable Society of the Middle Temple, London, to the author, dated 19 July 1971, *RAA*.
2. Nawab Sir Umar Hayat Khan Tiwana, CIE, CBE, KCIE, GBE (1874-1944), member, Imperial Legislative Council, 1910; member, India Council, 1929-34; president, Falconers Club, England.
3. Number 10 Albert Road (if the numbering has not been changed) is now Crown property, leased to the Nuffield Foundation, and serving as flats to accommodate visiting academics from the Commonwealth. I lived next door to it in 1976 and 1979.
4. A copy of this application form is in *RAA*. The original is in the Emmanuel College archives.
5. Emmanuel College was founded by Sir Walter Mildmay in 1584 on the site of a former priory of the Dominican Order, also known as the Black Friars or Preachers. Of the first 100 university graduates who settled in the New England colonies in America no less than one third were from Emmanuel; one of them, John Harvard (B.A., 1632), gave his name to the first American university. The entrance front is by James Essex. The chapel, and the cloister with the gallery above it, were designed by Sir Christopher Wren. The library used by Rahmat Ali dates from 1930. The herb garden in the New Court is a later addition. The college entrance is on Saint Andrew's Street. On the west side lies the Emmanuel Street, with a tunnel beneath it leading to the North Court. Drummer Street and Parker Street lie on the north and north-west. It is one of the more pleasing colleges of Cambridge.
6. The testimonial read: "I have known Mr. C.R. Ali personally from [*sic.*] a long time. He is a distinguished graduate of the Punjab University and comes of a very respectable family, whose record of War services is highly creditable. He, himself, during the Great War, acted as a Secretary of the Recruitment Committee for the Punjab University Double Company and also as Secretary of the Our Day Fund Committee of the same University.

"In addition to his having taken the B.A. degree in Arts, in good Second Class, he has also attended, for two years, the full course of the LL.B. degree at the University Law College, Lahore, India. Mr. C.R. Ali has come here to study for the B.A. Law Tripos of the Cambridge University, to which seat of learning I deem him as eminently fitted for admission and deserving of consideration at the hands of the authorities of the University." *RAR*.

7. Some examples: He went to England in 1929 (Maqbul Ahmad Ansari, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 18 February 1979). He had a Ph.D. degree (Jahangard, "Pakistan: chand itarazat ka jawab", *Zamzam*, 15 August 1938). He was a student of "Cambridge University, London" (Akhtar Begum, "Allama Iqbal awr tahrik-i-Pakistan ky ibtida", *Musawat*, 22 April 1976). He took his M.A. degree "with distinction" (Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali lafz 'Pakistan' kay khaliq thay", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1977), and "with high marks" (Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali awr tahrik-i-Pakistan", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1976). He left for England for studies in 1927 (Mukhtar Ali Rahmani, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali nay ghayr mamalik mayn rah kar jang-i-azadi lary", *Jang*, 14 August 1978). He came to Emmanuel College in 1932 (Obituary Notice, *The Times*, 5 March 1951). He was a post-graduate student at Emmanuel College (Sarfraz Husain Mirza, *Muslim Women's Role in the Pakistan Movement*, Lahore, 1969, p. 39; S. Sharifuddin Pirzada, "Etymology of Pakistan", *The Pakistan Times*, 23 March 1963, and his *Evolution of Pakistan*, Lahore, 1963, p. 26). He was a graduate student at Cambridge (Waheeduzzaman, *Towards Pakistan*, Lahore, 1964, p. 148; and Mary Louise Becker, "Some Formative Influences on the Career of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah", *Papers Presented at the International Congress on Quaid-i-Azam, 19-25 December 1976, Islamabad*, 1976, p. 157). He was a student in London (Nazir Ahmad Sheikh, *Quaid-i-Azam*, Lahore, 1968, p. 57). He left for England in 1927 (Muhammad Anwar Amin, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Imroz*, 23 March 1970, and his "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 24 March 1971; Hafiz Muhammad Islam, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali nay tanha Pakistan ky tahrik chalayi", *Jang*, 15 August

1971; Chaudhri Bashir Ahmad, in *Jang*, 16 November 1977, and *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 18 November 1977). He left for England in 1929 (Manzur-ul-Haq Siddiqui, "Batayn Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky", *Sayyara Digest*, March 1978, p. 41). He left for England in the summer of 1931 (Ashiq Husain Batalwai, "Iqbal, Edward Thompson, Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 21 April 1964; Mian Abdul Haq, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan awr Chaudhri Rahmat Ali-I", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 25 June 1964, also rep. in *Gujjar Gazette*, 11 March 1966, p. 13).

8. Letter from Sir Gordon Sutherland, Master of Emmanuel College, to the author, dated 28 October 1969, *RAA*.
9. Information supplied by the Senior Tutor, Emmanuel College.
10. Rahmat Ali's Tutorial File, Emmanuel College.
11. Edward Welbourne (1894-1966), joined Emmanuel College as a Fellow in early 1920's; University Lecturer in Economic History; Master of Emmanuel College, 1951-64.
12. Letter from Sir Gordon Sutherland, Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to the author, dated 28 October 1969, *RAA*.
13. Waheed Ahmad, "Chaudhry Rahmat Ali and the Concept of Pakistan", *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan*, January 1970, p. 24 fn.
14. Sir Charles Oman.
15. "I hope you will excuse me for writing this letter for a friend of mine Mr. C. Rahmat Ali whom I have known in India. He is a brilliant student and had a great deal to do with Law in India. In fact I suggested to him that he would do very well if he took up Law in England and he is now studying at Cambridge University. He is not so well to do that he can waste his time or money. He will put his case before you and if he can be saved expense by your kind help I shall be very grateful. He has been very loyal to the Government in India and that is the reason I take an interest in him." Letter from Sir Umar Hayat Tiwana to Sir Charles Oman, dated 24 June 1931, *RAR*.
16. "I found your telegram awaiting my unexpectedly early return yesterday evening. I don't think it would serve any useful purpose for you to come for another interview at present. I had hoped to receive all your papers during last

week so that I might have consulted the Master on the matter before he went away for the vacation but beyond one letter from Sir Umar, nothing has reached me. The Master has gone away now and one cannot bother him with an entry for 1932 whilst on his holiday so that there is now no hurry. I talked to the Censor of St. Catherine's Society about you and he was quite clear that if Balliol could not take you, he would, so I think you can count fairly safely on getting in if the Latin is adequate." Letter from T.H. Tylor (on Balliol College notepaper) to Rahmat Ali, dated 7 July 1931, *RAR*.

17. On the cover of some of his pamphlets Rahmat Ali gives his academic qualifications as "M.A., LL.B., Barrister-at-law". He did not get his law degree from Lahore, so he must have earned it after leaving India. Both *The Cambridge Daily News* of 21 February 1951 and *The Times* of 5 March 1951 mention in their obituary notices that he took his LL.B. at Trinity College, Dublin. The same is asserted by Halide Edib (*Inside India*, London. 1937, p. 352) who had met Rahmat Ali, and by most of the writers who have published anything on him. I have not been able to find out the year of Rahmat Ali's residence in Dublin or any documentary proof of his study there. My letters of inquiry addressed to the Registrar of Trinity College remain unanswered. We have a fairly continuous record of Rahmat Ali's life in Cambridge from 1931 onwards, and there is no gap of 2 or 3 years in his activities to indicate that he had left Cambridge. Was it possible for him to have taken the Dublin examination as an external student without going and living there for an extended period?
18. Rahmat Ali, from London, to his tutor at Emmanuel College, 25 October 1932, *RAA*.
19. Letter, from Leonard Hollingworth, 208 Green End Road, Cambridge, to the author, dated 19 July 1971, *RAA*.
20. I visited the road and the house on 17 April 1971. The house had been sold twice since 1932, and the owners of Rahmat Ali's time were not traceable.
21. Chaudhry Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan: The Fatherland of the Pak Nation* (Cambridge, 3rd. ed. 1947), p. 214. Henceforth this volume will be cited simply as *Pakistan*.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 215. Also scattered entries in *RCPB*.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 215-217. Also scattered entries in *RCPB*.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 217-218; also *RCPB*.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 218; also *RCPB*.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 218-221, and especially the second footnote on p. 219; also *RCPB*.
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 222-223; also *RCPB*. Barring the Aga Khan, not a single Muslim delegate to the RTC has left behind him a diary, journal, letters, memoirs or an autobiography. So it is impossible to contradict or confirm Rahmat Ali's statement. One contemporary testimony says that he used to see the Nawab of Bhopal in London during the Conference, and later wrote several letters to the Nawab; the writer adds that he had seen one of these letters and describes the "Pakistan" notepaper on which it was written (Muhammad Ahmad Sabzwari, "Khud nawisht: Nawab Bhopal ky syasi basirat", *Afkar*, November 1981, pp. 26-27). Rahmat Ali's contemporaries in Cambridge told me that he visited London very frequently and on his return told them that he had gone to meet the Indian Muslim leaders foregathered for the Conference.
28. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Evolution of Pakistan* (Lahore, 1963), p. 132.
29. I.H. Qureshi, *The Muslim Community of the Indo-Pakistan Sub-Continent (610-1947): A Brief Historical Analysis* (The Hague, 1962), p. 297.
30. Choudhry Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan*, p. 223. The periods of suspension are in the original; I have not omitted any words here.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 223-224.
32. L.S. May, *The Evolution of Indo-Muslim Thought After 1857* (Lahore, 1970), p. 422, note 264.
33. Chaudhry Rahmat Ali, *et. al.*, *Now or Never* (Cambridge, 28 January 1933), p. 1, para 1. It is a 4-page leaflet printed on large-size (13" x 8") paper. In order to make my references clear, I give both the page and the paragraph numbers. Paragraphs running on to the next page are taken as belonging to the page on which they began.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 1, para 3.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 1, para 3.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 1, para 5.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 2, para 1.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 2, para 2.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 2, para 3.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 2, para 4.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 2, para 5, pp. 2-3, para 6.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 3, para 1.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 4, para 1.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 4, para 2.
45. *Ibid.*, p.4, para 3.
46. Chaudhry Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan*, p. 227.
47. This information is contained in *ibid.*, p. 227 fn.
48. Interview with Inayatullah Khan, and his letter to the author, dated 17 August 1970, *RAA*.
49. *Ibid.*, letter.
50. Aslam Khattak to Rahmat Ali, 17 March 1933. The original is in the National Museum, Karachi. A photocopy is in *RAA*.
51. Interview with Inayatullah Khan.
52. Chaudhry Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never: Are We to Live or to Perish For Ever?* The Pakistan National Movement, Cambridge, 1934.
53. Some examples of authors who attribute the circular to Muslim "under-graduates" or "students" (in the plural) of Cambridge: Guy Wint, in G. Schuster and Guy Wint, *India and Democracy* (London, 1941), p. 181; R.C. Kingsbury, James L. McPherson, *et. al.*, *Pakistan: A Compendium* (editor-in-chief, Raye R. Platt, American Geographical Society, New York, June 1961), p. 18 (mimeo, for limited distribution only); Holden Furber, "India", *Encyclopaedia Americana*, 1961 ed., Vol. XV, p. 28g; Aziz Ahmad, "Remarques sur les origines du Pakistan", *Orient*, no. 26 (1963), p. 22; Khalid b. Sayeed, *Pakistan: The Formative Phase, 1857-1948* (2nd ed., London, 1968), p. 105; Jahanara Shahnawaz, *Father and Daughter: A Political Autobiography* (Lahore, 1971), p. 77; M.E. Chamberlain, *Britain and India: The Interaction of Two Peoples* (Newton Abbot, 1974), p. 215; and Muhammad Munir (former Chief Justice of Pakistan), *Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah* (Lahore, 1976), pp. 7-8.
54. A selection of the wrong years: 1922 or 1923 (Mir Alim

Khan, Letters, *The Pakistan Times,* 7 April and 2 May 1964, who insisted in the second letter that he had personally received the pamphlet from Rahmat Ali in 1922 or 1923); 1929 (Kalim Siddiqui, *The Functions of International Conflict: A Socio-Economic Study of Pakistan,* Karachi, 1975, p. 72); 1930 (K.R. Minogue, *Nationalism,* London, 1967, p. 116; M. Raza Khan, *What Price Freedom,* Madras, 1969, p. 55; and International Commission of Jurists, Geneva, quoted in *Bangladesh Establishment Illegal,* Lahore, 1972, p. 8); 1931 (Major Kifaiet Ali, "Nazriya-i-Pakistan ka irtiqa", *Afaq,* 16 October 1949; Barkat Ali Khan Shamim, "Taswir-i-Pakistan ka suratgar", *Gujjar Gazette,* 4-18 March 1954, p. 19; G. Subha Rao, *Indian Words in English: A Study in Indo-British Cultural and Linguistic Relations,* Oxford, 1969 ed., p. 134; and Frank N. Tager, "The United States and Pakistan: A Failure of Diplomacy, *Orbis,* Fall 1965, p. 617 fn); 1932 (P. Sitaramayya, *The History of the Indian National Congress,* Bombay, Vol. II, 1947, p. 69; Faqir Sayyid Wahiduddin, *Ruzgar-i-faqir,* Lahore, 1965, p. 124; K.L. Gauba, *Passive Voices: A Penetrating Study of Muslims in India,* Lahore, 1975, p. 24; Bashir Ahmad, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang,* 23 March 1969; and Malik Muhammad Khan Awan, "Sadiq dost", *Sayyara Digest,* May 1980, p. 75); 1934 (Qadeeruddin Ahmad, a retired Chief Justice of Sind, *Pakistan: Facts and Fallacies,* Karachi, 1979, p. 3); 1935 (Hirendranath Mukerjee, *India's Struggle for Freedom,* Calcutta, 3rd. rev. ed., 1962, p. 217).

55. It was published by the National Pakistan Movement (Matlub Ahmad Shaikh, in *Imroz,* 23 March 1969); by the Pakistan National Liberation Movement (Muhammad Anwar Amin, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Imroz,* 23 March 1970, and *Jang,* 24 March 1971); by Foister and Jagg (G. Allana, *Our Freedom Fighters,* Karachi, 1969, p. 300 fn.). Sharifuddin Pirzada tells us that the original leaflet which was circulated was "cyclostyled" (which is not correct), but "in the same year it was printed as a pamphlet by Messrs. Foister & Jagg, Cambridge, and published by the Pakistan Movement"; which is again wrong: it was printed in 1934, not 1933, and published by the Pakistan National Movement (Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Evolution of Pakistan,* Lahore, 1963,

pp. 26-27).

56. It is called *Pakistan* by Leonard Binder, "Pakistan and Modern Islamic-Nationalist Theory: Part Two", *The Middle East Journal*, Winter 1958, p. 50.

57. For example, R.M. Whyte, *The Great Leader: The Quaid-i-Azam* (Lahore, 2nd. rev. ed. 1962); S.M. Ikram, *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan* (Lahore, 1965), p. 183; D.P. Singhal, *Nationalism in India and other Historical Essays* (Delhi, 1967), p. 220; Saleem M.M. Qureshi, *Jinnah and the Making of a Nation* (Karachi, 1969), p. 61; Ziauddin Ahmad, *Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan* (Karachi, 1970), p. 50; International Commission of Jurists, *op. cit.*; K.R. Minogue, *op. cit.*, p. 116; Mary Louise Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 157; Muhammad Munir, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8; M.E. Chamberlain, *op. cit.*, p. 215; Khalid b. Sayeed, *op. cit.*, p. 105; Holden Furber, *op. cit.*, Vol. XV, p. 28g; R.C. Kingsbury, James L. McPherson, *et. al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 18; Aziz Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 22; and Sayyid Hashim Raza, "The Role of Sind in the Pakistan Movement", *Dawn*, 23 March 1977.

58. The areas demanded for the Muslims in *Now or Never* included Bengal and Assam (Absar Alam, "Pakistan–tarikh kay pas manzar mayn", *Cheragh-i-Rah*, December 1960, p. 188; Muhammad Ilyas Farani, *Barr-i-saghir mayn Muslim qawmiyyat kay tasawwur ka irtiqa*, Karachi, 1968, p. 174; Muhammad V. Shallwani, Letter, *Dawn*, 26 April 1976); Bengal ("Nazriya-i-Pakistan ka bany: Iqbal", *Hurryat*, 24 March 1969); Afghanistan (M.E. Chamberlain, *op. cit.*, p. 215; David Loshak, *Pakistan Crisis*, London, 1971, p. 2); parts of Afghanistan (Stephen P. Cohen, *The Indian Army: Its Contribution to the Development of a Nation*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1971, p. 192 fn. 35; Max Gallo, "Gandhi l'avait predit", *L'Express*, 13-19 December 1971, p. 78); Bengal, Assam and Hyderabad (Sayyid Hashim Raza, *op. cit.*, and M.A. Karandikar, *Islam in India's Transition to Modernity*, Bombay, 1968, p. 254).

59. He told this to his secretary, Miss Frost, on returning to Cambridge. She told me this in her interview.

60. I heard this story for the first time about 20 years ago. The source quoted to me was Mian Arshad Husain, then Pakistan's foreign minister, and a contemporary of Rahmat Ali's

at Cambridge. I wrote to him in July 1968, inviting him to throw some light on the truth or otherwise of the version. I received a cryptic reply from his private secretary, saying "As regards your request, at the moment, the Foreign Minister is too busy to write anything about Ch. Rahmat Ali. He knew him quite well in Cambridge. The story about the name 'Pakistan' is not exactly what you have outlined, but there may have been some connection. To establish this, however, further research is required. In the meantime nothing should be said"; letter from Z.U. Shah, Private Secretary to the Foreign Minister, to the author, no. 3361-FM/68, dated 17 August 1968. *RAA*.

When I met his cousin, Mian Azim Husain, who also knew Rahmat Ali, and asked about this story, his answer was that "generally at that time we understood that the name 'Pakistan' had occurred to Rahmat Ali in this way"; interview with Mian Azim Husain.

61. This letter, along with all other writings of Rahmat Ali referred to in this work, is in *RAA*.
62. B.R. Ambedkar, *Pakistan or Partition of India* (Bombay, 1945), p. 5.
63. G. Allana, *Quaid-e-Azam Jinnah: The Story of a Nation* (Karachi, 1967), p. 306.
64. Muhammad Anwar, "The Forgotten Hero: I", *The Pakistan Times*, 23 March 1964.
65. *Ibid.*
66. G. Allana, *Quaid-e-Azam Jinnah*, pp. 308, 120A-120D. All these maps are now in the Pakistan National Museum.Photo-copies in *RAA*.
67; See List of Maps in *Pakistan*, p. 18. The historical maps are: Pakistan in Geological Times (p. 30), Pakistan at the Dawn of History (p. 172), Pakistan in the Eighth Century A.D. (p. 179), Pakistan in the 11th Century (p. 181), Pakistan in the 13th Century (p. 183), Pakistan in 1318 (p. 185), Pakistan in 1398 (p. 187), Pakistan in 1525 (p. 189), Pakistan in 1605 (p. 193), Pakistan in 1700 (p. 196), Pakistan in 1751 (p. 198), Pakistan in 1780 (p. 200), Pakistan in 1795 (p. 201), Pakistan in 1933 (p. 226), the Pak Millat in 1940 (p. 247), and the Pak Millat in 1942 (p. 272).
68. *Ibid.*, p. 227.

69. *Ibid.*, p. 231.
70. Waheed Ahmad, "Choudhry Rahmat Ali and the Concept of Pakistan", *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan*, January 1970, p. 11 fn.
71. *Minutes of Evidence given before the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform* (HMSO, London, 1934), Vol. II C, Questions nos. 9598-9600, p. 1496. Abdullah Yusuf Ali and Khalifa Shujauddin were appearing jointly as witnesses on behalf of the All India Muslim League and the All India Muslim Conference. Craddock and Foot were members of the Committee. Zafrulla Khan, who had been president of the Muslim League at the December 1931 Delhi annual session, was a British Indian representative on the Committee. The other Muslim co-optees on the Committee were the Aga Khan, Shafaat Ahmad Khan, Sir Abdur Rahim and A.H. Ghaznavi; none participated in this discussion.
72. *Ibid.*, Questions nos. 16,717-16,720, p. 2033. French was in the ICS from December 1906 to April 1932, and had spent almost all his service years in Bengal.
73. *Ibid.*, Questions nos. 16,803-16,810, p. 2038.
74. Waheed Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 14. He interviewed Zafrulla in London on 22 May 1970. (The January issue of the journal must have been published several months later; otherwise how could the proceedings of an interview of May appear in the January number of the same year?)
75. *Ibid.*, p. 21 fn.
76. Dr. Jahangir Khan quoted in Manzurul Haq Siddiqui, "Batayn Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky", *Sayyara Digest*, March 1978, p. 44. This meeting may have taken place, but Jahangir's statement about Yusuf Ali's pro-Congress views is baseless.
77. Duchess of Atholl, *The Main Facts of the Indian Problem* (London, 1933), pp. 25-26.
78. Mouse, "Empire's Danger-Spot", *Journal of the United Service Association of India*, rep. in *The Statesman*, 3 August 1933.
79. Eustace Percy, *Some Memories* (London, 1958), p. 157.
80. The declaration was reprinted in full in the July 1933 issue in the Urkunden (Documents) section under the title of

"Pakstan". The following editorial note accompanied it: "Der nachfolgende Aufruf wurde unter dem Datum: 3, Humberstone Road, Cambridge, 28. Januar 1933, und mit der Unterschrift von Rahmat Ali (Choudhary), dessen Name auch unter dem Aufruf steht, verbreitet. Er wirft Licht auf wesentliche Verhaltnisse und Entwicklungen des Islams in Indien und sei deswegen von uns hier mitgeteilt./Am Kopf steht in arabischem Urtext der Vers des Korans: *inna 'llaha la jugaijiru ma bi-quaumin hatta jugaijiru ma bi-anfusihim:* 'Gott verandert das, was in einem Volke ist, erst dann, wenn sie verandern, was in ihren Seelen ist' (Sura 13, 12). Nach diesem Vers beginnt der Aufruf so, wie er hier folgt." *Die Welt des Islams*, Band 15, Heft 1-2, July 1933, pp. 44-49; this note on p. 44. (Translation: The following proclamation, issued from 3 Humberstone Road, Cambridge, on 28 January 1933, under the signature of Rahmat Ali (Chaudhary), whose name also appears at the bottom of the appeal, has been circulated. It throws light on certain significant aspects of the condition and development of Islam in India, and for that reason we reprint it here./At the head of the leaflet stands, in the original Arabic, the verse from the Quran: *inna 'llaha la yoghayyiro ma bi-qawmin hatta yoghhayyiru ma bi-anfasihim*, "Verily, never will God change the condition of a people until they change it themselves (with their own souls)" (Sura 13:12). After this verse begins the actual proclamation as it is reproduced below.)

81. Rudi Paret, "On the conflict between Mohammedans and Hindus in British India", *RAA*. It is an 8-page hand-written article, commenting on three publications: Dr. Qudus Abdul Faroqi's *The Hindu Mohammadan Conflict*, Rahmat Ali's *Contribution to the Study of Hindu Muslim Problems*, and Chaudhary Rahmat Ali's *Now or Never*. It reads like a book review, but I have not been able to discover where it was published; it bears no date. I have not come across the first-named book. The second by Rahmat Ali (not to be confused with Choudhary Rahmat Ali) was actually a French publication: *Contribution a l'etude du conflit hindou-musulman*, Libraire Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, Paris, 1933. In 144 pages, it deals with four problems: Indian agriculture, the peasants, the intellectuals, and the bourgeoisie. It has not

been translated into English, and reads like a doctoral dissertation.

82. W.A. Barnes, Letter, *The Times*, 17 September 1959. He says that this broadsheet was shown to him by a non-Muslim "well-known businessman in Lahore".
83. "Federation of Muslim States? Scheme which may Eventually Evolve", *Star of India*, 14 April 1933.
84. *Ibid.*, 1 May 1933.
85. *Ibid.*, 6 May 1933.
86. K.G. Ahmad, Letter, *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 23 May 1933.
87. Muhammad Anwar, Letter, *ibid.*, 7 September 1933.
88. Khalid Saifullah, Letter, *ibid.*, 19 September 1933.
89. Muhammad Anwar, Letter, *ibid.*, 19 September 1933.
90. Muhammad Anwar, Letter, *ibid.*, 29 September 1933.
91. Khalid Saifullah, Letter, *ibid.*, 23 October 1933.
92. Muhammad Anwar, Letter, *ibid.*, 1 November 1933.
93. Haider Ali Abbasi, Letter, *ibid.*, 22 December 1933.
94. See Ghulam Rabbani, Letter, *ibid.*, 4 October 1934, also rep. in *Star of India*, 6 October 1934.
95. Niaz Mahmood, Letter, *ibid.*, 1 November 1934.
96. Sayyid Shaukat Ali, Letter, *ibid.*, 7 January 1935.
97. Malik Ataullah Khan, Letter, *ibid.*, 11 April 1935.
98. See A Muslim Correspondent, "What Muslim India Thinks", *ibid.*, 13 and 21 August, 2, 9, 13, 16, 23 and 30 October, 5, 20 and 27 November, and 4, 11, 18 and 25 December 1933.
99. See Muslim Political Correspondent, "The Muslim World", *ibid.*, 3, 10, 18 and 24 April, 1, 8, 14 21 and 28 May, 4, 11, 18 and 25 June, 2, 9, 16, 23 and 30 July, and 6 August 1934.
100. See A Muslim Correspondent, "What Muslim India Thinks", *ibid.*, 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29 January, 5, 12, 20 and 26 February, 5, 12, 19 and 26 March, 13, 20 and 27 May, 3, 10, 17 and 24 June, 1, 8, 15 and 22 July, 7, 14, 21 and 28 August, 4, 13 and 21 September, 4, 16 and 20 October and 11, 17, 24 and 31 December 1934.
101. See A Muslim Correspondent, "What Muslim India Thinks", *ibid.*, 7, 14, 21 and 28 January, 4, 11, 18 and 25 February, 4, 11, 18 and 25 March, 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29 April, 6, 12, 19 and 26 May, 2, 9, 16, 23 and 30 June, 9, 16 and 28 July,

8 and 18 August, 20 September, 6, 13, 20 and 27 October, 3, 10, 17 and 24 November, and 1, 15, 22 and 29 December 1935.

102. Cited in Khan A. Ahmad, *The Founder of Pakistan through Trial to Triumph* (London, 1942), p. 13.
103. *The Eastern Times*, 10 June 1934.
104. Reported in *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 19 August 1934.
105. *Ibid.*, 19 August 1934.
106. Gulshan Rai, "The Liberal Nationalist Standpoint: The Pakistan Mentality", *ibid.*, 30 March 1935, his "The Liberal Nationalist Standpoint: Pakistan Mentality of the Punjab Muslims", *ibid.*, 13 April 1935, and his article in the *Tribune*, 12 October 1935. It is reported that *The Statesman*, a British-owned-and-edited newspaper of Calcutta and Delhi, criticized Rahmat Ali's idea in its issues of 3 and 6 August 1933 (*The Aligarh Magazine*, Special Pakistan Number, 1944, p. 129).
107. See Waheed Ahmad (ed.), *Letters of Mian Fazl-i-Husain* (Lahore, 1976), pp. 429-435.
108. D.N. Wilber, *Pakistan: Yesterday and Today* (New York, 1964), p. 104.
109. Chaudhary Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan*, p. 227.
110. C. Rahmat Ali, *What Does the Pakistan National Movement Stand For?* (The Pakistan National Movement, Cambridge, 1933), pp. 3-4. Of its eight pages, the first carries the title and the second the prefatory note. The text covers only six pages. The pamphlet was reprinted in 1937 and 1942. It was not, unlike some other pamphlets, reproduced in *Pakistan;* a summary of it appeared on pp. 228-229, but it is substantially different from the original declaration, and will be referred to later when we come to his ideas as expressed in 1946.
111. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5. The italics, here and in all quotations from this pamphlet given in this section, are in the original.
112. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
113. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
114. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
115. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
116. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.
117. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

118. Dr. L.R. Khan (1908-1967) was born in Nabha State and educated at MAO College, Aligarh, and Government College, Lahore. He took his M.D. from St. Andrews University some time in the 1920's. In 1945 he became president of the Jamshedpur Muslim League; in 1947 he migrated to Pakistan and settled in Karachi, where in 1963 he founded the Thinkers Forum. He died on 5 November 1967. Sherali Alidina, Letter, *The Pakistan Times,* 31 January 1970. But Alidina is wrong in saying that the first circular which Dr. Khan received was cyclostyled and that when Rahmat Ali "subsequently printed the declaration, he used the word 'Pakistan' ". The declaration was never cyclostyled, and its later reissues on a smaller format were exact copies of the earliest text and retained the word "Pakstan" in capitals.
119. The year 1930 is mentioned by several persons: M. Sharif Salombar ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Jang,* 3 February 1981, who calls it the "National Liberation Movement"), Muhammad Sulaiman Tahir ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *ibid.,* 13 February 1978), Iqbal Asghar ("Pakistan ka nam Hindu press kay zariyay mashhur hua", *Hurryat,* 24 March 1969), and S.M.K. Wasti (*Chaudhri Rahmat Ali–dayi-i-Pakistan–tarikh kay ayna mayn,* Lahore, 1978, p. 16); 1931 by "Nukta Ras" (*Ehsan,* 18 July 1938, and *Inqilab,* 2 August 1938); 1932 by "A Liberal Partisan" ("Pakistan", *The New Times,* 13 September 1938); and G. Allana who writes that "it was during the years 1930 and 1933 that he seems to have established 'The Pakistan National Movement' " (*Our Freedom Fighters,* Karachi, 1969, p. 299).
120. "Rahmat Ali started the Pakistan National Movement in Britain in 1930", Hafeez Malik, "Nationalism and the Quest for Ideology in Pakistan", in Ziring, Braibanti and Wriggins (eds.), *Pakistan: The Long View* (Durham, N.C., 1977), p. 286.
121. Interview with Anwar, *Satluj,* 12 February 1976, pp. 5-6. "1930" cannot have been a misprint, for it is given twice on the same page. It is also incorrect that Rahmat Ali had been working in London.
122. See Choudhry Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan,* Preface, p. 8. I have not come across the two earlier cyclostyled editions, which,

says Rahmat Ali, were meant "for the use of the workers of the Pakistan National Movement".

123. Two of these forms are preserved in *RAR*. One is signed by "Khan Ghulam Hasan Khan, Alampura, district Hoshiarpur, Pakistan", and the other by Muhammad Inamul Haq Siddiqi, c/o Westminster Bank, Blackfriars Branch, SE1. Neither bears a date.

CHAPTER 3

THE IDEA TAKES SHAPE : 1933-1940

So far, Rahmat Ali had not succeeded in convincing anyone among those engaged in making a new constitution for India. The RTC had met thrice to hammer out and determine the basic principles for an Indian federation; a white paper containing a summary of recommendations had been issued by the British government; a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses of Parliament, aided by a brilliant team of Indian politicians, had worked long hours and made its report; a bill for the government of India had been drafted and was now, in 1935, before the Parliament for final disposal.[1] All this time Rahmat Ali must have been meeting the men in authority, especially Muslim members of the Joint Select Committee and Muslim witnesses appearing before it, trying to warn them that the creation of a federation would be disastrous for Muslims. His expostulations, exhortations, discussions, petitions and protests came to nought; and the unanimity with which Muslim leaders told the Joint Select Committee that the Pakistan plan was a fantasy cherished by a student, hardly worth talking about, must have humiliated and discouraged him.

In May 1935, during a debate on the India bill in the House of Commons, Vyvyan Adams made what must have been the first comment on Pakistan in the British parliament. "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 NWFP 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".[2] He did not explain in what way such a proposal amounted to Muslim disloyalty to the ruling

power. No other reference was made to Rahmat Ali's idea during the lengthy debates on the federation in both Houses.

Letter to Members of Parliament

Rahmat Ali was very well informed on Indian political and constitutional developments, and the report of Adams' speech would not have escaped his attention. This might or might not have instigated him to make one final effort to convey his objections and present his case to those in whose hands now lay the constitutional future of India. He decided to write directly to the members of the two Houses in an attempt to educate them in the intricacies and problems of Muslim politics in India. Of this, we have a written record.

On 8 July 1935, he addressed a letter running to four out-size pages to the members of the two Houses of Parliament. Of exactly the same length as *Now or Never* and printed on the same *format*, it was a circular letter, with "Dear --------" (Sir or Madam) on the copies dispatched to the members of the lower house and "My Lord" on those sent to the peers of the realm.[3] He signed it as "C. Rahmat Ali (*President, Pakistan National Movement*)", and gave his own address as 16 Montague Road, Cambridge. It was reissued on the same large *format* on 16 November 1936. A slightly amended version was brought out in 1937 in the form of an eight-page pamphlet under the title of *Islamic Fatherland and Indian Federation: Fight will go on for Pakistan.*[4]

In this communication he appealed "on behalf of the people of Pakistan" for sympathy and support in their struggle against "the ruthless coercion of Pakistan into the proposed Indian Federation". The demand of Pakistan was for the recognition of its right to a separate national existence, distinct from Hindustan, based on social, cultural, religious and historical grounds. "Pakistan is not Hindoo soil nor are its people Hindoostani citizens. It has always possessed a historical, spiritual, territorial and national individuality of its own. . . . While Hindoostanis claim Hindoostan as their mother country by birth, we claim Pakistan as our fatherland by the same right. If Hindoostan is theirs because they form three-fourths of its inhabitants, Pakistan is ours because we constitute four-fifths of its total population." The two peoples were so different in everything as to be two nations. "We have, as a nation,

nothing in common with them, nor they with us. In individual habits, as in national life, we differ from them as fundamentally as from any other civilized nation in the world. The very basis and content of our national life is founded on fundamentals essentially different from those on which Hindooism lives and prospers. Our agelong social system and our ancient national tradition has given us a civilization with a philosophy, a culture, a language, a literature and an art basically and fundamentally different from that of Hindoostan." These were hard facts which none could controvert. "They remain today, as they have ever been, unchangeable realities. This supreme distinction between Pakistan and Hindoostan is ineffaceable, as it is based on eternal truths. Our constitution-makers must reckon with Nature's decrees."

Nature had made Pakistan a geographical entity. The Jumna flowed as a boundary between Pakistan and Hindustan. History had confirmed the work of nature. "This great cleavage. . . has existed from time immemorial, and must exist forever. It represents our body and soul, as it stamps our separate national entity, and gives us an unchallengeable right to demand its recognition. It constitutes our ancient national heritage—of Faith and Fatherland—and we are firmly resolved to preserve it."

Repudiating the officially-nominated Muslim delegates who had come to London to make the "shameful surrender" of the right of their nation, Rahmat Ali demanded the creation of two federations in India, a Pakistan Federation and a Hindustan Federation, with equal status and identical legal position. This demand was not actuated by any hostility towards the British or the "Hindoostanis". It sprang from "the motives of self-defence and self-preservation alone". The people of Pakistan were neither anti-British nor anti-Hindustani, they were simply pro-Pakistani. They realized that their acceptance of Hindustani nationality and their amalgamation with Hindustan were not only impossible, not only unthinkable, but also inhuman. They had, therefore, a moral and legal duty to oppose, by all constitutional means open to them, the proposed federation. It was a pity that the British plan for one Indian federation did not take notice of these "eternal differences" between the Hindustani and Pakistani nations with which the makers of the plan were quite familiar. "The Indo-Pakistanian problem is not an inter-communal issue and will never be solved

on inter-communal lines. It is an inter-national problem and, therefore, will submit itself to a permanent solution on that basis alone. Any constitution–Federal or Unitary–which disregards this vital fact, while destructive for the Pakistanians, cannot but be disadvantageous to the British and Hindoostanis as well." (The reader will notice how after a few years Jinnah echoed this argument in almost identical phrases). If Burma was being separated from Hindustan and accorded a distinct national status, it was a mystery why Pakistan was being forced into an Indian federation against its will and in complete disregard of its interests and rights.

A federation for all India could be conjured up by the fiat of law, but could not be worked without the willing co-operation of the Pakistanians. The British Parliament could not impose a constitution unless it also imposed justice. The proposed federation denied "sacred justice" to Pakistan and would, therefore, "never satisfy the soul of the nation". The PNM would never accept the official dispensation as a permanent solution of the Indo-Pakistanian problem. "Nothing on earth will ever induce us to play the suicidal part allotted to us under the Indian Federal Scheme. We cannot give up what we have inherited from our forefathers, nor can we surrender what has been bequeathed to us by our heroes and martyrs. We can sacrifice all but we cannot commit an act of self-strangulation by joining the Indian Federation to please the British, or to satisfy the Hindoos. . . . The struggle may be long and trying; it may entail suffering and sacrifice; but no trial can be too severe and no sacrifice too great in this noble cause. We have the fullest faith in the justice of our national demand, and an unshakable belief in the destiny of our Fatherland." The letter concluded with a prayer that the help of God would bless these efforts and the inspiring example of national heroes sustain them.[5]

"Interview" with Halide Edib

Between 1935 and 1940 Rahmat Ali did not publish anything new, except a letter to *The Times*. This was the period in which Muslim India slowly but firmly turned towards partition, thus finally vindicating Rahmat Ali. Two weeks after the date of his letter to the members of parliament, *The Eastern Times* of Lahore, a Muslim paper, wrote: "Pakistan is a political term that has been recently coined to define the Movement for the Union of the

provinces of Sind, Baluchistan, NWF Province, and the Punjab and Kashmir. Between them, these areas have a Muslim population with a proportion of about four-fifths, and it is no exaggeration to say that the people of these provinces, Muslims in religion, culture and tradition, have much more in common with each other than with the Hindu India. The bond of Indian nationhood is founded on geographical and administrative conditions, the latter purely artificial and arbitrary; whereas the bond between the peoples of Pakistan is ethnic and organic."[6] I.H. Qureshi is of the opinion that "it was around 1935 that the demand for Pakistan began to gather support and developed a momentum which led to its establishment in 1947".[7] We have seen in the last chapter that several supporters of the Pakistan idea were writing letters to some Lahore newspapers in 1933-35, that an experienced statesman like the Aga Khan was using the word "Pakestan" in his correspondence as if it had already entered the common vocabulary of Indian politics, and some Hindu writers had accepted it as an equivalent of Muslim communal feeling.

But neither the Muslim League nor any other Indian Muslim political group had owned the idea or even made any sympathetic noises. This must have irked Rahmat Ali. This was also the period in which a large number of observers of public affairs suggested alternatives to an Indian federation which, they claimed, could secure Muslim rights without splitting India. It is almost unbelievable that Rahmat Ali should have remained silent in this public debate that was creating a revolution in the minds of Indian Muslims. Possibly he wrote something that has yet to be discovered, or has been lost, or was not published.

Fortunately, one window into this dark room has been opened by a happy chance. Halide Edib, a well-known Turkish journalist and woman of letters, visited India in 1935-36 and her detailed account of her tour and its impressions was published in London in 1937 under the title of *Inside India*. She was not an impartial observer of the Indian scene. Coming from the recently secularized Turkish Republic and labouring under the spell of Ataturk's anti-Islamic revolution, her sympathies lay with the Hindus, the Indian National Congress, the much-publicized gospel of Indian nationalism, and the so-called Nationalist Muslims. She made no secret of her dislike for the Muslim League and other Muslim groups and leaders who refused to subscribe to the Congress ideology or to

share its plans for the future. Given this outlook, it is certainly surprising that she should devote ten pages of her book to Rahmat Ali's opinions and plans while she had dismissed the much better-established Muslim parties and infinitely better-known Muslim leaders in as many paragraphs.

The explanation of this mystery is that Halide Edib was paid for inserting a chapter on the Pakistan ideal. She might have been asked by her publisher to subsidize the publication by a grant in cash or a guarantee of purchasing a large number of copies. Anyway, she needed money and a chance to make it came her way when Rahmat Ali and his co-workers were told that on her return from India she was living in Paris and preparing her impressions for publication. On one of her periodical visits to London, a delegation of these young men met her and proposed that she should include in her book one chapter on Pakistan. After some argument, she agreed on the condition that Muslim students in England undertook to buy 500 copies of her book. They agreed to the proposition. A slightly different version of the story is that when Rahmat Ali came to know of her intention to write a book on India, he went to Paris, had a long talk with her and failed to persuade her to present a sympathetic treatment of Indian Muslim aspirations. Disappointed by her refusal, it occurred to him that he might try to use her as a channel of publicity for his message. He therefore suggested that if she agreed to include a chapter on the Pakistan ideal he would arrange for the purchase of 500 copies of the forthcoming book by his movement and its sympathizers. The idea appealed to her, and she asked Rahmat Ali to prepare the chapter and bring it to her in Paris.

Rahmat Ali returned to Cambridge in triumph, told his friends about the bargain, and sat down to write the chapter in the form of an interview between Halide Edib and himself. His first visit to Paris had been on 16 May 1937. He spent about two months in writing, correcting and finalizing the chapter, and went to Paris on 7 or 17 August (the French immigration stamp is not very clear) with the finished contribution. What he had written appeared *in toto* in the book.

The students who had promised to buy 500 copies of the book had to make many sacrifices to collect the required money. Most of them gave up one meal a day, wore cotton socks in winter and surrendered other comforts and conveniences to slash their living

expenses. The funds thus saved were handed over to the committee established by Rahmat Ali for buying the book.[8]

The book, *Inside India*, came out towards the end of 1937, and must have helped spread Rahmat Ali's gospel to many places where otherwise it might not have reached. The chapter on Pakistan was translated into Urdu by Khurshid Alam (under the pseudonym of "Jahangard") and published by *Ehsan* and *Inqilab* of Lahore in July 1938.[9] Both newspapers had a large circulation that crossed the frontiers of the Punjab. Thus several thousand readers in north India were acquainted with Rahmat Ali's plan. The message reached an even wider reading public when, in 1939, an Urdu version of the whole book was published in New Delhi by the prestigious Anjuman-i-Taraqqi-i-Urdu.[10] In perspective, Rahmat Ali's initiative and penmanship and his friends' sacrifices brought in a rich harvest of propagation and instruction, and also some conversions.

This contrived "interview" is also a valuable addition to our knowledge about Rahmat Ali's opinions and ideas of this period. At places he provided clarifications and elaborations which throw a new light on his earlier statements. As Halide Edib's book is now a scarce item, the questions and answers prepared by Rahmat Ali are summarized in some detail in the following paragraphs. The quaint spelling of "Muslem" is Halide Edib's, and it is retained wherever she is quoted; Rahmat Ali spelt it in the normal way—"Muslim".

In reply to the first question, which asked about the origin of the PNM, Rahmat Ali traced the history of the fortunes of the Indian Muslims since 1857 with special reference to the areas in the north-west claimed for his Pakistan. For a thousand years the Hindus were a minority in this area. Further, the Muslims of this part were different from the rest of the people. "Their racial origins are from Central Asia, and socially their type of civilization is totally different from that of Hindoostan. Islam, as a social, moral and political system, is the key to, and the outstanding feature of, the Pakistani nation." Coming to the Muslims in other parts of India, he said something which explains his curious two-nation theory according to which Muslims of the north-west were a separate nation, separate even from the rest of the Indian Muslims. "The Muslems in Pakistan are in their national home. The Muslems in Hindoostan (*i.e.*, India proper) went there as con-

querors. Therefore Hindoostan was the Muslem Empire, where for over nine hundred years, they ruled over a vast native majority. But when they lost this Colonial Empire, as distinct from Pakistan, the Muslems who settled in these Muslem Imperial Dominions of Hindoostan became a minority community in Hindoostan. I have nothing to say against it: it is a fact. . . . At the time of the fall of their empire, had the Muslems possessed leaders with vision and courage, they could have preserved the national as well as territorial integrity of their homelands in Pakistan. The distinction between Pakistan and Hindoostan (India proper) has been, and shall ever be, clear as the midday sun. While in the former they are in their national home, in the latter they are a minority community, who had once ruled there by right of conquest. It is a tragedy that this historical reality was callously ignored. The two–Pakistan and Hindoostan–were confused. Hence the present catastrophe."

The initial mistake was made by the old leadership, but the new had continued to tread the same wrong path. At present, "with a few honourable exceptions", Muslim politicians were "a mere crowd of careerists" and divided themselves into two categories: the communalists, who were pro-British but anti-Hindu and followed a policy of subservience to the British, and the "nationalists", who were pro-Hindu but anti-British and advanced the cause of Hindu capitalism and Hindu nationalism. Both of them had no policy of their own and had never "considered that there is, and shall ever remain, a distinct Muslem homeland in Pakistan, which must not be confused with Hindoostan and Hindoo Nationalist interests".

This inefficient and purposeless leadership had pushed the Muslims into an Indian federation where they were "to be pariahs in their own country" and a "mere minority community belonging to the Hindoo nation". The PNM had been created to fight this grave menace and to struggle for the establishment of "an independent and separate Pakistan composed of the five Muslem Provinces in the north and possessing equality of status with Hindoostan, as with other civilized nations, in the comity of nations". The Movement believed that this solution alone "can ensure [an] honourable existence to both nations–Muslems in Pakistan and Hindoos in Hindoostan–and, also, put an end to the exploitation of both by British Imperialism".[11]

Asked how the Movement proposed to achieve this objective without the consent of the British Government, Rahmat Ali agreed that the British had declined to consider the demand. He knew their grounds of rejection. "They imagine that we are aiming at the revival of the old Muslem Empire; that we are Pan-Islamists. While they appreciate Hindoo Nationalism, Pakistani Nationalism they consider to be 'Empire's Danger Spot'. It is a mistake, an aberration." This was a misrepresentation of the Movement. It was neither anti-Hindu nor anti-British, not even pan-Islamist. It was simply a realization of the truth that "*within Hindoostan we will be a minority community, but, outside it, a virile nation of forty-two millions*".[12] (The reference to a "nation of forty-two millions" suggests that after partition all Pakistanis, Hindus and Muslims, were to be one nation, because the Muslims of this Pakistan numbered only thirty million. What happened, then, to Rahmat Ali's two-nation theory? It will be recalled that a similar difficulty actually arose, and gave rise to a bitter debate, in Pakistan during early-and mid-'fifties around the issue of electorates). Pakistan would be the fourth largest state in the world among the fifty-four countries in the League of Nations. It was true that British opposition made the struggle hard, but Muslims had faced heavier odds in the past and emerged triumphant. For them it was a question of "to be or not to be". Pakistan was their destiny. "It may or may not be realized in my lifetime; but, with time, it is sure to command recognition and become for the people of Pakistan an ideal worthy of the highest dedication."[13]

The next inquiry was about the position of the Movement in the territories claimed for Pakistan. Rahmat Ali thought that the work was "progressing favourably". The Movement "has its propaganda centres all over Pakistan. In all Provinces of the Fatherland we have our organizations". Pamphlets, tracts, handbills and other literature were being produced and issued by provincial centres. A weekly newspaper called *Pakistan* propagated the ideals of the Movement. "The mass of the young and energetic are with us."[14]

Rahmat Ali was then asked the same question about Pakistan's economic prospects which was, in later years, so often addressed to Jinnah, and answered it with the same confidence and the same emphasis on the priority of an honourable existence over an easy life of slavery. Pakistan had vast moral and material resources,

and with the removal of Hindu capitalism and British exploitation it should pay its way. The expensive, top-heavy administration would disappear and public services would be "made to work for the nation, not the nation for the services". There would be no room for a soulless and extravagantly-paid bureaucracy presiding over the misery and poverty of the taxpayer and the peasant. "I have fully worked out that side of our national life and, quite frankly, I have no doubts on that account." Karachi was a first-class port. The soil of Pakistan was the most productive in the sub-continent. Commerce and industry were growing and would grow further. With all the sources of revenue then going to the Government of India in the hands of the nation, there was no cause for worry about the future.[15]

Once again like Jinnah in later years, Rahmat Ali refused to be drawn into a discussion of details. Asked about the form of government in his Pakistan, he said that the first objective was to achieve independence. This was the most important question and eclipsed all others. But one thing was certain. The government of Pakistan would be "fundamentally both democratic and socialistic". Whether it would be federal or unitary could be determined by the people themselves when they were free to make a choice.[16]

Then Rahmat Ali answered a question on the effect of his Movement on the Hindu-Muslim problem of India. He was quick to point out that his scheme was the only permanent and honourable solution of this age-long problem. "Any understanding and co-operation between individuals and nations, if it is to be lasting, must be based on mutual respect for the rights of one another." Once both nations, the Hindu and the Muslim, achieved honourable existence in their respective national states, "the national pride of each will be satisfied, and the historic clash replaced by neighbourly goodwill and friendly co-operation". The underlying causes of the Hindu-Muslim problem had been confused by the British and the Hindus out of motives which suited them. But the fact was that "in its fundamentals, *the clash is neither inter-religious, nor inter-communal, nor even economic. It is, in fact, an inter-national conflict between two national ambitions - Muslim for survival and Hindoo for supremacy*".

The root of the problem lay in Hindu refusal to recognize Pakistan. Neither logic nor history supported this attitude. The Hindus denied to Pakistan the right of self-determination which

they claimed for themselves in India. They said that Pakistan was a part of India because many centuries ago it was a part of their empire; as if that made it theirs for all time. It was true that before the advent of the Muslims certain areas of Pakistan formed parts of the Hindu empire. But did that give them a perpetual lease on Pakistan? By the same logic, Muslims could claim the greater part of India over which hey had ruled for hundreds of years. Thus "in disputing our right to Pakistan on that basis they bring into question theirs to Hindoostan". Their claim to Pakistan on the basis of the once-upon-a-time empires was absurd. There had been Hindu empires and Muslim empires, and once they went, their boundaries too disappeared with them. Imperial frontiers of the bygone ages must be forgotten if a new future was to be shaped. "The Jumna is the boundary river between Pakistan and Hindoostan, and across it we stretch our hand of good will and friendship to Hindoostan. Will they grasp it in the spirit of good neighbours, recognizing Pakistan as we do Hindoostan?"[17]

Next came the important question about the future of the forty-five million Muslims to be left behind in India. Rahmat Ali's reply needs to be quoted at length. "The truth is", he said, "that in this struggle their thought has been more than a wrench to me. They are the flesh of our flesh and the soul of our soul. We can never forget them; nor they, us. Their present position and future security is, and shall ever be, a matter of great importance to us. As things are at present, Pakistan will not adversely affect their position in Hindoostan. On the basis of population (one Muslem to four Hindoos), they will still be entitled to the same representation in legislative as well as representative fields which they possess now. As to the future, the only effective guarantee we can offer is that of reciprocity, and, therefore, we solemnly undertake to give all those safeguards to non-Muslem minorities in Pakistan which will be conceded to our Muslem minority in Hindoostan."

"But what sustains us most is the fact that they know we are protecting Pakistan in the highest interest of 'the Millet'. It is as much theirs as it is ours. While for us it is a national citadel, for them it will ever be a moral anchor. So long as the anchor holds, everything is or can be made safe. But once it gives way, all will be lost."

"Times come when even brothers have to part. Cruel as such times naturally are, the highest good of the Millet must come

before everything else. . . . The nobler spirits among them appreciate this truth and are, therefore, actively supporting the Movement. They are fully conscious of the fact that Pakistan's struggle is as vital to them as it is to us. We all know that the idea of earth-rootedness is repugnant to Islam. The world is remoulding itself, and political boundaries are disappearing before the tide of moral and spiritual allegiances. Sooner or later, but sooner rather than later if we can make it, Nature's decrees are bound to be obeyed. Therefore, if all of us hold fast and remain true to our teachings, we have every hope that the future will see us even closer to one another than we are at present."[18]

The last question he posed and answered was "isn't there an alternative in 'one Indian nationhood' for you all?" To which Rahmat Ali's immediate answer was, "No, Madam, certainly not! We are not Indians: We are Pakistanis". Indian nationhood was very well for the Indians; for Pakistanis "it would mean our national death". "Has any nation in the history of the world ever committed national suicide in the interest of its neighbours' unity? I believe not. Defeat is a curse, but surrender a sin. . . . Don't you think, Madam, that India is vast enough to hold us both as distinct nations?" Everything separated the Hindus from the Muslims: geography, race, "the 'Himalayas' of human heart and soul", religion, culture, history, tradition, literature, economics, laws of inheritance, customs, calendars, dress, and food. In the face of all this, to unite the two nations politically and physically would be a grievous disaster. "Like every other nation in the world we have a definite mission for the service of mankind, which we can fulfil only if we protect the purity of the Pakistani soul. Therefore, for us to seal our national doom in the interest of 'One Indian Nationhood' would be a treachery against our posterity, a betrayal of our history, and a crime against humanity for which there could be no salvation."[19]

This testament of Rahmat Ali is important because it contains several ideas not to be found in his earlier writings and hardly referred to in later statements. For example, his short but straight assertion that the government of Pakistan would be based on the principles of democracy and socialism is of much significance, as much for its commission as for its omission. He wanted a socialist state at a time when even the Congress had not committed itself to socialism, when no Muslim leader was giving

thought to the economic issues of the future, and when even in Europe socialist states were scarce on the ground. Similarly, his emphasis on the weaknesses and dangers of a bureaucracy bred in the imperial stable put an unerring finger on one of the important problems of the future. But what is most striking is what he did not say. There is no mention of an Islamic state in his programme. In spite of his intense devotion to Islam, the Islamic basis of his two-nation theory, and his anxiety to save Islam from Hindu rule, he stood for a state which would be Muslim without being Islamic.

Another point which he made absolutely clear was the future he envisaged for the Muslims living outside Pakistan. In his theory of hostages, though he did not call it that, he anticipated what was to be repeated by many in later years. His explanation that the Muslims to be left behind in India would also gain by the creation of Pakistan, in so far as they would be participating in a cause which was in the interest of the entire *millat* and would be able to look to Pakistan as their moral anchor, is the only rational and realistic argument which could justify the two-nation theory and still find it practicable to surrender a part of the nation.

The thing which stands out in this exposition is the richness of its argument. There is hardly any point in favour of a partition of India which he does not make. The case for Pakistan is argued in such detail that all the Muslim League statements of the years 1940-1947 did not go beyond repeating, elaborating and clarifying what he told Halide Edib. In some cases the very words and phrases have been borrowed from him. This does not mean that the Muslim League leaders did not think; but it does mean that Rahmat Ali's mind was startingly far reaching. It also means that the debt the Muslim League leaders owed to him was never even acknowledged, not to speak of having been paid.

The Letter to *The Times*

In its issue of 5 December 1938, *The Times* of London had carried a special article on "Federation in India", in which Muslims were said to be "again toying" with the idea of the creation of a "Pakistan" in the Muslim-majority provinces. Rahmat Ali wrote a letter to the journal on the same day, alleging that the words used in the article were "somewhat misleading" in the sense that they gave "the impression to the reader that the 'idea' of creating a

Pakistan has been intermittent and spasmodic". After pointing out that the idea had first been put forth in 1933, and had since then been consistently upheld by the PNM, he affirmed that "no Constitution, whether federal or unitary, can succeed which condemns our 80,000,000 Muslims to the status of a minority community, especially in the territories where, for centuries, we have been, and still are, the overwhelming majority of the population". He concluded by declaring that the Muslims living in north-western India "have never been 'Indian' in the true sense of the word; nor do we aspire to that title in the future".[20]

The Meeting with Khaliquzzaman

In November or December 1938 Choudhry Khaliquzzaman was in England, and one evening Rahmat Ali invited him to tea when the two men had a long talk on Pakistan and the Muslim problem. Khaliquzzaman tells the story like this. "This was my first meeting with him and I took a sincere liking for this tall, graceful and well-cut figure. When we started talking about the scheme of Pakistan I found that not only had he thought deeply over the question but was earnest about its realization. . . . After meeting him I felt sad that a man of his calibre and attainment was being reviled by his own people in India, without any justification, as a British stooge. After some discussion I informed him that I was already a convert to the idea [of Pakistan] but I told him that I was not ready to use the word 'Pakistan' for partition of the country because that would make the British suspicious on the one hand and antagonise the Hindus on the other. Why should we not claim the right of self-determination for our areas instead of bringing in the name 'Pakistan'? But this did not appeal to him. We had many other talks on the subject later on. . . . In this scheme Bengal was excluded while the whole of the Punjab including Delhi found mention. Among others this was also one of the reasons why I was unwilling to give the scheme of partition the name of Pakistan. I preferred the idea of having two Muslim Federations."[21]

Several things in this narrative are revealing. Khaliquzzaman says that he had been converted to the idea of Pakistan before he met Rahmat Ali; which shows how close Muslim India had come to the idea of a partition by the end of 1938, and the plans of Rahmat Ali must have played a considerable part in effecting this

change in the Muslim attitude. But Khaliquzzaman's refusal to accept the name "Pakistan" is not easy to understand. The reasons he gives make it even more difficult. Why would the British be suspicious of the name, and, anyway, why should this consideration have deterred the Muslims from owning it? As for antagonising the Hindus, any demand for Muslim separation was an intolerable anathema to them, no matter by what name one called it. These points provided no grounds for rejecting Rahmat Ali's name for the Muslim state. A more reasonable objection was that since Bengal was excluded from the Pakistan scheme its adoption would not reflect the real wishes of the Indian Muslims who wanted a partition embracing the eastern wing. At the same time it is interesting to note that Khaliquzzaman himself, and probably some others too who shared his views, were in favour of two Muslim federations in India; in other words, two separate Muslim states, one in the west and one in the east. This continued to be the Muslim ideal and the Lahore Resolution staked a claim for (two) States, not one. Khaliquzzaman's further objection that Rahmat Ali's Pakistan included the whole of the Punjab is meaningless, for later the Muslim League leaders also demanded the inclusion of the Punjab province in Pakistan, though the Lahore Resolution did not mention provinces but Muslim-majority areas.

Khaliquzzaman's allegation that Rahmat Ali was being "reviled" by the Indian Muslims as a "British stooge" is difficult to substantiate. He himself believed that this was being done without justification. But there is little evidence to prove that Muslims considered Rahmat Ali a tool in British hands. The Hindus had been trying to paint Rahmat Ali black and had found it convenient to their purpose to allege British instigation of the Pakistan demand, without bringing forth any proof which could stand the briefest scrutiny. But we cannot find any Muslim echoing this libel, unless of course Khaliquzzaman was referring to the Congress Muslims who had to repeat every Hindu statement without exercising their critical faculties.

It is very interesting to see Khaliquzzaman making no reference to Rahmat Ali's plans for the future of the Muslims living outside the five northern provinces. He came from a Muslim-minority area, the United Provinces, and might have given some thought to the fate of the Muslims of his province in any plan of partition. The fact that he did not do so, in company with all others from these

areas, shows the strength of Rahmat Ali's arguments as presented to Halide Edib.

It seems, however, that during their conversation Khaliquzzaman had drawn Rahmat Ali's attention to the future of the Muslims of the Hindu provinces and perhaps inquired how and why they were to be expected to support a scheme which left them where they were or rather weakened their total strength in a free India. Rahmat Ali replied to this in writing and Khaliquzzaman has reproduced this letter. "At the moment", answered Rahmat Ali, "the Millat in the whole of the bi-national sub-continent counts 77,677,545, which is 22 per cent of the total population. Whatever our present representation in the Central Legislature, ultimately it will depend on our population. Now, if the whole Millat supports the creation of Pakistan as separate from India it will, by doing so, be reducing its representation in the Central Legislature from 22 per cent to 16 per cent at the lowest. Whether we should suffer this reduction of six seats in order to lay the foundations of a Muslim nation in Pakistan is a question that I leave to the judgement of all those who, like yourself, have always tried to safeguard the future of the Millat both within India and without it."[22] The argument could not have been put better.

The Karachi Address : March 1940

Rahmat Ali had not been to India since October 1930. First his studies and then his preoccupation with the PNM had kept him away from home. It was probably in 1939 that he decided to pay a visit to the subcontinent. By now several of his friends and former workers of the Movement had returned to India and were established in their respective professions. His name was known in northern India, especially intimately in the Punjab. It would be a good idea, he thought, to hold a meeting of his Movement in India, probably in Lahore where his ideas had wrought the greatest change among the Muslims. He was in the United States in the summer of 1939, propagating his message and trying to influence people, and he decided to make a round-trip back to England *via* Japan, Hong Kong, Sri Lanka and India.[23] His transit visa to Japan is dated 10 November 1939. From there he arrived in Hong Kong on 21 January 1940, and then on 30 January he landed in

Colombo on his way to Bombay.

Here, in Colombo, a shock was in store for him. Two of his former friends and sworn members of the Movement, who had promised to work for him in India regardless of their profession, were waiting for him. Pir Ahsanuddin and Khwaja Abdur Rahim, both officers of the Indian Civil Service in the Punjab commission, met Rahmat Ali at his Colombo hotel. He was glad to see them, believing fondly that they had come all the way from the Punjab to welcome him. The first half an hour of the conversation brought out the truth and shattered Rahmat Ali's faith in his erstwhile comrades and also in mankind. They explained, haltingly, a little shamefacedly, longwindedly, in wooly arguments and with far-fetched digressions, but firmly and with a hint of authority in their voices, that they had been ordered by their superiors in the Punjab to dissuade him from coming to India. It was in his own interest, they said again and again, to sail on to England without touching India; in any case, his attempt to enter the Punjab would mean his arrest. After recovering from this stab in the back, Rahmat Ali argued with them, reminded them of their sworn loyalty to the Movement, shamed them with sarcasm, told them of all the eloquent promises they had made at Cambridge only a few years ago, lectured to them on the virtues of faithfulness and the evils of licking the shoes of foreign masters for a little material gain, reprimanded them for their petty behaviour, called them traitors, threatened to expose them—but to no avail. They had their official instructions to carry out, their own future to protect, their own interest to promote. They could not afford to alienate their superiors. They were sure he would appreciate their situation and oblige them by desisting from visiting India. Rahmat Ali could not appreciate this at all. His integrity of character did not permit him the luxury of such an understanding. His self-respect did not let him abandon his programme. The two minions of the Punjab government and their former leader parted in anger and frustration—they to report their failure to their masters, he to brave the journey to India.[24]

More details of his friends' behaviour at Colombo emerge in Rahmat Ali's letter sent to Khwaja Abdul Waheed after his return to Cambridge. "Let me add also", he wrote on 22 July 1940, "that I truly enjoyed the talks. They enabled me to fully understand some of the men and their motives. I mean the men

who had, for a long time, been exploiting the Pak Nat. Movement to their own good–both moral and material. Not content with that, these self-seekers sought to make me, too, work for that sordid careerism which governs their conduct in life. As a matter of fact, one of them who has always posed as my best friend, was frightfully keen on enlisting my services on the side of his masters –some members of the Unionist Party. He asked for my co-operation on their behalf and had to be told off. I made it clear to him that I looked upon his conduct with contempt. Let us hope that he would, in future, keep his mean moves to himself. I fully agree with you that such men are doing more harm to the Movement than we care to realize. They have no truth in them. You will be simply surprised to learn that the same man committed the most despicable act of plagiarism in the history of political institutions. He sent me a message by his brother who, along with others, met me at Colombo saying that, as I intended travelling to Karachi (via Bombay) all the way by sea, I had better send the manuscript of my book with him to Lahore. I mean the manuscript, parts of which I read out to you. He impressed on me the soundness of his suggestion–a suggestion which, according to him, was inspired by the idea for the safety of my book. And he took good care to assure me that when he himself came to see me at Karachi he would, without fail, bring it with him.

Now, do you know what actually happened? Despite my repeated requests wired from Bombay and Karachi, he simply did not bring it with him when he came to see me at Karachi. He retained it at Lahore for twenty-four days and handed it over to me only when he had a copy typed for his priavate use. What a treachery! I do hope you would take care to keep such men at a respectful [*sic.*] distance."[25]

Why were Abdur Rahim and Ahsanuddin sent to Colombo on this mean mission? In the absence of any direct information from these two officers, we can only speculate. Their orders could have come from three sources: the British authorities, the Punjab Unionist government, or the Muslim League leadership. The British can be excluded without much ado. Rahmat Ali was living in England and propagating his message without let or hindrance. There is no evidence of any restrictions imposed on him or contemplated by the British authorities. He had no visible means of income and this would have served as a convenient pretext to ask

him to leave the country. No such step was taken. Further, there was nothing in his political opinions that could endanger the British presence in India or incite its subjects to a revolt. Indian politicians, most of whom were highly critical, even abusive, of British rule and some were firebrands and a real peril to the tranquillity of the *raj*, were going up and down the subcontinent, speaking their mind, spreading discontent, even preaching a revolution. The Mahasabha and the RSS among the Hindus and the Ahrars and the Khaksars among the Muslims are good examples of this kind of demagogy. No attempt was made to tie their tongues or restrict their movements. Why pick on Rahmat Ali?

The Punjab Unionist Party and the Muslim League can be considered together, for since the Sikandar-Jinnah Pact the two parties stood united as far as Punjab politics was concerned. Sikandar Hayat Khan, the powerful chief minister of the province whom even Jinnah could not persuade, buy or beat, had entered into an agreement with the Muslim League, according to which the Unionists would support the League in all-India politics in exchange for the League's undertaking not to interfere in provincial politics. Sikandar was a member of the League's Working Committee and one of the small group that drafted the Lahore Resolution. He had invited the League to hold its annual session at Lahore in March 1940, provided all facilities for the occasion, and made speeches in the open session. The Lahore Resolution for the first time demanded a division of India and the creation of two or more independent Muslim states. This was a frank and formal endorsement of Rahmat Ali's idea. Further, in the 1920's most of the Unionist leaders had been Rahmat Ali's friends and some of them were under an obligation to him for one service or another. And now the same Punjab government was so anxious to stop him from coming to the province that it took the unprecedented step of sending two ICS officers to Sri Lanka to meet Rahmat Ali and dissuade him from coming up country. How can we explain this conundrum?

The only credible solution (albeit speculative) to the mystery lies in the Muslim League's, and especially Jinnah's, disapproval of the name "Pakistan" and therefore of its inventor and originator. (A later chapter will discuss the reasons, or the lack of them, for this attitude of the Muslim League.) The League was now going to adopt the Pakistan ideal from its official platform, but to reject

the title and disown or ignore the man who had thought of it. Were Rahmat Ali to come to Lahore during or before the League session and hold a meeting of the PNM at the same time, the League was bound to be highly embarrassed. The Muslim students and Urdu newspapers of the Punjab had been demanding and propagating for a Pakistan at least since 1937 (details in the following chapter). Rahmat Ali's influence on them was immense. Their infatuation with the idea was profound. Had Rahmat Ali arrived in Lahore in February or March, held a press conference, addressed a few public meetings, and for the first time mixed with and talked to people who had given him their complete fealty without ever setting eyes upon him, he would have been the hero of the hour. The League session would have been compelled to acknowledge him, cheer him, and proclaim him as the originator of the plan which it was now going to inscribe into its constitution. The Lahore Resolution would have been called the Pakistan Resolution. Rahmat Ali's speech would have over-shadowed any one else's. All these possibilities and eventualities were distasteful to the Muslim League. How could it deny itself the credit and the glory and the publicity of what was to be its finest hour? Moreover, it would not have pleased the party to be told that the idea now being owned by it was exclusively the child of the brain of an outsider. How could it allow (to it) an unknown, obscure man, who lived in England, to join its elitist group? The bulk of the League leadership, now as ever before, belonged to the top social drawer: landed aristocracy, ancient lineage, successful lawyers, wealthy businessmen, titled gentlemen. There was no representative of the middle and lower middle classes, no spokesman of the labourer and the farmer, no delegate of the poor masses. (This was the tragedy of the Muslim League, and responsible for the later misfortunes of Pakistan.) In contrast, Rahmat Ali was a poor villager by origin, an exile by necessity, an intellectual by profession, and a man without a political constituency. He was not one of them. It was necessary to keep him away, to ignore him, to take no notice of him—especially now that his own idea was to be filched openly and shamelessly.

The conduct of Rahim and Ahsanuddin had stung Rahmat Ali to the quick. It rent his heart to think that he would not be able to go to Balachaur to meet his sisters and brother and the rest of the family. Powerful forces forbade that. But he was not prepared to

kiss the rod and sail for England. He came to Bombay on 5 February,[26] and from there to Karachi. Finding his way to Lahore barred by official edict, he changed the venue of the meeting of the PNM to Karachi.

In Karachi he made his temporary home at the North-Western Hotel. Muhammad Ali had come to Lahore from Balachaur and was staying with Yar Muhammad, awaiting the arrival of his brother. After a few days he received a message from Rahmat Ali, asking him to come to Karachi. He went there, met his long-lost brother and stayed with him at the hotel for a week. Rahmat Ali told him the full story of his inability to visit the Punjab, enquired about the welfare of his sisters and their children and other relatives and old friends of the village, and told him something of the pain of his heart on not being allowed to see his home. Muhammad Ali then returned to Lahore, but did not go back to the village, for Rahmat Ali had asked him to come again to Karachi for a longer stay. After two weeks he was called to Karachi, and he stayed there in the hotel till early May when Rahmat Ali left for England. They talked till the late hours of the night, reminiscing of old days, remembering their father who had died some years ago, mentioning other relations, reliving their childhood, mourning the dead, talking endlessly about the living, Rahmat Ali telling him of his Cambridge life and his mission of Pakistan, Muhammad Ali insisting that he should now return to India, Rahmat Ali replying that his life-work was yet unfinished, one brother repeating his heart's desire to see the other at home, the other making vague promises without firm commitments. Time flew in these intimate conversations, brotherly raggings, the raking of old memories, and the making of future plans. Then came the final loving quarrel. Rahmat Ali insisted that Muhammad Ali should leave for the village before his own boat sailed from Karachi. Muhammad Ali was adamant on bidding goodbye to his brother at the quayside before catching his train home. Rahmat Ali's will prevailed, as usual, and Muhammad Ali was seen off at the railway station by Rahmat Ali a few hours before he boarded the ship to England.[27]

Now about Rahmat Ali's professional activities in Karachi. He had called a meeting of the Supreme Council of the PNM in the city, and this body assembled on 22 March, one day before the Lahore Resolution was moved at the Muslim League session at Lahore and when the session had already begun its deliberations.

It was the first meeting of the Movement outside England. Rahmat Ali's address to the Supreme Council was later published as a pamphlet with the title of *The Millat of Islam and the Menace of "Indianism"*. On the first page of the text, above the title, appeared the words, "After 1302 Years"; below the title, as if providing a sub-title, the phrase "Choice between Re-Construction in Asia and Re-Destruction in 'India' " was written; and, just before the text began, the words "New Dawn or Twilight" were printed in large, black type. The pamphlet bears no date, but the covering letter with which it was circulated has "15th August 1941" written in hand on the right-hand top corner below Rahmat Ali's address. It is signed by M. Anwar, Member, Supreme Council, Pakistan National Movement.[28] Why should the address delivered in March 1940 be published eighteen months later? It is possible that the pamphlet was published soon after Rahmat Ali's return to Cambridge in June 1940, but its circulation and posting continued till much later. The copy in my possession, with Anwar's covering letter, might have been addressed to somebody who was not available in the summer of 1940 or who had asked for a copy in August 1941. The point is not important. We know that it is the text of the address of March 1940, and that is how it should be read and assessed.

Rahmat Ali began his speech by declaring that now after seven years, "according to all signs and indications, the Millat understands the mission of the Movement, appreciates its work, and looks to it for guidance". The first part of the programme had been completed by successfully creating a national consciousness and heralding in a moral revival among the Muslims, and by demonstrating the inevitability of the establishment of Pakistan. Struggle on this front would of course continue. In the meantime, the moment for initiating the second part of the programme had arrived. This related to Bengal and Hyderabad-Deccan. From now onwards the battle of freedom would be fought in "all the three Milli strongholds".[29] It was going to be "a test of life and death". It would affect the fortunes of the Millat in South Asia. It was a choice between Islam and Indianism, between the historic, sacred and proud Crescent and Stars and the new, sinister and dark Tri-Colour, between honourable sovereignty and miserable slavery. "This is the only choice. It has to be one or the other. It cannot be both."[30] History proved that the Indian environment had come

close to destroying the Millat spiritually, morally and politically. Any further surrender to Indianism would be "fatal beyond redemption".[31]

Indianism had strengthened its hold not only on "the Muslim careerists" but on all those who could not free their thinking from Indian strings. "To realise that one has simply to look at the hare-brained schemes of cultural cantons, economic enclaves, linguistic zones, social spheres, and provincial domains—schemes which they have produced for our safety." It was a tragic irony that all these proposals, though in theory prompted by the principle of self-determination, would in practice lead to self-extermination. Why? Because it was the territorial unity which defined the position of a nation. Yet these schemes perpetuated the myth of Indian unity and retained India as a territorial unit. To accept the territorial unity of India in any shape was to acknowledge the paramountcy of Indianism. This was the real flaw in these proposals. Their authors had not realized that as long as the premiss of the territorial unity of India was accepted Indianism "will create the Central government, control its civil administration, and command its military arm". Nothing but captivity awaited the Muslims under its aegis.[32]

He was glad that at long last the All India Muslim League had come to claim for the Muslims a nationality different from the Indians. But it puzzled him to see it still clinging to India and calling it their "common Motherland". There was no logic in it. How could one be half-Indian and half non-Indian; territorially Indian, but nationally non-Indian; internationally Indian, but internally non-Indian? India never was and never would be the Muslim motherland. The issue was clear. "Either they are 'Indian' or they are not. If they are, let them be consistent and live in, and abide by, 'India'. That is, embrace 'Indianism' and submit to 'Pax-Indica'. A capitulation which the Jati will welcome, but the Millat will oppose, and History will record as 'Boabdalism'. If they are not, let them be conclusive and abandon 'India'. That is, to sever all ties with 'India', to save the Millat from 'Indianism', and to serve 'Pax-Islamica'. A stand which the Jati will oppose, but the Millat will support, and History will acclaim as 'Mujahidism'." Muslim parties and organizations had now definitely adopted the "bi-national" character of India. That was a gain and an achievement. But they should also accept the second half of the

creed of the PNM, the de-Indianisation of the Muslim territories.[33]

Defining the fundamental creed of the Movement, he declared, "It is that we are Muslim, not Hindoo; Pakistani, not Hindoostani; and Asian, not 'Indian'; that, in retrospect, the 'India of today' is the 'South Asia of yesterday', but, in prospect, the sphere of the individual solidarity of several nations of tomorrow; 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 recognizes, and guarantees, the distinct nationhood of the nations living therein; and, finally, that, insofar 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". It respected the freedom of the other nations in the subcontinent. It promised the deliverance of the Muslims. It had to be accepted in its entirety, made the soul of Muslim political philosophy and the slogan of Muslim political struggle. The "inner realisation" of this creed must precede its "outer recognition". The Muslims must first realize its inner truth before they expected others to recognize it.[34]

What, then, was the next step? Pakistan, Bengal and Usmanistan were "the political foundations of our heritage" which must be saved to ensure the ulitmate safety of the Millat. The Pakistan demand, which was put forward in 1933, was merely the first part of the Movement whose final objective was, and remained, the "permanent defence of our entire Millat against the persistent dangers of 'Indianism' ". The second part, now to be taken in hand, was to save Bengal and strengthen Usmanistan.

Bengal, with its hinterland of Assam, was to the Muslims the "Beng-i-Islam". Like Pakistan, it too had a Muslim majority and was therefore entitled to the exercise of the right to self-determination. But the British and the Hindus had reduced this numerical majority to a political minority and seemed determined to perpetuate this act of injustice. Therefore the Muslim right to self-

determination would have to be won anew and for this purpose a national movement would have to be started and built up on the soil of Bengal. It was the duty and responsibility of Muslim leaders of Bengal to create such a movement, remembering that on their sincerity, labour and devotion depended not only the immediate future of the thirty million Bengali Muslims but also the ultimate fortunes of Islam in South Asia.[35]

Usmanistan (Hyderabad Deccan) was a princely state, not a part of British India. Yet it was "a part of our patrimony", and its future was inseparably bound up with that of the Millat. The Muslims derived their right to Usmanistan "from those canons of International law from which other nations deduce their claims to their domains". The *de jure* sovereignty of Usmanistan was a fact, acknowledged in the treaties originally made by the British and the Nizam. No other state in India enjoyed the special status and privileges exercised by Usmanistan. "These facts and factors constitute our title-deeds to Usmanistan." Recent Hindu moves aimed at forcing it to participate in Indian life and so to become a part of India were warning enough that strong measures were called for. The days were gone when it had been possible to achieve satisfactory results through such manoeuvres as reciprocal guarantees and political safeguards within India. There was only one defence against the encroachment of India. The people of Usmanistan should embark upon a "sustained constitutional struggle" for the *de facto* recognition of her *de jure* sovereignty. It was imperative for them to establish an organization to work to this end.[36]

The moral foundations of the demand for a Muslim Bengal and a sovereign Hyderabad were secure. Both the "countries" were clear-cut territorial units, treated as such for hundreds of years. They were different from Hindustan "in character, culture, and in composition as well as in geography, in history, and in ideology". To push them into India would be an act of injustice. The restoration of these lands, as of Pakistan, to their rightful positions on the map "involves no revision of the boundaries of India proper, no redistribution of her territories, no fresh demarcation of her provinces, and no exchange of her populations". They would form three independent Muslim nations in South Asia.[37]

But the struggle for the achievement of their independence could not be left in separate, divided hands without weakening it. The national effort must be co-ordinated by creating an inter-

national organization. The only existing central organization, the All India Muslim League, had become "an anachronism and a fatal one at that", because the Millat had decided to sever its ties with India and seek its future in Asia. The very name of the League bore the stamp of Indianism and so belied the Muslim struggle against Indianism. It bred the spirit of Indianism and so betrayed the Millat to Indianism. In national movements names were neither unimportant nor ineffective. They were their distinguishing marks. They established the identities of their bearers. They were moral symbols which served as sources of inspiration. If they did not reflect the spirit of the people they rejected the essence of the movements they professed to embody. As Muslims were not Indians, the styling of their institutions as Indian was an "act of renegation". That was why the PNM had given the name of Pakistan to the five northern Muslim provinces, that of Bang-i-Islam to Bengal and Assam, and that of Usmanistan to Hyderabad Deccan.

So the All India Muslim League must go and be replaced with "an alliance of the nations of Pakistan, Bengal, and Usmanistan". "That is the only road to our destiny in Asia under Islam. Pray Allah we may take it while yet there is life–and light!"[38]

Some features of this address will strike the reader at once. Perhaps because it was the spoken word, it lacked the close reasoning and crystal clarity characteristic of everything Rahmat Ali wrote. There is too much of rhetoric here as if he was carried away by his own eloquence. Words supplant arguments. At places his fondness for alliteration produces clumsy and silly statements which spoil his case. In a deliberate effort to create an effect he employs long words, mixes his metaphors, and repeats himself without end. There is little doubt that in style and reasoning this pamphlet is the worst he ever wrote.

The importance of this speech lies in its claims on behalf of Bengal and Hyderabad. Though Rahmat Ali said that they constituted the second step or stage of his programme and stemmed out of his original conception, there is no mention, direct or oblique, of Bengal or Hyderabad in his earlier declarations. He had concentrated on the north or north-west and completely ignored the Bengali or Hyderabadi Muslim. We can safely take these new claims as after-thoughts, but after-thoughts which were by no means original. Between 1935 and 1940 Bengal had featured in

various ways in several proposals or schemes suggested to solve the Muslim problem. Even Iqbal, who, like Rahmat Ali, had originally dismissed Bengal from his consideration, had later come to reckon in the eastern Muslims. The Hyderabad case was tricky, for it was neither a part of British India nor a Muslim-majority area. Yet it had been agitating the Muslim mind, partly because of its historical interest and partly because of a sustained Hindu campaign to harrass the Nizam and demand majority rule. The new Congress policy of interfering with the internal affairs of the states, particularly where this suited the Hindus, was also intensifying Muslim fears. Mawlana Mawdudi had already claimed Hyderabad to be a *dar-ul-Islam,* and Sayyid Abdul Latif, himself a Hyderabadi, was trying to save at least the culture of his home by making the state a separate zone under his scheme. Finally, Rahmat Ali's interest in Bengal coincided with the Muslim League's new policy of claiming it for its own Pakistan proposal. On two important points there was agreement between him and the League. Both demanded Assam in spite of its over-all Hindu majority, and both declared that Bengal-Assam would be a separate state.

In this speech Rahmat Ali mentions, in passing, that he had given the name of Bang-i-Islam to Bengal and Assam in 1937.[39] In a later pamphlet of October 1942, he again claimed that he had announced this for the first time in 1937. It is possible that he had done so, but no pamphlet or other writing has come to our notice in which the claim for Bang-i-Islam was made. His *Pakistan,* which contains all his important pamphlets and other writings, does not reproduce any declaration of 1937; nor does it print any pre-1940 map embodying Bang-i-Islam.

It is obvious that Rahmat Ali was well aware of the different schemes which had been suggested by several persons during the three previous years. He did not make a detailed criticism of them, but his single uncomplimentary reference to them suggests that he was not interested in wasting his time on any plan which retained the identity of India and kept the Muslims within it.

A very brief report of Rahmat Ali's Karachi address was published in the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore in its issue of 27 March 1940. Carried under the headline "Muslim League's 'Indianism': Indictment by 'Founder' of Pakistan National Movement", it opened with a hostile description of Rahmat

Ali as the "alleged founder-President of what is known as the Pakistan National Movement". Apart from this bias in the news item and in the headline, the report was factually misleading and inadequate. It omitted to mention that Rahmat Ali had said this in his speech before a certain organization; it merely told the readers that "in a recent statement from Karachi" he had declared such and such a thing. It also did not give the date of the speech or of the meeting of the Supreme Council.[40] Not being an agency report, and the newspaper, though British-owned, almost entirely Hindu-staffed, it was presumably the message of a Hindu reporter.

Rahmat Ali left Karachi on an unspecified date, probably at the end of April 1940. He sailed from Bombay on 2 May, passed through the Suez Canal on 15 May, was in transit in Naples on 19 May and reached Cambridge on 4 June.[41]

NOTES

1. On the origin of the 1935 constitution see J.P. Eddy and F.H. Lawton, *India's New Constitution: A Survey of the Government of India Act, 1935*, London, 1935; N. Gangulee, *The Making of Federal India*, London, n.d.; Shafaat Ahmad Khan, *The Indian Federation: An Exposition and a Critical Review*, London, 1937; S.K. Lahiri and B.N. Banerjea, *New Constitution of India*, Calcutta, n.d.; K.V. Punnaiah, *India as a Federation*, Madras, 1936; B.M. Sharma, *The Indian Federation*, Lucknow, 1932; F. Whyte, *India: A Federation*, London, n.d.; G.N. Joshi, *The New Constitution of India*, London, 1937; E. Thompson and G.T. Garratt, *Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India*, London, 1934; B.R. Ambedkar, *Federation Versus Freedom*, Bombay, n.d.; D.R. Gadgil, *Federating India*, Poona, 1945; *The Times*, special India Number, 23-March 1937; *Report of Indian Statutory Commission*, London, 1930, 2 Vols., Cmd. 3568, 3569, and Vols, 3-5 (Memoranda); *Indian Round Table Conference* (Proceedings and reports), London, 1931, Cmd. 3772, 3778, 3972, 3997, 4238; *Communal Decision*, London, 1932, Cmd. 4147; *Proposals for Indian Constitutional Reform*, London, 1933, Cmd. 4268; *Proceedings and Report of the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform*, London, 1933-34, 8 Vols.; *The Government of India Bill: Explanatory Memorandum*, London, 1935, Cmd. 4790; and also Cmd. 4805, 4843, 4903, 4998, 5133 and 5181.
2. Vyvyan Adams, *H.C. 301. 5s*, 8 May 1935, Col. 1033.
3. Copies of both are in *RAA*. Some of Rahmat Ali's "friends" have either an awful memory or a genius for inventing facts. Dr. Jahangir Khan, who was at Cambridge with Rahmat Ali, claims that he has a copy of this circular-letter, gives its date correctly, and then adds: "In fact, this pamphlet was a letter written to some woman. Her name is not mentioned in the pamphlet; she has been addressed merely as 'dear Madam' . . . it was printed on six foolscap-size pages" (his interview reported in direct speech, in Manzurul Haq Siddiqui, "Batayn Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky", *Sayyara Digest*, March 1978, p. 42). Surprisingly, the library of the

House of Lords does not have this letter on its shelves or in its catalogue; letter from the Record Office, House of Lords, to the author, dated 22 October 1969, *RAA*.

4. The reissue of 16 November 1936 and the 1937 pamphlet are in *RAA*.
5. Letter of 8 July 1935. Page references are not given because the letter is unpaginated.
6. *The Eastern Times*, 24 July 1935.
7. I.H. Qureshi, "A Case Study of the Social Relations between the Muslims and the Hindus, 1935-1947", a paper read at the Study Conference on the Partition of India, 1947, held at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 17-22 July 1967; published in C.H. Philips and M.D. Wainwright (eds.), *The Partition of India: Policies and Perspectives, 1935-1947*, London, 1970.
8. Details of this incident are taken from I.H. Qureshi, as quoted in M. Sajjad Zahir, "Dr. Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi: chand yadayn", *Jang*, 1 February 1981; Aftab Hasan, "Kya Kahun!", *Jadid Science*, August-December 1978, pp. 33-34, 40; Jahangir Khan, interviewed in Manzurul Haq Siddiqui, *op. cit.*, p. 44; and interview with Dr. Muhammad Baqir. Dates of Rahmat Ali's journey to Paris are taken from his passport, photocopy (supplied by the National Museum, Karachi) in *RAA*.
9. See "Pakistan" by Khalida Adib Khanum, *Ehsan*, 11 July 1938, and *Inqilab*, 12 July 1938. In his note to the translation, Khurshid Alam said that she had interviewed Rahmat Ali twice, once in London and a second time in Paris. Khurshid Alam told me in several of his letters that he was at this time writing much on Pakistan under the pen-name of "Jahangard".
10. *Andrun-i-Hind*, tr. by Mawlawi Said Hashmi, New Delhi, 1939.
11. Halide Edib, *Inside India* (London, 1937), pp. 352-356.
12. Italics in the original.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 356-357.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 357.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 357.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 357-358.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 358-359. Italics in the original.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 359-361.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 361-362.
20. C. Rahmat Ali, Letter, *The Times*, 7 December 1938. It was written on 5 December from a London address: 23, The Loning, Hendon, NW9.
21. Choudhary Khaliquzzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (Lahore, 1961), p. 200.
22. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman to Choudhary Rahmat Ali, 12 December 1938, *ibid.*, pp. 200-201.
23. M. Anwar's statement that Rahmat Ali "came to India in 1939 with a view to working for the Movement here, but finding the atmosphere uncongenial, he went back" (interview in *Satluj*, 12 February 1976, pp. 6, 21) is not correct. All his Cambridge contemporaries told me that this was only a visit and he had no intention to live in India. He had left all his things at the Cambridge residence and was travelling light. Besides, he had not yet been called to the Bar. He had also left a number of things incomplete in Cambridge.
24. Information supplied by Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, Muhammad Anwar, Khwaja Abdul Waheed, Niazuddin Khan, N.D. Yusuf, K.A. Rashid, Mumtaz Hasan, Muhammad Baqir, Miss Watson, Miss Frost, and three other Pakistani gentlemen who want to remain anonymous; *RCPB*, where the chief "traitor" is called "A". My letters of inquiry to Khwaja Abdur Rahim remained unanswered. When I met Pir Ahsanuddin in 1976 in Lahore and, after much talk around the subject, asked him directly about this incident, he gave no straight answer but promised to write down all he knew about Rahmat Ali and to send it to me. He failed to do this. and when I wrote to him a reminder I received a very rude reply.
25. Letter from Rahmat Ali to Khwaja Abdul Waheed from Cambridge, dated 22 July 1940. The original in the National Museum, Karachi; photocopy in *RAA*. Also references in *RCPB*.
26. All these dates of his travel are deduced from the immigration stamps on his passport.
27. Interview with Muhammad Ali.
28. The original of this letter is in *RAA*.
29. C. Rahmat Ali, *The Millat of Islam and the Menace of*

"Indianism" (Cambridge, n.d.), p. 1.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7. "Boabdalism" is a neologism by Rahmat Ali
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-11.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-13.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 14-16.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
40. See "Muslim League's 'Indianism': Indictment by 'Founder' of Pakistan National Movement", *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 27 March 1940.
41. The travel dates are taken from the immigration stamps on his passport. The date of arriving in Cambridge is given by Rahmat Ali in his letter of 22 July to Khwaja Abdul Waheed. From Bombay he travelled by S.S. Haruna Maru of Nippon Yusen Kaisha Steamship Company, and paid £ 50 as fare (receipt in *RAR.*).

CHAPTER 4

IN PURSUIT OF AN IDEAL : 1933 - 1940

Life in Cambridge

However mature, experienced and worldly-wise Rahmat Ali might have been when he arrived in Cambridge in 1930, the change in the surroundings must have been disturbing in some measure. The vitality of life at a British university town was different from the slack yet crowded *tempo* of an Indian city. Even in the 'twenties Lahore was a place of social vivacity, political vigour and much ado. But this difference was superficial and would not have upset a person of Rahmat Ali's temperament and character. The English way of life, however, was something which he had to learn to come to terms with, particularly in matters of cuisine, weather, cleanliness and whimsical landladies.

Contemporary observers speak of the ease with which Rahmat Ali adjusted himself to the new *milieu.* Several factors helped in this transformation. Fundamentally, Cambridge and Lahore were not very different in their educational, cultural and intellectual interests. Lahore had been a metropolis since 999 A.D., and a seat of learning and imagination for centuries. No other city in India could rival it in the variety of its cultural activities, the number of its colleges, the leadership of its elite in fashion and manners, the polished ease with which its social circles moved amongst themselves and civilized the newcomers, the elegance of its historical buildings, the riches of its libraries, the number and quality of its newspapers and journals in several languages, the beauty of its peaceful, tree-lined boulevards, and the cleanliness and order of its civil station. By reason of the historical conditions under which the Punjab had been conquered and administered by the British, Lahore was the most English of all Indian cities. Everything bore the stamp of this impact—the clubs, English, Indian

and mixed, the theatres, the well-laid out cantonement, the spotless colony of official residences with large lawns as soft as velvet, the Lawrence Gardens and the Government House, the *chic* hotels and restaurants, the upper strata who spoke English with enviable fluency and embarrassing vehemence. To go from such a place to Cambridge was not a matter of a sea change.

Some of the habits cultivated by Rahmat Ali in his Indian days facilitated the process of adjustment. Punctuality was an obsession with him; a difficult standard to live by in the East. In Cambridge it became a virtue, which surprised his teachers and friends. He had trained himself to keep regular hours in spite of his multifarious activities. This, too, helped at Cambridge, as much in his studies as in his social life. He was used to hard work, and this was another advantage to a man going to school after a gap of a dozen years. The company in which he had moved in Lahore had given him the confidence and bearing of an aristocrat, so that in his meetings and discussions with Indian leaders (most of whom came from a well-to-do background), British politicians and Cambridge dons, he behaved as if to the manner born. His seniority in age helped to close the generation gap between himself and his teachers and the public men he met. Even his rustic origins stood him in good stead. As an Englishwoman put it, he combined in himself the sophistication of a well-born with the simplicity of a child. And above all this hovered his innate charm and personality. Both the women who worked with him for several years referred to his "innate greatness", his "charm of manners", "something in his eyes that awed us", and "the beautiful weight of his personality".

The circle in which he moved during his visits to London was high by any standard. No ordinary undergraduate, whatever his credentials, would have dreamed of being invited to the table of men like Sir Umar Hayat Khan Tiwana or to all the parties given in honour of Iqbal and other delegates to the RTC. But he is there in all the photographs we have of this period.

In Cambridge he lived well; in fact, far better than his fellow-students or even the ICS probationers, the Brahmans of the British *raj* in the making who rated themselves several cuts above the ordinary mortals. His hospitality was legendary. He was always entertaining his friends and visitors to excellent Punjabi meals, and for this purpose had taught his landladies to cook Punjabi curries and fine, rich *parathas*. For himself he is said to have eaten chicken

curry with browned buttered toasts every day. He never cooked his meals or even visited the kitchen. He ate well but not heartily: a light but a fastidious eater. The cleanliness he expected in the food and the dishes was the bane of the life of his landladies. He wanted the dishes perfectly clean. The pots and pans were never allowed to be wiped dry after washing up; they were to be left to dry themselves, for even a laundered dishcloth was not clean enough. For the same reason he never used a towel to dry his hands before eating. When he had no guests, he often dined at the College or at the Cambridge University Arms (a restaurant of some reputation).

His favourite drink was tea, which he consumed in large quantities. In the summer he liked orange squash or freshly-made orange juice. He never took alcoholic drinks. He was a heavy smoker and always smoked Craven A cigarettes.

He dressed well, as he had been doing in India. But buying off the peg was not his idea of assembling a good wardrobe. All his clothes were bespoken and of good quality and taste. What really annoyed him was loud neckties and badly-pressed trousers. He polished his shoes himself and they burnished in mirror sheen.

In Lahore he had made it a custom to read newspapers with the avidity of a journalist. In Cambridge the habit became an addiction. But only the quality newspapers were delivered at his door. He was particularly fond of *The Times* and the *Manchester Guardian*, which he read from beginning to end, sometimes not even omitting the advertisement columns. The night between Sunday and Monday was often spent without sleep in reading all the heavy Sunday issues. The object of the exercize was not merely to find out what was happening in India, though that must have been uppermost in his mind. He kept himself abreast of British, European and American political developments, and the cuttings pasted into his commonplace book cover diverse items like British Labour Party policy, Hitler's statements, Italian incidents, French stories, and United States elections.

As he did most of his work at night his working day began late. Sometimes he woke up when the sun was high in the sky, and breakfast and lunch had to be combined. After this "brunch" he shut himself up in his sitting room to resume whatever he had been reading or writing the previous evening. Late in the afternoon or in the evening, depending on the season, he went out for a walk

which often included calls at his friends. Frequently he returned with a few visitors who were asked to stay for the dinner. The landladies knew his habits and were ready with large meals to meet these recurring eventualities. Hardly anyone who came to visit him was allowed to leave without eating with him.

He was a fanatic for work. When he was working nothing mattered or dared interfere. Meals became irregular. The succession of day and night decreed by nature was ignored. His secretary was asked to spend long hours in the libraries, seeking information, ferretting out facts and figures, collecting authentic quotations, and checking references. He wrote the first draft in his own long hand, but was never satisfied with what he had produced. Revision and correction went on for weeks. On facts he was very vigilant; he checked and doublechecked. On language he was a martinet; he re-wrote, consulted dictionaries, sometimes sought guidance from experts and grammarians, and then prepared the final draft. While toiling on his writing he worked like a galley-slave, straining himself to the utmost and consigning all comfort to oblivion.

Such pace of work could not have been maintained had he been fond of sleep. A few hours in the bed snatched between two long stretches of work sufficed. But he was also capable of sleeping long hours and then working non-stop without any rest. Sometimes he slept in the afternoons. But he was a bad sleeper and rarely enjoyed deep slumber.

Work for the Movement

Everyone speaks of Rahmat Ali's concentrated devotion to Islam, the future of Indian Muslims and the PNM. He treated his work as a mission and gave it his heart, soul, time and energy.

In his conversations with Indian Muslim friends and colleagues he was always stressing two points: the oneness of God and the equality of mankind. These, he said, were the two basic contributions of Islam to human thinking. If anyone disagreed or questioned his statement, he debated passionately but logically, and on such occasions he was no respector of persons. He talked very convincingly, and spoke well both in English and Urdu. Sometimes his devotion to his ideals made him use strong words in a discussion and this offended some people.

But his sincerity was above criticism or doubt. All who knew

him agree that he had no other interest in life except the welfare of the Muslims of India. Inayatullah Khan says that "I fail to recall any subject discussed with him other than what was in store for the Muslims of India if they failed to achieve Pakistan". (It is a measure of Rahmat Ali's impact on others that Inayatullah could write this in 1970 while he had met Rahmat Ali for only a few weeks in late 1932 and never seen him after that.) Similarly, Justice Anwar-ul-Haq, who met Rahmat Ali only once in 1940, wrote in 1969: "The only impression I have is of a very sincere man burning with a desire to see that a homeland was established for the Muslims of India."[1]

As there were more Muslim students in London than in Cambridge, Rahmat Ali visited London very frequently and at times lived there for weeks on end. For example, when Muhammad Anwar arrived in London in the summer of 1937 to study for the bar, he found Rahmat Ali living in Edgeware where he "ran a kind of a political school to propagate the idea of Pakistan among all Indian Muslim students who came in contact with him". At this time he had rented two rooms in a house, one for his living and the other for holding meetings of his followers and friends.[2]

By his unceasing efforts, transparent honesty and the essential appeal of his message, Rahmat Ali was able to convert a large majority of the students in England to his point of view. For lack of material and the failure of many of them to reply to requests for help, only a partial list of his supporters and opponents can be made up.

His critics may be taken up first, for their number is very small. Muhammad Din Tasir, though an old friend of the Lahore days, was critical of Rahmat Ali's "activites and character" and resented Rahmat Ali's insistent requests for subscription to his Movement.[3] Muhammad Baqir did not join the PNM because he badly wanted a job in the government and could not afford to lose the sympathies of the Punjab Unionist rulers.[4] Other opponents whose names have survived were all ICS probationers: Nazir Ahmad, Asghar Ali Shah and Ata Muhammad Khan Leghari.[5]

The only detailed attempt to refute Rahmat Ali available to us is a letter written by Ata Muhammad Khan Leghari to Rahmat Ali on 25 June 1937 from Oxford where he was an ICS probationer. After declaring that "in the present circumstances, I think, it is for the best that I have got into the ICS", he turned to his critic-

ism of the PNM. "My criticism is not only on practical grounds–for given sufficient faith, nothing is impossible–but largely on theoretic and ethnic grounds. The practice of the holy founder of Islam contradicts it. To my mind the situation in India very closely resembles the condition of the millat at the time of the Truce of Hudaibiyah, in many respects. And unless experience in India convinces me to the contrary, i.e. that the situation at present in India is different from that which the people had to face–I propose to follow in his footsteps. I have no time to write a long letter. But I feel that I must say that Indian Muslims are, with the exception of a few hundred thousand foreigners, native converts to Islam. Our situation is similar to the early Muslims–though infinitely stronger. The Hindus oppose us and hate us in their hearts, like the ancient Arabs they persecute us, they kill us for sacrificing [*sic.*] cows, etc. We have two courses open. The first is to declare war, and have a small Moslem North India on hostile terms with the Hindu India. The Hindu's [*sic.*] will bitterly oppose this from within and without. The Sikhs will go into their arms, although they are the natural allies of the Muslims. Within Punjab we will have a powerful opposition. It cannot be denied that the greatest bitterness and hatred will result from this.

The second course is one of conciliation, tolerance and friendship. Realising that truth most clearly shines in an atmosphere where bigotism [*sic.*] and hatred have not been stirred, he went to great lengths to achieve a friendly atmosphere. When Ali refused to cross Allah's name from first palce on the document, the Prophet himself crossed it. Among the onerous terms one was that if a Muslim fell in mushriq's hands he need not return him, but if a Muslim escaped from Mecca to Medina, he was to be handed over. A similar term may be operative in the constitution of India. if we do not have Pakistan. But if the Prophet accepted this burden to create a friendly atmosphere, we Muslims should follow him and not proclaim it as 'Surrender' and 'self-strangulation' like Omar did at that time. The Quran says

Truth is bound to prevail if you prepare a soil congenial for its acceptance. If Muslims and Hindus are on terms such that a Hindu accepting Islam is not regarded by his family and friends as a traitor to his nation, Islam will spread at an amazing speed. Who knows but that History may repeat itself, and that Muslims of India like the Arabs of 13 centuries ago, by accepting somewhat

unfavourable terms from the Hindus instead of giving combat, may have the whole of India in the fold of Islam in a few years.

'Divison of opinion', the Holy Prophet has said, 'is a blessing from God'. To hold these views, as I do, does not mean that I do not appreciate the efforts you are making, in all sincerity and with full belief of their being for the benefit of Islam and Millet. I do not know whether it has hitherto occurred to anyone that there are great similarities between the present situation of Indian Muslims, and of Arab Muslims in the time of the Prophet at Hudaibyah."[6]

Among Rahmat Ali's strong and consistent supporters were Sardar Abdus Samad Khan and Khan Ghulam Hasan Khan of Hoshiarpur, Aziz Ahmad, Abdul Waheed (later the managing director of Ferozsons, Pakistan's largest printing and publishing concern), Professor Jamil Wasti (a former teacher of English at Government College, Lahore), Shaikh Riaz Qadir (the youngest son of Sir Abdul Qadir, who was at this time an adviser to the Secretary of State for India), Amar Zia Khan, Inamul Haq Siddiqui, Muhammad Abdus Saeed Khan, Akhtar Hamid (an ICS probationer), Chaudhri Amjad Khan, Dr. Afzaal Qadri (a professor at the Aligarh Muslim University), Mahbub Murshad (later Chief Justice of East Pakistan), Muhammad Yusuf Khan (of Rampur), Muhammad Anwar, N.D. Yusuf (later Vice-Chancellor of the Agricultural University, Lyallpur), I.H. Qureshi (later a well-known historian, a federal minister in Pakistan, and Vice-Chancellor of Karachi University), Rahman and Zaki (full names not available), Jahangir Khan (a cricket blue, and later principal of the Zamindara College, Gujerat, and a senior officer of the Punjab education department), and Khwaja Abdur Rahim and Pir Ahsanuddin (the two ICS officers who went to Colombo in 1940 and betrayed Rahmat Ali).[7]

It is relevant to quote some of these persons to see how they reacted to Rahmat Ali's ideas. On receiving the literature on the movement, Aziz Ahmad wrote back: "It has certainly enlightened me a great deal. I as a member of the community owe you a great indebtedness for such a pioneer work which you have undertaken and hold your ideas and ideals in a high esteem. If one is honest one cannot find any flaw in the underlying principles of this movement and I assure you it is going to appeal to the heart as well as to the mind of everyone alike. I assure you that to the best

of my faith I shall not only be a great admirer but a sincere worker towards this common cause. My wholehearted sympathies and most loyal co-operation and moral support will be for the movement–as I do honestly believe that it is going to be 'the' future movement which is going to make history, at least in India."[8]

A. Waheed wrote an equally enthusiastic reply. "I shall do all in my small capacity to be of some help to this very vital question of our existence. Pakistan movement is not merely a matter of necessity for us but a national and a logical way of thinking. The word 'India' is in many ways comparable to the word 'Europe'. Both signify nothing as far as 'one nation' is concerned. The history of Europe will tell you that not very long ago 'Europe' meant a small patch of land on the western coast of Asia. Today it seems as if Asia means a small patch of land on the eastern coast of 'Europe'. Similar is the case with 'India'. Burma was once a part of India but the so-called Royal Commission told us 'Burma is not India'. That is perhaps a more reasonable way of thinking. Our demand is based on the same basic principle of Culture and we say 'Pakistan is not India'. Sooner or later the opposition will have to realize the soundness of our demand and the sooner they do the better, I assure you once again of my support."[9]

One of Rahmat Ali's young supporters went even further. Besides expressing his faith in the Pakistan movement and assuring Rahmat Ali of his help and sympathy, he wrote an essay on "Pakistan" for his university. This must have been the first time that an undergraduate at any university wrote on the subject as a part of his tutorial-*cum*-examination work. Muhammad Yusuf Khan, who was reading geography at Pembroke College, Cambridge, and always addressed his mentor as "uncle", wrote to him on 25 April 1938: "Every year Part I geographers have to submit a 'regional essay' as part of the year's work. I, therefore, took this opportunity of introducing 'Pakistan' to the examiners".[10] The 21-page (quarto size) essay, entitled "Pakistan and Pakistan Nationalism", was a fluently-written exposition and a passionate defence of the Pakistan demand of Rahmat Ali. Unfortunately, we don't know how the examiners reacted to this novel intellectual-*cum*-political exercize and how they rated it.[11]

Rahmat Ali was in constant touch with his friends and supporters in India. Unfortunately, only a few letters from these people are extant, but they show in what great respect they held

him and also, by implication, the sort of things Rahmat Ali wrote to them.

It appears that in 1937 a magazine called *Pakistan* was being published from Abbotabad and Rahmat Ali asked for its copies to be sent to him. Ghulam Ahmad, Khwaja Abdur Rahim's father who was employed in the office of the deputy commissioner of Jullundher, informed Rahmat Ali that he had asked seomeone in Abbotabad to do the needful. He congratulated him on the appearance of the article on "Pakistan" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, and inquired about the date of his return to India.[12] He sent him some newspaper clippings relating to the Iqbal Day, and asked him if he had received any reply from the editor of *Pakistan*.[13] Next month, he sent him cuttings of some articles on Pakistan that had appeared in the Lahore press, and said that Chaudhri Hakim Ali and others wanted to know when he was returning home, and again asked about any response from the editor of *Pakistan*.[14] In July 1938, he informed Rahmat Ali that two or three articles on the PNM were appearing in *Ehsan* every week, sent him some more press clippings, and enclosed the Urdu translation of the chapter on Pakistan in Halide Edib's *Inside India* which had been published in the *Inqilab* of 12 July.[15]

There are two letters from one Ghulam Mustafa written from Lahore and Gujerat, which contain some significant remarks. On 17 March, he said that he was very keen to see Rahmat Ali back in "Pakistan", and added, "Dr. Iqbal, the poet of Pakistan, is ill these days; therefore you must grace Pakistan with your return soon".[16] On 30 May, he sent Rahmat Ali a letter from "Zafar", "a relative of 'Gul' Sahib's", and said that from it he would gather that his return to Pakistan (this time without quotes) was "extremely urgent" (*bay had zaruri*). The outstanding feature of this letter is that Rahmat Ali is addressed a "Qibla Janab Quaid-i-Azam Sahib".[17]

Apparently, Rahmat Ali was also receiving press clippings from other sources. Malik Muhammad Khan used to send everything that was published in *Inqilab* of Lahore to his maternal uncle, Malik Ghulam Muhammad Khan of Kalabagh, who was then in London, to be forwarded to Rahmat Ali.[18] This kept Rahmat Ali informed of the extent to which his movement was gaining ground in the Punjab.

Propaganda in Britain

From the day his first circular, *Now or Never*, was published, Rahmat Ali had devoted himself to publicizing his message as widely as possible in Britain. In 1933-35, he sent the declaration and the pamphlet on the PNM to hundreds of people in Britain, went to London to meet Indian and British delegates to the RTC and members and witnesses of the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform. He also met some members of both Houses of Parliament besides sending them a detailed exposition of his case. His chapter in Halide Edib's book was a further attempt in propagating his ideals. He also met the editors of several newspapers and persuaded some of them to write on Pakistan.

His friends and co-workers helped him to the limit of their energies and resources. All pamphlets and other items were planned and written by Rahmat Ali himself, and the correspondence between him and his printers shows how closely he supervised their composing and *format* and the shape and colours of the maps. The maps were drawn in the rough by himself, perfected by Muhammad Yusuf Khan of Pembroke College, varnished by Messrs. Heffers, and finally printed by Messrs. Foister and Jagg.[19] Once the pamphlets and circulars were ready for distribution, Rahmat Ali made up from the current *Who's Who* and other soruces a list of persons to whom they were to be posted. Then his friends helped him in packing, addressing and stamping the post, carrying it in bags to the post office, and giving it into the care of the postmaster. They took copies with them to Oxford, London, and other towns and cities to give them to their friends, teachers and fellow students. Led by Muhammad Anwar, one group of these young enthusiasts used a part of Hyde Park's Speakers' Corner to broadcast the message and distribute circulars and pamphlets.[20]

Rahmat Ali is said to have brought out a newspaper or magazine or perhaps a mere news-sheet called *Pakistan* to give his movement a wider publicity. Some call it a "newspaper"[21], and some a "weekly".[22] But these reports are obviously incorrect. No such newspaper or magazine is to be found in the British Museum library or its newspaper depository in Colindale. There is no contemporary reference to it. And Rahmat Ali's secretary is sure that she never heard of it.[23]

What is definitely known is that at some unknown date Rahmat

Ali planned to bring out a journal with the title of *The Pakistan Quarterly*. In his papers there is a draft model of its outside cover, with the name of the journal printed in black in large capitals with a green silhouette, with a flag with a long pole on the left-hand side, the pole in black and the flag itself in green showing a crescent and five stars in white on a green background, and an outline map of Pakistan in black-*cum*-green borders below the title.

For some reason this name was dropped, and in the summer of 1938 he decided to issue a journal called *Pakistan: A Nation Reborn*. This time all arrangements seem to have been made, because an undated circular letter issued from 3 Clovelly Avenue, Colindeep Lane, Colindale, NW9, makes the following declaration:

"For the last five years we, the members of the PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT, have worked to educate the public opinion on the international character of the Muslim-Hindoo problem in the present-day 'India' which comprises PAKISTAN and HINDOOSTAN, the National Homes of the Muslims and the Hindoos respectively.

We have fostered the realization of the basic causes of the age-old Muslim-Hindoo conflict in the Bi-National Sub-Continent of India, and have launched a fundamental solution which alone can guarantee peace and future security to both Nations. And, to this end, we have held meetings, issued pamphlets and circulars, and published articles on the aims and objects of the PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT in many countries throughout the world.

Now we are taking a great step forward. We shall publish shortly from Lahore, Punjab, a quarterly journal 'PAKISTAN: A Nation Reborn' which will serve as the official organ of the PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT. It will hearten up the scattered souls of our MILLET on the Bi-National Sub-Continent, and will serve as an impregnable citadel to our sympathisers in this struggle for national re-determination, and, it will bring before the whole world the justice and fairness of our unalterable demand for equal status for the MILLET, with HINDOOSTAN as with other peoples in the League of Nations.

WE APPEAL TO YOU as a Muslim to furthr the cause of our Faith and Fatherland, by supporting this publication which alone seeks for our people a National Home in PAKISTAN, and full

National dignity abroad. 'PAKISTAN: A Nation Reborn' is the heart-cry of the Muslim MILLET for independent nationhood in the Sub-Continent. It is the standard-bearer of our inexorable demand for an inter-national solution of the Muslim-Hindoo problem, which alone can secure honour to both Nations, and bring lasting peace to the whole of the East. This alone will mould the destiny of the Muslim MILLET, and shape the future of the Bi-National Sub-Continent of India.

The first issue of 'PAKISTAN: A Nation Reborn' will appear on the 1st of September 1938, and every quarter thereafter. We enclose herewith subscription forms and beg you and your friends to support the PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT by becoming regular subscribers to our quarterly. Your help and that of your friends means much to us. The 80 million Muslims aspiring after a return to the honourable national life of their Forefathers, look up to you with expectant eyes.

TO YOU, a true son of the MILLET, we appeal for help, for sustenance, in the most critical of all moments in our History."[24]

With this letter was attached a circular subscription form, showing that the quarterly was to cost 2s. 6d. annually, 1s. 6d. half-yearly, and 6d. per single copy. For "Pakistan and Hindoostan", the comparative rates were Re 1, As. 8, and As. 4.[25] Considering the price, very slim issues must have been planned, for even in those days, 6d. for a copy of a quarterly journal was more than cheap. But the journal did not appear, either because enough funds could not be raised or for some other reasons.

The money received for the movement was kept in a separate account with the Lloyds Bank, Chesterton Road, Cambridge, under the name of "Bait-ul-Mal Fund".[26] Rahmat Ali's own accounts were maintained separately in Cambridge and the Lloyds Bank's Edgware branch in London. He signed all cheques as "C. R. Ali".[27]

Sometime in 1938, Rahmat Ali drafted even his writing pad into the service of the movement. Since he wrote several hundred letters every year it was a good idea to put Pakistan on the notepaper on the top of the page; in the centre there was an outline map of India with only Pakistan in green shown in full; the left-hand corner carried his and the movement's names in black relief on white paper: C. Rahmat Ali, Founder-President, Pakistan National Movement.[28]

Twice a year Rahmat Ali used to send Eid greetings to his

Muslim friends. It shows his obsession with the idea of Pakistan that he now designed an Eid card with a Pakistan motif. The top centre of the card carried the map and flag of Pakistan (as it was planned to appear on the title page of the abortive quarterly journal); below it were written the words, "Id Mubarak!" in bold type; and the left-hand bottom corner said "*From*: Choudhary Rahmat Ali, 16, Montague Road, Cambridge, England".[29]

Propaganda outside Britain

Not content with his efforts to acquaint the British public with his ideas, Rahmat Ali also tried to carry his message to the continent of Europe, the Middle East and the United States.

In the summer of 1937, he sent several copies of his pamphlets and circulars to one Mahmud in Germany with instructions to distribute them among his circle.[30] Soon afterwards he decided to go to Germany himself. He visited Marburg, Bonn, Berlin and perhaps a few more places.[31] Various versions of his visit are given in first-hand accounts, but without exact dates.

Dr. Akhtar Imam recorded in 1978 that in 1937 Rahmat Ali came to see him in Bonn, where he was then studying Arabic, introduced himself, and requested him to support the movement by sympathizing with it and extending financial assistance. They were then joined by Ihsanullah Khan, a Pathan of the NWFP who had come to Bonn to study philosophy, and the two began to question Rahmat Ali on Pakistan. During Rahmat Ali's exposition, two other persons joined the group: Professor Ahmad Zaki Walidi, a Turkish scholar and a specialist on the history of Central Asia, and Taqiuddin al-Hilali of Morocco, who had settled in Baghdad to escape French imperial rule and was now teaching at Bonn. All of them heard Rahmat Ali's long explanation and arguments, and at the end Walidi said, "I am completely convinced in favour of your movement. If, in forty or fifty years' time, your plan materializes, it will have two prominent features. First, a Lahore-Ankara axis will be established which will be joined by Iran. Secondly, in the coming years Islamic virtues may revive in their full glory and work hand in hand with modern technological civilization". Al-Hilali, too, was impressed with the idea. Thus in a few hours, Rahmat Ali had created four supporters in Germany (Akhtar Imam, Ihsanullah, Walidi and Al-Hilali). They

put their conversion to practical use. Al-Hilali wrote an article in Arabic on "Harkat Pakistan" for *Al-Fatah*, an Arab journal brought out by Muhibbuddin al-Khatib. Another by Ihsanullah Khan in German appeared in Goebbles's newspaper *Angriff*.[32]

Chaudhri Amjad, who was then studying engineering in England, tells of a visit to Berlin in 1938 during which he and Mirza Muzaffar Baig accompanied Rahmat Ali. There Rahmat Ali managed to meet Hitler and the interview, in which no one else was present, lasted for a half hour.[33]

In the spring of 1939, Rahmat Ali went to the United States. He arrived in Boston on 23 April, and was still there in July.[34] We don't know anything about the purpose or duration of his stay, except that he referred to his "prolonged illness" in a letter of 9 July 1939 to Khurshid Alam.[35] We have no record of Rahmat Ali's activities in England from March 1939 till his return from India in June 1940. He was in the United States in the summer of 1939, certainly till mid-July. In his letter to Khurshid Alam, he does not refer to any plan of returning to England. His passport shows a transit visa to Japan granted on 10 November 1939, and an immigration stamp of Hong Kong of 21 January 1940. From this it is fair to infer that he was in the United States till November 1939, and it is from there that he came to India in February 1940 *via* Japan, Hong Kong and Colombo. Otherwise, why should he have gone back to Cambridge in August or September 1939, and again left for India *via* the Far East? Muhammad Anwar told me that in December 1939 he arranged a meeting at the Slater's restaurant in London where Rahmat Ali explained his ideas to some people including Abdur Rahman Siddiqui and Choudhry Khaliquzzaman. Siddiqui immediately agreed with the Pakistan idea, but Khaliquzzaman did not. It is almost certain that Anwar is confusing the years. We know that Khaliquzzaman and Siddiqui were in London in November-December 1938 where they met Rahmat Ali. This could not have been in December 1939.

Rahmat Ali could not have lived for seven or eight months in the United States without a purpose. Even if he was ill for three or four months, the rest of the period must have been spent in travelling, meeting people and propagating his political plan for India. It is inconceivable that a man who lived with his ideal day and night had gone to America on such a long holiday. Unfortunately, there is a gap in our information and it is impossible

to say anything meaningful or definite about his activities from April 1939 to February 1940 except his itinerary as recorded in his travel document.

Influence in Britain

Slowly but unmistakably the time, energies, initiative and money that Rahmat Ali was puttting into the campaign to further and popularize his movement began to bear fruit. In a previous chapter we examined some evidence of Rahmat Ali's influence. The impact waxed with years.

In September 1934 the city editor of a provincial newspaper, *Torquay Directory–South Devon Journal,* had two meetings with Rahmat Ali in London, and was so impressed by his arguments that in his own article on the prospects for an Indian federation he reproduced Rahmat Ali's criticism of the proposed federal arrangements.[36]

A year later Rahmat Ali made his first appearance in the London quality press. *The Daily Telegraph* carried a note on "Pakistan" on 9 September 1935. "Until recently", wrote the anonymous contributor, "I must confess that I had never heard of the 'National Pakistan Movement'. I have now, however, received a number of beautifully printed pamphlets on the subject from the founder-president of the movement, Mr. C. Rahmat Ali. . . . Good Pakistanis dislike the Federal Constitution for India, and demand a Pakistan national home formed out of the Pakistani provinces." To this was added a brief explanation of the origin of the word "Pakistan" and of what it meant to the people living in the territories demanded by them as their own. It also reproduced the map of Pakistan as it had appeared on the cover of Rahmat Ali's *What Does the Pakistan National Movement Stand For?*[37]

Next month *The Irish Independent* of Dublin published a short contribution by "An Irish Gentleman" on the subject. The writer had obviously met Rahmat Ali, as the opening sentence shows. "I liked Mr. Rahmat Ali at first sight. His features are strictly Caucasian, but he is most irretrievably Muslim. He speaks perfect English, but he clings to Urdu as his native tongue. . . he is the arch-priest of an intensive nationalism based on religion. . . . I have spent a good deal of time with Mr. Ali. He is one of those pasisonately honest idealists who worship their ideal with religious devo-

tion. . . he has sound grounds for his objective. . . . My friend, Mr. Ali, can count upon only a few thousand supporters at the moment, but he is confident that all true Muslims will before long support the Pakistan National Movement. . . . He is a 'polished gentleman' in the best sense of that much abused phrase. . . . While he preaches an intensive nationalism, he does not mean it to be aggressively anti-British or anti-Hindu."[38]

In November 1936, *Great Britain and the East* published a letter by one T. Frost, writing from Holland House, Spalding, who, after complimenting the editor on his remarks published on 22 October that "between Hindu and Muhammadan there is not–and never can be–an effective *rapprochement*", turned to the real issue and the real solution. "It is tragically true; yet it is we, the British, who are bringing in the tragedy, foolishly refusing to face the real issue. On no single occasion have we ever attempted to find a lasting solution to the Hindu-Muslim conflict–beyond calling out 'militia' to put out the flames of the fires smouldering beneath the surface. As long as our Imperial interests have been safe, nothing else has mattered much. Indeed, in the opinion of the cynics, it is not going too far to say that these 'inevitable conflicts' have given us just the excuse we needed to remain as the 'policeman' in India; and that, for this reason, we have not found it necessary to seek the root cause of the conflict or its fundamental solution.

"We must know by now that this state of affairs cannot go on forever. The basic cause is, of course, the fundamental differences–religious, spiritual and racial–between the Muslims and the Hindus, and therefore the only solution is quite obvious. Each nation must be given its 'National Home' in India. Surely, India is vast enough to accommodate these two people under separate National Administrations.

"The present Federal Constitution cannot last forever because it aims at the fusion of two basically opposed elements. The Hindu element is there in an overwhelming proportion to the Muslim, and the Federal Government which is to take charge of the whole of India, including the five Northern States of the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan, where the population is four-fifths Muslim, is bound to be overwhelmingly Hindu. Truly the conflicts are 'inevitable', *unless* we acknowledge our responsibility to these peoples and accede to the demand of the Pakistan National Movement for a National Home for Indian

Muslims in these five Northern States. There is no other solution and, therefore, the sooner it is accepted, the better will it be for all three parties–British, Hindu, and Muslim–interested in the permanent welfare of that bi-national sub-continent, India."[39]

The widely-read London daily press carried even more encouraging items in 1937. F. Yeats-Brown, the popular writer on Indian affairs, affirmed that the Pakistan idea "is spreading rapidly", but regretted that it had hardly been noticed in England and had had no press coverage in India. "Nevertheless", he prophesied, "it is a movement which may exercize a profound influence throughout Asia."[40]

In June-July, *The Morning Post* published two letters in stout support of the Pakistan plan. Alice Forrester, of Princes Square, London, pointed out that the Hindu Congress had little following in the predominantly Muslim provinces of India, and therefore no right to rule in the five northern states. "Is it not mere common sense to settle the age-old Muslim-Hindu problem once and for all by the formation of a separate Federation for the Muslims in the five Northern States, as suggested by the Pakistan National Movement? This mode of settlement is surely the only fair one, and, therefore, one which is for the true welfare of all concerned–British, Hindus, and Muslims."[41]

A Muslim correspondent, M.I. Khan, wrote a long letter to the journal. He complained that by coercing the overwhelmingly Muslim provinces of the north into the Indian federation, the British were depriving forever their "stout and loyal friends" of their "distinctive national status". They felt that their future was being sacrificed to placate the Hindus. To them the Indian federation was "simply a change from British rule to Hindu domination. To this we will never agree for the very obvious reason that our participation in the Federation would mean our national doom. Racially, socially, culturally, and, above all, religiously we are an essentially different people from the Hindus". It was on the basis of this "fundamental distinction" that the Muslims were resolved to demand the recognition of their national right to live under their national administration in these Muslim homelands. "We want this, as our full national development is impossible within India." The only fair way of dealing with the current political situation was "to adopt the scheme of the Pakistan National Movement for a separate Federation of the territories where

the Muslims constitute eighty per cent of the population". He concluded, "In the name of justice and equity, let Great Britain give the Muslims their national rights and accept the demand of the Pakistan National Movement".[42]

A British army officer pointed out that the "main and overriding advantage" of Pakistan was that its creation would strengthen "our Indian frontier, which in turn would be of immeasurable benefit to the British Empire". He admitted that the difficulties presented by such a scheme were "very great", but affirmed that if a division in Palestine was possible, "a similar division in India may not be impracticable".[43]

About two weeks later, Alice Forrester returned to the subject. "For more than one reason we cannot afford to ignore the demand of the Pakistan National Movement." One was the splendid British tradition of fair play. "Can it be considered fair to coerce the Muslim nation into the Indian Federation, where they will be in a pepetual minority of one in four?" There were "tremendous" difficulties in the way of adopting the Pakistan plan, but these were "not nearly so many or so great as those which must inevitably arise if the Muslim demand . . . is not granted".[44]

Some of these articles, notes and letters might have been written on Rahmat Ali's instigation by his friends. This is by no means unusual in political controversies. But no amount of persuasion by Rahmat Ali would have made a paper of the standing and reputation of *The Morning Post* to open its correspondence columns to pro-Pakistan expositions had it not considered the subject inherently significant. Nor was a writer of Yeats-Brown's experience and integrity going to allow his conscience to praise a plan to please Rahmat Ali whom in all probability he did not even know. Two factors lay behind this remarkably successful campaign. One was the inherent justice of the demand. The other was the heroic efforts of Rahmat Ali and his band of workers. Placed in its proper context, the success was even more than remarkable. An obscure student puts forward a scheme of revolutionary dimensions in 1933. It is immediately dismissed as a fantasy and a chimera by all the spokesmen of Muslim India gathered in London for the RTC and the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform. Other leaders in India take no notice of it. But a debate starts on its pros and cons in India and in Britain—broadly favourable to its ideal. Iqbal's Allahabad address

of 1930 had been completely ignored by the British press, except a curt paragraph in *The Times*. Later, when Jinnah and the Muslim League demanded a division of India, the news had to be splashed in all the newspapers, as the Muslim League was the largest and the most representative Muslim party in India and the Muslims were providing at least one-third of the entire Indian army during the war. But the Lahore Resolution received scant support in Britain. All public comment was critical of it.[45] Thus, on merit, Rahmat Ali alone was more successful than the entire Muslim League in his scheme's presentation, defence and publicity, and in making it an issue worth discussing in the columns of respectable newspapers. This was no mean triumph for any man. It was an unparalleled feat for one without any public standing, or a political party behind him, or a millionaire to back him, or a newspaper of his own, or even a sympathetically-oriented public of his own countrymen and fellow-Muslims. It adds to his laurels that he achieved this at a time when the Muslim League in India and its supreme leader were opposing the Pakistan plan. No other man in the history of modern Muslim India has had so much to contend with and so much to show as his accomplishment.

Influence in Germany

As we have seen, Germany was the first country to reproduce Rahmat Ali's *Now or Never* in one of its foremost journals. This might have induced him to redouble his efforts. His visit(s) to Germany's various cities in 1937 did not go unrewarded. He was able to persuade some teachers and students in Bonn and Marburg to share his views, and at least two of them wrote articles on his movement. Not content with this, he approached the editors of some German newspapers, their staff writers and other men of letters. We don't know how far he succeeded with them, and it has not been possible to scan German newspaper files of this period to find out if something on the movement appeared in them. But we have at least one substantial article on his movement in a daily newspaper, which demonstrates that his efforts were not all in vain, and also indicates that more might have appeared elsewhere in the country.

The *Volkischer Beobachter* (the official organ of the Nazi Party) of 12 December 1937 carried an article by Dr. Karlheinz

Neunheuser on the "Aims and Significance of the Pakistan National Movement in India", covering the entire fifth page of the issue (the size of the newspaper was roughly as large as that of *The Times* in the 1930's). The writer had certainly met Rahmat Ali, for he quotes him several times as "an Indian Muslim". Citing the report of the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform, he begins by putting the Indian problem in its historical context, and then proceeds to underline the basic distinction between Hindus and Muslims. "Two irreconcilable ways of life oppose each other in India, two races, two cultures: Islam and Hinduism. They differ from each other in every possible way. Neither the two attitudes nor the bases underlying them can be brought together under one roof or united by any kind of synthesis at all." Tracing the origin of the word Pakistan to Rahmat Ali, he explains: "So *Pakistan* means 'the land of the pure, the good, the chosen people'. The leader of this pure Muslim movement is striving to stress the territorial and national unity of these five provinces through the unifying name of Pakistan. The name will be dialectically opposed to the other part of India, inhabited by the Hindus–Hindustan."

There are good foundations on which Pakistan will be created. It is "well defined in terms of historical tradition, language, cultue and religion; furthermore, the five provinces show a historical continuity . . . the customs and culture of the population have been unified through a centuries-long development and the permanent influence of Islam. There is linguistic unity, too. Urdu is an established language, highly evolved in dialects, spoken and understood by the Muslim population". All this shows that "the Islamic peoples living in this part of India constitute, in the strictest sense of the word, a political nation". For these reasons, the Muslims see no solution to the Indian problem in the recently-formed federation. It is not likely to provide a principle of democratic majority, permanence, or peace between the Muslim and Hindu populations. In terms of a democratic majority, the Hindus can rely on dominating other areas and peoples, and so gradually crowding the Muslims out of India. This, of necessity, will involve both sides in an open war. The solution is, therefore, through popular autonomy, not democratic majority.

The article concludes with an assessment. "The Pakistan movement is still young, in the initial stages of its development.

One cannot yet predict the chances of its success. As it is still young, so also is it a youth movement, especially a student movement. With a peculiarly Muslim strength and passion, the call to the people to awake and unify echoes throughout the land. Many supporters are in Europe, studying in England, some even in Germany."[46]

Influence among the Arabs

Rahmat Ali made some attempts to put his message across to the Arab world, but with what effect we don't know.

One of the workers of the PNM, Muhammad Abdus Saeed Khan, was returning to India after completing his studies in England in early 1939 when on board his ship he happened to meet the leader of the Jamiat-ul-Islamia of Morocco who was on his way to Mecca for hajj. The Moroccan's "ignorance of the developments in the Islamic world" caused Saeed "surprised pain". He explained a few things to the Arab, and gave him some literature on Pakistan to be delivered to some people in Mecca whom he knew, with the request that they might try to get it published in a Meccan journal.[47] It is not known whether anything was published in Mecca or any other Arabian city, but at least some people there must have read the pamphlets and thus become acquainted with Rahmat Ali's ideas.

A more effective step was taken when Rahmat Ali persuaded Shakib Arsalan[48] to publish an exposition and defence of the idea of Pakistan in his journal *Les Nations Arabes* which he was then issuing from Geneva. The journal had a wide circulation among the educated in the Arab Middle East, Turkey and North Africa, and Arsalan himself was respected for his learning and missionary spirit. The article should have spread the message from Cambridge among many who had never heard of a Muslim problem in India.[49]

Influence in the United States

As we saw above, Rahmat Ali spent a good part of 1939 in the United States, but we have no definite information about the people he met and anything that was published on the Movement in the country.

In his papers, however, there is a typewritten MS. of an article

called "Pakistan Considered Historically" by G.L. Schanzlin of Upland, Indiana, with a letter from the author. "Enclosed find a copy of the recast article, I feel that it is improved in appearance. The magazine *Foreign Affairs,* N.Y., will probably publish it; at least I have not heard from them to the contrary, unless they should return the manuscript in the last minute. Perhaps also one or two other magazines will take the paper [three words illegible]."[50]

It is certain that Rahmat Ali was in touch with some Americans long before going to the United States, and had persuaded at least one of them not only to write on Pakistan but to get his piece approved by himself.

The seven-page (quarto size) article, which I have not seen in published form anywhere, certainly not in *Foreign Affairs,* is a very brief summary of Indian history from the earliest times to the end of the Mughal rule, bringing out the historical and cultural unity of the Indus basin. There is nothing about Islam or the problem facing the Indian Muslims. The word Pakistan is neither defined nor explained, and the PNM and Rahmat Ali find no mention. The only two sentences on the subject are vague and talk of a confederation of countries and nations. The people of these areas, he writes, "feel the underlying unity of racial and cultural traditions, tying them together into one solid bloc of territories which, as they fondly hope, may become a strong confederation of countries and nations, rather than one consolidated commonwealth. The name under which the people wish these countries to be known is *Pakistan,* as distinguished from the races and nations of Hindustan". He concluded the cursory treatment by saying: "In Europe, after centuries of conflict between warring elements of race, clan, creed and class, the central authority of the modern state finally evolved. Instead of one empire, like the old Roman empire, the Western world has now for many centuries consisted of a congeries of commonwealths and nations, each one free to work out its own salvation, even if it be with fear and trembling. It may be that the solution of some of India's present problems lies in the same direction."[51]

It is fair to speculate that the article did not win Rahmat Ali's approval. Barring the use of the word "Pakistan" at one place, it had nothing to do with his movement or scheme. It merely hinted that the solution of the Indian problem might lie in a division

of the sub-continent: something that was almost a commonplace by now. On merit alone, too, it was neither a satisfactory exposition of any alternative nor a convincing analysis of the Indian political predicament. In all probability, Rahmat Ali told Schanzlin that this rough treatment of the problem would not carry any weight; anyway, it was not even a gesture of support for the Pakistan idea.

Influence in India

As was mentioned earlier, the first circular by Rahmat Ali had caught the imagination of some people in the Punjab and had caused a lively debate in the correspondence columns of the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore which continued till 1935. By that time the word "Pakistan" had entered the vocabulary of Indian politics so well that its use needed no explanation or elaboration.

But Rahmat Ali's real triumph was yet to come. In 1933 he had cast a seed, and no sooner had the first tender shoot emerged from the fertile soil than its utility and future came under discussion. The seed was strong and the climate salubrious, for in less than three years the single, slim shoot had thickened into a plant with its own boughs and buds and leaves. The faster it grew the greater the popularity it was able to win. Between 1935 and 1939, and particularly from 1937 onwards, Pakistan became the talking point of Indian politics. In perspective, the headlong speed with which the young, almost infant, idea gained support seems astonishing. But, apart from its own appeal, which embodied a multi-dimensional religious, historical, cultural, territorial and national aspiration, some external factors encouraged its acceptance by a rapidly increasing portion of the Indian Muslims—Congress obduracy, political awakening in Muslim provinces, Iqbal's poetry, British failure to devise a constitution that could allay Muslim fears, an efficient Muslim Urdu press, etc.[52]

No idea, however popular, is without its critics, and reportedly a few discordant notes were heard. Mian Kifait Ali relates how he met Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain, a cousin of his, in July 1935, when the word Pakistan "was already on the tongue of the people" and educated circles knew of Rahmat Ali, and asked him what he thought of the Cambridge plan. Fazl-i-Husain paused for a while

and then replied, "It appears to be rather impossible. Why should the British, with a view to creating a large Muslim state in Asia, free north-west India, then conquer Afghanistan and subdue Iran, and finally persuade the Turks and the Iraqis to join this state?" Kifait Ali was taken aback, but understood that Fazl-i-Husain had a very hazy idea of what he was talking about. He was confusing Rahmat Ali's plan with Jamaluddin Afghani's. "I dared not debate the point. I kept quiet."[53] This report is hard to credit. Fazl-i-Husain was one of the most intelligent and best informed politicians of his time. He must have received Rahmat Ali's pamphlets and at least looked through them. The debate on Pakistan in the Lahore press could not have escaped his eyes. Then, how could he possibly ascribe Jamaluddin's alleged scheme to Rahmat Ali? He was ill, but by no means senile.

A more confident report is about the Aga Khan's opposition to the Pakistan idea. Speaking to a journalist in Karachi on 1 February 1936, "He declared that he was opposed to the Pakistan movement, as it was fraught with danger for Muslims".[54] He did not elaborate. But two other reports, far more reliable and fully documented, cast some doubt on the veracity of the Associated Press of India's message from Karachi. In a lengthy letter to Sir Fazl-i-Husain, written from Paris on 13 August 1935, the Aga Khan had used the word Pakestan (his spellings) four times without quotation marks and meaning north-western Indian Muslim provinces.[55] Thus he knew the word well, and at that time it carried only one connotation, that given it by Rahmat Ali. There is nothing against the word or the idea in the letter which dealt at some length with the problems of Muslim India. Again, on 14 January 1936, writing from Bombay to Sir Fazl-i-Husain, he says, "I have never looked upon Aligarh or U.P. as the *leadership* of Islam but I do understand here with its geographical position midway between Pakestan and Bengal how important it is that the Congress should not capture our 'Centre' ".[56]

If a man of the Aga Khan's stature used the word Pakistan as a matter of course, he must have known what it meant and stood for. How could he employ the term to describe the Muslim north-west so regularly as if Pakistan already existed, and at the same time declare that it was fraught with danger for the Muslims? There is something wrong with the API report from Karachi.

The only Muslim rejection of the Pakistan idea appeared in two

newspapers in 1938. In an editorial comment the *Zamzam* of Lahore criticized it on 3 August.[57] Then, on 19 August, it carried an article against the idea by one Muhammad Yunus, a student of the Islamia College, Lahore.[58] In December, the *Haqiqat* of Lucknow condemned the plan, and the *Zamzam,* after quoting the Lucknow paper in its support, argued against Pakistan on two grounds: if Muslims feared Hindu rule, their *iman* (faith) was weak; and a majority of Muslims would be left behind in India for the sake of giving freedom to half their number.[59]

But *Zamzam* (literal meaning: the fountain in the precincts of Kaaba in Mecca, generally believed to be sacred by Muslims) was howling in the wilderness, and its words were writ on water. It was then edited by Nasrullah Khan Aziz, a follower of Mawdudi and later a member of his Jamaat-i-Islami. Mawdudi and his party persevered in their opposition to the creation of Pakistan even after the state had come into existence and they had migrated to it from India. The quality Muslim newspapers of the Punjab vied with each other in publishing articles in support of the Pakistan idea. Interestingly enough, some of them were regular supporters of the Muslim League, like *The Eastern Times,* and at least one, *The New Times,* was an official spokesman of the party. But throughout this period the Muslim League maintained a complete silence on the issue, and at one or two occasions Jinnah opposed it. Unmindful of the largest Muslim party's indifference and hostility, notwithstanding Jinnah's great prestige, oblivious to possible British disapproval, the entire press braved all opposition and filled its columns with articles, notes, comments and letters in favour of Pakistan.[60]

It was beyond the means of Rahmat Ali, or any human being, even the mighty British empire, to force or bribe the Punjab's best six Muslim newspapers to write in favour of a particular idea or scheme. Rahmat Ali had not even visited the Punjab since 1930 (in 1940 he was not allowed beyond Karachi). No political party had been formed in the Punjab to uphold and propagate his message. His efforts were confined to sending his pamphlets to the people he knew and the word-of-mouth publicity by his erstwhile co-workers in England. With these severely restricted channels of communication he was able to convert to his point of view the Punjab and Sind, a little later the whole of Muslim northern India, and finally the Muslim League. Substantially, the entire

achievement was effected in two years, 1937 and 1938. Till 1937 the debate was sporadic and mainly academic. The constant flow of articles began in 1937, and became a veritable torrent in 1938. By 1939 the field had been won. By early 1940 the Muslim League had inscribed the goal of Pakistan on its national banner, thus making Rahmat Ali's idea and his word the unanimous demand of Muslim India. No man could have achieved a bigger triumph. No party could have shown greater ingratitude. The word and the ideal were filched; their maker was first ignored, then disowned, and finally branded as an enemy.

A brief survey and analysis of the 1938-39 press literature on Pakistan will be rewarding.[61] In the summer of 1938, Zafar Ali Gondal, a middle-class landlord of Kamalia, Lyallpur District, translated the *Now or Never* into Urdu, thus introducing the original message to non-English speaking people. At the same time, he wrote several articles, bringing out the fact that the fears entertained by Rahmat Ali in 1933 had come dreadfully true and the Indian federation imposed on the Muslims was proving a nightmare. "There is only one way to save the Indian Islamic civilization: the establishment of a separate federation of Muslim provinces." He asserted that "nearly all the inhabitants of these Muslim provinces now accept the basic principles of the [Pakistan National] Movement". They were now awake, and could no longer be sent to sleep with the lullabies of trust and peace or spellbound by the music of safeguards. "They know where their duty lies, and they are determined to put in their best effort to achieve their separate federation."[62]

The Muslim League (a short-lived, poorly Lahore paper) argued in its leading article that the creation of a separate Muslim federation was essential on every ground were the Muslims of India to live honourably. "It may be called 'Pakistan' or Muslim Federation; the plain objective is that, since the Hindu majority has miserably failed to treat the Muslim minority with justice, the only way out should be adopted, viz., the Muslims should separate for the sake of safeguarding their political aims and objects." The Muslims "have no other goal but the creation of a separate Muslim Federation".[63] (This Muslim League support for Pakistan should be read with the bold step taken by the Sind Provincial Muslim League in October 1938 of adopting the division of India as its formal policy. This was done much against Jinnah's will. The

Sind Conference will be discussed in a later chapter dealing with Rahmat Ali and the Muslim League). Simultaneously, *Ehsan* supported the plan for a division of India into a "Muslim Federation" and a "Hindu Federation", citing arguments apparently taken from Rahmat Ali. But it did not use the word Pakistan.[64] On the last day of 1938, an anonymous article in *Inqilab* declared that "in the present despairing situation [*yas-angez halat*] the creation of Pakistan is the only first step towards our salvation".[65] Why the only "first step"? Was it foreseeing Rahmat Ali's later proposals for the sub-continent?

At some date in 1938 an Urdu weekly called *Pakistan* was started from Lucknow, but nothing is known about its editor or founder.[66] In all likelihood, there were several other magazines of the same type. In the thirties, Urdu magazines and journals of literary and political nature sprang up like mushrooms all over India. Most of them were short lived, poorly financed, badly printed and narrowly circulated, and hardly any library or collection took the trouble of buying or preserving them. That is why they re not extant.

With the coming of the year 1939 public opinion in the Punjab advanced from written statements in defence of Pakistan to political demands for its realization. On 23 January, for example, a large public meeting of the Muslims of Rawalpindi was addressed by Mawlana Mawla Bakhsh (*khatib* of the Jami' mosque), Sayyid Ghulam Mustafa Shah Gilani (secretary, Tahrik-i-Pakistan) and Mawlana Muhammad Ishaq Mansehrawi. The Tahrik must have existed for some time before this occasion, because the meeting resolved that all efforts to popularize it should be lawful and constitutional, and reprimanded those agitators who were bringing a bad name to the Tahrik by spreading ill-founded rumours. It reiterated its faith in Pakistan, and made it clear to the local administration and the Punjab government that the Tahrik was a peaceful movement.[67]

A Pakistan Association already existed in Lahore, and in May 1939, it issued "under the caption 'Now or Never' a manifesto in the form of an appeal to 'the Muslims of Pakistan' ". The Indian Muslims, it said, were being slowly sacrificed on the altar of Hindu nationalism "to the lasting disgrace of Islam". It enumerated four arguments—from nationalism, separatism, religion and democracy—in support of its case, and declared that "it is on the basis of these

power will be established between the two major communities in proportion to their numerical strength and historical and political importance . . . . The Hindu minorities in the Muslim States will be the effective safeguards for Muslim minorities in Hindu India and *vice versa*. Further, a compromise between Hindus and Muslims on the above lines will avert all danger of future civil war and will considerably relieve all communal tension that exists at present in an acute form".[70] Neither Rahmat Ali nor the word Pakistan was mentioned in the article.

On the day the newspaper published this contribution, it made its first editorial comment on the Pakistan demand. In a leader entitled "Muslim States", it questioned whether the proposed solution "offers any administrative advantages commensurate with the problems which they [the Muslims] threaten to create, not so much for the Hindus as for Muslims themselves". It also perpetuated the communal divergence of India, instead of removing it by welding together the divergent elements as the federal constitution did. Under the provincial autonomy granted by the 1935 Act the Muslims of these provinces "stand in no danger of losing their Muslim culture or their independence".[71]

The paper's unfavourable comment angered its Muslim readers, who wrote dissenting letters which were duly published in the correspondence columns. Muhammad Sharif Toosy wrote from Wazirabad to say that no future constitution would satisfy the Muslims until it conferred upon them "independent sovereign rights in Pakistan and Eastern Bengal and Assam". He pointed out that "the Pakistan national movement is daily growing in force". He emphasized that the two states at the two ends of India would be completely independent and there was no scheme for uniting them. Provincial autonomy provided by the Indian federation was not what the Muslims wanted and could never be a substitute for the Muslim demand of "complete independence of and separation from Hindu India".[72] It is assumed in the letter that the north-western state will be called Pakistan; no explanation is offered for the name, thus showing that by now the word had come to possess a defined and well-known meaning.

Mir Rafique from Amritsar argued that the Hindu-Muslim clash was international, not inter-religious, and that all attempts made so far to unite the two peoples or to devise a suitable constitutional machinery for them had failed. The recently-issued

manifesto of the PNM deserved full support. "To all impartial thinkers Pakistan will offer the only just solution and can alone ensure honourable existence to both nations." He allayed the fears of those who suspected in the creation of Pakistan a revival of the old Muslim empire in India. He assured everyone that the Pakistan Movement was neither anti-Hindu nor anti-British.[73]

Avaice Asar of Rawalpindi asked "why this denial of an elementary right [of self-determination] to Indian Muslims? . . . Why should they not carve out their own destiny?" They had the sanction of democracy and had a right to assert themselves and satisfy their national aspirations.[74] Two weeks later he returned to the subject. The conception of one nationhood for the sub-continent of India was "ridiculous". If India was a nation, why did the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha not step on to the so-called national platform of the Congress and embrace each other? "The Jews, driven from their birthplace, demand a 'national home' and other nations are being asked to make room for them. But when the Muslims of India put forth a similar demand, it is turned down as 'communal' and 'untenable'."[75]

Ahmad Bashir clarified the origin and meaning of the Pakistan demand. Writing in his capacity of secretary of the Majlis-i-Kabir-i-Pakistan, he reminded the readers that the PNM was founded by Rahmat Ali in Cambridge in 1932 [*sic.*], summarized the principal points of its demand, reiterated the main arguments of Rahmat Ali, and concluded that the Muslims wanted a "complete severance" of Pakistan from the rest of India.[76]

Professor Gulshan Rai, the Hindu critic-in-chief of Pakistan in the Punjab, declared, in an article in the paper on 11 August, that the scheme was a "physical impossibility and maniacally suicidal". He gave some figures to prove that Pakistan would be financially bankrupt. In reply, "A Pakistani" of Lahore quoted different figures of revenue and expenditure to demonstrate the future state's viability. Answering Gulshan Rai's point that Pakistan would have to spend much on the defence of the north-west frontier (a burden which was then being borne by the Government of India), he foresaw a different configuration of foreign alliances in the area. Pakistan, he said, "would enter into alliance with other Muslim States of the Middle and Near East and form along with them a common front against any possible threat of aggression from Japan and Hindu India in the East and Europe in the West. The Frontier

question would then practically lose all importance".[77] There was some element of foresight or prophecy in the last point. Soon after independence, Pakistan tried to forge a Muslim alliance in West Asia, but, finding some important Arab states in opposition to the idea, cultivated close relations with Iran and Turkey. Mir Rafique again wrote from Amritsar, warning Gulshan Rai that "our claim to Pakistan is a claim of a nation fundamentally different from that living in Hindustan". It was in order to maintain that distinct entity that the Muslims refused to live under an Indian federation. Financial difficulties might occur, but a nation did not abandon claim to its fatherland for such fears. The Muslims had in the past in this very land faced so-called "impracticable" situations and overcome them.[78]

This debate was not one sided. There were a few letters from Muslim correspondents who decried the idea of Pakistan. Abdur Rashid of Kalaski argued that there was no concept of a nation in the Quran or Islam. The Muslims who were shouting for a "national home" were "those who either do not understand what Islam demands or are trying to befool everybody, including themselves". The people living in the Indus Zone or Pakistan were not different from other Indians "as regards their social and cultural qualities". "Let them not befool the ignorant masses by saying that the Indian Muslims are a nation and that therefore there must be a 'national home' for them. Let them not confuse this problem with Islam. Islam is above nations and national homes."[79] Amjad Husain of Batala, whose entire family was stoutly Ahrari and therefore irrevocably bound to the Congress point of view, called the Pakistan idea un-Islamic. Islam demanded that its adherents should spread its message to every corner of the world. "Muslims are out to establish their ascendancy and supremacy on every plot of land of the world. They cannot and should not support the vulgar idea of confining themselves to the limited part of India called Pakistan. The Pakistan scheme is purely against the saying of the Holy Prophet. The Holy Prophet foretold that the Islamic message would reach every land, every nook and corner of the world .... After reading the history of Islam one feels highly ashamed to hear of such important schemes of Pakistan and a separate 'National Home'."[80]

This argument from Islam was answered by Muhammad Rafique Toosy of Lahore. He asked how the creation of Pakistan would

prevent the Muslims from establishing "their ascendancy and supremacy on every plot of the land of the world". If Amjad meant political ascendancy, the process had to start with small beginnings. Unless there was a network of independent Muslim states, all talk of political ascendancy of the Muslims was useless. "The Pakistanis have no other aim but to add one more powerful Muslim State to the Islamic world." Amjad's anxiety to spread the message of Islam throughout the world and his opposition to the idea of Pakistan were inconsistent. Muslim missionary work lacked state encouragement and was therefore slow. If it received the backing of a Muslim state, there was every possibility that it would gain in effectiveness. "When the goal is the conversion of the entire world, it is immaterial whether Muslims remain a minority or majority in a country. But no Muslim is fool enough to strike the axe at the root of his own political existence and to forego his claims for political domination even in those parts of the world where he is in a majority."[81]

Abdur Rashid's criticism was refuted by Saifullah Khan of Baste Baba Khail. He argued that the Muslims of north-west India were a nation by the possession of a separate political history, language, religion, politics and culture. Countering the statement that Indian Muslims could not be a nation because Islam did not sanction the concept of nationhood, he said: "The Muslims of India cannot be called members of the 'Indian nation' because there is no such thing in existence, and they cannot claim Afghan or Turkish nationality because nobody will allow that. They can only be termed members of the Muslim nation in India. And as such they are perfectly justified in demanding a separate national home in India."[82]

Amjad Husain's views attracted further criticism. Abdul Aziz Beg of Jullundher believed that Amjad had confused the ideal with the actual. He had spoken like an orthodox *mulla* who had forgotten the world in which he was living. The ideal of Islam was laudable. Was it also practicable in these days? Could the Muslims of today go and conquer Spain as Tariq had done, a parallel that Amjad had quoted? The Pakistan scheme would consolidate the position of Muslims in India, and, without this consolidation, Muslims would remain powerless to accomplish anything great in India or the world. Nor did the plan contravene the Holy Prophet's saying. The Prophet never asked his followers to divorce reason

from life. Pakistan, he concluded, was "the sovereign panacea for all our ills, the *sine qua non* of our future progress, and an essential prologue to higher things that we might like to do in accordance with the dictates of our religion".[83]

Tej Bhan Malhotra, a Hindu from Gujranwala, was incited by this "idle gossip of Pakistan" to remind the Muslims that "India must remain a united India ruled by Indians and for Indians". Hindus formed the major part of the Indian population and they had lived in the country from very ancient times, so "it is but natural that they should play the major part in the Indian Government". If the exponents of Pakistan asserted that they had a right to political ascendancy in states where they were the majority, they should remember that the Hindus had the same political ideal. They should also not forget that once upon a time Hindus were not only the masters of India but of the neighbouring countries also.[84]

Fida Husain, who called himself a "strong supporter of the Muslim League", wrote from Rawalpindi that the ideal of Pakistan was bound to end in smoke. His conclusion was based on his own Shia convictions. The British were impartial in their religious policy, but would the Pakistan supporters answer one question: "Will Shias be allowed to commemorate the holy month of Moharram peacefully and in the manner they do under a foreign domination? Will it not end in bloodshed, revenge and vengeance?" Secondly, in a Pakistan the various sects of Muslims would bring their differences into the open and thus start an endless struggle; such "trivial controversies" did not exist under British rule. In short, the Pakistan plan was an impossible dream. "Religiously, the scheme is an illusion. Politically, much ink has already been wasted."[85] It is quite true that Fida Husain's opposition to Pakistan was widely shared by his Shia sect. Even in the early and middle 'forties, when almost the whole of Muslim India backed a partition and voted for the Pakistan plan of the Muslim League, the All India Shia Political Conference maintained its anti-Pakistan stand, asked its members to vote against the League, and its president, Lalbhai Lalji, opposed Jinnah in the election to the central legislature from the Bombay constituency (and lost his deposit).

Malhotra's castigation of the Pakistan plan was answered by Avaice Asar, who assured the Hindu that it did not amount to

depriving other communities of their legitimate rights. The Muslims were demanding what had always been and now was theirs. They had no aggressive motives and no plans to take over Hindustan. On the contrary, they felt that Hindustan was anxious to annex Pakistan; hence their apprehensions about the future. Malhotra's reminder that the Hindus had once ruled over areas even outside India evoked the counter-warning that Muslim rule over the sub-continent was more recent history, and that by the Hindu's own logic the Muslims could lay claim to the whole of India. As for nationalism, the concept of an Indian nationalism was as much worth as Asian or World nationalism. Hindu nationalism was a reality; Indian nationalism was a myth. He drew Malhotra's attention to another dimension of the problem. The people of Pakistan, both Hindus and Muslims, were now being economically exploited by the self-seeking interests of the industrialists and traders of Ahmedabad, Bombay and Cawnpore. Was it not to the benefit of all living in this area to join hands and keep the wealth of the country within it?[86]

Fida Husain was taken to task for his sectarian outlook by Muhammd Rafique Toosy. In a long letter, he reminded Fida that the recent Shia-Sunni riots in the United Provinces had been incited by the Ahrars and the Deobandis, both of whom belonged to the Congress and were hand-in-glove with the provincial Congress administration. Such an eventuality was not likely to arise in a purely Muslim state.[87]

Mirza Abdul Aziz Beg of Jullundher also replied to Malhotra's criticism. After arguing for a separate Muslim nationalism, he asserted that "in the eyes of a large number of sane people in the country, the scheme [of Pakistan] offers the only lasting solution of the grave communal problem which is eating into the very vitals of Indian life and politics". As for its practicability, some difficulties would arise, but the benefits accruing from it would be greater. "No sacrifice is too great for the peace and prosperity it will assuredly bestow in [*sic.*] India. Not the mightiest force in the world can prevent the realization of the Pakistan plan if it embodies the just grievances of the Indian Muslims." Replying to the point that the Hindus had lived in India longer than the Muslims, Beg noticed that "priority in time does not establish in these days the superiority of a particular community to all others who have appeared later". By Malhotra's logic, the aboriginals of

India, the Ghonds and the Bhils, should be placed on the pedestal of power and all Hindus and Muslims should either migrate or acquiesce in the regime of these antique predecessors.[88]

This analysis of the contents of the Punjab press of 1936-40 (inevitably based on incomplete files) demonstrates the extent of Rahmat Ali's influence on the newspaper-reading public. These writings exist, and can neither be wished away nor dismissed as void of any significance. When the entire press of a province devotes its columns to the propagation and defence of the message of one man, his impact on the thinking sector of the people is proved to be decisive and incontestable.

But there is yet more evidence pointing to the same conclusion. In 1937-38, Rahmat Ali's supporters formed several associations and societies with the express purpose of spreading his idea in an organized way. As we have seen, there existed in 1939 a Tahrik-i-Pakistan in Rawalpindi, and an Anjuman-i-Khalida and a Pakistan Association in Lahore. We don't know anything about these three organizations. But the Anjuman-i-Khalida must have been a very lively body to be able to enlist the sympathies of leaders like Abdullah Haroon, Aurungzeb and the Nawab of Mamdot—the Muslim League leaders of Sind, NWFP and the Punjab, respectively. There might have been several other societies working towards the same end, of which we don't have any record because all the newspapers of that period have not been preserved. For example, some writers have mentioned the Inter-Collegiate Brotherhood of Lahore, which appears to have been a society of Muslim students from all colleges of the city. It supported Rahmat Ali and circulated some material on Pakistan. Whether it later merged with the Punjab Muslim Students Federation or just withered away is not definitely known.

There were, however, four associations about which we have documentary information.

Probably the earliest body was the Tahrik-i-Khilafat-i-Pakistan, which was founded by Ibrahim Ali Chishti in 1937. He prepared and published his scheme and a map to go with it in the same year. Later, in 1939, the Punjab Muslim Students Federation adopted it as its goal and presented a detailed scheme of "Khilafat-i-Pakistan".

The Punjab Muslim Students Federation was founded in the same year, 1937, by a group consisting of Khan Abdus Sattar

Khan Niazi, Hamid Nizami, Aftab Ahmad Qarshi and Abdus Salam Khurshid. It was the first well-organized representative Muslim body in India to officially own the idea and the word of Pakistan. From its inception it continued to press the Muslim League and Jinnah to adopt the Pakistan scheme.[89]

In the same year Khurshid Alam and Abdullah Anwar Beg founded the Alamgir Association in Lahore. It was under the inspiration of this body that the mid-1938 campaign of writing articles on Rahmat Ali and Pakistan in the Urdu press was started and organized. Authors were approached to write on the subject, and their contributions were sent to the local newspapers. It was through its efforts that some articles were also published in Sind, Kashmir and NWFP.[90]

When this publicity campaign started showing some results and more supporters were forthcoming, it was decided, in June 1938, to establish a Majlis-i-Pakistan. The founding fathers were Khurshid Alam, Abdullah Anwar Beg and Ahmad Bashir. They began with establishing an office in Lahore, but very soon branches sprang up in towns like Lyallpur, Sialkot, Amritsar and Kamalia, and one also in Karachi. Their activities were reported regularly in *Ehsan*, *Inqilab* and *Zamindar*, the three most influential Urdu newspapers of Lahore.

In June or early July 1938 the first Majlis was established in Lyallpur. Reporting this, Khurshid Alam said that the Lyallpur body should consider itself as a branch of the central organization which would soon be established in Lahore under the leadership of Rahmat Ali, who was returning shortly "to Pakistan"; then all other bodies would be affiliated to the Lahore centre.[91] In its first meeting the Lyallpur Majlis chairman, Muhammad Shafi, declared that it wanted Rahmat Ali to come and take over the control of the movement; but it was necessary to create, before his arrival, a congenial atmosphere so that he would not have to start afresh.[92] In July a branch was set up in Sialkot.[93]

In August, it was reported that the movement was becoming popular in Sind and Baluchistan, and *Al-Wahid*, the Sindhi newspaper of Karachi, was supporting it and had published a Sindhi translation of the chapter on Rahmat Ali in Halide Edib's book.[94] The Lyallpur branch was being looked after by Chaudhri Muhammad Shafi, Riaz and Khaliq Qureshi.[95]

Reports from Karachi, Amritsar and Kamalia were encourag-

ing.[96] In a meeting of the Lyallpur Majlis on 28 September, a long speech on the Pakistan movement was made by a Deobandi scholar, Mawlana Muhammad Muslim Usmani.[97] The Sialkot branch held a meeting on 28 January 1939 under the chairmanship of A. Faruq Rahmatullah. One of the resolutions passed offered the Majlis's services to the Nizam of Hyderabad, declaring that the "youth of Pakistan will shed its last drop of blood in protecting and maintaining this last memorial of Islamic civilization and culture in India [Hyderabad Deccan]".[98]

The Majlis-i-Kabir-i-Pakistan (The Great Pakistan Society) came into being in Lahore on 13 January 1939. The supporters of Rahmat Ali met at Riaz Manzil on Beadon Road, and, on the initiative of Khurshid Alam, the body was established with Abdullah Anwar Beg as President and Ahmad Bashir as Secretary. A working committee was named, and a sub-committee appointed to draw up the constitution and bye-laws of the association. A resolution was passed thanking all the newspapers, like *Inqilab, Ehsan,* and *Zamindar* of Lahore and *Al-Wahid* of Karachi, for "extending their support to the growth of the Pakistan movement".[99]

The Majlis-i-Kabir used all its resources in getting material in its favour published in the press and in trying to influence the important public figures to share its views. Letters and appeals were sent to Jinnah, Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Rajendra Prasad and the Viceroy, conveying the determination of the Muslims to have a Pakistan and nothing else in the future constitutional shake-up of the sub-continent. More branches were opened to carry the new message to the distant parts of the north-west. In places like Delhi, Srinagar, Rawalpindi, Jehlum, Wazirabad, Peshawar, Multan and Amritsar either affiliated branches were opened or some people were found who were in sympathy with the movement and were prepared to work on its behalf in their individual capacity. The members and office-bearers of the Majlis also met prominent leaders and explained to them their point of view and the background of the Pakistan idea. Public opinion was sought to be influenced by holding open meetings and inviting the well-informed persons to address the people and elaborate the ideals of the movement. By these means a solid effort was made to change the direction of Muslim politics.[100] According to Mian Kifait Ali, Gandhi never replied to, or acknowledged, or com-

ing.[96] In a meeting of the Lyallpur Majlis on 28 September, a long speech on the Pakistan movement was made by a Deobandi scholar, Mawlana Muhammad Muslim Usmani.[97] The Sialkot branch held a meeting on 28 January 1939 under the chairmanship of A. Faruq Rahmatullah. One of the resolutions passed offered the Majlis's services to the Nizam of Hyderabad, declaring that the "youth of Pakistan will shed its last drop of blood in protecting and maintaining this last memorial of Islamic civilization and culture in India [Hyderabad Deccan]".[98]

The Majlis-i-Kabir-i-Pakistan (The Great Pakistan Society) came into being in Lahore on 13 January 1939. The supporters of Rahmat Ali met at Riaz Manzil on Beadon Road, and, on the initiative of Khurshid Alam, the body was established with Abdullah Anwar Beg as President and Ahmad Bashir as Secretary. A working committee was named, and a sub-committee appointed to draw up the constitution and bye-laws of the association. A resolution was passed thanking all the newspapers, like *Inqilab, Ehsan,* and *Zamindar* of Lahore and *Al-Wahid* of Karachi, for "extending their support to the growth of the Pakistan movement".[99]

The Majlis-i-Kabir used all its resources in getting material in its favour published in the press and in trying to influence the important public figures to share its views. Letters and appeals were sent to Jinnah, Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Rajendra Prasad and the Viceroy, conveying the determination of the Muslims to have a Pakistan and nothing else in the future constitutional shake-up of the sub-continent. More branches were opened to carry the new message to the distant parts of the north-west. In places like Delhi, Srinagar, Rawalpindi, Jehlum, Wazirabad, Peshawar, Multan and Amritsar either affiliated branches were opened or some people were found who were in sympathy with the movement and were prepared to work on its behalf in their individual capacity. The members and office-bearers of the Majlis also met prominent leaders and explained to them their point of view and the background of the Pakistan idea. Public opinion was sought to be influenced by holding open meetings and inviting the well-informed persons to address the people and elaborate the ideals of the movement. By these means a solid effort was made to change the direction of Muslim politics.[100] According to Mian Kifait Ali, Gandhi never replied to, or acknowledged, or com-

mented publicly on the letters sent to him by the Majlis. Some Congress leaders, like Rajendra Prasad and Nehru, wrote back, often asking for further information on the subject of Pakistan. Jinnah was approached, but showed no interest. The Muslim League took no notice of the activities of the Majlis and did not even try to make contact with it. The Majlis used some interesting means of publicity. Handbills were distributed at railway stations and a large number of their copies put in the compartments of all classes in the trains. Pamphlets were left on the banks of the Ravi river to be noticed and picked up by the thousands of Hindus who went there to bathe. Bundles of propaganda material were placed at different points in the Lawrence Gardens (the largest park in Lahore) in the hope that the early morning walkers would see them and take them home for reading.[101] The Majlis was active till March 1940. Once the All India Muslim League owned the idea, the task of whipping up support for it was taken over by the party. The Majlis was not formally wound up; its members joined the Muslim League. The entire record of the association has been lost.[102]

In addition to the established press which was cultivated so well by the movement that the bulk of it came over to its side, some magazines and journals were established especially to propound and defend the Pakistan idea. We have some information on the Urdu weekly of Abbotabad called *Pakistan;* in 1937, as we have seen, Rahmat Ali had asked Ghulam Ahmad to try to get its copies and send them to him in Cambridge. It was started in 1935 by Sayyid Ghulam Hasan Kazmi, the nephew and son-in-law of Agha Lal Shah (a former editor of the *Zamindar* of Lahore).[103] If the date is correct, it must have been the first magazine in India, or anywhere else, to carry that title and to be brought out in support of Rahmat Ali's idea. The other journal, to which reference was made earlier, was the *Pakistan Weekly* of Lucknow. It was started "probably in 1938" by Ziauddin Kirmani, a lecturer at the University of Lucknow, with the express purpose of popularizing Rahmat Ali's ideas.[104]

We have some indications of the non-Muslim reaction to Rahmat Ali's plans in the Punjab. Joshua Fazluddin, a Lahore lawyer and a Christian leader, agreed with Rahmat Ali that the Punjab should be separated from India. But the plan of merging it with a Pakistan was a "communal move". The goal should be "a

great and separate Punjab which will not belong to any community".[105]

This Christian response was a benign comment in comparison to what the Hindus were saying. The most noted Hindu critic among the educated class was Professor Gulshan Rai. His disapproval was as strong as it was virulent. The supporters of Pakistan "think that these provinces and States should be governed by the Muslim Law of the Middle Ages". This was "what may be called a Pakistan mentality" which "is possessed by a very influential section of the Muslim population". He warned that if the Muslims of north India wanted the co-operation of the non-Muslims in the future administration of the country, "they must make a final good-bye to the chimerical idea of Pakistan, and consider themselves Indians first and last".[106] The *Daily Herald* of Lahore of course rejected the idea in 1936, but by entitling its leading article as "Pakistanis and Congressmen", it marked an acceptance of the new word and its derivatives.[107] Similarly, *Pratap,* a Hindu Urdu daily, used the word Pakistan in its headlines, meaning communalism.[108] The *Hindu* of Lahore was plainly abusive in describing the Punjab Muslim press's approval of the Pakistan idea. The Muslims had been licking the bone of communalism for some fifteen or twenty years. With some difficulty the filthy bone was taken away from their mouths and thrown away on to the dung heap. Now the Muslim newspapers of Lahore had once again picked up the dirty mouthful. The truth was that a dog never left a bone alone. Since the bone had lain for so long amid the garbage, the mouths and gullets of the Muslim press were emitting stench.[109] The Urdu original of this piece is more revolting than this English version.

On the whole, the Congress leaders did not think it worth their while to pass comment on an idea for which the Muslim League had yet shown no love. They kept their powder dry until March 1940. But the All India Hindu Mahasabha had more foresight and less patience. In his presidential address at the Ahmedabad annual session of the party in 1937, V.D. Savarkar thundered in wrath as if the Muslim League had already adopted the Pakistan scheme. Talking of the League's objection to the singing of the Hindu song of Bande Mataram on official occasions in the provinces ruled by the Congress, he said the Muslims would not be satisfied till "Hindusthan" or "Bharat" was called "Pakastan", and a national

song composed by an Iqbal or Jinnah himself in chaste Urdu hailed "Hindusthan as a Pakastan–the land dedicated to Muslim domination". He warned his audience of the "audacious proposal openly debated in the League regarding the Muslim demand to cut up the body-politic of our Motherland right in two parts–the Mahomedan India and the Hindu India–aiming to form a separate Muslim country Pakastan".[110]

It is noticeable that these declarations of Hindu hostility to the idea of Pakistan came much earlier than Muslim statements in approval of it. It was in 1938 that the idea really caught on, as is reflected in the Lahore press. But Gulshan Rai wrote in March 1935, the *Daily Herald* in March 1936, the *Pratap* in June 1937, and Savarkar spoke in 1937. This leads to two speculations. First, the Hindu realization of the danger posed by Pakistan to their ambitions was prior to the Muslim appreciation of the security implicit in the scheme of division. Secondly, part of Muslim sympathy for Rahmat Ali's plan might have been evoked by Hindu opposition; communal relations being what they were, anything condemned so strongly by the Hindus had to have something good in Muslim eyes. This does not detract from the inherent strength of the idea or from Rahmat Ali's originality and influence. It merely explains why the Hindus were first in the field with their shields before the Muslims appeared with their swords.

Enough evidence has been produced above to show Rahmat Ali's impact on the thinking of the Indian, particularly Punjabi, Muslim. A yet more convincing proof can be adduced from the schemes and proposals made by various Muslim individuals and groups between 1933 and 1940. Most of them carry a direct or indirect impress of his ideas. Those which favour a partition are obvious reflections of his original suggestion. A hurried look at these schemes and their makers will bring out two points: the large debt they owed to one man, and the reluctance of most to acknowledge the debt.

Between January 1933 (publication of *Now or Never*) and March 1940 (Muslim League's Lahore Resolution), twenty-nine suggestions were made; twenty-four were for the creation of an independent Muslim state in the north-west, and five for some sort of a zonal or confederal or abnormally federal arrangement.

In June 1933, Khan Bahadur Haji Rahim Bakhsh of Lahore made a case for a separate Muslim nationalism and the right of the

Muslims to their "self-expression through what would be Hindu India or Muslim India respectively". Some of his phrases were borrowed from Rahmat Ali, but there was no direct reference to the source.[111] In September, F.E. Holsinger presented his plan for splitting India into Hindu and Muslim dominions. His list of thirteen dominions included one made up of the NWFP and Muslim districts of the Punjab. Twelve of the bigger native states, implicitly covering Kashmir, could be turned into kingdoms.[112]

In January 1935, Gulshan Rai, probably realizing the inevitability of some kind of Pakistan, recommended a partition of the Punjab on Hindu-Muslim lines.[113] In June or July 1936, Hubert Calvert, an ICS officer who had spent 37 years in the Punjab, published the *Wealth and Welfare of the Punjab,* in which he suggested the creation of a new federation consisting of the Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir State, NWFP, Baluchistan and Sind. His argument was that in the Indian federation the commercial and industrial interests of Bombay would be so strong that the central government would be forced to adopt a protectionist policy which would mean the imposition of a greater burden of indirect taxation on the agricultural consumers of the Punjab.[114] Though the argument is purely economic, the proposed federation is identical with the one demanded by Rahmat Ali. In the same year was published *Magna Britannia,* the work of another Indian administrator, in which he reported a Muslim plan for amalgamating Afghanistan with the north-west Muslim India and setting up a large Muslim state.[115]

Four schemes appeared in 1937. Muhammad Yusuf Yaqub Kheirati of Karachi wrote a four-page leaflet entitled *Islamabad tahrik kya hay*?, which demanded an independent Muslim state in the north-west (larger than Rahmat Ali's Pakistan) to be called Islamabad. He sent a copy to Rahmat Ali in March, with a letter saying, "If you are serious about your ideas, then 'Pakistan' [two words illegible: 'go by'?] and take up 'Islamabad' as the object of your concentration. Open the parties [*sic.*] Foreign Office at yours and supply me information".[116] Rahmat Ali's reply is not available. In May-June, Muhammad Iqbal, the poet, in his letters to Jinnah, talked of self-determination and suggested a separate federation of Muslim provinces in the north-west and north-east of India.[117] In July, Muhammad Hashim Gazdar of Sind wrote to Jinnah, asking him to consider the plan of an independent Muslim

song composed by an Iqbal or Jinnah himself in chaste Urdu hailed "Hindusthan as a Pakastan–the land dedicated to Muslim domination". He warned his audience of the "audacious proposal openly debated in the League regarding the Muslim demand to cut up the body-politic of our Motherland right in two parts–the Mahomedan India and the Hindu India–aiming to form a separate Muslim country Pakastan".[110]

It is noticeable that these declarations of Hindu hostility to the idea of Pakistan came much earlier than Muslim statements in approval of it. It was in 1938 that the idea really caught on, as is reflected in the Lahore press. But Gulshan Rai wrote in March 1935, the *Daily Herald* in March 1936, the *Pratap* in June 1937, and Savarkar spoke in 1937. This leads to two speculations. First, the Hindu realization of the danger posed by Pakistan to their ambitions was prior to the Muslim appreciation of the security implicit in the scheme of division. Secondly, part of Muslim sympathy for Rahmat Ali's plan might have been evoked by Hindu opposition; communal relations being what they were, anything condemned so strongly by the Hindus had to have something good in Muslim eyes. This does not detract from the inherent strength of the idea or from Rahmat Ali's originality and influence. It merely explains why the Hindus were first in the field with their shields before the Muslims appeared with their swords.

Enough evidence has been produced above to show Rahmat Ali's impact on the thinking of the Indian, particularly Punjabi, Muslim. A yet more convincing proof can be adduced from the schemes and proposals made by various Muslim individuals and groups between 1933 and 1940. Most of them carry a direct or indirect impress of his ideas. Those which favour a partition are obvious reflections of his original suggestion. A hurried look at these schemes and their makers will bring out two points: the large debt they owed to one man, and the reluctance of most to acknowledge the debt.

Between January 1933 (publication of *Now or Never*) and March 1940 (Muslim League's Lahore Resolution), twenty-nine suggestions were made; twenty-four were for the creation of an independent Muslim state in the north-west, and five for some sort of a zonal or confederal or abnormally federal arrangement.

In June 1933, Khan Bahadur Haji Rahim Bakhsh of Lahore made a case for a separate Muslim nationalism and the right of the

state comprising the four Muslim provinces of the north-west. "Without this I have despaired of any economic, political and educational improvement of Muslim masses of these provinces."[118] In the same year, as mentioned above, Ibrahim Ali Chishti founded the Tahrik-i-Khilafat-i-Pakistan, devoted to the realization of Rahmat Ali's Pakistan with the additional features of more Indian territory and the Islamic fundamentalist nature of the state.

Another four plans were presented in 1938. In October the Sind Provincial Muslim League took the courageous and unparalleled step of demanding a partition of India. Jinnah resolutely opposed the decision which was mainly the work of Seth Abdullah Haroon, G.M. Syed, Pir Hissamuddin Rashdi and Abdul Majid Sindhi.[119] In November, Abdus Samad Khan Rajistani, writing from Jaipur, expanded the Pakistan idea of Rahmat Ali and demanded a Muslim federation in the whole of north India, embracing NWFP, Sind, Baluchistan, Punjab, United Provinces, Bihar, Bengal and Assam.[120] At the same time, Jamiluddin Ahmad, a lecturer in English at the Aligarh Muslim University, in his pamphlet, *Is India One Nation?*, asked for a federation of Muslim-majority provinces and states.[121] The last plan offered in this year was presented by Abul Ala Mawdudi, later the founder of the Jamaat-i-Islami, who did not reconcile himself to the creation of Pakistan till his death in 1979. But even he was compelled by current Muslim thinking to propose three possible solutions: India to be an "international federation of States of Federated Nations" (whatever that meant), India to be divided into several cultural zones and these areas to be converted into autonomous states under a weak centre with an exchange of population within twenty-five years, and two separate national federal states of Hindus and Muslims joined on the top in a confederation.[122]

Seven schemes were offered in 1939. In February, Muhammad Sharif Toosy of Wazirabad prescribed the "final solution" of creating one Muslim state in the north-west and one in the north-east.[123] Gulshan Rai's proposal was meant to avoid a Pakistan: separate the eastern divisions of Ambala and Jullundher from the Punjab, and amalgamate Rawalpindi and Multan divisions and a major portion of Lahore division with the NWFP to form a separate Muslim province. This would solve the Hindu-Muslim problem in the Punjab.[124] In the same month, Dr. Abdus Sattar Kheiri, after arguing for a separate nationhood for Muslims, asked them

to demand their right of self-determination in the provinces and states where they were in a majority.[125] In March, Asadullah, a lawyer of Dacca, demanded the whole north of India, where the Muslims could live honourably and securely in a large federation of provinces; Muslim migration from the rest of India to this state would be encouraged and would result in their predominance in one half of the sub-continent.[126] In the same month, Chaudhry Khaliquzzaman suggested to Col. Muirhead, the Under-Secretary of State for India, and Lord Zetland, the Secretary of State, in London that the Muslim-majority areas in the north-west and north-east should be separated from India and allowed to become independent.[127] On his return to Bombay on 12 May, Khaliquzzaman met Jinnah and told him of his proposal. He also explained why "I had opposed to use [*sic.*] the word Pakistan for the scheme", but does not mention this explanation in his autobiography.[128] In July, the Punjab Muslim Students Federation adopted Ibrahim Ali Chishti's 1937 plan and published it as their own as "Khilafat-i-Pakistan" scheme. The Pakistan of this proposal was to be an Islamic state, ruled by a spiritual dictator. It was to include Rahmat Ali's Pakistan and parts of the United Provinces, the Central Provinces and Bihar.[129] The press cutting containing this scheme in the Rahmat Ali papers carries a comment in Urdu, probably in his handwriting: "The irresponsible schemes of this kind are a source of harm to our objectives" (*Is qism ky ghayr zimmadarana skimayn hamaray maqasid ko nuqsan pahuncha rahy hayn*), and a remark in English: "This strikes at the roots of our movement. How indiscrete are the ways of the Inter-Collegiate Muslim Brotherhood." At the place where the newspaper wrote that these plans "are from the Punjab Muslim Students", there is a note in pencil, "Inter-Collegiate Muslim Brotherhood".[130] Finally, in August, the Faqir of Ipi, a tribal leader of the north-west borderland, was reported to be working "for the constitution of a Muslim State in North India".[131]

In the first two months of 1940, four plans were put forth. In January, Muhammad Sharif Toosy reiterated his earlier suggestion of "independent sovereign states in the North-West and North-East". In order to increase the Muslim percentage in the north-western state he prescribed the exclusion from it of the eastern portion of the Punjab and the Hindu and Sikh native states.[132] The other three schemes are vaguely reported without

any details or exact dates. Mawlana Azad Subhani wanted a separate Muslim state which he called Hakumat-i-Rabbani (divine government). Afzal Haq Kashmiri proposed the same thing under a different name, Hakumat-i-Ilahiyya (God's government). Sayyid Rizwanullah, a Muslim League politician from the United Provinces, suggested a division of India into a Hindu and a Muslim state.[133]

The five schemes which in some way stopped short of a clear division were those prepared by Sayyid Abdul Latif of Hyderabad Deccan (1938), a Punjabi (Mian Kifait Ali), Nawab Sir Shahnawaz Khan of Mamdot, Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan, and two dons of the Aligarh University (all in 1939).[134]

With the exception of the Sikandar scheme, all others bore lesser or greater imprint of Rahmat Ali's ideas. Latif's zonal plan was devised expressly to save the culture of Indian Muslims, which was one of Rahmat Ali's major arguments. Mian Kifait Ali was working under the inspiration of Rahmat Ali and was an active member of the Majlis-i-Kabir-i-Pakistan; his inability to propose a clear-cut division, or to christen his state as Pakistan, was forced upon him by Jinnah's instructions. The Mamdot scheme was really the Punjabi scheme with a few riders added to it.[135]

The Aligarh scheme caused bad blood between Rahmat Ali and one of its makers. Dr. Afzaal Husain Qadri had been a strong supporter of Rahmat Ali and a very active member of the PNM in Cambridge. Before his return to Aligarh he had given an undertaking to Rahmat Ali in 1938 to serve as his lieutenant in India and to do his best in spreading his message. Though the Aligarh scheme contained some ideas borrowed from Rahmat Ali, its whole configuration and several of its basic features were opposed to the Pakistan plan. Rahmat Ali wrote to Qadri, demanding an explanation, and Qadri sent him a letter of apology on 8 March 1940 from Aligarh.[136]

NOTES

1. This picture of Rahmat Ali's life in Cambridge is drawn from material supplied by Muhammad Anwar Amin ("Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Satluj*, 12 February 1976, p. 13), Jahangir Khan (quoted in Manzurul Haq Siddiqui, "Batayn Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky", *Sayyara Digest*, March 1978, p. 43), Inayatullah Khan (letter to me, dated 17 August 1970), S. Anwar-ul-Haq (letter to me, dated 17 October 1969), Leonard Hollingworth (letter to me, dated 19 July 1971), and interviews with Miss Watson, Miss Thelma Frost, N.D. Yusuf, I.H. Qureshi, Muhammad Anwar, Ian Stephens, and Mr. X.
2. During his visits to London he stayed at several places. From his papers, letters and bank statements I have been able to compile a (naturally incomplete) list of his London addresses:

1930 (November)	:	10 Albert Road, Regents Park (residence of Sir Umar Hayat Khan Tiwana).
1932 (October)	:	37 St. George's Road, Golders Green, NW 11.
1937 (July)	:	Artillery Mansions, 75 Victoria Street, SW 1.
1937 (Oct.-Dec.)	:	71 Camrose Avenue, Edgware, Middlesex.
1938 (April)	:	109 Vancouver Road, Edgware, Middlesex.
1938 (Summer)	:	3 Clovelly Avenue, Colindeep Lane, Colindale, NW 9.
1938-39	:	23 The Loning, Hendon, NW 9.

3. Mian Kifait Ali, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan ka aghaz", *Musawat*, 14 August 1970. This was told to Kifait Ali by Muhammad Din Tasir in 1935. Tasir later became principal of Islamia College, Lahore.
4. Interview with Muhammad Anwar. Baqir later became principal of the Oriental College, Lahore.
5. Their names and the fact of their dislike for Rahmat Ali and the PNM are mentioned in a letter from Abdus Samad written from Cambridge to Rahmat Ali on 4 February 1938, *RAR*; interview with I.H. Qureshi.

6. Ata Muhammad Khan Leghari, from "Almanzar", Benson, Oxford, to Rahmat Ali, dated 25 June 1937, *RAR*.
7. These names are mentioned in various papers in *RAR*. Letters from at least two of them are available; see following notes; interviews with I.H. Qureshi, Inayatullah Khan, N.D. Yusuf, K.A. Waheed, and Miss Frost.
8. Aziz Ahmad, from 109 Wilberforce Road, Finsbury Park, London, to Rahmat Ali, dated 27 February 1936, *RAR*.
9. A. Waheed, from 37 Chepstow Villas, London, W11, to Rahmat Ali, dated 15 February 1938, *RAR*.
10. Muhammad Yusuf Khan, from 8 Fraser Road, Cambridge, to Rahmat Ali, dated 25 April 1938, *RAR*.
11. Muhammad Yusuf Khan, "Pakistan and Pakish Nationalism", *RAR*.
12. Khwaja Ghulam Ahmad, from Lahore, to Rahmat Ali, dated 23 September 1937; original in the Pakistan National Museum, Karachi, photocopy in *RAA*.
13. Khwaja Ghulam Ahmad, from Jullundher, to Rahmat Ali, dated 21 January 1938, *ibid.*
14. Khwaja Ghulam Ahmad, from Jullundher, to Rahmat Ali, dated 10 February 1938, *ibid.*
15. Khwaja Ghulam Ahmad, from Jullundher, to Rahmat Ali, dated 19-20 July 1938, *ibid.*
16. Ghulam Mustafa "Pakistani", from Lahore, to Rahmat Ali, dated 17 March 1938, *ibid.*
17. Ghulam Mustafa, from Gujerat, to Rahmat Ali, dated 30 May 1938, *ibid.* Another letter from Ghulam Mustafa also addressed Rahmat Ali as "Quaid-i-Azam" (from Lahore, dated 30 April, with no year given), *ibid.*
18. Malik Muhammad Khan, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan ky faramosh kary", *Sayyara Digest*, April 1978, p. 108.
19. Muhammad Yusuf Khan, from 8 Fraser Road, Cambridge, to Rahmat Ali, dated 6 January 1939, *RAR*; Rahmat Ali's correspondence with Messrs. Foister and Jagg of Cambridge, *RAR*; interviews with Muhammad Anwar, Miss Watson, and Miss Frost.
20. Al-Haj Chaudhri Amjad Khan (who was studying engineering in England from 1937 onwards), quoted in Mukhtar Ali Rahmani, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali nay ghayr mamalik mayn rah kar jang-i-azadi lary", *Jang*, 14 August 1978.

21. "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1975.
22. Maqbul Ahmad Ansari, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 18 February 1979; and S.M.K. Wasti, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
23. Interview with Miss Frost.
24. The typewritten circular letter in *RAR*.
25. The typewritten subscription form in *RAR*.
26. Correspondence between the manager and Rahmat Ali, *RAR*; also *RCPB*.
27. Some statements of account and used cheques are preserved in *RAR*. The London account was a small one in 1938-39, with only a few pounds coming in and paid out. Some of the persons in whose names the cheques were made out were Dr. M. Jahangir Khan of London, Dr. M.M. Ahmad of Oxford, Mr. S.A. Khan of Cambridge, and Mrs. H. Jones (probably his landlady, for the cheques are weekly and always for £ 5). Only one large amount was paid in: £ 100 on 9 March 1939.
28. A blank sheet from this pad was sent to me by M. Khurshid Alam, now in *RAA*. The die of the map was made by Messrs. S. Sirkett of 13 New Street Hill, London, EC4; G.W. Sirkett's letter of 18 August 1938 to Khan Abdus Samad, 3 Clovelly Avenue, Colindeep Lane, Colindale, NW9, *RAR*.
29. The original in *RAR*.
30. Letter from Mahmud (no initials), from Marburg, Germany, to Rahmat Ali, dated 20 July 1937, *RAR*. In this letter Mahmud says that he has secured admission into Oxford and would soon be coming there; most probably he was M.M. Ahmad of Aligarh, then studying philosophy at Marburg. Later he became professor of philosophy at Aligarh, and after 1947 joined the Karachi University.
31. This is indicated in letters from Tarik bin Taimoor (of Muscat), from Frankfurt, to Rahmat Ali, dated 25 July 1937, and from Akhtar Imam, from Bonn, dated 2 December 1937, *RAR*. There is also a reference to his visit to Berlin in *RCPB*, Vol. I, but no date is mentioned.
32. Rais Amrohawi, "Pakistan 1937 mayn", *Jang*, 6 January 1978, who reproduces Dr. Akhtar Imam's letter. Imam, a former member of the Pakistan Foreign Service, resigned

his appointment in sheer disgust at the sight of corruption rampant in his service and left Pakistan to live in Sri Lanka. For an interim survey of Walidi's life and work see an unsigned article on him in *Die Welt des Islams*, Band 14, 1932, pp. 22-25.

33. Chaudhri Amjad, quoted in Maqbul Ahmad Ansari, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Jang*, 18 February 1979.
34. His passport shows that he got a visa for the USA from the American Consulate-General in London on 2 February 1939, and arrived in Boston on 23 April. His passport (no. 242442) had been issued on 13 July 1934. It was renewed at Boston by the British Consul till 13 July 1944.
35. Rahmat Ali, from Boston, to Khurshid Alam, dated 9 July 1939; postmark on the evelope is 11 July. The letter and the envelope sent to me by Khurshid Alam, *RAA*.
36. The article on Rahmat Ali in *Torquay Directory–South Devon Journal* (Torquay) of 12 September 1934 was entitled "Indian White Paper Proposals–Muslim Opposition–Special Interview with Leader of New Pakistan Movement". The journal "was an independent newspaper giving full coverage to local news. The newspaper also gave lists of local entertainments, visitors, hotels, etc. It ceased to be an independent publication in 1973 when it was incorporated into the *Newton Abbot Times*". Letter from Superintendent, The British Library, Newspaper Library, London, to the author, dated 15 March 1982, *RAA*. Its Urdu translation by Khurshid Alam was published in the *Inqilab* of 3 September 1938.
37. "Pakistan", *The Daily Telegraph*, 9 September 1935. An Urdu translation of this note was published in the *Inqilab* of 20 November 1938.
38. *Irish Independent*, 21 October 1935. Some Indian Muslim newspapers reproduced it on 22 November. An Urdu translation appeared in the *Inqilab* of 6 September 1938.
39. T. Frost, Letter, *Great Britain and the East*, 19 November 1936. Its Urdu translation was published in the *Inqilab* of 20 November 1938.
40. F. Yeats-Brown, "I've Seen Them Fight on the N.W. Frontier", *Daily Mail*, 16 April 1937. Francis Yeats-Brown (1886-1944) served in India, 1906-14; assistant editor, *Spectator*, 1926-28; author of several books on India.

41. Alice Forrester, Letter, *The Morning Post*, 14 June 1937.
42. M.I. Khan, Letter, *ibid.*, 12 July 1937.
43. Major W.R.J. Ellis, Letter, *ibid.*, 21 July 1937.
44. A. Forrester, Letter, *ibid.*, 7 August 1937.
45. For full details see K.K. Aziz, *Britain and Muslim India*, London, 1963.
46. Dr. Karlheinz Neunheuser, "Sinn und Ziel der Pakistan National-Bewegung in Indien", *Volkischer Beobachter*, 12 December 1937, no. 346, p. 5.
47. Letter from Muhammad Abus Saeed Khan, abroad P. and O. *Maloja*, from Marseilles, to Rahmat Ali, dated 12 January 1939, *RAR*.
48. Shakib Arsalan (1869-1946) was born in the Lebanon. Son of Hamud bin Hassan al-Arsalani, he received his education under Mari Shahin Salman and Asad Faisal, then at the American School in his village ('Ain 'Alub), the Madrasat-ul-Hikma of Beirut, the Madrasat-ul-Sultaniyya of Beirut where he was a pupil of Muhammad Abduh, and at Damascus. From then onwards he was often on the move. In Egypt he contributed several articles to *Al-Ahram*. In 1890 he went to Turkey where he met Jamaluddin "al-Afghani". In 1892 he was in France, and made the acquaintance of Ahmad Shawqi, the well-known Arab poet. He returned to the Lebanon in 1908, served the government, and was later elected a member of the Ottoman parliament from Syria. In 1911, when Italy invaded Libya, we find him in Egypt and (in disguise) in Tripoli to help the Libyans fight the invaders. Next year he went to Turkey and was appointed Inspector for the Egyptian Red Cross. In 1914 he established a school in Medina. After that he was a roving self-appointed missionary in exile and working for Arab unity, Ottoman strength and Islamic brotherhood. He was not allowed entry into Lebanon by the French mandatory power, and spent many years in Switzerland. Though "not particularly religious, he was wholeheartedly dedicated to the idea of the Islamic state; he wanted to see Islam able to stand up to Europe which he passionately detested". In him "Islamism and Ottomanism found one of their strongest exponents. . . . He saw Islamic unity as the only foundation upon which political action could be built and the Ottoman

caliphate as the only power capable of providing this foundation. . . . After the war he upheld a pan-Arab ideology founded on the principle of pan-Islamism and practically indistinguishable from it" (Hashim Sharabi, *Arab Intellectuals and the West*, Baltimore, 1970, pp. 110-123). For Arsalan see also E. Levi-Provencal, "L'Emir Shakib Arsalan (1869-1946)", *Cahiers de l'Orient Contemporain* (1947), pp. 5-19 and Ahmad Al-Sharbasi, "Shakib Arsalan: R'ayia al-'Aruba wal Islam" (Shakib Arsalan: Missionary of Arabism and Islam), an unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Khartoum

49. The file of *Les Nations Arabes* is not available to me. But I was told on good authority that such an article appeared in it. Rahmat Ali's secretary confirmed this.
50. Letter from G.L. Schanzlin, from Upland, Indiana, to Rahmat Ali, dated 17 September 1938, *RAR*.
51. G.L. Schanzlin, "Pakistan Considered Historically", MS. in *RAR*.
52. For a detailed discussion of these factors see K.K. Aziz *The Making of Pakistan*, London, 1967.
53. Mian Kifait Ali, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan ka aghaz", *Musawat* 14 August 1970.
54. Associated Press of India report, *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 4 February 1936.
55. Full text of the letter in Waheed Ahmad (ed.), *Letters of Mian Fazl-i-Husain* (Lahore, 1976), pp. 429-435.
56. Text in *ibid.*, p. 481.
57. Editorial Comment, "Pakistan", *Zamzam*, 3 August 1938.
58. Muhammad Yunus, "Pakistan", *ibid.*, 19 August 1938.
59. "Bahas-wa-Mazakira" column, *ibid.*, 23 December 1938
60. Complete files for 1936-40 of any of these newspapers are not available. From various sources (my special thanks to Khurshid Alam and Ahmad Saeed) I have been able to collect about 50 items, most of them belonging to only one year, 1938. I am certain that if all issues of these papers are procured and consulted, there may well be found a few hundred contributions in support and praise of Rahmat Ali and his idea. If the search is successfully extended to other parts of India, the writings may be counted in thousands. What I have in my possession is the following (excluding the dozens of letters and contributions which were pu

lished in *The Civil and Military Gazette*): Saracen, "Pakistan Ideal and Palestine Partition", *The Eastern Times*, 16 July 1937; M.S.T., "Are the Muslims a Minority in India? Another Scheme to Solve the Communal Question", *ibid.*, 3 February 1938; Zoay, "Mujawwaza federation awr tahrik-i-Pakistan", *Ehsan*, 2 May 1938; Zoay, "Gandhi-Jinnah guftugu", *ibid.*, 16 May 1938; Aik Pakistani, "Pakistan", *ibid.*, 20 June 1938; Jahangard, "Pakistan", *ibid.*, 13 June 1938; Didawar, "Pakistan", *ibid.*, 26 June 1938; Dusra Pakistani, "Pakistan", *ibid.*, 29 June 1938; Khalida Adib Khanum, "Pakistan", *ibid.*, 11 July 1938; Khalida Adib Khanum, "Pakistan", *Inqilab*, 12 July 1938; Zoay, "Federal dastur kay 'tahaffuzat' awr congressi waday", *Ehsan*, 18 July 1938; Didawar, "Pakistan", *ibid.*, 1 August 1938; Nukta Ras, "Pakistan", *Inqilab*, 2 August 1938; Jahangard, "Pakistan: chand itarazat ka jawab", *Zamzam*, 15 August 1938, and *Ehsan*, 15 August 1938; Khaliq Qureshi, "Pakistan jughrafyayi awr qudraty haysyat say", *Ehsan*, 22 August 1938, and *Inqilab*, 23 August 1938; Zoay, "Musalman awr fawji talim", *Ehsan*, 22 August 1938; Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan: baqai-i-qawm wa tahaffuz-i-watan", *Inqilab*, 23 August 1938; Farida Jahan Begum, "Pakistan", *ibid.*, 8 September 1938; A Liberal Partisan, "Pakstan", *The New Times*, 13 September 1938; Jahangard, "Pakistan", *Inqilab*, 17 September 1938; Eessa Nafass, "Creation of Pakistan only Alternative to Perpetual Hindu-Muslim Civil War", *The Eastern Times*, 30 September 1938; Farida Jahan, "Islam awr Pakistan", *Inqilab*, 1 October 1938; Muhammad Shafi Chauhan, "Pakistan awr is ky jughrafiyai haysyat", *Zamindar*, 2 October 1938; Muhammad Shafi Chauhan, "Pakistan jughrafiyai haysyat say", *Inqilab*, 5 October 1938; Aik Pakistani, "Hindustan ky lassany taqsim", *Ehsan*, 10 October 1938; Eessa Nafass, "The Creation of Pakistan", *The New Times*, 11 October 1938; Eessa Nafass, "Pakistan ky zarurat", *Inqilab*, 26 October 1938; A Punjabee, "Hindu-Muslim Relations: Pakistan the only Solution", *The New Times*, 8 and 14 November and 4 December 1938, and 3 February 1939; Kamgar, "Jamhuriyya-i-Turkya aur Pakistan", *Inqilab*, 3 December 1938, and "Congress kay asayb say Pakistan ko bachao", *ibid.*, 31 December 1938; Muhammad Shafi

Chauhan, "Pakistan tamaddani haysyat say", *ibid.*, 10 January 1939; Sattar Kheiri, "Muslims in India are a Nation, not a Minority Community", *The New Times*, 3 February 1939; M.S. Toosy, "Misreading of History of Turkey: Real Lessons for Indian Muslims: Salvation in Separation from Hindu India", *The Eastern Times*, 10 February 1939; Batil Shikan, "Musalmanon ka chiragh-i-hasti gul karnayn kay lyay congressi samryon kay chchumantar: Pakistan kay Musalman hoshiar rahayn", *Zamindar*, 12 February 1939; M.S. Toosy, "Are the Muslims a Minority in India? Demand for Muslim Federations in North-West and North-East Justified", *The Eastern Times*, 24 March 1939; and Jahangard, "Pakistan mayn ghayr mulki propaganda", *Shahbaz*, 14 August 1939.

61. Apart from the articles and other items directly cited, much of my information about this period, the newspapers, the writers and the general *milieu*, comes from Khurshid Alam, who wrote to me several long and very informative letters from Lahore in 1969-70. He was the most prominent and prolific author in this period, writing under the name of "Jahangard". Born on 12 December 1911, and coming from Gujjar Khan, district Rawalpindi, he was educated at the Islamia High School of his home town and at Gordon College, Rawalpindi, from where he graduated in 1932. He worked as a clerk in the office of the Postmaster General at Lahore from 1932 to 1942, in the office of the Director-General of Post and Telegraph, New Delhi, from 1942 to 1947, and the office of the Director-General of Post and Telegraph, Pakistan, Karachi, from 1947 to 1951. After working on the editorial staff of *The Evening Times* of Karachi for a few months, he served as assistant editor of *The Times of Karachi* till December 1958. From there he came to *The Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, of which he became the editor in 1962; but soon he resigned from this paper and joined *The Pakistan Times* in November 1962, working there till May 1963. Since June 1965 he has been editing the *Sayyara Digest* and supervising the editing of *Hikayat* (two well-known and widely-read Urdu monthlies of Lahore).

62. Zoay (the Urdu letter with which the word Zafar begins) Gondal, "Federal dastur kay 'tahaffuzat' awr congressy waday", *Ehsan*, 18 July 1938.

63. *Muslim League* (leading article), 9 October 1938. *Al-Islam*, an English fortnightly of Lahore and an organ of the Anjuman-i-Khuddam-ud-Din, edited by Khwaja Abdul Waheed, reproduced the full text of *Now or Never* on 22 April 1938, pp. 169-171.
64. *Ehsan* (leading article), 7 October 1938. At this time its editor was Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash, who had himself demanded a partition of India in as far back as December 1928.
65. Kamgar, "Congress kay asayb say Pakistan ko bachao", *Inqilab*, 31 December 1938..
66. On 23 March 1966 *Jang* published a colour photograph of its cover, without any details about its publisher, editor or proprietor. The cover was dated 16 December 1938, and carried a message in favour of Pakistan from Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan.
67. *Inqilab*, 25 January 1939.
68. *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 23 May 1939.
69. Full report in *Inqilab* and *Shahbaz*, 14 June 1939. The meeting lasted from 9 P.M. to midnight.
70. A Muslim Correspondent, "What Muslim India Thinks: Are the Muslims a Minority in India?", *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 3 February 1939.
71. *Ibid.* (leader), 3 February 1939. The paper had much earlier reprinted long extracts from *Now or Never*, see the issue of 8 December 1933.
72. Muhammad Sharif Toosy, Letter, *ibid.*, 10 March 1939.
73. Mir Rafique, Letter, *ibid.*, 28 May 1939.
74. Avaice Asar, Letter, *ibid.*, 27 July 1939. This was written in answer to Hindu criticism of Pakistan. He criticized the Congress for standing for a Hindu nation but denying the same right to the Muslims.
75. Avaice Asar, Letter, *ibid.*, 10 August 1939.
76. Ahmad Bashir, Letter, *ibid.*, 15 August 1939.
77. A Pakistani, Letter, *ibid.*, 16 August 1939.
78. Mir Rafique, Letter, *ibid.*, 17 August 1939.
79. Abdur Rashid, Letter, *ibid.*, 15 August 1939.
80. Amjad Husain, Letter, *ibid.*, 18 August 1939.
81. Muhammad Rafique Toosy, Letter, *ibid.*, 20 August 1939.
82. Saifullah Khan, Letter, *ibid.*, 24 August 1939.

83. Abdul Aziz Beg, Letter, *ibid.*, 25 August 1939.
84. Tej Bhan Malhotra, Letter, *ibid.*, 25 August 1939.
85. Fida Husain, Letter, *ibid.*, 29 August 1939.
86. Avaice Asar, Letter, *ibid.*, 30 August 1939.
87. Muhammad Rafique Toosy, Letter, *ibid.*, 31 August 1939.
88. Mirza Abdul Aziz Beg, Letter, *ibid.*, 1 September, 1939.
89. See Aftab Ahmad Qarshi, "Punjab kay tulaba awr tahrik-i-Pakistan", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 14 August 1972.
90. Jahangard (Khurshid Alam), *Shahrah-i-Pakistan* (Lahore, n.d. (? 1964)), p. 134.
91. *Ehsan*, 18 July 1938.
92. *Ibid.*, 28 July 1938, see also the issue of 28 August 1938.
93. *Ibid.*, 1 August 1938.
94. *Inqilab*, 9 August 1938.
95. *Ehsan*, 20 August 1938.
96. *Inqilab*, 16 September 1938.
97. *Ibid.*, 30 September 1938.
98. *Ibid.*, 29 January 1939.
99. *Zamindar*, 25 January 1939.
100. Jahangard (Khurshid Alam), *Shahrah-i-Pakistan* (Lahore, n.d.), pp. 134-135. The author's preface is dated November 1945; Abdullah Anwar Beg's foreword is dated 1946. The book was written between 1941 and 1945.
101. Mian Kifait Ali, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan ka aghaz", *Musawat*, 14 August 1970. There are passing references to the Majlis in Jamiluddin Ahmad, "Evolution of the Concept of Pakistan", *Contemporary Affairs*, Autumn 1969, p. 155, and in *Struggle for Independence: Photographic Album* (Bureau of National Reconstruction, Government of West Pakistan, Lahore, n.d. (? 1970)), p. 8. Otherwise, this vital development in the campaign for the creation of Pakistan has been ignored by contemporary and later historians.
102. Letter from Khurshid Alam to the author, dated 14 November 1969. *RAA*.
103. Sher Bahadur Khan Panni, *Tarikh-i-Hazara* (Abbotabad, 1969), p. 792.
104. Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali awr Tahrik-i-Pakistan", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1976; interview with Sayyid Nazir Niazi who had consulted many newspapers of this period; interviews with K.A. Rashid and K.A. Waheed

who lived through this time.

105. Joshua Fazluddin, "Pakistan", *Inqilab*, 22 July 1938.

106. Gulshan Rai, "The Liberal Nationalist Standpoint: The Pakistan Mentality", *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 30 March 1935. He went on repeating the same points in most of his contributions to this column until 1940.

107. See "Pakistanis and Congressmen" (leading article), *Daily Herald* (Lahore), 23 March 1936.

108. See *Pratap*, 4 June 1937, and several other issues.

109. Quoted in *Inqilab*, 1 September 1938.

110. V.D. Savarkar, *Hindu Sangathan: Its Ideology and Immediate Programme* (Bombay, 1940), pp. 25, 27.

111. Haji Rahim Bakhsh, "The Two Distinct 'Nations' of India", *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 15 June 1933.

112. Frederick F. Holsinger, "Not One Dominion But Many", *Indian Affairs*, September 1933, pp. 176-179.

113. Gulshan Rai, "The National Liberal Standpoint", *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 29 January 1935.

114. Hubert Calvert, *Wealth and Welfare of the Punjab*, London, 1936.

115. John Coatman, *Magna Britannia* (London, 1936), pp. 318-322.

116. Letter and enclosure from Muhammad Yusuf Yaqub Kheirati, from Kheirati House, Chakiwara, Karachi, to Rahmat Ali, dated 18 March 1937. The letter reached Rahmat Ali on 6 April. *RAR*.

117. *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah: A Collection of Iqbal's Letters to the Quaid-i-Azam conveying his Views on the Political Future of Muslim India*, Lahore, n.d., letters of 28 May and 21 June 1937, pp. 14-18, 18-23.

118. M.H. Gazdar to M.A. Jinnah, 10 July 1937, quoted in Lawrence Ziring, "Jinnah: The Burden of Leadership", *World Scholars on Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah* (ed. by A.H. Dani, Islamabad, 1979), p. 406.

119. Full details in Allen H. Jones, "Mr. Jinnah's Leadership and the Evolution of the Pakistan Idea: The Case of the Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference, 1938", in *ibid.*

120. Abdus Samad Khan Rajistani, Letter, *Star of India*, 4 November 1938.

121. Jamiluddin Ahmad, *Is India One Nation?* Aligarh, 1939.

He wrote this towards the end of 1938; his letter to the author from Rawalpindi, dated 9 December 1969.

122. See his three articles in *Tarjuman-ul-Quran*, October, November and December 1938.

123. Muhammad Sharif Toosy, "Misreading of History of Turkey: Real Lessons for Indian Muslims: Salvation in Separation from Hindu India", *The Eastern Times*, 10 February 1939.

124. Gulshan Rai, "The Muslim Minority in India", *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 22 February 1939.

125. Abdus Sattar Kheiri, "90 Million Muslims form Biggest Nation in India", *Star of India*, 25 February 1939.

126. A Muslim Lawyer (Asadullah), Letter, *ibid.*, 22 March 1939. He elaborated the proposal in another letter under his own name, *ibid.*, 4 April 1939.

127. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (Lahore, 1961), pp. 204-206; and Marquess of Zetland, *'Essayez': The Memoirs of Lawrence, Second Marquess of Zetland* (London, 1956), Letter to the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, 28 March 1939, pp. 248-249.

128. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

129. A summary of the scheme, along with a flag and a map, was published in *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 16 July 1939. See also *The Times of India*, 18 July 1939 and *Islamic Culture*, October 1939, p. 500.

130. The clipping with these remarks is in *RAR*; some entries in *RCPB*.

131. This was stated by Pir Ali Muhammad Rashdi, a Sindhi Muslim Leaguer, on his return to Lahore from a tour of the NWFP, *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 9 August 1939; see also *Star of India*, 17 August 1939.

132. M.R.T., "Protection versus Separation: Alternatives before Muslims in Independent India", *The Eastern Times*, 5 January 1940. As Toosy was employed in a government high school in Wazirabad and was as such a civil servant, he wrote under the initials of his brother, Muhammad Rafique Toosy.

133. *Cheragh-i-Rah* (Karachi), Pakistan Number, 1960, p. 212, cited by Sayyid Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Evolution of Pakistan* (Lahore, 1963), p. 193.

134. For the Latif scheme see S.A. Latif, *The Cultural Future of India*, Bombay, 1938, and *The Muslim Problem in India*,

Karachi, 1939; for the Punjabi scheme, A Punjabi, *Confederacy of India,* Lahore, 1939; for the Mamdot scheme, *The Civil and Military Gazette,* 29 June 1939; for the Sikandar scheme, Sikandar Hayat Khan, *Outlines of a Scheme of Indian Federation,* Lahore, 1939; for the Aigarh scheme, Syed Zafrul Hasan and Muhammad Afzaal Husain Qadri, *The Problem of Indian Muslims and its Solution,* Aligarh, 1939.

135. For a detailed discussion of these points, and a full scrutiny of these and all other plans mentioned in this chapter, see my forthcoming *A History of the Idea of Pakistan.*

136. Text of Afzaal Qadri's letter of apology (in Urdu), in *Jadid Science,* August–December 1978, pp. 121-122. Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi tried to defend Afzaal Qadri, by alleging that what really offended Rahmat Ali was that the Aligarh scheme did not mention his name or his Pakistan National Movement (see Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi, "Cambridge mayn Doctor Afzaal Qadri", *ibid.,* pp. 10-11). This is an untruth. Rahmat Ali's letter accused Qadri of disloyalty to the PNM and of producing a scheme which went counter to the original plan to which he had sworn fealty. For details of this controversy and full text of Qadri's letter in Urdu and its English translation see Khan A. Ahmad, *The Founder of Pakistan through Trial to Triumph* (London, 1942), pp. 21-24.

CHAPTER 5

THE EXPANDING VISION: 1940-1947

There is virtually nothing in the Rahmat Ali papers to help us in constructing his life from his return from Karachi in June 1940 till his death in early 1951. His writings are available and make it possible to chart the evolution of his ideas. But for his everyday life, his feelings and thinking, his joys and frustrations, his outlook on life and his future plans, we have to depend on the memory of those of his contemporaries who could be interviewed and on a few odd pieces of information which come our way. His commonplace book does not date the entries and therefore provides no guidance, but it is an authentic reflection of his raw feelings and reflections.

The Indian Rebound

There can be little doubt that he returned from India with a very heavy heart. His deep distress and disillusionment are understandable. First, some of his old friends had betrayed him, and that left a wound that never healed. Secondly, his ban on entry into the Punjab deprived him of the joy of meeting his family. His brother came to see him in Karachi and they talked of their sisters and nephews and nieces and other relations, but these conversations added to the anguish of his heart. He was not allowed to pray at the grave of his father. His access to the persons he had loved from his infancy was barred. The sisters were unable to travel so far. In those days a journey from a village in Hoshiarpur to the seaport of Karachi for women who had never left their homestead was nothing short of an excursion to another part of the universe. Rahmat Ali's relatives in Jullundher and other towns of the Punjab were also beyond his reach. For over nine years he had pined to see their faces and talk to them. The dream remained unfulfilled;

now its memory was a nightmare.

Thirdly, all his supporters were in Lahore, ready and anxious to receive him. Associations and groups had been founded to spread his message. Newspapers had been writing about him and his ideals. Societies and individuals in Lyallpur and Amritsar and Sialkot and Rawalpindi had waited for his arrival. They would have lionized him, brought him out in processions, arranged public meetings for him to address, and held press conferences to enable the journalists to meet the man on and about whom they had written and reported but whom they had never seen in flesh and blood. This would have been a golden opportunity for Rahmat Ali to advance his cause and win more supporters. All these plans and possibilities were blown away by the ill wind of a secret fiat. Finally, he had arranged to hold the first meeting of his movement in India and had chosen Lahore as the venue. The city had its own natural attractions for him. It was here that he had studied, made his first friends, got his first job, cultivated its social circles, understood the realities of politics, and made a name for himself. It was the youth and intellect of this city which had been the first to give their heart and soul to his call for Pakistan. Without having cast their eyes upon him, they had gone forward to embrace the idea, to popularize it, to convert the press, and to mount an effective campaign in its behalf. The natural centre of the movement lay in Lahore, and that is where the Supreme Council of the PNM should and would have met. The plan was frustrated by an alliance of expediency between the Punjab Unionist rulers and the budding Muslim League. At the last moment Rahmat Ali had to shift the proposed meeting to Karachi, a city to which he was such a stranger that he was reduced to take up his lodging in a hotel.

He returned from India with three sentiments uppermost in his mind. First, friends cannot be trusted; don't make new ones; keep in touch with the old ones, but be wary of possible treachery. Secondly, the Muslim League will never acknowledge his existence or his role in demanding a Muslim state and coining the word Pakistan and circulating the scheme in Britain and India. Thirdly, his work must go on; the resolve must not weaken; the ideal should override and defeat transient setbacks. In short, he returned to Cambridge with mixed feelings: frustration but not cynicism (not yet), suffering but not defeat, disillusionment but not despair. He decided to carry on with his work, to develop his ideas further,

to devise more means to save the maximum number of Indian Muslims from future Hindu dominance, and to hope that, like his original Pakistan plan, the new suggestions would appeal to those for whose good they were made.[1]

His weak constitution, the inability to enjoy undisturbed sleep, and, above all, the prolonged illness of 1939 were wearing him out in body. Long hours of hard work had left their mark. Though still in his early forties, he was already a middle-aged man. The mental shock that he had received in India made matters worse. He found it more difficult to rest his mind in sleep. Now worry came on small pretexts. With his trust in mankind shaken to its core, social relationships could no longer act as a balm. An overpowering emotional bond would have compensated these deprivations. Let us suppose he had fallen in love with a woman at this stage and developed a genuine, maddening desire capable of laughing the defeats and depressions of life to scorn. A woman to make his heart glow with her quivering awareness, to make his spirit leap, to give him the joy of kings, to hold him by the heart; love's sovereign touch and supreme delicious thrall–that is what he needed to regain his peace of mind and tranquillity of soul. But this anodyne, this monarch of all feelings, was beyond his reach. Such a relationship, even the desire for one, was alien to his psyche. He was obsessed with one thing and one thing alone, his mission in life. This devotion ruled out all extraneous influences or interests. He was alone in his world, self-contained, confident, contented, sufficient unto himself. He had made his way in life with his own inner resources. Nobody had helped him. He would tread the same path. His step might not be as jaunty as it once used to be. The smile might not come to his eyes and lips as unbidden as it had come till a few months ago. But given his faith, he would ride out the storm on the crest of the wave. The old confidence might return. Circumstances might change. Life might bring new tidings. He hoped and lived.

The Millat and the Mission

The first part of Rahmat Ali's programme was the 1933 Pakistan plan, and the second was his 1940 plan for a Bang-i-Islam and an Usmanistan. In 1942 he inaugurated what he called Parts III, IV, VI and VII of the Pak Plan.[2] This was done in a pamphlet

entitled *The Millat and the Mission: Seven Commandments of Destiny for the "Seventh" Continent of Dinia*, published in October 1942. The note appended to its "Printed edition in August 1944" (the only one available to me) says that the statement issued here is "in a slightly abridged form", which suggests that the earlier, fuller texts (issued in October 1942 and again in January 1943) were not printed but cyclostyled or reproduced in some other way.

The pamphlet opens with a list of seven commandments: avoid minorityism, avow nationalism, acquire proportional territory, consolidate the individual nations, co-ordinate them under a Pak Commonwealth of Nations, convert India into Dinia, and organize Dinia and its dependencies into a Pakasia.[3] Postponing the elaboration of these principles, he first repeats the motives which had led him to propound his earlier plans. Two points in this narrative are to be noticed, for they throw new light on his proposals and amend at least one of them.

His conception of Usmanistan is now substantially amended so as to change the character of this third state. In his previous pamphlet, *The Millat of Islam and the Menace of Indianism*, he had suggested that the people of Hyderabad should demand that the *de jure* sovereignty of the Nizam be converted into a *de facto* sovereignty. Though he does not say so, he must have realized after making this proposal that the elevation of the Nizam to the status of a sovereign ruler would not make Hyderabad a truly Muslim state, for a majority of its population would still remain Hindu. Now, therefore, he asserts that this "old demand" was "no more than a prelude to the national construction of Osmanistan by a voluntary exchange of her Hindoo population with Muslim population of the neighbouring regions". This would be to the good of both Hindus and Muslims. It would help the Hindus by giving them the right of self-determination (he does not explain how). It would benefit the Muslims by enabling them to secure Hyderabad, "the nucleus of Osmanistan", and transforming her "from an ephemeral heterogenous state into a homogeneous nation and powerful country". So it turns out that now the reference to Osmanistan is not to the then-existing Hyderabad Deccan, but to "the Muslim national stronghold in South India".[4] This shows that Rahmat Ali had by now changed his mind on the question of exchange of population. In the previous pamphlet he had given it as one of the

arguments in favour of creating the Muslim states of Pakistan, Bang-i-Islam and Osmanistan, that this would not involve any transfer of population. Now he is convinced that without such a transfer at least Hyderabad would never become a Muslim state.

In another footnote, he gives his reasons for including Ceylon in the Pak Plan. Nature itself has made it a part of the continent of Dinia. It had always been treated as a part of India by the British in their plans for the defence of the sub-continent. It figured as a part of "greater India" in all Hindu schemes of national expansion. The Ceylonese themselves had often discussed the desirability of federating themselves with India. The Muslim right to the island dated from the time of Adam.[5]

Having dealt with these "minor" points Rahmat Ali comes to his seven commandments. The first is "avoid minorityism". He defines minorityism as "the problem created by those religious, racial or political minorities which possess an active consciousness of their own nationality and consequently oppose their inclusion in, or assimilation by, another nation or state". Since the rise of nationalism such minorities have done much harm to the nations concerned; therefore, most of the nations, in their own interest and for the sake of their security, want to get rid of their minori ties by exchange, expulsion or segregation. But it is strange to find some people still wanting to keep the minorities in the hope that the sullen, gruntled groups of today would by some mysterious alchemy become the proud citizens of tomorrow. History would prove this to be nothing more than a "pure wish-thought". In the past, minorityism was a major enemy of the Muslims; at present, it is sabotaging them religiously, culturally and politically; in the future, it would destroy them throughout the sub-continent including the places where they were in a majority.

Therefore, it must be avoided. The Millat should not leave its minorities in Hindu lands even if the British and the Hindus offer them constitutional safeguards. The Millat should also refuse to have Hindu and Sikh minorities in Muslim lands even if they were willing to stay with or without special safeguards. In normal times they would retard national re-construction; in a crisis they would betray and destroy the Muslims. They could never be a part of the Millat, and that was reason enough to keep them out.

In practical, concrete terms, the leaving behind of Muslim minorities in Hindu lands would have the following consequences.

It would leave thirty-five million Muslims, full one-third of the whole Millat, under Hindu rule and without any allies to help them in their struggle for freedom. It would deprive the Millat of valuable resources at a time when every man and woman should contribute to the progress of the nation. It would mean that these thirty-five million Muslims would be devoting their life and labour to the cause of the Hindu nation. The argument that a similar number of Hindus and Sikhs would be working in Muslim lands forgets that the work of the one cannot compensate for the work of the other. It would also mean that such a large portion of the Millat would be exposed to the absorbing, de-nationalizing influence of Hinduism. Their fate would surely be the same as that of the Muslim minorities left in the past in Sicily, Italy, France, Portugal, Spain, Austria and Hungary. Was the nation prepared to lose such a large part of itself?

Looked at from the other side the argument is equally compelling. The keeping of Hindu and Sikh minorities in Muslim states would have the following results. It would amount to receiving no more than one-eighth of the Hindu nation in exchange for surrendering one-third of the Muslim nation to India. It would condemn to permanent Hindu servitude a Muslim population equalling two Turkeys, more than two Irans, three Afghanistans, ten Iraqs, eighteen Syrias, or twenty Palestines. It would expose the Millat, even in its own homelands, to those Indian influences which in the past had undermined it and in the future would annihilate it. It would perpetuate minorityism, which was ever the handmaiden of imperialism. Every imperial power in history had exploited the minority question and thrived on it. To keep the problem alive would be an invitation to imperialism in one guise or another. Finally, the example of the Ottoman Empire should be enough of an eye-opener to those who saw no evil in the existence of minorities. The formidable Turkish empire was destroyed by the treachery and treason of its religious, racial and political minorities. Did the Millat want the same thing to happen in its national strongholds?

In short, to allow Hindu and Sikh minorities to live in Pakistan, Bang-i-Islam and Osmanistan or to agree to leave a Muslim minority in India would be a tragic act of insanity and treachery.

The second commandment, which is to avow nationalism, is complementary to the first, and means that "we must assert,

and demand the recognition of, the distinct national status of our Minorities in the Hindoo majority Regions of Dinia and its Dependencies, and reciprocally offer to give similar status to the Hindoo and Sikh Minorities in Pakistan, Bangistan, and Osmanistan". The inspiration behind the commandment is the truth that "nationhood is to people what majority or manhood is to individuals". Its justification is the historical fact that in practice minorities may be able to do something for others but they can do precious little for themselves, particularly if they are as scattered and dispersed as Muslims are in the sub-continent. Their conversion into national groups would liberate thirty-five million Muslims living in the United Provinces, Bihar and Orissa, the Central Provinces, Bundhelkhand and Malwa, Rajistan, Bombay and South India, Western Ceylon and Eastern Ceylon, and would transform them into seven nations. This would free the Muslim states from the dangers of minorityism, and ensure "the spiritual purity, the fundamental unity, and the national homogeneity of the Millat". Even if the British and the Hindus did not agree to this, the demand for it would at least put on record the right to nationhood of these thirty-five million Muslims and improve the Millat's bargaining position in regard to Pakistan, Bang-i-Islam and Osmanistan.

Such a claim could not have been easy to make before 1940. But since the Sikh demand for a separate national status in Pakistan, Muslims could bid for similar concessions in Hindu lands. The Sikh demand should be met and they should be given the three Sikh states of Patiala, Nabha and Jind, but on the absolute condition that the Muslim demand for similar status in the seven Hindu regions be met by the British and Hindu supporters of the Sikh claim.

The third commandment asks for the acquisition of proportional territory to create the seven Muslim national homes in the Hindu regions. Land "is to nations what homes are to individuals and fields to farmers". In proportion to population the Millat was entitled to one-quarter of the area of the sub-continent. The states of Pakistan, Bang-i-Islam and Osmanistan would cover about 325,000 square miles, after giving the Hindu and Sikh minorities their proportional share of the area in the three countries. This would be about 75,000 square miles less than what is due to the Muslims. The shortfall should be made up by acquiring an area equal to it in Hindu regions. For example, in the United Provinces,

where Muslims are 15 per cent of the population, 15 per cent of the area, that is, about 17,000 square miles, should be given to the Muslims and made into Haideristan. Similarly, areas proportional to Muslim population percentages in the Central Provinces, Bundhelkand and Malwa, Bihar and Orissa, Bombay and South India, Western Ceylon and Eastern Ceylon, would be converted into Muslim national countries to be called, respectively, Siddiqistan, Faruqistan, Muinistan, Maplistan, Safiistan and Nasaristan. It is true that only a few of these national homes would be strongholds, the rest amounting in size and population to mere footholds. Yet, to be free in small places is better than to be slaves in large ones.

The fact of Muslim dispersal all over India thus produces a picture of the Millat organized in ten countries: the three Muslim states of Pakistan, Bang-i-Islam and Osmanistan, and seven national homes spread over Hindu regions. This is unfortunate but unavoidable. A partial compensation for this splitting of the Millat into ten units is, however, possible. The proportional areas for the Hindu and Sikh minorities in the three Muslim states should be allotted, where possible, as enclaves. This would bring some advantages. It would keep the Hindus and Sikhs and their areas separate from one another. It would also keep the Hindu areas just as separate from their main strongholds as the Muslim national homes would be from the Muslim states.

The fourth commandment wants the Millat to consolidate the individual nations, *i.e.*, the seven nations which are to constitute the seven national homes. From now onwards "we must treat them in thought, in word, and in action as nations equal in importance and in status to the Pak nation herself". The Muslim nations or countries should never be referred to as parts of Pakistan, but as her equals. To do otherwise would be to renew the fatal policies of the All India Muslim League of calling the Muslims a minority community of an Indian nation, to repeat the dangerous phraseology of Jinnah of referring to India as the common mother country of both Hindus and Muslims, and to drag down Muslim nations to th position of sub-nationalities and Muslim countries to that of provinces and regions of India.

These ten countries, the three major states and the seven national strongholds, are to be co-ordinated under a Pak Commonwealth of Nations. This is the fifth commandment. Two dangers made this imperative. To stand alone in the modern world

is to invite aggression if not outright annihilation. As the ten nations belong to one Millat, they must sink or swim together. The international organization which would bring them together and would be called the Pak Commonwealth of Nations would "inspire their purposes and integrate their policies, mobilise their resources and direct their activities to the common deliverance of all, to the common defence of all, to the common development of all, and to the common destiny of all". The central object of this association would be co-operation. Its form was not to be sacrosanct. The nations concerned might prefer a confederation or a league of nations; though a commonwealth had the advantages of both and the defects of neither.

It was not any idea of the superiority of Pakistan over other nations which had inspired Rahmat Ali to call it the Pak Commonwealth. The designation reflected the historical fact that, "in whatever country of the Continent of Dinia and its Dependencies we may be living today, we all are originally Paks; just as the Arabs whether in Arabia, in Iraq, or in Egypt, are still Arabs". In this sense, the Pak Commonwealth would be "the real focus of the international solidarity of our nations and the living symbol of the fraternal unity of our Millat in Pakasia".

Nations, like men, have their own ideals for the service of humanity. Since the seventh century the Muslim ideal was the service and salvation of India. The Millat it now, under the sixth commandment, called upon to renew its dedication to this ideal. It must "liberate the soul of 'India' from the domination of 'Indianism' into the domain of 'Dinianism' and, thereby, restore her to her *original* and *rightful* position in the world".[6] All efforts must be concentrated on three fundamentals. The Millat must put an end to the "deceptive fiction" that India is the sphere of Indianism; it must proclaim that India is the domain of Dinianism; and it must announce that the sub-continent of India is really the continent of Dinia.

There was nothing unhistorical in this mission. India was, to begin with, Dravidia because all her inhabitants were Dravidians. When the Hindus came and exterminated the Dravidians, she became India. With the advent of the Muslims in the eighth century she became partly Hindu and partly Muslim, though the world continued to call her by the misnomer "India". Today she is the land of many religions and to go on calling her India, which was

originally the land of Indians or Hindus, is to deny the existence of several faiths and their followers. A better and more suitable designation would be the continent of Dinia.

Three considerations went into the making of this new name. It is called a "continent" because it is a huge land mass with its own natural barriers. The term "Dinia" is composed of the letters of the word "India". If the non-Pak nations objected to the word "Dinia" as being an Islamic name (Dinia from *Din* = creed or religion), they could adopt another word, "Adiania", which meant the land of religions, and, barring the first and the last letter "a", was again made up of the letters of "India".

The next and the final step is to organize the continent of Dinia and its dependencies into the "Orbit of Pakasia". This is the last commandment and aims at a consolidation of the results of all the preceding commandments. Unlike the terms Arabasia, Australasia, Malayasia and Caucasia, the word Pakasia has no racial significance; but, like them, it has a cultural and a geographical connotation. Culturally, it means that part of Asia where the Pak culture is actually or potentially predominant. Geographically, it includes the whole continent of Dinia and all its dependencies.[7]

At the end, Rahmat Ali draws up a timetable for the realization of his formidable programme outlined in these seven commandments. With the blessings of Allah and the faithful dedication of the Millat, the first stage, the creation of Pakistan, Bang-i-Islam, and Osmanistan, would be achieved within fifteen years (*i.e.*, 1957). The seven national strongholds would be in existence before the end of the century. The conversion of India into the continent of Dinia and its organization into the orbit of Pakasia would be effected "in far less time than we took to build our present heritage".[8]

"Such is the eternal promise, and such the ultimate prize", Rahmat Ali told his people. "To us, the one is the assurance and the other the substance of the grace Divine. And, of us, both demand only the discharge of our duty to the Millat." The struggle would be the hardest, the longest, and the greatest of all the struggles of Muslim history, but the reward was sure to match the effort.[9]

With this pamphlet we reach the end of Rahmat Ali's plans. He has stretched the concept of Pakistan to its uttermost limits and seen the final shape of things to be no less than another Islamic

sway over the sub-continent. In essence the entire scheme takes him to the conclusion drawn by F.K. Khan Durrani more than ten years earlier. Both wanted a re-enthronement of Islam in India: Durrani by outright conquest leading to an Islamic empire, Rahmat Ali by slow stages resulting in an Islamic orbit.

The scale of Rahmat Ali's plan is truly breath taking. The dimensions of his thought are heroic. Starting with the modest demand for self-determination in northern India, he includes the Bengali Muslim in his scheme, then proceeds to annex Hyderabad Deccan on grounds of its historic links with the earlier Mughal empire and the Muslim background of its culture. Finding that this would still fail to free all Indian Muslims, he provides for seven national strongholds scattered throughout the sub-continent, making a strange political patch-work out of India, a mosaic of several large and small sovereign entities which would have added much colour to the map but also many problems of gigantic proportions. Still not satisfied with a commonwealth of Islam containing ten Muslim nations in its generous bosom, he is swept to the ultimate end of his argument and sees no alternative to a conversion of the whole of India to Islam and the creation of a new Muslim Asia in which the old but never-forgotten Islamic heritage will live again in yet greater splendour.

The unrealism of such grandiose schemes is beyond question. They did not take notice of the insuperable difficulties involved in realizing them. They also forgot that the other two parties to the issue, the Hindus and the British, were and would ever be implacably opposed to all plans aimed at a revival of Islam. They ignored some of the practical implications of the creation of small, landlocked states which would be no more than tiny islets in the midst of surging Hindu waters. These and other weaknesses of his Pak Plan are indefensible. But before we make too much play of its unrealism, we must remember that almost till the very moment of its establishment, Jinnah's Pakistan was judged by its opponents to be an impossible dream of an impossible man. And yet it came true. If politics are the art of the possible, nationalism is the force which makes the impossible possible. To call Rahmat Ali unrealistic in approach is justified in the language of everyday life. But in that chapter of world history which nationalism writes with its blood we read of many impossibilities becoming realities by the force of circumstance and the wit of man.

If Rahmat Ali may be accused of imprudence, he has also the virtue of courage. He is unafraid of following the logic of his argument and going cheerfully where it leads him. In consistency of thought and loyalty to reason he was superior to Muhammad Ali and Iqbal. He corrected his mistakes when he found them out. He could change his opinions as his thought developed, which shows an open mind. In the beginning he was interested only in the north-west and called its Muslims a nation. Then he discovered that there was a flaw in his two-nation theory. Either it was the entire Muslim population of India which constituted a separate nation, or there was no Muslim identity in the sub-continent. A part of the community could not be a nation. So he extended the application of his theory and called all the Indian Muslims a nation or a Millat. This naturally brought Bengal into his plan. So far he was at one with the Muslim League. But soon he left it behind in the application of his two-nation theory. With complete logical justification he argued that as the right to self-determination belonged to the nation as a whole, it was the entire nation which should exercise it, even if the result was impracticable. In doing this he removed the major weakness of Muslim League reasoning. The League propounded a two-nation theory, claimed to speak on behalf of the Muslim nation, and yet left a considerable portion of that nation in Hindu hands. In practical terms Jinnah was right and there was no solution to this difficulty. But Rahmat Ali was not worried by impracticalities. He followed the star of logic as if there were no other stars in the national firmament. Every individual member of the Muslim nation must be saved from Hinduism, even if the effort led to impossible sovereignties, artificial frontiers and impracticable transfers of population. He was loyal to his belief in the purity of nationalism. If the Muslims were a nation and were to be shielded from a Hindu onslaught, then no thought of difficulties should be allowed to cloud the effort of those who set out to fulfil the mission. Difficulties were there to be overcome, not to retard the complete fulfilment of an ideal upheld by history, sanctified by faith and dictated by the sheer instinct of self-preservation. There is no occasion to doubt Rahmat Ali's perfect sincerity.

Nor can his common sense be brought into dispute. An imperfect acquaintance with full details of his plan may give the impression that he was suggesting an impossible course. But it is

important to remember that he prefaced his demand for the seven Muslim national strongholds (the only really impracticable part of his scheme) with a proviso which few observers have cared to notice. After making the proposal he wrote, "on the other hand, if the British and the Hindoos do not agree, it will at least put on record the right to nationhood of our thirty-five million brethern; register our protest against their 'Indianisation'; improve our bargaining position in regard to Pakistan, Bangistan, and Osmanistan; and render a lasting service to the cause of freedom of all nations in the Continent".[10] Not a single one of his other demands carries such qualifications. He knew that this proposal would be turned down by the other parties and that there was little chance of its realization. But, as he said, there were some advantages in making the claim. Above all, he had to make it in consistency with his theory of saving the entire Millat. Moreover, as he himself points out, his suggestion could hardly be deemed absurd after the Sikhs, tiny in number as compared to the Muslims of Hindu regions, had demanded a state of their own in a part of the Punjab. Therefore, his scheme of small Muslim states spread throughout Hindu India was not as wild as it may look at first sight.

That leaves the case of Hyderabad. It is easy to argue that Rahmat Ali's claim to the Nizam's dominions is defective. But, is that really so? The only objection that can reasonably be raised is the absence of a Muslim majority in Hyderabad. But other factors, historical and cultural, could offer themselves for consideration. It should not be forgotten that Hyderabad was unique in enjoying a special relationship with British paramountcy. It was unlike any other native state. It had many privileges denied to other principalities. If, with the lapse of British paramountcy, sovereignty reverted to the princes, the Nizam had a greater right than others to declare himself a sovereign ruler and make Hyderabad a "Muslim" state. It should also be remembered that in actual event Hyderabad was made a part of Hindu India in 1948 only by military conquest. That was the only argument the Hindus could give in defence of their right to it. The case for their right to Kashmir is weaker than Rahmat Ali's to Hyderabad; for here even military conquest could not have succeeded without British help in drawing convenient boundary lines.

Moreover, Rahmat Ali was not alone in looking at Hyderabad as a part of Muslim heritage. Several other Muslim and non-Muslim

suggestions made before the appearance of this pamphlet had mentioned Hyderabad as falling within the schemes or ambitions of Indian Muslims: F.E. Holsinger (September 1933), Abul Ala Mawdudi (1938), Sayyid Abdul Latif (1938), Asadullah (1939), the Nawab of Mamdot (1939), and the Aligarh dons (1939). All of them had sought a political formula by which Hyderabad could be retained as a Muslim state, zone, region, or cultural entity.[11]

Bangistan

The next development of Rahmat Ali's plan cannot be understood in its proper perspective without considering his schemes for Bengal-Assam and Hyderabad. He claimed that he had included these two areas in his plan in 1937. I have not been able to discover any of his 1937 pamphlets dealing with these territories. But in his 1942 pamphlet, examined above, he takes it for granted that these areas would form a part of his larger plan for the sub-continent. In the catalogue of pamphlets printed on the inside cover of some of his writings, entitled "Pakasia Literature Series", he lists 12 items in this order: Pakistan, Bangistan, Osmanistan, Siddiqistan, Faruqistan, Haideristan, Muinistan, Maplistan, Safiistan, Nasaristan, Dinia, and Pakasia. Assuming that this list is chronological, the schemes of Bangistan and Osmanistan came before those of seven "strongholds" from Siddiquistan to Nasaristan. The difficulty is that no pamphlets on these two are available as dated before 1943. It is fair to assume that he thought of Bangistan and Osmanistan at some time before 1943, though the two pamphlets were not published before 1946; possibly, the earlier treatments were cyclostyled or they were issued under different titles. Whatever the case, the chronological evolution of his thought demands that these two schemes should be considered here, even if we have to depend on pamphlets first published in September 1946.

The aim of this pamphlet, *Bangistan: The Fatherland of the Bang Nation*, was to "introduce Bangistan to the world, and also to explain the reasons for its demand for recognition as a sovereign country in the Continent of Dinia".[12] Bangistan is the land of the Muslims living in Bengal, Assam and the two islands belonging to them. Four "facts" about this region should be noted. First, nationally, the Muslims of these areas reject their present status and want to be "a separate, sovereign nation". Secondly, demo-

cratically, they must exercize their right of self-determination, a right in the defence of which in Europe thousands of them are being killed in battle. Thirdly, internationally, they want to "live and let live"; this policy will result in a Muslim "national revival and re-organization" in Bangistan and at the same time in "the crystallization and consolidation" of the Caste Hindus in the rest of the area of this region. Lastly, spiritually, the plan is "a summons to the Muslims to attend to the saving call of their destiny", and the only protection against their "national extinction by the forces of Indianism".[13]

What is Bangistan? It is an abbreviation of Bang-i-Islamistan, which is "composed of the letters taken from the names of the components of the country".[14] Though the "vernacular" spoken by a great majority of the Bangs is Bengali, the national language will be "Pak" or Urdu, because it is the national literary language of all other nations of the Millat. Besides, the Bangs have contributed much to the development of Urdu and enriched it with their creative talents.[15]

The resources and communications of Bangistan are neither inadequate nor incapable of future development and improvement. The country is largely agricultural, and its mineral and industrial resources are considerable, though "for the most part these are potential rather than actual". The exploitation of these resources cannot be taken in hand till the region is free to plan its economic life. The communications are "fairly good", with a network of metalled roads, and three railway systems: the East Indian Railway, the Eastern Bengal Railway, and the Bengal-Nagpur Railway. The principal seaports of Calcutta and Chittagong are serviceable.[16]

The Bangs are as devoted to the ideal of the Pak Commonwealth of Nations as any other nation of the Millat. This devotion springs from the fundamentals of their faith, is steeled by the teachings of their history, and is sharpened by their understanding of the immediate as well as the ultimate responsibilities of their mission. The independent existence of Bangistan will be a lasting solution of the age-old conflict of nations in the sub-continent. Its work for the betterment of the material and moral well-being of its own people will indirectly help the well-being of the whole continent. The security of its people against the joint British-Hindu exploitation will leave them free to devote themselves to the cause of the

peace, progress and prosperity of mankind.[17]

At least a part of the content of the cultural heritage of Indian Muslims is the gift of the Bangs. They have contributed to it their own charm, humanism and vigour.[18]

The rise of Bangistan will mark an "epoch of history" and signify a "fateful revolution in the affairs of one-fifth of the whole human race". Its reprecussions will be felt far beyond the frontiers of India, in Asia and also throughout the world.[19]

The only criticism of these arguments relates to the claim made for the Urdu language. Rahmat Ali should have known that Urdu was a foreign tongue, popular or literary, to the people of Bengal and Assam, and the presence of a few Urdu-speaking elite families did not change the picture. The same mistake was made by the All India Muslim League and later by successive governments of Pakistan with disastrous consequences.

Osmanistan

Simultaneously, Rahmat Ali made out a similar case for the independence of the Nizam's dominions in his *Osmanistan: The Fatherland of the Osman Nation*. Osmanistan is the land of the Osmans, the Muslims living in the ancient, historic region of the Deccan, also known as the lands of Golkanda and Berar. After repeating the four "facts" he had mentioned about Bangistan and applying them to Osmanistan, he concludes that "obviously its reasonableness is unquestionable and its appeal to the Muslims irresistible". The Muslims are determined to fight, and, if need be, die for the "formal and full recognition" of Osmanistan.[20]

Then he explains the meaning of the word. It is "composed of the letters taken from the names of the places of the Region" (he does not explain how). The word "Osman" is an Arabic word, meaning The Great, and its adoption "was inspired by the considerations of its historical appeal and eternal inspiration". In the history of Islam, Osman is the name of one of the four rightly-guided caliphs; it is also the name of the present ruler of the region, Mir Osman Ali Khan. Thus the sources of the name are both hsitorical and spiritual, and national and territorial.[21]

Osmanistan is a country within a country, and therefore must be an enclave. Its boundaries are not demarcated as the British did not find delimitation in their interest. Corresponding to their

proportion in the population of the region, the Osmans are entitled to about 17 per cent of the total area, nearly 17,000 square miles. This is not too small to militate against the formation of an independent state. There are several European countries with smaller territories: Denmark, Switzerland, Netherlands and Belgium. The population is estimated at three million: three times the population of Albania, nearly twice that of Syria, equal to those of Norway, Eire and Finland, and almost the same as that of Switzerland and of Denmark.[22]

The national language is Pak, so far called Urdu. Hyderabad's prominent role in the development of this language is uncontested. Its people have enriched its vocabulary, popularized its use, improved its substance, refined its style, and strengthened its virility. According to some scholars of the origin of Urdu, the language had its birth in Hyderabad.[23]

Like Bangistan and Pakistan, Osmanistan is also predominantly an agricultural country. Mineral and industrial resources are not inadequate, though their development has been neglected. The communications are fairly good. There are metalled roads, and three railway systems serve the area: the Nizam's Guaranteed Railway, the Madras and Southern Marhatta Railway, and the South Indian Railway.[24]

The people of Osmanistan are good Muslims. They also realize that their future lies in freedom as a nation and in an alliance with the other Muslim nations of the sub-continent. They will welcome the membership of the Pak Commonwealth of Nations. They share the culture of the rest of Muslim India, and will be glad to become its co-upholders in the future.[25]

Seven Strongholds

Rahmat Ali had completed his plans for the revival of Indian Islam in the aptly-titled *The Millat and the Mission,* issued in October 1942. Then he had elaborated the plans for an independent Bengal and Assam and a sovereign Hyderabad. But all these schemes still left a sizeable Muslim population in Hindu India. Could something be done to save them?

After the demand for a Pakistan, a Bangistan and an Osmanistan, the essence of his plan was the creation of seven Muslim strongholds in Hindu regions. So far he had mentioned it but not

gone into full details. The novelty of the claim, the fundamental place it occupied in his scheme, and the failure of the Muslim League to turn it into a demand of its own, necessitated a deeper study of it. This Rahmat Ali proceeded to do in seven pamphlets, each devoted to one "nation". All of them were published on the same day, 15 March 1943. In them he demanded a Siddiqistan for the Muslims of the Central Provinces, a Faruqistan for those of Bihar and Orissa, a Haideristan for those of the United Provinces, a Muinistan for those of Rajistan, a Maplistan for those of South India, a Safiistan for those of Western Ceylon, and a Nasaristan for those of Eastern Ceylon. Much of the argument in each case was the same, and there is no need to go over each pamphlet one by one. We will take one or two of them and examine the arguments, referring to others only when they contain a new point or provide some fresh insight into Rahmat Ali's mind.[26]

Each pamphlet opens with a general appeal to the Muslims of that region and concludes with the hope that they would struggle for the creation of a separate state for themselves. In the middle he tackles three questions of why, how and when the state was to be established, estimates the opposition which would try to frustrate the achievement of freedom, and prescribes ways and methods of dealing with this opposition.

The first pamphlet concerned itself with Siddiqistan and argued for the setting up of a separate state for the Muslims of Central India– "I mean the land which is also known as Bundhelkand and Malwa"– to provide a "permanent defence against the mortal dangers that beset us in Central India". Why was such a state needed? Because the Muslims were in a minority and were scattered. Dispersal was an enemy of nations, and more dangerous than defeat. Defeat merely degraded, dispersal destroyed. It was to the body politic what vivisection was to the human body. "In other words, it is dissection; it is dismemberment." In the past many nations had lived in Central India which were now gone without leaving even a name. They had met this fate because they had disregarded the need for unification, integration and consolidation. A similar failure had led to Muslim defeat in 1857, and a like weakness had brought them to near extinction in the early 'thirties when an Indian federation was imposed upon them. The creation of Siddiquistan would be a step towards nullifying the federation, protecting the dispersed Muslim minority of Central India, and

bringing about the "national re-integration" of all Muslim minorities in Hindu regions. The only path to salvation lay in the creation of this Fatherland "whose name springs from our Islamic share in the history and inheritance of Central India, symbolises our Islamic national status in the lands of Central India, and stands for our Islamic hopes for the ultimate destiny of Central India".[27] This was his answer to "Why create Siddiqistan?"

Then he turned to the question of how to create it. History showed that new countries had been created in four ways: military conquest, spiritual conversion, mass colonization, and partition of an existing country. The first three methods being out of question, only the application of the principle of partition could result in the creation of Siddiqistan. Partition was justified on several grounds. It was in the immediate and ultimate interests of both the Muslim and Hindu nations because it would result from the exercise of the right of self-determination. It was feasible and "practical politics" because it would not call "for any convulsive change in the existing order of things in Central India"; in fact, it would be a more rational and truly international arrangement of territory. It was favoured by historical experience: in every bi-national situation it had solved age-old conflicts, averted civil wars, and saved the peace of the world.

After thus asserting the principle of partition, Rahmat Ali prescribed three practical steps to apply it. First, the Muslims must reject the "false and fatal conception of the historical, the national, and the territorial unity of Central India", repudiate their existing position of minorityism, re-assert their status of distinct nationhood, and demonstrate their unshakable determination to establish and perpetuate that status in Siddiqistan. Secondly, they must claim a share proportional to their population in the territory of Central India. This should be done in that part of Central India where it would involve the least possible transfer of population. Finally, when this had ben done, they must convert their proportional area into the fatherland of Siddiqistan and call for recognition as a distinct country by the nations of the world.[28]

The answer to the third question of when to create Siddiqistan was "here and now". Directly or indirectly every nation and country had "found its completion" in war. "For, in Asia or Africa, in Europe or America, there isn't one single nation or one single country whose organic creation, whose human composition,

whose territorial extent, or whose political position is not the direct or indirect result of wars." The present war (World War II) was throwing into the melting-pot the entire arrangement of human affairs. In due course this would result in transforming communities, nations, countries, continents and civilizations. The process had actually begun and "there is going on a re-interpretation of the philosophies of life, a re-integration of the peoples, a re-alignment of the nations, a re-construction of the countries, and a re-orientation of the policies and purposes of all in the world". After the war India could not remain changeless even if she wanted to. She was "ripe for re-construction on new foundations". This was an ideal situation for the Muslims, who should follow the wise saying of the Saracens, "strike while the iron is hot– and polish it at leisure". Therefore, in view of the turn the world affairs were taking and of the situation arising in India, the time for the creation of Siddiqistan was at hand.[29]

This did not mean that there would be no difficulties in the way of its establishment. Active opposition was bound to come from the British and the Hindus. The imperialism of the first and the nationalism of the second would range themselves against the Muslim demand. Passive opposition might also be expected from the Muslim League. The British would not like the new situation because it would put an end to their divide-and-rule policy by solving the Hindu-Muslim problem. The Hindus would try to fight it because they wanted to absorb the Muslims and found it easier if they remained a small and dispersed minority. The Muslim League would stand against it because it was a careerist organization used to support a cause only if it helped its careerism: it had opposed Pakistan from 1933 to 1940 and then adopted it when it had become a popular demand and could be exploited to further its own career.

Rahmat Ali foresaw the arguments the Muslim League would bring forth against the Siddiqistan idea. First, that the Hindus and Muslims were so mixed up in Central India that they could not be sorted out as separate nations into separate countries. Secondly, that even if this were possible, Muslim population and area were too small to make up a state. Thirdly, that even if Siddiqistan were created, it would not be a viable state. Finally, that as the struggle for Siddiqistan would compromise the struggle for Pakistan and Bangistan it should be postponed until after the achievement of

Pakistan and Bangistan which, in fact, would facilitate the rise of Siddiqistan.

The way to frustrate this opposition was to adhere firmly to the fundamentals of the case for Siddiqistan, to work for it with single-minded devotion, and to take the stand on seven "basic facts of national life". First, to be a small nation was better and more honourable than to be no nation at all. Secondly, to have a small homeland was safer and more honourable than to have no homeland at all. Thirdly, history taught the lesson, through such examples as Greece, Rome, Arabia and England, that the position and strength of a nation or a country did not depend on its size, but on its spirit. Fourthly, it was wrong to say that Siddiqistan would be the smallest country in the world: many a well-established nation in the world were smaller in area and population. Fifthly, far from being alone in the world, Siddiqistan would stand together with nine other fraternal nations in the Pak Commonwealth of Nations. Sixthly, the argument that Hindus and Muslims were too mixed up to be sorted out was disproved by the way in which in Europe and Asia several new nations and countries were demarcated and made sovereign after the first world war. Finally, the demand for Siddiqistan, instead of compromising the struggle for Pakistan and Bangistan, would actually help it. To miss this last opportunity to create Siddiqistan before the final re-construction of India came about would be a tragedy in itself and a disservice to the cause of Pakistan and Bangistan.[30]

With the aim of organizing the Muslims of Central India and fighting for the creation of a separate state for them Rahmat Ali announced that he was founding the Siddiqistan National Movement.[31]

Haideristan was the name Rahmat Ali gave to the Muslim state to be carved out in "Hindoostan", *i.e.*, in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. All the arguments given in favour of Siddiqistan were repeated and, finally, the establishment of a Haideristan National Movement was announced.[32] In this way, all the seven pamphlets argued the same case, each for a different region and each announcing the formation of a separate National Movement to work in and for that area.[33]

In addition to these seven national strongholds, claim was laid to four sets of islands in the Indian Ocean on the grounds that they were of strategic importance and were populated by Muslims. As

they carried Hindu names, these were changed to mark their transformation into Muslim lands. The demand related to the Laccadive Islands, re-christened Alam Islands, and Maldive Islands, now called Ameen Islands, both on the western side of south India and Ceylon. On the eastern side, the Andaman Islands were given the name of Ashar Islands and the Nicobar Islands that of Balus Islands.[34] Rahmat Ali did not care to argue for the inclusion of these islands in his plan; they are always mentioned in passing. It was presumed that they would form parts of the Pak Commonwealth of Nations.

Ten Nations

In the following year Rahmat Ali announced the details of Part IV of his Pak plan which dealt with the establishment of the Pak Commonwealth of Nations. This was the stage immediately following the achievement of freedom by the ten Muslim nations. It included the foundation of a new movement: the All-Dinia Milli Movement.

This part of the plan was unfolded in a new pamphlet published in June 1944. After recapitulating the development of his PNM into a demand for ten Muslim states and four Muslim islands, Rahmat Ali pointed to the next destination as "the rise of our nations in our own lands and islands as members of the Millat, their co-ordination in the Pak Commonwealth of Nations, and their dedication to the Mission of the Millat in the Continent of Dinia and its Dependencies". This he called the "very heart and core of the Pak Plan". The aim was to see that "Indianism", in any shape or form, disappeared from "the councils of our nations and of our Millat", that nothing was left of its principles, purposes and policies in Muslim social, political and educational organizations, that all Muslim "All-India" institutions were re-created as "All-Dinia" institutions, and that henceforth all Muslims, individually and institutionally, nationally and internationally, thought, spoke and acted as nations in their own countries and as members of their own Millat.[35]

Three imperatives demanded this transformation. In the first place, the country of India was no longer what she was when the Muslims had arrived to rule her, or flourished on her soil, or finally seen themselves overthrown. The radical changes which had come

to India with time carried a grave warning that if the Muslims failed to create their own nations and thus reconstruct the Millat they would lose everything. In the second place, if the urge of a people to nationhood was left unattached to an ideal higher and greater than mere nationhood, the result was suicidal exclusiveness. Muslim India of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and Europe of the twentieth bore testimony to this truth. In order to guard against the self-destructive tendency of a nationalism without ideals it was necessary to convert India into Dinia. In the last place, for the Muslims nationalism could never be an end in itself. It was a means to the revival of their Millat in the shape of a "comity of nations" for the fulfilment of her mission. This mission was impossible of attainment as long as Muslims persisted in their attachment to India.

The entire span of Muslim history in India taught one lesson: Muslims should never again build in the name of India or as a part of India, they should never fail to provide "for the co-existence of our nations and our Millat", they should always ensure their existence in a larger association which would embrace them all, and they should never again subordinate the spiritual interests of their Millat to the secular interests of their nations.[36]

An organization was needed to ensure the simultaneous growth of the Muslim nations and the Millat in the continent of Dinia. It should be milli in character and founded, built and worked on the Pak concept of Dinianism. Its fundamental creed was going to be a disavowal of Indianism, without which the integrity of even Pakistan and Bangistan would be in peril and the thirty-five million Muslims living in Hindu regions would be surrendered to India.

He named this organization the All-Dinia Milli Movement and fixed its basis as "the equality of our ten national movements between movement and movement, and of our ten nations between nation and nation; the independence of each nation in its individual national homeland, and the supremacy of each national movement in its individual sphere; the common ideology of our national movements and nations, and their common loyalties to the cause of our Millat and her Mission in the Continent of Dinia and its Dependencies".[37]

The Movement aimed at three things. First, to claim for the Millat "at least" ten nations, ten countries, six seas and four island groups. Secondly, to co-ordinate the ten national movements

already founded to work for the integration of individual nations in their respective territorial spheres. And, thirdly, "to animate these movemens with the Pak concept of Dinianism, to organize their work for the establishment of the Pak Commonwealth of Nations, and to foster their dedication to the sacred cause".[38]

Rahmat Ali nowhere mentions the "six seas" he is here demanding. But they were shown on the map printed on the front cover of all pamphlets published since 1942. From there we know that they are: the Pakian Sea on the coast of Sind, the Maplian Sea on the western coast of south India, the Safian Sea on the western coast of Ceylon, the Nasarian Sea on the eastern coast of Ceylon, the Osmanian Sea on the Karnatak coast, and the Bangian Sea on the coast of Bengal.

The Continent of Dinia

Thus far all his declarations, suggestions and plans had been directed to the Muslims of India. Convinced that the sympathy and support of others were now also required, Rahmat Ali, in May 1945, for the first time issued an appeal specifically addressed to the non-Muslim "nations" living in India, who, in his opinion, were being denationalized and "Indianized" by the British-Hindu alliance in the name of the myth that India was a country and all the peoples living in it were Indians. Announcing the founding of a new movement, the Dinia Continental Movement, he asked for the non-Muslims' co-operation in the acceptance of the truth that the "country of India" was really "the continent of Dinia", in the recognition of the fact that the non-Indian nations were distinct from the Indian nation, and in the demand for the creation of separate homelands for them. He argued that only the realization of this aim could bring them sovereign nationhood and at the same time put an end to the Indo-British condominium.[39]

By the non-Indian nations Rahmat Ali meant Muslims, Dravidians, Christians, Sikhs, Buddhs, Parsis, and the Depressed Classes. For the last-named he coined the word "Akhoot", "derived rather irregularly from the Arabic root 'Akh' ", meaning brother (in the Biblical sense); it was to be the antithesis of the term "Achhoot", meaning untouchable, which was used by the Hindus for this class. "I have coined it", he wrote, "to express the Muslim condemnation of the Hindoo use of the term 'Achhoot' for the

Depressed Classes, to symbolize the Muslim attitude towards them, and to impress upon them the Islamic creed of the universal brotherhood of man."[40]

All these nations had one thing in common. They were the victims of the myth of Indianism, which made India the exclusive possession of Caste Hinduism, and which had been created by the Caste Hindus, buttressed by the British and believed by the world. It was "false in its origin and foul in its teachings", and had ruined the cause of human freedom in the world, compromised the status of Asia, distorted the history of "Dinia", and degraded the peoples of that area. By making minorities out of nations and disinheriting them territorially, it had frustrated their spiritual missions and perverted their civilizations; thus making India a country of doom for all.

The myth was no nearer its end. On the contrary, the Caste Hindus and the British were co-operating "to canonize it anew" and to preach its "fatal cult" so that they could go on ruling the continent in its name. The reasons for their love for the myth were not difficult to find. It alone gave the Caste Hindus the opportunity of keeping the non-Indian nations as weak minorities, disintegrating them, and finally absorbing them into the Indian nation. It enabled the British imperial power to keep these nations intermingled with the Caste Hindus, to exploit the consequent conflict in the interest of its dominion over India, and to justify before the world the continued existence of its rule for the good of India.

These two worshippers at the shrine of the Indian myth used two arguments to rationalise their belief. One was that the unity of India is too natural to allow a partition into separate homelands for all the Indian and non-Indian nations. The other was that the principle of "one country, one nation" was so decisive as to reduce 110 million Muslims, 60 million Akhoots, 40 million Dravidians, 7 million Christians and 6 million Sikhs, to the position of mere sub-nations or satellites of the Indian nation. Both were "pure cant and casuistry". The first was refuted by history and geography, the second by international law.[41]

The choice before the non-Indian nations was clear. It lay between myth-destruction and self-destruction. "If we do not destroy the Myth, the Myth will certainly destroy us." Destroying the myth was not as hard a task as it appeared at first sight. Its

supporters were materially strong, but morally powerless. They knew the weakness of their case as much as they recognized the strength of the opposite case. The time was, therefore, ripe for throwing a challenge to the myth and smashing it once for all. Then freedom would come and sweep the Indo-British entente out of sight. If the opportunity was missed, the Bania-imperialist alliance would reimpose its tyranny and the long night of slavery would begin once over again.[42]

The breaking of the myth, continued Rahmat Ali, was an integral part of his plans for India. In fact, it was Part VI of the Pak Plan which dealt with the cause of the Continent of Dinia. Without it he could not fulfil the mission of his life, which "is to change forever the foundations, the framework, and the form of the political thought, expression, and action of the nations of the Millat and of all other nations, including even the Caste Hindoo, with a view to creating a comity of sovereign nations, living in separate homelands in the Continent of Dinia, working out their individual national destinies in their own ways, and making their individual national contributions to the solution of the common problems of Dinia, of Asia, and of the world". This ideal should have great attraction for the non-Muslim non-Indian nations because they had, in the past, suffered more than the Muslim nations and would, in future, suffer still more. Being smaller in number than the Muslims, more Indianized in outlook, less conscious of the dangers inherent in the myth and more exposed to its subtle and suppressive activities, they stood to pay an impossible price for agreeing to continue as members of an Indian nation. All their troubles were due to the myth; and for them to try to improve their position, individually or in relation to one another, was to treat the symptoms of the disease rather than the disease itself.

They must grasp the distinction between sovereign nationhood and sub-nationhood. Even if they were promised a state of their own, but without full sovereignty, they would not be a real nation. The fate of the Bavarians in imperial Germany had a lesson for them: they had a state and a king and yet they were a unit of the German nation, their territory was a part of the German state, and their nationality was, in international law, still German. In an India they would be worse off than were the Bavarians in Germany, because they would not have that sense of patriotism and pride in India which the Bavarians had in imperial Germany. The

Bavarians had it because they were German. Were the non-Indian nations really Indian? No, they could not even pretend to be Indians. If, therefore, they chose to keep themselves in India they would have no defence before their peoples, their history and their posterity. If, on the other hand, they followed their ancient, proud traditions and gave heed to the voice of their own conscience, they would see that their only choice was that of sovereign nationhood. To win this they ought to make a common cause with the Muslims, so that the myth of India could be given the final quietus.[43]

How was the myth to be destroyed and replaced with truth? This was to be done by believing in, proclaiming and publicizing two "supreme facts". The first was that the vast and varied land now commonly called the country of India was "*geographically as well as historically*" a continent. The second was that the so-called India, instead of being the exclusive property of the Caste Hindus, was, "*creedally as well as humanly*", the joint domain of several religions and fraternities, *i.e.*, Dinia.

It was easy to see that India was a continent, not a country. Geographically, a country was normally defined as "a fair-sized, politically-demarcated area of land that possesses some individual characteristics"; and a continent as "a huge, continuous mass of land that is bordered by mountain chains or high seas, or partly by one and partly by the other". A look at any atlas would show tht India was an immense expanse of land (in fact, equal in area to the whole continent of Europe, excluding Russia); that in the north-east, north, and north-west, it was shielded by the highest mountain ranges in the world, and in the south-east, south and south-west its shores were washed by a vast ocean and high seas; and that it was divided off from the continent of Asia by barriers even more stupendous than those which marked off the continent of Asia from the continents of Europe and Africa. In terms of geography, therefore, India was a continent in size, in structure and in setting. Like Asia, Africa, Europe, North America and South America, it should be called a continent.

Historically, a country meant "a respectable-sized unit of territory that is, as a rule, uni-lingual, uni-cultural, and uni-statal"; while a continent signified "an aggregation of such territorial units and is, as a rule, multi-lingual, multi-cultural, multi-national, and multi-statal". That was to say, that whereas the history of a

country was, in general, that of one land, one language, one culture, one nation, and one sovereign state, the history of a continent was, in general, that of several lands, several languages, several cultures, several nations, and many sovereign states. Any history book would indicate that though in its incidentals the history of India, like that of other continents, was that of a vast region inhabited by peoples possessing certain affinities and living for a few short spells under united administration, yet, in its essentials, it was a history of many separate countries inhabited in different ages by many distinct peoples who had their own languages, philosophies, and civilizations, and who were, for the most part, organized into a number of sovereign states ruled by their own kings and emperors. This was true of the 20 centuries of the Dravidian period, of the 21 centuries of the Hindu period, and of the 12 centuries of the Muslim period. During the one hundred and fifty years of British rule, in spite of all British efforts to unite India and all Hindu pretensions that it was already united, the ancient distinctions and divisions of India remained intact and indestructible. It continued to stand divided religiously and ideologically, linguistically and culturally, territorially and, nationally. In historical terms, therefore, India could only be a continent, not a country.

The second supreme fact was that "India" was really "Dinia". Rahmat Ali explained the change of name in the following words: ". . . in spite of its origin in the Sanskrit word *Sindhu,* its evolution in the Greek word *Indus,* and its consummation in the present English form, the word '*India*', as applied to these lands, has ever meant, still means, and ever will mean the lands of Caste Hindooism and the Caste Hindoos; and the word '*Dinia*', in spite of its origin in the Saracenic word '*Din*' and its evolution in the present Urdu form, signifies and will ever signify the lands of '*Dins*' (religions), whatever they are, and of their followers, whoever they may be. That is to say that whereas the word '*India*' defines the lands as the exclusive domain of Caste Hindooism and Caste Hindoos and consequently denies the existence and share therein of Dravidianism and Dravidians, of Akhootism and Akhoots, of Buddhism and Buddhs, of Islam and Muslims, of Sikhism and Sikhs, of Christianity and Christians, and of Zoroastrianism and Parsis, and misrepresents all peoples as Caste Hindoos in the lands of Caste Hindooism; the word '*Dinia*' defines these lands as the

joint domain of all the religions and their followers therein, and consequently acknowledges the existence and share therein of them all, and describes them as the peoples of the lands of religions—without reference to any particular religion or fraternity." The sole reason for using the word "Dinia" was the fact that religion as such was the most prominent characteristic of all its peoples. It played the most vital part in their lives, defining their national entities, inspiring their national ideologies, shaping their national histories, and sustaining their national hopes.

Every country and continent changed its name with the march of history and with a change in its moral and human content. From 3500 to 1500 B.C. India was actually Dravidia, because during these twenty centuries its religion, language, culture and civilization were exclusively Dravidian. Then came the Caste Hindus, who conquered the territories of the Dravidians, crushed them, colonized their lands with their own people, and made Dravidia into an exclusive domain of Caste Hinduism. That is how Dravidia was changed into India. A change in creedal and human factors had ushered in the new name. The next revolution came in the sixth century B.C. when Buddhism arose to defy the moral sway of Caste Hinduism. But by the end of the third century B.C. the challenge had been successfully met and Buddhism banished from the lands of its origin. Caste Hinduism was once again in the ascendant. The next challenge to Hindu supremacy came in the eighth century A.D. when Islam invaded India, colonized it, converted many Indians, created a mighty millat and ruled the Hindu lands for over a thousand years. In these centuries the human and moral composition of India was changed. India was no longer a land of the Hindus, but a continent containing several religions. It had already become Dinia, though the world continued to call it by the old and out-of-date name of India.

An understanding of these two facts is enough to destroy the myth of India as a country. By reviving the myth, the Indo-British entente was not only committing a crime against the seven religions prevailing in the continent, but upholding a fraud and falsifying history. This conferred a right on the non-Indian nations to repudiate the myth and to call upon the British and the Caste Hindus to recognize the multi-religious and multi-national character of India. In this task the suppressed nations would have the support of the science of semantics, the practice of nations, and the

common sense of mankind. To go on calling the continent of Dinia by the name of the country of India was as absurd as calling America, Red India; or Tunis, Carthage; or France, Gaul; or Afghanistan, Gandhara.[44]

Finally, Rahmat Ali asked all the non-Indian nations to realize that, whatever differences they might have on other issues, the cause and the future of the continent were common to them all, and on their success and outcome depended "the national life and liberty, the national position and status" of the Muslims, the Dravidians, the Akhoots, the Christians, the Sikhs, the Buddhs and the Parsis. In struggling to be free they were not denying the existence or interests of any religion or fraternity, but merely demanding the recognition of the existence and interests or their own religions and fraternities. Their failure to make such a demand would be "an act religiously of renegation, morally of self-degradation, territorially of self-disinheritance, and nationally of self-destruction".

He announced the formation of the Dinia Continental Movement which would work for the recognition of this claim on behalf of all the non-Indian nations. It would transcend all communalisms, nationalisms, provincialisms and regionalisms, and would be open to all those people who, "irrespective of religion and race, of nationhood and nationality, of local patriotism and territorial allegiance", believed in the cause of Dinia and were prepared to work for its triumph. The movement stood for the replacement of Indianism by Dinianism and of countryism by continentalism.[45]

The Cabinet Mission Plan

We must now turn from this gazing upon the future to actual events in India and Rahmat Ali's reaction to them. The Muslim League had passed its Lahore Resolution in March 1940 which demanded separate Muslim states in India on the grounds that Muslims were a separate nation and were not prepared to live in a united India under a permanent and hostile Hindu majority. Rahmat Ali had frowned upon the Lahore Resolution and declared the Muslim League plans for the future to be cowardly, inadequate and harmful to the interest of the Millat. He had gone his way and prescribed his Pak Plan which was meant to bring freedom to *all* Indian Muslims and ultimately to create a Dinia and a Pakasia. He must have closely followed Muslim League's policies and the

course of its negotiations with the British and the Congress between 1940 and 1946. But we have no record of his comments on Indian politics. It seems as if he had turned his back on all contemporary developments in order to concentrate on preparing detailed schemes for the future which were rich in imagination and noble in structure, but had little relation to what was happening in India. He was contemptuous of the Muslim League and obviously did not consider it worth his while to write a commentary on its policies and activities.

Moreover, nothing outstanding had happened in India in these six years. The Muslim League had become the greatest Muslim organization and the only party capable of speaking for the Muslim nation. Jinnah had made himself the supreme leader without whose consent or approval nothing permanent or vital could be decided for India. The ideal of Pakistan (of the Muslim League variety) had gripped the Muslim mind and nothing else was considered to be worth looking at or negotiating about. These were substantial achievements and were to determine the future course of history. But these were lean years for decision making. Negotiations had been conducted fitfully, half-heartedly and sometimes aimlessly. The British were fighting a deadly war and saw the Indian problem only as a disturbing distraction on the margin of their consciousness. The Hindus were marking time with no definite policy to offer, hoping that the Muslim problem would somehow solve itself but making no effort to help in the solution, harping on the essential unity of India without letting it influence their policy or attitude. The Muslims were strengthening themselves for the coming struggle, tightening their organization, winning the loyalty of the masses, and nullifying Hindu attempts to pretend that India was one at heart and that freedom for India would mean freedom for all.

It was only after the war was over and the British government was in a position to attend to India that things began to move. The Cabinet Mission, after failing to present a plan which would be acceptable to both Hindus and Muslims, produced its own scheme of a complicated, three-tier constitutional structure,[46] which would have been unworkable even without Hindu-Muslim rivalry and with the best intentions. This was, after the 1935 Constitution, the first occasion when a definite and important decision was reached and made public. It gave Rahmat Ali an opportunity to

express his views on the future of India in the context of his own plans for it.

In a statement on the Cabinet Mission plan, issued to the press on 20 May 1946, he summarized the judgment of the PNM on the British scheme. In his usual, forthright style, brimming with frankness, he opened the statement with the verdict that the plan was "one of the most biased and vicious verdicts in history". He had reasons for such an outspoken comment. "It gives absolute and eternal supremacy to the Caste Hindoos over the whole Continent of Dinia, denies elementary nationhood and sovereignty to the Muslims even in the two countries of Pakistan and Bangistan, seals forever the fate of all non-Indian nations. . . and seeks to perpetuate the opportunity for British interference in the affairs of the Continent."

The plan had rejected all proposals for a partition of India, citing four grounds for its decision: the unity of India, the problem of Indian defence, the problem of Indian communications, and the insolubility of the minority problem. To Rahmat Ali these arguments amounted to no more than "pure cant". Facts exposed their hollowness. The unity of India had never existed and could never be effected with her territorial and human composition which was arbitrary and unhistorical. The argument from the defence of India was mischievous. If it were accepted as justifying the destruction of the non-Indian nations of India, a plea for the defence interests of bigger nations would become the supreme arbiter of the fate of the smaller nations of the world. The coming of the atomic age had made nonsense of such old maxims as "defence in depth"; and if size was the only criterion of effective defence, Britain should be the first to lose her national freedom and sovereignty. The problem of Indian communications was no greater and offered no more serious complications than did European communications; and the latter had never been made a plea for the abolition of national frontiers in Europe. The idea of the insolubility of the minority problem could be entertained only by those who were unfamiliar with Rahmat Ali's Pak Plan, which offered a solution that left no minority unprotected.[47]

On behalf of the PNM, Rahmat Ali declared that Muslims would never accept the British plan, and that for the following reasons. It reduced the Muslims to the position of a minority. It denied the right to sovereign nationhood of the Muslims of the north-west, of

Bengal, of Hyderabad and of the seven other regions. It Indianized the Muslim Millat and established Caste Hindu hegemony over it.

At the same time, he repudiated the basis on which Indian Muslim politicians (he meant Muslim League leadership) had negotiated with the British and the Hindus and also all the agreements that might have been reached as a result of this bargaining. In underlining the mistakes they had committed, he indicated the fundamenal points which separated them from his own policies. They accepted the myth of *the country of India*. They called the Indian Muslims a nation, while in fact they were a Millat comprising a community of eight nations. (He does not explain this number. But obviously he meant the Pak nation (of Pakistan, Bangistan, and Osmanistan) and the seven nations of Hindu regions. Earlier, of course, he had been talking of ten nations). They claimed only two states for the Muslims: Pakistan and Bangistan; while in fact the Muslim demand was for eight states. (Here again he has changed his original figure. He had always been demanding ten states. In the list given here he omits the two states demanded in Ceylon, presumably because here he was talking only about India). They excluded Kashmir from their Pakistan, though it was an integral and inseparable part of Pakistan which, without Kashmir, would be "*Pastan*". They admitted that Muslims living outside Pakistan and Bangistan would be minority communities in the Hindu-majority Indian regions; while in fact they were distinct nations and should not be allowed to continue in the degrading and dangerous position of minorities. Finally, they agreed to a common central government for India in control of defence, foreign affairs, finance and communications, which would be fatal to the sovereignty of the Muslim nation and the Millat.[48]

Muslims would not recognize a transfer of power made by the British to the Caste Hindus. Any transfer to be valid would have to be from the present rulers, the British, to the previous ones, the Mughals. Power should be transferred "to the rightful representative of Emperor Siraj-ud-Din Bahadur Shah, who would delegate it to, and divide it among, all nations as his forefathers did throughout the centuries of their supremacy. It can be made only to him because it was from his ancestors or their Muslim, Hindoo, or Sikh viceroys that the British formally and finally took power in India in 1857".[49] He based this demand on the normal rules of the law

of succession. Power, privilege or position, be it personal, familial or national, was, in law and equity, a part of human moral assets. Like material assets, its disposition should be governed by the principles of grant and reversion, of succession and inheritance. Two precedents were quoted in support of the application of this law to the Indian situation. In 1799 the British had restored the power to rule the Mysore State to the rightful representative of the Maharaja of Mysore to whom it had belonged before his defeat and dethronement by the Muslims in 1762. Again, in 1941, the British and their allies had restored Emperor Haile Selassie to the throne of Abyssinia five years after the conquest and occupation of his empire by the Italians.[50]

One rather minor, but interesting, point may be mentioned here. All pamphlets thus far issued by Rahmat Ali carried a map of India a

considerations: to register the profound achievement of the Pak Culture in the moral and intellectual history of all the peoples of that region of South Asia; to protect and preserve the region itself against the sinister designs of the Caste Hindus, who have throughout been determined to re-convert it into "Hindasia"; and to record forever the mutual right and noble resovle of the standard-bearers of the Pak Culture to ensure its final supremacy in the Orbit of Pakasia.

Unlike the terms Arabasia, Turkasia, Malayasia and Caucasia, the name Pakasia has absolutely no racial significance; it is "merely a cultural designation" of a specific region, and embodies a culture to which recialism has ever been, and will ever be, repugnant.[52]

In its composition, Pakasia comprises all countries of the sub-continent of India (henceforth called Dinia by him), together with its seas and dependencies. There are twenty countries, each of which "represents, on the one hand, the natural int[redacted]

Bihar and Orissa.

Bihar: The province of that name without the proportional area of the Muslim nation of the province.

Orissa: The province of that name without the proportional area of the Muslim nation of the province.

Akhootistan: The territory lying between Bihar and Orissa on the one side and Central India on the other, and representing the Akhoot nation's fatherland (the untouchables or Achhuts).

Mahrashtar: The Bombay Presidency (minus the areas partly included in Osmanistan and partly in Pakistan).

Siddiqistan: The area of the Muslim nation in Central India.

Osmanistan: The area of the Muslim nation in the Deccan.

Takamia: The area of the Caste Hindu nation in the Deccan.

Maplistan: The Malabar district and its adjoining tracts belonging to the Muslim nation of Madras.

Dravidia: The bulk of the Madras Presidency and the homeland of the Dravidian nation.

This division is based on the principle of nationalism, and is "natural and inevitable". Europe, minus Russia, which is about the same area as Dinia and has about the same population, contains 31 national countries and states.

The Dinian Ocean (the Indian Ocean) comprises the following seas: the Pakistan Sea, the Marhatian, the Maplian, the Dravidian, the Safian, the Siyalian, the Nasarian, the Osmanian, the Orian, the Biharian, and the Bangian. Each bears the name of the nation to which morally belongs the right of its defence and control.

The dependencies of Dinia are the following islands, given Muslim names because most are overwhelmingly Muslim in population: the Alam (the Laccadives), the Ameen (the Maldives), Safiistan (western Ceylon), Ceylon proper, Nasaristan (eastern Ceylon), the Ashar (the Andamans), and the Balus (the Nicobars).[53]

The total area of Pakasia is over one million, six hundred thousand square miles. Compared to the domains of other cultures, like the Japanese or the Turkish, it is immense.[54]

Pakasia is one of the most heterogeneous areas in the world, and includes elements of all races and stocks of the human family: Dravidians, Aryans, Semites, Hemites, Scythians, Mongolians. This makes it the most cosmopolitan and internationally minded region

in the globe. The population is 400 million, one-fifth of the total population of the earth. In comparison, the number of people living in the sphere of Turkish culture is only 50 million, of German 80 million, of Japanese 100 million, and of Russian 180 million.[55]

Religions abound in Pakasia. There are Islam, Dravidianism, Akhootism (the faith of untouchables), Caste Hinduism, Sikhism, Christianity, Buddhism, and Zoroastrianism. All have been "profoundly influenced" by Islam. Two, Dravidianism and Akhootism, owe their survival to Islam. One, Sikhism, owes its very birth to Islam. The cultural history of Pakasia speaks of tolerance in this area of diversity of faiths.[56]

Except the Caste Hindu culture, all other cultures in Dinia have lost their vigour and vitality, and are in a state of decay and decline. Having served their cause in their day, they are now dying a natural death. The Hindu culture is alive mainly because of its caste system. But the impact of the Pak culture is bound to defeat it, since the former is too exclusive, it runs counter to the spirit of the time, and the appeal of the latter is irresistible.[57] The concept of Pakasia offers great possibilities for the Pak culture. Read in the light of history, it holds every promise of achievement. The new dynamic forces are on the rise, and are inspired by the ideals and ambitions of the Pak culture itself. The present moment presents a rare opportunity to serve its cause.[58]

Dinia

Rahmat Ali wrote this fifteen-page pamphlet (eleven pages of text) to "restate the cause of the Continent, to renew its claim to recognition by the Comity of Nations, and to expose the Anglo-Caste Hindoo conspiracy against its recognition".[59] It repeats much material of the previous pamphlet: boundaries, area, the twenty countries, the seas and islands, population, peoples and religions. The fresh portion may be summarized briefly.

The division of the world, made by the geographers and historians of the modern age, into six continents is neither sacrosanct nor eternal. The possibility of a new division cannot be excluded. Such redivisions are natural, inevitable and have materialized more than once in human history. The huge mass of land known as the Old World and lying between the Pacific and the Atlantic, created

by nature as a single unit, was riven by the ideology of Hellenism, first culturally, then politically, and finally physically, into the continents of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Similarly, the New World was one continent for ages, but in the eighteenth century the rise of the United States divided it, first politically and then psychologically, into North America and South America.

These ideologies which undo the work of nature are "really the manifestations of the inter-play of those eternal, mysterious forces of Nature which move silently and work constantly for the re-construction of the world". The manifestations of these forces are not subject to the ordinary human conception of time, of space, or of place. When such ideologies are born, they foreshadow the end of the old order and the beginning of the new in their spheres of activity.[60]

One such ideology was that of "Pakism", born in 1933, which "has created the cause of the seventh continent of the world"– Dinia. Dinia is the new "designation and destiny" of the old India which is dying its well-deserved death. By transposing the letter "d" of India, a new continent of Dinia has come into being. This change is semantically significant and morally historic.

The old name was both a misnomer and a menace. A misnomer, because it literally and politically meant that India was the domain of only Caste Hinduism. In fact, its several faiths, religiously and socially, represent systems and civilizations, conceptions and codes of life, and, nationally and territorially, possess heritages, histories and hopes absolutely distinct from those of Caste Hinduism. A menace, because it was being systematically exploited by the Indians (Caste Hindus) to "Indianize" the non-Indians and to make them "nationally honourless, rightless and futureless in the lands of their birth"; it was being used as a cunning, convenient argument to deny the national rights of the non-Indian nations. In contrast to India, Dinia means, literally and politically, the joint domain of all *dins* (religions) and fraternities that flourish therein.[61] So much for the change of India into Dinia.

The conversion from a country to a continent is justified on several grounds. First, the geography of Dinia, which makes it a vast, clearly-defined natural entity. Secondly, the history of Dinia, which is one of

that of Europe minus Russia. Lastly, the creedal and cultural diversity of Dinia, which makes it more like a continent than a country.

The new term does justice to the past, present and future of all the peoples and lands comprising the continent. It acknowledges the existence of all the nations inhabiting the territory, and ensures their full rights.[62] Excluding the dialects, ten languages are spoken in Dinia: Pak (Urdu), Hindi, Punjabi, Rajastani, Bangi (Bengali), Marathi, Telugu, Tamil, Kanarese, and Malyalam. All have their own literature and, broadly speaking, represent the national languages of most of the national groups in Dinia.[63]

The rise of this Dinia is "decreed by Divine forces", and its recognition is demanded by the destiny of one-fifth of mankind. It is being opposed by the Caste Hindus and the British, because any change would mean the end of their hegemony in "India". When communities become nations and provinces turn into countries, they will unite to overthrow this Anglo-Hindu alliance. But the new awakening nations are strong because they recognize the opposition. One day they will liberate themselves

Allah Abad". The second arose from the exclusion of the state of Jammu and Kashmir from Pakistan. This was a mortal loss, for it involved the very existence of Pakistan and of Jammu and Kashmir as Muslim lands. Without Jammu and Kashmir Pakistan "will be *Pastan*—a story of the past". The third arose from the recognition of the sovereign status of the princely states in Pakistan. (Criticism of Muslim League recognition of native states sounds strange on the lips of one who had so recently demanded the transfer of power from British hands to a representative of the defunct Mughal royal house). This would create "at least six Sikhistans and thirty Hindoostans inside one Pakistan". The fourth peril was created by Jinnah's "humiliating" acceptance of the Cabinet Mission plan which was the very negation of Pakistan and the Pak ideology. It created a crisis similar to the one brought about by Muslim League acquiescence in the 1935 Indian federal scheme.[65]

In a savage attack on Jinnah, Rahmat Ali called him "Quisling-i-Azam", charged him with distorting the original concept of Pakistan, and accused the Muslim League of fighting for a Pakistan which was perverse and puerile. Declaring that his Movement would never accept any settlement reached between the League and the British-Hindu alliance, he rather grandiosely added that the Movement "would tear such a settlement to pieces, as it tore the Federal Constitution of 1935, and as it is tearing the British plan of 16th May, 1946".

Continuing his catalogue of perils, he came to the fifth one which arose from the fact that "most of the parties which have lately adopted Pakistan as their ideal are neglecting the supremacy of religion in the Pak ideology". Religion was the fundamental source of this ideology and the greatest cementing force among Muslims. Unless it were raised to its paramount place in the national life and in the national struggle, Muslims would be redisintegrated into Punjabis, Pathans, Kashmiris, Sindhis and Baluchis, the Pak ideology would lose its appeal to the Muslims of Iran, Afghanistan and Tukharistan and thus delay their integration with the Pakistani Muslims, and the entire scheme of the Pak Commonwealth of Nations, the Continent of Dinia and the Cultural Orbit of Pakasia would be jeopardised. Finally, there was the peril arising from the rumours that the Muslim League and the British government had reached an understanding by which Pakistan would be a "dominion or a satellite state of Britain". This

would "paralyse Pakistan at its birth and claim its life before its growth".[66]

If the Muslim League acceptance of the Cabinet Mission plan had angered Rahmat Ali, its acceptance of the 3 June 1947 plan drove him wild. On 9 June 1947 he issued what was to be the last pamphlet of his fourteen-year campaign for his "Pakistan". It is a pity that the last declaration from his pen should have been so intemperate in language.

He opened the attack with sentences which set the pattern for the rest of the text. "The incredible has happened. In its life and death struggle, the blackest treachery has been committed against the Millat. . . . To his crying shame, to the consuming agony of the Millat, and to the contemptuous joy of the British-Bania Alliance, Mr. Jinnah, followed by the All-India Muslim League, has accepted the British Plan of the 3rd of June 1947[67]. . . . In accepting the British Plan Mr. Jinnah has acted the Judas and betrayed, bartered, and dismembered the Millat."[68]

Then he pointed out the crippling effects the acceptance was bound to have on the history and prospects for the Millat. First, for the first time in the history of Islam, the unity of the Millat was destroyed; and an asset was thereby lost which was "universally accepted by all great communities as essential to their progress in the world". Secondly, for the first time in the history of Muslim India, Muslims had accepted from the British-Hindu combination the dubious recognition of two of their ten nations with several fatal qualifications. Pakistan was to forfeit half of the Punjab, half of the historical Sind (Palanpur, Kachch, Kathiawar, and Kambay), the whole of Kashmir, the Delhi division, and the cis-Jamna territories. Bangistan was to lose half of Bengal and the whole of Assam, minus the district of Sylhet. Both Pakistan and Bangistan were to stay in the British Commonwealth and thus be "the slaves of Britian". The other nations of the Millat were to be "the eternal serfs of the Caste Hindoos"; renouncing their nationhoods, embracing Hindu nationality, and swearing an oath of allegiance to the head of the Caste Hindu Indian State. Thirdly, for the first time in the history of Muslim India, Muslims had surrendered to the Caste Hindus all their strategic places and historic battle-fields, which were the shrines of their chivalry, the scenes of their victories, and the shields of their defence, and almost all their famous cities containing their great mosques, seats of learning,

palaces, monuments, royal mausolea, and the *mazars* of their saints, *mujahids* and savants. Fourthly, the Muslims had renounced their pan-Islamic creed. Lastly, the acceptance had wiped out the achievements "of 1308 out of the 1309 years" of the existence of the Millat. These were some of the "dire consequences of the act of Mr. Jinnah".[69]

When he came to examine the arguments given in justification of Jinnah's decision, he found them to be "attempts to whitewash the betrayal". In trying to pervert[70] the verdict of history, Jinnah "is befooling the Muslims into hailing their miserable fate as good fortune, and their betrayal by him as a blessing . . . . Little does he realize that, by doing this, he is adding the smear of shame to the sorrow of disaster suffered by Islam; that he is sprinkling salt on the gaping wounds inflicted by him on the body of the Millat . . . his crime is too black to be whitewashed . . . its consequences are too calamitous to be forgotten by the Millat . . . his attempts are too crude to deceive history".[71]

He countered Jinnah's argument that his acceptance was a compromise, not a settlement, by saying that morally and legally an accepted compromise was synonymous with a settlement, and that a compromise like his, made at the cost of the fundamentals of a cause, was nothing but capitulation. The cause had been the salvation of all the Indian Muslims, and a compromise which left millions of them in Hindu hands could only be a calamity for the Millat, by whatever name one called it. Another argument on behalf of Jinnah, that what the acceptance had won for the Muslims could not have been won otherwise, was dismissed by Rahmat Ali as "an insult to the Millat's intelligence". In accepting the June 3rd Plan, Jinnah had merely accepted "what had already been rejected by the Muslims when a part of it was given by the British in the partition of Bengal in 1905 and when the rest of it was offered in their oftrepeated proposal to create a big Muslim province comprising the Western Punjab, Afghania, Sindh, and Balochistan". Not only that, but the 1947 compromise amounted to less than what Lala Lajpat Rai had offered to the Muslims in 1924 and which they had rejected.[72] In fact, the British and the Hindus were now rejoicing over their success, because "by clever tactics, including mock-heroic opposition even to *what they had voluntarily offered before*, they both inveigled him [Jinnah] into the belief that for him to get that much now would be a great

victory for the Muslims, a great defeat for the Caste Hindoos, and a great concession by the British".[73]

Jinnah's point that the distintegration of the Millat was unavoidable because he could not possibly have demanded Muslim-minority areas for his Pakistan carried no weight with Rahmat Ali. The plea was false, he thundered, because Jinnah could and should have taken a firm stand on the implementation of Rahmat Ali's Pak Plan. To the possible objection that such a scheme would have entailed a huge operation of transferring Muslim populations numbering no less than 50 million, his answer was tha

At this juncture the salvation of the Millat lay in the hands of neither the Muslim League nor Muslim politicians, but in the sustained action of the Muslims themselves. Every me[illegible]

Millat had so far faced: the events of 1857 had led to its defeat, those of 1947 might well result in its doom. It "involves the very being of us all". If the Muslims realized these two facts they could not go wrong.[78]

Recent events made no difference to the plans and aspirations of PNM. On behalf of it, Rahmat Ali declared that it rejected the British plan, repudiated the acceptance of that plan on the Millat's behalf by Jinnah and the All India Muslim League, reiterated its demand for the implementation of the Pak Plan, and warned the British, the Hindus, the Akhoots, the Dravidians, the Sikhs, and all other nations, and the princely states, that "any treaties, pacts or agreements they may conclude with Mr. Jinnah and his All-India Muslim League on the basis of the British Plan" would not bind the Movement, the Pak nations and the Pak Millat. In order to reflect the amended aims of the Movement, it would in future be known as the Pakistan National Liberation Movement. The word "Liberation" was now added also to the names of all other movements founded by Rahmat Ali.[79]

The declaration concluded with an appeal to all Muslims to continue to strive for the future of the Millat without fear of persecution. "It shall never be said of us that, when the time came to choose between the greatest battle for the Millat and the greatest betrayal of the Millat, we too followed Quisling-i-Azam Jinnah and chose betrayal; that we too acquiesced in his treacherous sale of the lives of fifty million Muslims to the Hindoos, and in his shameful mortgage of the honour of fifty million Muslims to the British; and that we too joined him and his 'Johukmies' in their cowardly retreat to the position from which the ancestors of us all sallied forth in 711 to conquer India for Islam and to convert it into Dinia."[80]

The Fatherland of the Pak Nation

In the middle of 1947, Rahmat Ali published the only book he ever wrote: *Pakistan: The Fatherland of the Pak Nation.* The preface bears the date of 15 November 1946, but the volume must have appeared after June 1947 because it contains, as a postscript, the revised version of his statement of 9 June 1947 which we have just been considering. This is the third edition for, as we are told in the preface, the two earlier editions were called "Pakistan: My

Faith, Fatherland, and Fraternity", and were issued in 1935 and 1939 in cyclostyled form for the use of the workers of the PNM. In other words, this is the first printed edition. It is published from his usual Cambridge address, 16 Montague Road, under the imprint of the new movement, the Pakistan National Liberation Movement.

It is a large volume of 392 pages, but not all of it is new. The first fifteen chapters deal with the land, regions and people of the Pakistan of Rahmat Ali's 1933 conception and dimensions. Their headings convey their substance: general description; physical featu

clue in the preface and we are left to speculate. The most feasible explanation that comes to mind is that he was plánning to write a series of volumes studying the lands, histories and peoples of all the Muslim states or nations included in his larger plan. As his earliest suggestion was for a Pakistan in the north-west of India, he began with this and devoted the first volume to it. Other volumes on Bangistan, Osmanistan and the other seven homelands were to appear later, but his death put an end to this programme. Or, it is possible that at the end he had gone back to his first love, the Muslim north-west India, and wanted to write his last book on his dearest favourite, Pakistan.

Whatever moved him to write this book, for our purposes it contains some new concepts which mark a further point (the last as it turned out to be) in the development of his Pakistan idea. No study of Rahmat Ali's plans will be complete without a consideration of this ultimate stage of his thinking.

In one of his earlier pamphlets he had, in passing, referred to enclaves to be granted to non-Muslims in Pakistan. This idea was elaborated in *Pakistan.* He earmarked three special regions in Pakistan for the minorities who wanted to consolidate themse

Kathiawar and the Rann of Kachch for the Caste Hindus of western Pakistan. Here, too, a Hindu-Muslim exchange of populations was to be effected.[81]

As expected in one who wanted to eliminate all traces of Hinduism from Pakistan, Rahmat Ali gave new names to many natural objects in Pakistan. Some of these attempts at Islamizing nature are interesting.

The Himalayas were the first to be re-christened. The word Himalaya, made up of two Sanskrit words *him* and *alaya*, meaning "abode of snow", was Hindu in origin, conception and composition, and was given at the time when Hindus ruled over Pakistan. If allowed to stand, it would remind the Pakistanis of the old Hindu days and would encourage the Hindus to dream of re-capturing the mountains. Anyway, "in a Muslim land there is no room or reason for the non-Muslim names that de-Islamize its atmosphere and endanger its existence". It was not enough to translate the word into Urdu, for that would still amount to accepting an alien conception. Therefore the Himalayas were to be called the Jabaliya, *i.e.*, Jab-ul-Aliya, the great mountain (Arabic: *Jabl* = mountain, *aliya* = great).[82]

Two ranges in the Himalayas were also given new designations. The Sivalik hills of the Punjab were too obviously Hindu in name to be left intact; in Hindu lore they belonged to Siva. They were to be known as the Saliks. Two considerations inspired this change. Morally, the word Salik, as opposed to Siva, had an Islamic significance. Botanically, it was more suitable, as Sal was the chief product of these hills.[83] Similarly, the Brahui range, an off-shoot of the Koh-i-Sulaiman running through the Qalat state and the Quetta-Pishin district, was now called the Central Ibrahimi range.[84]

For the Indus, the biggest Pakistani river and one of the greatest in the world, he chose the ancient, historical name of Mihran.[85] The Thar desert, in the south-west, was to be called the Pak-Raj desert.[86] The region lying between the old Hariana, Thar desert and Bhatinda was given a new name, Bhattiana, after the Bhattis, a well-known Muslim community, who had already given their name to Bhatinda of Patiala state and Bhatnair of Bikaner state.[87]

We must take notice of the fact that in 1947 Rahmat Ali added four areas to the territory claimed for Pakistan in 1933. One of these was Kachch, which was destined to cause a sr : ll-

its full territorial and national life, nor play its proper role in the world."[88]

Rahmat Ali's attitude towards native states was different from the Muslim League's. He gave the status of provinces to only two states, Kashmir and Kachch. The rest, of whom he counted 240, he called "chiefships". While he was prepared to recognize "all legitimate rights, whether of private individuals or of princes", he totally rejected the principle of the sovereignty of princes. To accept any such principle, he said, would involve three things. It would be renouncing all Muslim claims to Kashmir and Kachch and other states, creating about two hundred "sovereign Caste Hindoostans" and six sovereign Sikhistans within Pakistan, and dismembering Pakistan before its rise and recognition. That is why he characterized Jinnah's statement acknowledging the sovereighty of states as "sweeping and senseless".

But he did not make his own policy clear. In the chapter dealing with states and entitled "The Principalities", apart from giving a detailed list of all the states lying in Pakistan, he did not go beyond such general and irritatingly vague statements as that the Muslims of Pakistan wanted "to be fair to all interests including the future of the nation, and to regulate justly the existence and position of the principalities within the body-politic of the nation". This, in his opinion, "sums up the basic position of the Paks with regard to the principalities".[89]

The Pakistan of Rahmat Ali, with the boundaries as indicated above, was to be a Muslim country where "the religion of a great majority of the people" would be Islam. But there would inevitably be some non-Muslim communities scattered all over the country. As we have seen, he had tried to eliminate the Caste Hindus and Sikhs by creating enclaves for them. However, some minorities would still remain within Pakistan, and he estimated their numerical strength as follows:[90]

Community	Number	Percentage of total population
Caste Hindu	10,989,043	19.98
Akhoot	2,598,384	4.72
Sikh	5,303,735	9.64
Christian	573,901	1.04

Community	Number	Percentage of total population
Jain	129,297	0.23
Buddhist	41,836	0.07
Parsi	8,631	0.16

He emphasized the sovereignty of Pakistan by giving it certain national symbols, like a flag, a language, a code of honour and so on.

It will be recalled that in the reprints of all his pamphlets he had put a flag on the map printed on the outside front cover showing a white crescent and five stars on a green background. In the last pamphlet the number of stars had been doubled. He seemed to have forgotten this change in the number of stars, because he said that "in its present form the national flag of Pakistan is a green oblong with a white Crescent and Five Stars in th centre", and added that "in its present form, the Flag is only fourteen years old, having been designed by me in 1933". The green colour and the crescent were ancient Islamic symbols and needed no explanation; together the two portrayed the Islamic fraternity. The stars, "a sign akin to the symbol of the Crescent, register the historic regions of Pakistan – regions which today are split into many lands, provinces and principalities; but which, under the Flag, are destined to be so reintegrated as to re-create our old unified and compact Fatherland".[91] He did not name these "historic regions", but evidently he meant the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province (his "Afghania"), Kashmir, Sind, and Baluchistan.

The national language of Pakistan was to be Urdu, but its name was now changed to Pak. The fact that it was also the language of the whole Millat, including those portions of it which lived in Bangistan, Osmanistan, Siddiqistan, Faruqistan, Haideristan, Muinistan, and Maplistan, and that it was "the most widely spoken language in the Continent of Dinia", meant that it was, "in fact, the *lingua franca* of the whole Cultural Orbit of Pakasia and one of the most extensively understood languages in the neighbouring Continent of Asia".[92] It will be noticed that there is a strong element of exaggeration in these claims for Urdu. It was

certainly not the language of Bengal and Assam, and probably not of Muslim south India. And it would have been hard to supply proof of the assertion that it was "one of the most extensively understood languages" in the rest of Asia.

The national laws of Pakistan would be "Muslim laws, whose science is called Fiqh, which has for its sources the *Quran* (the Holy Book), the *Hadees* (the Traditions), the *Ijmaa* (the Consensus), and the *Rai* (the Opinion)". The *Sharia*, the comprehensive legal system evolved from these sources, had two distinctive features of which the Paks, like all Muslims in the world, were proud. It was the only system of law in which sovereignty belonged to God and therefore human allegiance was due only to Him; and, far from being a collection of commands enforced by the sanction of the state, it gave paramount consideration, not to the state, but to the individual and his welfare.

Most of these laws had been "in abeyance" since 1857 when they were superseded by British Indian laws; the important exception being the personal laws. The time was not far off, however, when national laws would be fully enforced and the courts of the country would administer none others.[93]

Probably realizing that law could determine only the externals of human behaviour while the internal springs of action emerged from the morals of a people, Rahmat Ali proceeded to lay down a national code of honour. "It represents the essence of its [a nation's] moral values and of its social customs which command universal allegiance." The Pak code of honour would reflect all those virtues and values which had been evolved by mankind through the course of its progress from primeval barbarism to modern good living and which had received the homage of all good men. Six basic virtues made up the code: *izzat* (honour), *azadi* (freedom), *bahaduri* (bravery), *wafa* (faithfulness), *panah* (protection of the weak), and *tawazo* (hospitality). He singled out *izzat* for special explanation, because it was not easily translatable into English. "It comprehends the conceptions of self-respect and pride, of good name and reputation. So, in its primary sense, it signifies to the Paks what the word 'honour' does to the Europeans and the word 'face' to the Chinese and Japanese."[94]

Another national symbol which summed up the idea of social dignity among a people was the courtesy titles used by a society to symbolize moral, social and cultural accomplishments. They

were "the sweet-scented blossoms" of a nation's social history. For the Paks, the oldest and the proudest of these honorifics was *Khan*. Used by many people and in many ways, it meant lord or chief or leader in the social, tribal or clannish sense. Prefixed to the name of a man it distinguished him in the eyes of others. The equivalent religious title was *mawlana* or *mawlawi*. The feminine of *Khan* was *Khanum*, but it was used only for married women. *Khanzada* was the son of a *Khan*, and *Khanzadi* the daughter of a Khan. As these titles prevailed in Muslim societies only, the minorities of Pakistan would naturally prefer to use their own, of which several were well known, like *sardar* for the Sikhs which in fact was an Urdu word meaning "leader".[95]

As Islam was the guiding force in the thinking and planning of all of Rahmat Ali's schemes, it was but natural that he should have emphasized Pakistan's place in and links with the Muslim world. The land of the Paks "primarily belongs to the Muslim world, with which its fate and fortune are indissolubly linked". He calculated that Pakistan, with an area of 521,000 square miles, would cover about five per cent of the total territory of the Muslim world, and thus be the seventh largest Muslim state in the world. In terms of population, the 55 million Paks, among a world total of 400 million Muslims, would constitute the second biggest Muslim state in the world, the first being Bangistan with a population of seventy million.

Quantitatively, therefore, the standing of Pakistan would be high in the Muslim world. But it would be even higher in certain qualitative aspects. Pakistan was to be "geographically, the heart of the Orient; spiritually, a bulwark of Islam against Caste Hinduism; politically, a buffer state which covers one of the most vulnerable frontiers of the world of Islam; and, strategically, an impregnable citadel standing between Muslim Asia and Hindoo Dinia". From the point of view of world communications, it would be "a junction on the most direct land and air route between Dinia, Europe, and Asia".

These geographical and strategic advantages of Pakistan, taken together with its territorial size and population figures, showed how important was the existence of Pakistan to the Islamic world community, and how vital its freedom to itself, to Asia and to the whole world. The security of the Muslim world was interdependent in every sense – spiritually, economically, politically,

militarily. The heritage and hopes of the fraternity were one and indivisible. The integrity and independence of one part of it depended on those of all others. The indifference of one part to the others would be a disaster, for unity alone could ensure the safety of the Muslim world and its future greatness.

These, said Rahmat Ali, were dangerous times, and nowhere more so than in Asia where, in addition to other imperialisms which the world knew well, "an old hegemony is rising again in all its ruthlessness. I mean the Caste Hindoo hegemony, which is supported by its two hundred and fifty million beneficiaries; and which, at the present stage in its growth, few outside Dinia recognize, fewer regard with apprehension, and fewer still resist with determination. Yet the fact remains that this hegemony, which is in league with British imperialism, is the greatest menace to the peace of the Orient. It denies the right of existence not only to Pakistan, but also to other nations of the Millat in Pakasia. It is therefore painfully clear that should it succeed in its sinister designs, it would be a calamity—a calamity which would involve the destiny of the whole world of Islam".[96]

In the Orient Islam was to be saved, first, by the creation of Pakistan, secondly, by the creation of other Muslim countries in India, and, finally, "after achieving the independence of our Indian homelands", by integrating them with "our 'Asian' homelands". This was the only way to "unify the nationhood of all our peoples in all our homelands in India and Asia".[97] He did not specify these Asian homelands, but it can safely be deduced from his other writings and his general line of thought that he looked forward to an ultimate integration of Muslim India with Iran and Afghanistan. It is a testimony to Rahmat Ali's perspicacity and foresight that in later years Pakistan's foreign and economic policy developed in this direction. The Regional Cooperative Development (RCD) scheme embracing Pakistan, Iran and Turkey aimed, to start with, at economic unity. The idea of a confederation of Pakistan, Iran and Afghanistan has been voiced by many in Pakistan and outside,[98] and, the difficulties in the way of its realization notwithstanding, no perceptive student of Asian and Muslim affairs should be surprised if such a consummation came about in one or two generations.

NOTES

1. This account of his frame of mind at this period is based on interviews with people in Cambridge who were close to him, with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali and K.A. Waheed, and some entries in *RCPB*.
2. What was to be part V, and what happened to it, is not mentioned in this or any other pamphlet.
3. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *The Millat and the Mission* (Cambridge, first issued in October 1942, printed ed. August 1944), p. 1.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 5 fn. He has now changed the spelling of "Usmanistan" to "Osmanistan". I have followed the change for the sake of purity of quotation.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 7 fn.
6. Italics in the original.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-20.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21. There are dozens of references to the subject in *RCPB*.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
11. Dr. Beni Prasad, a keen student of the Hindu-Muslim problem wrote in 1944 that "already Hyderabad figures as 'Usmanistan' in the expositions and maps of the more ardent advocates of Pakistan" (see his *Communal Settlement*, Bombay, 1944, p. 19). He does not identify these advocates, nor does he refer to any literature on the subject. But his use of the word "Usmanistan" suggests that he had Rahmat Ali in mind; and perhaps also S.A. Latif, but Latif can hardly be called an advocate of Pakistan.
12. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Bangistan: The Fatherland of the Bang Nation* (The Bangistan National Movement, Cambridge, Pakasia Literature Series No. 2, September 1946), preface, p. 4.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
20. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Osmanistan: The Fatherland of the Osman Nation* (The Osmanistan National Movement, Cambridge, Pakistan Literature Series no. 3, September 1946), pp. 5-6.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-11. *RCPB* has several references to this topic.
26. Curiously enough, Rahmat Ali reproduced only one of these seven pamphlets in his *Pakistan,* that on Haideristan on pp. 285-298. One reason might have been that all of them were reissued on 5 February 1946, and were still available when *Pakistan* went to the press.
27. Chaudhary Rahmat Ali, *The Millat and Her Minorities: Foundation of Siddiqistan for Muslims of Central India* (Cambridge, 15 March 1943, reissued 5 February 1946), pp. 2-6. It was published by the Siddiqistan National Movement.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
32. This was repeated on p. 5 of each of the above-mentioned seven pamphlets.
33. See Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *The Millat and Her Minorities: Foundation of Haideristan for the Muslims of Hindoostan* (Cambridge, 15 March 1943, reissued 5 February 1946). It was published by the Haideristan National Movement.
34. See Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *The Millat and Her Minorities: Foundation of Faruqistan for the Muslims of Bihar and Orissa; The Millat and Her Minorities: Foundation of Muinistan for Muslims of Rajistan; The Millat and Her Minorities: Foundation of Maplistan for Muslims of South India; The Millat and Her Minorities: Foundation of Safiistan for Muslims of Western Ceylon;* and *The Millat and Her Minorities: Foundation of Nasaristan for Muslims of Eastern Ceylon.* All these were issued from Cambridge on 15 March 1943, each by its own National Movement.

The Maplistan claim has an interesting but incomplete sequence. In 1947, a Maplistan proposal was formally tabled at the Madras conference on linguistic states, but was ruled out of order. (See Ronald E. Miller, *Mappila Muslims of Kerala,* Madras, 1976). In 1969, the Kerala Muslim League was able to compel the Kerala government to create a Muslim-majority district situated in the historic centres of Muslim settlement in Malabar–Malappuram. On this a modern historian of the Moplas comments: "Apart from Pakistan itself, this was the only one of Choudhary Rahmat Ali's seven Muslim 'countries' which achieved a legal political identity in South Asia after 1947", Stephen Frederick Dale, *Islamic Society on the South Asian Frontier: The Mappilas of Malabar, 1498-1922,* Oxford, 1980, p. 226.

35. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *The Millat and Her Ten Nations: Foundation of the All-Dinia Milli Movement* (Cambridge, 14 June 1944), p. 5. It was published by the All-Dinia Milli Movement, and is reproduced in *Pakistan,* pp. 301-311.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
39. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *India: The Continent of Dinia or the Country of Doom?* (Cambridge, 15 May 1945), Prefatory Note, p. 2. It was published by the Dinia Continental Movement, and was reprinted on 20 March and 1 May 1946. It carried the sub-title "Sovereign Nations in Homelands or Sub-Nations in Hindoolands?" It is reproduced in *Pakistan,* pp. 313-330.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 3 fn.
41. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
44. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-11. Italics in the original.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
46. For details of the Cabinet Mission Plan see *India: Statement by the Cabinet Mission and His Excellency the Viceroy,* London, May 1946, Cmd. 6821; *India: Correspondence and Documents connected with the Conference between the Cabinet Mission and His Excellency the Viceroy and representatives of the Congress and the Muslim*

League, London, May 1946, Cmd. 6829; D.R. Parkash, *Cabinet Mission and India*, Lahore, 1946; R.R. Sahni, *To the British Cabinet Mission*, Lahore, n.d.; Saida, *A Nation Betrayed*, Delhi, 1946; Hugh Tinker, *Experiment with Freedom*, London, 1967; A.K. Azad, *India Wins Freedom: An Autobiographical Narrative*, Bombay, 1959; E.W.R. Lumby, *The Transfer of Power in India, 1935-47*, London, 1954; and R.A. Smith, *Divided India*, New York, 1947.

47. Choudhari Rahmat Ali, *The Pakistan National Movement and the British Verdict on India* (Cambridge, n.d.), p. 1. It was published by the Pakistan National Movement. Rahmat Ali signed it on 19 May 1946, and it was issued to the press on 20 May; but the date of the publication on the pamphlet is not indicated on it. It is reproduced in *Pakistan*, pp. 339-343. A very brief summary of it was carried by the *Paisa Akhbar* of Lahore, 24 May 1946.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 2. Italics in the original.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 3. Rahmat Ali does not indicate who this "rightful representative" was or could be.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 3; also a few entries in *RCPB*.
51. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Pakasia: The Historic Orbit of the Pak Culture* (The Pakasia Cultural Movement, Cambridge, Pakasia Literature Series no. 12, August 1946), Preface, p. 4.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
53. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
56. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.
57. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
59. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Dinia: The Seventh Continent of the World* (The Dinia Continental Movement, Cambridge, Pakistan Literature Series no. 11, September 1946), Preface, p. 4. The preface is dated 5 September.
60. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
61. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.
62. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
64. *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15; also a few entries in *RCPB*.

65. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan*, pp. 338-339.
66. *Ibid.*, pp. 344-345; also entries in *RCPB*.
67. Here the date is correct. In the pamphlet it is given wrongly as 2 June on p. 2.
68. *Ibid.*, pp. 353-354. The text given in this book is a revised one (see pp. 352-376) and is harsher in tone than the original text, though the original was by no means a mild statement. I have used both versions here, indicating the source of each quotation. The pamphlet is cited as *The Greatest Betrayal*.
69. *The Greatest Betrayal*, pp. 2-4. In *Pakistan* the number of consequences is increased to seven by splitting up two of the earlier ones; and some more details are added, *e.g.*, lists of names of cities and places lost to India, see pp. 355-358.
70. The word used in *The Greatest Betrayal*, p. 4, is "escape".
71. The whole passage was added later; see *Pakistan*, pp. 358-359.
72. Here Rahmat Ali was falsifying history on a large scale. The Muslims had *not* rejected the 1905 partition of Bengal, but welcomed it; it was annulled under Hindu pressure. The Muslims were *never* offered a big Muslim province in the north-west. Nor did they reject Lala Lajpat Rai's 1924 "offer", which was not an offer made by any party, but a suggestion thrown out by an individual who could not interest his own people in the scheme.
73. My italics: to show how far from the truth Rahmat Ali could go in attacking Jinnah.
74. *The Greatest Betrayal*, pp. 4-7; *Pakistan*, pp. 358-359. He gives no details of the European transfer of populations, and, in fact, omitted this reference from the revised version in *Pakistan*.
75. *Pakistan*, pp. 365-366.
76. *The Greatest Betrayal*, p. 7; *Pakistan*, pp. 366-367.
77. *The Greatest Betrayal*, pp. 7-8; *Pakistan*, pp. 367-369.
78. *The Greatest Betrayal*, pp. 9-10; *Pakistan*, pp. 369-373.
79. *The Greatest Betrayal*, pp. 10-11; *Pakistan*, pp. 373-374. The change in the Movement's name is mentioned only in the revised version.
80. *The Greatest Betrayal*, pp. 11-12; *Pakistan*, pp. 374-376. The personal attack on Jinnah was an after-thought and occurred only in the revised text. There are also some

entries in *RCPB*.

81. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan*, Chapter VIII, pp. 123-124. Italics in the original. To avoid any confusion it must be repeated that by "eastern Pakistan" and "western Pakistan" Rahmat Ali meant the eastern and western parts of his Pakistan of 1933, not the eastern and western wings of the pre-1971 Pakistan.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 34 fn.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 36 fn.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
85. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
87. *Ibid.*, p. 126.
88. *Ibid.*, pp. 114-116 for all these areas. For Kachch and Kathiawar see also pp. 23 and 108.
89. *Ibid.*, Chapter VII, pp. 117-118, the states of Pakistan are listed on pp. 118-122, with the name, "character" (religion of the ruler), area, population and capital of each.
90. *Ibid.*, p. 153. It is not clear from his statement whether these figures were reached after or before the departure of Caste Hindus and Sikhs for their respective enclaves. The large percentage of Caste Hindus and Sikhs suggests that the calculation was made as before the creation of the enclaves.
91. *Ibid.*, pp. 155-156. It may be recalled that the flag of the All India Muslim League was a white crescent and star on a green background. With the coming of independence, Pakistan adopted this flag with one change: a white strip symbolizing the minorities was added to the mast-side of the background; which evoked a ribald comment from some members of the minority: the pole has been thrust right through us.
92. *Ibid.*, p. 160. I wonder if this exaggerated estimate of Urdu owed something to Sayyid Abdul Latif's claim that it "has thus not only won a more or less recognized position as the common language of India, but promises by virtue of its intrinsic qualities to play one day the role of the lingua franca of the East", Sayyid Abdul Latif, *The Influence of English Literature on Urdu Literature*, London, 1924, pp. 3-4.
93. *Ibid.*, pp. 161-162.
94. *Ibid.*, p. 162. The word "panah" may be translated better

as "sheltering the weak".

95. *Ibid.*, pp. 162-163.
96. *Ibid.*, Chapter XXI, pp. 331-333. The passage quoted is on p. 333.
97. *Ibid.*, pp. 347-348.
98. See, for example, Richard V. Weekes, Pan-Islam and Pakistan's Foreign Policy, Columbia University Ph.D. thesis, 1954; K.F. Yusuf, Economic and Political Co-operation of Pakistan, Iran and Afghanistan, Clark University Ph.D. thesis, 1959; Z.H. Hashmi, The Dynamics of Contemporary Regional Integration: The Growth of Regionalism among Iran, Pakistan and Turkey, University of Southern California Ph.D. thesis, 1970; K.A. Nasir, The Foreign Relations of Pakistan: First Ten Years, American University Ph.D. thesis, 1957: K. Sarwar Hasan, *Pakistan and the United Nations*, New York, 1960; Zubeida Hasan, "Iran, Pakistan and Turkey –Regional Co-operation for Development", *Pakistan Horizon* (1964), pp. 276-285; several official publications on the subject issued by the Government of Pakistan; and the contents of the *Journal of the Regional Cultural Institute (Iran, Pakistan, Turkey)*, published from Tehran by the RCD Cultural Institute.

CHAPTER 6

HOME IS WILDERNESS: 1948

Between 1940 and 1947, while Rahmat Ali was busy, in his Cambridge study, carving out of India an indomitable collection of Muslim states, nations, countries, strongholds, enclaves, and proportional areas, the maelstrom of Indian politics was churning out new realities. Before narrating the tragedy of Rahmat Ali's first and last visit to Pakistan it is necessary to summarize the developments in India which led to the creation of Pakistan.

The Making of Pakistan

Thanks to a succession of people going back to the end of the nineteenth century who had underlined the fundamental reality of Hindu-Muslim conflict, and suggested various devices to re-arrange, re-distribute, re-demarcate or divide the sub-continent, the idea of a Muslim state had been present in Indian politics at least since the 1920s. In 1933, Rahmat Ali had given it a new shape, a definite name and a politically respectable ballast of the two-nation theory. In a few years the idea of Pakistan had won enough appeal and support to compel the Muslim League to borrow it (minus its name) and make it the party's official objective. With the nightmare of Congress rule in the Hindu provinces fresh in their memory and the power of public opinion impelling them forward, the League leaders decided in Lahore on 24 March to make a formal demand for Pakistan. The Lahore resolution asked that all areas in India in the north-west and north-east where Muslims were in a majority should be constituted into " 'Independent States' in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign". Muslim nationalism had now come into its own.

Jinnah toured the country from one end to the other, arguing

for separation, appealing to the Muslims, persuading the Hindus, and convincing the British. Echoing Rahmat Ali, he harped on the cultural and religious gulf that yawned between the two communities, talked of two nations, and stated repeatedly that the Indian problem was international, not national, and must be solved as such. The propaganda campaign among the Muslims was a foregone success. They needed no goading on this point. In fact, they had forced his hands in 1937-40 to come over to the separatist camp. The Hindus remained unconvinced to the last. A few among them studied the proposal carefully and then rejected it. The great majority, including Gandhi and Nehru, was not even prepared to consider or discuss it. The British looked upon it as a cataclysmic disruption of their century-old achievement of creating a united India.

British hesitation was eroded gradually by the expediency of the war, the unanimity of Muslim option, the refusal of the Congress to give any acceptable assurances to the minorities, and the general palsy of the imperial hand. If the two communities were so irrevocably opposed to each other, the majority was not generous enough to accommodate the minority, the minority was not prepared to be ruled by a permanent majority, and the British, weakened by a prolonged war, could not stay in India indefinitely and play the part of a policeman hated by both sides—in such a situation of sheer desperation Britain surrendered, more to uncontrollable realities than to Muslim pressure.

The first victory of the Muslim League came in March 1942, when Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord Privy Seal and the Leader of the House of Commons, came to India to negotiate with its leaders on the basis of a draft declaration approved by the British Cabinet on 3 March. Cripps arrived in Delhi on 22 March, and made the draft public on 29 March. It envisaged, after the war, the creation of an Indian Union with the status of a Dominion and with a constitution made by an Indian body. There was a provision for any province to remain out of the proposed Union with the right of forming its own independent government. This "non-accession clause" was a major, if not a complete, concession to the Muslim demand for Pakistan. It was also one of the two grounds on which the Congress rejected the offer on 11 April; the other being the default of immediate independence. The Muslim League also turned it down, saying that the terms of provincial non-accession

were too indefinite and vague to result in a Pakistan.[1] But the development must have gratified Jinnah. He redoubled his efforts, improved the organization of the League, streamlined the publicity campaign, and tightened his hold over the party. As the League grew in strength, Jinnah gained in authority.

Congress mistakes and miscalculations assisted the League's strategy. During the negotiations with Cripps, the Congress had made a bid for the control of entire India. When this failed, the party turned frustrated, bitter and impatient. The result was the disturbances of August-September 1942, which Gandhi called an "open rebellion". In five Hindu provinces widespread anti-government riots broke out. Telegraph wires were cut, air-field installations destroyed, railway stations burnt, post offices looted, and policemen killed. The Muslims kept aloof from the violence. Even the Hindu Mahasabha did not support the Congress. The revolt failed and sent all Congress leaders to jail.[2] This gave Jinnah a rare opportunity to consolidate the League, to argue that the Congress was an irresponsible body, and to gain the ear of the Viceroy.

It is a testimony to the new prestige of the League that when Gandhi secured his release in the late summer of 1944 he saw no alternative to negotiating with it. The way to these talks had been prepared by C. Rajagopalacharia, a front rank Congress leader, who had first argued, in his pamphlet *The Way Out*, that the Cripps offer had been a *bona fide* scheme and should be revived and reconsidered, and had later expostulated with Gandhi and his other colleagues that they should accept the Pakistan proposal and try to reach some agreement with the Muslims. In July he prepared a formula, known as the C.R. Formula after his initials, which conceded the principle of Pakistan under two conditions: partition would come after the British withdrawal, and it would be contingent upon the favourable outcome of a plebiscite of *all* inhabitants of the areas claimed by the League.

The Gandhi-Jinnah talks were held in Bombay in September 1944, but failed to end in any agreement. Jinnah did not trust the Congress and demanded a partition there and then, before the British left. Gandhi did not concur. The negotiations were broken off after several meetings and some letters exchanged during the encounter.[3] The League gained much from the incident, its failure notwithstanding. By the simple fact of agreeing to meet Jinnah as

the representative of the Muslims, the Congress had tacitly abandoned its claim to speak for all India. The meeting also revealed the sharpness and depth of the differences between the two peoples. No longer could the Congress take shelter behind the pretence that no communal problem existed. Jinnah had triumphed by getting Gandhi to recognize the Pakistan idea.

Next year another attempt at reconciliation was made, this time by the government, when the Viceroy, Lord Wavell, summoned all leaders to a conference at Simla. The idea was to discuss the formation of an Executive Council (entirely Indian except for the Commander-in-Chief) from amongst the Indian parties "in proportion which would give a balanced representation of the main communities, including equal proportion of Muslims and Caste Hindus". The attempt failed not only because Jinnah wanted parity between the Muslims and the Hindus (which was conceded) but also insisted that the Muslim League should nominate all Muslim Councillors (which was not conceded).[4]

Two significant features of these discussions strike the eye. The Congress agreed to the principle of parity between Caste Hindus and Muslims, thus acquiescing in the two-nation theory. Hindus and Muslims were two separate nations, coming together for the time being in the Viceroy's Council. The Muslims were not a minority to be fobbed off with a meagre representation. They were a nation entitled to equality with the other nation, the Hindus. The other astonishing item related to the Caste Hindus. The Hindu nation did not include the untouchables. This vindicated Rahmat Ali's repeated assertion that the Hindus of India who constituted a nation were the Caste Hindus, not all Hindus.

Basically the Simla Conference had failed on the question of credentials. Both the Congress and the League had made claims on behalf of their respective constituencies, but without any electoral evidence. No general elections had been held since 1934 to the central legislature and since 1937 to the provincial assemblies. The balance of political power and the loyalties of the people had shifted in these years. In August 1945, therefore, it was announced that elections to all legislatures would be held in the following winter.

The elections were fought on two plain but mutually irreconcilable issues. The Muslim League contested to vindicate two claims: it represented all Indian Muslims, and Pakistan was the only

solution of the Indian problem. The Congress position was equally unambiguous and resolute: it spoke for all India including the Muslims, and it wanted independence without partition. The results were as clear to everyone as they were frustrating to the decision-makers. The League won every single seat in the central assembly and 428 out of the possible 492 seats in the provinces. The Congress did equally well in the general (non-Muslim) constituencies.[5] The verdict was unmistakable. The Muslims were a nation and wanted to separate from India. The rest of the people insisted on a united India under the rule of the Congress. The cleavage was as deep as it had been. The deadlock was worse than before.

The impossible task of finding an acceptable solution of this riddle was assigned to three wise men from London. It was announced on 19 February 1946 that a mission from the British Cabinet was being dispatched poste-haste to Delhi to try to seek a constitutional way out of the impasse. Lord Pethick-Lawrence, the aged Secretary of State for India, Sir Stafford Cripps and A.V. (later Lord) Alexander duly arrived on 24 March. After several rounds of unfruitful conversations with all varieties of leaders, the mission put forth its own scheme on 16 May.

The Cabinet Mission plan ruled out Pakistan as a practical possibility. The mission was "greatly impressed by the very genuine and keen anxiety of the Muslims lest they should find themselves subjected to a perpetual Hindu majority", and found this feeling too strong and widespread to be allayed by "mere paper safeguards". But, Pakistan provided no solution. It would not solve the minority problem without massive population migrations, and it was not feasible to divide the Punjab and Bengal. The communications system had been established on the basis of a united India, and to disintegrate it would "gravely injure" both parts of India. An even stronger argument against partition lay in the future defence needs of the sub-continent. Besides, the native states would find it difficult to associate themselves with a divided India. Finally, the geographical fact that the two parts of Pakistan would be separated by hundreds of miles made the creation of Pakistan an act of hazard.

The plan offered by the mission was an exceedingly complicated three-tier, loose Indian Union made up of provinces, sections and the federal centre. The Union would control foreign affairs,

defence, communications, and the finance required for these subjects. All other powers would belong to the provinces, who would be free to form groups with group executives and legislatures, and each group could determine which provincial subjects should be taken in common. The constitutions of the Union and the groups were to be subject at ten-year intervals to reconsideration if demanded by any province. The three groups of provinces were: (1) Madras, Bombay, the United Provinces, the Central Provinces, and Orissa; (2) the Punjab, NWFP, and Sind; (3) Bengal and Assam. A constituent assembly, consisting of 292 members from the provinces and 93 from the native states, was proposed. Following the convening of the constituent assembly, the representatives of each of the three groups were to meet separately to decide the nature of their group constitutions. After this action the group representatives were to reassemble in a single body for the drafting of the Union constitution.[6]

Now started the tragically amusing process of the Congress and the League accepting, rejecting, again accepting, and partially rejecting the plan. Some of the ups-and-downs of this see-saw are worth recording, for they determined the final conclusion.

On 6 June the League accepted the long-term plan, in the hope that it would ultimately result in the establishment of Pakistan; it was also agreeable to join the interim government. On 25 June the Congress accepted the long-term plan with reservations on certain vital points, but rejected the short-term proposition of entering the interim government. On 16 June the Viceroy had announced that if the major parties, or either of them, refused to come into the government, he would proceed with its formation in co-operation with the party or groups that were prepared to join it. But when Congress rejected the short-term plan on 25 June, the Viceroy, instead of forming a government with the help of the League and other parties which had accepted the whole plan, postponed the formation of the interim government. The League took this as a breach of promise.

At the same time the Congress leaders were making intemperate speeches, defining the position of the Congress in the plans for the transfer of authority in India. Jawaharlal Nehru declared that what his party would do in the constituent assembly depended entirely on its own free will. "We have committed ourselves to no single matter to anybody", he said. The Congress president sup-

ported him by announcing that the constituent assembly would have "the unfettered right to make a constitution; it would be sovereign; and would legislate for a united, not a divided, India".[7] These utterances reduced the Congress acceptance of the long-term plan to nonsense. On the other side, the Viceroy was not keeping his word about the formation of the interim government. On 27 July the League reversed its acceptance of the plan, and announced that the time had come to resort to "direct action" to achieve Pakistan.

Meanwhile, the Congress changed its mind and accepted the short-term plan. Now the Viceroy hurried to invite it to form the interim government, and the new administration took office in September. The day of the installation of the new government was observed as a day of protest and mourning by the Muslims and black flags were flown to demonstrate their feeling of resentment. It was not till 15 October that the League revised its decision. Realizing that the Congress was enjoying all the fruits of power and this was proving detrimental to Muslim interests, Jinnah sent his team of Leaguers to join the Viceroy's Executive Council.

A fresh controversy raised its head in December. The first meeting of the constituent assembly was scheduled for 9 December, but the League asked for its postponement so that discussion could be held on the vexed question of the grouping clause. The Congress interpreted this provision to mean that each province had the right to decide both as to its grouping and as to its own constitution. To overcome the impasse, the British Government invited the Viceroy, Jinnah, Liaquat Ali Khan, Nehru and Baldev Singh to come to London to discuss the controversy. When these talks of December 1946 failed to produce an agreement, the Biritish Government reaffirmed that the League's interpretation was the right one, *viz.*, that the decision of the assembly's sections on provincial constitutions and grouping should be taken by a simple majority vote of each section. But the Congress still refused to accept this version, and demanded that the League should either enter the constituent assembly on the Congress interpretation of the grouping clause or resign from the interim government. The League refused to quit the government and maintained its boycott of the assembly on the ground that it was the Congress that had refused to abide by the official interpretation of

the grouping clause.[8]

With the coming of the new year the turn of events reached a new tempo. On 20 February the British Government announced its intention to withdraw from India by June 1948 and the immediate replacement of Wavell with Mountbatten as Viceroy of India. When Mountbatten reached Delhi on 22 March he saw a country in a state of virtual civil war being governed inefficiently by a rickety interim government riven with acute internal conflicts and rivalries. Conferences with political leaders deepened his impression that there was no time to wait upon events and no prospect for the emergence of a united India. Hurriedly he drew up a plan for a divided India and sent it to London. When he showed a copy of it to Nehru, the latter exploded and told the Viceroy that the Congress would never accept it. In an emergency, V.P. Menon, the Hindu constitutional adviser of the Viceroy who was in the confidence of the Congress, was asked to prepare a new scheme which would meet Congress's objections. This plan was rushed to London, placed before the Cabinet, and approved without a single amendment. It was announced from Delhi on 3 June, and accepted by all parties.[9]

On 4 July the Indian Independence Bill was introduced in the British Parliament and became law on 15 July. Power was formally transferred to the two new Dominions on 15 August 1947.

The State of Pakistan

Independence came to the sub-continent in a state of unparalleled confusion and carnage. The flames of communal enmity were fanned into a conflagration by the speeches of irresponsible leaders. The viceroy was in a tearing hurry to return to London to command the British navy which had been his lifelong ambition. The administration of India was falling apart. The law and order situation was horrifying. There was no man of integrity, patience and human feeling on the top, intelligent or objective enough to see the coming whirlwind and determined enough to break its strength. For several months before and after the date of transfer of power the bulk of the population in northern India, Bihar and Bengal went wild with an uncontrollable fury. The ordinary, decent citizen shed all his inhibitions, moral values, neighbourly obligations, restraints of friendship, relationships of years and

decades, and considerations of humanity. For the time being man went mad and committed horrors of which animals would have felt ashamed. Several million people were uprooted from their ancestral homes, forced to leave their possessions behind, and compelled to flee hundreds of miles to another strange country which was now their motherland. They were not migrating; they were being hounded out of their homes. A few million were butchered on the way by roving bands of the followers of another faith or shot dead in cold blood by the soldiers and officers of the "peace-keeping" boundary force. Unheard-of crimes were committed in the name of religion and freedom. Girls were raped. Women were mutilated. Fathers were forced to witness the ravishing of their daughters, husbands the dishonouring of their wives, mothers the killing of their young children. Hundreds of thousands of women were abducted and made to stay behind as wives and concubines of the conquering hordes. Many of them were never recovered. People lost their properties, their families, their honour, their livelihood.

When at last they arrived in the refugee camps run by their own government and voluntary agencies, it was not rare for their daughters to be picked up by the camp commander's staff or the doctors and assistants of the hospitals set up for their care and help. Now the refugee lost what he had kept intact during his journey through massacres and brutalities: his self-respect. Dazed and frightened, he tottered out of the camp in search of security and food. Respectable families were humbled. The common folk were insulted. The rich, furnished properties left by the Hindus and Sikhs were occupied by the greedy, the enterprising and the strong. A lock broken, a hurried entry, a gift of a few rupees to the officer in the police station, a few more rupees to the government clerk who registered the distribution of evacuee properties, *perhaps a larger bribe to the senior "rehabilitation" officer, and* the house was transferred to a new owner, who surveyed the luxuries surrounding him with a deep pleasure, and soon slid into the unaccustomed role of the lord and master of a household which others had built and then abandoned to avoid death. Corruption thus arose and flourished. Soon no rehabilitation was possible without the greasing of the palm. The local population, which had braved no risk and lost neither man nor money, entered this prosperous business with a lot of glee and some built-in advan-

tages. It knew which house or shop or plot of land was valuable. It was on friendly terms with the police of the local area. It had its own relatives and acquaintances working in the official rehabilitation machinery. Fabulous claims were fabricated, asserting that precious properties had been left behind in India. Large bribes were given to the civil servants or politicians whose word was law. How could a minister who had got a hundred squares of agricultural land allotted to him on bogus grounds, or an officer who had moved into a well-appointed five-bedroom bungalow, object to the locals who occupied a shop with all the stock-in-trade intact or shifted to an abandoned house full of furniture and trunks of clothes?

Corruption was accompanied by inefficiency and inexperience. As an educationally backward people, the Muslim majority of the north-west had never been represented in the public services and other professions in proportion to their number. With the departure of the non-Muslims, a striking prospect of vast promise opened before the new masters of the country. Some places were filled by the deserving refugees who had done similar work in India. But most of the openings were filled by other means. Sudden accelerated promotions were made at all levels of the public services. Joint secretaries in the former Government of India (the highest rank that a half dozen Muslims had reached) were made full secretaries, under-secretaries became deputy and joint secretaries, clerks were turned into officers, the stamp-vendor at the post office sat in the office of the assistant postmaster, and assistant engineers and sub-divisional officers jumped several places to become senior technocrats. In the army a like good fortune befell all ranks. Junior officers who had never dreamed of going beyond their "majority" now wore red lapels; their seniors were now generals. More than three-fourths of the academic staff of all government colleges and of the only university in West Pakistan had left. The gaps were filled by poorly qualified, inexperienced lecturers, in most cases by men and women who had just taken their master's degrees. The same story was repeated in banking, insurance, trade, commerce and industry; in fact, here there were no breaches but a vacuum. Economic and financial interests had been a non-Muslim monopoly. Literally overnight, the entire sector was taken over by Pakistanis.

Politics could not escape the consequences of the upheaval.

Though the Muslim League had been the major Muslim party in India and had won Pakistan, it had virtually no experience of administering even a province. Apart from a short-lived ministry in Bengal and a much shorter-lived one in Sind, the League leaders had never been in office. A nationalist movement was transformed into the sole ruling party, with disastrous consequences in policy making and daily administration. In the first central cabinet of seven members, there was no well-known name except the prime minister's. The strongest and ablest minister was an ex-civil servant, Ghulam Muhammad. In December, two more ministers were added, Zafrullah Khan and Abdus Sattar; the former an outsider. Five more members were included in 1948-49, one of whom, M.A. Gurmani, was not a Muslim Leaguer. Practically the entire cabinet was a collection of obscure, inexperienced Muslim League politicians. The best among the administration were outsiders.

In the provinces, the situation was even more dismal. The Punjab was ruled by the Nawab of Mamdot, a weak, taciturn, irresolute aristocrat, trying in vain to cope with masterly intrigues within his party. In the NWFP, the majority Congress party government of Dr. Khan Sahib was dismissed and replaced by a Muslim League cabinet under Khan Abdul Qayyum Khan, till recently the deputy leader of the Congress party in the central legislature. Sind was put under M.A. Khuro, soon to be dismissed by Jinnah himself for corruption; to be succeeded by Ilahi Bakhsh, who lasted a year; to be succeeded by Yusuf Haroon, who also had to depart within twelve months; to be succeeded by Qazi Fazlullah, who survived for one year; and so on. Bengal was slightly more stable under Khwaja Nazimuddin, but within thirteen months he was replaced by Nurul Amin, and the rot started. The less said the better about the quality of provincial ministers, most of whom were nonentities or unscrupulous henchmen of the chief minister of the day.

The League was so critically short of manpower on the top that, besides giving the most important portfolios to outsiders (finance to Ghulam Muhammad, foreign affairs to Zafrullah Khan), it employed several Englishmen in key posts. The first governor of the Punjab was Sir Francis Mudie, of the NWFP Sir George Cunningham (to be succeeded by Sir Ambrose Dundas; his successor was a political service officer, Muhammad Khrushid), and of East Bengal Sir Frederick Bourne. Another British civilian, Sir

T.C. Creagh, was joint secretary in the Ministry of Foriegn Affairs from 1947 to 1950 (and for the next three years the Establishment Secretary or the head of the civil service). In defence forces, the commander-in-chief of the Navy was a foreigner and so was the Air Force Commander. Sir Douglas Gracey was chief of staff of the army in 1947-48 and commander-in-chief in 1948-51. With such sensitive and controlling posts in alien hands it was a matter of wonder that in 1948 Pakistan went to war with India over Kashmir.

Incompetence, corruption, dishonesty, political intrigue–these things have not been unknown to newly independent countries; but none has collapsed because of them. (Though Pakistan did in part in 1971). Pakistan was in a poor shape, but its national existence was upheld by the enthusiasm of the people, the exhilarating feeling of being free, Jinnah's overpowering prestige and authority, and the threat of annihilation from India. Pakistanis recognized the uphill task facing the new government. Setting up a brand new capital, making do with whatever resources of finance and manpower were available, running the country without prior training, receiving and settling millions of refugees, creating an infrastructure for indsutry and development, establishing relations with foreign countries, recruiting and training a diplomatic service out of nothingness, re-forming and equipping the national army, expostulating with India about the division of assets, facing a serious problem in Kashmir, administering the unruly north-western tribes, allaying the fears of the Pathans who had always voted for the Congress, developing self-government in Baluchistan, and, above all, keeping the eastern wing of the country in yoke with the western–this was a daunting roster for a country born amid slaughter, anxiety and panic. So, with all its weaknesses and faults, people supported the government and trusted the leaders.

But soon, too soon, signs of discontent appeared on the horizon. The refugee rehabilitation process became a racket which smirched the reputation of several ministers and many politicians. The inexperience and ignorance of ministers gave the bureaucracy courage and power, with power came arrogance and vanity, and with general inefficiency came corruption and graft. It became known that every government functionary, from the messenger boy to the head of the department, was not only in the market but was also a good bargain. Perhaps what dismayed the common

man most was the spectacle of politicians fighting over offices and privileges like over-excited children. Were these the respected leaders, he wondered, who till so recently had been asking the people to sacrifice everything for the sake of the creation of Pakistan, making passionate speeches about suffering and religion and honour, preaching honesty and rectitude, promising a paradise, guaranteeing democracy, assuring a revival of Islamic values? Where were these things for which they had struggled and fought and lost so much? Had they been duped? Was power politics a form of democracy? Was corruption an Islamic ritual? Were oppression and censorship essential instruments of a popular government? They worried and grumbled and waited, and in the meantime lived on hope. The sight of a newly-arisen rich class outraged them. The behaviour of the civil servant was a halter around their necks, increasingly galling as time passed.

The seeds of discontent were sown in the months following the independence. In West Pakistan there were only murmurs, some muted utterances, a sharp word from here and there. In the eastern wing there was open criticism, reflected in the astonishing behaviour of the students of the Dacca University when they interrupted Jinnah and did not let him finish his address because he insisted on making Urdu the only national language of the country. His death in September 1948 removed the last restraint on public outspokenness and clamour.

Criticism of the Father of the Nation had been equated with treachery. But attacks on the government led by any other man were the legitimate right of the people. The opposition gained strength, the loyalty to the Muslim League weakened, elections were demanded, base motives were attributed to the prime minister, and the ruling *junta* was charged with following a deliberate policy of delaying the making of a constitution for the country.[10]

Rahmat Ali in His Country

This was the state of Pakistan when Rahmat Ali decided to end his long exile and return home. We do not know if he went with a heart buoyant with joy and hope, for he has left us no account of his life. But it was certainly not an ordinary traveller or emigrant who landed in Karachi one day and saw with his eyes a part of the reality which had come in his dream fifteen years ago in a small

room in Cambridge. He breathed its air in gulps and found it good. Anxious to meet his family, to see his friends, and to be in the city where he had spent his youth, he hurried to Lahore.

He arrived in Lahore on 6 April 1948. Some of his old friends were at the airport to receive him: Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan, Chaudhri Sir Shahabuddin, Dr. Bashir Ahmad, Shaikh Abdul Haq and others.[11] The Lahore press reported the event, *The Pakistan Times* saying that the "Founder-President of the Pakistan National Movement in Cambridge" had arrived from England, and was staying with Yar Muhammad.[12] There was no reference to his work and sacrifices, or even to the fact that he had named the country whose creation its readers were still celebrating.

For some time Rahmat Ali was engrossed in meeting his family, seeing his friends, reviving old acquaintances, visiting places with happy associations, and tracing people whose whereabouts were uncertain. He had long talks with people who had come from his home district and heard, with a stab in the heart, their stories of murder, hair-breadth escapes from death, the pangs of leaving their ancient homes, the dreadful end of those who had fallen in the way, and the even more agonizing disappearance of women and young girls who neither lived nor died. Often, when he was with these afflicted refugees, his eyes misted with unshed tears; sometimes he wept like a child. His brother and sisters had arrived safely by a lorry arranged by Yar Muhammad, though one of the sisters lay dying of shock. This was a great mercy; but even great mercies were apt to be buried under the intolerable burden of such an enormous tragedy.[13]

The partition of the Punjab and of Bengal and the loss of Assam he found "unbearable". He confessed to his friends that "what he would have considered as a triumph was in fact but a defeat for the Muslims, in that large areas of lands which by right belonged to Pakistan had through machination of Radcliffe and Lord Louis Mountbatten been handed over to Hindoostan".[14] He told Khaliquzzaman, whom he had invited to lunch with him, that the partition of the two major Muslim provinces was a "betrayal".[15] The national misfortune encompassed a personal despair. The division of the Punjab had swept out of existence all the haunts of his infancy, childhood and youth, the ancestral acres, the graves of his two mothers and his father, the common green, the playing ground, the schools, the four walls which had given him birth and

love and innumerable moments of sheer gladness and pure joy. His entire world had been wiped off the surface of the earth. He was struck with an unknown horror, but tried to suppress his anguish.

The fact that half the nation was wilting under the effect of this mass uprooting could not assuage the pain. The death of a crowd was not a happy occasion, however the local proverb went. He believed that the national tragedy could have been averted but for the ineptitude and criminal negligence of Muslim politicians and British overlords. Now the loss was irreparable. The despair of this realization added to his distress.

Nor did the mood of the country offer any compensations. There were grumblings, signs of discontent, an occasional criticism, some cutting remarks by those who had always opposed partition, even an angry word from a sensitive sufferer. The antics of the politicians spoke ill of the future. The country was burning, and they fought for offices and authority like a pack of dogs over a bone. The bureaucracy was busy in asserting its power and lining its pockets to the exclusion of any other thought. The sight sickened him, not merely as a common Pakistani who had hopes of a better future in national freedom, but much more as one who had given his all to the cause. Was this the country and the dispensation for whose sake he had spent years of devotion, self-sacrifice, hard work, loneliness and exile?

For the first time the full realization of the political bargain made dawned upon him, strengthening his earlier resentment against the Muslim League's unwillingness or incapacity or both to avert this disaster to Pakistan.[16]

But he was worldly-wise enough to hold his peace. He did not talk of his disillusionment to anyone except his brother and the closest friends. In the meantime, he lived in physical comfort in Yar Muhammad's house at 3 McLeod Road. The surroundings were familiar, and the house an old abode of his. Even the servant who looked after him, Nur Muhammad, was an old hand who had known him since his Chiefs' College days of thirty years ago. With the coming of the summer and the closure of the Medical College, Yar Muhammad left for Abbottabad to spend the long vacation in the cool of the hills, but the house and the domestic staff and other facilities remained at Rahmat Ali's disposal. He had brought a large amount of money with him from Cambridge and

had ordered a Hillman car.[17]

The servants noticed that Rahmat Ali ate little. One curry and a few toasts satisfied him. A table laden with several courses was a thing of the past. He stayed indoors most of the time, receiving his friends and callers and making an occasional telephone call. He looked worried and slept uneasily. His good manners with the servants had not changed: courtesy, sympathy, almost affection. But he was preoccupied, sometimes staring at walls or far into the horizon as if in perplexity and deep thought. He did not smile as often as he used to. The hearty laughter had died away. While going out he wore the English suit with a Turkish cap, at home he dressed in *kurta* and *salwar*. He said his prayers regularly and took some time over them. Age was stamping him. His hair had gone somewhat grey, and his face a little heavy.[18]

Some of his erstwhile colleagues of the PNM tried to mend their relations with him. They came with assurances of their loyalty and explanations of their temporary faithlessness, often attributing their aberrations to British pressure and the Punjab Unionist regime's pleasure. He met them politely and listened to their excuses and apologies with patience. The delicate fabric of friendship could not survive a crack, he told them courteously but firmly. Khwaja Abdur Rahim now felt so guilty that he sent his father to Rahmat Ali, and the old man begged him to forgive his son's behaviour and, as a mark of reconciliation, visit their house. Rahim's treachery at Colombo was still fresh in Rahmat Ali's memory. He found it impossible to forget it or to forgive Rahim or to act as a hypocrite, and told Ghulam Ahmad (Rahim's father) not to ask for a kindness that was beyond his generosity. Pir Ahsanuddin did not even try to see Rahmat Ali.[19]

What did Rahmat Ali want to do in Pakistan? From his interviews to the press and his conversations with friends, it is clear that he planned to have a go at politics and journalism and law simultaneously. With his degrees in law from Cambridge and Dublin, his out-of-court legal experience in Lahore in the 1920's, his mature age, his analytical mind, his fluent tongue, and his outstanding ability to persuade and convince, there is little doubt that he would have excelled as a lawyer. His long writing practice and his old habit of reading attentively every newspaper he could get qualified him to try the journalistic profession. Politics had its own appeal for him. He had learned how to devote oneself to a

cause, how to present it with force and elegance, how to win converts, and how to influence people. He had a past of which he was proud. In 1938 the Muslim newspapers of Lahore had carried his name and his message much more often than they had mentioned Jinnah, not to speak of the smaller fry in the Muslim League. It could hardly have been personal ambition alone which drove him to this programme (though ambition is neither a bad thing in itself nor can any politician be free of it). He had fought for a certain cause, and as much of it as was reasonably praticable had been achieved. He now wanted to serve the country he had helped to bring into existence.

In pursuance of these plans he tried to rent a house and fit it up for use. His friends told him that as a refugee who had abandoned his property in India he was legally and morally entitled to the allotment of a residence in Lahore. It took them a few days to persuade him, and then they showed him a large bungalow on Jail Road situated between the Race Course Road and the Kinnaird College for Women. He liked the house and the area, and the bungalow was transferred to his name. On opening it he found it full of high-quality furniture and a lot of other expensive items. He did not think he had a right to these and sent the entire contents to the government treasury. One of his friends who accompanied him in this mission recalled, after over twenty years, the clear signs of incredulity on the faces of the treasury staff. They looked at one another with knowing glances: was this tall, bearded man a mere eccentric or an utter fool! Rahmat Ali never lived there. He was still living at Yar Muhammad's bungalow and buying things for his new house when he was asked to leave the country. After his departure, one of his friends got the Jail Road house allotted to himself.[20]

In a few days Rahmat Ali took measure of the national sentiment and of the obsequiousness of the press, and deemed it prudent not to give public expression to his disillusionment. On 12 April, he told *The Pakistan Times* (which this time called him the "originator of the Idea of Pakistan") that Pakistan had a bright future, provided that the people devoted all that was best in them to the service of the newly-born state. "The creation of Pakistan is a life's chance for the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent to establish themselves as a free and independent nation. It is a question of now or never. I hope the people of Pakistan will

strive their utmost to build themselves up into a progressive Islamic State, which may be second to none in this world."[21]

But he did not let his circumspection become a recantation. He stuck to his earlier opinion of the 3 June partition plan, and made it clear that he would start his political work outside the Muslim League, and that it would involve a complete repudiation of the plan and a reconsideration *de novo* of the question of Muslim security in the sub-continent. "Never, never, shall we forget the forty-five millions of Muslims in India." Asked if his plan for the "sovereignization of Muslims of India in National States" would not create fresh difficulties for the Indian Muslims, he replied, "To begin with yes, it would. But in the end such a determination would be the best shield for their defence". Revealing that he would shortly call a meeting of his friends and sympathisers from all over Pakistan to finally chalk out a plan of action for launching the "Pakistan National Liberation Movement", he said, "I will thus renew my oath to do or die for this cause". Explaining the basic aims of the proposed movement, he said they were (1) complete territorial re-integration of Pakistan, (2) sovereignization of Muslims of India in National States, and (3) organization of the Islamic fraternity so that it can play its historical role in solving the problems facing mankind. The immediate problems facing them were (1) the re-settlement of refugees and (2) the successful prosecution of the war in Kashmir and Palestine. He emphasized that he was not planning an anti-government campaign. "I would be the last person to come into conflict with the powers that be. I am grateful to them for what they have done for us Muslims and I sympathise with them in what they have not been able to achieve." Answering a question about the possibility of some political office being offered to him, he said that he had no interest in these things as "it is against my will to take an oath of allegiance to a non-Muslim King".[22] A month later, he told *Ehsan* that he was planning to issue one Urdu daily newspaper and two English journals.[23]

Obviously he was not welcome to the Lahore press. An anonymous columnist in *Maghrabi Pakistan* wrote a damaging piece on 11 April which abounded in sarcasm. "Pakistn has been created, but sometimes people discuss as to who is its founder (*bany*). Some say Iqbal was the first to give us this concept (*tasawwur*). Others believe that Jamaluddin Afghani is responsible for it.

Most think that Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah deserves the credit. But then there is a gentleman called Chaudhri Rahmat Ali. Some people think that he is the real founder, and had he not written his pamphlets in England there would have been no Pakistan in India. These days Chaudhri sahib is in the Pakistan which he had founded. God have His mercy upon us. He is living with Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan. His arrival raises the question of the real founder of Pakistan. Chaudhri sahib offers arguments in support of his claim, but still he is not believed. Surely, he does not want that he should have been appointed the first governor-general of Pakistan, but that his claim to be the founder of the country should be admitted and his picture be hung in the national parliament. Or, let all the elders put their heads together and give a decision about the real founder of Pakistan, otherwise it would be very difficult to write the history of Pakistan. By chance Chaudhri sahib is here these days, and this can be done easily."[24]

On 22 May, *The Pakistan Times* wrote an editorial on Rahmat Ali, full of criticism, digs and serious warnings. "Chaudhry Rehmat Ali is well known as an assiduous pamphleteer and his expensively produced brochures on Muslim politics have had a free and fairly wide distribution for many years. Whatever the value of his support for Pakistan in the past, the policy he has been advocating since its inception can only be regarded as the ill-advised outpourings of a visionary which, if taken seriously, can do only harm to Pakistan and its people. On his arrival in this country Chaudhry Rehmat Ali has expressed his intention of launching a Pakistan National Liberation Movement with the object of securing a repudiation of the June 3 Plan, 'by agreement if possible and without agreement if necessary'. This gentleman regards Pakistan as it stands today a betrayal of the Muslim people and his dream of Pakistan (as shown in one of his pamphlets) consists of the present Pakistan areas somewhat enlarged and a series of Muslim islands throughout the territory of the Indian Union. He intends working outside the Muslim League and seeks 'no conflict with the powers that be'. Chaudhry Rehmat Ali's scheme is opposed to every single important declaration made by the Quaid-i-Azam and the leaders of Pakistan; his future plan of action is likely to cause disruption and raise the most serious complications for the Pakistan Government. It will also make the task of securing adequate economic and political rights for Muslims in India much

more difficult. We would advise this enthusiast from Cambridge to spend a few years in this country and study at close quarters the problems of Pakistan before launching any fantastic campaigns, for whatever his intentions, if his ideas are given any more attention than they deserve, trouble and chaos can be the only result."[25]

The tone and contents betray prejudice, ignorance and probably an external pressure. His pamphlets are called "expensively produced", without a word about their originality, message and influence. His visionary plans will harm Pakistan; but it is not explained how they will have such an effect. He is opposing Jinnah and other leaders of Pakistan, and his scheme will disrupt the country and embarrass the government. It will also damage the interests of the Indian Muslims. Trouble and chaos are inevitable if any attention is paid to what he is saying. Most significantly, the editorial did not mention the fact that Rahmat Ali had coined the word Pakistan. Regardless of the leader-writer's own opinion about Rahmat Ali's past schemes and future proposals, his deliberate omission of this outstanding fact carries a message: the people of Pakistan should not know who named their country. This attitude (policy describes it better) did not change with time. Till now there has been a general determination among the rulers, the journalists and the academics to keep the nation unaware of this fact, so that the credit for it is given, by default, to others.

The rest of the press ignored Rahmat Ali. Many of his friends lost their warmth for him, for they were accustomed to worship the rising sun. Some others were preoccupied with tending their penniless and ill-used refugee relations. Yet others found life too busy in the exploitation of new opportunities of money-making to find time for him. As days passed, Rahmat Ali turned more morose and forlorn. He had arrived with large expectations, which now seemed to fail to materialize. But he persisted. Determination and concentrated effort had opened many doors to him before. With dedication and perseverance he would once again make a way for himself.

And then came the ultimate humiliation, which broke his spirit and shed the last illusion. It descended in four quick stages. First, Rahmat Ali found that he was being shadowed by plain-clothes-men of the Criminal Investigation Department. His movements were spied on and noted. When he met Khaliquzzaman and

complained about this treatment "in my own country", Khaliquzzaman promised to speak to Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan; but, wrote Khaliquzzaman, Rahmat Ali "regretfully told me not to do it and went back to London".[26] This has been confirmed by several other sources.[27]

Secondly, Rahmat Ali applied for a Pakistani passport and received a rebuff. He had told a friend that in future he wanted to travel as a Pakistani; "it has been my dream to possess a Pakistani passport since 1933", he said. His application was entertained, but no reply was given. When he went to the passport office to inquire, he was put off with vague excuses. No passport was issued to him.[28]

Thirdly, he suspected that at a dinner hosted by a friend in his honour an attempt was made to poison him. He believed that this was done on the government's behest. He survived the ordeal, but was "utterly heartbroken".[29]

Finally, the government took direct action. Muhammad Masud, a Punjabi ICS officer who had known Rahmat Ali in England, was sent to Yar Muhammad Khan with a message from the prime minister himself. The ultimatum said that unless he persuaded Rahmat Ali to leave the country the Cambridge visitor would be arrested under the Pakistan Safety Act and the good doctor might find himself in hot water.[30] Rahmat Ali and Yar Muhammad had been friends since 1918. A generation of close relationship ruled out any possibility of misunderstanding. When Rahmat Ali was told of the threat, he decided immediately to leave. He could not have brought himself to do anything to embarrass his friend. Yar Muhammad, too, could talk freely to Rahmat Ali, without giving the slightest impression that he was turning him out of his house. Their understanding of each other and of the government was perfect. Rahmat Ali had seen too many ominous signs. So much had happened in quick succession that it could not be explained away by the logic of coincidence. If the rulers of the country were for some reason afraid of him and were bent upon driving him out, there was no point in tempting fate. He packed his bag and said good-bye to his native land on 1 October 1948.

The government of Pakistan has never explained its decision to banish Rahmat Ali, nor are the relevant files open to public or scholarly consultation (in all probability they have been destroyed). Without knowing the facts mentioned above, some writers

have tried to speculate about the reasons that made Rahmat Ali leave Pakistan.

According to one, he had come to mobilize public opinion in favour of his Pakistan National Liberation Movement which sought to regain the areas lost to Pakistan. The Indian government protested at this and "the Pakistan Government cautioned its security hounds".[31] This does not sound convincing. At this time Pakistan was at war with India over Kashmir and at loggerheads with it on several other issues. Why should Pakistan have cared so much for Indian sensitivities? Besides, there was no logic in Pakistan's sending its army into Kashmir to annex the territory and at the same time judging Rahmat Ali a criminal for saying that the areas lost to Pakistan in the partition procedure should be recovered.

Another version is that he left Pakistan with the purpose of propagating the cause of Kashmir, for he believed that Pakistan was incomplete without its inclusion.[32] But, why should he have to leave Pakistan to achieve this end? Another writer does not try to explain anything. He ascribes the departure to "some unknown reasons".[33]

Rahmat Ali's brother was of the opinion that he had been disappointed with the political climate of the country and also with the government's inability to do anything for the large number of Muslims left behind in India. He said that he could fight the battle of the unprotected Indian Muslims better from England than from Pakistan.[34]

Not to speak of condemning the official decision, one former minister, Abdul Waheed Khan, fabricated the story of the offer of an ambassadorship to Rahmat Ali by the prime minister in 1948. He had written this in an article in an Urdu newspaper some time in mid-1960's. I had not taken a clipping but remembered the contents. In October 1969, I wrote to the Pakistan Foreign Office, inquiring if any such offer to Rahmat Ali was on their files. The reply was: "We have checked our records and have also made inquiries from other sources to ascertain the position with regard to the reported offer of an ambassadorial appointment to Choudhury Rahmat Ali in 1947-48. There is no record in this Ministry of such an offer having been made to Choudhury Rahmat Ali".[35]

On the same day, I also wrote to Abdul Waheed Khan, remind-

ing him of this article, asking him to confirm what he had written, and seeking proof of his assertion. He replied a month later: "You have referred to my article in some Urdu paper that government offered an ambassadorial appointment to the late Chaudhary, I do not know in which paper the article was published. But I do remember having written it somewhere . . . . However, I have no documentary proof. My assertion was based on information given to me by late Nawabzada Liaqat Ali Khan the then prime minister of Pakistan who told me in 1950 when I was a member of the first Constituent Assembly that Chaudhary Rahmat Ali expressed himself against the appointment of the first ambassador of Pakistan in U.K. He might be expecting a step by the League Government similar to that of the Congress Government in appointing their first ambassador who probably was Mr. Krishna Menon. Mr. Krishna Menon was working for a long time for Congress in London when Chaudhary Rahmat Ali was introducing the Idea of Pakistan in his own way. Late Liaqat Ali Khan told me that they could have appointed him ambassador elsewhere but he declined".[36]

The explanation is riddled with vacuities and mistakes. One would assume from it that Rahmat Ali had met the prime minister and, in a friendly chat, disapproved of Pakistan's choice of its first High Commissioner in London. Then Liaquat Ali Khan had good humouredly asked why he thought so, and Rahmat Ali had mentioned the parallel appointment of Krishna Menon as the first Indian High Commissioner in London, and said that he himself would have been an ideal or at least a more suitable envoy as he had worked in England for eighteen years. The prime minister had then offered him an ambassadorship in some other country, but Rahmat Ali had refused to accept it. The former Information Minister of a Commonwealth country was also not aware of the distinction between an ambassador and a high commissioner. The whole exercise seems to have been merely an attempt to whitewash Liaquat Ali's record and mislead Pakistani public opinion.

When Rahmat Ali was hounded out of the country, there was no public reaction. The press took no notice of his exit. No regrets were expressed by anyone. However, much later, when the government was reported to be considering the transfer of his remains from Cambridge to somewhere in Pakistan, a few commentators had the courage to castigate the 1948 official action. One of them regretted that "our Government did not appreciate his services".[37]

A professor of Karachi University wrote with sadness that when Rahmat Ali had come to Pakistan, none knew or recognized him or realized his greatness, because the people living in this country were ignorant of his efforts and there was none to tell them that this was the man whose mind had given birth to Pakistan. He had to go back to England with a broken heart.[38] A senior journalist commented in anger: "and once again the hero of Pakistan was hounded out–hounded into exile and desolation".[39]

It is interesting to recall, wrote a popular historian, that "even our government did not take any notice of Rahmat Ali's great services".[40] "It is a pity", said a columnist, "that when he came to Pakistan in 1948, this crusader, who had devoted every moment of his life to making the achievement of Pakistan a success, was taken no notice of." The neglect affected him so much that he had a heart attack and left for England in a poor physical condition.[41] Another writer blamed both the people and the government. "We, Pakistanis, treated him with exceeding callousness. The government, too, neglected him, and his book was proscribed."[42]

Even if Rahmat Ali had lived long enough to know the feelings of such people, it would not have mitigated his heart-ache. His entire life and work were destroyed at one fell stroke. His health was already poor, and his constitution not strong enough to withstand such buffets of ill-wind. His personal life was also disrupted. When he had decided to come to Pakistan, he had packed all his belongings–clothes, books, private papers–and sent them to Karachi by sea. Some of these things were still lying in Karachi awaiting the renovation of the house allotted to him in Lahore. Others he had managed to get over to Lahore. Now that he was ordered to leave on short notice and under threat of arrest, he had neither the time nor the inclination to get all his stuff at one place. In whose care was he going to leave it? Even its possession might have spelled trouble for the caretaker. In his state of mind, he probably did not care what happened to his worldly goods. Some crates were left with some people in Karachi, a few more in Lahore with somebody else, the very valuable things (his pamphlets and his commonplace book) he carried back with his person. (That explains the virtual disappearance of his private papers.)[43] The motor car he had ordered arrived when he was still in Lahore, but by that time his future was beyond his planning, and he did

not take its delivery. A friend later settled the matter.[44]

Rahmat Ali's return trip to Cambridge was a journey of despair. His baggage was the heavy burden of insult and injury. He had witnessed with his own eyes the cruel ravages of an unjust partition. He had seen his family uprooted, impoverished, bruised in body and mind; one of his sisters was dying of the traumas she had received while wending her way from Hoshiarpur to Pakistan. The crowning sorrow came from the realization that he was now doomed never to set his eyes upon his dear ones. The parting was final, ultimate, irrevocable—but more deadly than death. The sight of the death of a loved one produces, after a little while, a kind of resignation, a fatalism, a surrender to the will of the Maker. But parting under the whip of an arbitrary dispensation summons different emotions. An unjust and mindless cruelty invites a corroding resentment, a galling vexation that gnaws at the vitals, wounds the soul, kills the spirit, and destroys the will to live.

He might have hoped for a hero's reception in Pakistan, for, had he not thought of it long before the present generation of Muslim League leaders had spared it even a passing thought; given it a name which everyone had applauded, which even the League had finally owned but without a word of acknowledgement to its creator; and, in his own way, struggled for independence, devoting all his resources, material and intellectual, to its successful consummation, passing long lonely years in an exile which, he thought, had come to an end with the creation of Pakistani! But, how had his own country and his own people treated him? Unexpectedly, indifferently, shockingly, pitilessly. Instead of being lionized, he had been ignored. Instead of being thanked for his services, he had been condemned as a danger to the security and tranquillity of the country. The government did not remember, or even let it be known, that he had named the country over which it ruled, but it could not forget that he had criticized Jinnah for accepting an incomplete Pakistan. He was not a creator, or even one of the creators, of Pakistan; he was a plain criminal, to be shadowed by the police, to be threatened with arrest, to be tortured mentally, and to be deported. This was done at a time when the government of Pakistan was welcoming into the country a horde of anti-Muslim League politicians—the Khaksars, the Ahrars, the Congressmen, the Mawdudiites, the Deobandis, the Nationalists—who had not slated Jinnah for accept-

ing a small Pakistan but had called him dirty names for demanding Pakistan and had opposed the very creation of it. They were welcome guests of the nation. Rahmat Ali was a devil who had to be exorcized. The contrast was flagrant enough to break any heart.

Interest in Indian Muslims

Pakistan, of whatever sort, had been created, but Rahmat Ali's original idea of extending protection to many more Indian Muslims was still unfulfilled. It speaks volumes for his mental resilience, steely nerves and complete devotion, that even during the period of his mental agony in Lahore he mustered enough peace of mind to write a nine-page letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations on the plight of the Muslims of independent India.

Completed and signed in Lahore on 15 August 1948 (Pakistan's first independence anniversary), it was an appeal to the conscience of the world to save the life and honour of the Muslim minority of India. "It deals", wrote Rahmat Ali in the prefatory note to the published version, "with the horrible crimes that are being committed against them by the Hindoos, explains the causes of their present helpless position under Hindoo hegemony, and demands the immediate despatch by the UNO of a Commission of Inquiry to India." He trusted that this plea "on behalf of our persecuted Muslims will have the practical sympathy and support of all those people who believe in the humane and civilized treatment of all minorities–racial, religious or political".[45]

He told the Secretary General that the Hindus were "persecuting and pulverising" the Muslims who obeyed the laws of the land and gave them no provocation. India was becoming one vast concentration camp for the Muslim minority–a minority which in numbers (fifty million) constituted the largest minority in the world and had made a most profound contribution to the history of India. What was happening to it was "murder or suicide; it is imprisonment or emigration; it is suppression or submission". The Muslim princes were being made fugitives, puppets or captives. The Nawab of Junagarh was forced to flee his state. The Nizam of Hyderabad was humbled and his dominions conquered by the Indian army. Other states had been effaced from the map. The Muslim public men, the "trustees of the national tradition", were

being victimized so much that those among them who could were migrating to Pakistan. The Muslim masses, "harassed and hunted, mourning for their slain and maimed, are living in constant fear of the Hindoo firing-squads and axe-men, who regularly visit them in their towns and villages, foredoomed to extinction". Their mosques were being desecrated, their shrines turned into stables, their language banned, their literature proscribed, their civilization "perverted, and their system of life subverted".[46]

The "fatal significance" of this phenomenon lay in its scale. The Muslims were being destroyed, not as individuals, but as a people; not in battle, but in peace; not in passion, but in cold blood. Available figures were horrifying. Five million had already been rendered homeless, ten million made paupers, two million maimed, and one million killed. This "holocaust" was comparable with what had happened to the Jews of Germany at Belsen, Buchenwald, Dachau and Nordhausen.[47]

Then he quoted Jawaharlal Nehru, the prime minister of India, who had admitted in a public speech at Lucknow on 19 October 1947 that murder and destruction had become a profession and was pre-planned; cited *The Times*' special correspondent in India; and referred to other Indian and foreign press reports. This was evidence enough that the Hindus were "committing a systematic genocide of our people and polity"—a crime not only against its immediate victims but also against humanity.[48]

The reasons for the Hindu action were clear. First, it was the Hindu tradition to wipe out any non-Hindu people who had the conviction and the courage to resist absorption and the misfortune to live under them. The examples of the Dravidians and the Buddhists were written on the pages of history. Secondly, besides being a minority, the Muslims were all "disintegrated and disarmed", and consequently unable to defend themselves against their oppressors. Two further considerations were worth noting. Once the Muslims had been put in their place, the Hindus would turn to the smaller minorities who would make a much easier morsel. Besides, this Muslim persecution was not a passing instrument of Hindu policy; it would persist and the Muslims of India would ever remain in a precarious situation.

All this had come to pass, he reminded his readers, because his own plan of protecting the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent had been ignored. He had warned the world of these future

dangers, but he had not been heard. The fulfilment of tragedy was now before everybody to see.[49]

It was in this grave hour that the Muslims of India were turning to the United Nations, which was the trustee for all minorities and, as such, pledged to protect them in the countries of its members. They sought justice which was their right to demand and which it was the United Nations' duty to dispense. They were invoking Section 3 of Chapter 3 of the Charter, which empowered it to protect minorities and to which all its members, including India, had subscribed.[50] They demanded that the international body exercized its power and sent a commission of inquiry to India to enable it to take up their case with the Government of India. Apart from the principles, the purposes, and the provisions of the UNO Charter itself, there were many historical precedents which supported their plea for its active interest in their tragedy. Here Rahmat Ali enumerated nine precedents dating between 1840 and 1923, where the Great Powers, the Congress of Berlin, the Paris Peace Conference and the World Court of Justice had acted in far less serious cases.[51]

Would the UNO honour its Charter and do its duty? If so, how soon? Time was precious. The plight of the Muslims was terrible and admitted of no delay, for "even while you read this plea horror walks in India". The commission should be dispatched at once, armed to investigate these charges of genocide. If it found them true, it should suggest ways and means of "stopping this terrible crime and of protecting the Muslim's national being and well-being". He hoped that the UNO would heed the plea and fulfil its "saving duty to the Muslim Minority" in India. "For only the fulfilment of that duty will protect the national future of the Muslim minority in India, secure the peace of the world, and vindicate the UNO before humanity and history."[52]

Only one comment will suffice on Rahmat Ali's appeal. At this time, the Government of Pakistan was following the same course, and its foreign minister, Zafrulla Khan, was using the very same word "genocide" for the condition of Indian Muslims in his speeches before the General Assembly of the United Nations.[53]

NOTES

1. See *India (Lord Privy Seal's Mission): Statement and Draft Declaration of His Majesty's Government with Correspondence and Resolutions Connected Thereto*, London, 1942, Cmd. 6350. See also Indian newspapers issued between 30 March and 13 April 1942.
2. For this "Quit India" movement see E.W.R. Lumby, *The Transfer of Power in India*, London, 1954; R. Coupland, *India: A Re-Statement*, London, 1945; Abul Kalam Azad, *India Wins Freedom: An Autobiographical Narrative*, Bombay, 1959; Frank Moraes, *Jawaharlal Nehru*, London, 1956; G. Sahai, *'42 Rebellion: The Authentic Review of the Great Upheaval of 1942*, Delhi, 1947; and A. Prasad, *The Indian Revolt of 1942*, Delhi, 1958.
3. On the C.R. Formula and Gandhi-Jinnah talks see Jamiluddin Ahmad, *Through Pakistan to Freedom*, Lahore, 1944; *The Indian Annual Register 1944*, Vol. II, Calcutta, n.d.; D.N. Bannerjee, *Partition or Federation?* Calcutta, 1945; R. Coupland, *India: A Re-Statement*, London, 1945; P.C. Joshi, *They Must Meet Again*, Bombay, 1944; Alp Arslan, *Pakistan Explained*, Lahore, 1945; and *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks: Text of Correspondence and other Relevant Matter*, New Delhi, 1944.
4. The lengthy discussions of the Simla Conference are well recorded and analyzed in *India: Statement of the Policy of His Majesty's Government by the Secretary of State for India, 14 June 1945*, London, 1945, Cmd. 6652; V.P. Menon, *The Transfer of Power in India*, Calcutta, 1957; and Asoka Mehta and Kusum Nair, *The Simla Triangle: A Projection of the Communal Triangle*, Bombay, 1945.
5. On the elections and their results see *The Indian Annual Register 1946*, Vol. I, Calcutta, n.d., pp. 229-232; and I.H. Qureshi, *The Struggle for Pakistan*, Karachi, 1965.
6. See *India (Cabinet Mission): Statement by the Cabinet Mission and His Excellency the Viceroy*, London, 1946, Cmd. 6821; and other references mentioned in the notes on the previous chapter.
7. Quoted in A.C. Banerjee and D.R. Bose (eds.), *The Cabinet Mission in India*, Calcutta, 1946, pp. 312-315.

8. On the "grouping clause" controversy see J.P. Chunder, *Is Grouping of Provinces Compulsory?* Lahore, 1947; and K.P. Mallikarjunudu, *Constituent Assembly and Its Work*, Bombay, n.d.
9. The transfer of power is well recorded in *Indian Policy: Statement of the Prime Minister of 20 February 1947*, London, 1947, Cmd. 7047; *Indian Policy: Statement of the Prime Minister of 3 June 1947*, London, 1947, Cmd. 7136; V.P. Menon, *The Transfer of Power in India*, Calcutta, 1957; I.H. Qureshi, *The Struggle for Pakistan*, Karachi, 1965; Hugh Tinker, *Experiment with Freedom: India and Pakistan, 1947*, London, 1967; Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, *The Emergence of Pakistan*, New York, 1967; Sudhir Ghosh, *Gandhi's Emissary*, London, 1967; Lord Ismay, *The Memoirs of General the Lord Ismay*, London, 1960; Francis Tuker, *While Memory Serves*, London, 1950; and Nicholas Mansergh (ed.), *Constitutional Relations between Britain and India: The Transfer of Power, 1942-47*, London, 1970– in progress, esp. Vols. IX and X.
10. For a full account of this period see my *Party Politics in Pakistan, 1947-1958*, Islamabad, 1976; M. Rafique Afzal, *Political Parties in Pakistan, 1947-1958*, Islamabad, 1976; Keith Callard, *Political Forces in Pakistan*, New York, 1959; Khalid bin Sayeed, *Pakistan: The Formative Phase*, Karachi, 1960, and *The Political System of Pakistan*, Boston, 1967; L. Ziring, Pakistan: A Study in Representative Government, 1947-1958, Columbia University Ph.D. thesis, 1961; S.M.K. Wasti, *op.cit.*; dozens of articles and letters to the editor in national newspapers of this period and hundreds of similar items in later newspapers referring back to this time: and contemporary and later Urdu literature.
11. *Zamindar*, 7 April 1948, Orient Press Report.
12. *The Pakistan Times*, 9 April 1948.
13. Interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali.
14. M. Anwar, "The Forgotten Hero: I", *The Pakistan Times*, 23 March 1964.
15. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (Lahore, 1961), p. 201.
16. Rahmat Ali told these things to his brother, to Muhammad Anwar, to Dr. Yar Muhammad's servants in Lahore, to K.A.

Waheed, and to some of his friends in Cambridge on his return.

17. Interview with Dr. Rafique Khan.
18. Interview with Master Allah Ditta and Jamadar Nur Muhammad.
19. Interviews with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, M. Anwar, Mumtaz Hasan, K.A. Waheed and Miss Frost; also some entries in *RCPB*.
20. Interviews with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, Muhammad Anwar, Dr. Rafique Khan, Master Allah Ditta, Jamadar Nur Muhammad and K.A. Waheed.
21. *The Pakistan Times*, 13 April 1948.
22. Rahmat Ali's interview in *ibid.*, 20 May 1948.
23. Interview in *Ehsan*, 22 June 1948. The *Ehsan* published two very sympathetic accounts about Rahmat Ali and his plans, written by "Our Staff Reporter", on 8 and 22 June 1948. A short report also appeared in the daily *Ghazi* of 23 May; in its sub-heading he was called "Chaudhri Rahmat-ullah", though the text mentioned the correct name. The *Milap* of New Delhi (a rabidly anti-Muslim newspaper of Lahore till August 1947) published a brief report on 23 May, datelined 21 May from Lahore, under the heading: "Pakistan kay mujid ky nayi shararat" (The New Mischief of the Inventor of Pakistan).
24. Kohistani, "Sang-o-Khisht", *Maghrabi Pakistan*, 11 April 1948. My translation is as literal as I could make it without loss of readability. The original Urdu reads much nastier.
25. *The Pakistan Times*, editorial, 22 May 1948.
26. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, statement to the press from Karachi on 16 July 1970, *ibid.*, 17 July 1970. Khaliquzzaman also repeated in his statement that Rahmat Ali wrote his pamphlet *The Greatest Betrayal* on his return to England; he had said the same thing earlier in his *Pathway to Pakistan* (Lahore, 1961), p. 201; at both places he gives the title of the pamphlet incorrectly as *The Great Betrayal*. This is incorrect; the pamphlet was written and published in June 1947, about a year before Rahmat Ali came to Pakistan.
27. Interviews with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, Muhammad Anwar, two servants of Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan, and one senior police officer of that time, Mian Anwar Ali, who said

this was done on orders from Karachi; some entries in *RCPB*.

28. Interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali.
29. He told this to his private secretary, Miss Frost, on returning to Cambridge. Interview with her.
30. Muhammad Anwar's interview published in *Satluj*, 12 February 1976, p. 22; he named the official emissary in his interview with me. This incident has been referred to by dozens of writers in articles and letters in Pakistani English and Urdu newspapers during the last 25 years (but never editorially); for the latest inquiry see Dr. Ehsan Qureshi Sabri, of Railway Road, Sialkot, Letter, *The Pakistan Times*, 17 April 1983.
31. A T. Chaudhri, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: Time to Honour Him", *Pakistan Monitor*, 14 August 1970.
32. Anonymous, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: unhon nay sab say pahlay Pakistan ka nam tajwiz kiya", *Kohistan*, 13 February 1967.
33. G. Allana, *Quaid-e-Azam Jinnah: The Story of a Nation* (Karachi, 1967), p. 309.
34. Interview with Chaudrhi Muhammad Ali; S.M.K. Wasti, *op. cit.*, p. 31. In his interview I.H. Qureshi professed complete ignorance of Rahmat Ali's forced exit from Pakistan.
35. Letter from A.M. Abbas, Director-General (Administration), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad, to the author, dated 30 October 1969, *RAA*.
36. Letter from Abdul Waheed Khan, Lahore, to the author, dated 14 November 1969. In this letter, he also asserted, without offering any evidence, that the name "Pakistan" was "originally suggested by Allama Iqbal himself and not by Chaudhry Rahmat Ali", *RAA*.
37. Iqbal Asad, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Aqdam*, 7 May 1961.
38. Ghulam Sarwar, "Apnay muhsin ko faramosh na kijiyay", *Gujjar Gazette*, 18 February 1964, p. 14.
39. A. T. Chaudhri, *op. cit.*
40. Salahuddin Nasik, *Tahrik-i-azadi* (Lahore, n.d. (? 1972)), p. 240.
41. Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Choudhari Rahmat Ali lafz Pakistan kay khaliq thay", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1977.

42. Maqbul Ahmad Ansari, "Choudhari Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 18 February 1979; S.M.K. Wasti, *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 8, 9, 12.
43. Interview with Miss Frost.
44. Interview with Dr. Rafique Khan.
45. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *The Muslim Minority in India and the Saving Duty of the U.N.O.* (Cambridge, n.d.), Note, p. 2. The letter was sent from P.O. Box 111, Lahore, on 15 August 1948, and was signed by Rahmat Ali as Founder-President, All-Dinia Milli Liberation Movement. It was published as a pamphlet by the All-Dinia Milli Liberation Movement, most probably on Rahmat Ali's return to Cambridge. In size, shape, printing and the design of the outside cover, it follows his other pamphlets, and, like them, is printed by Messrs. Foister and Jagg of Cambridge.
46. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
48. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
49. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.
52. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
53. See Zafrulla Khan, *The Kashmir Dispute*, Pakistan Institute of International Affairs, Karachi, 1950, and *Kashmir Question*, New York, n.d. (speech in the U.N. Security Council, February 1950); Sardar Muhammad Ibrahim, "Kashmir in the Security Council", *Pakistan Horizon*, June 1950, pp. 59-68; Government of Pakistan, *Kashmir Documents*, Karachi, 1962; and S.M. Burke, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis*, Karachi, 1973, and *Mainsprings of Indian and Pakistani Foreign Policies*, Karachi, 1975.

CHAPTER 7

THE WELL OF LONELINESS : 1948 - 1951

Rahmat Ali was turned out of Pakistan on 1 October 1948; he died in Cambridge on 3 February 1951. During these twenty-eight months he must have corresponded with some of his friends in Pakistan, though these communciations would have had to be muted as the post of his relatives and known friends was subject to official censorship.[1] But even then, except one letter from him to his brother, nothing of this correspondence is extant or available.[2] The only sources we have are the two pamphlets he published, the testimony of his Cambridge contemporaries, the information supplied by his College and the hospital in which he died, and his last will and testament. This chapter is based on the material provided by these sources.

The Muslim Minority in India

In August Rahmat Ali had written from Lahore to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, drawing his attention to the pitiful condition of the Indian Muslims. In December he followed it up with what he called "a brief, interim report on the work of the mission which I undertook for the cause of the Indian Muslims' freedom". It was addressed to "the Pak Millat, to which the [All-Dinia Milli Liberation] Movement belongs; and to which is due the allegiance of all individuals and organizations". He hoped that it would help all Paks "to realize that they stand or fall with the Indian Muslims; that to help them is to help themselves; and that their liberation is vital to the being and well-being of the Pak Millat throughout the Orbit of Pakasia".[3]

In pursuit of his mission, he had first visited Britain where the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference was held on 11-22 October. The Indian and Pakistani premiers had attended it for the

first time, and the outcome of their agreement was fatal to the cause of the freedom of the Indian Muslims. The two leaders had agreed on "an utterly unwarranted and unjust re-affirmation of the old, wicked falsehood that they [Indian Muslims] are an integral part of the Indian nation—and so no concern of Pakistan". This meant that Pakistan had washed its hands of the 50 million Muslims in India; that she would take no action to save them from annihilation; and that "we should expect nothing—absolutely nothing—from such a conference to help these victims of the oligarchy of Hindooism". This re-affirmation should be repudiated.[4]

After the conference, and after recovering from an illness which had incapacitated Rahmat Ali "for some time", he had gone to Paris where the United Nations was in session. There he had met many of the delegates and the journalists. In some of his talks he had been accompanied by Iqbal Shaidai, who was engaged in interesting French financiers and industrialists in the markets of Pakistan. The men he had met[5] had affirmed their anxiety to protect minorities throughout the world and had shown a keen interest in the problem of the Indian Muslims. He had had long discussions with them and explained every aspect of the position of the Indian Muslims—religious and cultural, and political and international. "I am glad to be able to state that, as a result of these discussions, they were convinced of the essential justice of our cause, and of their own moral obligation to that cause." Further, they had "promised to do all they could do to help them". The majority of them had "shared, and supported, my view that our brethren would never be safe under a Hindoo hegemony in India; and that only a further and a fuller partition of India—still a continent as large as Europe without Russia—could save them".

Most of them had offered to do one thing officially and immediately. If the Pakistani delegation, realizing its prime responsibility for the Indian Muslims, raised the question before the United Nations they would support it in the name of their governments. But he had found the Pakistani delegation both inaccessible to him and indifferent to the purpose of his mission. He could not find out any reason for this, except a rumour that was current in Paris. "This was that a member of the Delegation was negotiating with the Indian Delegation for the cession of Qadian to Pakistan—a

cession for which India was, in one way or another, to be liberally compensated in Pakistan's whole attitude towards the Hyderabad issue and in the settlement of the Kashmir conflict, both of which are before the U.N.O. It may be that for fear of offending the Hindoo Government of India and of compromising the chances of the success of these negotiations, the Delegation preferred to take no interest in my mission."

In view of this apathy, Rahmat Ali could make no use of the proffered help of the various foreign delegates and could not have the question raised in the session of the General Assembly. This experience "has a soul-searching moral for us all". It should be the paramount duty of every future Pakistani delegation to any international forum "to work—or at least to help those who work—for the liberation of the Indian Muslims". This was imperative, if for no other reason, for the sake of self-preservation. "For, make no mistake, their fate today spells our fate tomorrow."[6]

The difficulties in the way of the liberation of the Indian Muslims would be grim. The case of Pakistan itself and of Palestine proved the vicissitudes of the Islamic world's struggle for survival. It had taken a hundred million Muslims of India full 15 years to establish this Pakistan which, in fact, was "*Pastan*"—"in other words, a 'mutilated, truncated, and moth-eaten' Pakistan". (He was quoting Jinnah's words). It was over 30 years ago when seven sovereign Arab states and 50 million Arabs, morally supported by 400 million Muslims in the world, had started their struggle for Palestine. The result was still inconclusive, anxieties were deepening and prospects darkening. A tyranny faced and challenged the entire Muslim world. It could be defeated, but not without "unbounded devotion of our people".[7]

The first step of his mission had been to contact the various delegations at the United Nations. The effort should not stop there. The next step was to organize all available forces for the liberation of "our brethren". Without this liberation, the Pak nation could not survive in Pakistan, nor the Pak Millat in Pakasia. This was the time to ensure their survival. There was no time to wait. ". . . look at the clock of History. This is the zero-hour for humanity and the world is on the eve of an elemental revolution—a revolution which will make or break fraternities. Perhaps for centuries. Perhaps for ages. To miss this opportunity is to miss our destiny."[8]

Rahmat Ali's perseverance commands our respect. Broken in spirit, bruised in soul, poor in health, homeless, stateless, spurned by his own country—he yet kept the flame of his cause burning bright in his breast. Nothing could swerve him from his mission. The tragedy of the Indian Muslims haunted him and drove him forward with an elemental force.

His optimism was invincible. The two major Muslim provinces of India—Punjab and Bengal—had been divided, thus causing untold misery to millions of Muslims. Communal riots still stalked the vast land of India. The struggle for Kashmir had been virtually lost by Pakistan. Hyderabad had been captured and occupied by India. Junagarh, which had opted for Pakistan, was soon taken over by Indian forces, and its Nawab had fled to Karachi with a planeload of his concubines, jewellery and pet dogs. The internal politics of Pakistan was riddled with corruption, inefficiency and selfishness. Its foreign policy ambitions were creating resentment and jealousy among the Arab world. During its early months, when it came near breaking point, Pakistan did not get any sympathy from Muslim states. In the Kashmir war, it received no support from its Muslim brethren. (In later wars with India, the Muslim world's attitude was to be one of indifference; until in 1971 when India invaded East Pakistan not a single Muslim country sent a note of protest to India or recalled its ambassador from New Delhi). Yet Rahmat Ali talked of an Islamic fraternity and a Muslim survival. His sincerity is not open to question. The reality of his expectations is, as is his understanding of the Muslim mentality in the twentieth century.

The Last Word

Rahmat Ali had made it a habit to issue a message to his people and the PNM on each anniversary of the publication of his first declaration, *Now or Never,* 28th January. Probably these messages were short in their text and were not published as pamphlets; or, if they were, they are not extant.

However, his last message, issued on 28 January 1950, and entitled *Pakistan or Pastan? Destiny or Disintegration?* is a remarkable document by any standard. It is the only annual message available in full. It is by far the longest pamphlet he ever published (63 pages). It is a stinging critique of Pakistan. It contains at least one remarkable and prophetic prediction. And, it is his last will

and testament. He must have distributed it very widely, for the copy in my possession is the third reprint, still of 1950. Its scope and importance justify a full summary in the direct narration.

It deals with the critical condition of our whole Milli heritage, and indicates the opportunities and points out the perils inherent in the present position of Pastan. It stresses the needs and suggests the means of saving the heritage and of securing the Fatherland. All Paks must remember that History's verdict will be determined not by our loyalty to individual politicians or their parties, but by the sincerity, the soundness, and the sequel of our declarations and deeds in the service of the cause. As for the Quislings, this message is my final answer to their renewed threats and acts of persecution by which they want to stop me from criticizing their "doings, non-doings and misdoings". They boast of the addition to their power made by their masters and say they can now completely frustrate my work and suppress and silence me forever.[9] (As I use the direct narration, all quotation marks, capitals and italics should be taken to exist in the original; all views and statements are his, with nothing added by me).

What happened in 1947 was tragic enough, but worse is here before us now. Our whole heritage is in mortal peril, and with it the security of our brethren in Iran and Afghanistan. All we have got to defend our heritage with is Pastan, not Pakistan. It is Pastan because it does not include even East Punjab, Delhi Division, Jammu and Kashmir, West Bengal and Assam. In the ultimate analysis, the reduction of Pakistan to Pastan is the root cause of our inaction, and of our failure to defend our heritage in the Continent. The only solution is to convert Pastan into Pakistan. In this plan, what is the balance-sheet of our strengths and weaknesses?[10]

We have four assets: faith, history, human power, and strategic superiority. Our greatest asset and opportunity is our faith, which has created what we possess and made us what we are. Islam has worked miracles for us in the past, and it can and will do the same for us now and always, if only we let it do so. Such is the promise of Islam. But such is our perversion that we simply are not following Islam. We are ignoring it in every sphere of life, and turning to alien, "Western" cults. This is a form of apostasy, an act of enmity against Islam. Nothing so degrades and destroys a religion as its neglect by its own followers. We must change; we

must revert to Islam; we must follow its code in thought, in word, and in action. How can this be done? First, by making Islam the core and content of the constitution of Pastan. Secondly, by making the observance of at least its five pillars compulsory for all Muslim citizens of Pastan. Only the practice of Islam can make us glow with life, transform our defeatism into defiance, and enable us to frustrate the designs of the enemy.[11]

The next greatest asset is our history. A nation lives upon its history, which is the source of its thought and action, which is the sum of its experience and its wisdom, which is its moral food and mental armour, and which is its safest guide and most faithful guard. Our history is inspiring. We are the only people in the world who have altered the map of a continent and moulded the fate of one-fifth of mankind. Such an achievement can and should be a source of pride, ambition and vitality. Our people must be informed of their national record, so that they become history-conscious, proud of their national greatness, and anxious to add to that glory. To teach history is really to practise *tabligh* (religious preaching); this is our traditional method of all creative conversion, spiritual as well as political. It will transform them, and nothing short of transformation will prepare them to stake their all for the sake of Islam, the nation and the millat.[12]

Our human power is our next opportunity. It is heroic, tested and tried. If we keep it in full vigour and virtue we can redeem the defeat of 1947, and re-write a shameful chapter of our history. But we are neglecting this source of power and letting it rot. How can this be rectified? First, by being truly solicitous for its welfare. It must be given the best possible education and the best possible nutrition, so that it is kept in good heart and in good health. To fail to provide for the welfare of a people is to commit a capital crime, for which the guilty will have to pay on the day of reckoning.[13]

Lastly, our strategic position is a source of strength. It gives us far-reaching advantages. It enables us to fortify our ties with Iran and Afghanistan. It can promote our natural, national reunion with these two countries, so that we have an effective voice in the Orient. Leaving the military side of the question to our strategists and tacticians, who are bound to base their defence policy on the foreign policy of the government, we as a people must do three things to turn the position to our national good. First, we must

revive and re-cultivate the old, brotherly relations with Iran and Afghanistan. On this will depend not only the future of the three individual countries, but of Central Asia and ultimately of the Muslim world. Secondly, we must make sure that the direction and execution of our foreign policy are in the hands of a competent, conscientious and courageous statesman, who is a true Muslim and a true Pak, and who has never been a quisling. In foreign relations, character counts more than cleverness, and faith and patriotism more than a knowledge of law and jurisprudence. Thirdly, to ensure the proper direction and execution of our foreign policy, we must learn to think hard, honestly and deeply. At present we as a nation are the most wishful and superficial thinkers in the world. We are so fond of the vague and the woolly that we seldom bother about the inwardness and outwardness of a question, about the immediate effects and ultimate consequences of a policy. This habit is dangerous. A nation that cannot or does not inspire and control its foreign policy fails to achieve its destiny.[14]

As against these four actual or potential advantages, the nation faces no less than nineteen perils. Each of these poses a serious hazard. Taken together, they will be mortal. These dangers are:

1. *The Fate of Jammu and Kashmir.* The history of this danger goes back, not to 26 October 1947 when Maharaja Hari Singh Dogra handed over the territory to India, but to 17 September 1944 when Jinnah in his letter to Gandhi excluded Kashmir from the definition of and the demand for Pakistan. By losing Kashmir, we have created a danger that Pastan may turn into Registan (desert), for we have lost the control of the waterheads of the rivers feeding our canals, which are the very lifeblood of Pastan. The only way to fight this danger is to fight to the death, rule out all compromise, and refuse to accept the dubious, deceptive solution of plebiscite, arbitration or mediation. We must not forget that whoever holds the mountains and the rivers of that region is more the master of Pastan than its own Government. The whole nation must dedicate itself to the crusade of making this territory a part of Pastan, and to treat as the "cursed of the nation" any citizen who accepts any partition of Kashmir.[15]

2. *Lack of Conviction.* A spirit of indifferentism afflicts us all– our masses, our classes, and our so-called leaders. Nothing appeals to us but sordid careerism. No high ideal inspires us and no healthy ambition stirs us. None can renew our old sense of duty and our

old urge of destiny. Our trouble is not the "relaxation after the achievement of Pakistan", but the "frustration after the non-achievement of Pakistan". This non-achievement is the fault of the Muslim League. The PNM demanded Muslim homelands in India to save the minorities from Hindu hegemony after the creation of Pakistan. Jinnah disowned this demand and discredited the PNM in a press conference in Delhi on 26 April 1943. Again, on 17 and 18 September 1944, in his letters to Gandhi, Jinnah defined his Pakistan in such a way as to renounce all Muslim claims to half of the Punjab, half of Bengal, the whole of Assam, and the whole of Jammu and Kashmir. In other words, he gave away to the Hindus and Sikhs half of Pakistan and two-thirds of Bangistan, let alone ask for more territory for the survival of the Millat. Morally foul and strategically fatal, this definition was at once an unwarranted surrender of, and an unforgivable treachery against, the Millat's cause.

Yet again, Jinnah accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan of 16 May 1946, provisionally on 19 May and finally on 6 June. And he did this with the declaration that "if we do not accept it, we shall be crushed". Many men have ruined themselves and their parties with a single sentence. To Jinnah's declaration belongs the unique but shameful distinction of ruining the whole cause of a people. Then came his acceptance of the partition plan of 3 June 1947, a scheme that offered us a paralysed Pastan, a shadow of even that Pastan which the Hindus, without any struggle on our part, had offered us as far back as 1924. This was the final, fatal failure of our "leadership". When, as a result of this acceptance, all hell was let loose in northern India, no leader came to our rescue. When we were being butchered by the Hindus and Sikhs, our leaders were being feted by their cronies and lackeys. When our blood was flowing in the streets, wine and whisky were flowing in their *salons*. For weeks this went on: programme of massacre and mutiliation of our people side by side with the orgy of self-indulgence by our leaders. And when we wiped the blood and dust from our eyes and could see what had happened, we witnessed the ghastliest sight ever seen by a people in history. We found all our hopes reduced to dust and ashes by the folly and foul-play of one man and one man alone—*Quisling-i-Azam-Jinnah*.

What has this tragedy cost us? The figures are appalling: 3 million dead, 5 million maimed and disabled, 10 million rendered

homeless and penniless, 50 million enslaved by India; the most wounding shame and humiliation, the jeopardization of the whole cause of Islam and the Millat; the reduction of Pakistan to Pastan, a country which Jinnah himself had once condemned as a "moth-eaten, truncated, and mutilated Pakistan", and the loss of self-confidence, morale and faith in leadership.

On top of all this, we have not been told how and why and when and under what circumstances the Muslim League accepted the 3 June plan. This silence is strengthening the rumours that the plan was accepted and a pledge given by Jinnah long before their publication and announcement on 3 June. These rumours are being further enforced by the hush-hush statements of some of Jinnah's apologists that he was driven to do what he did by the Viceroy's *private and confidential warning* to him that if he didn't accept the plan, and didn't give the pledge, the British would deliver the whole of India to the Congress. This can only be an exercize in white-washing, for this warning conflicts with the British Prime Minister's statement of 20 February 1947 promising that the powers of the Central Government would be handed over to "some form of central government for British India or to existing Provincial Governments in some areas or otherwise as seemed best in Indian interests". Further, if such a warning was given to him, why did Jinnah not put it before the Muslim League Council and let it decide the matter? The real truth about this development must be told to the nation, for it is vital to the moral health of the Millat, to our whole future, and to the personal position of Jinnah himself, whose responsibility for these events is supreme. The truth will also silence those who think or allege that he doublecrossed the League Working Committee, suppressed the true report of the proceedings of the League Council meeting of 9 June 1947, and gave his advanced pledge of acceptance of the partition plan with a view to deceiving his people, posing as the "builder of Pakistan", becoming the Governor General of the new Dominion, and also ensuring his own place in history: if Pakistan stood, it would serve as a monument to his "statesmanship"; if it fell, owing to the inherent defects and deformities of his creation, it would serve as a monument to the "stupidity" of his successors—a "stupidity" which would automatically spotlight his own "statesmanship".[16]

3. *The Refugees.* The next danger arises from the terrible plight of the 8 million refugees. They have made the greatest sacrifices

for the cause of Pakistan. They represent an immeasurable amount of suffering and misery. The danger comes, not from their bereavement and penury, but from the fact that they are now being starved and skinned by our own people. This has resulted in their bitter disappointment. Thousands of them now prefer the "Hindu Hell" to the "Pak Paradise", and are preparing to go back to India. Others, in their utter exhaustion and helplessness, are rapidly losing faith in us and in Pastan. The latter pose a potential danger, which can only be removed by treating them as brethren and resettling and rehabilitating them immediately in suitable social groups and in appropriate regions of the country. As Lahore is receiving the largest number of refugees, the central government should make it its temporary capital and devote itself to the task of relief and resettlement. Unless this problem is tackled with full vigour and solved to the satisfaction of those affected, the plight of the refugees will undermine the very foundations of our state; and, in a crisis, it will prove fatal to the nation. A nation which does not treat its members fairly never gets that loyalty from them on which alone it can base its life and build its future.[17]

4. *Integration of Pastan and Bangistan into One Country.* The integration of West Pakistan (Pastan) and East Bengal (Bangistan) has its advantages, but the losses far outweigh the gains. The danger of integration is so deceptive that it actually looks like deliverance, and is, therefore, all the more deadly.

Five elements in this relationship argue against the integration:
(a) At least 1,000 miles by air as by land and 3,000 miles by sea separate the two wings. There have been in history, and still are, empires with far-flung colonies and dominions, but never a country with one half of its territory lying so far from the other. The iron laws of life show that to integrate into one country two such territories is so unsound and unsafe as to defeat the very purpose of their integration.
(b) Neither the shortest nor the longest route between the two wings runs through air or over land and seas that could be called neutral, let alone safe. Every inch of it runs through the Hindu-ruled air or territory, or over the Hindu-dominated seas. If an enemy invades any wing, though both will be automatically at war with him, yet they will not be able to co-ordinate their defence and give any effective aid to one another.
(c) The national capital of Bangistan is in Pastan, and for a country

to have its national capital outside its own confines is dangerous both to itself and to its partner in whose territory that capital lies. The very fact of its supreme government being outside its frontiers creates among its people the humiliating and subservient feeling that they are a colony of that other country.

(d) In spite of a community of religion between the two wings, there is not that complete identification of each with the other which is vital to their existence as one country. Their outlook, interests and economics, which ultimately determine the course of life of a people, are radically different, and this difference always leads to the rise of centrifugal forces.

(e) *The ultimate destinies of Pastan and Bangistan lie in different directions.* Geography and history dictate that Bangistan turns towards the neighbouring Muslims in the north-east and Pastan towards those in the north-west. To ignore this dictate is to court disaster.

There are other elements of danger in the integration, but to refer to them here would be against the interests of the nation. The only way to meet this source of danger is to *recognize "Pastan" and "Bangistan" as two separate distinct countries, each with a supreme Government of its own,* and, when that is done, to *re-unite them as allies* by a comprehensive treaty on the basis of perfect equality. Such an alliance could secure all the advantages and, at the same time, eliminate all the disadvantages, of their present integration.[18]

5. *Situation of Capitals.* Our national and provincial capitals stand much too near the frontiers. They are not only beyond the reach of most of our own people, but also within easy reach of most of our neighbours, some of whom can be our potential enemies. Karachi, the national capital and also of Sind, is most difficult to defend militarily, and most inaccessible administratively to four-fifths of the population of the country. In peace, its situation makes the people and the governemnt isolated from each other. In war, it will make for its capture or destruction by the enemy. Lahore, the capital of the Punjab, lies right on the Indo-Pakistan frontier. Quetta and Peshawar are hardly 40 and 30 miles, respectively, from the Afghan frontier. Dacca is 35 miles from the Indian boundary.

These cities are not merely administrative capitals. They are also the centres of education, marts of commerce and trade, work-

shops of craft and industry, arsenals of equipment and armament, and centres of communications. Thus their physical situation is a danger not only to themselves but to the country as a whole. Our rulers must transfer them to some safer and more central places.[19]

6. *The Minorities.* The religious minorities in the country number nearly 19 million, almost 27 per cent of the population. They represent Indian irridentism, and in a war or at a time of national danger they will act as a fifth column. To avert this disaster, we must, first, try to arrange with India the exchange of minorities, with, of course, the cession of territory to us by India in view of the numerical excess of our Muslims in India over the Caste Hindus in Pastan. Until we can redeem the betrayal of 1947, this is the only safe and sound solution of the problem. If that is impossible, then we must ask India to agree to a reciprocal consolidation of the minorities in some appropriate parts of the countries. In case of an Indian refusal, we must consolidate our Caste Hindu minority in some suitable region or regions of the country.

Until this is done, we must exercize no general discrimination against any minority—something that is being done at present. The national cabinet has not a single Caste Hindu member, though about one-sixth of our total population belongs to this faith. *This, to my mind, is at once unfair, unwise, and anti-Islamic.* It is unfair in the name of civic morality, unwise in the name of national security, and anti-Islamic because it exposes one half of the Millat (50 million Muslims of India) to Hindu retaliation for this treatment of Caste Hindus in Pastan. India has a sizeable group of Muslims serving as central and provincial ministers, governors and ambassadors. They may all be Congressmen, but they are still Muslims. The record in Pastan, where there is not a single Cast Hindu minister or ambassador or governor, is stupid and shameful. It amounts to disqualifying a whole community from all high offices in the state. To rectify this mistake of policy is the demand of ordinary justice.[20]

7. *The Demand of Pathanistan.* Another danger comes from the government's mishandling of the demand for Pathanistan. In its original form, the demand meant the re-designation as Pathanistan of the NWFP and some of its adjoining tribal areas, and their recognition *by name* as the "Land of the Pathans", which they are in fact. It is a *natural* demand, because these territories belong

to the Pathans who, like other nationalities in Pastan, have a pride of social entity, and because the present name of these lands is semantically non-descript and socially wrongful. It is also an old, historical demand, because the creation of Pathanistan has been the ambition and aim of the Pathans for at least three generations.

Our leadership should have blessed this demand even before the referendum for Pakistan was held in the NWFP on 6 July 1947. This would have been an act both of moral virtue and of political wisdom. But our foolish leaders first contemptuously ignored it, and later, when it was formally made by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, abusively opposed it and finally rejected it. To add insult to injury, the government proceeded to arrest Ghaffar Khan, sentence him to three years' rigorous imprisonment after a mockery of a trial, and order that he should serve that sentence outside his own province. This arrest and consequent imprisonment were an act of vindictive despotism against him and of blazing folly against the country. The sequel was the perversion of the demand, the open adoption of it by Afghanistan, and the resulting bad relations between Afghanistan and Pastan. Worse consequences are likely to follow.

The rulers must change their policy from one of coercion to one of reconciliation, and learn from India which has cemented its relations with as divergent neighbours as Nepal and Afghanistan. Ghaffar Khan should either be released or tried in a court of law. The NWFP should be given the name of Pathanistan, or a referendum held on the issue. These steps may not achieve everything, but they will satisfy all fair-minded, patriotic Pathans, strengthen their loyalty to Pastan, improve our position on the north-west frontier, and ease the tension between Pastan and Afghanistan.[21]

8. *The Inequitable Distribution of National Wealth.* The economy of the country is another source of trouble. Wealth is being concentrated in the hands of a few and grinding poverty inflicted on the many. This cripples the life of no less than 95 per cent of our people. This distribution is immoral, illegal and un-Islamic. It is also fatal to the soul, the solidarity and the security of the country and of Islam in the world. It is a principle of human nature that when people realize that their own co-religionists and co-patriots rob them of their proper share in the national inheritance, they turn to other fraternities or other rulers who will treat them fairly. It is a principle of Islam that such a system of economics and

finance is sheer exploitation and opposed to the laws of the *Shariat*.

Our rulers should take immediate steps to right this wrong. Pending the formation of a long-term policy, they can help in a hundred ways by granting subsidies, reducing taxes on low-income groups, abolishing land revenue on small holdings, and distributing state lands among the landless, able-bodied peasants. Besides saving millions of people from starvation and homelessness, this will promote the cause of common honesty and humanity among the people and renew their faith in Islam.[22]

9. *Corruption and Favouritism.* Graft, corruption, nepotism and favouritism are rampant in the country. They are rendering efficient administration difficult; they are robbing the average citizen of the sense of security and of the hope of justice; and they are sapping the foundations of our national life and liberty.

One case of common knowledge will illustrate this. A corrupt official, in 1947, bartered away to India our vital cause in the partition of the Punjab for 25 million rupees. In 1948, he compromised the success of our Kashmir crusade by misappropriating 1.5 million rupees worth of goods and material which were meant for the Kashmiri freedom fighters.

Nepotism and favouritism are perverting the officialdom of the country. The ablest and most deserving young men and women are being ignored and kept out or down by the rulers. Flattery and connections open all doors. Merit is ignored and demerit exalted. The courtiers are patronized. This cancer is eating into the vitals of our society and state and leading us to the abyss of degradation and disintegration wherein lie the dead and damned of history.

These evils can be stamped out through education and salutary punishment. In every school the children should be told of the horror of the crime and the disastrous consequences of corruption and favouritism. The offenders should be given deterrent punishments. A permanent commission composed of men and women of the highest integrity should investigate this curse in all departments of our life.[23]

10. *Treason and Treachery.* Treason and treachery walk free and unfettered in the fatherland. Their practitioners are opulent and arrogant. Their crimes remain unquestioned and uncondemned. Their ill-gotten gains are untouched. The positions they occupy, the privileges they enjoy and the properties they own are a perma-

nent source of encouragement to other weak and vicious spirits to follow their example. They are a standing temptation to them to betray the nation and claim the reward.

The responsibility for this rests solely on the government, which should learn a lesson from the 1945 French trials of traitors. All cases of suspected treason and treachery should be investigated by a competent commission and the clearest of them should be tried by the highest court in the land. By refusing to take any action, the government is lending credence to the charge that the record of some of its own supporters is not above suspicion.[24]

11. *Forsaking the 50,000,000 Paks in India.* The next danger arises from Jinnah's having abandoned 50 million Muslims in India by accepting the 3 June plan. These Muslims whom we deserted feel betrayed and embittered. The betrayal of a brother by a brother makes the iron enter into one's soul. When the Indian Hindu will try to use them against us, he will find many among them ready to do his bidding. If and when the Hindus decide to do that, it would mean that, with the blood and with the wealth of our own 50 million brethren in India, they would break us, the 50 million Muslims in Pastan. This is the full meaning of the danger arising from what was done in 1947.

What can we do now? First, we should confess before them the grievous wrong we did them and ask for their forgiveness. This will ease our conscience and assuage their bitterness. Secondly, we should take a deep, sincere interest in their fate, and assure them that we shall do all that is humanly possible to secure their life and liberation. This will redeem our soul and sustain their loyalty to Islam and the Millat. Thirdly, we should ask our government to use its good offices to improve their present lot. This will inspire us to do our duty towards them, as it will inspire them to cling to their hope of survival. Fourthly, we should stop vilifying their leaders such as Abul Kalam Azad. This vilification is against Islam. Besides, it is these leaders to whom the Indian Muslims can and will turn for help in their troubles and trials. Our vilification will weaken these leaders' position in India and disqualify them from helping their own people. Lastly, we should take the case of the Indian Muslim minority to the Great Powers, to the United Nations, and, above all, to the Muslim nations, and try to enlist their sympathy. We should do all these things in the realization of the fact that to help those brethren is to help the whole Millat,

including ourselves.[25]

12. *Careerism and Quislingism.* This is the danger of subordinating and sacrificing everything, including the good of Islam, the nation, and the Millat, to one's own personal gain—social, material or political. This violates the code of honour and morality which constitutes the basis of national being and well-being and which provides the strongest bulwark of national freedom and prestige in the world. In our case, this careerism has been a calamity, and has ruined us as a people, wrecked us as a power and frustrated us as a polity.

The extent of this disaster will be obvious if we compare our actions with those of the Hindus during the last two centuries. While the Hindus, defying British disapproval, created and followed a leadership that was the embodiment of Hinduism and the expression of its protest against Britishism, we, succumbing to British reaction, created and followed a leadership that was the embodiment of the negation of Islam and the expression of our subservience to Britishism. While they raised their orthodox men to the status of *mahatmas* and *mahashas*, we ridiculed ours as *mad mullas* and fanatical *faquirs*. While they fostered martyrdom and heroism amongst their masses for the cause of Hinduism, we fostered minionism and helotism among ours against the cause of Islam. While they opposed the British designs on the Hindu Kingdom of Nepal, we enlisted as mercenaries in the British forces to destroy first our own power in India and then the independence of other Muslim countries. While they behaved patriotically, we behaved slavishly.

The tragedy is that we have not reached the end of practising this art, because unselfish service and sacrifice have lost their appeal to us; their place having been taken by government service, mercenary work and commercialization of ideals. We have become a nation of stooges, job-hunters, office-seekers and gold-worshippers. This has become the be-all and end-all of our lives. And no wonder. For, in our society, to be an ordinary citizen has come to mean failure in life and loss of face. I know this from personal experience.

Our quislings have developed careerism into a plausible science, and they can palm off any of their actions as good deeds in the interests of Islam and the nation. It will not be easy to eradicate this disease. An old vice or weakness of human character is hard

to remove. The process demands a metamorphosis of the individual, and that is possible only by the true and traditional instruction which is given by word and by deed. We must foster heroism and create crusadism, and teach our people to place Islam's honour above everything in life and seek satisfaction in national work.[26]

13. *Political Heresy-Hunt.* This is the vindictive persecution and suppression by the men in power of their actual or potential personal enemies, political opponents, or ideological rivals. It is a sordid and stupid game. It is my conviction that to oppose the rulers in the national interest is both the sacred right and the sacred duty of every Pak, and that to persecute people for exercizing this right and for discharging that duty is not only cruel to them but also dangerous to the nation. History confirms this conviction. Heresy-hunters have never done any good to the hunters or to the nations concerned. On the contrary, they have caused personal vendettas and political feuds, bred secret societies and revolutionary parties and subversive movements.

Our rulers must realize that it is their duty to tolerate opposition, to understand their opponents, and to encourage criticism of their actions, policies and programmes. For, after all, they are not infallible. Besides, they are not above criticism. They are the servants of the nation. Further, they are not immortal. Sooner or later they will have to yield their places to others for whom opposition provides the best training and preparation. In this, Pastan should learn from India, where the leaders have succeeded in holding together all elements in their body politic and thus enabled every one of them to contribute its best to the good of the country, might he have been a revolutionary, a reformer, an extremist, a moderate, an orthodox, a modernist, a pro-British or anti-British, a Rightist or a Leftist, a Muslim Leaguer or a Congressman.

Rational criticism and opposition can do the utmost good to a nation. They should be encouraged, not stifled; tolerated, not suppressed; helped, not hindered. Indeed, the rulers should challenge their critics to excel their record in the service of the national cause.[27]

14. *The Dominion Status.* The status of Pastan as a dominion in the British Commonwealth is a betrayal of our historical ideal and of our glorious past. By accepting this position we continue to subject our people to Britain, to expose our society to *British influence,* to incur *political responsibilities* that are compromising,

to undertake *international commitments* that will be crippling, to earn the *contempt of the Comity of Nations, of our posterity, and of History*, and to pay homage to a power which destroyed Muslim rule in India, despoiled our heritage from 1857 to 1947 and handed over most of that heritage to the Hindus in 1947.

To say that Pastan, though in principle a dominion of Britain, is an independent, sovereign state, is a fraud upon constitutional history and an insult to our intelligence. A nation whose rulers solemnly pledge their allegiance to a foreign king and are actually appointed by him never has been, and never will be, a sovereign nation. "Sovereignty" and "Dominionism" are the antithesis of each other, and their equation is a device invented by the imperialists. Nor can it be argued that this Dominion Status is in our national interest, as it would make Britain support us against India. This is sheer nonsense, if not deliberate deception. Britain will never support Pastan, and for obvious reasons. India is a large state, and it is led by men whose patriotism has won British respect and who are statesmen.

What India decides to do is her business. Our responsibility towards our honour, our security, and our destiny demands that we repudiate this Dominion Status and declare Pastan as an independent, sovereign, and socialist Republic, and make it a truly Islamic state.[28]

15. *Alignement with the Western Bloc.* The next danger lies in the foreign policy of our government which has lined up Pastan with the West as against the East. This policy is needlessly provoking fate. It is wrecklessly throwing our lives and liberties into the furnace of power politics.

Our vital interest demands that, as a *first principle of policy*, Pastan should join *neither the Western nor the Eastern Bloc* into which most of the world is getting divided. Secondly, if and when, *in all responsibility*, it realizes that it cannot keep out of both blocs, then, as a *second principle of policy*, it should join that bloc which, to its *reasonable satisfaction*, guarantees the conversion of Pastan into Pakistan and the national consolidation and sovereign freedom of our 50 million brethren in India and Ceylon. Lastly, if and when the government makes up its mind to join a bloc, it should seek the nation's approval of its decision.[29]

16. *Hindu Designs on Dinia.* This danger is born of the original, age-long Hindu dream to achieve the fullest Hinduization of the

whole continent through the absorption or annihilation of all non-Hindu polities and peoples. In the light of this, our position is much more critical now than at any time during Islam's history. Our leadership has been completely fooled into ignoring Indian designs, forsaking our vital interests, and keeping most of us not merely unaware of the success of Hindu planning but satisfied with themselves and hopeful of a different sequel.

This is the moral failure of our own statesmanship. Never must it forget–which it does–that at the first opportunity India will undo Pastan. If we want to survive, we must take note of these warnings. Otherwise, we shall suffer re-destruction that will be absolute and final, and that, according to the laws of God, will be deserved by us.[30]

17. *Prejudice against "Provincialism" and "Tribalism"*. Some of our ruling circles are prejudiced against the alleged undue attachment of the old Paks to their provinces and their tribes. Although expressed in the name of nationalism, this prejudice proves itself to be more careeristic and convenient than patriotic or justifiable. There is no unhealthy provincialism or tribalism among the old Paks. Significantly, this prejudice is being shown by the circles opposed primarily to the appointment of the old Paks to high key positions in the state. It is really prompted by those who want power in Pastan but find this difficult because of their "newness" and "provincelessness". They cling together to keep to their high offices without having much following in the country.

The results are damaging. This attitude is creating among the local population a feeling of victimization, which might split the nation from top to bottom, imperil the integrity of the state and frustrate the whole cause of the fatherland. It is also bringing a bad name to the circles concerned who are being called *Hindustani Hakims* (rulers from India) by the people; gradually it will undermine their authority. They should not forget that they form a very small fraction of the nation.

In order to remove this prejudice the affected circles should be made to understand the following points about the "provincialism" and general position of the local population:

(a) Like one's love for one's family, one's love for one's tribe or province is a natural, human feeling. It does not negate one's love for the nation.

(b) The local population's loyalty to Pastan and its qualifications

to serve it are second to none.
(c) Like the Hindustani refugees, the local population is a great and gifted people, completely devoted to the advancement of Islam. In fact, historically they were the first to accept Islam, and they laid the foundations of Muslim rule in India. They were the last to stop fighting the British and the first to resume that fight on the Afghan and Baloch frontiers.

I am a Gujjar by tribe and a Punjabi by province, and I am as proud of that sociological fact as Jinnah might have been of being a Poonja and a Kathiawari. It is my aim to raise our tribes to their original, natural and historical status of nationalities constituting the Pak nation, and our provinces to those of states constituting Pastan. I am proud of that emancipating aim. Finally, I am a Muslim and a Pak, and I am proudest of that supreme, spiritual truth; and, needless to add, as such I am in duty bound to subordinate, and if necessary sacrifice, everything to that highest loyalty.

To my mind, partiality or discrimination in matters concerning locals and Hindustanis is a crime against the fatherland and a sin against Islam. I am convinced that if and when the rulers concerned get really naturalized in Pastan and when they have studied the local people they too will come to the same conclusion that I have come to. They must study the people of the country, and to do that they must get out of Karachi, go into the villages and mix with the masses. If they don't do this, the result will be a tragedy. Rulers who do not understand the ruled do not last long.[31]

18. *European Culture.* The steady adoption by us of European culture in place of our own Pak culture raises another problem. Today the whole life of our intelligentsia is modelled on that of the Europeans. Indeed, to ape their habits and manners, their diet and dress, their attitude and outlook, has become the highest aim and ambition of us all. We use the English language, copy the British institutions, and follow the Western calendar. Our thoughts, our expressions and our actions are all inspired by European culture, the core and content of which is Christian. In other words, we are voluntarily and systematically surrendering Islam, Saracenism and Pakism to Britishism, Europeanism and Westernism. In fact, such is our degradation that the fuller the surrender we make of our heritage, the happier we feel with ourselves.

Most of us point to Turkey and justify our action by praising

Kemalism, little realizing that Kemalism is neither a heaven-sent cult nor was it originally anything but a protest against Europeanism. Besides, Turkey's subsequent Europeanization has admittedly proved to be a curse to the cause of Islamic culture and civilization.

Others explain our Westernization as an inevitable result of British rule. This is a bad excuse. We are not the only people in the world to have been subjected to British rule. Take the Hindus. They were the subjects of the Muslims for a long time before becoming the subjects of the British. But they did not change their culture and adopt Muslim culture in twelve hundred years, just as they did not surrender their culture to the British way of life in one hundred and fifty years. On the contrary, they went further, and in this long period of subjection revived and popularized their own old, Aryan and Vedic culture and took a pride in it.

Our Europeanization is our own fault. Had we remained as loyal to our culture during the one hundred and fifty years of British rule as the Hindus had remained loyal to theirs during twelve hundred years of non-Hindu rule over them, we could have avoided the ill-effects of this change. Let us be honest about our failing, admit it, and make a start by reverting to our own culture, language and way of life. Remember that we are now in the third generation of our Westernization, and history shows that, after the third generation, the deculturization of a people destroys its very soul.[32]

19. *Lack of a Constitution.* Lastly, one of the gravest dangers confronting us is the lack of a constitution for the country. It involves the very foundations of our national life. Indeed, we cannot speak of any foundations in the absence of a constitution. It is the constitution which lays these foundations and enables the people and their rulers to raise on them the edifice of their national existence and welfare. It creates the rulers and clothes them with the authority to rule, and it commands the citizens to obey them, to co-operate with them, and to carry out their lawful orders. It also gives the people their rights and the means to protect and enjoy them. Constitution is to a society and a state what law is to a court and a tribunal. Without law a court degenerates into arbitrariness. Without a constitution a state deteriorates into despotism. Where law ends, tyranny begins.

Therefore, the lack of a constitution is a peril to Pastan. But

our rulers have not even explained the long delay in its formation. Indifference in such a vital matter is affecting people's respect for the regime and compromising the integrity of the rulers. It also humiliates us in the world, particularly by contrast with India which started at the same time as us but has discussed, drafted, debated, adopted and promulgated its constitution on 26 January 1950. Our rulers owe an explanation to the country. Unless and until the constitution comes into force, the basis of our state cannot be said to exist—and for a state not to have a basis is to court disintegration.[33]

The challenge posed by all these dangers, weaknesses and failures is all-fateful and cannot be ignored. Other nations and states which ignored such hazards paid the ultimate penalty and were all struck down. That thought should arouse us to action. Time is short. The task is stupendous. The situation is charged with the fate of eternity. If we fail, th[redacted]

in 1947; the damaging results of mishandling the Pathanistan issue and thereby alienating Afghanistan; the discontent of the masses in the face of a capitalist economy which concentrated wealth in a small class and led to a situation in which industrialization failed to bring about any improvement in the condition of the common man; the debilitating effect of corruption in the civil service and the inability of any government to eradicate it; the worsening of Indo-Pakistan relations because of Pakistan's active interest in the Indian Muslim minority; the political damage caused by professional careerism and the witch-hunting by the party in power; the unpopularity of Pakistan among the non-aligned nations and among several Arab countries because of its alliances with the Western bloc; the political and social complications arising from the clash of interests between the local population and the refugee-rulers from the Urdu-speaking areas of India; the disintegrating effects of Westernization, creating two nations within the count[illegible]

1947 represented Jinnah's personal choices or men approved by him. Most of them were second-rate politicians. Some of them were plainly dishonest and had to be dismissed by Jinnah himself, *e.g.*, M.A. Khuro of Sind. A few were civil servants who had never shown any smypathy for the Pakistan movement or the Muslim League. Moreover, under the transitional constitution Jinnah had more powers than the British Viceroy in the hey-day of imperial rule. The Muslim League party was being run and controlled by unscrupulous people. With the exception of Jinnah, who combined his other offices with the presidentship of the League, there was no Leaguer above suspicion or in the trust of the people. The state and the party were considered the same thing by the rulers. Rahmat Ali was not wrong in putting the responsibility where it lay. Later developments proved his charges against the party. By 1954 the party which had once spoken for the entire Muslim India and had created Pakistan was turned out of office in the national government and in every single province.

Another noteworthy feature of this pamphlet is its balanced and cool counsel on some points. Rahmat Ali condemns the government's treatment of Ghaffar Khan, though Ghaffar had always been a staunch opponent of the creation of Pakistan. He was now a Pakistani citizen and entitled to his rights. By throwing him into prison under a black law the government had offended the Pathans and worsened the Pathanistan issue. This was both undemocratic and shortsighted. Similarly, Rahmat Ali, his hatred for the Hindus notwithstanding, had no hesitation in admiring the leaders and policies of India and shaming their Pakistani counterparts by the contrast.

What Rahmat Ali wrote about the undesirability and impracticability of yoking together West Pakistan and East Bengal into one state is truly prophetic. He might have been defending his own scheme, under which the two territories were to be two sovereign states, but then the Lahore Resolution too demanded "states" in the plural. It was a later decision taken by a convention of all Muslim League members of the central and provincial legislative assemblies in 1946 (a body which had no legal power to take such a decision) which altered the Lahore Resolution, turning the "states" into "a state". Rahmat Ali's foresight is amazing. In 1949 (when he wrote this pamphlet) he could see and put it in italicized writing that East Bengal was bound to split away from West

Pakistan, and he warned the rulers of the country that this was a danger which could and should be avoided. No heed was paid to his warning, and Pakistan was forced to suffer unparalleled humiliation and infamy in 1971. Even his broken health and tortured brain had the lucid soundness to foresee what Pakistani parties and governments and generals failed to notice till a few weeks before the making of Bangladesh.

Rahmat Ali's love for Pakistan pervades every sentence of the pamphlet. In spite of all that he had suffered at the hands of the people, the press and the government of Pakistan, his devotion to the land did not waver or falter. He was living in exile, with no hope of getting back. Yet he speaks like one whose heart writhes in anguish at the sight of the misfortunes surrounding his country. He is still a Pakistani, it is still "my fatherland", "my country", "our future", "our destiny". Pakistan had been his first love in January 1933 when he had offered the name and the idea to the world. Pakistan was his last love in January 1950 when he was on the rack, his agony of heart and mind was past endurance, and he was barely a year away from his death. Those who doubted and still doubt his loyalty have much to explain to their conscience for the libel.

Death and Burial

Life's night had begun for Rahmat Ali when he had returned to Cambridge from Pakistan in October 1948. Tormented by the remembrance of things recently past, he spent his time in drawing the attention of the world to the problem of the Muslim minority in India, reading newspapers, worshipping his Maker, and going for long walks. His health was causing concern to his friends and neighbours, who had known the young, erect, keen-eyed youth of the 'thirties. But this did not seem to worry him. He avoided social gatherings and kept himself away from convivial occasions. Joy had fled out of his life. His once-dancing eyes had dulled with disillusionment. Memory swelled the tide of unhappiness, and from the dregs of his despair rose a sombre pessimism. The most extreme agony arose from the feeling that he had been utterly forsaken.

One can be agonizingly alone "midst the crowd, the hum, the shock of men". There are many to share your joys, to laugh at

your jokes, to eat at your table, to befriend you when all is going on swimmingly, to accompany you in your halcyon days. It is the defeats, the sufferings, the slings and arrows of life that you want to speak about to friends, to confide to, to mourn the hopes that are ashes, the sad things that eat you up, that draw you down. To taste the wormwood of fallen fortune is bad; to do this without a friend, a brother, a wife or a child to console you is many times worse. No matter how hard Rahmat Ali tried to shut the door of memory, he found the past always ambushing the present. The swirls of memory never settled. The long pain of hollow hopes never went away. There are many ways of dying; in the body, and in the mind, and in the heart. He breathed and walked and ate, but

> There is no music more for him:
> His lights are out, his feast is done;
> His bowl that sparkled to the brim
> Is drained, is broken, cannot hold.

Some time in the second half of 1950 Rahmat Ali shifted from Hurstpark Avenue to Cherryhinton Road, and this move was destined to be the last of his many changes of address in Cambridge. He might have taken this step to economize, for he was in needy circumstances, almost poverty stricken. (The causes of this penury are discussed in Chapter 9). But neither disappointment and frustration nor the desperate state of his finances had broken his pride. He brooded in his loneliness like a Greek god. He ate less and less, either because his appetite was gone or because he had no money to buy enough food. Malnutrition might have contributed to his death. He still worked hard and carried on a large correspondence, sleeping intermittently and uneasily. He went to bed late in the night but, unlike his earlier years, woke up very early, said his prayers and went out for a walk.[36]

His last Pakistani visitor was Muhammad Masud, whom he had known in the 'thirties as an ICS probationer in England. He met Rahmat Ali in 1951 (this could only have been in January) and recalled his impressions in 1976. "He often complained about Muslim character, finding nothing good in it. . . . His health was extremely bad, he was always coughing. . . . It seemed that because of long solitude, isolation in a foreign country and desertion by

all those who had once been his friends and colleagues, he had turned gloomy and had developed a cynicism that had overpowered his power of speech and his mood in spite of his endemic humour which he still retained. He died lamenting that his services to the cause of Pakistan had not been acknowledged by the Government, the intelligentsia or the masses."[37]

In this state of health, slight carelessness or a mishap could prove fatal. And that is what happened. Rahmat Ali's second residence in Cambridge to which he had moved in late 1933 was No. 16 Montague Road. As long as he had lived there he had used it as the official address from which his pamphlets were published. Later when he had moved elsewhere he had made an arrangement for a consideration with the owner and his landlady, Miss. A. Watson, that he would continue to use the address for his post and also as the official headquarters of the Pakistan National Movement. When he founded other movements and issued pamphlets on their behalf, the address remained the same. A permanent address was a convenience, particularly for a man who changed his lodgings so often. Rahmat Ali called at 16 Montague Road every evenin[illegible]

worry ruled out any chances of recovery. He was almost beyond cure on his arrival. Life was wearing away like a fluttering candle. He struggled for life, or rather his doctors and nurses fought on his behalf, for three nights and two days. The attempt was useless, and the balm of death stole over the wearied eyes at 1:00 P.M. on 3 February.[39]

One enters this world alone and leaves it alone, says Baba Farid, the famous Punjabi sufi poet. This is a pious and virtue-stirring thought. But Rahmat Ali left the world in a loneliness of a different and more heart-rending kind. He died in neglect, indifference and apathy. No Pakistani brought him to the hospital, or sat near his bedside, or called to inquire about him, or prayed for him, or mourned him, or took his dead body away.

The hospital had no address to contact. It was by chance that Rahmat Ali's old tutor at Emmanuel, Welbourne (now the Master of the College), heard of his illness. "When I came to know that my old friend Mr. Ali was dying in Cambridge in great helplessness and penury, I attended to his needs. . . . I assured the private hospital in which he was lying that I will pay for his stay and treatment."[40]

For the burial, too, Welbourne offered his services and resources. He paid for the funeral and the burial from his own pocket. "I am glad that I was able to prevent him dying as an unclaimed beggar in poverty and avert the disposal of his body as an unclaimed person."[41] Fifteen months later, Emmanuel College decided to reimburse the Master with the expenses involved in the funeral.[42]

The funeral took place on Tuesday, 20 February, at 3:00 P.M.[43] The mortal remains were lowered into the hallowed soil in the expanse of the Cambridge City Cemetery at New Market Road. Only a few English friends were in attendance. The Pakistan High Commission in London had been informed by the College, but there was no response. The grave is nothing but a flat spot of earth, without any wall, fence, hedge, railing, or marking. There is no tombstone or wooden plaque or monument bearing his name. When I visited it, I found an empty square stone flower-holder on which some visitors had tried to scratch Rahmat Ali's name with a penknife or some other sharp-edged implement. The tomb has a number (B. 8330) in the register of the cemetery, but it is hard to find it because it carries no number on it. Were there not other graves on both sides, some with their numbers ascribed on blue

It is not difficult to imagine what his last thoughts would have been. The older one grows the farther back he looks. For him, anyway, there was nothing gladsome to remember or recall from the recent past. While pouring out his life-blood in slow, silent agony in the stillness of the hospital room, memories of childhood and youth came to him like dreams vaguely remembered. He heard ghostly echoes of the past. The village green, the modest homestead, the walk to the mosque, the daily trek to the school in the next village, the painful, exhilarating process of growing up, faraway cities, new schools and colleges, strange townsmen, longer journeys, newer surroundings–all this flashed on the flickering screen of his wandering mind. Shapes flitted on the edge of consciousness. Some darling figures emerged from the shadows of memory–the overpoweringly affectionate stepmother, the loving father, the indulgent sisters–all had gone before him where he was now going. Their faces danced before his eyes like blown leaves: now one, now in twos; now separate, now together. All lovable, all beautiful beyond imagination. Will they be waiting for him when he arrived! Will there be one final ultimate reunion, with no partings, no separations, no intervals! Thinking these thoughts and seeing these visions he passed from life into history.

NOTES

1. Interviews with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, Muhammad Anwar, Dr. Rafique Khan, K.A. Waheed, Mrs. Turner and Miss Frost.
2. I wrote to nearly everyone in Pakistan whose name was associated with Rahmat Ali. Most did not respond; others said they had nothing to tell or give me.
3. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *The Muslim Minority in India and the Dinian Mission to the U.N.O.* (Cambridge, 1949), Note, p. 2. It was published by the All-Dinia Milli Liberation Movement. The prefatory note is dated 20 December 1948; the address given at the end of the pamphlet is P.O. Box 111, Lahore, but it was printed and published in Cambridge in 1949.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
5. He lists the following: Ahmad Khassab Pasha (Foreign Minister of Egypt), Riaz Sultan (Prime Minister of the Lebanon), Dr. Faris Al-Khouri (Syria), Salem Sarper (Turkey), Nasrollah Entizam (Iran), Sheikh Hafiz Wahba (Saudi Arabia), James Hyde (USA), Andrews (South Africa), Jean Rouss (editor, *Franc Tireur*, Paris), Simon (Agence France Presse), H. Ghosh (editor, *Adiar*), Senator Mahmoud Abul Fatih, Habib Jamati, and El Abed Bouhafa (of *Al-Misr* of Cairo); *ibid.*, pp. 4-5.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-9.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
9. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan or Pastan? Destiny or Disintegration?* (Cambridge, 1950), Note, pp. 5-6. It was published by the Pakistan National Liberation Movement. Its dedication ran as follows: "To/The Immortal and Inspiring Memory/of/The MUJAHIDS/who/In heroic devotion to the Sacred cause of Islam/Laid down their lives and thereby laid the foundations/Of the mighty heritage of the MILLAT/In the Continent of Dinia and its Dependencies/A heritage which/THE/PAKISTAN NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT/is pledged/Before ALLAH and HIS RASOOL/To protect and perpetuate in Pakistan/As in the other lands and islands of the Continent". The stroke denotes a new

line.

10. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 15-28.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30. He repeated this to Masud in a conversation in January 1951. "He said that that province was extremely vulnerable, and prophesied that sooner or later the western half would have to wash its hands of it all together", M. Masud, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali As I Knew Him", *Dawn*, 13 June 1976.
19. *Pakistan or Pastan?* pp. 30-32.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 32-35.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 35-38.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 38-40.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 40-42.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 43-45.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 45-49.
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 49-51.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 51-52.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 52-53.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 53-56.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 56-58.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 58-60.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 60-62.
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.
35. See Zafrullah Khan, *Tahdis-i-ni'mat*, Dacca, n.d.; Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, *The Emergence of Pakistan*, New York, 1967; *Tarikh-i-ahmadiyyat*, Rabwah, Vol. X, n.d.; Kalim Siddiqui, *Conflict, Crisis and War in Pakistan*, London, 1972; Muhammad Munir, *From Jinnah to Zia*, Lahore, 2nd ed. 1980; Khalid bin Sayeed, *Pakistan: The Formative Phase, 1857-1948*, Karachi, 1960 and London, 1968; and Lahore and Karachi newspapers in Urdu and English for the period June-December 1947.

36. Interviews with Miss A. Watson, Mrs. Turner and Miss Frost; letters from Ian Stephens to me, dated 11 November 1969 and 29 April 1971; letter from Leonard Hollingworth to me, dated 19 July 1971; Miss A. Watson's letter to Dr. Waheed Ahmad, dated 18 September 1970 (used with his permission); entries in *RCPB*.
37. M. Masud, *op. cit.* He does not mention the exact date of the meeting.
38. Interview with Miss Watson.
39. Interview with the management of the Evelyn Nursing Home. I had a bit of luck here. Though the records of the patients are not kept beyond ten years (I visited the hospital on 20 April 1971), the old register of admissions and discharges was unearthed by an enterprising member of the staff, and the matron gave me her kind permission to go through it and make notes of the dates relating to Rahmat Ali. The correct date of his death was a precious find, for *all* Pakistani writers give the wrong date.
40. Welbourne's letter to M. Anwar, dated 12 May 1964, quoted in *Satluj*, 12 February 1976; interview with Miss Watson.
41. *Ibid.* The letter is quoted in Urdu translation. I have translated it back into English from the Urdu version.
42. "It was agreed that the funeral expenses of the late Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, a graduate of the College, be paid by the College, in view of the difficulties reported by the Master concerning the deceased's estate in Pakistan", Minute no. 137 of the proceedings of the meeting of the Governing Body of the Emmanuel College, Cambridge, held on 26 May 1952; Emmanuel College archives.
43. *The Cambridge Daily News*, 19 February 1951, for the notice of his death and the date of the funeral; 21 February 1951, for the report of the funeral.
44. For untraceable reasons, everyone in Pakistan who has written about Rahmat Ali has given wrong dates of his demise, wrong places of his death, and wrong places of his burial. Some examples:

    Dates of Death: 1948 (Mahmoud Shah Qureshi, *L'Etude sur l'evolution intellectuelle chez les Musulmans du Bengale, 1857-1947*, Paris, 1971, p. 116, fn. 2); 12 February 1950 (Muhammad Anwar Amin, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Satluj*,

12 February 1976, p. 13, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Imroz*, 23 March 1970, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 24 March 1971, and "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Mashriq*, 12 February 1971; Muhammad Sulaiman Tahir, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 13 February 1978; and S.M.K. Wasti, *op. cit.*, p. 31); 11 February 1951 (Muhammad Husain Zuberi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Musawat*, 14 August 1977; Hidyatullah Khan, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Mashriq*, 11 February 1976; and Mukhtar Ali Rahmani, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali . . .", *Jang*, 14 August 1978); 12 February 1951 (Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1976 and 13 February 1977; A.T. Chaudhri, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: Time to Honour Him", *Pakistan Monitor*, 14 August 1970; Abdur Rashid, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Nida-i-Millat*, 12 February 1970; Abdul Jabbar Khatana, Letter, *Jang*, 25 January 1976; Shamsul Haq Ansari, Letter, *Dawn*, 7 April 1975; Malik Muhammad Khan, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan ki faramosh kary", *Gujjar Gazette*, 4-18 March 1954, p. 24; Gujjar Ali Hasan Chauhan, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *ibid.*, 18 February 1964, p. 3; Ghulam Sarwar, "Apnay muhsin ko faramosh na kijiyay", *ibid.*, p. 14; and anonymous writers in *Imroz*, 13 February 1975 and 11 February 1977, *Hurryat*, 13 February 1975, and *Mashriq Weekly*, London, 8 August 1970).

Places of Death: on the staircase of Emmanuel College (*Imroz*, 12 February 1975 and 11 February 1977; Abdur Rashid, in *Nida-i-Millat*, 12 February 1970); on the staircase of a hotel (I.H. Qureshi, quoted in Gujjar Ali Hasan Chauhan, *ibid.*, p. 3); London (Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali awr tahrik-i-Pakistan", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1976; Muhammad Anwar Amin, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Satluj*, 12 February 1976, p. 13; and Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, statement to the press from Karachi, 16 July 1970, *The Pakistan Times*, 17 July 1970).

Places of Burial: Emmanuel College Compound (M. Sharif Salombar, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Jang*, 3 February 1981; Muhammad Anwar Amin, in *Imroz*, 23 March 1970, *Mashriq*, 12 February 1971, *Jang*, 24 March 1971, and *Satluj*, 12 February 1976, p. 13; Muhammad Sulaiman Tahir, *op. cit.*; Maqbul Ahmad Ansari, "Chaudhri

Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 25 February 1979; and S.M.K. Wasti, *op. cit.*, p. 31); Woking (Hidayatullah Khan, in *Mashriq*, 11 February 1976).

45. Last Will and Testament of Rahmat Ali, dated 19 July 1940, *RAR*. It was prepared by A.H. Wild, solicitor, Cambridge, and signed by him and his clerk, B. Sadler. Rahmat Ali's own solicitors were Messrs. Dyer, Morris and Frost, 2 Church Lane, Boston, Lincolnshire, England.
46. Letter from Rahmat Ali's solicitors to Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan, dated 6 April 1951, and letter from Messrs. Lyon and Code (Solicitors of Foister and Jagg) to Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan, dated 28 March 1952, *RAR*. The Englishman from whom Rahmat Ali was said to have taken a large loan was T.H.A.S. Tufton, of 18 Walpole Street, Chelsea, London, SW3, who wrote to Dr. Khan on 9 January 1952 that when Rahmat Ali died "he still owed me a sum of £ 11,000, repayable within 11 years from now, together with interest at the rate of £270 per annum", *RAR*.
47. Interview with Dr. Rafique Khan.

CHAPTER 8

TRUTH ON THE GALLOWS

The attitude of the Muslim League towards Rahmat Ali, his plan and the name he gave it, is an interesting study in ingratitude, obscurantism and slander. There is so much mystery about the way the League treated Rahmat Ali that a full investigation of their relationship is required. Three questions demand an answer. Why did the Lahore Resolution of March 1940 fail to use the word Pakistan for the partition plan it formulated? Why did the League never own the fact that it had borrowed the term Pakistan from Rahmat Ali, even after its own demand had come to be universally known as Pakistan? Why did Jinnah use the arguments and even the words and phrases of Rahmat Ali without acknowledging their origin?

But before taking up the Muslim League-Rahmat Ali problem, we should examine briefly the allegation that Rahmat Ali's plan was nothing but an intensified version of the proposal allegedly contained in Iqbal's Allahabad address of December 1930. As the Allahabad suggestion was made in the course of Iqbal's presidential address to the Muslim League, this discussion falls in the general field of Muslim League-Rahmat Ali relationship.

Iqbal and Rahmat Ali

In connection with Iqbal there are two schools of Rahmat Ali's detractors. The more extreme among the Iqbalites claim that it was Iqbal, not Rahmat Ali, who coined the word Pakistan. Let us look at the evidence they produce for this new twist in history.

A Muslim Leaguer from the United Provinces, Abdul Waheed Khan, asserted in 1960 that he met Iqbal in Bhopal in 1935 by which time, according to him, the term Pakistan had become

famous and Muslim thinkers had begun to seriously consider the Pakistan scheme presented by Iqbal. As the word Pakistan was then being attributed to Rahmat Ali, Waheed asked Iqbal about the truth of the matter and received this answer: "When I was in London in 1930 [*sic.*] for attending the Round Table Conference, Chaudhri Rahmat Ali came to see me once and asked me by what name the government [*sic.*] (*hakumat*) established under my Allahabad scheme would be called. On this I told him that if you take the first word [*sic.*] (*lafz*) of each province in the north-west of India and the 'tan' of Baluchistan, you get a meaningful and nice word, Pakistan. That will be the name of the government [*sic.*]." "I remember well", added Waheed, "that Iqbal picked up the first word [*sic.*] of each province like this: the 'P' of the Punjab, the 'A' of the tribal areas, the 'K' of Kashmir, the 'S' of Sind and the 'TAN' of Baluchistan."[1]

This piece of reminiscence is full of holes. Iqbal had *not* presented the Pakistan scheme at Allahabad in 1930. The original text of the address is available and has been reproduced in several collections of documents. It neither suggested the creation of an independent state in the north-west nor gave it the name of Pakistan.[2] It is also totally wrong to say that in 1935 Muslim thinkers of India were seriously considering Iqbal's proposal. On the contrary, it was completely ignored by nearly everyone, including the Muslim League itself, the All India Muslim Conference, and the entire Muslim delegation to the Round Table Conference. Nor did Iqbal himself repeat the proposal ever afterwards, not even from the presidential platform of the All India Muslim Conference in March 1932.[3] Iqbal was not in London in 1930. The Round Table Conference was meeting in the winter of 1930-1931, and Iqbal was not a delegate. Nor did Rahmat Ali arrive in England till November 1930. When did this meeting between Iqbal and Rahmat Ali take place? The word Pakistan is partly made up of the first *letters* of the names of certain areas, not the first *words*. The "A" in Pakistan did not stand for the tribal areas, but for the NWFP plus the tribal areas. In Iqbal's computation, as reported by Waheed, the NWFP is excluded from Pakistan.

This long list of errors in Waheed's statement rules it out as credible evidence. The ultimate refutation of it lies in the fact that between 1933 (or 1930 if Waheed is to be believed) and 1938 (the year of Iqbal's death), Iqbal did not mention the word

Pakistan, not to speak of claiming its parentage, even once in his poetry, public statements, letters, prose writings and private conversation. Barring some odd undiscovered item, every extant word that he wrote or spoke has been collected and published. In the entire corpus there is not a single reference to his fatherhood of the term. Besides, Waheed is an unreliable witness. As we have seen already, he also claimed that the Government of Pakistan offered an ambassadorship to Rahmat Ali in 1948, though the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the same government denies this.

The Civil and Military Gazette of Lahore also mentioned in passing in 1940 that Iqbal had given "the idea of a separate Muslim zone" the "poetic name of Pakistan".[4] Of course, it produced no testimony. An Indian journalist, Frank Moraes, made a more cautious statement in 1973. Iqbal, he said, "is thought by some to have coined the word Paksitan before Rahmat Ali published it".[5]

An American author of a book on Iqbal published in Lahore in 1974 has made Iqbal the father of the idea and the name in three spaced sentences which, singly or taken together, make no sense. "It was Iqbal who formally presented the Pakistan scheme, because Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, a student at Cambridge, did not circulate his pamphlet, *Now or Never,* until three years after Iqbal's presidential speech." "He reiterated the 'Pakistan idea' in his presidential address before the Muslim League during its annual meeting (on 21 March 1932 at Lahore)." "Iqbal standing on the opposite fence publicly had presented his 'Pakistan scheme' in India and, while in London to attend the last two of the Round Table Conferences, imparted it privately to Jinnah and other delegates."[6] Iqbal did *not* present any "Pakistan scheme" at Allahabad in 1930. He did *not* "reiterate" the "Pakistan idea" at Lahore in March 1932; this meeting was *not* of the Muslim League, but of the Muslim Conference. Why had Iqbal to go to London to impart his "Pakistan scheme" privately to Muslim leaders, when he was meeting them in India during 1931-33?

The evidence against Iqbal's parentage of the term is overwhelming. Nothing of his own word, written or spoken, can be found to support the claim made on his behalf. One or two references which are available actually refute these extreme Iqbalites. In late September 1937, a delegation of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation met Iqbal to seek his guidance on its aims and

objects. The Federation did not want to own the Muslim League's objective, because it was fixed as dominion status and the students wanted complete independence. During the meeting it was decided to make "the establishment of a Muslim National State in north-west India composed of the Punjab, NWFP, Sind and Baluchistan" the goal of the Federation. "We liked this proposal, and we were already acquainted with Chaudhry Rahmat Ali's Pakistan move-ment. But Iqbal did not use the word 'Pakistan'."[7] Had Iqbal coined the word, or even approved of it, he would have prescribed it, or at least used it, on this occasion.

On 3 January 1938, the following conversation took place between Iqbal and Sayyid Nazir Niazi. Iqbal: "The modicum of unity achieved through the efforts of the Muslim League holds out much hope. The Congress appears to be impressed with it. This unity will produce very glorious results. It will be even better if the Muslims can get a piece of territory for themselves." Niazi: "Pakistan?" Iqbal: "Yes. Pakistan or whatever else you wish to call it."[8] The conversation stopped here, but to make the issue clear, Niazi gives a long footnote saying that Rahmat Ali, not Iqbal, had coined the word Pakistan, and that on his return from the second Round Table Conference Iqbal told Niazi that "our young students who are studying in England have invented the name Pakistan for the Indian Islamic state which I had proposed" in 1930, and explained the etymology of the word as Rahmat Ali had composed it.[9]

Without wasting any more space on this problem we can leave it with the remark that "no evidence was found to support the view, sometimes expressed, that the term was coined by the poet Iqbal".[10]

The second school of Iqbalites insists that Rahmat Ali's scheme was borrowed *in toto* from Iqbal's 1930 proposal and that his own contribution was confined to giving it the name of Pakistan. Several writers go on repeating this, almost in identical words. A chronological summary of their statements will suffice to illustrate their point of view.

Mian Kifait Ali (1941): "In 1932 Chaudhri Rahmat Ali started propaganda in favour of separation as suggested by Iqbal by naming it as 'Pakistan'."[11] The wording is confused. It is not clear whether Iqbal suggested the opening of a propaganda campaign, or a scheme of separation, or the very name Pakistan. His date of

1932 is incorrect.

Sardar Iqbal Ali Shah (1942): "There is some controversy about the actual origin of the movement" but "there seems to be no doubt that its spiritual father was the late Sir Muhammad Iqbal". In proof of this, he said that "a few years ago, in a speech in London, Iqbal advocated . . . a division of the country into a Hindu part and a Muslim part . . . . But the idea took a concrete shape in the Pakistan movement which began in August 1935 among Indian Muslims studying at Cambridge. The prime mover was Chaudhri Rahmat Ali".[12] With so many errors of fact in so few lines by a man who was living in England we need hardly tarry to comment.

A.Q. Hashmi (1946): "The fact is that since 1930, when Allama Iqbal mentioned a 'Muslim India' in his Allahabad address, some young men were propagating [*isha'at kar rahay thay*] similar ideas. Among them the name of Chaudhri Rahmat Ali sahib, M.A. (Cambridge), deserves special mention."[13] Thus Iqbal had given the original concept of Pakistan, and Rahmat Ali was one of those who took the idea from him and publicized it.

S.M. Ikram (1950, 1965): "Another person [besides Jinnah] who met him [Iqbal] in England was Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, a Cambridge student, who had been greatly attracted by Iqbal's political proposals. He published pamphlets on the subject, and some outsiders . . . have taken Chaudhri Rahmat Ali to be the author of the Pakistan scheme. The truth, however, is that Iqbal was the first to put it up in a reasonably practical form, and bring it for serious consideration before the biggest political organization of the Muslims . . . . At this time [1931-33] Chaudhri Rahmat Ali's attitude was that of an admirer of Iqbal, who was greatly impressed by Iqbal's proposal and had enthusiastically taken it up to give it a more concrete shape."[14] In the first edition, this passage occurred exactly as it is given here, but the following sentences, which had appeared in the first edition, were omitted from the second edition: "Iqbal had not given his proposed state any name. Chaudhri Rahmat Ali . . . gave the proposed state the name of Pakistan. This name caught the fancy of the people and certainly contributed to the popularity of the scheme."[15] He does not give any evidence and does not quote any source. The presumption is that the evidence is so patent that it need not be given. Evidence of such an order could have come to us from only

one source, Rahmat Ali himself. But in his own writings there is no mention that he borrowed the idea of Pakistan from Iqbal. Conversely, if Iqbal had said something about his meetings with Rahmat Ali and his influence on him, this would have constituted evidence of some value, though only one sided, unless there were corroborative affirmation from Rahmat Ali himself. But Rahmat Ali is never mentioned by Iqbal, though the latter must have been familiar with the Pakistan scheme before he died in 1938. Moreover, by omitting some sentences from the second edition, Ikram implies that he is not prepared to credit Rahmat Ali even with the coinage of the word Pakistan. In this book, Ikram also asserted that during his 1931 visit to England Iqbal had met Jinnah and had been able to interest him in his Allahabad scheme: a statement for which there is not an iota of evidence or confirmation from any other source. Ikram says that all this is based on his personal knowledge. It is hard to accept the assurance that an ICS probationer was so intimate with Iqbal and Jinnah that they told him whatever passed in their private conversations. To assert the imaginary without furnishing proof is bad; to do so on the strength of nothing beyond "personal knowledge" is worse, for then it invites critics to talk about personal integrity.

M.A. Khan (1952): Rahmat Ali was "deeply influenced" by Iqbal's 1930 scheme.[16] The whole book, running to over 500 pages, is an argument for the case that Iqbal had suggested a clear-cut partition of India in 1930. The writer, who was a former chief justice of Bhopal, does not produce any witnesses or evidence.

A.M. Salik (1955?): Rahmat Ali gave the name of Pakistan to Iqbal's 1930 concept.[17] Salik was a senior journalist of Lahore and author of several books.

A.A. Qarshi (1961): When Iqbal had presented the "concept of an independent Islamic state in India" at Allahabad, a group of Muslim students in England had found it attractive and had enthusiastically taken up the task of propagating it. "The leader of this group was Chaudhri Rahmat Ali who lived in London."[18] Qarshi was one of the founders of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation.

S.F. Mahmud (1963): "The idea of Pakistan, originally only an academic theme with Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, became an inspiring goal when Iqbal gave it life and shape."[19] This teacher and scholar reverses the process. Iqbal took up Rahmat Ali's idea and breathed

a new spirit into it. When?

A.S. Khurshid (1964): "The fact is that he borrowed this idea from Iqbal. If he arrived at this idea independently or thought about this problem before Iqbal, we should not be surprised because this scheme had many times been brought before the public." He ran his movement "living in Oxford".[20] No comment is necessary.

M. Amiruddin (1964): It is stated on Khwaja Abdur Rahim's authority that "when Iqbal came to attend the Round Table Conference in 1931, some Muslim students at Cambridge including Rahmat Ali and Khwaja Rahim called on Iqbal. Iqbal was ill and, therefore, confined to bed in his apartment. The boys managed to reach him and told him that they had worked out a name for the Muslim State he had proposed in his Allahabad address of 1930. Then Rahmat Ali and Khwaja Abdur Rahim told him that it was PAKISTAN. Iqbal suggested to them that they should write each letter of this word separately and place it in front of his eyes. The students did as they were told. They visited Iqbal again on the following day and Iqbal approved of the name". Rahim "possesses about thirty letters of Rahmat Ali".[21] Several things in this account marr its reliability. The date of 1931 is unlikely. Even Rahmat Ali never claimed that he had thought up the name as early as that. Why is Amiruddin writing on behalf of Rahim, his son-in-law? Rahim was alive in 1964 and could have written the article himself. Amiruddin was a Muslim League leader and his opinion of Rahmat Ali was well known in Lahore, as was Rahim's own conduct towards Rahmat Ali in Colombo in 1940. There was no point in mentioning that Rahim possessed 30 letters from Rahmat Ali if the relevant portions from them were not quoted. Was he using this reference merely to inflate his credibility?

Faqir Sayyid Waheeduddin (1965): "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali has become quite famous after the establishment of Pakistan, and a particular movement is being run with a view to trying to make him the real proposer and founder of Pakistan. There is no doubt that during the third Round Table Conference in 1932 he had published and circulated one pamphlet on this subject in London. But practically Chaudhri Rahmat Ali was one of those admirers of Iqbal who paid their respect to him after his return from England in 1908."[22] Ignoring the sarcasm in the first sentence, there are five factual errors in these six lines written by a

man who based the entire book on a lifelong personal and intimate friendship with Iqbal. There was no movement aimed at making Rahmat Ali the real founder of Pakistan. The RTC session is wrong. The date of 1932 is incorrect. Rahmat Ali did not publish one pamphlet. When Iqbal returned from England in 1908 Rahmat Ali was an 11-year old student at the Middle School of Rohan. There is no evidence that he ever called at Iqbal in Lahore.

Chaudhri Muhammad Ali (1967): Rahmat Ali's only contribution was that his scheme "gave concise expression to Iqbal's idea and was both a symbol and a slogan".[23] The author was a former prime minister of Pakistan.

Mozibur Rahman (1968): Rahmat Ali "christened" Iqbal's 1930 scheme "with the name of 'Pakistan' before its birth".[24] He is the only Bengali writer in our list.

S.H. Mirza (1969): Rahmat Ali's Pakistan National Movement "had the blessings of Allama Iqbal" in 1932.[25]

A.S. Khurshid (1970): Rahmat Ali gave the name of Pakistan to Iqbal's 1930 plan.[26]

Choudhry Khaliquzzaman (1970): Iqbal's 1930 scheme won no popularity among the Muslims of India and was bitterly opposed by all. "Later Chaudhri Rahmat Ali owned [*apna liya*] this concept of Iqbal's."[27]

Aziz Ahmad (1975): Iqbal had suggested the idea of a separate Muslim state in 1930. "The name 'Pakistan' was given to the Muslim state thus conceived by him, by a group of Indian Muslim students, most prominent among whom was Chaudhri Rahmat Ali."[28] Aziz Ahmad was a leading Pakistani historian of his day.

Raziuddin Siddiqui (1978): Rahmat Ali "proposed the name 'Pakistan' for the Islamic state suggested by Allama Iqbal".[29]

Abu Saeed Anwar (1979): "Rahmat Ali proposed the name 'Pakistan' for the Muslim state suggested by Allama Iqbal", and the "S" in the word represented Sind and NWFP (*sarhad*).[30]

Khaliquzzaman, in spite of what he said in 1970 as quoted above, erred on the other side in 1961 in his autobiography. He gave a different turn to the controversy by making Iqbal a borrower from Rahmat Ali. We find a new order of chronology when we are told that "in November-December 1930 during the first Round Table Conference Chaudhri Rahmat Ali met many Muslim leaders in London and explained to them his scheme of partition, for the first time giving it the name of Pakistan . . . and finally in

December 1930 Allama Iqbal himself unfolded the scheme".[31] The chronology is surely topsyturvy. Rahmat Ali arrived in England in November 1930. He could not have started explaining his Pakistan plan immediately on arrival and at least two years before writing his *Now or Never*. Nor was Iqbal in London at this time.

With Pakistani authors thus caught in a thicket of errors and fabrications, it is no wonder that most foreign writers have followed their lead.[32] They need not be quoted.

What strikes one in the assertions and statements (convictions would be a better description) of these Pakistani authors is their dogmatism and their superiority to the need of producing evidence. They offer their opinion as if it were a fact. They do not explain, argue, expostulate or prove. They only assert, uphold and enthrone. Even the trained scholars among them are wont to conclude without premises. Those who offer their observations as personal knowledge have weak credentials. On scrutiny, their accounts are found to suffer from so many incompatibilities, contradictions and errors of fact that common sense and prudence demand their rejection. Unless some new evidence of unimpeachable character and substantial content turns up, the historian is bound to regard such attempts as worthless and misleading.

Those who claim that Rahmat Ali was a great admirer of Iqbal and was deeply influenced by the Allahabad address seem not to have read Rahmat Ali at all. On at least two occasions Rahmat Ali passed an unequivocal judgment on Iqbal's 1930 suggestion. In *Pakistan*, his comments on Iqbal cover three pages and leave no doubt about his opinion.

After a graceful compliment to the poet—"that immortal poet of Islam, whose poetry served as a beacon light in the darkest period of our history and whose message will ever help us on the way to our destiny"—he examined in some detail the operative passages of the Allahabad speech and concluded that in four aspects it would prove disastrous to the Muslims. First, Iqbal "was specifically supporting the Muslim politicians' demand for Indian Federation, comprising all the provinces of India, including our own". Secondly, he "spoke of India as a country, of Indians as a nation, and of Muslims as one of the communities of that nation". Thirdly, his "suggestion for the amalgamation of the four

provinces was obviously limited in nature and restricted in range". Fourthly, the "concession of his demand for an Indian Federation . . . could only complicate our problems and aggravate our perils". In spite of these defects, his suggestion for the amalgamation of the four Muslim provinces "made a profound contribution to our cause" and "re-inspired our people to think in terms of the consolidation of our nation, revived the issue of our future, and riveted our gaze on our homelands in the north-west of 'India' ". In conclusion, Rahmat Ali was sorry to see Iqbal participating in the making of a constitution under which the Muslims were treated as "a minority community of the Indian nation", and the provinces which he had once wished to see amalgamated become in effect no more than administrative areas of a country called India.[33] Like anyone else who has read the text of the Allahabad address, Rahmat Ali had realized that Iqbal's suggestion was limited to the creation of a large north-western Muslim province within the Indian federation, and by no stretch of imagination had he proposed a sovereign Muslim state. Then how could Rahmat Ali have given a name to this imaginary state?

As for Rahmat Ali's much-trumpeted borrowing of the Pakistan ideal from the Allahabad proposal, he made it clear in his first circular that his scheme was "basically different" from Iqbal's. "While he proposed the amalgamation of these Provinces into a single state forming a unit of the All-India Federation, we propose that these Provinces should have a separate Federation of their own."[34] Rahmat Ali's later proposals took him even farther away from Iqbal's position. Before Iqbal came to make his suggestion to Jinnah for a Muslim state in the north-west and, almost as an afterthought, another in the north-east, Rahmat Ali had taken a firm stand on the creation of three independent states of Pakistan, Bangistan and Osmanistan and on the formation of a triple alliance among them. With such fundamental divergences between the two schemes, it is difficult to see how Rahmat Ali's ideas can be said to have developed out of Iqbal's Allahabad suggestion. Those who think that they did have read neither Iqbal nor Rahmat Ali in the original.

It seems, on the contrary, that Iqbal was familiar with Rahmat Ali's ideas and at least on one occasion used the word "Indianism" in the special and characteristic sense in which Rahmat Ali alone had made it current.[35]

Before bringing the Rahmat Ali-Iqbal story to its close, it may be mentioned that according to Anwar, who was then working as honorary private secretary to Rahmat Ali, "only a short while before his death" Iqbal had "expressed the desire to Rahmat Ali to join the Pakistan National Movement".[36] In reply to this "communication", Rahmat Ali "wrote back to Dr. Muhammad Iqbal that he would welcome him as the President of the Pakistan National Movement provided Dr. Iqbal renounced his Knighthood. Before, however, Dr. Iqbal could accept the Presidentship, he died".[37] In the absence of any written record or verifiable evidence it is impossible to determine the accuracy of this report. But there is nothing inherently improbable in Iqbal's wish to lead the PNM, as during this period (1937-38) he was for the first time impressing upon Jinnah that the Muslim League must demand the creation of an independent Muslim state in the north-west—in other words, endorsing Rahmat Ali's scheme.[38] Jinnah's replies are not extant, but evidently he did not commit himself.

Rahmat Ali's opinion that Iqbal's 1930 proposal would not protect Muslim interests did not detract from his great admiration for the poet's achievements. On his death in April 1938, Rahmat Ali sent a cablegram to his family saying, among other things, that "truly in Iqbal the Millat has lost its apostolic poet, Pakistan her national hero and herald, and his friends a great source of noble inspiration. Iqbal is dead but his message lives, and to the service of that message we Pakistanians in this hour of tragedy solemnly dedicate our lives".[39] It is significant that this cablegram was published by the *Star of India* along with a special note by the editor, which ran: "As this message may create an impression that the late Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal was the brain behind the Pakistan National Movement, it is essential to note that the poet had nothing to do with it and his scheme of forming the North-Western India (Sind, Baluchistan, Frontier and the Punjab) into one autonomous Federal unit of the Indian Federation was basically different from the Pakistan Scheme which seeks to make Punjab, Frontier, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan into a separate and independent Federal State outside the sovereignty of the Indian Federation. Dr. Iqbal never approved of any such fragmentation of India. He repudiated this idea in 1933 in a statement from Delhi –Ed."[40] Iqbal's letters to Jinnah were not issued to the public till several years after his death.

Soon after this message was sent by Rahmat Ali, a meeting to mourn and pay tributes to Iqbal was held at a Bloomsbury hotel in London, which was addressed by scholars from Egypt, Arabia, Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan and India. The Indian speakers included Rahmat Ali, Sardar Abdus Samad Khan, Muhammad Anwar, Dr. Abdul Waheed and others. Rahmat Ali's address on the occasion is available. He remembered the dead poet in phrases of uninhibited praise–the great sage; his immortal work which will ever command the homage of the Muslims all over the world; our greatest hero of modern times; his matchless gifts; his stirring voice rang out and called us back to the eternal springs of our life; he renewed our faith in the future of the Millat and reformed our broken front; what an honourable legacy to leave behind; the apostle-poet; the greatest fighter for equality and justice between the Hindu and Muslim nations; we salute his memory[41] (Rahmat Ali's exact words).

The Muslim League and Rahmat Ali

Was the Muslim League influenced by Rahmat Ali's ideas? The answer is an unequivocal yes. But what requires investigation and possible explanation is the mystery of the League's attitude. Its borrowing from Rahmat Ali was great. Its neglect of his name was total. Its hostility towards him, even after his death, was implacable. Its initial dislike of the word Pakistan was firm. Even after owning the term and starting a movement in its name, it never acknowledged its debt to Rahmat Ali. It was probably under Muslim League pressure that Rahmat Ali was not allowed to enter the Punjab in 1940. It was a Muslim League government that banished him from Pakistan in 1948. It was a Muslim League leader who, as Pakistan High Commissioner in London in 1951, refused to send a representative to his funeral or to pay its cost.

We cannot find a complete explanation for this attitude, for none is available. What we can do is to record the League's conduct from contemporary sources and then to speculate on its whys and whereofs. The following sections will discuss four developments. First, the tardy and reluctant manner in which the League came to adopt the partition of India as its goal. Secondly, the failure of the Lahore Resolution to use the word Pakistan. Thirdly, the general attitude of the League leaders towards the word and their attempt

to make it out to be a Hindu or British name. Finally, Jinnah's special dislike for the word which coloured the party's policy and influenced its attitude towards Rahmat Ali and his coinage. After chronicling this unpleasant story of prejudice, ignorance and ingratitude, we will try to indicate its possible causes and consequences.

Muslim League and the Pakistan Idea: 1933-1940

There is nothing in the League resolutions or in the statements and speeches of its leaders between 1933 and 1936 to show that the party was interested in the Pakistan scheme, by whatever other name it was called. Far from embracing the Pakistan idea, the League did not talk of two nations, the first premise of separation, until the spring of 1936. Even this was done in a qualified statement. In his presidential address at the Bombay session on 12 April 1936, Sir Wazir Hasan declared that "the Hindus and the Muslims inhabiting this vast continent are not two communities but should be considered two nations in many respects".[42] There was no mention of separation or partition.

A provincial branch of the Muslim League made its first move towards Pakistan in October 1938, when the newly-organized Sind Provincial Muslim League held its conference in Karachi on 8-13 October. Seth Abdullah Haroon was the chairman of the reception committee, and in his address he talked of a possible division of India on religious lines. Jinnah ignored the point completely, and made no reference to it in his address. The snub failed to intimidate the Sindhi leadership. Haroon, Shaikh Abdul Majid Sindhi and Pir Ali Muhammad Rashdi drafted a resolution, demanding the creation of "two Federations, viz., the Federation of Muslim states and the Federation of non-Muslim states" in India, and asking the All India Muslim League to devise a scheme embodying this recommendation. Some members of the Subjects Committee objected to the text and Jinnah opposed it stoutly. Under pressure of this criticism the operative paragraph was amended by excluding the reference to a division, but it retained two significant points: the Muslims were a separate nation, and they had a right to exercize "political self-determination". In other words, the Sind Muslim League was asking for what Rahmat Ali had demanded in 1933. The amended resolution was passed, but when it was introduced at the following All India Muslim

League Annual Session at Patna by Abdul Majid it was rejected.[43] The national party did not want its official policy even to mention the two-nation theory or the right to self-determination.

Jinnah's disapproval notwithstanding, the Sindhi Leaguers began talking of a Pakistan, now by that very name, and went on insisting on its creation in public statements and interviews until February 1940. The national Muslim League did not support them.

This bizarre policy was brought to an end abruptly in early February 1940. The AIML Working Committee decided on 4 February to ask for a partition of India. On 6 February Jinnah met the Viceroy and told him that in the coming Lahore session the party was going to make a formal demand for dividing India.[44] But in his public statements he did not refer to this decision.

Around this time, or perhaps a little earlier, the Muslim League established a "Foreign Committee". According to one version, it was appointed by the Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference of October 1938 "for the purpose of examining and demanding effective safeguards for the Muslims". Later the Committee recommended the creation of a separate Muslim state, and the suggestion was endorsed by the AIML Working Committee.[45] A second version says that it was appointed on 4 December 1938 at Delhi, with Haroon as president.[46]

On 25 March 1939, the AIML Working Committee met at Meerut and appointed a Constitutional (or Constitution) Sub-Committee (or Committee) to examine and report on the various draft schemes of constitutional reforms presented to the party (or the Foreign Committee?). It had seven members: Jinnah, Sikandar Hayat Khan, Sayyid Abdul Aziz, Khwaja Nazimuddin, Haroon, Sardar Aurungzeb Khan and Liaquat Ali Khan.[47] Another contemporary observer says that the strength was nine, not seven; and that it was asked to study and report on only five schemes: those of Sayyid Abdul Latif, A Punjabi, Rahmat Ali, Sikandar Hayat, and the two Aligarh professors.[48]

It was reported that the Committee was to meet in Bombay on 2 July, and according to the agenda issued to the members there were "three schemes of any consequence" to be examined. One was Rahmat Ali's, the second Latif's and the third the "Regional Federal Scheme".[49] If it met on that date or later nothing was published about its proceedings.

On 2 February 1940 the Foreign Committee met at New Delhi with the authors of the schemes submitted to the League. Haroon was in the chair. It examined nine schemes, and then passed a resolution asking the Working Committee to prepare the Indian Muslims "for launching a struggle to achieve the following fundamental rights": self-determination, no reduction to the status of a minority community, "the Muslims shall have a separate national home in the shape of an autonomous State", the Muslims living in the rest of India "shall be treated as the nationals of the aforesaid Muslim State", and any reform scheme opposed to these principles would be resisted stoutly by the Indian Muslim nation.[50]

This meeting appointed a nine-member sub-committee which was ordered to hold daily sessions and draft "a detailed constitutional scheme" incorporating the five "rights". Its members were: Haroon, Ghulam Rasul Mehr, Ali Muhammad Rashdi, Chaudhri Akhtar Husain, Sayyid Abdul Latif, Sayyid Rizwanullah, Dr. Afzaal Qadri, Dr. Abdus Sattar Kheiri, and K. Ali. The nine schemes on which the final plan was to be based were those of Mamdot, Latif, A Punjabi, Rizwanullah, Afzaal Qadri, Khan Bahadar Kifayatullah, Asadullah, Pakistan Scheme, and the Punjab Muslim Students Federation's Khilafat.[51]

The Working Committee meeting on the following day took no decision, or at least none was issued to the press. On 13 February, Haroon, in his capacity as chairman of the Foreign Committee, wrote a letter to *The Times*, reproducing the resolution passed by the Foreign Committee on 2 February, and calling it the Muslim demand.[52] He did not quote any decision of the Working Committee, which indicates that the latter had reached no agreement on 3 February.

This confusion continued even after the Lahore Resolution had been passed on 24 March. In a statement to the press from Karachi on 16 April, Haroon criticized the non-Muslim attacks on the Resolution as premature and reminded the public that the League had yet to evolve the final plan.[53] His Foreign Committee continued its work, and in December 1940 produced a plan which recommended the creation of two Muslim States: one in the north-west, comprising Sind, Baluchistan, NWFP, and the Punjab, together with Delhi; the other in the north-east, comprising Bengal and Assam, minus the districts of Bankura and Midnapore and plus the district of Purnea from Bihar. It was also considered "desirable

to perpetuate Muslim influence wherever it predominated in any form in non-British India". All Muslim native states, large and small, were to be "Sovereign Muslim States". The two Muslim States were to be in an "organic relationship" with the rest of India, through the instrumentality of a common agency for defence, foreign affairs, communications and customs.[54]

It appears that the Committee sent this report to the AIML in December, and when the Working Committee and Jinnah refrained from considering or approving it, Haroon, after waiting for two months, leaked it to the press. Immediately Jinnah disowned it.[55] But the AIML did not prepare a new or different plan.

These developments raise a host of questions. Why did the League take so long to agree on a partition of India? Who authorized the Foreign Committee? What was the relationship between it and the Constitution Committee? Did the latter report to the Working Committee or to the Foreign Committee? Why did the Working Committee fail to take a final decision on the proposed scheme? In short, when and how was the Muslim Leageu decision to demand a partition made? Was such a decision ever made at all at any definite moment of time? Was it Jinnah's personal decision, without any reference to the Working Committee, as is suggested by the absence of any published decision in the party's official record of resolutions for this year?

Two points ought to be noted here. Throughout this murky debate and deliberation Rahmat Ali's name was never mentioned. According to one report, he was one of the authors of the various schemes interviewed by a subsidiary committee of the League in Delhi. This is a palpable falsehood. In February, when he is supposed to have been explaining his plan to the Leaguers he was actually in Colombo and later confined to Karachi.

The Lahore Resolution

The annual session of the All India Muslim League met in Lahore on 22-24 March 1940. The principal resolution was introduced on the 23rd and passed on the 24th. I have discussed elsewhere the manner of its adoption and the atrocious drafting which made it a collection of conflicting provisions and vague sentiments.[56] The question to be raised here relates to the absence of the use of the word Pakistan in the Resolution and in the speeches

and discussions which preceded its passage.

Contemporary eye-witness evidence is self-cancelling. One observer, Dr. Muhammad Baqir, says that on the day before the session began a small group of students argued with Jinnah till midnight that the demand to be made the next day should be called by the name of Pakistan. "But he was justifiably adamant in his 'no', because in response to his querry [*sic.*] the poor students could not define Pakistan at that time. Next day, on the 26th [*sic.*] March, 1940, the following historic resolution was unanimously passed."[57] It is incredible that the Punjab students who had adopted Rahmat Ali's scheme in 1937 as their official goal, who had been reading his pamphlets, and who had been writing dozens of articles on him and his plan, were unable to tell Jinnah what the word meant. The date given for the passage of the resolution is also incorrect.

Abdul Majid Salik, who had served the Punjab Unionist Party well as editor of an influential Urdu daily and knew its top leadership intimately, blames Sikandar Hayat's influence on Jinnah for the omission of the use of Pakistan. Sir Sikandar, he writes, was of the opinion that the word Pakistan was "extremely provocative" for the Hindus and the British. Jinnah, who was "yet not accustomed to the word", agreed with Sikandar. That is why the term did not figure in the Resolution.[58] This seems a reasonable explanation because at this time Sikandar was being pampered by Jinnah with a view to enlisting the support of the Punjab for the League.

A Madras Leaguer who attended the session as a delegate recalls that "throughout the proceedings, on the two days, nobody used the word 'Pakistan', even in a casual way".[59] On the other hand, it is reported by other sources that the word Pakistan was used during and immediately after the session, though not in the body of the Resolution.

Begum Muhammad Ali, the widow of the Khilafat leader and a member of the AIML Working Committee, in her speech supporting the resolution, called it the Pakistan Resolution, because, thanks to Rahmat Ali's efforts, this word had become well known and she found it a better description of what the League was demanding than the phrase "resolution for the partition of the Indian Sub-Continent".[60] Rahmat Ali had prepared a poster on Pakistan, and it was sent to Lahore and distributed at the ses-

sion.[61]

On the day following the passing of the Resolution, Fatima Begum, an enterprising teacher, social worker and Muslim Leaguer of Lahore, gave a large reception to Jinnah in her school in Nawan Kot. The main attraction of the party was a huge cake bearing the word "Pakistan". When one of the guests took up a knife to cut the cake, Jinnah said, "Don't cut Pakistan", sliced off the upper layer with the inscription, put it in his handkerchief and gave it to his private secretary.[62]

Whatever the Lahore Resolution said or omitted to say was considered irrelevant by everyone: Leaguers, other Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs and the British. Rahmat Ali had done his work so well that nobody was taken in by the Resolution's failure to use the operative word. All realized what was being demanded and called it by its right name.

The Indian newspapers coined the phrase "Pakistan Resolution" for their headlines next morning.[63] *The Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore entitled its leading article as "Pakistan Storm" on 16 April, in which it referred thrice to the Lahore Resolution as "the Pakistan Scheme". On 15 April, the Amritsar District Political Conference[64] and the first U.P. Sikh Conference[65] attacked the League for demanding a Pakistan. During the Azad Muslim Conference held at Delhi on 27 April, Allah Bakhsh Soomro and Mufti Kifayatullah called it Pakistan.[66] However, the *Star of India,* in its leading article of 25 March entitled "The Only Solution", used the phrase "the creation of independent Muslim States" again and again and avoided the word Pakistan.

No satisfactory explanation has yet turned up of the Muslim League's failure or refusal to put the word Pakistan in the Lahore Resolution. The term had been current since 1933. In 1934-35 its use had become common both among its supporters and opponents. In 1937-38 it had been defended by a large number of Muslims, several societies and organizations had sprung up to publicize it, and at least two magazines of the same name had appeared. By 1940 it was being generally employed to denote the aspirations of the Indian Muslims. Therefore, there must have been strong reasons or firm prejudices to account for its omission. Barring Khaliquzzaman, none of the League leaders of this time has left his memoirs which could throw light on the problem. Very few letters have been published, and they contain nothing

of our use. With such limited information at our disposal we can only speculate on some possible explanations.

It might have been an attempt to snub or disown Rahmat Ali; an open declaration that the League wanted a Pakistan, but not of Rahmat Ali's variety. Or, it might have been aimed at making a case for the League's originality. The League did not owe anything to any outsider. Rahmat Ali was not a member of the League, yet the League had taken up his scheme and pronounced it as its own. This put it in an embarrassing position. To announce that it had borrowed its principal and chief objective from Rahmat Ali would have been an admission of lack of originality. Therefore, the party decided not to use the word, but at the same time retained the idea behind it. Another possibility is that the League was afraid of scaring the Hindus by using a word which had created misgivings among them. Already they were equating it with communalism or interpreting it as the first stage in the creation of a Muslim empire in India or a pan-Islamic union in Asia. It was considered prudent not to give heart to this non-Muslim fright, and therefore to drop the word. But this tactic failed, because the Lahore Resolution immediately came to be known as Pakistan.

Still another interpretation may be that the League's formal adoption of the word might have conveyed to the Hindus and the British that the states demanded by the Resolution would be purely Muslim territories administered under Islamic law. This would have created a feeling of insecurity among the prospective minority groups in the lands claimed by the League. Some Hindu commentators were allowing full play to their imagination in speculating on the intentions and secret motives of those who wished to create a "land of the pure". If that is so, the League's subterfuge was a wasted effort. Still another reason might have been the League's official policy of aloofness in relation to the native states. It could not use a word whose very composition announced the inclusion of Kashmir. Nor could it eliminate the letter "K" from it, turning a beautiful name into an absurd and meaningless monstrosity. I must confess that this explanation is rather farfetched.

Probably the explanation nearest to the truth lies in the astonishing but historically documented fact that most of the League leaders just did not like the word Pakistan. This will be elaborated in the next two sections.

For these possible reasons the League decided to leave its proposed states unchristened. But then what did it expect to happen? Either that, since the word Pakistan was so popular among the people, gradually the party's goal would be called by that name so universally that its absence from the Lahore Resolution would not matter. This implies that the League wanted the name without putting it forward formally. Or, that it was hoping for a new name to emerge in time, which it would then accept and use in official negotiations and public propaganda. There is no third possibility. No party or people can demand a territory or a new state without giving it a name. Had Pakistan not been current in the Indian political world in 1940, would the League have continued to demand "separate independent states"? That was absurd. In all nationalist movements throughout history the party demanding a new state, carved out of an existing country or made up of parts of two or more lands, has found a name for it. The League's predicament was made more serious by the demand for "states". It had to invent two new names, or to wait till somebody else suggested them, or to borrow them from outside. In the Lahore Resolution it decided to do nothing. It proposed no names; it invited no suggestions; it did not use Pakistan. Here again, the weight of evidence indicates that the League had no name of its own to offer, that it was fully aware of the popular demand for a Pakistan, and that it did not want to use that word. So it bided its time, hoping that some other name would appear and be acceptable to the people; and, if that did not happen, it would own Pakistan but imperceptibly, quietly, pretending that the final choice had been imposed upon it by time and circumstance. On close scrutiny this policy was disingenuous. It yielded to two possible interpretations: if the League had made up its mind privately that the word Pakistan would have to be accepted, it was cheating the public by hiding the thought; if it decided to borrow the name at a later stage, it was plagiarising Rahmat Ali without acknowledgement.

The League made its position untenable when it ultimately adopted the name Pakistan without any rational explanation. In practical terms, of course, it was a natural and obvious development. The Muslim demand was so unanimously known as Pakistan that it would have looked silly to continue to ignore the word. How could the leadership overlook it when in every

meeting and procession the public shouted itself hoarse with the cries of "Pakistan Zindabad" (long live Pakistan) and "*lay kay rahayngay Pakistan*" (we shall achieve Pakistan no matter what happens), and when every article, editorial and letter in the pro-League press asked its readers not to accept anything "other or less than Pakistan"? But when the League finally decided to own the name, was this not the right occasion to mention the origin of the word and the person who had coined it? It had a moral obligation to explain its change of mind and acknowledge its act of borrowing. It had a political duty to tell the people what the word meant. Neither the explanation nor the acknowledgement was forthcoming. This wears the look of a deliberate policy to ignore Rahmat Ali, though even his critics admit that "by passing the Lahore Resolution the All India Muslim League gave the [Pakistan National] movement a proper and popular shape".[67]

There is another dimension to this mystery. Jinnah's claim that the word Pakistan was forced upon the Muslim League by the Hindu press has no historical support. Between 24 March 1940 and some vague date much later when Jinnah became reconciled to the name, we find several League leaders using the term in public utterances and some provincial League organizations ordering the observance of a "Pakistan Day". In fact, this had begun even before the passing of the Lahore Resolution. A few examples follow.

In November 1938 Haroon forwarded to the Aga Khan copies of Jinnah's address to the Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference of October and the resolutions passed by it. In his reply of 20 December 1938, the Aga Khan wrote: "About Hindu-Muslim relations we would all welcome a possible solution. Is your League likely to advocate Pakistan as the final policy of Muslims? If so the sooner public opinion is prepared gradually the better".[68] Apparently, th Aga Khan had read in the Karachi conference resolution (the original text, and also the amended adopted text) the League's willingness to own the Pakistan idea.

Haroon lost no time in starting his campaign to prepare Muslim opinion in favour of Pakistan. On 29 January 1939, he met the representatives of the Majlis-i-Pakistan of Lyallpur and those of Lahore at the Nedou's Hotel in Lahore, and told them that he hoped to see "Pakistan" realized in the near future. He asserted that the educated Muslims believed in Pakistan with both their

hearts and heads. It "was the duty of all Pakistanis to propagate the message of the Pakistan Movement among all those who were yet unconverted to the idea". His secretary, Ali Muhammad Rashdi, promised that during his forthcoming tour he would properly acquaint "the people of Pakistan" with this movement.[69] Which Pakistan were the two talking about? The League had not yet adopted partition (of any name, model, variety or origin) as its policy. The only plan called Pakistan was Rahmat Ali's. Were they setting out to propagate the Cambridge scheme? Haroon used the words "Pakistan Movement", which makes it certain that he had Rahmat Ali's campaign in mind. Then, why was Rahmat Ali's name not mentioned?

On 20-21 May 1939, the first political conference of the Bindiki branch of the Deccan Muslim League heard its president, Mawlana Muhammad Faruq, outlining the Pakistan scheme, and his speech was greeted continually by the cry of "Pakistan Zindabad" from the audience. On the second day the conference passed a resolution "approving and commending" the "Pakistan scheme".[70]

On 18 November, the Raja of Mahmudabad addressed the Assam Provincial Muslim League as follows: "The provinces in the north, predominantly Muslim, are instinctively and now actively aspiring for a freer and fuller life–a life unhampered, unrestricted by forces which the people regard as unhelpful, if not opposed, to the growth on the lines of their choosing. The people want, that is to say, to work out their own destinies. Here then is the genesis of that idea which is known generally as the Pakistan Movement."[71] Thus Muslim League leaders and Muslim League local and provincial organizations were using the word Pakistan before the Lahore Resolution was passed.

The League's claim that it adopted the term Pakistan quite some time after March 1940 is contradicted by its own activities and instructions. In the first week of April 1940, the AIML issued a circular to all provincial organizations ordering them to observe 19 April as "Pakistan Day". Accordingly, on 14 April the Sind Provincial Muslim League sent notices to all its local branches to carry out the orders of the central party by holding meetings "to explain the Lahore League resolution to Sind Muslims".[72] The day was duly observed on 19 April in all provinces "as directed by the All India Muslim League".[73] The meetings held in various cities used the word Pakistan for the Lahore Resolution.[74] At the

Lucknow meeting, held in the Amin-ud-Daula Park, Khaliquzzaman thanked the Hindu press and the Hindu leadership for christening the Lahore Resolution as Pakistan and thus offering to the League a very suitable name. In future, he added, "we will call this resolution by the name of Pakistan Resolution".[75] In the same month, a Muslim League writer, commenting upon the Lahore Resolution, wrote, "The Pakistan scheme has raised a storm of opposition from certain quarters which do not see eye to eye with Muslims".[76] The official compilation of League resolutions shows that the Working Committee of AIML used the word Pakistan in its resolution No. 2 of February 1941. From then on the word was *de rigueur* in the League circles. But at no place or time did the League define Pakistan or make a mention of Rahmat Ali's name (with the exception of the reference in the following paragraph).

In a book published on behalf of the League in 1946 there is a passage on the origin of the idea of Pakistan which needs to be quoted in full. After claiming that the Pakistan idea was first conceived by Jamaluddin "Afghani" (for which there is no evidence at all) and then revived by Iqbal, the writer goes on: "Thereafter the idea was given a definite shape by a highly cultured Punjabi, Choudhry Rahmat Ali, who is popularly known to have coined the word Pakistan to denote the North-Western Muslim part of India. The choice of the word should not be considered provocative as it is merely an artificial contrivance to express a common name for the five units which make up Pakistan. Those who object to the word Pakistan as being repugnant to their ears, and feel that it implies Muslim Raj on and out [*sic.*], may use some other appropriate word in its place such as Industan of Sindhistan after the name of the river Indus in English or Sindh in Urdu, but they have no right to force the majority community in Pakistan to discard the word in favour of a new one at their dictation. The Muslim masses in the absence of a better word which can express the union of their five majority areas cannot be induced to give it up. The Muslims in Hindu India form an important majority, and the word Hindustan is generally understood to mean the land of Hindus; yet they have never objected to its use. . . . The Lahore Resolution of the League does not specifically mention the word Pakistan though there is no gainsaying the fact that it has furnished the real basis for Pakistan Movement. Mr. Jinnah deserves credit for

giving a wider scope and significance to the word Pakistan which was so far confined to Muslim NorthWest."[77]

Several points in this statement catch our eye. Rahmat Ali is said to be "popularly known" to have coined the word Pakistan. There is no description of Rahmat Ali's scheme or an account of how and when he had come to develop it. The whole passage is really an appeal to the non-Muslim population of the areas demanded by the League for its Pakistan to accept the name, not to regard it as provocative or repugnant, not to look at it as an earnest of the coming of a Muslim *raj*, and to use another word if this one is wholly unacceptable to it. This is strange reasoning indeed. What possibly could have made the name provocative and repugnant? The permission given to the Hindus to call it by some other name is ridiculous. Was the same country to be called by one name by the majority and by another by the minority? The alternative suggestions of Industan and Sindhistan might suit the north-western area, but did he really think that these names were relevant to the Pakistan demanded by the League, which by this time included the north-west and Bengal-Assam? Finally, it is admitted that the "Pakistan Movement" (not the League's) inspired the Lahore Resolution and Jinnah took Rahmat Ali's scheme and broadened it to include the north-east. This was the closest that any publication reflecting the Muslim League view came to acknowledging Rahmat Ali's influence. But even here there is no word of thanks, however belated.

During his visit to London in December 1946 for discussions with the British government, Jinnah had been persuaded to establish a Muslim League propaganda machinery in England. A Muslim India Information Centre was hurriedly rigged up and put in charge of two League journalists, Altaf Husain and Z.A. Suleri. In an undated (probably early 1947) pamphlet entitled *50 Facts About Pakistan*, the League propagandists fabricated a new meaning of the word Pakistan. "The term PAKISTAN has been popularized by common usage and *coined* as follows: 'P' for Punjab; 'A' for Afghania, land of the Pathans, *as well as for Assam*; 'K' for Kashmir; 'S' for Sind; and 'STAN' for Baluchistan and *also Bangistan, which is a popular name for Bengal.*"[78] Then the invention was embroidered with ignorance. "Some critics of PAKISTAN say that because pak in Arabic means 'pure', PAKISTAN stands for the 'Land of the pure'. . . ."[79]

The italicized words mark the League manipulation. Who coined the word in this sense? Rahmat Ali's etymology was very different. Did the League give this interpretation to the word; if so, when and where? The "A" never stood for Assam. The "STAN" is meaningless; it produces a Pakistan with two "ss", one for Sind, and one for something else. Bangistan was never used for Bengal before Rahmat Ali invented it. Which definition was the pamphlet following? It was not Rahmat Ali's, and there was no other precise definition in existence. The Muslim League never defined Pakistan. Why was Rahmat Ali not mentioned, even if his definition was distorted? Finally, to call *pak* an Arabic word is to betray a total ignorance of the language of the Quran. The letter "p" is absent from the Arabic alphabet. The word is Persian.[80]

League Leaders Dislike the Word

The Muslim League's unwillingness to use the word Pakistan for its political goal might be traced to the personal dislike for the word of some of its leaders. Some of them testified to this feeling in public statements and writings. As we have seen above, Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan had a revulsion against the word. Jinnah shared this sentiment (*cf.* the following section). A few others felt the same.

In his meeting with Rahmat Ali in London in December 1938, Khaliquzzaman, though convinced of the need for a separation, did not agree to the adoption of the word Pakistan. In March 1939, when he saw the Secretary of State for India (Zetland) and told him that the Hindu-Muslim problem could only be solved by a division of India, he again avoided using the word in his talk.[81]

Mian Kifait Ali, who wrote the *Confederacy of India* in 1939, remarked in 1941, "There are a few who are restive over the use of the word 'Pakistan'. They say that it has gathered round itself such associations and implications as give provocation to the non-Muslims". He was prepared to accept some other name which did not create unnecessary bitterness and yet represented the spirit of the Lahore Resolution.[82]

Sir Hasan Suhrawardy, a distinguished Bengali Muslim, expressed his dislike in unmistakable language. "It is a term which I do not like, and I dare say it is distasteful to many other Muslims."[83]

These people did not give any reason for their dislike. The most

they said was that the word had certain undesirable associations and implications, without enlarging on these aspects. It is impossible to comment on their attitude in the absence of any knowledge of their thinking. In any case, their prejudice carried no weight. The general public, including some Muslim League leaders, summarized their demand in one word–Pakistan–and took no notice of the reluctance of some of their own leaders. Later, once Jinnah had surrendered to the will of the people, these very leaders swung over to the use and praise of the term as if it were the word of God.

Jinnah and Rahmat Ali

Jinnah was not only the last among Muslim leaders to be won over to the idea of partition but also the last to call it by the name devised by Rahmat Ali. The more he pretended to have nothing to do with the Cambridge movement, the greater his indebtedness to the Pakistan National Movement. He never acknowledged his debt to Rahmat Ali,[84] and even after the adoption of the Lahore Resolution avoided the use of the word Pakistan.[85] He "resisted the temptation of using the word Pakistan [but] changed his mind later".[86]

Was Jinnah influenced by Rahmat Ali's ideas and plans? If he was, to what extent? These are not unimportant questions and have much significance for the historian of Pakistan. There is little direct evidence, for Jinnah did not write his memoris, he left no journal and a good part of his correspondence has been destroyed. His associates are silent on this aspect of his life. There is no full or authentic biography of the man. Nevertheless, there is enough in his speeches and writings and other corroborative testimony to draw a credible picture of his reaction to the idea of partition, to Rahmat Ali and to the word Pakistan.

During his meetings with the Muslim delegates to the RTC Rahmat Ali must have seen Jinnah and talked to him about the futility of the making of an Indian federation. Later on, when Jinnah chose to stay on in London there may have been more meetings between them, for both were living in the same country and each, in his own way, was pessimistic about the flow of Muslim politics current in India. Rahmat Ali sent his pamphlets to everyone who could possibly be interested in the future of

Muslim India or capable of influencing public opinion. If student leaders, journalists and lawyers in India were receiving this literature, it is inconceivable that Jinnah's name was omitted from the mailing list both when he was still in London and later when he had returned to India. But all contemporary reports and later evidence show that he was not converted to any idea of separation.

During the second RTC Frank Moraes, then a student in England, heard the Muslim delegates talk about Pakistan at a dinner in an Indian restaurant in London. Iqbal was one of them. Shortly afterwards Moraes met Jinnah, told him about the discussion he had heard, and asked him what he thought of Pakistan. "To this day I remember vividly his reaction. He threw his head scornfully back in a characteristic gesture and chuckled. 'My dear boy', he said, 'don't you know that Iqbal isn't a politician? He is a poet. Poets are dreamers.' I have never forgotten it."[87] Had Jinnah not read *Now or Never*? Or, did he understand Moraes as saying that Iqbal had agreed with the idea of Pakistan? Anyway, he is not reported to have been taken by surprise by the new word.

In the spring of 1933 Rahmat Ali gave a banquet for Jinnah at the Waldorf Hotel, and argued with him for a long time in the hope of convincing him of the value and relevance of his scheme. "He received a chilly rebuff. Pakistan, Jinnah told him, was 'an impossible dream'."[88] A year later another attempt was made. Rahmat Ali, Khwaja Abdur Rahim and some others met Jinnah as a deputation and appealed for his support of the Pakistan idea. His reply was: "My dear boys, don't be in a hurry; let the waters flow and they will find their own level".[89]

Jinnah returned to India in 1935, and from his arrival till early 1940 he opposed all movements and policies favouring Pakistan. He was prepared to co-operate and form coalitions with the Indian National Congress in 1936-37. In 1938, when a good part of the Muslim press was clamouring for Pakistan, he remained unmoved. The enthusiasts of the Majlis-i-Kabir-i-Pakistan of Lahore wrote him letters; they received no satisfactory reply.[90] Abdus Salam Khurshid, who was a follower of Rahmat Ali, wrote a letter to Jinnah on behalf of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation requesting his opinion on the Pakistan National Movement. The answer was completely non-commital, and said that one should

not expect a reply to such inquiries in a letter, that Muslims had yet to organize themselves, to learn to speak the language of politics and to be patient for a while.[91] In the October of the same year, he stopped the Sind Muslim League from discussing or adopting a resolution favouring partition (the supporters of the resolution were calling it Pakistan in informal talks).

On 1 March 1939, during a lunch at Dr. Sir Ziauddin's residence in New Delhi where Jinnah, Zafrulla Khan, Sir Yamin Khan and Sayyid Muhammad Husain (a barrister of Allahabad) were present, Muhammad Husain began to advocate Rahmat Ali's Pakistan scheme. Zafrulla opposed it on the ground that it was impracticable. Jinnah listened to all the arguments on both sides and then said to Yamin Khan: "Why shouldn't we own it and make it the creed of the Muslim League. If we uphold it, an understanding with the Congress might be possible; otherwise, such an understanding will not come about". Yamin objected that while the idea might be applicable to the north-western area, it could not encompass Bengāl. Jinnah paused a little and then said that "we will raise the question of separating the areas on both sides of India; without this we will have no pressure to exert on the Congress".[92] Even if we give full credence to the contents of this conversation, Jinnah appeared to be exploring the possibility of exploiting the Pakistan idea as a bargaining counter in negotiating with the Congress. This impression gains added weight by a statement he issued from Bombay on 30 July 1939. Referring to Congress's insistence on the implementation of the federal scheme he said: "Is Mr. Gandhi going to fall into the trap for the sake of merely having a Congress majority under this wretched Federal scheme? Is he going to be frightened to death on the score that the Muslims will break away and it might lead to a partition of India? Will the Congress be allured into accepting the Federal Scheme, as it is urged upon them to do so, on the ground that otherwise the Muslims will break away, as they are thinking already of Pakistan, which will mean the destruction of All-India unity?"[93]

In all his speeches, articles and confidential talks with the Viceroy, Jinnah did not talk of a partition. Even in the oblique references he made to Muslim desire for freedom, the unsuitability of the western democratic system for India, and the essential precondition of perfect equality of any agreement between the Congress and the League, he never used the words division or

Pakistan.[94]

Apart from his late conversion to the idea of dividing India, he was, by all accounts including his own, opposed to the use of the term Pakistan. We have definite information on this point from the summer of 1939 onwards.

In about May Mian Kifait Ali, writing as "A Punjabi", finished his book which made a most detailed case for the partition of India and the creation of a Muslim state in the north-west. He took the final manuscript to Abdullah Haroon of Sind and Nawab Shahnawaz Khan Mamdot of the Punjab, the presidents of the provincial Muslim Leagues in their areas. Haroon offered to finance its publication and distribution. A little later Mamdot volunteered to do the same. Finally, Mamdot's offer was accepted and the book was sent to the Ripon Printing Press of Lahore for composing. Mian Kifait Ali had given it the title of *Pakistan* and argued for a complete severance of the Muslim north-west from India under the influence of Rahmat Ali. But when Mamdot sent a typed copy of the manuscript to Jinnah, he received a telegram from Bombay saying that he (Jinnah) did not want the book to be called *Pakistan*. The printing was not yet complete, so Kifait Ali hurriedly changed his scheme of division into one of a confederal plan of five federations. The amendment was embodied mainly in the Introduction of the book, and a few sentences were inserted into the body of the text mentioning confederation as the desired solution.[95] So far the explanation is clear: the change was effected to please Jinnah.

But in the Introduction Kifait Ali wrote: "The foreign element amongst us is quite negligible and we are as much sons of the soil as the Hindus are. Ultimately our destiny lies within India and not out of it. And it is for this reason that we have abstained from using the word 'Pakistan' and have instead used the word 'Indusstan' to denote the North-West Muslim Block. 'Pakistan' is a term which has somehow or other gathered round itself some unwholesome and alien associations which are far from our mind".[96] Evidently Jinnah, in the brevity of a telegram, could only have asked for the dropping of the word Pakistan from the title of the book, and not given detailed reasons for it. Should the above-quoted paragraph be then taken as an expression of Kifait Ali's own feeling against the use of the word? He did not explain the "unwholesome and alien associations" of the word. In 1941,

again, as we have seen, he argued against the use of the term.

Jinnah did not like the word Pakistan, and he had every right to his partialities and aversions. However, had he given reasons for his preference it would have been possible to read his mind. Since he did not, the suspicion will abide that he did not like Rahmat Ali and this personal feeling extended to the use of the word.

This suspicion is strengthened by two further developments. First, he never mentioned Rahmat Ali's name in his innumerable speeches on Pakistan even after having accepted the term. Secondly, the explanation he gave for finally owning the term had neither the sanction of history nor the support of common sense. The second point needs elaboration and documentation.

He accepted the word Pakistan in early 1941, but delayed what he called an explanation for two years. In his presidential address to the All India Muslim League annual session at Delhi on 24 April 1943, he said: "I think you will bear me out that when we passed the Lahore resolution we had not used the word 'Pakistan'. Who gave us this word? [Cries of "Hindus".] Let me tell you it is their fault. They started damning this resolution on the ground that it was Pakistan. They are really ignorant of the Muslim movement. They fathered this word upon us. . . . You know perfectly well that Pakistan is a word which is really foisted upon us and fathered on us by some section of the Hindu press and also by the British press. Now our resolution was known for a long time as the Lahore resolution, popularly known as Pakistan. But how long are we to have this long phrase? Now I say to my Hindu and British friends: We thank you for giving us one word. [Applause, and cries of hear, hear.]

"What is the origin of the word Pakistan? It was not Muslim League or Quaid-i-Azam who coined it. Some young fellows in London, who wanted a particular part of north-west to be separated from the rest of India, coined a name in 1929-30, started the idea, and called a zone Pakistan. They picked up the letter P for Punjab, A for Afghan, as the NWFP is known even today as Afghan, K for Kashmir, S for Sind, and Tan for Baluchistan. A name was coined. Thus, whatever may have been the meaning of this word at the time it is obvious that language of every civilized country invents new words. The word Pakistan has come to mean Lahore resolution. We wanted a word and it was foisted on us and

we found it convenient to use it as a synonym for Lahore resolution."[97]

The Hindus did not give this word to the Muslim League. It had been in use long before the Lahore Resolution was passed. The Muslims themselves had called the Resolution by the name of Pakistan from the day of its adoption. Even the League had used it on several occasions. His references to the Pakistan National Movement of Cambridge are sarcastic and incorrect. The "some young fellows" were not working in London, nor was the name coined in 1929-30. The name was not "foisted" or "fathered" on the League by the Hindus and the British. Jinnah had an excellent memory. He had met Rahmat Ali in England. He had read his pamphlets very carefully and many times (as we will see a little later). He had carried on a correspondence with Rahmat Ali in 1939-40.[98] He requested him in February 1940 to come to Delhi for a meeting. How could he have forgotten all these things by April 1943? No ordinary man can dislocate so many facts!

Why Jinnah hated Rahmat Ali we will never know. He took the secret with him to the grave. In June 1947 and later Rahmat Ali used almost abusive language for Jinnah, because he believed that by accepting the June 3, 1947 partition plan he had betrayed the nation and accepted a smaller Pakistan. If Jinnah turned against Rahmat Ali after this attack the reaction is understandable. But we are talking of 1933-43. In these years nothing happened which could possibly justify Jinnah's dismissal of him as "some young fellows in London", his determination not to use the word Pakistan in the teeth of opposition from his own people, and then to attribute his change of mind to the Hindu and British press. A journalist who was close to Jinnah reported: "I noticed a distinct lift of Jinnah's eyebrows whenever I happened to mention Rahmat Ali. He seemed to regard Rahmat Ali's concept of Pakistan as some sort of Walt Disney dreamland, if not a Wellsian nightmare, and I think he felt the professional's contempt for the amateur's mistake of showing his hand without holding the trumps".[99]

Ultimately history vindicated the thinker rather than the politician. In 1933 Pakistan was only a gleam in the mind of Rahmat Ali. In 1940 Jinnah's Muslim League found a way out of the Indian conundrum by the light of this gleam. In 1941 Jinnah owned the word. For seven years he fought for the creation of Rahmat Ali's Disneyland. When he achieved it, he was hailed by

his people as the creator of Pakistan. The dogma of one student had become the cult of a movement and the passion of a nation. Neither the personal like and dislike of the creator nor the assiduously inspired ignorance of the nation can strip Rahmat Ali's laurels of their lustrous leaves. History has its own balance of judgement and neither policy nor prejudice dare tip it.

Personal feelings did not, however, stop Jinnah from borrowing Rahmat Ali's arguments, style and language for his own speeches. In his presidential address to the March 1940 Lahore session of the League, Jinnah summarized the theory of two nations in these words: "The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religions, philosophies, social customs, literatures. They neither inter-marry nor inter-dine together and, indeed, they belong to two different civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Musalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, different heroes, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is the foe of the other and, likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. . . . Musalmans are a nation, and they must have their homelands, their territory and their State."[100] What Rahmat Ali had written in 1933 was this: "Our religion, culture, history, tradition, economic system, laws of inheritance, succession and marriage are basically and fundamentally different from those of the people living in the rest of India. . . . These differences are not confined to the broad basic principles–far from it. They extend to the minutest details of our lives. We do not inter-dine; we do not inter-marry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different. . . the Hindus and Muslims are the followers of two essentially and fundamentally different religious systems."[101]

Again, in the same address Jinnah said: "The problem in India is not of an inter-communal but manifestly of an international character and it must be treated as such. So long as this basic and fundamental truth is not realized, any constitution that may be built will result in disaster and will prove destructive and harmful not only to the Musalmans, but also to the British and the Hindus."[102] Rahmat Ali had written in 1935: "The Indian-Pakistanian problem is not an inter-communal issue and will never be solved on inter-communal lines. It is an inter-national

problem and, therefore, will submit itself to a permanent solution on that basis alone. Any constitution–Federal or Unitary–which disregards this vital fact, while destructive for the Pakistanians, cannot but be disadvantageous to the British and Hindoostanis as well."[103]

At least a dozen more passages of similar affinity may be quoted. It is obvious that Jinnah had made himself thoroughly familiar with Rahmat Ali's ideas and had probably re-read his writings just before coming to Lahore for the historic session.

The similarities in the thinking of the two men do not stop here. The arguments Jinnah gave for the creation of separate Muslim states repeat the logic and vocabulary of Rahmat Ali's pamphlets: fear of Hindu rule, protection of Muslim culture, futility of safeguards and promises of good treatment, failure of the federation to solve the communal problem, irreconcilable differences between the interests of the two nations, proud memories of Muslim rule in India, freedom to follow Islamic ideals in an Islamic environment, confidence that non-Muslim minorities in Pakistan would be well looked after, and a hope that the Muslim minority in India would receive similar treatment. Another point common to Jinnah and Rahmat Ali was their faith in a constitutional approach to the settlement of all issues. Both undertook to use all legal and constitutional means in the achievement of their ends. Both were opposed to the use of violence or to extremist action of any kind.

Any reader who cares to make a comparative study of the writings and speeches of the two men will discover that there is a great deal to draw parallels between them. Perhaps the most consequential political utterance of Jinnah was his Lahore address. Read closely, its entire text is an enlargement upon and a confirmation of Rahmat Ali's three publications: *Now or Never, What Does the Pakistan National Movement Stand For?* and *Letter to the Members of the House of Lords.*

Had Rahmat Ali been invited by Jinnah to move the Lahore Resolution in the open session of the Muslim League all concerned would have been saved several unpleasant consequences. Jinnah would have proved that he was great enough to accept and acknowledge others' contribution to his movement. The League would not have had the stigma of plagiarism and ingratitude stuck to it forever. Rahmat Ali would not have suffered the mental torture he did and might have lived longer.

There is nothing inherently unrealistic in this might-have-been reconstruction of history. The League was on the point of making a demand which so far none of its leaders, including Jinnah, had mentioned in public. Several suggestions for separation and partition were in print, but the only clear-cut scheme for the creation of an independent sovereign state that had been before the people for seven years and had won considerable popularity was that of Rahmat Ali. Within a year the League was even to adopt the name Pakistan for the state demanded in the resolution. By any standard Rahmat Ali was the ideal person to be called upon to move the resolution. The technical disability of his non-membership of the League could have been met without difficulty by enrolling him as a member before the session opened.

Had Jinnah enlisted Rahmat Ali's sympathy at this time the League would have gained much. Even without a formal merger of the Muslim League and the PNM, the advantages of an alliance between the two were obvious. The League had had no branch in Britain since before World War I, when Sayyid Ameer Ali had withdrawn from the London Muslim League and the Aga Khan had shown a reluctance to support what he considered to be the extremist policies of the All India Muslim League. During the post-war years the League had been eclipsed by the All India Khilafat Conference and later by the All India Muslim Conference. Now that it was revived by Jinnah and put in the very centre of Indian politics, it should have given top priority to the need of opening a branch or establishing a parallel organization in Britain where all the vital decisions were to be taken in the coming years. Once the demand for Pakistan was made the necessity of having such an arrangement in London became overpowering. The division of India was such a new concept and so far removed from the thoughts of the ordinary Englishman that a well-mounted propaganda campaign in Britain would have brought a rich reward to the League. Had the party persuaded Rahmat Ali to ally his PNM (in effect, his own person) with the League, the latter would have secured an established and trenchant platform in Britain. Rahmat Ali had lived in that country long enough to have valuable contacts. His enterprise and persuasive ability had won some support among the British. Even the tradition-bound quality newspapers had published letters and columns on his movement. He was capable of hard work and complete devotion. The over-

riding problem now was to acquaint British public opinion with the Pakistan issue, and who could be better qualified to do this than Rahmat Ali, who had coined the word, drawn up a detailed scheme and publicized it? Such an alliance would also have armed the League with another argument in its favour: the claim that the partition proposal, far from being such a new demand, went back to 1933 both in concept and in title. Further, this joining of hands would have given Jinnah the support and loyalty of a man who had a facile pen, a rich imagination and an immeasurable zeal for the Muslim weal. The League was at no time in its history so rich in able and sincere spokesmen that it could let go the opportunity of bringing men of Rahmat Ali's stamp into its fold.

In ideological terms, too, it was in the fitness of things that the two men and the two movements should have come together. Basically both were fighting for the same goals: protection of the Indian Muslims against Hindu rule, revival of Islam in India, recognition of the separate nationhood of Muslims, and creation of two or three Muslim states in India. Till October 1942, when Rahmat Ali expanded his scheme to include seven smaller Muslim states scattered over Hindu India, the aims and objectives of the two movements were very nearly identical. The only difference concerned the creation of an Osmanistan in Rahmat Ali's scheme, but here, too, there were some among the Muslim League who were worried about the future of Hyderabad, and the party certainly hoped that in the ultimate decision the Nizam would declare his independence and thus establish a third Muslim state in the south. Some of the resolutions adopted officially by the League formulated these expectations. Moreover, up to April 1946 the Muslim League was formally and officially committed to the creation of two Muslim states: one in the north-west and the other in Bengal and Assam. This was exactly what Rahmat Ali was demanding. Once the League had adopted the name Pakistan there was little left to differentiate it from the PNM.

Another weighty consideration also dictated the same course. Rahmat Ali's idea had been popular in north-west India, particularly in the Punjab and Sind. Further, he had succeeded in winning over the hearty support of the students and of the youth in general. It was precisely this section of the Muslim population which was the first to agitate for the Pakistan demand when the League committed itself to partition. For several years after 1940

the Unionist Party continued to rule the Punjab and the Congress to govern the NWFP. Sind failed to have a stable Muslim League ministry till 1946. During the years of struggle, therefore, the Pakistan demand was not supported by a majority of the politicians or the parties in power. The base of the League's strength lay in the students, the young leaders and the middle classes. These groups formed the vanguard of Jinnah's following, and the League's sweeping victory in the 1945-46 elections was primarily their achivement. They were Jinnah's men because he had inspired them as no other leader had done before, and also because Rahmat Ali's movement had over many years conditioned their minds in the direction of partition. His propaganda had played a crucial part in preparing them for the ideal of Pakistan, so that when they found a leader of Jinnah's superb political sense declaring finally for Pakistan they gathered around him in such numbers that the opposition was taken by surprise. Jinnah must have known that the ground had been prepared for him, at least in the Punjab and Sind, by Rahmat Ali's propaganda. He himself might have been persuaded by Rahmat Ali's arguments. Thus, viewed from any angle, Jinnah should have made every possible effort to win Rahmat Ali's support. What he actually did was neither politic nor seemly.

It was not till 1947 that Rahmat Ali came out with a personal attack on Jinnah. By that time the final decision on Pakistan had been made and the hour for seeking or making allies was gone. But before that Rahmat Ali's own criticism of the Muslim League concerned the rather silly point about its prefix "All India". He was harshly critical of the entire Muslim leadership which had co-operated with the British and the Hindus at the RTC in hammering out an Indian federation and had later acquiesced in its implementation. This was a general criticism on a matter of policy and would hardly have offended Jinnah. In fact, Jinnah himself had been dissatisfied with the London parleys and proceedings, and then rejected the federal part of the 1935 Act and agreed only to work its provincial sections. Even this agreement was rescinded after the experience of Congress provincial governments in 1937-39. From 1938 onwards he was attacking the very concept of federalism. Slowly but inevitably he came round to Rahmat Ali's 1933 view that the federation was a snare, as it would hand over the Muslims to the Hindu majority to be treated as a powerless minor-

ity. And within another year or so he was asking for a partition, arguing that this was the only permanent solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem, and repeating all the points already made by Rahmat Ali. After another year he had even come to adopt the name Pakistan. Thus, in theory or in practice, there was little to separate the two men in principles, policies, attitudes and ultimate objectives.

Nor would there have been anything unusual or uncharacteristic in Jinnah's attempt to woo Rahmat Ali. Throughout his later years, when he was fighting for Pakistan, he was asking his Muslim critics and opponents to come into the Muslim League, to join the national struggle and, if they had any differences of opinion, to try to convert the League to their own line of thought. He made many appeals even to the Congress Muslims, who were his bitterest enemies, to join hands with him or at least to enter the Muslim League.

In spite of all his criticisms and strong words Rahmat Ali was not an enemy of the Muslim League, nor was he an opponent of Jinnah in the sense in which the leaders of all non-Muslim League Muslim parties were. The League could make compromises with the Punjab Unionists on humiliating terms (the Muslims among the Unionists were to support the Pakistan demand on the national level provided that the League did not interfere with the provincial affairs of the Punjab), open its ranks to Congress veterans like Khan Abdul Qayyum Khan, woo back irresolute and vacillating politicians like A.K. Fazlul Haq, allow re-entry to former Leaguers like Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan who had forsaken the party at critical moments, and give red-carpet treatment to the Viceroy's executive councillors like Malik Firoz Khan Noon, and to "Nationalist" Muslims like Malik Barkat Ali. But it could not treat Rahmat Ali even with ordinary formal courtesy. The Cambridge man was more akin to the League than any of the host of big and small politicians who flocked to the Muslim League when its star was in the ascendant.

In conclusion, we must assert that Rahmat Ali's influence on Jinnah's thinking and consequently on Muslim League policy was much greater than has ever been acknowledged. To say this is not in any way to belittle Jinnah's achievement which remains unique and beyond dispute. No man, however perceptive, and no leader, however great, creates something out of nothingness. Every in-

dividual has predecessors as every idea has antecedents. There is nothing absolutely new in human affairs: complete originality is the privilege of Divine creation. When the League took up the idea of Pakistan and made it its own it was not offering a new concept. Jinnah never said that he was the first to think of Pakistan, nor did the Muslim League ever claim that it was the original creator of the scheme. Nor for that matter was Rahmat Ali's the first voice calling for a separate Muslim state. There is a long line of thinkers, speculators and dreamers who played with the idea and put it before the public in varying colours and shapes. Rahmat Ali's distinction lies in that he was the first to argue in detail in favour of the two-nation theory, to offer a concrete scheme, to give a name to the proposed state, and to establish a movement to achieve the ideal. These are stupendous achievements for one man. Others had made suggestions and then forgotten them or passed on to other things. He alone devoted his life to it and stood like a rock in its cause. He had no material resources to lighten his labours. No crowds applauded him. No public deification buoyed him up in dark hours. No party advanced his name or his plans, or fought for his principles. With none to cheer his lonely exile, not even a wife to share his solitary existence, he literally lived and died with the idea which he had made the sole justification of his life. He was an idealist, a maker of ideas, a perfectionist who did not believe in compromises.

Jinnah had everything that Rahmat Ali lacked. He was a realist with a supreme sense of timing. He knew the value of coming to terms if the tide of fortune demanded it. With a nerve of steel and a coolness of mind that disconcerted the steadiest of his opponents he could play his cards with consummate skill. His courage in the face of heavy odds won him a following whose number was matched by its unflinching loyalty. By uniting the Muslims he gave them a signal advantage which they had not enjoyed before in their history. A politician to his finger-tips, he put behind him a party in whose increasingly high name he could speak and be heard. Equally at home in the arts of tactics and strategy, he knew how to meet this difficulty, to remove that obstacle, to defeat one enemy, to outmanœuvre another opponent, to disarm this rival, to outdistance that competitor.

And yet there was an affinity between these two men. Their undeviating devotion to a single cause was the secret of their

success. Both had no interest in life except the fulfilment of their mission. Both were lonely men, without family, close friends or a social life. Both lived in isolation, with nothing but their ideas to keep them company. Both were dedicated souls to whom life could have but one successful end: the achievement of what they had set out to do. Even in their death they had something in common. One approached his end uncared-for in a broken-down ambulance on the roadside in the capital of the country he had created. When some called it murder only a few protested. The other died in exile and loneliness, spurned by the government and the people of a country of which he was the spiritual father and the christener.

Conclusion

To recapitulate, there are five points on which the Muslim League policy was inspired or influenced by Rahmat Ali's ideas. First, in spite of the absence of the word Pakistan in the Lahore Resolution, everyone knew that it was Pakistan that was being demanded; the League took over the name from Rahmat Ali. Secondly, the two-nation theory on which this demand was based, was for the first time argued in detail by Rahmat Ali. Thirdly, until April 1946 the League's official position was that (two) separate states should be created in the north-west and the north-east of India; this followed Rahmat Ali's scheme for a Pakistan and a Bangistan. Fourthly, the League's insistence on including Assam (not a Muslim-majority province) in the north-eastern state is traceable to Rahmat Ali whose Bang-i-Islam or Bangistan was to embrace Bengal and Assam. Fifthly, every argument brought forth by the League in support of its Pakistan movement had already been used by Rahmat Ali.

To dismiss all this as coincidence is to reject history in favour of a prejudice. The League leaders might have had their reasons (which they never pronounced) for not mentioning Rahmat Ali in their prolonged and articulate campaign for Pakistan, and later historians of the party and the movement might or might not be able to explain their failure to acknowledge Rahmat Ali's influence—but if facts are anything to go by there is little doubt that the Muslim League's idea of and struggle for Pakistan owed a great deal to the PNM and the ideas and opinions of Rahmat Ali. Anyone who sets out to study the history of the Muslim League without realizing this begins at the wrong end.

NOTES

1. Abdul Waheed Khan, *Ta'assurat wa tasawwurat* (Lahore, 1960), pp. 61-62.
2. Muhammad Iqbal, *Presidential Address at the All India Muslim League Allahabad Session, December 1930*, the Author, Lahore, 1930; Shamloo (comp.), *Speeches and Statements of Iqbal* (Lahore, 1945, 2nd rev. ed. 1948), pp. 3-35; Muhammad Noman (ed), *Our Struggle, 1857-1947* (Karachi, n.d.), pp. 1-18; and Rais Ahmad Jafri (comp.), *Rare Documents* (Lahore, 1967), Part II.
3. This has been fully discussed with complete documentation in Chapter 13 of my *A History of the Idea of Pakistan.*
4. See *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 20 April 1940.
5. Frank Moraes, *Witness to An Era* (London, 1973), p. 79 fn.
6. Lini S. May, *Iqbal: His Life and Times, 1877-1938* (Lahore, 1974), pp. 204-205, 205, 206.
7. Abdus Salam Khurshid, *Waiy suratayn ilahi* (Lahore, 1976), pp. 55-56. Dr. Khurshid was in the delegation.
8. Sayyid Nazir Niazi, *Iqbal kay huzur* (Lahore, 1971), p. 131.
9. *Ibid.*, fn. on pp. 131-132; interview with Sayyid Nazir Niazi.
10. R.W. Burchfield, "Etymology of 'Pakistan' ", *Notes and Queries*, April 1960, p. 124.
11. "A Punjabi" (Mian Kifait Ali), *Pakistan: The Critics' Case Examined* (Lahore, 1941), p. 7.
12. Sardar Ikbal Ali Shah, "The Political Aims of Muslim India", *Asiatic Review*, April 1942, pp. 151-158.
13. Abdul Qaddus Hashmi, *Tashrihat-i-Pakistan* (Hyderabad Deccan, March 1946), p. 30.
14. S.M. Ikram, *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan* (Lahore, 1965), pp. 181-183.
15. Al-Beiruni (S.M. Ikram), *Makers of Pakistan and Modern Muslim India* (Lahore, 1950), pp. 181-182.
16. M.A. Khan, *Iqbal ka siyasy karnamah* (Karachi, 1952), pp. 514-515.
17. Abdul Majid Salik, *Zikr-i-Iqbal* (Lahore, n.d. (?1955)), p. 179.
18. Aftab Ahmad Qarshi, "Jihad-i-hurryat mayn tulaba kay mukhtalaf dawr", *Kohistan*, 25 December 1961.

19. S.F. Mahmud, *The Story of Indo-Pakistan* (Karachi, 1969), p. 263; first published by Oxford University Press, London, 1963.
20. Abdus Salam Khurshid, "Pakistan ka bany kawn?", *Mashriq*, 1 April 1964, see also his "Iqbal: aik mustaqbil shanas siyasatdan", *Naqush*, January 1966.
21. Mian Amiruddin, "More about the 'Forgotten Hero'", *The Pakistan Times*, 10 May 1964.
22. Faqir Sayyid Waheeduddin, *Ruzgar-i-faqir* (Lahore, 1965), p. 124.
23. Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, *The Emergence of Pakistan* (New York, 1967), pp. 25-26.
24. Mozibur Rahman, *Friends not Foes* (Dacca, 1968), p. 42.
25. Sarfraz Husain Mirza, *Muslim Women's Role in the Pakistan Movement* (Lahore, 1969), p. 39.
26. Abdus Salam Khurshid, "Introductory Essay", in Riaz Batalawi, *Lidran-i-Karam* (Lahore, 1970), pp. 14-15.
27. Chaudhri Khaliquzzaman, interview, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 129.
28. Aziz Ahmad, "Islamic Reform Movements", in A.L. Basham (ed.), *A Cultural History of India* (Oxford, 1975), p. 390.
29. Raziuddin Siddiqui, "Afzaal Qadri marhum", *Jadid Science*, August-December 1978, p. 15.
30. Abu Saeed Anwar, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan ka pas manzar", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 23 February 1979; the same claim is made by a Lahore lawyer, Hamid Yusuf, *Pakistan in Search of Democracy*, Lahore, 1980, p. 6. Pakistan's largest work of reference is riddled with errors: in 1930 Iqbal was the first to demand a Pakistan (Khalifa Abdul Hakim and Ghulam Rasul Mehr, "Iqbal", Vol. 3, 1968, p. 11), and Rahmat Ali's 1933 Pakistan demand did not include Sind (editorial board, "Pakistan", Vol. 5, 1971, p. 420), *The Urdu Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Lahore.
31. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (Lahore, 1961), pp. 238-239.
32. For example, B.R. Ambedkar (the Indian Untouchable leader), *Pakistan or Partition of India* (Bombay, first published December 1940, 2nd ed. February 1945), p. 5; Andre Guimbretiere, "Le reformisme musulman en Inde", *Orient*, no. 18 (1961), p. 48, fn. 40; Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims* (Bombay, 1959), pp. 231-232; Richard W. Weekes, *Pakistan:*

Birth and Growth of a Muslim Nation (Princeton, 1964), pp. 81-82; P.H.L. Eggermont, "The Pakistan Concept: Its Background", in A.H. Dani (ed.), *World Scholars on Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah* (Islamabad, 1979), p. 234; and article on "Rahmat Ali Chowdhury" in S. Bhattacharya (ed.), *A Dictionary of Indian History* (Calcutta, 1967), p. 707.

33. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan*, pp. 218-221.
34. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never*, p. 3.
35. See Shamloo (comp.), *op. cit.*, p. 229.
36. M. Anwar, "The Forgotten Hero–I", *The Pakistan Times*, 23 March 1964.
37. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, *Evolution of Pakistan* (Lahore, 1963), p. 142; this was told to Pirzada by Anwar in a letter. Anwar repeated this in his interview with me, and again in *Satluj*, 12 February 1976, p. 21.
38. See *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah: A Collection of Iqbal's Letters to the Quaid-i-Azam conveying His Views on the Political Future of Muslim India*, Lahore, n.d.
39. Full text in *Star of India*, 7 May 1938.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Full text of his speech in *ibid.*, 11 May 1938.
42. Quoted in A.A. Ravoof, *Meet Mr. Jinnah* (Lahore, 2nd. ed. 1947), p. 79; see also *Indian Annual Register 1936*, Vol. I, pp. 293-299.
43. For full details see Allen H. Jones, "Mr. Jinnah's Leadership and the Evolution of the Pakistan Idea: The Case of the Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference, 1938", in A.H. Dani (ed.), *op. cit.*; *Star of India*, 10-15 October 1938; *The Statesman*, 11 October 1938.
44. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (Lahore, 1961), p. 234.
45. Pakistan History Board, *A Short History of Hind-Pakistan* (Karachi, 1955, rep. 1963), p. 435.
46. *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 1 August 1939.
47. *Indian Annual Register 1939*, Vol. I, p. 374.
48. Ashiq Husain Batalawi, *Hamary qawmy jidd-o-juhad* (Lahore, n.d.), pp. 143-144.
49. *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 2 July 1939.
50. *Star of India*, 3 February 1940.

51. *Ibid.*
52. See *The Times*, 19 February 1940.
53. *Star of India*, 17 April 1940.
54. *Quarterly Survey of the Political and Constitutional Position of British India*, no. 8, 19 December 1940, pp. 32-33, a British Government paper, quoted in Kuldip Nayar, *Distant Neighbours* (Delhi, 1972), p. 17. It was also reproduced in *The Statesman*, 19 February 1941.
55. E.P. Moon, "Mr. Jinnah's Changing Attitude to the Idea of Pakistan", in A.H. Dani (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 269.
56. See Chapter 13 of my *A History of the Idea of Pakistan*.
57. M. Baqir, "The Pakistan Movement—In Retrospect", *The Pakistan Times*, 23 March 1961.
58. Abdul Majid Salik, *Sarguzasht* (Lahore, 1955), p. 452.
59. M. Raza Khan, *What Price Freedom* (Madras, 1969), p. 67.
60. Sayyid Hasan Riaz, *Pakistan naguzir tha* (Karachi, 2nd. ed. 1970), pp. 256-257.
61. Maqbul Ahmad Ansari, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 18 February 1979.
62. Aziz Javed, *Pakistan ky namwar khawatin* (Peshawar, n.d. (?1968)), p. 92.
63. Hector Bolitho, *Jinnah: Creator of Pakistan* (London, 1954), p. 129.
64. *The Civil and Military Gazette*, 16 April 1940.
65. *The Statesman*, 16 April 1940.
66. *Ibid.*, 28 and 29 April 1940.
67. A.S. Khurshid, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ka tasawwur-i-Pakistan", *Kohistan*, 14 August 1963.
68. A.M. Ahmad Shafi, *Haji Sir Abdullah Haroon: A Biography*, p. 140, quoted in S.S. Pirzada, *Evolution of Pakistan* (Lahore, 1963), p. 150.
69. *Inqilab*, 1 February 1939.
70. *The Deccan Times*, 11 June 1939.
71. *Star of India*, 27 November. The Raja was delivering his presidential address. Interview with the Raja of Mahmudabad.
72. *Ibid.*, 15 April 1940.
73. *The Statesman*, 22 April 1940.
74. For example, the one held by the Cawnpore City Muslim

League; see *ibid.*, 29 April 1940.

75. Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali awr tahrik-i-Pakistan", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1976.
76. M.R.T., "Pakistan Scheme and the Sikhs", *The Eastern Times*, 26 April 1940.
77. M.R.T., *Pakistan and Muslim India* (Bombay, 2nd. ed. 1946), pp. 15-17.
78. *50 Facts About Pakistan* (Muslim India Information Centre, London, n.d.), Point Five, p. 3.
79. *Ibid.*, Point Six, p.3.
80. An equally clumsy attempt was made by Z.A. Suleri, one of the former directors of the Muslim India Information Centre, in 1959 to differentiate Rahmat Ali's Pakistan from the Muslim League's; see his letter, *The Times*, 17 September 1959.
81. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (Lahore, 1961), p. 341.
82. A Punjabi, *Pakistan: The Critics' Case Examined* (Lahore, 1941), pp. 11-12.
83. Sir Hasan Suhrawardy, who presided during a discussion on A.H. Byrt's paper on "The Indian North-West Frontier under Modern Political Conditions", read before the Royal Central Asian Society, London, on 14 May 1941, *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, July 1941, pp. 291-294.
84. Waheeduzzaman, *Towards Pakistan* (Lahore, 1964), p. 153; S.M.K. Wasti, *op. cit.*, p. 12; Tayyeb, review article, *Dawn*, 28 October 1982.
85. "Bany-i-Pakistan Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Ehsan*, 8 June 1948.
86. Choudhri Khaliquzzaman, *op. cit.*, p. 341.
87. Frank Moraes, "Whereby Hangs A Tale", *Indian Express*, 11 September 1965.
88. Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre, *Freedom at Midnight* (London, 1975), p. 101.
89. Mian Abdul Haq (at this time an active member of Rahmat Ali's movement), quoted in *Gujjar Gazette*, 11 March 1966, p. 14.
90. Mian Kifait Ali, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan ka aghaz", *Musawat*, 14 August 1970.
91. A.S. Khurshid, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ka tasawwur-i-Pak-

istan", *Kohistan*, 14 August 1963.

92. Muhammad Yamin Khan, *'Amal nama* (Lahore, 1970), Vol. I, pp. 725-726.
93. *The Mail* (Madras), 31 July 1939.
94. See *Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah* (ed. by Jamiluddin Ahmad, Lahore, 1952 ed.), Vol. I, pp. 131-155; M.A. Jinnah, "Two Nations in India", *Time and Tide*, 9 March 1940; and V.P. Menon, *The Transfer of Power in India* (Calcutta, 1957), pp. 81-83.
95. Mian Kifait Ali's letters to me from Lahore dated 5 September and 10 October 1968.
96. A Punjabi, *Confederacy of India* (Lahore, 1939), pp. 17-18.
97. *Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, Vol. I, pp. 555-557.
98. At least one letter from Jinnah to Rahmat Ali, dated 8 February 1940 from New Delhi and written in his long hand, is preserved in the Pakistan National Museum. It shows that he knew Rahmat Ali very well and was not replying to a stranger's first communication. It reads: "I am glad that you are arriving [at] Karachi soon. I am at Delhi at present and shall be here for about four weeks at least. If it be convenient for you please come to Delhi and see me. I shall be I need hardly say very pleased. I am looking forward to meet you." Photocopy in *RAA*.
99. Frank Moraes, *Witness to An Era* (London, 1973), pp. 79-80.
100. *Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, Vol. I, pp. 178-180.
101. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never*, p. 2.
102. *Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, Vol. I, p. 177.
103. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Letter to Members of the House of Lords*, 8 July 1935, p. 3.

CHAPTER 9

FALSEHOOD ON THE THRONE

If a country be judged by the way it treats its heroes Pakistan has much to answer for. In 36 years of its independence it has witnessed the death of the father of the nation in extremely suspicious circumstances (in September 1979 the Minister of Law declared that he had been killed through a conspiracy), the murder of its first prime minister, and the hanging of its only elected prime minister. Events which should have shaken it to the core were allowed to pass without protest, almost without notice. Such a nation could not be expected to remember or rehabilitate Rahmat Ali, not to speak of making a hero of him. In this chapter an attempt is made to examine how he has been treated by the public, the press, the scholars, the teachers, the governments and his "friends". The overwhelming reaction has been one of forgetfulness, indifference, ignorance, rejection and hostility. Evidence for this is presented here. But there have been some exceptions to this attitude, and we begin with these.

Tributes

Rahmat Ali's services in the cause of freedom have been acknowledged by a motley collection of people, most of whom did not know him personally but felt that a richly deserved recognition was being withheld.

Only two of his friends and colleagues spoke out on his behalf. Facts are witnesses of his "unparalleled and historic struggle", wrote Choudhari Amjad Khan. In the epic of the rise of nations it has happened rarely that the history-maker was living thousands of miles away and yet moulding the evolution of his nation. His personality was "the pole star on the horizon of the freedom of Pakistan". His "thinking was the foundation of the establishment

of Pakistan, his consciousness the life and soul of the Muslim League movement, and his demand the present-day state of Pakistan". He "is that foundation stone of Pakistan which the external construction of the building has hidden from our eyes".[1] He was extremely devout, completely unselfish, and had no ambition for status or money, recalled Muhammad Masud. His great virtues were an Islamic fervour and the human qualities. During his last days a cheerful temperament had been turned gloomy by "long solitude, isolation in a foreign country and desertion by all those who had once been his friends and colleagues".[2]

Among those who contributed to the development of the idea of partition Mian Kifait Ali ("A Punjabi") alone acknowledged that Rahmat Ali is "the first person to present the concept of a divided India in a comprehensive form".[3]

Four persons known to the public and carrying some weight appreciated his work. "He was an idealist", wrote G. Allana, "who was not prepared to talk or think in terms of other alternatives or to discuss compromise solutions."[4] A former chief justice of Pakistan believed that it was his farsightedness that "ultimately culminated in a separate homeland for the Muslims", and that "if the rulers at that time had subscribed to Rahmat Ali's views, they would have succeeded in avoiding the excessive bloodshed".[5] The Pakistani High Commissioner in London claimed wrongly in 1956 that the country had not forgotten Rahmat Ali "who had worked like a mad man for the Pakistan Movement in Britain". He regretted that "though he had christened the country of Pakistan, yet on his return to Pakistan he was not only disallowed to live there but also did not find two yards of land for his grave".[6] "In my eyes", said Pir Ali Muhammad Rashdi, "Rahmat Ali occupies the same place in the Pakistan ideology as does Karl Marx in Communism. If there is any difference in their positions, it is this that while the people who profited from Marx's intellectual labours remembered him, those who gained from Rahmat Ali's intellectual exertions have forgotten him."[7]

Only one newspaper commented editorially on his death. "The deceased was one of the earliest servants of the Pakistan movement; in fact, he was in the real sense one of its founders", said the *Nawa-i-Waqt*. "It was he who gave the name Pakistan to our beloved country. . . . The nation did not appreciate him at all during his lifetime, but he was in reality a great man. When the

future historian will write the history of Pakistan he will not be able to deny his greatness."[8] At this time the editor of the paper was Hamid Nizami, one of the founders of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation and a leading figure in the Pakistan movement in the Punjab from 1937 onwards. After his death the policy of the paper changed, and in the 1960's it published several most vulgar articles on Rahmat Ali.

The rest of the appreciative references can be summarized more quickly. The nation owed a debt of gratitude to Rahmat Ali whose contribution in the making of Pakistan could not be exaggerated. He called for a Pakistan with a "staggering confidence" when Muslim leaders were at a loss to decide their future course of action.[9] He "lighted the beacon of PAKISTAN and wrote a deathless page of history". Besides giving the country its name, he "provided it with a rationale, spelled out its *raison d'etre*, and gave the Pakistan movement its cherished vocabulary".[10] Pakistan and Pakistanis "owe a great debt to him".[11] "We owe a deep debt of gratitude to him."[12] He was certainly one of our "national heroes".[13] He was a "great son of this soil".[14] He prepared the younger generation of Muslims for Pakistan and thus facilitated Jinnah's later task.[15] He was the first to present the idea of an independent Muslim state. Anniversaries of his birth and death should be observed officially. *Now and Never* should be given wide publicity, and his biography should be prepared.[16] "His grave in Cambridge poses a question to the Pakistani nation: 'Is that all you owe to the man who lies here?' " The government should do everything possible "to restore the honour and dignity of the man who gave Pakistan its name".[17]

He "was not only the first one to propose the name of Pakistan, but also the one to propagate the necessity of a national State".[18] He devoted all his life to the welfare of the nation, and offered the concept of an independent motherland at a time when most Muslim political leaders were content to accept constitutional safeguards as their ultimate objective.[19] "It can be stated without fear of contradiction that had the Muslim leaders given the slightest encouragement to Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, the demand for dividing India would have emerged on the political scene seven years before March 1940."[20]

That is the sum total of tributes to Rahmat Ali: two old friends, four relatively well-known figures, one newspaper and thirteen

journalists and authors of letters to the press. I don't claim to have consulted *all* newspapers and magazines published in Pakistan since 1947. A wider scrutiny might discover a few more items. Still the fact remains that in 36 years a nation of over a hundred million (less after the 1971 break up) could not produce more than two dozen individuals who had the honesty or the courage to speak out on behalf of Rahmat Ali. A more shocking aspect of this silence is the absence, among the people quoted above, of any historian, scholar, party leader and public man, and of any newspaper (except one). The nation had collectively and individually turned its back on Rahmat Ali.

Some efforts were made to reclaim Rahmat Ali from this obloquy by groups of his erstwhile followers and a few unknown persons who had never met him or read him but had heard of him and were revolted by the universal indifference of their countrymen.

The first in the field was the Gujjar community to which Rahmat Ali belonged. Soon after his death the Anjuman-i-Markazia (Central Council) of the Gujjars of Pakistan held a meeting at Lahore on 27 May 1951 to chalk out a programme for honouring and perpetuating his name and memory, but nothing came out of this gathering. Another meeting took place on 4 January 1953 and decided to create a "Rahmat Ali Memorial". A Memorial Trust Committee was appointed under Chaudhri Abdur Rashid. Some people gave or promised donations. The memorial was to take four forms: A Rahmat Ali Academy to conduct research on "Pyam-i-Rahmat", his message; buildings at various places, like a Rahmat Ali Hall, a Rahmat Ali Library, etc.; Rahmat Ali Scholarships; and "economic institutions named after" him.[21] The Gujjar magazine reminded the community of its duty in this direction and hoped that the committee would discharge its trust with devotion and alacrity.[22] Nothing happened.

In early 1963 the West Pakistan Youth Movement met at the Bureau of National Reconstruction Centre at Lahore to observe the twelfth death anniversary of Rahmat Ali. Abdul Waheed Khan, the then minister of information, promised before the gathering that Rahmat Ali's name would be engraved on the pillar of the Pakistan Memorial along with those of the "Makers of Pakistan".[23] Nothing was done.

Then in 1967 a meeting of Rahmat Ali's admirers was held

at the residence of Muhammad Anwar at Lahore, and a Rahmat Ali Memorial Society was established with Anwar as patron, A.S. Khurshid as president, and Abdur Rashid as secretary. "The letter-forms were printed and I was given a pad", wrote Khurshid, "but after that nothing was known of it. I could not find time to inquire from Mr. Anwar."[24] The society expired before starting to function.

Another attempt was made by Anwar in April 1970, and again a Rahmat Ali Memorial Society was founded in Lahore. A former chief justice of Pakistan, S.A. Rahman, inaugurated the body and was elected its president. Those who spoke on the occasion included Anwar himself, A.S. Khurshid and M.R. Chaudhri.[25] It, too, was largely inactive.

In 1976 the centre of these efforts moved to the federal capital, Islamabad. In February some citizens got together under Nazir Ahmad Butt and formed a Rahmat Ali Ideal Society, which was to work for bringing his remains to Pakistan for reburial, spreading his ideas among the youth of the country, and popularizing his message among the masses. Chaudhri Bashir Ahmad was elected its chairman and Muhammad Ali Wasti its president.[26] The society held several public meetings, symposia, seminars and exhibitions on Rahmat Ali between 1976 and 1978. The guiding spirit behind the activities was Chaudhri Bashir, by profession a sweetmeat seller, who was generous in the cause with his time and money. Besides the publicized functions, he arranged and financed a Khatm-ul-Quran and the feeding of the poor on Rahmat Ali's death anniversary at the red mosque.[27] The society put considerable pressure on the Capital Development Authority to build a "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali Hall" in Islamabad, and the Authority agreed in principle to the proposal. But no further step was taken in spite of the society's reminders.[28] The CDA was also asked to name a road in the capital after Rahmat Ali, and later it was suggested that the Raza Shah Pahlawi Road (formerly Murree Road) should bear his name.[29] The society again reminded the CDA in June 1981 of its promise to construct the memorial hall in the blue area of the city.[30]

Sometime in the 1970's Chaudhri Amjad Khan, an old friend of Rahmat Ali's, established a Rahmat Ali Centre in Karachi. In a special meeting in August 1978 it demanded the removal of Rahmat Ali's body to Pakistan and the construction of a befitting

memorial over its grave. It was also decided to establish a research institute, which would edit his writings and publish his biography, and a hospital to be called after him. One of the members, Rais Amrohawi, proposed that the centre should also issue a newspaper called *Rahmat*.[31]

The founders and activists of these societies and centres were inspired by selfless motives, but their programmes and aims remained unfulfilled partly because of the usual weaknesses of all voluntary bodies–lack of funds, lethargy, absence of patronage, professional preoccupation of members–but mainly because of official indifference and opposition. The governments were not only unsympathetic but at times positively hostile.

Demand for Reburial in Pakistan

Since his death a large number of people in Pakistan have been calling for the transfer of Rahmat Ali's mortal remains from Cambridge and their reburial in Pakistan. As he was buried in a strong wooden box lined with zinc, not just wrapped in a shroud, the general impression was that this was done to facilitate a later reburial.

The demands for reburial began in earnest in 1954. "Will Rahmat Ali's nation ever have the honour of bringing the coffin of its great son from a foreign land to its own soil?" asked one admirer.[32] All the societies and organizations founded in his memory gave this demand top priority in the list of their aims and objectives. In 1967 Anwar met the Governor of West Pakistan for the allotment of a central place in the Punjab for the proposed grave. He was told to forget about the whole thing.[33] In the same year Pir Ali Muhammad Rashdi argued for the transfer of his remains, adding that the "Pakistan Memorial in Lahore will be a meaningless thing until Rahmat Ali is not buried there–the man who gave us the name Pakistan and taught us the principle of a partition of the subcontinent".[34] The *Gujjar Gazette* endorsed the proposal in a strongly-worded editorial.[35] Nawab Jahan Imdad Ali of Model Town supported Rashdi's suggestion.[36] A. S. Khurshid insisted on its execution.[37]

From 1969 onwards the demand was made by an increasingly wider section of people who made the same points again and again. He should be brought to the country which received its name from

him.[38] He should be buried in the Aitchison College where he had been a teacher and a befitting monument built on his new resting place.[39] He should be buried in Islamabad where "a national monument should be built in his honour", and the Aitchison College be named after him.[40] He should be buried near the place where the Lahore Resolution was passed.[41] He should be buried near Iqbal's tomb.[42] His body deserves a burial in Pakistan.[43]

In the summer of 1970 it was given out that his body was soon to be brought to Pakistan. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman was pleased that "the conscience of the people of Pakistan has at last awakened to do justice to that great visionary . . . there should be a monument to remind the world of the man who gave the name of Pakistan which 130 million people swear by".[44] The general secretary of the Islamia College Old Boys Association claimed the right of the college to receive the body of its distinguished son.[45] The news brought "tremendous excitement" to another admirer, who wanted him to be buried at the Pakistan Memorial: this would save the government much money on the construction of a new monument.[46] Surely, it was time "we got back Rahmat Ali's remains and gave the originator of Pakistan a place of honour in Pakistan".[47] For a second time the government changed its mind, and no further development occured.

In 1971 Pakistan broke up and lost the majority of its population to Bangladesh. For some time this occupied the minds of the people. But in 1975 the campaign for reburial again came alive. His body must be brought back and buried at some suitable place.[48] This was the least that his country should do for him.[49] The transfer of the remains is an obligation on Pakistan and so is the construction of a befitting mausoleum over them.[50] Chaudhri Bashir Ahmad appealed to the Chief Martial Law Administrator to arrange for his burial at the Pakistan Memorial in Lahore; "without this the monument will remain incomplete".[51] He was supported in this by others.[52] The Rahmat Ali Ideal Society passed a resolution incorporating Chaudhri Bashir's demand.[53] An old friend of Rahmat Ali's suggested two places for reburial: the Pakistan Memorial or the Islamia College.[54] Chaudhri Bashir reiterated his appeal to the military ruler,[55] and a gathering of the intellectuals of Islamabad endorsed the demand but considered the capital a better place for the grave.[56]

Tired of official insensitivity to all appeals, on 20 March 1979

a lawyer of Lahore, M.D. Tahir, moved a writ petition in the Lahore High Court asking it to order the government to arrange the removal of the remains to Pakistan. The chief justice postponed the hearing for two weeks to enable the mover to inform the court as to the law under which it could issue such instructions to the government.[57] Nothing was heard of the matter after this. Since then appeals have continued to be made from time to time but with no result.

Here again, it should be pointed out that, with the single exception of Khaliquzzaman, the demand for reburial was not supported by any politician, historian or scholar. No newspaper in the country considered it worth its while to comment editorially. The radio and television, under firm control of the government, omitted all news of it from their bulletins, commentaries and talks. The official blackout extended as far as it could go.

Apart from this public clamour two separate attempts were made by Rahmat Ali's brother and his friends to bring home his remains.

Chaudhri Farzand Ali, an advocate of Lyallpur, went to Rawalpindi in 1962 to seek the government's permission for reburial in Pakistan. Mawlawi Akhtar Ali, a member of parliament, and Chaudhri Fazl-i-Elahi, the senior deputy speaker of the National Assembly (later President of Pakistan), helped in the matter, and finally a permit was granted. Consequent arrangements took some time. In the meantime, the publication of Anwar's articles on Rahmat Ali in a Lahore daily evoked a public debate in which some of Rahmat Ali's old "friends" managed to fling so much mud on his name that the government cancelled the permission.[58] The transfer of the body was to be done privately by Rahmat Ali's brother, who was asked by the government to arrange for Rs. 2,300 in foreign exchange and he had agreed to it. The burial, too, was to be a family-and-friend affair with no public functions to mark it. The brother had agreed to all the terms, but the thing did not come off. The decision of the government was taken under pressure from two sides: politically, Mian Abdul Haq, a member of President Ayub's party in the National Assembly, led a small deputation to the President and argued against the permission on the ground that Rahmat Ali was an enemy of Pakistan, Jinnah and Iqbal (see later section on Rahmat Ali's "friends" for details); bureaucratically, Khwaja Abdur Rahim and some of his

former ICS colleagues poisoned the senior civil servants against Rahmat Ali, so that when Ayub called for reports he was fed with the material supplied by this group.[59]

In the summer of 1970, after Ayub's overthrow by a political movement and the army, the Rahmat Ali Memorial Society approached President Yahya Khan and found him more sympathetic than his predecessor. Anwar, at this time Advocate General of West Pakistan, received assurances from the very top that permission would be forthcoming. A Memorial Committee was formed, Anwar went to London to talk to the Pakistan High Commissioner, and many Pakistanis living in Britain promised contributions to the proposed mausoleum. The government of Pakistan was said to have sought Chaudhri Muhammad Ali's permission for burying his brother in Islamabad. It was also reported that the reburial would take place with full honours to the "national hero". *The Times* reported that he was to be buried next to the grave of Iqbal in Lahore. Once again, Mian Abdul Haq drummed up an opposition group and put enough pressure on Yahya Khan and his civilian advisers to postpone matters. Before Anwar could renew his effort, the 1971 crisis overwhelmed the country.[60]

The above reference to Anwar's articles of 1964 on Rahmat Ali calls for an elaboration. Thinking that Jinnah had been dead for over 16 years and Liaquat Ali Khan for over twelve years and that the dust of political controversy was now settled, Anwar prepared a 13-article series on Rahmat Ali and received a promise from *The Pakistan Times* of Lahore to publish it. Entitled "The Forgotten Hero", the first piece appeared on 23 March 1964. Two more appeared later. Immediately the anti-Rahmat Ali group swung into action. On the official level the government was persuaded to stop the publication of further instalments, and the editor of the newspaper (owned by the government) told Anwar that he had to discontinue the series on official orders.[61] In the press Anwar's plea for granting Rahmat Ali the recognition due to him was answered with abuse and invective.[62] The *Nawa-i-Waqt*, a right-wing Urdu daily of Lahore, opened its columns to personal attacks on Rahmat Ali and Anwar himself. No arguments were offered and no evidence of Rahmat Ali's bad faith reproduced. Two contributors were particularly offensive. Ashiq Husain Batalawi, a former Muslim Leaguer, filled his article with unpleasant personal remarks on Rahmat Ali and Anwar and self-important references to his own

part in the drafting of the Lahore Resolution.[63] Z. A. Suleri, a senior journalist, accused Anwar of not knowing anything about the history of the Pakistan movement, of insulting Jinnah and of demeaning Iqbal. There was no argument in his article and no reply to the points raised by Anwar. Two months later Suleri returned to the attack with greater venom. He appealed to the government to proscribe such writings as Anwar's because they belittled Jinnah and Iqbal. "To say that another person is the *bany* [founder] of Pakistan is tantamount to give such a big abuse to these great men as the nation will not tolerate." Anwar was trying to give to Rahmat Ali the place rightfully occupied by Jinnah and Iqbal.[64] In the face of this virulence, rich in prejudice and poor in judgement, Anwar and other friends of Rahmat Ali retreated into the silence of self-respect. The field was left open to ignorance, indifference and hostility, the details of which are given below.

Ignorance

At several places in this narrative I have had occasion to point out the inaccuracies characterizing most references to Rahmat Ali and his movement. On almost every major aspect and incident of his life and work we come across wrong dates, inaccurate details, ill-informed expositions and general ignorance of facts. Some more examples follow.

Though Rahmat Ali studied, lived, worked and died in Cambridge, and all his pamphlets were issued from there, several writers placed him and his movement in other places. Some made London the centre of the PNM.[65] The president of the Rahmat Ali Memorial Society, A.S. Khurshid, believed that he had been a student at Oxford and had launched his movement from there.[66] The secretary-general of the Motamar al-Alam al-Islami said that in 1933 Rahmat Ali was a young barrister living in Oxford.[67] A former ICS officer who was in England in the 'thirties insisted that *Pakistan: The Fatherland of the Pak Nation* was published in 1933.[68] A colleague of his declared that he had "written a book, *The Betrayal of the Millat*, denouncing the 1947 partition and the Quaid's role".[69] We are told by another that he wrote "The Greatest Betrayal" on his return to Cambridge in 1948.[70] Still another writer alleged that in his *Pakistan* he collected all his earlier writings with changes and amendments and "added a lot

of unmentionable things".[71]

In London, Rahmat Ali's legal practice at the Privy Council reached lakhs of rupees as he acted as lawyer for nearly all the big landholders, *jagirdars*, *nawabs* and *rajwaras* of the Punjab.[72] In February 1936 a student delegation met Jinnah in Lahore and argued for a Pakistan; Rahmat Ali was the leader of this delegation.[73] According to a writer who spent several years in Cambridge in preparing his doctoral thesis on the 1935 Act, the idea of Pakistan emerged "from a group of Indian Muslim students at Cambridge" who asked for the creation of Pakistan. In the footnote, the reader is referred to *Now or Never* which the author consulted in the Reading Collection; but in this circular the word used is PAKSTAN not Pakistan. Nor were all the signatories to the circular Cambridge students.[74] There is a general unwillingness or inability to go to the original sources. In 1960 an Islamic right-wing journal of Karachi, *Cheragh-i-Rah*, brought out a voluminous issue devoted to Nazriya-i-Pakistan (concept of Pakistan). The one-page treatment of Rahmat Ali was not based on his writings, but declaredly on a summary of his proposals contained in a book by an Indian Hindu journalist.[75] The idea of Pakistan, wrote another author, was presented to the Muslim leaders "at the time of the Round Table Conference in 1931 by a set of Indian Cambridge students under Choudhry Rahmat Ali".[76]

A number of people have asserted that Rahmat Ali left his "entire library" to Emmanuel College and that it contains extremely valuable papers, correspondence with top Indian leaders and unpublished pamphlets.[77] God knows from where this information originated. There is nothing at the College except four notebooks and a few published pamphlets.[78]

It will need a thick pamphlet to enlist all examples of errors and inexactitude. Clearly a large majority of Pakistani writers have practised the art of carelessness with diligence. This has had two unfortunate consequences. Pakistanis themselves are ill informed about Rahmat Ali, and gradually this misinformation has frozen into solid history. Further, with so much ignorance to rely upon it is no wonder that foreign writers repeat and confirm these inaccuracies, sometimes adding their own contributions to the original model. But by failing to quote their sources they have chosen to accept the responsibility for their statements.[79]

Indifference and Hostility

Ignorance is a voluntary misfortune. The inaccuracies listed above might have been caused by carelessness or lack of knowledge. Ignorance is also a curable disease. Reference to the original source or to a well-informed book should have removed it. But indifference and hostility, which are divided by a thin line, are deliberate attitudes, cultivated with a will, fuelled by prejudice, propelled by interested motives, sometimes imposed by Authority. The following examples illustrate the varying shades and nuances of this attitude.

Let us consider the scholars first. They have performed no better than common journalists. Two authors (one Pakistani and one British) of a book meant for higher secondary students have succeeded in committing two factual errors within the space of six words. The word Pakistan was first used by "a Muslim students' society in London".[80] Next we come to two comments which acknowledge Rahmat Ali's parentage of the word Pakistan and credit him with some influence on events, but assail him for failing to be something which he never said he was. "In my opinion", writes A.S. Khurshid, "Rahmat Ali's services were valuable, but he never entered the field of politics, he never condencended to come to this part of the world, and thus he remained aloof from the people. You are welcome to make a hero of him, but the fact is that he was not a hero of the masses."[81] Professor Aziz Ahamd repeats this criticism and then treats with Rahmat Ali in much harsher words: "It can be safely said that this name [Pakistan] was the only contribution of the Cambridge group to the Pakistan movement. . . . In its other demands the movement was an illustration of obscurantist political eccentricity which, because of its confusion with the genuine Pakistan movement, exposed it to a great deal of embarrassment." And further, "Chowdhari Rahmat Ali and his associates had no contact with Muslim masses or the political life of Muslim India. Their views embarrassed the Muslim political leadership and inspired some virulent criticism in the Hindu press between 1933 and 1947".[82] To blame him for having no contact with the masses is to fail to distinguish between political ideas and political action. Would these criticis dismiss the role of the Fabian Society in the history of British socialism on similar grounds? As for his "eccentricity",

historians know how every pioneer has been accused freely of that vice, and we know how often and how widely Jinnah was called an eccentric by those who wanted to break his ideals with a slogan.

In a full-length study of Muslim separatism in India (grown out of a doctoral thesis) by a senior historian, Rahmat Ali does not get any mention at all. His ideas receive no attention, his works are not included in the bibliography, and his name does not appear in the index. This is an astonishing omission in a book dealing specifically and exclusively with the origin and growth of the sentiment of separatism among Indian Muslims.[83] Was he following the tradition of intolerance established by the ruling party, which found it beyond its moral resources even to mention Rahmat Ali's name in a sixty-two page pamphlet on the historical background of Pakistan?[84] Or, was his manuscript vetted by his superiors in the department of education of West Pakistan government? (All school, college and university teachers are obliged to submit their writings to the relevant authorities and obtain a written clearance and formal permission before publishing them.)

Other remarks of the same category can be listed without much commentary. Rahmat Ali "was purely an idealist and could not stand his ground when faced with realities or summoned by the call of action".[85] His thinking was Zionist, like that of Sir Yamin and th Ittehad-ul-Muslimin, insofar as he wanted to make Hyderabad and Bhopal into Islamic states. That was why he became a severe opponent of Jinnah after the creation of Pakistan.[86] The name Pakistan did not exist anywhere between 1933 and 1940.[87] In the early 1940's a woman writer published a small book on *Pakistan Defined;* it contained no reference to Rahmat Ali.[88] In 1941 El Hamza (a college lecturer in English writing under a pseudonym) published his *Pakistan: a Nation,* making a strong case for Pakistan, but omitting all mention of the origin of the word or of Rahmat Ali.[89] In 1942 appeared Muhammad Noman's *Muslim India,* the most detailed history of modern Muslim India up to that time. It did not discuss the origin of the idea of partition, or trace the genesis of the word Pakistan, or mention Rahmat Ali. It was written with the help of the Muslim League central office and of Jinnah who had given the author some of his own material.[90] The only contribution, said Aziz Ahmad in 1963, made by Rahmat Ali and his "le groupe de Cambridge" was the name Pakistan. Their "vues fantastiques" only discomfited the

Muslim leaders of India.[91] Rahmat Ali's "claim to have founded the 'Pakistan National Movement' in 1932 in Cambridge . . . is mere fiction", wrote a Cambridge-trained young man after considerable research on Rahmat Ali. In his opinion, Rahmat Ali's message "produced little impact on the people to whom it was addressed".[92] In a 976-page book on the two-nation theory published in 1973 the name of Rahmat Ali is not mentioned, nor any reference made to his schemes and plans.[93]

Most foreign scholars have followed the Pakistani opinion on the subject.[94]

Apart from this general approach, which may be called an attitude of mind, two specific accusations have been levelled against Rahmat Ali: that he was a British stooge in the pay of the India Office, and he lied when he claimed that he had coined the word Pakistan.

No sooner had Rahmat Ali's proposal begun to win some support among the Muslims of India than Hindu newspapers and commentators began to charge him with being in the pay of the British government. Most of the references to him in non-Muslim and pro-Congress Muslim circles repeated this allegation. "Thus was Pakistan born in London in the year 1933. It was reared by a group of Muslim students residing in London with the kind patronage of British imperialism."[95] Iqbal's Allahabad proposal and "the inspiration that came from some retired British officials led a number of Muslim students (of whom Rahmat Ali was one) at Cambridge to issue a secret circular in 1933".[96] "At this time it was generally believed among Indian students at Cambridge that Chowdhary Rahmat Ali who was not pursuing any specific course of studies and had no ostensible means of support but at the same time had ample funds for his somewhat luxurious entertainments of celebrities and propagandist activities derived his inspiration and funds from the India Office. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that although in India no one had heard of or talked of Pakistan and the Muslim Delegation showed no interest in it, yet the Diehard Press and the Churchill-Lord Lloyd group of the Conservative party waxed eloquent over it and saw in it a suggestion of the gravest import with the result that questions were asked in the Houses of Parliament on several occasions."[97] "Only Rahmat Ali or his God knows who inspired him with the idea of Pakistan. But there was a general impression among the Indian students

at Cambridge in 1933 that Chaudhri Rahmat Ali was not studyi
for any examination, that he had no apparent source of incom
and yet he could afford to invite and lavishly entertain very famo
personalities at his home. . . . Besides he spent a lot on propagan
work. He received funds from the India Office for circulating a
popularizing the concept of Pakistan. . . . From this our readers c
decide for themselves who is the real originator of Pakistan."
No evidence is offered; the assertion rides freely on the wheel
"it is generally believed".

Such talk has been commonplace in the history of Hind
Muslim relations in India, and there is no Muslim leader fro
Sayyid Ahmad Khan to Jinnah who, at one time or another, h
not been called a mouthpiece, an agent or an instrument of Briti
imperialism. Whenever the Muslims made a demand which did n
meet Hindu approval—quota in public services, separate electorat
for local and legislative bodies, weightage in assemblies, separa
universities, special safeguards, coalition ministries, separa
provinces, partition of India—they were said to be siding with t
British to strengthen a reactionary imperialism at the expen
of Indian nationalism. This attitude was an integral part of t
fond belief that the British were practising the divide-and-ru
formula. Naturally Rahmat Ali had the same slur cast upon hi
In itself this would not merit a reply, for no illusion would st
for an answer. But when responsible Western experts, who clai
to have made a special study of the Indian Muslim proble
spread around the same story it is necessary to examine the
arguments lest history be distorted by fake scholarship.

The first serious reference to Rahmat Ali as a voice of h
British masters occurred in Professor W.C. Smith's full-length stu
of modern Islam in India, which first appeared in May 194
Talking of Iqbal's 1930 suggestion, he wrote: "The idea ma
little impression at that time, and hardly anything was done abo
it until some Indian Muslim students in Cambridge, as we have sai
*set themselves (or were set?) to propagate it. There is so
evidence* that it was the British who pressed the partition idea."[99]

There is a footnote marked on the word "evidence" in the la
sentence and when we go to the footnote we find that it contai
no evidence, authority, original source or argument. His "evidence
is made up of three points. First, he thinks that hints about t
possibility of a future Muslim state were given by John Coatma

in his *Years of Destiny: India, 1926-1932* (the title is given incorrectly by Smith). From this he implies that it was the British who had instigated the Pakistan plan. Secondly, he feels that the questions asked on Pakistan by membes of the Joint Select Committee "show the British officials trying in 1933 to press the Pakistan idea". It is an indication of the quality of his scholarship that Smith does not quote the Joint Select Committee minutes from the original report of the proceedings but from a secondary, unacademic source. Thirdly, he makes his own contribution to the "evidence", as if clinching the argument, by saying: "Further, it has been widely believed in India that an Indian 'student' at Cambridge who lavishly sponsored the Pakistan campaign, and whose means of support were not obvious, was in the pay of the India Office".[100]

To call this "evidence" flimsy is to pay it a compliment. But even this offering is a big draft on credulity. Rahmat Ali was a British stooge because what he demanded had already been vaguely foreseen by Coatman. By that logic, every Congressman was a British agent because Indian independence had been foreseen, in fact demanded, by a long line of distinguished Englishmen. Smith's understanding of what was said in the Joint Select Committee is also defective. British members of the Committee were not pressing the idea of Pakistan on the Committee or on the Muslim witnesses appearing before it. They were curious to know about its details and wanted to find out if any Muslim party or section of public opinion was behind it. Inquiring into a matter is quite different from suggesting or pressing it. The last piece of "evidence", claiming that "it has been widely believed in India . . .", is not only hearsay but a gross misstatement. By "India" Smith obviously means Hindu or Congress India, for it was only there that this libel was being uttered.

This catalogue of Smith's incorrect facts and dubious inferences is not yet complete. As the footnotes to this book do not appear at the bottom of each page but are collected together and put at the end of the volume, the unwary or general reader, seeing a footnote mark on the word "evidence", may pass on, assuming that the author must have produced in the footnote the required evidence proving the allegation. Moreover, it is clear from Smith's description of the meaning and etymology of Pakistan that he does not know anything about Rahmat Ali's schemes or ideas.[101] Nowhere

is he directly quoted. His works are not listed in the bibliography His name does not appear in the index.

The Soviet historians of Pakistan have kept the myth alive. Two scholarly works, bearing the high imprint of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, accept it as an histor

worked with Rahmat Ali in the PNM for some years, but later turned against him like Khwaja Rahim, Pir Ahsanuddin and several others. In July 1964 he wrote a series of articles in the *Nawa-i-Waqt* assailing Rahmat Ali in abusive words and opposing his reburial in Pakistan. But on the allegation of his being a British agent, even he recalled: "A 'Pakistani' friend of Rahmat Ali brought an offer from the Duchess of Atholl that if the Pakistan National Movement co-operated with her plans, Rahmat Ali and his friends would receive financial aid, be introduced to high political circles, and in other ways brought nearer to the official political establishment. Rahmat Ali rejected the offer with contempt and severed all connections with the friend who had brought the offer although he had been one of the financial backers of the movement."[107]

Rahmat Ali's finances are not a closed book. We have seen that he came to Cambridge reasonably well-off, with nearly one lakh of rupees (in 1930: £ 7,500) left with Yar Muhammad Khan. He lived on its investment income, and when that was not enough his requests for more money were met promptly by Yar Muhammad.[108] This regular income, supplemented by occasional receipts of extra remittances from Lahore, did not leave him in needy circumstances.[109] In addition, he was always asking his friends for subscriptions and donations to his movement, besides levying special fees to finance the printing and distribution of his pamphlets. His friends and acquaintances gave freely and often without reminders.[110] Anwar mentions one particular case of the son of a Nawwab who was so deeply affected by Rahmat Ali's sincerity and integrity and by the appeal of his message that he changed his extravagant style of living and sold his motor car in order to divert most of his allowance to the movement.[111] All contemporary accounts agree on the impact made by Rahmat Ali's magnetic personality on the minds of the Muslim students who came in touch with him. Once his devotion to his ideals had kindled in them a live spark and the movement had captured their imagination, it was easy for them to open their purse-strings for him.

While we are talking about the contributions of these students, we must remember one thing. They were not ordinary undergraduates of limited means living on the edge of poverty on bursaries and meagre scholarships in an inflationary world. Living in England in the 'thirties was not that expensive. Nor did these

students come from poor or middle classes. In those days only the wealthiest Indian families could afford to send their sons to Europe for higher education. Money, therefore, was not a major consideration for these young men. Nor were there any foreign exchange restrictions on the transfer of funds. Moreover, some of Rahmat Ali's co-workers were ICS freshmen spending their probation years at Oxford and Cambridge. They were in receipt of their salaries in addition to other foreign and probationary allowances. Even if they had a middle-class background they lived well and spent lavishly. All this means that when we talk of the help given to the movement by these students we do not mean sixpences and half-crowns. The contributions must have been on a much larger scale and could easily have covered a major portion of the movement's budget.

And this budget could not have exceeded reasonable limits. We know the number of circulars and pamphlets issued by Rahmat Ali, their size and the quality of their printing. Postal expenses of circulating the publications could not have been much. The movement did not have a proper office with clerks and typists and machines and telephones. The movement was composed of Rahmat Ali himself, his private secretary, an occasional typist, a typewriter and a few files. All this moved with him as he changed houses. He wrote everything himself and prepared the mailing lists. The secretary typed the manuscripts. The printing was supervised by Rahmat Ali, who also read the proofs. His friends brought the pamphlets from the printers, packed them, addressed and stamped them and took them to the post office. Rahmat Ali was a bachelor by status, a puritan by training, and a stoic by temperament. His only luxuries were good clothes and well-cooked food. House rents were low. Within Cambridge transport expenses were negligible. The entire movement could have been, and probably actually was, run on a very modest budget. There is no need to search for any secret and sinister backer(s) to account for the success of his campaign. Those who insist on doing so have an obligation to explain their motives.

Asked about this story of being a British agent, his former secretary answered in sharp categoricals. "Absolutely not", she said. "Not in the pay of any government, office, agency or individual. It is impossible. He was just not that kind of person."[112]

What we know of Rahmat Ali's finances also rules out any

external assistance. He had no problems until 1948. In that year he went to Pakistan and took all his money with him because he planned to settle down in Lahore and publish one newspaper and one journal. When he was turned out of the country he was not allowed to take back the money he had brought in; foreign exchange barriers were then in position and one needed official permission to transfer money abroad. The government withheld the permission and he came to Cambridge penniless.[113] But he still hoped that he would soon be able to get his money in Lahore back in Cambridge, and it was probably on the strength of this expectation that he began to borrow money from a London friend. The loan piled up with time, the Lahore money never arrived, and when he died he owed this person the very large amount of £ 11,000. Had he been on the payroll of the British government he would not have been allowed to die a penniless debtor.

The internal evidence provided by his writings also belies the fable of his being a British puppet. From his first circular of January 1933 up to his last pamphlet of 1950, what he wrote was as critical of the British as it was of the Hindus. There is no praise of British rule in India, no admiration for any aspect or consequence of British administration, no grateful reference to the peace and order brought by the imperial power to the chaos in which it found India, no appreciation of the official efforts to give India a just and impartial government, an irrigation system, a network of communications, security against famine, a proper judicial machinery based on law instead of whim, the spread of eduation—all the things for which the British had been congratulated by an earlier generation of Muslim leaders (Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Ameer Ali, the Aga Khan, and several presidents of the Muslim League). Nor do we find Rahmat Ali affirming the argument, so popular among Muslim politicians, that it was British presence which had stood between the Muslims and an oppressive Hindu rule over the whole of India. There is not a single word which can be interpreted as a compliment to the ruling power. On the contrary, his tone is harsh and his pen dipped in acid whenever he talks of the British. He blames them for overthrowing the Mughals and for reducing a Muslim India to a country in which his people have become the actual slaves of the British and potential serfs of the Hindus. He regards the British as usurpers of Muslim sovereignty, not only in India but in many other lands. He speaks

of the agelong hostility of the Christian West against Islam. He dislikes the British so much that he reserves his hardest words for those Muslim politicians who look to foreign rule for protection and help. In his last pamphlet he asks Pakistan to abandon the British Commonwealth, to reject Western culture and to give up its pro-West political stance. These are not the sentiments of a stooge, nor the words of an agent, nor the voice of his master. If we suppose for a moment that the British government had asked him to do its bidding, it had from the first moment of the agreement a veritable Frankenstein's monster on its hands. The accusation is so silly that it will not bear any sane sc

had asked questions about Pakistan in Parliament and in the Joint Select Committee were not supporting it, but showing up the Hindu-Muslim differences, and trying to withhold freedom from both Hindus and Muslims.

In the second place, he pointed out that in 1933 there were in England, apart from the Muslim delegates to the RTC, several Muslim politicians who were "title-holders, collaborators, and office-bearers in political organizations". If the British had wanted some agents from among the Muslims to protect or advance the imperial cause, they would have turned to these "loyal" Muslim politicians, not to a mere student. "They would have done this because, in so great a matter as the future of 100 million Muslims and the Constitution of India, the names of such politicians would have carried far more weight than those of students like myself and my co-signatories."

Finally, he reminded his critics that the partition of India, which he had demanded in 1933 and the Muslim League a few years later, was the surest way of finishing British imperialism, for it implied independence for the whole sub-continent. Even the Hindus realized this nine years earlier, for Lala Lajpat Rai had suggested a partition with the specific purpose of getting rid of foreign rule. For the British to instigate a demand which would bring to an end their supremacy in India was tantamount to committing suicide. Moreover, "even the insinuators will admit that what was a sincere suggestion when made by a Hindoo could not, even by their standards, be called a stooge's demand when made by a Muslim".

Rahmat Ali also denied that he had tried to enlist the support of some British politicians or retired Indian officials. Such allegations were "absolutely devoid of truth". "I never did any such thing, directly or indirectly, and this on principle." He had sent copies of his first circular to all members of parliament and politicians just as he had sent them to Indians of all denominations and political views. The formal postal replies of the British had shown to him "the negative British reaction". Then or later he had had no talks or personal interviews with any British politician.[115]

Similarly, the charge that he had had a rich backer to finance the movement was an utter falsehood. "No such person has ever been associated with us. On the contrary, we have been a body of ordinary Muslims with ordinary means, means which we had to

husband so carefully that from the beginning I had to decide to print only some of the most important declarations and to issue in typescript all other literature, including even the first two editions of this book [*Pakistan*]. This was to reduce to the minimum our expenditure, which from 1933 to 1939 was shared by those of our members who could afford to, though the overall responsibility was and has always been my own. After 1939, to make the Movement self-supporting, I had to dispense with even that and to rule that, in future, apart from the membership subscriptions, the only acceptable contributions to the funds of the Movement even from old members would be the price of literature which they might buy for personal distribution. That is all. The income from this source coupled with that from the membership subscriptions and the general sale of literature through booksellers has, with some contributions from me, sufficed for our work, including the free supply of *lacs* of copies of our propaganda literature to such people all over the world who may be interested in it."[116]

This explanation by Rahmat Ali should be enough to silence the spinners of such stories. But there is yet more evidence in his defence. If Rahmat Ali was speaking with the voice of the British we must be able to find some references to him and his movement in the writings, speeches, books, letters, diaries and journals of at least some of the British public figures who were then active in Indian affairs. Much has now been published relating to that period. Newspaper files, parliamentary debates and party conference proceedings have always been available. Barring one question in the House of Commons and a few in the Joint Select Committee, there is absolutely nothing in favour of or against the PNM in published contemporary political literature. Private papers of most statesmen and politicians of the period have been opened to scholars. Official and cabinet papers up to Rahmat Ali's death are now accessible to the public. Several books based on this new information have appeared. A number of doctoral theses on this period have been prepared in British and American universities under expert and knowledgeable guidance and partly based on unpublished material. There is nothing about Rahmat Ali in this vast literature. It is inconceivable that British official circles, who were allegedly his instigators and financiers, did not write or arrange to be written anything on an issue which had originated

with them.[117]

From 1933 onwards, the period which we are considering here, there was not much sympathy for the Muslims among the British public, in British official policies or in the general British thinking about India. Almost everywhere there was a complete failure to understand the Muslim problem. In the light of this universal apathy it is impossible to believe that the Pakistan scheme originated with the India Office. On the other hand, even those who had some appreciation of the Muslim plight (and their number was very small indeed) were not prepared to consider for a moment the solution of partition, far from blessing Rahmat Ali's ideas and supporting them with monetary help or intellectual effort.[118]

As for the British government's alleged role in instigating Rahmat Ali, it is enough to recall that every cabinet, from Baldwin's at the time of the making of the 1935 federation to Attlee's at the final hour of British withdrawal, was opposed not only to the Pakistan solution but also to the safeguards and ordinary concessions demanded by the Muslim minority. The last imperial act by which an unjust division was carried out in a desperate hurry, by a Viceory anxious to rejoin the Royal Navy, under the guidance of a Labour government, leaves no doubt at all about British attitude towards the creation of Pakistan.

The second reflection on Rahmat Ali consists of the doubts cast by several authors on his parentage of the word Pakistan. These writers divide themselves into four groups.

The first is represented by F.K. Khan Durrani, who, after stating that "it was Iqbal's scheme which a few years later gave birth to Pakistan ideology", claims that "the name itself is of Hindu coinage".[119] This is a surprising statement from the author of a book called *The Meaning of Pakistan*, and is evidently false. There is no need to stop to examine it.

In the second and the largest group it is caution, not ignorance, which leads to doubt. They know that Rahmat Ali coined the word, have a feeling that their knowledge is correct, but are still reluctant to make an unqualified affirmation in his behalf. So they put in a conditional proviso variously phrased as "it is said that", "it is generally considered that", "it is regarded by many that", "there is good reason to believe that", etc. A few examples should be noted. According to a Muslim writer from Hyderabad Deccan, "it is said that these people" (Rahmat Ali and his student

colleagues) created the name Pakistan out of certain letters.[120] A Hindu historian of the Muslim League writes: "Choudhary Rahmat is regarded by many to have been the first to chalk out a scheme of Pakistan", and then goes on to say that he "was certainly not the original author of Pakistan" because "the philosophy of isolation taught to the Muslim community from Sayyid Ahmad's time has to answer for their course".[121] In a doctoral thesis by a Pakistani it is recorded that Rahmat Ali "is considered the originator of the word Pakistan".[122] An American author implies the existence of several versions of the origin of the word in prefacing his account of Rahmat Ali's scheme with the phrases, "The word first appeared in 1933 among Muslim students at Cambridge, with differing accounts of its genesis. According to one source it derived from . . .".[123] Another Pakistani Ph.D. thesis exercizes unnecessary caution in accepting Rahmat Ali's claim. "Rahmat Ali claims to have coined the word 'Pakistan' ", it says, "and there is good reason to believe that his claim was warranted. At least no evidence has been discovered of the use of the term before the publication of this pamphlet [*Now or Never*]."[124]

For the third group, even scepticism is not enough and has to be replaced by denial and by a counterclaim. There has always existed a so-called Iqbal School which has used much enthusiasm and vigour in putting in a claim for their hero which he himself never made. We have already seen that in trying to make Iqbal the sole inspirer of Rahmat Ali, they tell many stories, including the one saying that he approved the name Pakistan when it was submitted to him by Rahmat Ali and his colleagues. There is no evidence for these accounts, but that does not worry their conscience or damp their zeal.

There are some in this group, however, who go further and claim that Iqbal not only gave the idea to Rahmat Ali, but actually coined the word and made a gift of it to the Cambridge student. As far as I have been able to discover, Abdul Waheed Khan, a Muslim Leaguer from the United Provinces, was the first to enter this claim. In a book published in 1961 he said that when Iqbal "went to the Round Table Conference he suggested to an enthusiastic League student worker, Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, that the proposed state should be named PAKISTAN. Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, inspired by the name and conception of the scheme of Pakis-

tan, made it from that very moment his lifelong objective to propagate it in the United Kingdom".[125] Of course, he produces no evidence for this statement. But there is enough testimony on the other side to disprove the allegation. In the first place, his reference to Rahmat Ali as a "League student worker" exposes his total ignorance. In the second place, there is no corroborative evidence from other sources, including those most anxious to advance Iqbal's claim, to support this assertion. In the third place, if Iqbal really did coin the word, how can we explain his failure to support the idea of Pakistan between the RTC and his letters to Jinnah suggesting a division of India? In the fourth place, how could Iqbal have given the idea and the name to a movement at a time when he was participating in the making of a federation which was a most hateful concept to Rahmat Ali and his movement? In the fifth place, if Iqbal had created the word in 1933, 1932 or 1931 (Waheed and others either do not give any date or do not agree on it), why did he not apply it to the scheme he later sent to Jinnah—a scheme which was similar to Rahmat Ali's? Finally, on other points about Rahmat Ali (like Liaquat Ali Khan's alleged offer of an ambassadorship to him in 1948) Waheed's information has been proved to be baseless. The historian has no obligation to accept the word of such a witness.

G. Allana had probably Waheed in view when he wrote that Rahmat Ali "is generally credited with having coined the word Pakistan. However, there are some that hold the view that it is Iqbal who should be given credit for it, as he was the first to suggest it".[126] As he does not refer to Waheed, his readers may be forgiven for counting him among those who are bent upon bringing in Iqbal's name to belittle Rahmat Ali without sufficient reason or authority.

The last group has an interesting background. Between March and July 1964, as was mentioned above, Muhammad Anwar published three articles in a Lahore English daily in which, for the first time, the services of Rahmat Ali to the cause of Pakistan were recalled and an account of his ideas and movement given. This set off a bitter controversy. Anwar was assailed by three different groups. One was the Iqbal School which asserted that the poet was the real progenitor of the Pakistan idea and Rahmat Ali owed everything to his inspiration. The second saw in any effort to appreciate Rahmat Ali a cirticism and belittling of Jinnah, and

emphasized Rahmat Ali's attack on him to the exclusion of other things. The third made a new claim, *viz.*, that even the name Pakistan was not really coined by Rahmat Ali, but by Khwaja Abdur Rahim.

It is this last point which concerns us here. It was Mian Abdul Haq who claimed that the word was coined by Rahim. In his thrid article, Anwar called it untrue, pointed out that Rahim himself had never, in his lifetime, made this claim, and characterized Abdul Haq's article as "a strange amalgam of some truth, a good deal of half truths and a large amount of fable" and "an attempt to belittle the stature and role of Rahmat Ali".[127] Haq had produced no evidence except his own knowledge and memory. S.M. Ikram, whose book was being written when this controversy was raging, seemed to believe Haq, and justified his conviction by referring to the testimony of Dr. Jahangir Khan, who was at Cambridge in the 'thirties and to whom Ikram had addressed "an oral inquiry".[128] In 1978 Jahangir came out with his own assertion of Rahim being the coiner of the word. According to him, in December 1932 Rahmat Ali, Rahim and he went to see Iqbal. During this meeting Rahmat Ali pointed towards Rahim and told Iqbal that "the word 'Pakistan' is his coinage [*tadwin*]", and then explained its etymology. Iqbal said, " 'What you should do is to write all these words [*sic.*] on a piece of paper and pin the paper on the wall above my head. I will think about it in the solitude of the night'. Next day when Chaudhri Sahib went to Iqbal, the latter said that he had been contemplating for a long time but had not been able to think of a better word and that it should be adopted".[129] This is a slightly different version of what Mian Amiruddin had written in 1964,[130] and which was quoted in the previous pages. But Amiruddin, though a bitter critic of Rahmat Ali and the father-in-law of Rahim, did *not* claim that Rahim had coined the word. Rahim's own testimony disproves Jahangir's and Abdul Haq's claims on his behalf. In his speech on the occasion of a Rahmat Ali Remembrance Day meeting at the Aitchison College, Rahim is reported to have said: "We were all sitting together when Chaudhri Rahmat Ali suggested the name Pakistan for our country. I personally went to Iqbal to inform him of this. I found him sitting at the bank of the Thames, and on hearing what I told him he jumped out of his seat from joy and said, 'it is such a nice name as to warrant unlimited pride' ".[131]

The only other person to make Rahim the father of the name was Khwaja Salahuddin Ahmad, the son of the late Khwaja Kamal-uddin who founded the Ahmadiyya Muslim Mission at Woking, who, in an article in January 1966, asserted from memory that Rahim had coined the word at a meeting in Woking.[132] But there are so many contradictions in his narration that it is difficult to believe him.

In sum, only three persons—Mian Abdul Haq, Dr. Jahangir Khan and Khwaja Salahuddin—contest Rahmat Ali's parentage of the word. They are not supported by any other source. They produce no documents. They rely on their power of recall. All this amounts to the belated awakening of a memory, and nothing more. For over thirty years no one had refuted Rahmat Ali's claim that he had coined the word. Then abruptly someone gets up and says that Rahim was the real coiner. Then somebody else confirms this from memory. Fourteen years later another Cambridge man wakes up and tells the unlikely story of three students visiting Iqbal and finding him sitting on the bank of a river.

Three questions arise out of the matter being discussed. First, why did these people keep silent on such an important issue for so many years? Why did their memory need the prod of Anwar's article to become active? Were they reminiscing about Rahmat Ali in a genial, nostalgic, friendly mood, or trying deliberately to run him down? Did they have a vested interest in making these statements? Mian Abdul Haq's wild invective rules him out as a trustworthy chronicler. Jahangir makes so many innuendos and insinuations in his interview that he has to be declared a hostile witness. (Full details are given in the following section.) Salahuddin is bent upon making a connection between the birth of the word Pakistan and the Ahmadiyya missionary work in England.

Secondly, Rahmat Ali's own account of how and when he came to coin the word must have been well known to these people. He had used the word for the first time in his leaflet in January 1933, and on two later occasions set it down clearly that he had thought of it towards the end of 1932.[133] As they claim to have been his contemporaries, close friends and colleagues, it is natural to assume that they were not only familiar with all his writings but actually participated in the development of the movement. If Rahmat Ali's claim was false, then, by failing to expose him at

that time and by continuing to be active in his movement, they made themselves accessories to a fraud. If they were not inside the movement, then we are being asked to accept their word on something which they had had no opportunity of knowing at first hand. If they were in possession of some evidence which bears out their claim (like a letter from Rahmat Ali or something published in the 'thirties) but refuse to share it with us, then we are entitled to entertain genuine doubts about an evidence which is so shy as to hide itself behind the deceptive facade of human memory.

Finally, what possible explanation can they give for Rahim's failure to make this claim in his lifetime? He was once a friend of Rahmat Ali's. In 1940 he had agreed to act as an emissary of the Punjab government and had travelled to Colombo in order to stop Rahmat Ali from coming to India. Their friendship was at an end. Later offers of a reconciliation by Rahim's father were spurned by Rahmat Ali: patronage of traitors was no part of his moral code. From 1940 till his death Rahim had ample opportunity to strike back and claim the credit of having coined the word. In spite of his self-glorification and his bitterness against Rahmat Ali he did not do so—because he had no evidence to sustain such a claim. That should be enough to repel this charge brought against Rahmat Ali by his former "friends".

Rahmat Ali's "Friends"

Friends are the prizes of life, and in a civilized society friendship is as much a convenience as a grace of human intercourse. We are born into a family and have no voice in the choice of our relatives. But we choose our friends, nourish the connection, foster the relationship, cherish the bonds, and feel entitled to rely upon them, to have expectations, and to call upon them for help, support and sheer joy of living.

Rahmat Ali's temperament was warm, and he was fond of human company. His circle of friends was large when he lived in Lahore. In Cambridge he made many Indian friends, to whom he gave generously whatever he had: time, affection, loyalty, hospitality, even money. How did they return these kindnesses? On their return to India, some forgot him as if he had been a companion of a few hours in a train journey, some kept in touch by correspondence, some worked for his movement with enthu-

siasm, but the majority cast him out of its mind. The problems of daily life, of making a career, of currying favour with the government and other preoccupations dried up the old sentiment. Gradually the tender plant withered and died. This is not the group which interests us.

But Rahmat Ali had also created a small, close circle of friends and confidants who had sworn their loyalty and promised to advance the cause of his and their movement in India. Next to the cruelty of the governments of Pakistan, the ingratitude and betrayal of this group were the biggest tragedy of Rahmat Ali's life. With one or two exceptions, these people not only left him one by one but missed no opportunity of besmirching his name and piosoning the government and the nation against him. The activities of a few of these supple opportunists are worth recording.

We have already described how Khwaja Abdur Rahim and Pir Ahsanuddin behaved in Colombo in 1940 and shocked Rahmat Ali by their conduct. When his entry into the Punjab was barred none of his friends protested. His "loyal supporters", who had established societies and associations to propagate his message, written articles in praise of him and hugged his Pakistan Plan to their breasts, were not to be found anywhere. Again, in 1948 when he was persecuted, tortured and finally hounded out of Pakistan, the silence of his friends was audible throughout the country. None spoke on his behalf. None came to sympathise with him. When the news of his death reached Pakistan in 1951 there were no obituary notices, no messages of condolence, no public statements of mourning, no homage to the deceased, not even a meeting to pray for his soul. For his "friends" he had died several years ago. This was the general attitude. But a few of his erstwhile colleagues went further and joined the campaign of vilification against him.

Jahangir Khan was in Cambridge from 1932 to 1939, earning a doctorate in history. He was also a founding member of the PNM and one of its active workers. In his interview on Rahmat Ali given in 1978 there was no trace of fairness or justice, not to speak of affection or regard. He rejected Rahmat Ali's claim of being the inventor of the word Pakistan. About his writings, he said, "I have seen some of these short pamphlets. These books contain many misstatements". Asked about Rahmat Ali's sources of income in Cambridge, he replied, "I don't know anything about this". When

asked if there was a regular fund maintained for the movement, he answered, "No, just a few friends and acquaintances contributed something from time to time". About Rahmat Ali's open letter to members of parliament distributed in July 1935, he said that "it was a letter sent to a woman whose name I don't remember". On Rahmat Ali's college days in Lahore, the comment was, "He was not a good student and failed three or four times".[134] These are the views and "facts" supplied by a man who lived in Cambridge and worked with Rahmat Ali for seven years. He was also a trained historian and an academic by profession.

Khwaja Abdur Rahim, an ICS probationer, was at Peterhouse, Cambridge, from 1930 to 1932. In 1965 he wrote that "for the first two years, viz., end of 1930 to end of 1932, the cradle of the [Pakistan National] movement was undoubtedly Cambridge". On his return to India at the end of 1932 "I started work for the movement in the areas of India now known as Pakistan".[135] By this account, Rahmat Ali founded the movement in 1930, when he was still in Lahore; the implication being that it was Rahim himself who established it in 1930 and ran it till the end of 1932.

In the movement itself there were several careerists and exploiters whose misdeeds are recounted by one of their colleagues. One of them was an ardent supporter of the movement, won the confidence of Rahmat Ali, and was entrusted by him with an important mission. He accepted the responsibility, but exceeded his intructions to such an extent as to compromise his own honour, damage the cause of the movement and bring a bad name to Rahmat Ali. When disciplinary action was taken against him, he became hostile and had to be expelled. This deepened his bitterness and he made it the purpose of his life to smear Rahmat Ali's name and work.[136]

Another friend put in much practice to learn to imitate Rahmat Ali's Urdu handwriting, and used this accomplishment for forging a large number of letters on Rahmat Ali's private stationery, both headed and plain. For certain reasons he could not work openly for the movement (was he an ICS probationer or a government servant on leave?). On the pretext of using the map of Pakistan for unobtrusive propaganda among potential supporters, he managed to get from Rahmat Ali a considerable quantity of his private stationery. Then, with the excuse of making a hobby of collecting

various types of stationery, he asked Rahmat Ali to send him always an extra sheet or two of any odd notepaper he might use in his travels for writing to him from a hotel or a steamship. On these sheets he forged a large number of letters in Urdu couched in Rahmat Ali's style and interspersed with passages from his original, genuine letters. It is said that his plan was to use these letters after Rahmat Ali's death to establish himself as having been his greatest confidant, and also to use them in obstructing Rahmat Ali's work in his lifetime by exploiting bogus criticisms by Rahmat Ali of his own friends and followers and thus prejudicing them against him.[137]

Then there was the friend who attempted to plagiarize some of Rahmat Ali's writings. In 1937 Rahmat Ali prepared an abridged edition of *Pakistan* and had roneoed a small number of copies for the private use of his close associates. The idea was to equip them with a concise yet comprehensive information book providing answers to various questions and criticisms concerning the Pakistan plan; this was intended to help them in their propaganda for the movement. In 1939 a fuller summary of the book was issued for the same purpose. To safeguard his right of authorship Rahmat Ali had instructed all users of the book to treat it as meant only for their personal use and in no case to let it go out of their possession. In 1940 he was forced to entrust to a person for safe-keeping a copy of the full manuscript of the book, including several maps. This was done in Colombo, and the friend was expected to hand it back to Rahmat Ali in Karachi. However, he kept it with him in Lahore for several weeks, knowing that Rahmat Ali could not come to Lahore, and had a copy typed.[138]

Another friend tried to steal the authorship of the word Pakistan by a trick of forgery. "In 1932 when Rahmat Ali derived the name Pakistan from the names of the five provinces . . . 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 of Pakis-

tan. 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 inquiry, it was found that this forger had added a dot under the letter ز , added a little blob to the first ر , making it و , and dotted the second ر , 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!"[139]

The most virulent personal attack on Rahmat Ali also came from an old "friend". Mian Abdul Haq, who had lived in London in the 'thirties, was called to the bar and had been a member of the PNM, started in 1964 a well-organized campaign against the proposed reburial of Rahmat Ali's remains in Pakistan. At this time he was practising law at Montgomery (later Sahiwal in the Punjab) and was a member of the National Assembly of Pakistan and a supporter of President Ayub Khan's regime. He died in Sahiwal on 26 January 1971 at the age of 62.

In reply to Anwar's three articles in *The Pakistan Times* in March-June 1964, Haq wrote seven articles in Urdu in the *Nawa-i-Waqt* of Lahore in which he let his hatred for Rahmat Ali go on the rampage. He made the following points. In 1932 when one day Rahmat Ali, Rahim and Pir Ahsanuddin were strolling on the bank of the Cam in Cambridge, Rahim suggested that a demand should be made for a separate Muslim state comprising the Punjab, Sind, NWFP, Baluchistan and Kashmir. This was agreed upon. Then the idea was presented to Iqbal, who appreciated it very much, but refused to put it before the RTC. Later, while travelling in a bus in Golders Green in London, Rahim told Rahmat Ali that this state should be called Pakistan. Rahmat Ali agreed, and later Iqbal also approved of it. A few days later Rahmat Ali and Rahim wrote *Now or Never*. The three signatories (apart from Rahmat Ali) to the declaration had nothing to do with the leaflet beyond a financial contribution towards its publication. Later Iqbal told us that the leaflet was placed before a meeting of all the Muslim delegates to the RTC at the Aga Khan's flat, and almost everybody had condemned it. Only the Aga Khan had said, "Don't criticize it. This manifesto is the veritable foundation-stone of the

politics of the future." We asked Iqbal to patronize our movement, but he refused. In 1934 we founded the Pakistan National Congress, with Rahmat Ali as its founder-president, I myself its president and Jahangir Khan its joint secretary. A deputation of this Congress, consisting of Rahmat Ali, Rahim and some others, saw Jinnah in London and requested him to support the Pakistan scheme. He put them off. In reply to the attitude of the Muslim League witnesses before the Joint Select Committee and of the Muslim members of the Committee, I wrote a memorandum which was published in nearly every British and Indian newspaper. On his return to India, Rahim was the most active propagandist of the PNM. In 1937, when I returned from England, I found his residence (4 Sanda Road, Lahore) to be the biggest centre in the sub-continent of the movement. When Halide Edib came to London, we decided that Rahmat Ali should see her and convince her of the Pakistan ideal. In spite of being a great talker, he failed to have any effect on the Turkish visitor. When he reported his failure to us in Cambridge, Jahangir, I and he discussed the matter and finally thought of a plan to persuade her to support us. We would claim that a majority of the people of north-west India were Turks from Central Asia, and therefore Pakistan would be a country with a majority of Turks. This tactic succeeded and Halide asked Rahmat Ali to write an article on this. This article was written by Jahangir and myself in several days and it appeared *verbatim* in a chapter of her book. Despite many weaknesses, Rahmat Ali was an admirable person. He was very honest and a man of integrity. After 1937, when I and Jahangir Khan returned to India, Rahmat Ali turned a fascist by temperament and dictatorial in attitude. In 1940, after his return from India, Rahmat Ali became an enemy of Jinnah because he realized he was a failure and he suffered from an inferiority complex. He came to Lahore in 1948, but after a while wenft back for no known reason.[140]

Only the printable portions of Haq's narration have been translated and summarized here. His general tone was one of hot displeasure, contempt and blind rage. The concluding article was abusive, at places obscene. One can see in this outpouring convulsions of jealousy, paroxysms of rage, but no twinge of remorse. Calumny is his favoured weapon. An ego of an uncommon size glories in self-praise.

Haq's autobiographical narrative does not deserve a serious

analysis. But a few gross inaccuracies ought to be underlined. Both the idea and the name of Pakistan have been made the exclusive invention of Rahim, though Rahim himself never claimed the honours. How could Rahim have helped Rahmat Ali write *Now or Never* when he was back in India at the end of 1932? Why did Haq himself not sign the declaration? The meeting at the Aga Khan's flat is not mentioned in his memoirs. The Pakistan National Congress has never been heard of. What was its connection with the PNM? When was it wound up and by whom? The memorandum which he wrote is not to be found in any British or Indian newspaper. Rahim was an ICS officer and was posted to various places in the 'thirties. How did he manage to work for the "movement" so actively while serving as a government servant? How did his home in Lahore become the biggest centre of the Pakistan movement in India? Was Halide Edib, who had visited north-west India so recently, really taken in by the argument that the majority of the people in that area were Central Asians? How did Haq and Jahangir Khan achieve the miracle of writing the article for Halide's book in Rahmat Ali's style and language? Jahangir Khan says that he returned to India in 1939, but according to Haq he came back in 1937. Did Haq's departure from England effect such a magical change in Rahmat Ali's character that an honest and admirable person was transformed into a fascist and a dictator? Though claiming to have known Rahmat Ali so well, Haq did not know why he had to leave Pakistan in 1948. The omissions in his diatribe are as significant as his assertions. There is no mention of the Pakistan National Movement or of the pamphlets issued by it, of Rahmat Ali's efforts to popularize the ideal of Pakistan, or of any other associates and members of the movement except Rahim, Jahangir and himself. The firm impression given by these articles is that Rahim was the originator of the idea of Pakistan and the inventor of the name, that Haq was the guiding spirit in establishing the Pakistan National Congress, that the Pakistan National Movement did not exist, that Rahmat Ali was an insignificant and dim-witted worker of the Congress, acting under the shadow and orders of Haq and Jahangir, that, in short, Rahmat Ali was an obscure man who should be left in a well-deserved oblivion.

Not content with putting this plethora of libels in print, Haq put enough organized pressure on Ayub and his government to order the cancellation of the permit issued to Rahmat Ali's brother

to bring his remains to Pakistan for reburial.

It is significant that during this debate on Rahmat Ali, none of his old "friends" spoke out. Jahangir who was mentioned so often by Haq kept quiet. Rahim, whom Haq made the real hero, was so overwhelmed by modesty that he did not say a word. The silence of these and other people who knew the facts approved of Haq's despicable falsehoods and sealed the fate of Rahmat Ali. Haq was deeply gratified and boasted to his friends that he would always see to it that Rahmat Ali was never buried in Pakistan. In an evil society such prophecies are apt to be fulfilled.

In 1970 Anwar and Rahmat Ali's brother made another effort to transfer Rahmat Ali's coffin to Pakistan. The government of General Yahya Khan was on the point of granting permission when Haq again came into the field. In two articles published in *Nida-i-Millat* in June he repeated his earlier statements with some added embellishment. He stressed these points: In August 1933 I was elected the first president of the Pakistan movement. Rahmat Ali had come under the influence of Rahim when they had met at Malik Umar Hayat Tiwana's house in London in late 1930, and it was on his suggestion that Rahmat Ali gave up the idea of seeking admission in Oxford and joined Cambridge. Rahim had coined the word Pakistan and had received Iqbal's approval for it. Soon after my election to the presidentship of the movement Rahmat Ali swore on the Quran and gave me in writing that he would always remain loyal to the Pakistan ideal and strive for its achievement. Rahim returned to India in December 1938 and continued his struggle for Pakistan. I published a pamphlet on 1 November 1933 in reply to the anti-Pakistan attitude of the Muslim members and witnesses of the Joint Select Committee. The chapter in Halide Edib's book on Pakistan was written jointly by Rahmat Ali, Jahangir Khan and myself. I returned to India in 1936. In 1939 Rahmat Ali visited Colombo and on Rahim's suggestion came to Karachi. I went to Colombo to welcome him. In Karachi the Pakistan National Congress held its sessions. When Rahmat Ali was in Karachi, Rahim, Jahangir, Taskhir Ahmad, Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan and I impressed upon him the necessity of his staying back in India to help the Pakistan movement, but for personal reasons he was not prepared to do so. The Pakistan scheme issued from Cambridge in early 1933 was the work of the Pakistan National Congress. Later Jinnah added Bengal to it. So

when in 1940 Rahmat Ali saw that the Muslims had begun to trust Jinnah and accept him as their only spokesman he was, quite naturally, deeply disappointed. He considered Jinnah as his rival. In the 'thirties he had been deeply influenced by the ideology of the German Nazi party and had come to have a faith in its principles. It was under this influence that he developed a hatred for Jinnah and the Muslim League. He wanted Pakistan but he let the League fight its battle, himself choosing to live far away from the battlefield for purely personal reasons. It is a pity that instead of fighting the enemy he decided to curse the very people who were struggling to achieve Pakistan. Whatever he said against Jinnah and the Muslim League was historically untenable and in fact betrayed his own defeat and desperation. His writings after 1940 contain severe attacks on Iqbal. Thus he blackened the names of our two greatest heroes and allied himself with the enemies of Islam and Pakistan. A man who preferred the comfortable life of Cambridge to the national struggle in India had no right to criticize the freedom fighters. After 1940 he was very thick with the pro-British Punjabi Unionists in Britain. Was he serving the cause of Pakistan in this company? Today the Pakistani nation is passing through a critical and perilous period, and at this stage any attempt at giving Rahmat Ali a status which he does not deserve is tantamount to creating a mental and intellectual confusion in the nation, raising new issues and adding to its trials and troubles. To ignore his infamoûs conduct during the years after 1940 is to belittle Iqbal and Jinnah and those hundreds of thousands of martyrs who died for the achievement of Pakistan. To bring his remains to Pakistan means approving his abuse of Jinnah and the League and his venomous remarks about our spiritual leader Iqbal. Those who demand his reburial here are in reality disruptionists and subversionists who want to disfigure (*masakh karna*) Jinnah's and Iqbal's personalities for their own selfish and unholy ends.[141]

This outburst was not enough to assuage his wounded pride or whatever moved his diseased brain. On 11 July 1970, Haq wrote an open letter in English and distributed it widely in Pakistan. He also sent many copies of it to people in Britain. Portions of this missive, entitled "Rahmat Ali's anti Quaid-i-Azam, anti Iqbal, anti Muslim League Propaganda and Question of Removing His Body to Pakistan", should be reproduced here to show the level

of his argument. "You may have noticed a sinister move which has been set afoot by certain persons for bringing the body of the late Chaudhry Rahmat Ali from Cambridge, where he lies buried since 1951, to Pakistan." Once Jinnah was accepted as the sole authoritative leader of the Muslim nation, "Rahmat Ali, in sheer desperation and frustration, launched a campaign of vilification and hatred against the Quaid-i-Azam". He lived in England and "did not care to be in the sub-continent where the battle for Pakistan was fought against the heaviest odds". The advice to him of his friends and well-wishers to return to Pakistan proved fruitless. "The reasons for his staying away from the country were entirely private." In his pamphlets and statements he "used highly abusive, dirty, shocking and provocative words against" Jinnah, and "made defamatory and derogatory statements" against Iqbal. "The purpose of those who want to bring his body for burial in Pakistan is to create a centre of disruption, and to provide opportunities for bringing into disrepute the personalities of Jinnah and Iqbal, and damage their historic role, and that of the Muslim League in winning the battle for Pakistan. The adherents of foreign ideologies who are enjoying licence to advocate them freely in Pakistan today, and other disruptors who are attacking the foundational principles of the Nation and the State, are bent upon disfiguring the national images of Jinnah and Iqbal, and deprive the Muslim League of the credit due to it for its historic work in winning Pakistan. Their technique is to damage the personalities of the two national heroes, and undermine people's loyalties to and faith in them, and confuse and confound the masses, and thus create an atmosphere for planting imported 'isms', or disrupting the nation from within, and rob the nation of its discipline, faith and unity, and thus either wreck or weaken Pakistan for ulterior motives. It appears that the object is not to honour Chaudhry Rahmat Ali, but to exploit his name, for acquiring cheap popularity or facilitating the realization of anti-national objectives. The suggestion has been made that Chaudhry Rahmat Ali should be buried either near Allama Iqbal's tomb (Mazar) or near the Pakistan Memorial in Iqbal Park, Lahore. If this project is allowed to fructify, no graver insult could be offered to the memories and historic task performed by the Quaid-i-Azam and Allama Iqbal. I, therefore, appeal to you that, as a patriotic Pakistani, you rise in defence of your national heroes, the Quaid-i-Azam and Allama

Iqbal, must activate yourself, and frustrate the plans and designs to which I have alluded above, and thus save the vexed nation from further spiritual and mental confusion and torture. . . . I, therefore, hope that you will, in every way possible, publicly express yourself against the said sinister move, pregnant with evil."[142]

It will be noticed that in this circular letter there is not the slightest reference to Rahmat Ali's movement, his coinage of the word Pakistan, or his services and sacrifices. Among Rahmat Ali's "friends" common decency seems to have been an uncommon virtue.

One of the persons to whom this letter was sent was Mr. Ian Stephens, a former editor of the *Statesman* and at this time a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Let the words of this British scholar from a Christian land stand as the final commentary on the perjury of a Muslim Pakistani from an Islamic state: "For twenty years or more I have vaguely felt that Chaudhri Rahmat Ali had been regretfully ignored, or at any rate insufficiently honoured in Pakistan; a State to which, whatever may be thought about some aspects of his activities, he unquestionably rendered a major and indelible historical service by inventing her name . . . . I had of course heard, on a number of occasions while in 'our subcontinent', from 1947 onwards, that, round about the date of the creation of Pakistan, he had found himself in some disagreement with her creators, notably with the Quaid, and that there had been unpleasant controversy. But I have never seen the 'pamphlets and statements' mentioned in paras. 6 and 7 of your circular, nor, indeed, have I met anyone else who has done so. And I am therefore unable to guess how I, personally, might react to them. In any case, do you not perhaps think that, in generosity to a dead man who spent his declining years in neglect and penury, things which he may have written or said in those years, even if 'shocking and provocative', might now after so long a time, be allowed to fade from memory, and some remaining national honour, by Pakistan, be rendered to him? I do venture to suggest that you should consider this."[143]

The Governments of Pakistan

Since 1948 the attitude of the successive governments of Pakistan has been one of active hostility against Rahmat Ali and

everything associated with him. In fact, the campaign against him was started by the government of Liaquat Ali Khan. Rahmat Ali was treated like a common criminal and ordered to leave the country. His money was forzen in a Pakistani bank and he was not allowed to transfer it to England. His writings were proscribed, but this edict was not published in the press. Requests by his relatives and friends to permit his reburial in Pakistan were turned down.

Rahmat Ali finds no mention in the hundreds of official publications put forth since 1947 on the country's history. There is no entry on him in the 23-volume *Urdu Encyclopaedia of Islam*, the most comprehensive work of reference produced in Pakistan, whose planning, preparation and publication by the University of the Punjab took 36 years. The 209-page article on Pakistan prepared by the editorial board dismisses him in 8 lines, saying that he gave a name to Iqbal's 1930 demand, established a party in London in 1932, held public meetings in England, and that his Pakistan comprised the Punjab, NWFP, Kashmir and Baluchistan (with Sind omitted). The 12-member committee which managed and supervised the Encyclopaedia project consisted of 8 civil servants, one retired general, and 3 professors of Urdu, Persian and Islamiat. All school textbooks are prepared by government employees and approved by official Textbook Boards. Naturally they don't contain correct information on him. Books used for teaching in colleges and universities present the same picture.[144] Radio and television transmissions are a part of the federal ministry of information and broadcasting, and follow the official line or rather prescribe it. Programmes are prepared and broadcast or shown on obscure poets, writers, politicians and singers, but none has ever featured Rahmat Ali. A chain of important newspapers, both English and Urdu, is owned and run by the government, and whatever its several dailies and magazines publish is subject to official approval. The bulk of the rest of the press is either indifferent or too cowardly to run the gauntlet of official displeasure.

Regrets on Indifference

Even in the atmosphere of near-universal neglect and official and non-official hostility protests have been made and regrets

expressed on the way the nation and the state have treated Rahmat Ali. A short summary of this reaction is given here, partly to show that the spark of sympathy has not been snuffed out completely by public indifference and the official encouragement of it, partly to set the record straight lest the reader might think that all Pakistanis bowed their heads before the ill-wind of enmity and prejudice, and partly to find out something about the background of those who expressed this sentiment. We will list these expressions in a chronological order.

"To forget the lives of such famous sons of the country is not only a misfortune but an ominous sign of political decline", wrote a member of Rahmat Ali's Gujjar community.[145] Khaliquzzaman, the only Muslim League leader to have said a kind word about him, concluded his treatment of Rahmat Ali in these words: "What a shame that the people in Pakistan do not offer *Fateha* [Muslim prayer for the soul of the dead] for one who gave them the name of the State by which they swear! Is it not indeed the height of ingratitude?"[146] "It is a matter of deep regret", wrote Khwaja Rahmat Husain, "that we did not give this young man the appreciation and respect he deserved".[147] Another mourned the fact that the Muslim nation "for which he sacrificed whatever he had has today cast him out of its mind completely".[148] A professor at the Karachi University bemoaned the mentality of his countrymen in stronger words. "It is indeed regrettable that till today the country for which he devoted the best years of his life has neither created a memorial to him nor taken any step to recall his achievements. A pity! What a pity! Our nation has become so insensitive that it does not feel the need of putting its benefactor's name on the page of its history. . . . Will the feeling portion of our people abandon its indifference and even now establish a memorial to this forgotten hero? We are waiting for it."[149] A letter-writer to a daily was shocked to find that "his services were never acknowledged during his life: perhaps he never needed it. Let us do so now, otherwise history will never forgive us. . . . He is a great national hero."[150]

"There could be no greater ingratitude on the part of Pakistanis", said a senior journalist, "than to ignore the contribution of Chaudhri Rahmat Ali to the evolution of Muslim nationalism. Besides giving this country its name, he provided it with a rationale and spelled out its *raison d'etre*".[151] He complained later that it

was a pity that Rahmat Ali's "pioneering contribution . . . should have been ignored by his countrymen".[152] An anonymous writer in an Urdu daily found it a strange sight that Rahmat Ali's name and achievements were unknown, not only to the present generation of Pakistanis but also to the great majority of those who had participated in the Pakistan movement and had helped in the creation of the country.[153] A professor of Political Science at the Karachi University used stronger language in giving vent to his bitterness. "This is the height of our national callousness, and I hope that both the government and the public spirited leaders of Pakistan should take prompt action to set up a research institute in his memory for the purpose of conducting researches on Rahmat Ali and other leaders of Pakistan Movement. . . . I wish to draw the kind attention of Prime Minister Bhutto to the prevailing ignorance of our people about the genesis of the Pakistan Movement and its founders like Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, and hope that he will issue directives to the Commission on the National History of Pakistan, and other similar research organizations and universities of Pakistan to initiate a well co-ordinated research programme ultimately leading to the preparation of an authentic official biography of Chaudhri Rahmat Ali."[154] One Karachiite regretted that "our leading city has so far taken no steps to commemorate his achievement";[155] another added that "in the Bath Island area of Karachi there is a road named after Chaudhri Rahmat Ali, but in this city of 5.5 million there will hardly be two to four hundred persons who know that he coined the word Pakistan".[156]

A former civil servant believed that he "deserves much more attention from us Pakistanis than we have showed him so far".[157] A former diplomat, who resigned in disgust after ten years' experience of moral corruption in his service and migrated to Sri Lanka, and who had met Rahmat Ali in Bonn in 1937, expressed similar ideas.[158]

Of these thirteen expressions of regret only one came from a politician and a Muslim Leaguer. No other leader of the League or any other party shared this feeling. There were two ex-bureaucrats who spoke out, and two known journalists, and two Karachi professors. The rest carried no weight. About half of these comments appeared during 1975-77 when Pakistan was experiencing one of its rare spells of democracy, and the government was not as unsympathetic to Rahmat Ali as its predecessors and its successor.

There was no historian with enough courage to make a public statement on the topic.

Even when we add to this list of complaints the tributes paid to Rahmat Ali at various meetings and in several articles and letters to newspapers, the total is by no means impressive. If one hundred individuals have remembered or appreciated him in 36 years, it is a compliment to their courage of conviction, but it does not exonerate the nation, the country and the governments of their senseless indifference and animus. As one of his British contemporaries in Cambridge wrote in 1971, "Like Mazzini in Italy, he was the prophet whose propaganda led to the creation of a new state which other people governed and effectively barred him from any share in its national life."[159]

Reasons for this Attitude

To the Pakistani public Rahmat Ali is not even a name. But the fault lies not so much with the public as with the intellectual moulders of opinion and the media of communication and projection, both of whom have always been under draconian official control and guidance. And yet much that has been done for other leaders and historical figures has been denied to Rahmat Ali. There exist several societies and associations and academies devoted to reviving and perpetuating the memory of individual politicians and men of letters. Rais Ahmad Jafri established a Muhammad Ali Academy in Lahore in the 1960's. In Karachi there are Nawab Bahadur Yar Jang Society, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad Memorial Society, even an Abul Kalam Azad Research Institute, and others. There was even a Josh Academy, founded in his lifetime, to celebrate the achievements of a second-class poet who publicly reviled Jinnah, Iqbal, the Muslim League, the creation of Pakistan, and the Prophet of Islam. A succession of governments gave him Pakistani citizenship, well-paid jobs, a free residence and a handsome monthly allowance. He was made a founding-member of the national Academy of Letters, and on his death in 1982 the President of the country paid him homage in a public statement.

Pakistani newspapers, both English and Urdu, have a commendable practice of publishing large supplements on the anniversaries of national significance: 23 March or Pakistan Day when in 1940 the Lahore Resolution was passed (though in fact it should be 24

March), 21 April or Iqbal Day when the poet died, 14 August or Independence Day on which Pakistan was created, 11 September or the day of Jinnah's death, 9 November on which Iqbal was officially born, and 25 December on which Jinnah was born. Supplements also appear on the death anniversaries of much smaller men, like Abdur Rab Nishtar and Hamid Nizami. Several of the articles carried by these special issues contain valuable historical material and offer much that is not available elsewhere. In view of the meagre historical scholarship in the country, and the politicians' general reluctance to write books but ready willingness to contribute to the newspapers, these supplements provide compulsory reading for students of modern national history. Unfortunately, the practice of years has made these collections of articles monotonous and formalized. They follow the easy way of producing a lot of stuff on certain well-known figures, completely ignoring others. Every supplement has a riot of columns on Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the birth of the Muslim League, the Simla Deputation, the Khilafat movement, Mawlana Muhammad Ali, Jinnah, the Lahore Resolution, and Iqbal. No attempt is made by the editors to commission contributions on other subjects or other personages. Some men of acknowledged brilliance and influence, like Sayyid Ameer Ali, are ignored. Several articles, particularly on Jinnah and the creation of Pakistan, are repeated at intervals of two or three years without any indication of their earlier appearance.

One reason for this make-up of the supplements is the general tendency of giving the purely political a priority over the intellectual, the literary and the social. Another is the established newspaper view of giving the readers what they want—popular stuff which will keep them happy and at the same time save the editor some hard work. For the government-controlled newspapers, the scope and reach of the articles are dictated by the establishment. Without exception, the articles are a collective exercize in hagiography.

On Rahmat Ali some newspapers have carried short articles and letters to the editor. Longer and more serious contributions appeared only during the 1964 controversy engendered by Anwar's articles, and almost all of them were harshly critical of Rahmat Ali.[160] No newspaper has ever issued a supplement on him.

Research and historical societies and institutions have taken no more notice of Rahmat Ali than have the newspapers. They are

ideally placed in terms of funds, resources and talent to broaden their interest into fields which so far have received little attention. Far from producing any studies on him, they have not even reprinted some of his pamphlets which are not proscribed. Much misunderstanding and misrepresentation have surrounded Rahmat Ali and his movement for the simple reason that some of his writings are banned by the government and the rest are not available in any library in the country. No librarian has been moved by his professional conscience or by a demand from scholars to fill the gap by procuring photocopies from foreign holdings. Only the National Museum of Karachi has acquired two or three of his pamphlets.

The departments of history at the various universities have paid no attention to Rahmat Ali. The staff has written nothing about him. The students have produced a few hundred M.A. dissertations of varying quality on minor, even insignificant, topics. There is none on the origin of the Pakistan movement, or Rahmat Ali, or the meaning and genesis of the word Pakistan. No established historian has attempted a book on Rahmat Ali. In early 1963, I.H. Qureshi told Gujjar Ali Hasan Chauhan that he had in his possession all that Rahmat Ali had published, and was planning to write his biography. Chauhan offered his services in this undertaking, and begged Qureshi to sell the source material, after use, to the Gujjar Association which would preserve it. Qureshi did not agree to accept any help from the Association, but promised to write the book. After a year, on an inquiry by Professor Ghulam Sarwar of the Karachi University, Qureshi said that he had been too busy even to start work on the biography.[161] Between 1964 and his death in 1981, Qureshi wrote and published several books, but the one on Rahmat Ali did not get written.

The result of this indifference is a massive ignorance about Rahmat Ali among the country's educated and intellectual classes; and because of Rahmat Ali, this ignorance extends to the meaning of the name of the country. Between 1969 and 1982 I conducted a private survey of my own on what Pakistanis knew about Rahmat Ali and the word Pakistan. During my frequent visits to the country, and particularly in 1973-78 when I lived there, I had ample opportunity to ask simple questions and record the answers. While recruiting research fellows of various grades for the National Commission on Historical and Cultural Research

in 1974, I had to interview thirty-five candidates, ranging from fresh M.A.'s in history to school teachers and college and university lecturers and professors with foreign research training. I asked them my four questions and was staggered by the replies. The results of my survey are summarized in the table 2:

These figures don't invite comment. They incite horror. Out of two hundred members of the elite of Pakistan, only eleven know that Rahmat Ali coined the word (two are in doubt), only one has the correct precise date, and only 19 know the correct meaning of the word. Less than ten per cent of the educated Pakistanis know what the name of their country stands for. The mind boggles at the sight of such massive ignorance among the cream and salt of a country which was created only one generation ago. The level of knowledge of the man in the street can well be imagined. The most ominous is the misinformation and ignorance prevalent among the teachers of all varieties. That is an assurance that knowledge will never be allowed to invade the minds of the students. This in itself is a perilous prospect and should shock any government and its educational planners. The cultivated peril becomes monstrous and outrageous when it is remembered that it is the product of a deliberate exercize in personal animosity. Simply in order to punish Rahmat Ali for his candid criticism of Jinnah and the League (he never criticized Iqbal) the whole nation is being misinformed, miseducated, misled and fed on fables and falsehood.

How can we explain this ignorance about and hostility towards a man who was beyond the slightest doubt the first to come out in favour of Pakistan, to give it a name and to make immense sacrifices for his perseverance and devotion, and whose influence on the Pakistan movement and the Muslim League was not inconsiderable? Some of the factors that caused and encouraged this attitude have been mentioned before and need only a passing allusion.

The generally accepted and assiduously propagated myth that the idea of a separate Muslim state was first formulated by Iqbal in 1930 has put Rahmat Ali in the shade. It has kept the historians away from either a thorough inquiry into the origin and history of the idea or a proper appreciation of Rahmat Ali's contribution and importance. As the myth gains in strength with passing years, it not only means that Iqbal is to be accepted as the only progenitor of the idea but also that any similar claim in someone else's behalf

TABLE – 2: PAKISTANIS' KNOWLEDGE OF RAHMAT ALI AND PAKISTAN

No.	Category	Number of Persons in Category	ANSWERS TO Question 1: Who coined the word Pakistan?		Question 2: Where did he live?		Question 3: When was the word coined?		Question 4: What does the word stand for?	
1	University teachers of History[1]	10	Rahmat Ali	2	Cambridge	1	1933 (?)	1	Correct	2
			Jinnah (?)	1	Bombay	1	Don't know	9	LP	8
			Iqbal (?)	1	Lahore	1				
			Don't know	6	Don't know	7				
2	University teachers of Arts and Humanities (excluding History)[2]	20	Rahmat Ali	1	Lahore	1	Don't know	20	Correct	1
			Iqbal (?)	1	Don't know	19			LP	19
			Muhammad Ali (?)	1						
			Don't know	17						
3	College teachers of History[3]	10	Rahmat Ali	1	Don't know	10	Don't know	10	Correct	1
			Don't know	9					LP	9

4	College teachers of Arts and Humanities (excluding History)[4]	20	Muhammad Ali (?) Don't know	1 19	Don't know	20	Don't know	20	Correct LP	1 19
5	School teachers of History and Social Studies[5]	10	Iqbal (?) Don't know	2 8	Lahore Don't know	2 8	1940 Don't know	1 9	LP	10
6	Senior Civil Servants[6]	10	Rahmat Ali Don't know	1 9	Don't know	10	Don't know	10	Correct LP	1 9
7	Junior Civil Servants[7]	20	Rahmat Ali (?) Sayyid Ahmad Khan Don't know	2 1 17	England (?) Don't know	1 19	Don't know	20	Correct LP	2 18
8	Senior Army Officers[8]	5	Don't know	5	Don't know	5	1940 Don't know	1 4	LP	5
9	Junior Army Officers[9]	10	Sayyid Ahmad Khan Don't know	1 9	Don't know	10	Don't know	10	LP	10

TABLE – 2: PAKISTANIS' KNOWLEDGE OF RAHMAT ALI AND PAKISTAN

No.	Category	Number of Persons in Category	ANSWERS TO Question 1 Who coined the word Pakistan?		Question 2 Where did he live?		Question 3 When was the word coined?		Question 4 What does the word stand for?	
10	Senior Diplomats[10]	10	Don't know	10	Don't know	10	Don't know	10	Correct	1
									LP	9
11	Junior Diplomats[11]	10	Muhammad Ali	1	England (?)	1	1940's (?)	1	Correct	1
			Don't know	9	Don't know	9	Don't know	9	LP	9
12	Journalists[12]	20	Rahmat Ali	4	Cambridge	2	1930's	2	Correct	6
			Iqbal	2	Oxford (?)	2	1940's	3	LP	14
			Don't know	14	Lahore	2	Don't know	15		
					Don't know	14				
13	Professionals[13]	10	Rahmat Ali	1	England (?)	1	Don't know	10	LP	10
			Don't know	9	Don't know	9				

| | | |

NOTES TO THE TABLE

1. 7 had foreign degrees, 5 of them doctorates.
2. 14 had foreign degrees, 11 of them doctorates.
3. 4 had foreign degrees, 2 of them doctorates
4. 5 had foreign degrees, 3 of them doctorates.
5. 2 were trained abroad, half of the 10 taught at prestigious public schools.
6. Included 4 secretaries, 2 additional secretaries, 3 joint secretaries to the Government of Pakistan and one Chairman of an autonomous body; 8 of them were members of the former Civil Service of Pakistan.
7. Included 8 deputy secretaries, 5 section officers, and 7 secretarial staff; 6 belonged to the superior civil services.
8. Included one general, 2 major generals, and 2 brigadiers.
9. Included 2 lieutenant-colonels, 4 majors and 4 captains.
10. Included 4 serving ambassadors (two from the Foreign Service), 2 ministers (one from the Foreign Service, and one information chief at a large embassy), 4 senior officials of the Foreign Office (all from the Foreign Service).
11. Included 4 first secretaries, 3 second secretaries, and 3 third secretaries (all but one from the Foreign Service).
12. 8 from English newspapers, 8 from Urdu newspapers, and 4 from the Government Information Department.
13. Included 4 lawyers, 3 bankers, 2 doctors, and one computer manager.
14. They studied at the Universities of the Punjab, Karachi and Islamabad (now Quaid-i-Azam); 10 were reading for M.A. degree in various subjects, and 20 were undergraduates.
15. Included 2 educated housewives, 1 retired civil servant, 1 manager of an airline office, and 1 air force officer.

LP Pakistan means: Pakistan, the Land of the Pure, the Pure Country, an Islamic state.

? A question mark against an answer indicates doubt and hesitance, *i.e.*, ("Well, I think it was Iqbal." "Wasn't it Muhammad Ali?" "I am not sure, but I think it was Rahmat Ali, or some name like that." "I don't know, wait a minute. Wasn't it Iqbal? It must have been Iqbal.")

is to be branded as an anti-national and anti-patriotic move. Therefore, any attempt to present Rahmat Ali as the creator of the idea is, *ipso facto,* taken to be an attack on Iqbal's established position. With the odds decked so deftly against him, it is no wonder that Rahmat Ali's name has been forced into the pit of oblivion. Thus the supporters of Iqbal (the politician) have created an artificial situation in which they present Iqbal and Rahmat Ali as rivals and competitors, and then challenge the audience to make their choice with the guns of invective and charges of treachery trained at their heads. The idea is that people have to choose one or the other, that the roles of the two men exclude each other, and that it is impossible to take note of both in the history of the idea of Pakistan. Neither history nor logic supports this proposition, but the Iqbalites pretend to make it respectable by offering repeated assertions that Rahmat Ali took his concept of Pakistan from Iqbal. No proof or evidence is offered. Incantation takes the place of argument. Assumption does the work for reasoning.

The second major factor is Rahmat Ali's attack on Jinnah in his pamphlets of June 1947 and 1950 and his book *Pakistan.* This savage criticism lost him the sympathy of many. It is difficult to convey to those who did not experience it personally the reverence and loyalty that Jinnah enjoyed among the masses and the intelligentsia. In the popular estimation he was more than a politician or a statesman or a leader; he was the father of the nation and the only man to whom the nation owed its freedom. There were Gandhi and Nehru and a dozen others who could rightfully share the credit for Indian independence. But among the Muslims Jinnah alone towered as *the* leader and the maker of Pakistan. Few Pakistanis were or are prepared to tolerate any criticism of him. Rahmat Ali's intemperate assault carried overtones of treachery to the Muslim ear. No amount of reference to his services to the national cause could assuage the outraged feelings of Muslim Pakistanis (we will return to the other aspects of this factor a little later).

Another reason is the general ignorance about Rahmat Ali. People who are otherwise knowledgeable know so little about him that general unfamiliarity with his name or work appears a natural thing. This ignorance may be traced to at least four causes. First, he was the only important figure associated with the idea of Pakistan who lived abroad. Only a few had known him in person.

After 1940 hardly any Indian newspaper referred to him or published news or summaries of his writings. Distance encouraged indifference. Secondly, with a few honourable exceptions, his friends and old colleagues either betrayed him or chose to witness the murder of his reputation in silence—thus becoming accessories to the act. Thirdly, Pakistani scholars have ignored him with a suspicious unanimity. It is true that they have not been very active in any direction: there is still no readable biography of Jinnah or Iqbal, or a history of the Muslim League of any kind. Yet, books have been written on Abul Kalam Azad, Ataullah Shah Bukhari, Abdul Ghaffar Khan (all anti-Muslim League leaders), the Jamaat-i-Islami, the Ahrar Party, Liaquat Ali Khan, Zafar Ali Khan, H.S. Suhrawardy, Nawab Abdul Latif Khan, Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Muhammad Ali, Shibli, and others. Only a few of them are scholarly and even fewer from the pen of a historian. But on Rahmat Ali there is a total silence. Finally, the major responsibility for creating this ignorance and the consequent indifference and prejudice (the ignorant are always prejudiced) lies with the government. With the single exception of the period 1972-77, every administration—civil and military, Muslim League and non-Muslim League—has been a sworn enemy of Rahmat Ali. His writings are banned in the country. When people cannot read what he said, but only hear from his enemies what he is supposed to have said, how can they form a judgment of the man? The only message they receive is that he was an enemy of Jinnah and Iqbal and the League and a traitor to Pakistan. They have no means to check its veracity. The counsel for the prosecution has been speaking since the trial began. The defence counsel has awaited his turn but has not been heard. A string of false witnesses has sworn away the reputation of a great man, and a suborned court has delivered its judgment. The trial is closed. There is no appeal against the State.

One last question remains to be asked and answered. Why has the government sided with Rahmat Ali's enemies rather than with the truth? The answer lies in the peculiar condition of Pakistan, the mentality of the Pakistanis and the tradition of folk Islam.

Since its inception, Pakistan has suffered from a deep sense of insecurity. Afraid of a powerful India and an unfriendly Soviet Union, it has often entertained fears about its future. The apprehension that the country may not survive has plagued its policies and politics; the military rulers have encouraged this feeling to

make the political role of the armed forces more acceptable, and the break up of 1971 has deepened the fear. Thus the nation has since its birth lived in a state of siege. In such an atmosphere the power of the rulers sheds all limits and the subservience of the subjects loses all shame. The whim of the government becomes the law of the land.

The mentality of the people is shaped by its leaders and rulers. Obedience to the government, long instilled by the Mughals and the British and the native feudal aristocracy, becomes a habit. The rulers are feared instead of being respected. The national trait of jealousy strengthens the tradition of intolerance. The nation is still immature: unwilling to hear a word of criticism, unable to examine its own conscience, afraid to face the truth, scared of looking history in the face.

The folk Islam, the strait-jacket worn so proudly by the Pakistanis, helps to paint the state as a divine institution. The theologians preach the edict of "obey your rulers" to the exclusion of any refererice to consultation, accountability and public opinion. Criticism of a state created in the name of Islam is equated with both crime and sin. When state and government are not distinugished, opposition to the government becomes an un-Islamic act entailing dire punishment. The cult of personality is born and is nourished meticulously.

Given these circumstances and outlook, the government dare not seek the truth, it hunts and kills it. Its objectives are security, passivity, acquiescene, and traditionalism. To love the past is safer than to study it. Myths are more serviceable than history. In concrete terms, no criticism of the Muslim League is permitted, for that means questioning the creation of Pakistan; Jinnah is to be put on the pedestal and revered, to examine his career is to utter a blasphemy. This line of thought and policy has been given the name of "national ideology". Liaquat Ali started this deception. Pakistan had an ideology of its own and it was above and beyond criticism. To oppose it was unpatriotic, anti-national, un-Islamic. Nobody defined it; that would have clipped official authority. With years this ideology, whatever it means, has become sacrosanct, a new religion, vague but powerful, undefined but untouchable. There are four entities in Pakistan which are beyond any comment other than praise and veneration: Iqbal, Jinnah, Islam and the government in office. Tradition, and now law, ensure

conformity. Pakistan is an ideological state and cannot afford to let people speak against the foundation (Islam, as defined by the authorities), the fathers (Iqbal and Jinnah) and the protectors (the government) of the ideology.

Where does Rahmat Ali stand in this pantheon? Nowhere. He is not only an outsider, but an enemy of this ideology. Did he not fail to join the Muslim League? Did he not make unseemly attacks on the father of the nation? Did he not assail the government of Pakistan for its inefficiency and corruption? He might have been a better Muslim than Jinnah, both in conviction and practice. But his sins are unforgivable. He assailed Jinnah, and therefore he must be banished from Pakistani history, from the history books, even from the national consciousness. The virulence of the decision is equal to its irrelevance.

To see the absurdity of this attitude we have to recall the background of a good many rulers of Pakistan. In considering Rahmat Ali's strong language against Jinnah and the League, we cannot ignore his motives. He believed that the League had made a nasty mistake in accepting, first the Cabinet Mission Plan of May 1946, then the Partition Plan of June 1947, and then the hurried arrangements made for the transfer of power. This was his opinion, and many historians have agreed with him. His grievance was that Jinnah had accepted a smaller Pakistan than the Muslims were entitled to. This again is a point made by a large number of Pakistani writers and public men, including Muslim Leaguers. Rahmat Ali was arguing from sincerity, not enmity. He was not against the creation of Pakistan. He wanted a bigger Pakistan. He did not join the Congress to oppose the Muslim League. He did not side with the pro-British Punjab Unionists. He did not support those Muslim parties which were against the partition of India. From his point of view, his loyalty to Pakistan was greater than Jinnah's: Jinnah accepted a truncated Pakistan, he criticized Jinnah for having done so. This does not make him an enemy of the League or a traitor to Pakistan. But that is how he is presented by the government and its henchmen.

If Rahmat Ali was not qualified to become a Pakistani because he had attacked Jinnah, the same logic should have been applied to others. It was not. There is a long line of public men who had abused Jinnah in vulgar language, criticized the Muslim League, kept it out of office in Muslim provinces, opposed the creation of

Pakistan, sided with the Hindus or the British and against the Muslims—and, after independence, they were welcomed in Pakistan, their political parties were allowed to function and contest elections, their pre-1947 writings and speeches were reprinted and sold in the country, their fresh writings were not banned, and several of them became ministers, governors, chief ministers, governor generals and presidents.

The history of Pakistan is well stocked with their names. Only a few examples can be cited here. Ghulam Muhammad, the first finance minister and the last governor general, was not a Muslim Leaguer, not even a fellow-traveller. Iskander Mirza, the first president, was a civil servant, and formed his own party in opposition to the League. Firoz Khan Noon had been an executive councillor of the Viceroy before independence; in Pakistan he acted as governor of East Pakistan, chief minister of the Punjab, federal minister, and prime minister of the country. Qayyum Khan, the deputy leader of the Congress party in the Indian Legislative Assembly, ended up as chief minister of the NWFP and a federal minister. Sardar Abdur Rashid and Qurban Ali, serving police officers, occupied the posts of chief minister and federal minister. Dr. Khan Sahib, who refused to take the oath of allegiance to Pakistan on 14 August 1947 as the Congress chief minister of NWFP and had to be dismissed by Jinnah, later became chief minister of West Pakistan. Unionists like Nawab Mazaffar Ali Qizilbash, M.A. Gurmani and A.H. Dasti became ministers and chief ministers. All this happened during the first eleven years of Pakistan's history. During Bhutto's prime ministership the two frontier provinces, NWFP and Baluchistan, were for some time ruled by the Jamiat-ul-Ulema of Mufti Mahmud and the National Awami Party (former Red Shirts), both arch-foes of the pre-1947 Muslim League. They were voted into power by the people; nobody protested that they had once been traitors.

Once the palace doors had been broken open by the generals, starting with Ayub Khan, a stream of former and current enemies of the Muslim League and a flux of civil servants poured into federal and provincial ministerial offices and into provincial government houses. For some years all the parties which had once presented a united front against the Pakistan Movement of Jinnah—the two Jamiat-ul-Ulema, the Jamaat-i-Islami, the Ahrars, the Khaksars—ruled the country, and Mawdudi, who had been calling

Pakistan a *palidistan* (the land of the filthy) and reviling Jinnah and the Muslim League, was the chief ideologue of the country. No murmurs of discontent were heard from the patriots and the Muslim Leaguers.

Thus it came to pass that places of honour and authority were frequently offered to well-known men who had spent a good part of their public lives in attacking Jinnah, criticizing the Muslim League, and using their influence and strength against the creation of Pakistan. At no time did the upholders of the national ideology protest against the handing over of the country to its former (in some cases current) enemies. Old Muslim Leaguers, Jinnah's admirers, the Iqbalites, the honourable keepers of the nation's conscience–all accepted the new dispensations with bended knees and grateful gestures.

It is difficult to understand why Rahmat Ali alone has been singled out, even after his death, for special treatment. All enemies can be forgiven and rewarded, but not he. All sins and follies and crimes can be washed away, but not his. The government and people of the country which he named owe an explanation, and after that a humble apology, to his memory and soul, to their own conscience, and to posterity.

NOTES

1. Choudhari Amjad Khan, quoted in Mukhtar Ali Rahmani, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali nay ghayr mamalik mayn rah kar jang-i-azady lary", *Jang*, 14 August 1978. Amjad worked with Rahmat Ali in England in 1937-40 when he was studying engineering.
2. M. Masud, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali as I Knew Him", *Dawn*, 13 June 1976. Masud was an ICS probationer in England and a colleague of Rahmat Ali's.
3. Mian Kifait Ali, writing in *Afaq*, 16 October 1949.
4. G. Allana, *Our Freedom Fighters* (Karachi, 1969), p. 296.
5. S.A. Rahman, presidential address, inaugural meeting, Rahmat Ali Memorial Society, Lahore, 11 April 1970, *The Pakistan Times*, 13 April 1970.
6. M. Ikramullah, speech in London on 23 March 1956, *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 30 March 1956.
7. Pir Ali Muhammad Rashdi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky mayyat", *Jang*, 1 April 1967: see also S.M.K. Wasti, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 and 6 for Dr. Aminuddin's opinion and p. 7 for Wasti's own.
8. *Nawa-i-Waqt* (editorial), 16 February 1951.
9. Talat Mahmood, Letter, *The Pakistan Times*, 20 December 1969.
10. A.T. Chaudhri, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: Time to Honour Him", *Pakistan Monitor*, 14 August 1970.
11. Nasim Zakaria, Letter, *The Pakistan Times*, 1 January 1970. He was a professor of Political Science at the Forman Christian College, Lahore.
12. M.S.A. Qureshi, Letter, *ibid.*, 29 January 1970.
13. Qayyum Wazirabadi, Letter, *ibid.*, 4 May 1970.
14. A. Rauf Abbasi, Letter, *ibid.*, 30 July 1970.
15. M. Sharif Sálombar, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Jang*, 3 February 1981.
16. Abdul Jabbar Khatana, Letter, *Jang*, 25 January 1976, and L. Jafiri, Letter, *The Pakistan Times*, 2 April 1976.
17. Shamsul Haq Ansari, Letter, *Dawn*, 7 April 1975.
18. Zeno, "The Word 'Pakistan' ", *The Pakistan Times*, 18 January 1970. The author, Safdar Mir, was a ranking journalist and a former lecturer in English Literature at Govern-

ment College, Lahore.

19. "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Imroz*, 11 February 1977.
20. Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali lafz 'Pakistan' kay khaliq thay", *Hurryat*, 13 February 1977. Similar sentiments were expressed by the Raja of Mahmudabad in his interview with me.
21. *Gujjar Gazette*, 4-18 March 1954, p. 4. The first meeting was held at the Standard Restaurant on the Mall, and the second at 12 MacLagan Road, Lahore. Chaudhri Din Muhammad of Rawalpindi donated Rs. 1,000, and Chaudhri Badruddin of Mandi Bahauddin promised Rs. 500. Two Rahmat Ali Scholarships of Rs. 5 each for students of 5-8th classes were advertised in this issue, p. 15.
22. *ibid.*, p. 3.
23. Reported in *ibid.*, 18 February 1964, p. 7; the meeting was held on 12 February 1963. The Pakistan Memorial is a tall pillar erected on the spot in Minto (now Iqbal) Park in Lahore where the Lahore Resolution was passed on 24 March 1940.
24. A.S. Khurshid's letter to the author from Lahore, dated 21 October 1969.
25. For reports of speeches made at this meeting on 11 April see *Jang* and *Dawn*, 13 April 1970.
26. *Jang*, 24 February 1976.
27. Personal information. I attended and addressed some of these functions. A seminar on Rahmat Ali was also held at the National Commission on Historical and Cultural Research, Islamabad, when I was its chairman.
28. Report of a meeting held on 9 February 1979, *The Pakistan Times*, 12 February 1979.
29. *Ibid.*, and report of a meeting of the Society a year later, *The Muslim*, 4 February 1980.
30. See Letter from Muhammad Gulzar, public relations secretary of the Society, *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 15 June 1981.
31. Report of proceedings in *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 8 August 1978. Among those who attended the meeting were Chaudhri Amjad, Rais Amrohawi, Sayyid Muhammad Taqi, Abdullah Shamim and Shamim Muhammad Ahmad.
32. Abdul Aas Mehruddin Qamar, "Bary mushkil say hota hay chaman mayn didawar payda", *Gujjar Gazette*, 4-18 March

1954, p. 2.
33. Interview with Muhammad Anwar.
34. Pir Ali Muhammad Rashdi, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky mayyat", *Jang*, 1 April 1967; also rep. in *Gujjar Gazette*, 11 March 1968, p. 4.
35. *Gujjar Gazette* (editorial), 18 March 1968, p. 3.
36. In her article, "Akabar-i-millat-i-Pakistania say appeal", *ibid.*, p. 2.
37. A.S. Khurshid's speech, Rahmat Ali Day, Lahore, 20 February 1966, reproduced in *ibid.*, 11 March 1966, p. 5.
38. Talat Mahmud, Letter, *The Pakistan Times*, 20 December 1969.
39. Nasim Zakaria, Letter, *ibid.*, 1 January 1970.
40. M.S.A. Qureshi, Letter, *ibid.*, 29 January 1970.
41. M. Jahangir Khan, *ibid.*, 5 February 1970.
42. Arif Chatta, Letter, *ibid.*, 5 February 1970.
43. Qayyum Wazirabadi, *ibid.*, 4 May 1970; see also Muhammad Ashraf, Letter, *The Muslim*, 2 February 1981, and another letter in the issue of 12 February.
44. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, statement to the press, Karachi, 16 July 1970, *ibid.*, 17 July 1970.
45. Bedar Malik, statement to the press, Lahore, 17 July 1970, *ibid.*, 19 July 1970.
46. A. Rauf Abbasi, Letter, *ibid.*, 30 July 1970.
47. A.T. Chaudhri, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: Time to Honour Him", *Pakistan Monitor*, 14 August 1970, p. 34.
48. Shamsul Haq Ansari, Letter, *Dawn*, 7 April 1975.
49. L. Jafiri, Letter, *The Pakistan Times*, 2 April 1976.
50. M. Masud, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali As I Knew Him", *Dawn*, 13 June 1976.
51. *Jang*, 8 October 1977.
52. For example, Sahibzada Sikandar Riaz of Rawalpindi, Letter, *ibid.*, 13 December 1977.
53. See *ibid.*, 4 February 1978.
54. Malik Muhammad Khan, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan ky faramosh kary", *Sayyara Digest*, 8 April 1978, p. 109.
55. *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 15 April 1978; also S.M.K. Wasti, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
56. The meeting was held at the Pakistan National Centre on 9 February 1979; report in *The Pakistan Times*, 12 February

1979.

57. *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 21 March 1979.
58. For full details see Chaudhri Farzand Ali's speech on Rahmat Ali Day, Lahore, 20 February 1966, *Gujjar Gazette*, 11 March 1966, p. 7.
59. Interview with Chaudhri Muhammad Ali.
60. Interviews with Muhammad Anwar and Chaudhri Muhammad Ali; Nasim Ahmad's dispatch from London, *Dawn*, 9 July 1970; P.H.S., "The Times Diary", *The Times*, 15 August 1970; and *Jang*, 1 December 1970.
61. Muhammad Anwar's interview in *Satluj*, 12 February 1976, p. 21.
62. Some examples: Raja Hasan Akhtar, "The Forgotten Hero", *The Pakistan Times*, 29 March; Mubassar, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali awr tahrik-i-Pakistan", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 29 March, an Urdu version of Akhtar's article under a pseudonym; A.S. Khurshid, "Pakistan ka bany kawn?" *Mashriq*, 1 April; Jamiluddin Ahmad, Letter, *The Pakistan Times*, 19 April; S.A. Vahid, "Iqbal as a Politician", *ibid.*, 21 April; Ejaz Malik, "Quaid-i-Azam awr Allam Iqbal par hamlay", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 18 May; M. Siddiq Soofi, "Quaid-i-Azam awr Allama Iqbal par hamlay", *ibid.*, 22 May. Anwar replied to these attacks in his "Quaid-i-Azam awr Allama Iqbal par hamlay", *ibid.*, 13 May; and "Bany-i-Tahrik-i-Pakistan", *Tamir*, 14 August. The only Urdu piece in defence of Rahmat Ali was a letter by Muhammad Mushtaq Khan from Montgomery in the *Mashriq*, 21 June. All dates are of 1964.
63. Ashiq Husain Batalawi, "Iqbal, Edward Thompson, Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 21 April 1964.
64. Z.A. Suleri, "Fikry intishar kay naqib", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 25 March 1964, and "Quaid-i-Azam awr Allama Iqbal par hamlay", *ibid.*, 13 May 1964. The quotation, a literal translation, is from the second article.
65. Rais Amrohawi, "Pakistan kay gumnam sitaray", *Jang*, 23 March 1963; Ejaz Ahmad, *Hamaray Quaid-i-Azam: Bany-i-Pakistan Muhammad Ali Jinnah* (Lahore, 1976), p. 105; Maqbul Ahmad Ansari, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 18 February 1979.
66. A.S. Khurshid, "Iqbal, Pakistan awr Muslim tulaba", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 21 April 1961, and his "Azady kay mutawalay

akhbar nawis", *Mashriq*, 14 August 1966.

67. Inamullah Khan, "Pakistan: A New Light on the World Horizon", *The Muslim World* (Karachi weekly), 15 August 1981, p. 1.
68. Sayyid Hashim Raza, "The Role of Sind in the Pakistan Movement", *Dawn*, 23 March 1977.
69. M. Masud, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali As I Knew Him", *Dawn*, 13 June 1976.
70. Hafiz Muhammad Islam, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali nay tanha Pakistan ky tahrik chalaiy", *Jang*, 15 August 1971.
71. Manzurul Haq Siddiqui, "Batayan Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky", *Sayyara Digest*, March 1978, p. 41.
72. Mukhtar Ali Rahmani, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali nay ghayr mamalik mayn rah kar jang-i-azady lary", *Jang*, 14 August 1978.
73. Abdul Waheed, "Tasawwur-i-Pakistan awr Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Maghrabi Pakistan*, 1 February 1977.
74. Waheed Ahmad, "The Formation of the Government of India Act, 1935", University of Cambridge, Ph.D. thesis, 1969, p. 238. *Now or Never* is not listed in the bibliography, p. 358.
75. "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Cheragh-i-Rah*, Nazriya-i-Pakistan Number, December 1960, pp. 503-504. The book drawn upon is Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims*, Bombay, 1959.
76. S. Hyder, *Progress of Pakistan* (Lahore, June 1947), p. 41. A reviewer of a book on Rahmat Ali stated that he "made repeated visits to Pakistan after the attainment of independence", Tayyeb in *Dawn*, 28 October 1982.
77. Muhammad Anwar Amin, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Imroz*, 23 March 1970, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Mashriq*, 12 February 1971, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 24 March 1971, and "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Satluj*, 12 February 1976, p. 13; Muhammad Sulaiman Tahir, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Jang*, 13 February 1978.
78. Sir Gordon Sutherland, Master of Emmanuel College, letter to the author, dated 28 October 1969.
79. Some examples of foreign ignorance. "In 1930 when the Round Table Conference was going on, certain Muslims had formed themselves into a committee with headquarters in London for the purpose of getting the Round Table

Conference to entertain the project of Pakistan. Leaflets and circulars were issued by the Committee and sent round to the members of the Round Table Conference in support of Pakistan" (B.R. Ambedkar, *Pakistan or Partition of India*, Bombay, 2nd ed. 1945, p. 329 and its footnote). Rahmat Ali's Pakistan proposal came "shortly after" December 1930 in London (Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims*, Bombay, 1959, p. 269). His "first scheme for the creation of Pakistan was issued in 1932" (S. Abid Husain, *The Destiny of Indian Muslims*, Bombay, 1959, p. 108). He was living at 3 Humberstone Road, Cambridge, in August 1947 (Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre, *Freedom at Midnight*, London, 1975, p. 242). His Pakistan did not include Baluchistan (Guy Wint, in G. Schuster and G. Wint, *India and Democracy*, London, 1941, p. 181). His Pakistan's "A" stood for Afghanistan (R.E.C. Broadbent, Letter, *The Times*, 18 September 1959). Some people took his Pakistan's "A" to stand for Afghanistan (W.C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India: A Social Analysis*, London, 2nd rev. ed. 1946, p. 254, Lahore, 1947 ed., p. 307). His Pakisan did not include Sind (article on "Pakistan" by Sir John Charles Walton, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1957 ed., Vol. 17). His Pakistan did not include Kashmir (Kenneth Cragg, *Counsels in Contemporary Islam*, Edinburgh, 1965, p. 20). His Pakistan did not include Sind (Derek E. Wood, *This Modern World*, London, 1967, p. 285 fn. 1). His plan was that north-west India should "combine with neighbouring areas to form an Islamic empire"; Pakistan's "i" stood for Iran, "t" for Tukharistan and "a" for Afghanistan (Geoffrey Ashe, *Gandhi*, London, 1968, p. 339). The word was devised by "a group of Muslim Indian students" at Cambridge in 1932; its "a" stood "for Afghans on the frontier" (Colin Cross, *The Fall of the British Empire, 1918-1968*, London, 1968, p. 200). His Pakistan meant "*P*unjab, *A*fghania, *K*ashmir, *I*ran, *S*ind, *A*fghanistan, and Baluchista*n*" (Elie Kedourie, Introduction to his (ed.), *Nationalism in Asia and Africa*, New York, 1970, p. 30; the quotation is not footnoted). The letters composing Pakistan were "taken from the names of the Muslim homelands in the subcontinent" (David Loshak, *Pakistan Crisis*, London, 1971, p. xv). His Pakistan did not include Sind

(Peter Hardy, *The Muslims of British India*, Cambridge, 1972, p. 219; he quotes *Now or Never* from S.S. Pirzada's *Evolution of Pakistan*, fn. 26). He suggested the name Pakistan in 1931 (Richard V. Weekes, *Pakistan: Birth and Growth of a Muslim Nation*, Princeton, 1964, p. 4). The name Pakistan was "used by the poet-philosopher Muhammad Iqbal to designate a spiritual or religious realm, meaning 'Land of the Pure'. It was first employed as a political slogan by C. Rahmat Ali and some associates at Cambridge, England, in 1933, to symbolize their ideal of a Muslim state. . . . In Indian Muslim circles the name also came to be regarded as an acrostic indicating the political units to be included in the hoped-for state" (*The Encyclopaedia Americana*, 1961 ed., Vol. 21; this part of the article signed by Richard D. Lambert).

80. Rafiq M. Khan and Herbert S. Stark, *Young Pakistan* (London, 1951), p. 4.
81. A.S. Khurshid, "Pakistan ka bany kawn?" *Mashriq*, 1 April 1964.
82. Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan, 1857-1964* (London, 1967), pp. 169-170; see also his *Iqbal: nayi tashkil* (Lucknow, n.d.), p. 411. When I questioned him on this point in 1974 he refused to change his opinion, though he confessed that he had not consulted Rahmat Ali's pamphlets in the original.
83. See Abdul Hamid, *Muslim Separatism in India: A Brief Survey, 1858-1947* (Lahore, 1967).
84. Pakistan Muslim League, *Qyam-i-Pakistan ka tarikhi pas manzar* (Rawalpindi, 14 August 1964).
85. S. Hyder, *Progress of Pakistan* (Lahore, June 1947), p. 42.
86. Muhammad Sarwar, *Tahrik-i-Pakistan ka aik bab* (Lahore, 1975), p. 142.
87. *Imroz*, 1 April 1976. Dr. Muhammad Baqir said this in a meeting called in Islamabad by the Rahmat Ali Ideal Society to pay him homage. All other speakers, including ministers, teachers and parliamentarians, praised Rahmat Ali. A professor of journalism at the Punjab University has asserted that Rahmat Ali's movement "could not play an effective and direct role in the freedom movement of the Indian Muslims", Waris Mir, "Tasawwur-i-Pakistan awr panislami

sazish", *Nawa-i-Waqt Magazine*, 16 April 1982.

88. See Begum Firdaus Rizvi, *Pakistan Defined*, Lahore, n.d.
89. See El Hamza (Ashfaq Ali Khan), *Pakistan: A Nation*, Lahore, 1941.
90. See Muhammad Noman, *Muslim India*, Allahabad, 1942.
91. Aziz Ahmad, "Remarques sur les origines du Pakistan", *Orient*, no. 26 (1963), pp. 22-23.
92. Waheed Ahmad, "Chaudhry Rahmat Ali and the Concept of Pakistan", *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan*, January 1970, pp. 21, 28.
93. See Shafique Ali Khan, *Two Nation Theory*, Hyderabad (Sind), 1973. I give here two more examples of crass ignorance presented as history. The chronicler of the Majlis-i-Ahrar, in a multi-volume history of the party, states that the word Pakistan was first used by an English Member of Parliament in 1932 and was repeated by Rahmat Ali in his *Now or Never*, and that Rahmat Ali presented his Pakistan scheme for the first time in his pamphlet entitled *Pakistan National Movement* which was published on 28 January 1933; not content with these outrageous assertions, he reproduces in facsimile the title-cover of *The Millat of Islam and the Menace of Indianism* and gives it the caption of *"Chaudhri Rahmat Ali kay pamphlet (Ab phir kabhi nahin) ka title"* (the title of Chaudhri Rahmat Ali's pamphlet *Now or Never*), Janbaz Mirza, *Karwan-i-Ahrar*, Lahore, Vol. IV, 1979, pp. 337, 350, 351. The second example comes from a scholar. The editor of a volume of documents on the Punjab Muslim Students Federation offers the reader the following facts about Rahmat Ali : he was born in village Mohar; he finished his college education in Lahore in 1909; he graduated from Cambridge in 1931; he coined the word Pakistan in 1932; his *Now or Never* was a circular addressed to the members of the "Joint Parliamentary Committee of Indian Constitutional Reforms"; he died on 12 February 1951; he is buried "in the yard of the Emmanuel College, Cambridge, London"; in the next sentence, which is enclosed in quotation marks but without any indication of the source, "he lies buried in Working [*sic.*]", Sarfraz Husain Mirza (ed.), *The Punjab Muslim Students Federation: An Annotated Documentary Survey, 1937-1947*, Lahore, 1978, pp.

427-428, also p. fiv. fn. 3. This book was published by the Research Society of Pakistan, Lahore, with a foreword of commendation by its Director.

94. Some selected examples. "No doubt the kindest thing is to ignore" Rahmat Ali (Kenneth Cargge, *op. cit.*, p. 25). His "industrious bombast has proven inconsequential" (Richard Ettinghausen, *A Selected and Annotated Bibliography of Books and Periodicals in Western Languages dealing with the Near and Middle East*, Washington, D.C., 1954, p. 84, annotion on Rahmat Ali's *Pakistan*, item no. 1487; Rahmat Ali is listed under the section "Muslim League"). Rahmat Ali merely repeated the proposal made previously by Lala Lajpat Rai and formulated an "epithet, *Pakistan* . . . by the clever manipulation of certain letters" (H.K.S. (probably Haroon Khan Sherwani), reviewing *Mohammad Ali Jinnah* by M.H. Sayyid in the *Islamic Culture*, Vol. XX (1946), pp. 335-336). He "hardly left any impact on the Muslim mind" (N.N. Gidwani, "Genesis and Growth of Pakistan", in S.P. Varma and Virendra Narain (eds.), *Pakistan Political System in Crisis*, Jaipur, 1972, p. 3). The only favourable non-Pakistani comment that I have come across occurs in a book by a Christian missionary: "Thus it was largely as a result of the ingenuity and enthusiastic efforts of this group of Cambridge students in devising the name PAKISTAN as a slogan for their Pakistan National Movement, that on March 23rd, 1940, at Lahore, under the presidency of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the All-India Muslim League officially adopted the historic Pakistan Resolution" (Murray T. Titus, *Islam in India and Pakistan*, Madras, rev. ed. 1959, p. 220; the first ed. of this book, entitled *Indian Islam*, was published in London in 1930).

95. H.R. Aiyer, *Why Pakistan?* (Trivandrum, 1945), p.4.

96. B.M. Chaudhri, *Muslim Politics in India* (Calcutta, 1946), p. 59. He does not quote origional sources for his account of Rahmat Ali's ideas, but relies on Sachin Sen's "Political Thought of Indian Muslims", an article published in the Bengali quarterly *Visvabharati Patrika*.

97. Shaukatullah Ansari, *Pakistan: The Problem of India*, quoted in Kirpal Singh, "The Origin of Pakistan", *The Spokesman* (New Delhi weekly), Anniversary Number, 1970.

98. *Partap* (editorial), 8 February 1945.
99. W.C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India: A Social Analysis*, 2nd. rev. ed., London, 1946, p. 254, 1947 ed., Lahore, p. 308. My italics.
100. *Ibid.*, London ed., footnote no. 20, p. 227; Lahore ed., p. 431.
101. See his explanation of "Pakitan" in *ibid.*, London ed., p. 254.
102. Y.V. Gankovsky and L.R. Gordon-Polonskaya, *A History of Pakistan* (Moscow, 1964), p. 66.
103. A.M. Dyakov, in V.V. Balabushevich and A.M. Dyakov (eds.), *A Contemporary History of India* (New Delhi, 1964), p. 376.
104. S. Abid Husain, *The Destiny of Indian Muslims* (Bombay, 1965), p. 67. *Pakistan* is italicized in the original.
105. Chaudhri Muhammad Ahsan, "Quaid-i-Azam awr Allama Iqbal par hamlay", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 17 May 1964. It is also referred to in passing in Mahmud Shah Qureshi, *L'Etude sur L'evolution intellectuelle chez les Musulmans du Bengale, 1857-1947* (Paris, 1971), p. 116, fn. 62.
106. Mushtaq Ahmad Wajadi, *Hangamon mayn zindagi* (Lahore, 1974), p. 136.
107. Mian Abdul Haq's article, quoted in *Gujjar Gazette*, 11 March 1966, pp. 13-14.
108. Interview with Dr. Rafique Khan.
109. Interview with Muhammad Anwar.
110. Interview with N.D. Yusuf.
111. Anwar, quoted in "Chaudhari Rahmat Ali ka tasawwur-i-Pakistan 1935 mayn talib-i-ilmon mayn maqbul tha", *Kohistan*, 1 March 1967.
112. Interview with Miss Frost.
113. *Ibid.*
114. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan*, pp. 206-207.
115. *Ibid.*, pp. 232-233.
116. *Ibid.*, pp. 233-234.
117. These findings are based on a thorough study of a great deal published or said in Britain during these years. For my doctoral research in 1957-59 I had to read every published official document on India, the annual statements of the Government of India, parliamentary debates of both houses,

reports of all annual party conferences and of the Trades Union Congress, a very large number of historical works, biographies, autobiographies, memoirs, letters, diaries, speeches, statements and general studies on India. In addition, I went through the complete files for this period of *Asiatic Review, Foreign Affairs, Political Quarterly, Quarterly Review, Round Table, Contemporary Review, Empire Review, Fortnightly Review, National Review, Nineteenth Century and After, Economist, Listener, New Statesman, Observer, Spectator, Sunday Times, Daily Herald, Daily Telegraph, Manchester Guardian, The Times,* and odd issues of some other periodical publications.

118. For full details of and evidence for these conclusions see my *Britain and Muslim India: A Study of British Public Opinion vis a vis the Development of Muslim Nationalism in India, 1857-1947,* London, 1963. The bibliography to this book contains a full list of all the sources consulted by me and referred to in the previous note.
119. F.K. Khan Durrani, *The Meaning of Pakistan* (Lahore, 1944, rep. March 1946), p. 110.
120. Abdul Qaddus Hashmi, *Tashrihat-i-Pakistan* (Hyderabad Deccan, 1946), p. 30.
121. Lal Badadur, *The Muslim League* (Agra, 1954), p. 284.
122. K.B. Sayeed, *Pakistan: The Formative Phase* (Karachi, 1960), p. 113.
123. D.N. Wilber, *Pakistan: Yesterday and Today* (New York, 1964), p. 104.
124. Waheeduzzaman, *Towards Pakistan* (Lahore, 1964), p. 149.
125. A.W. Khan, *India Wins Freedom: The Other Side* (Karachi, 1961), p. 120.
126. G. Allana, *Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah* (Karachi, 1967), p. 301.
127. M. Anwar, "Forgotten Hero– III", *The Pakistan Times,* 19 July 1964.
128. See S.M. Ikram, *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan* (Lahore, 1965), p. 184.
129. Jahangir Khan's interview, in Manzurul Haq Siddiqui, "Batayn Chaudhri Rahmat Ali ky", *Sayyara Digest,* March 1978, pp. 39-40.
130. See Mian Amiruddin, "More About the 'Forgotten Hero' ", *The Pakistan Times,* 10 May 1964.

131. Quoted in Abdur Rashid, "Bany-i-tahrik-i-Pakistan ka pyam wa kam", *Gujjar Gazette*, 18 February 1964, p. 11. The date of the speech is not given.
132. Khwaja Salahuddin Ahmad, "Woking Muslim Mission's Role in the Creation of Pakistan", *Light*, 16 January 1966.
133. See his *The Millat of Islam and the Menace of Indianism*, p. 16, and *Pakistan*, p. 24.
134. Jahangir Khan, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-45. Jahangir repeated this, and added that Khwaja Abdur Rahim was the real coiner of the word Pakistan, in his interview of 20 December 1977 to Janbaz Mirza, see Janbaz Mirza, *Karwan-i-Ahrar*, Lahore, Vol. IV, 1979, pp. 338-339. Dr. Jahangir Khan was for several years the Director of the Research Society of Pakistan, Lahore.
135. Khwaja Abdur Rahim's letter to Ian Stephens, from 77 Kensington Court, London, W8, dated 3 October 1965. The original is now at the Centre of South Asian Studies, University of Cambridge; photocopy in *RAA*.
136. Khan A. Ahmad, *The Founder of Pakistan Through Trial to Triumph* (London, 1942), p. 21. There is some difference of opinion about the identity of the author. Some think that this was his real name, others that it was a pseudonym adopted by Prof. Jamil Wasti of Government College, Lahore, who was then in England. Anwar told me that Ahmad was really one Aziz Ahmad, then a member of the Punjab Education Service on study leave in England. I have not been able to find any irrefutable evidence for any of these views.
137. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
138. See *ibid.*, p. 31, and Rahmat Ali's letter to Khwaja Abdul Waheed from Cambridge on his return from Karachi (already quoted).
139. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
140. Mian Abdul Haq, "Tahrik-i-Pakistan awr Chaudhari Rahmat Ali", *Nawa-i-Waqt*, 25, 27, 28, 29 June, 1, 2 and 3 July 1964.
141. Mian Abdul Haq, "Pakistan awr Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Nida-i-Millat*, 2 and 5 June 1970.
142. Mian Abdul Haq, open letter, from Burj Jeeway Khan, district Sahiwal, dated 11 July 1970. Photocopy, supplied

by Ian Stephens, in *RAA*.

143. Ian Stephens' letter to Mian Abdul Haq from Cambridge, dated 31 July 1970. The original is now in the Centre of South Asian Studies, University of Cambridge; photocopy in *RAA*.

144. For example, the *Pakistan Yearbook* in its chapter on "Historical Background". It was published by an official printing concern, National Publishing House, Karachi.

In 1980 the Government of Pakistan decided that in future no university or college would award a degree in arts, sciences, engineering, medicine or commerce (why was law excluded?) until the candidate had also been examined and declared successful in a paper called mutal'a-i-Pakistan (Pakistan study). The University Grants Commission immediately appointed a "Course Committee" of 7 scholars of history, political science and Urdu to determine the basic requirements of the course. The Commission's decision was then passed on to the Allama Iqbal Open University with orders to prepare a master textbook for use throughout the country. The Open University proceeded to appoint a "Course Team" of 11 historians, political scientists, Urdu teachers, civil servants and university administrators, which drew up the final syllabus, selected the authors and allotted them portions of the planned book. Each chapter was written by one person and then revised by another. The chapter on the Pakistan Movement, written by Dr. Muniruddin Chughtai, the Oxford-trained professor of Political Science at the University of the Punjab, and revised by Dr. Safdar Mahmood, Deputy Director General of Pakistan Sports Board, after asserting 4 times on 4 pages that in 1930 Iqbal had demanded the creation of a separate independent Muslim State, went on to say that during the second and third RTC sessions "some Muslim students resident in England met Iqbal in London and on his advice, and under the leadership of Chaudhari Rahmat Ali, in the beginning of 1933, a movement under the name of the Pakistan National Movement was started [the Urdu grammar in the book is defective and a literal translation becomes meaningless]. The centre of this movement was in Cambridge, and it was launched with the publication of a pamphlet entitled

Now or Never, which used Pakistan as the name of the suggested Muslim State". (Azhar Hamid (ed.), *Mutal'a-i-Pakistan,* Islamabad, 1981, p. 77). Among other things, now even Rahmat Ali's authorship of *Now or Never* is denied. This multi-dimensional falsification of history is now the standard acquisition of knowledge of every Pakistani boy and gril with a university degree. Incidentally, this book contains several other errors of fact.

145. Abul Aas Mehruddin Qamar, "Bary mushqil say hota hay chaman mayn didawar payda", *Gujjar Gazette,* 4-18 March 1954, p. 2.
146. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (Lahore, 1961), p. 201.
147. Khwaja Rahmat Husain, "Sir Sayyid say Quaid-i-Azam tak", *Anjam,* 11 November 1963.
148. Gujjar Ali Hasan Chauhan, "Chaudhari Rahmat Ali", *Gujjar Gazette,* 18 February 1964, p. 3.
149. Ghulam Sarwar, "Apnay muhsin ko faramosh na kyjiay", *ibid.,* 18 February 1964.
150. Talat Mahmood, Letter, *The Pakistan Times,* 20 December 1969.
151. A.T. Chaudhri, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali: Time to Honour Him", *Pakistan Monitor,* 14 August 1970.
152. A.T. Chaudhri, "The Man Who Gave Pakistan Its Name", *Dawn,* 23 March 1975.
153. "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali marhum", *Hurryat,* 13 February 1975.
154. Manzooruddin Ahmad, Letter, *Dawn,* 30 March 1975. The Commission did publish a 2-volume collection of Rahmat Ali's works edited by me in 1978; it was proscribed by the government though protests were made against the ban by some Pakistanis, *e.g.,* Muhammad Ashraf, Letter, *The Muslim,* 2 February 1981.
155. M.N. Kotwal, Letter, *ibid.,* 6 April 1976.
156. Fida Ahmad Abbasi, "Chaudhari Rahmat Ali lafz Pakistan kay khaliq thay", *Hurryat,* 13 February 1977.
157. Syed Hashim Raza, "The Role of Sind in the Pakistan Movement", *Dawn,* 23 March 1977.
158. See Dr. Akhtar Imam's communication rep. in Rais Amrohawi, "Pakistan 1937 mayn", *Jang,* 6 January 1978.

159. Leonard Hollingworth's letter to the author from Cambridge, dated 19 July 1971.

160. The bias of some newspapers has been blatant. In publishing A.S. Khurshid's article, "Pakistan ka bany kawn? Allama Iqbal – Chaudhari Rahmat Ali – Quaid-i-Azam", in its issue of 1 April 1964, the *Mashriq* of Lahore put in the title-heading the Urdu letters *ray* and *hay* after the names of Iqbal and Jinnah but not after Rahmat Ali's. For those who are unacquainted with Arabic or Urdu and with this Muslim practice, it may be pointed out that putting these letters after a dead person's name is an invocation to God to have mercy on his soul. To discriminate like this in the title of an article shows not only a bad taste but also the measure of the prejudice which plagues the hearts of some editors. Of all the Urdu newspapers, *Nawa-i-Waqt* showed the greatest bias. It opened its columns wide to any attack, howsoever groundless and vulgar, against Rahmat Ali, and declined to publish dissenting opinions. When it published Mian Abdul Haq's 7 articles on Rahmat Ali, I wrote 3 letters to the newspaper, not contradicting or condemning what Haq had said, but merely asking him to furnish proof of his assertions; none was published.

161. See Gujjar Ali Hasan Chauhan, "Chaudhri Rahmat Ali", *Gujjar Gazette,* 18 February 1964, p. 3.

CHAPTER 10

THE CONDEMNED HERO

Ideas

Rahmat Ali's published ideas marched with his private opinions. A few principal passions ruled his life and mind to the exclusion of all details, personal ambition or worldly gain. In this sense he was a "whole man". His heart throbbed with anxiety for the future of Indian Muslims. His words defined the Hindu-Muslim chasm. He believed with Mazzini that without a country people were the bastards of humanity.

He was equally critical of Hindu and British aims and designs. For him the destiny of Indian Islam lay in a deliverance from both. The British should leave India *and* the Hindus should leave the Muslim territories. In this way alone could the Muslims achieve real freedom. Otherwise, the Muslim minority in India would always be in peril. Once his plans were realized, he wanted Pakistan to live in peace and friendship with India. His disapproval of Hinduism and Hindus can hardly be called hatred or contempt.

He looked at them as enemies in so far as they barred the way to the freedom of his own people. After the lifting of this threat and the creation of a Hindu India and a Muslim Pakistan (and other states) the two countries could exist in amity.[1] As long as the Hindus wanted to rule over the Muslims or even a small part of them he believed it to be his duty to oppose them in the strongest possible language.

In this fight on behalf of the Indian Muslim, Rahmat Ali's logic and sense of the practical were superior to the Muslim League's. The League often used the word "homeland" to describe what it called Pakistan. All Indian Muslims formed one nation. Pakistan was being demanded on their behalf. It would be their homeland. This was far from the truth. Pakistan could never have

been the homeland of all Muslims. In using this argument the League leadership was misleading the nation. Rahmat Ali, on the other hand, claimed a free homeland for the people of the five provinces of his Pakistan. This made better sense. He also believed that the real homeland of the Muslims was in the north-west (his Pakistan), and, in his chapter in Halide Edib's book, explained the reasons for excluding the Muslims of the Hindu provinces from the Pakistani nation. Later he called for another Muslim state in Bengal and Assam, but it was to be no part of Pakistan, and its people were to form a separate nation and were to claim their own homeland.

The primal cause and source of all his plans and ideas and demands was Islam. It was the love of his religion that sowed the seed of an idea in his mind, goaded him forward to give it a name and expression, took him to the apparent extremes of demanding tiny Muslim sovereignties all over the sub-continent, made him condemn Jinnah for accepting a smaller Pakistan, and finally disillusioned him with the state of things he found in the Pakistan that had been achieved. Yet, he was not a fanatic. He commanded enough objectivity and balance to spy the weaknesses of Indian Muslim character and the defects of Indian Muslim political leadership. He wanted Pakistan to be run on democratic socialist lines. His ideal was a Muslim, not an Islamic, state. Not until 1947 do we find in his writings any mention of *sharia* as the law of the land (but still combined with socialism); even then he did not define the system in fundamentalist terms. Anyhow, he made it clear that his idea had nothing to do with pan-Islamism. Nor would a fanatic have harped on the necessity and value of developing and maintaining amicable relations between a free India and a free Pakistan.

His criticism of Jinnah and the Muslim League has been misconstrued universally in Pakistan. The role of an enemy of the nation has been thrust upon him without any evidence to support the charge. It is forgotten that his attacks on the League policy were based on principle. As an Indian Muslim in whose name the League was speaking, negotiating and bargaining, he had every right to criticize the party when he differed from its statements and decisions. He was not a rival intriguing to take Jinnah's place. There was no personal animus or ambition in his condemnation. He was convinced that the League was following a wrong path

and misleading the Muslims. He feared that wrong decisions would lead to the creation of a Pakistan which would be unable to save more than half of the Indian Muslim population. By speaking out in protest and warning others, he was doing his duty and following his conscience. To brand this difference of opinion as treachery is to attribute the creation of Pakistan to a fascist party and a dictatorial leader.

Character

All who knew Rahmat Ali speak highly of his moral and intellectual qualities. (Even Pir Ahsanuddin who was reserved in his comments on Rahmat Ali's political ideas and schemes was all praise for his personal charm, honesty of purpose and mental prowess.) From the recollections of his British, Indian and Pakistani contemporaries emerges a picture of a very remarkable man. "I never saw him losing his temper. A smiling face. Very kind and affectionate to everyone. Good to work with. A persuasive conversationalist. Generally looked a lonely man, but was fond of company. A perfectionist. Never satisfied with the first attempt. Did not suffer fools. He told me that he could judge a person's character from the way he shook hands."[2] "A very pleasant man, indeed, and easy to talk to. It was a pleasure to work with him. What struck me most was his single-mindedness, power of concentration, and total devotion to his work. His manners were as impeccable as his clothes. A very, very honest man."[3] "He was extremely honest and straightforward. He worked very hard and did not spare himself. A puritan with an upright character and reputation. I feel very strongly about the shameful way Pakistan treated him and is still treating his memory."[4]

"He had no other interest in life except the welfare of the Muslims of India. His honesty was transparent, and his dedication to his ideal a model for everyone. My association with him was extremely brief, but the abiding impression I still have is of a great and good man."[5] "A very well-read man. Skilful in argument. Persuasive in discussion. A jewel of a man."[6] "A man of dignified presence and outstanding personality. Widely educated."[7] "He was hospitable, fair spoken, well-dressed, well-mannered. Did not lose his temper even in the heat of discussion. Enjoyed the simple and civilized pleasures of life. When he laughed with abandon

tears fell from his eyes."[8] "He had neat habits and good tastes. He was very generous and hsopitable to all he met. What struck me much was his wide and deep reading in history. He had a magnetic attraction for all of us, and we regarded him with respect, admiration and some awe. Khwaja Abdur Rahim, Mian Abdul Haq and Pir Ahsanuddin were his loyal lieutenants and were known as his *basta-bardars*. They carried his briefcase, umbrella and cigarette box. His personal life was spotless."[9] "He had most businesslike methods . . . it was a pleasure to do work for Mr. Ali."[10]

Rahmat Ali's personal integrity was a legend. One incident illustrating this trait of his character is related by his bitterest enemy, Mian Abdul Haq. On his return from a holiday in Germany, Muhammad Din Tasir, an old friend of Lahore days and then a research student in Cambridge and a worker of the PNM, wrote a long letter to Rahmat Ali mentioning an offer of help from the Nazi party. In reply, Rahmat Ali sent a harshly-worded rejection and stopped seeing Tasir.[11]

Extreme devotion to a cause usually leads to the sublimation of other human emotions and desires. It is clear that Rahmat Ali had banished all kinds of sexual relationship from his life in pursuit of his mission. No woman entered his life as a wife or a friend or in any other position. In fact, he never had a woman visitor.[12] "We never heard of or saw any girl or woman with or around him."[13] Miss Watson of 16 Montague Road, who knew him from 1933 till his death, tells an interesting story. Once a friend of his, a peer, came to see him from London in a chauffeur-driven car, and he brought a young woman with him to Rahmat Ali's room. This offended him so much that the visitor had to send the girl out to sit in the car and wait until their conversation was finished.[14]

This complete aloofness from the fair sex was neither misogyny nor misogamy; nor was it the result of any disappointment in love. The reason was not romantic but missionary. He used to say that he was married to a cause and that was enough of an attachment.[15] When Anwar asked him why he did not marry, he received the same answer: he was wedded to a cause and needed all his financial resources to further his campaign for Pakistan and threfore could not afford a wife or a family.[16] In mid-'sixties a rumour was spread in Pakistan, initiated by a Lyallpur student studying in England and spread widely by Rahmat Ali's detractors, that he had had a liaison with, or had married, a woman in Cam-

bridge, and had left a son who lived in England. Inquiries in Pakistan and England failed to discover any truth in this report.[17]

Rahmat Ali's obsession with cleanliness, taboos in food, irregular working hours and large-scale entertainment did not endear him to his landladies. That explains his frequent change of lodgings. It is not known where he lived before 1932. In early 1933 he was at 3 Humberstone Road, from where *Now or Never* was issued. Towards the end of the year or in early 1934 he shifted to 16 Montague Road (the house bore the name "Ecclesbourne", which was still visible in 1971 in the inscription in relief on the outer wall above the front room window), where he stayed till 1937. From here he seems to have gone to "St. Winifride" in Woodlark Road; the house is not traceable now. In August 1941 his address was 9 Highfield Avenue; in October 1942, 91 Hurstpark Avenue; in 1947, some house in Holbrooke Road; and then again in Hurstpark Avenue; and finally in 1950 Cherryhinton Road.[18]

Influence

Above all it was the young Muslim student class, both in India and England, which felt the impact of Rahmat Ali's ideas and let its imagination be inspired by them. According to Khurshid's testimony, he received a pamphlet from Rahmat Ali in 1935, and the plan for a separate Muslim state at once captivated him, as it did "thousands of young Muslim students". Anwar-ul-Haq, a former chief justice of Pakistan, says that he was familiar with Rahmat Ali's concept of Pakistan before his departure for England when he was still a student in the Punjab. Some Muslim leaders had been dissuaded from supporting Pakistan by their cautious attitude and political expediency, but it swept the young students into an emotional storm. Anwar, too, was a follower of Rahmat Ali while still an undergraduate at Government College, Lahore.[19] Khaliq Qureshi of Lyallpur, one of the earliest supporters of Rahmat Ali in the Punjab, has made the point that while in Aligarh several dons were influenced by the Pakistan ideal between 1934 and 1937, in the Punjab there were few among college and university lecturers who were affected by the movement. Here the spell was cast upon the students and the youth in general. In the Clocktower Square of Lyallpur, on the wall of a

big building, a map of the proposed Pakistan state was made, and all expenses were borne by a local worker of the movement, Shaikh Firoz-ud-Din.[20]

An even greater impetus was given to the movement through Muslim students who went to England for higher studies. Here was the cream of the nation ready to be converted to any reasonable plan which safeguarded the rights of Muslim India. This group was well informed, educated, politically conscious, and mostly mature in years. Some of them had already heard of Pakistan and were anxious to meet Rahmat Ali. When they met him the few doubts they might have had were dissipated by his sincerity and persuasive power and by the sheer simplicity of the solution. Rahmat Ali seems to have had a magnetic personality, for a great majority of these students found themselves attracted to this large-eyed man whose logic dissolved all uncertainties, whose clarity of mind removed all difficulties, and whose confidence in himself touched the heights of fanatic devotion.

Some incidents of those days recall the links which bound these enthusiastic young men to Rahmat Ali. The time was 1936. A big dinner was being held for those who had qualified for the bar. Anwar from the Punjab found himself sitting opposite a young man from Bengal, who introduced himself as Mahbub Murshed (later to become chief justice of East Pakistan). Anwar asked him, "From which part of India do you come?" "From Pakistan", came the spontaneous reply. They began to talk about Pakistan, and on Anwar's enquiry if he had met Rahmat Ali and Murshed's answer in the affirmative, the Bengali barrister promised to take Anwar to the originator of Pakistan. Rahmat Ali was then living in a set of two rooms in a house situated in Burnt Oak, near Edgware, London. When the two young men reached there, Anwar saw a room crowded with forty or fifty students, who were sitting on the floor, in the chairs, on top of the table and in every conceivable place, all listening in rapt attention to Rahmat Ali's elaboration of his Pakistan plan. From that moment, Anwar was Rahmat Ali's man, and worked with him as an assistant, a secretary and a colleague till 1943.

Another young man from the Punjab, Anwar-ul-Haq, went to England on probation as a fresh entrant into the ICS. Already familiar with the Pakistan idea, he was naturally keen to meet Rahmat Ali. Muhammad Masud, another ICS probationer and a

follower of Rahmat Ali, solved the problem for Anwar-ul-Haq and brought the two men together. In this meeting, in answer to a question by Masud, Rahmat Ali explained that he was living in Cambridge, so far from his home and his country, so that he could inspire a love for Pakistan in the hearts of the Muslim students who came to England for higher education and who would, in the future, reach high places in Indian public life and thus be in a position to play an effective part in determining the shape of things to come.[21]

These students who fell under Rahmat Ali's influence came from all walks of life, and on their return to India joined different professions and services. Most of them belonged to three classes: lawyers who later became judges or politicians, undergraduates and research students who taught at various Indian colleges and universities, and new members of the ICS who were to exercise much power as time passed. This was the elite of Muslim India, and undoubtedly Rahmat Ali gained an inestimable advantage in being able to interest it in his ideas. When these men returned to India, replete with zeal for Pakistan, they acted as valuable channels for the spread of the message. Without actually entering politics or making public speeches, they were able to introduce the concept of a separate state into the Muslim mind. Each of these categories was ideally suited to disseminate the word. The lawyers met a large section of humanity in the course of their professional work, wrote articles for the press, and let their opinions be known in general during the interminable discussions and conversations in the thousands of bar-rooms scattered all over India. The teachers were in an even better position to propagate the ideal. In Muslim universities and colleges they could of course talk about Pakistan to their hearts' content. In other places nothing could stop them from injecting the idea into the minds of Muslim students, in private conversation or in small circles, and from distributing or lending Rahmat Ali's pamphlets to their students. The civilians were not public men, but their exceptional position in Indian society of those days made them powerful instruments in the service of the idea. Here was a "sahib", a part of the Olympian bureaucracy, a very big man in common estimation, and whatever he said in private conversation, in the club, in the family circle, or among friends, was taken note of, remembered and repeated humdreds of times. If a servant of the government,

a dispenser of favours and privileges, a giver of punishment, the *mai bap* of the people, said that Pakistan was a desirable thing, for thousands the idea immediately became unquestionable.

We must also remember that even in the 'thirties the "England-returned" had a special prestige in Indian eyes. Irrespective of his profession, status in life, income or ability, he enjoyed a unique distinction in society. By virtue of his stay in England he became, in some mysterious way, a part of the common image of British authority and infallibility. His words carried special weight. His opinions commanded respect. His person demanded esteem. To challenge his ideas called for extraordinary courage. This was a minor, but significant, manifestation of imperial power. Imperialism transmuted everything that it touched.

Thus we see how wrong it would be to measure Rahmat Ali's influence by the number of people who joined the ranks of his following. This was a case where quality vanquished quantity. He was neither a politician seeking popular support, nor a candidate angling for votes. Even more than being an arm-chair politician, he was a philosopher of political ideas, a creator of concepts, a maker of plans. For such people mass contact is not the aim, and hardly of much use. Communication of ideas takes place on a higher level than the spread of political opinions. The channels used are also of a different variety. Men of influence are needed to carry the philosophy abroad, to talk to and persuade other men of influence, to mould the mind of the elite in a certain direction. When this has been done, the philosopher of ideas has achieved what he had set out to do. The rest lies in the hands of the politicians and the way they manipulate the political machine. But if the idea has sunk deeply into the mind of those who make, rather than follow, public opinion, the work of the politician becomes easier and lighter. In this sense, Rahmat Ali's contribution to the history of the idea of Pakistan is unique, and all those who helped to make his ideas known to their own circles in India must justly share the credit.

The fact of Rahmat Ali's following being mainly among the youth and the students is confirmed by several contemporary observers. Halide Edib, who was in India in 1935 and whose long "interview" with Rahmat Ali has been quoted above, recorded that "according to a considerable number of Muslims in or out of politics whom the writer questioned in regard to the Pakistan

National Movement, its adherents are mostly in [the] Punjab or among Muslim students who live abroad".[22] Another author, wrongly in our opinion, confines Rahmat Ali's influence to Muslim students taking their first degrees at Cambridge, when he writes, "It was this Rahmat Ali who, after he had given the first concrete shape to the idea of Pakistan and had given it a name, sent out his emissaries to India (those same fellow-under-graduates who were now passing out of Cambridge and returning to their home) to explain the idea to the Muslim League and convert its leaders". And he continues, "At first the young ambassadors of Pakistan received a cool reception in India. Gradually, though influenced by the internal situation in the country, Mr. Jinnah began to grow sympathetic to the idea and asked its authors to present it in writing. That was before 1938."[23]

A modern historian, who was himself in Cambridge in the 'thirties, has emphasized the significance of Rahmat Ali's influence on the Muslim students studying in England. He, said I.H. Qureshi, "went on working and ultimately came to exert great influence upon the Muslim students from the sub-continent studying in the United Kingdom. . . . The United Kingdom was at that time the centre of higher studies for Indian students, and in converting the Muslim students in England, Rahmat Ali was converting the cream of the future intelligentsia and its most influential section, because only the most brilliant or the wealthiest students could get the privilege of studying in England in those days".[24] As has been pointed out by a recent commentator, these Muslim students living in England did double service to the cause of Pakistan. In England they helped Rahmat Ali by sharing his work. Returning to India they acquainted the Muslims with his ideas and theories.[25]

From the evidence made available to us so far it is clear that the main area of Rahmat Ali's influence lay in the Punjab, and there are circumstances to explain this. To start with, he was a Punjabi himself. This widened his contacts with people from his own province and made the Punjabis specially susceptible to his ideas. The number of Indian students in England was then so small that it was quite a standard practice for a new student setting out from his home to be told to look up so and so on his arrival. Many Punjabis leaving for England must have been given Rahmat Ali's name and advised to meet him. Then there was the natural ten-

dency of students from the same province and speaking the same language to locate one another and move in one circle. Living in a foreign country so different and distant from their own, they found in one another's company a home away from home. The fact that Rahmat Ali had been educated and had worked in Lahore before going to England also helped. Lahore was the intellectual and political heart of Muslim North India. With leaders like Shafi, Fazl-i-Husain, Zafar Ali Khan and Zafrulla, and poets of Iqbal's stature, it was fast becoming the nerve-centre of Muslim consciousness. A strong Muslim press reflected the community's aspirations and apprehensions. Recently a number of Punjabis (Maikash, Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Iqbal) had pointed to a new path which could lead to separation. All this had prepared the Punjabi mind to receive the idea of Pakistan with little resistance, with the result that when Rahmat Ali threw the first seeds of separation at least in the Punjab they did not fall on stony ground.

But the strongest factor helping Rahmat Ali was the nature and scope of his scheme. We must not forget that his first proposal was for a Pakistan in the north-west of India; it was some years later that he paid attention to other Muslim areas. Primarily, etymologically and exclusively Pakistan meant a Muslim state in the north-west. In this area the Punjab was obviously the most important province: in size, area, material advance, political progress and national awakening. Naturally, therefore, Rahmat Ali's scheme had a special appeal for the people of the Punjab. That explains the popularity it enjoyed in the province and also the large number of Punjabi students who supported Rahmat Ali in England.

In India itself, his impact was not inconsiderable. Mian Kifait Ali ("A Punjabi") was deeply influenced by him. "I was much impressed", he wrote, "by his vision, zeal, courage of conviction and devotion to duty to his people. His faith in the ideal of Pakistan was so great and deep that he never hesitated in expressing his views on it with an unmatched courage and boldness. No doubt he was blessed with the true spirit of a great pioneer. I discussed Chaudhri Sahib [in mid-'thirties] with a number of Lahore intelligentsia. They all spoke against him and pooh-poohed his views. I failed to agree with them".[26]

Similarly, Sayyid Abdul Latif's zonal proposal of 1939 also carried the impress of Rahmat Ali's ideas. Though he did not

acknowledge his debt to the Cambridge scheme, the two plans h
much in common. Both refused to see any national unity in Ind
underlined the fundamental clash between Hindu and Muslim cu
tures and ideals, and expounded a two-nation theory according
which Muslims constituted a separate nation or nationality. Whe
Latif spoke of the impossibility of the two cultures blendi
with each other, his very phraseology was borrowed from Rahm
Ali. Both rejected the 1935 constitution on identical ground
and emphasized Muslim determination to oppose its impleme
tation and operation regardless of consequences. Both wer
anxious to retain the Nizam's dominions as a Muslim regio
Rahmat Ali wanted it to be a sovereign state, Latif made a separat
zone of it. Both provided for the creation of a small "home" fo
the Hindu and Sikh minorities of the north-west. Both establishe
several small Muslim strongholds in the heart of Hindu India. Bot
included Assam, a Hindu-majority province, in the Muslim north
eastern zone or state. Both were deeply concerned with the future
of the untouchables, whom they wanted to see separated from the
Caste Hindus and, if possible, allied with the Muslims. Such close
and sharp resemblances could hardly have been a matter of coin-
cidence. In fact, the only major point distinguishing them is that
while Rahmat Ali stood for a complete separation of the Muslims
from the rest of India, Latif did not want to break up the unity of
the country and believed that, in spite of Muslim loss of faith in
the Hindu, a reconciliation was possible and a common federation
workable.

Speaking of Rahmat Ali, Halide Edib wrote: "It is evident that
the formative influences of his early youth led him to mix nation-
hood with religion, and his contact with the Hindus led him to
believe that the Muslems can expect no quarter from the Hindus,
and must therefore either organize themselves to meet the coming
danger of Hindu domination, or go down for ever. In speaking
about the British it was also evident that he was under the in-
fluence of what he read about European expansion, mostly at the
expense of Muslem nations, and the exploitation of the subject
peoples by Western imperialism".[27] This seems a fair summary of
the mental and moral influences which impelled Rahmat Ali
towards thinking on separatist lines. His reading of the Hindu mind
and the burning consciousness of being a Muslim ruled out any
possibility of a composite Hindu Muslim state and therefore of a

united India. His study of the history of British imperialism which had prospered mostly at the expense of Muslim lands and the natural inner urge to be free drove him to oppose the continuation of an alien rule over India. With these two alternatives out of the way, there was only one solution to the Hindu-Muslim problem, the issue of Indian independence and the question of British withdrawal. That was the creation of a few Muslim states in India so that Hindus and Muslims would live in peace in separate countries, instead of trying to live together amid bloodshed, frustration and perennial rivalry. It seemed an easy and natural solution once it had been enunciated, but its impact on the parties concerned was significant.

The Hindus were the first to realize its implications and see its threat to their position. Unlike the Muslim leadership of the 'thirties, they "did not dismiss Pakistan as an impracticable stu dents' dream. They saw its power and realized its dangers for their own schemes against the Muslims".[28] In as early as August 1934, Rai Sahib Mehr Chand Khanna, an influential Hindu from the North-West Frontier Province and that year's chairman of the Frontier, Punjab and Sind Hindu Conference, warned his co-religionists that "if steps were taken to turn this dream of Pan-Islamism into reality, Hindus of the Frontier, the Punjab and Sind would be the first and foremost to suffer".[29] From 1933 onwards we find Hindu commentators generously using the word "Pakistan" as an adjective qualifying what they called the Muslim mentality and attitude. Professor Gulshan Rai and others began to employ the word as equivalent of "communal". A man of Dr. Rajendra Prasad's standing could write that Rahmat Ali "claims that the Muslim League has been partly converted to his views. Who knows that in course of time the other parts of his scheme already published and yet to be published will also be not accepted by the League and thus Indians must be prepared to look forward for the day when the very name India will have disappeared and, the Millat being established all over, the continent will have acquired the name of Dinia".[30] Fear and dislike were thus the predominant elements of Hindu reaction.

The impact on the Muslims was more varied and reflected their initial uncertainty in owning ideas which appealed to their hearts but had yet not been completely accepted by their leaders.

It was the youth of north-west Muslim India, particularly of the

Punjab, which first felt the force of Rahmat Ali's message. With their minds already prepared for something of this kind by Durrani, Maikash, Zulfiqar Ali and Iqbal, and by the events occurring daily around them, they found in happy amazement that the Pakistan plan struck a very responsive chord in their hearts. The Punjab Muslim Students Federation and the Inter-Collegiate Muslim Brotherhood of Lahore were among the youth organizations which resolved in 1937 to struggle for a Muslim state in the north-west. In 1938 the followers of Rahmat Ali established a separate association in Lahore called Majlis-i-Kabir-i-Pakistan. The 1939 "Farogh-i-Urdu" issue of the *Crescent*, the students' magazine of Islamia College, Lahore, carried an article by "Jahangard" and also one by A.S. Khurshid on the PNM.[31] The members of the Majlis "won over, by correspondence, individual converts to the idea of Pakistan, wrote articles to explain to the public the fundamental differences between the communities and their clash of interests, both political and economic".[32] In this way the idea of Pakistan came to be propagated in the Punjab (and to some extent outside, too, for Muslim newspapers of Lahore had a wide reading public throughout India) at least two years before the Muslim League adopted it as its goal. This attests to Rahmat Ali's influence and defines his role in the independence movement.

The Muslim League, as we have seen in previous pages, owed much to Rahmat Ali's ideas and plans, in spite of its conspicuous failure to acknowledge the debt. The (two) separate Muslim states envisaged in the Lahore Resolution followed his scheme whereby Pakistan and Bangistan were to be separate countries. Later when it was implicitly assumed by the League leaders (and explicitly declared in April 1946) that the two states would in fact be one, they might have been thinking of his projected alliance between Pakistan, Bangistan and Usmanistan. The major point of difference between the League plan and Rahmat Ali's scheme was the inclusion of a free Hyderabad Deccan in the latter. In virtue of its declared policy of non-interference in the affairs of the native states the League could not possibly mention or claim Hyderabad in the Lahore Resolution (in fact, it did not mention even Kashmir where, unlike Hyderabad, a great majority of the population was Muslim). But it could not ignore the fact of general Muslim anxiety about the future of Hyderabad, and there were occasions when its leadership expressed opinions which brought

them much closer to Rahmat Ali's ideal than they would have cared to admit. We saw how the Raja of Mahmudabad had pointed out in 1939 that the suggestion of Iqbal was not acceptable to the Muslims of Hindu-majority provinces because it left them unprotected and also because it did not concern itself with the future of Muslim native states like Hyderabad and Bhopal. There is no doubt that the League, though not making an official statement to this effect, hoped and believed that Hyderabad would be an independent state after British withdrawal. In a publication which fully and faithfully reflected the League point of view, without, however, committing the party in formal terms, we read this, "Hyderabad, alone of all the Indian states, will be entitled to independent political existence in view of its treaty rights as an ally of the British Government".[33] Mawdudi of the Jamaat-i-Islami also argued in favour of a sovereign Hyderabad on the ground that Muslim rulership of the state made it a *dar-ul-Islam*.

When India was finally partitioned and Pakistan was established there was a general feeling among the Muslims that the division had been unjust to them and that they had been deprived of territory to which they were entitled under the terms and principles on which the division was professedly carried out. They argued, as Rahmat Ali had done in June 1947, that they had been victims of a British-Hindu alliance which was anxious to avoid a partition and, when it became unavoidable, to concede a Pakistan which would always remain weak and defenceless. One major reason for Rahmat Ali's banishment from Pakistan in 1948 was the fear that he would exploit this feeling, thus bringing a bad name to the Muslim League and Jinnah. This feeling of having been dealt an unfavourable deal grew with years, and continual reports of suppression of Muslims in India intensified it. Pakistani thoughts went back to Rahmat Ali's suggestions for a larger Pakistan and for a few "national homes" to accommodate the Muslims scattered all over Hindu India. As more and more Muslims, driven out of their homes by fear of losing their life and honour, arrived in Pakistan even the government began to feel the pressure of events. "It is gratifying to note", wrote Anwar in the spring of 1964, "that the present leadership of Pakistan, for the first time, is beginning to think along the lines of Rahmat Ali, and in the course of the last few weeks, demands have been made by those who matter, for additional territory for the Muslims whose genocide is proceeding apace

in Hindoostan according to a calculated plan."[34]

Simultaneously, another observer pointed out the relevance to present times of Rahmat Ali's diagnosis of the Indian problem and of his plans for providing an honourable place to the various nations living in the sub-continent. "The truth of Rahmat Ali's sayings is being amply vindicated by what is happening in India today", wrote Dr. Haque. "The Sikhs have been scattered all over the country and their complete elimination is only a matter of years. The Muslim genocide is going on and fears about the Muslims being merged in, and submerged by, the overwhelming number of caste Hindus are being increasingly acknowledged, so much so that the [Pakistan] National Assembly could see no other remedy except to demand additional territory for those who are being evicted and those who were migrating to save themselves. The Dravidians are receiving step-motherly treatment and are likely to assert themselves before long. The Goanese have been liquidated and the Untouchables are fast losing importance. Will these people allow themselves to be submerged by caste Hindus in a 'secular' India which is actively working for their elimination, or will they survive to heed Rahmat Ali's advice to demand independent sovereign States?"[35]

The demand of the Pakistan National Assembly for a larger Pakistan was a bitter irony. It was repeating Rahmat Ali's proposal and, by implication, supporting his criticism of the Muslim League and of Jinnah, at a time when some of its members led by Mian Abdul Haq were asking the Government of Pakistan to cancel the permission granted to Rahmat Ali's brother to bring his dead body to Pakistan for reburial. The Government surrendered to their demand.

Achievements

The refusal of Rahmat Ali's countrymen to acknowledge his role in history is brought into full relief by the generous tributes paid to him by the British in Cambridge who knew him well. "I was sure that he was a great man almost from the beginning", recalled his secretary.[36] "I certainly felt even then that he was a great man", said his typist and general assistant.[37] "If you have invented a new name for India it is an astonishing achievement and historically such inventions have sometimes been a success",

wrote his former tutor.[38] The *Emmanuel College Magazine* mourned his loss in touching words. His contemporaries, it said, "may remember how impressive could be his formal and sincere courtesy and how, suddenly, he could speak as if inspired on the subject which he had already made his life, the defence of Islam against Hindu nationalism . . . it would be absurd not to record the fact that this obscure and single-handed undergraduate of Emmanuel College . . . has influenced world events . . . . By mere accident, we may have made the College a place of pilgrimage to the faithful and the curious, and have added another name to be misunderstood by the guide books. 'This College was the College of the founder of Pakistan'. . . . If a guide were to be overheard in such a story it would be a much truer one than many which are heard today in our Front Court about John Harvard."[39] The *Daily News* of Cambridge recorded that he "was respected throughout the world for that primary quality of greatness, singleness of purpose . . . [he] so devotedly gave his life to his work as to precipitate his untimely death. It is not without pride that Cambridge may remember Chaudhary Rahmat Ali as creator, in 1933, of the Pakistan Ideal . . . the world is poorer, also, by the loss of a creative idealist, and a great man".[40]

The outstanding quality of Rahmat Ali's character was sincerity. Except Jinnah, few people in the history of the Muslim nationalist movement equal his record of single-mindedness and devotion. It was above all his honesty of purpose that effected a transformation in the Muslim students around him in England and later in the youth of northern India who had never seen him.

This earnestness and probity lent his pen the immense virtues of clarity, logical reasoning and vitality. He evolved a style that suited his purpose in all respects. It is free of all ambiguity and vagueness. The right word is in the right place. Vividness and clarity make his meaning unmistakable. It is an intensely personal style, individual in every dimension, wearing his crest and livery. He reasons from conviction and therefore with lucidity and exactness. One point follows another with logical acuteness. The argument is well rounded. The writing is vigorous and forceful. The ideas are neatly put. He speaks plainly but with a hidden strength. He has the hand of a ready writer. However, two things mar his style: repetition and an excess of alliteration. Sometimes the repetitiveness impairs the effect of his words. He is essentially

a preacher with a mission to instruct, enlighten, enunciate, inculcate, indoctrinate, expound, discourse and moralize. Inevitably this makes some of his writings declaratory, flat, insistent and dogmatic; but it also imparts to them the virtues of confidence, emphasis and solemnity. His fondness for alliteration is a more serious flaw. It jars on the ear and distracts the reader's attention from the argument being offered. Generally, however, he has a fair command of the language and an uncommon persuasive dexterity.

His loyalty to the cause which he had made his own was unquestionable. Once after giving an interview to a German journalist about the Pakistan Movement he travelled all the way to Berlin to make sure that he was correctly reported in the newspaper.[41] The impact of his personality was immediate on his contemporaries. "What one saw", wrote Anwar, "was a man with big sparkling eyes and faith writ large on his face. He spoke with a fervour and a zeal such as only a man possessed is capable of."[42] He "had only one passion in life and that was 'Pakistan' ".[43] By preaching to his circle and converting them to the Pakistan idea, he also weaned them away from Communism which was then quite fashionable. His "deep influence upon them was soon shown in their personal lives, when they withdrew from the frivolities of undergraduate life and became sincere and practising Muslims".[44]

With such personal moral resources to back up his movement, success was bound to bless his efforts. It was an added advantage that his ideals suited the temper of the time. Muslims were then in search of a permanent solution that would lift the curse of insecurity from their political and social existence and give them hope of an honourable and free life. The Pakistan plan answered their requirements in every way; and once they grasped the idea, nothing could stop them from pursuing it to the ultimate end.

Of course, there were weaknesses in Rahmat Ali's scheme. No human effort is perfect. His Pakistan and Bangistan were reasonable demands, justified by every political principle: self-determination, nationalism, common sense, expediency, justice, popular will, stability, practicability. The Osmanistan plan was less feasible, with nothing but the memory and tradition of an Islamic past to support it. The proposals for other Muslim states and national homes were hardly realistic. Neither the Hindus nor the British would have agreed to them. They also involved a large-

scale transfer of population that might not have been acceptable to the Muslims themselves. Even in the unlikely event of their successful establishment, these mini-states could not have been viable. There are a few examples of very small countries existing in the world, but they are not surrounded by hostile states on the look-out for bringing them to a swift end. Similarly, his larger scheme of converting India into a continent of Dinia was too idealistic to be realizable within any foreseeable future.

But there were also elements of strength that more than compensated for the defects. Apart from the details of his scheme, he emphasized three broad principles that testify to his deep understanding of the Muslim problem in India and the general history of Islam in the world.[45] One was the Islamic nature of his appeal. Naturally he brought up other arguments that are useful and relevant in every political campaign—arguments from democracy, nationalism and anti-imperialism. But what inspired his thinking and gave coherence to his aspirations was the love of Islam. His non-Muslim detractors might call it a slogan, or whatever else pleases them; but the fact remains that, for Muslims, there can be no ideal higher than the protection of their faith and the integration and honour of their millat. The Muslim League campaign for Pakistan was also rooted in the same instinct. The second of his principles related to the nature of minorities as demonstrated in the larger historical perspective. He realized that minorities were always a source of danger. They could only be dealt with in two ways: they could be liquidated, so that the state should be free of all fear of treachery; or, and particularly if they were of sizeable proportions, they could be made free and allowed to go their own way. This he saw as a historical truth to which the experience of so many countries, nations and races was a witness.

The third principle, which he derived from a study of both India and Islam, concerned the reaction of the Muslim minority faced with the possibility of leading a life of perpetual subservience. The history of India proved that it had never constituted one united country since the days of the Dravidians. It was always the sword of an alien warrior that had brought these vast tracts of land together under one rule. Force alone had been the instrument of creating the one out of the many; and when the strong hand of the unifier had lost its cunning, the *facade* of unity had crumbled into chaos. The history of Islam taught another lesson

that fitted into the Indian situation. The size of the Muslim minority of India posed a question to which the history of Islam had already given an answer. Muslim communities of such a large size had never been slaves to anyone. Either they had wrested their freedom from the hands of those who claimed a right over them or they had vanished from history and been lost to the faith. If they loved honour and independence and dignity, they fought for the prize and carved out a place of their own. If their determination was unequal to their ambition, they met the fate of the weak and disappeared from view as a people: the Muslims of Spain, of Austria and of Yugoslavia offered a salutary example of the decline and fall of the *ci-devant* rulers. This was a lesson of history which offered the Indian Muslims only two choices: either to accept the rule of the Hindu and thus vanish from the roll of Islam, or to fight for a country of their own and live in honour and faith. There were no other possibilities, no half-way houses, no virtuous compromises.

It is a measure of Rahmat Ali's intellect that he chose to build up his movement on the foundations of these broad principles vindicated by history rather than on minor arguments sanctioned by expediency. By doing this, he raised the level of debate to historical verities and left the world of politicians behind him. His role in the development of the idea of Pakistan was essentially that of a thinker. He learnt many lessons from the past. He realized that he was living amidst events that were soon bound to give a new shape to the things to come. He saw far into the future, and did what he could to ensure that it should be in keeping with the better traditions of the past. No man could have done more.

His achievements were no less remarkable on the narrower plane of concrete schemes and exact suggestions. He was the first to think of a sovereign status for the Muslims of India, to prepare a well-defined plan for this, to organize a movement for advancing the cause, and to mount a proper campaign for preaching to the unconverted. That he did this alone speaks volumes for his resolution, enterprise, industry and devotion. In one particular respect, Rahmat Ali's name is unique in the history of the world. He is the only man to have given a name to a country many years before that country came into existence. There are examples, though not many, of countries being called after a great man. But Pakistan stands alone as a country which owes its name to the imagination

of one man.

In this narration we have looked at two Rahmat Alis: a human being and an individual person, and a historical figure and a seminal thinker. The man and the hero combined in one body and mind. The virtues and achievements of both were of heroic proportions.

In his person he was an image of grace and a man of attractive mould. He emitted charm with the careless ease of a glow worm. With a heart brimful with affection, he gave and received much love. Transparently honest and incapable of uttering a falsehood or doing an evil, he saw others as if they were made in his image, until the treachery of his friends and the meanness of his country taught him to be careful of humanity. He combined a harmless and wholesome character with an alertly nimble intelligence, a nerve of iron and a strong conscience. Born with the qualities of a gentleman, his manners had a silken elegance and his talk the charm of civilized embroidery and the depth of wisdom.

As a figure in history he moved public opinion because his call touched a chord aching to respond. Conviction winged his words with strength, and men felt his influence like a storm wind. Knowing no doubt and feeling no fear, he saw the goal and not the obstacles—this was his greatness.

He lived without pride of ancestry and died without hope of posterity, but between his mother's kisses and the grave he achieved much.

APPENDIX 2

3, Humberstone Road,
Cambridge.
28th January, 1933.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am enclosing herewith an appeal on behalf of the thirty million Muslims of PAKSTAN, who live in the five Northern Units of India—Punjab, North-west Frontier (Afghan) Province, Kashmir, Sind, and Baluchistan, embodying their inexorable demand for the recognition of their separate national status, as distinct from the rest of India, by the grant of a separate Federal Constitution on social, religious, political and historical grounds.

May I venture to request you to acquaint me please with your valuable opinion as to the proposed solution of this great Indian problem as explained herein?

I do hope and trust that, vitally interested as you are in the permanent solution of this problem, the objects outlined in the appeal will meet with your fullest approval and active support.

Yours truly,
RAHMAT ALI,
(Chaudhry).

NOW OR NEVER

ARE WE TO LIVE OR PERISH FOR EVER?

At this solemn hour in the history of India, when British and Indian statesmen are laying the foundations of a Federal Constitution for that land, we address this appeal to you, in the name of our common heritage, on behalf of our thirty million Muslim

brethren who live in PAKSTAN–by which we mean the f
Northern units of India, viz.: Punjab, North-West Frontier P
vince (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan–for yo
sympathy and support in our grim and fateful struggle agai
political crucifixion and complete annihilation.

Our brave but voiceless nation is being sacrificed on the alt
of Hindu Nationalism not only by the non-Muslims, but to t
lasting disgrace of Islam, by our own so-called leaders, with reckle
disregard to our future and in utter contempt of the teachings
history.

The Indian Muslim Delegation at the Round Table Conferen
have committed an inexcusable and prodigious blunder. They ha
submitted, in the name of Hindu Nationalism, to the perpetu
subjection of the ill-starred Muslim nation. These leaders ha
already agreed, without any protest or demur and without an
reservation, to a Constitution based on the principle of an Al
India Federation. This, in essence, amounts to nothing less tha
signing the death-warrant of Islam and its future in India. In doin
so, they have taken shelter behind the so-called Mandate from th
community. But they forgot that that suicidal Mandate was frame
and formulated by their own hands. That Mandate was not th
Mandate of the Muslims of India. Nations never give Mandates t
their representatives to barter away their very souls; and men o
conscience never accept such self-annihilating Mandates, if given-
much less execute them. At a time of a crisis of this magnitude
the foremost duty of saving statesmanship is to give a fair, firm an
fearless lead, which, alas, has been persistently denied to eighty
millions of our co-religionists in India by our leaders during the las
seventy-five years. These have been the years of false issues, of los
opportunities and of utter blindness to the most essential and
urgent needs of the Muslim interests. Their policy has throughou
been nerveless in action and subservient in attitude. They have al
along been paralysed with fear and doubt, and have deliberately,
time and again, sacrificed their political principles for the sake
of opportunism and expediency. To do so even at this momentous
juncture is a policy of Bedlam. It is idle for us not to look this
tragic truth in the face. The tighter we shut our eyes, the harder
that truth will hit us.

At this critical moment, when this tragedy is being enacted,
permit us to appeal to you for your practical sympathy and active

support for the demand of a separate Federation—a matter of life and death for the Muslims of India—as outlined and explained below.

India, constituted as it is at the present time, is not the name of one single country; nor the home of one single nation. It is, in fact, the designation of a State created for the first time in history, by the British. 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.

In the five Northern Provinces of India, out of a total population of about forty millions, we, the Muslims, constitute about thirty millions. Our religion, culture, history, tradition, economic system, laws of inheritance, succession and marriage are basically and fundamentally different from those of the people living in the rest of India. The ideals which move our thirty million brethren-in-faith living in these Provinces to make the highest sacrifices are fundamentally different from those which inspire the Hindus. These differences are not confined to the broad basic principles—far from it. They extend to the minutest details of our lives. We do not inter-dine; we do not inter-marry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different.

It is preposterous to compare, as some superficial observers do, the differences between Muslims and Hindus with those between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Both the Catholics and Protestants are part and parcel of one religious system—Christianity; while the Hindus and Muslims are the followers of two essentially and fundamentally different religious systems. Religion in the case of Muslims and Hindus is not a matter of private opinion as it is in the case of Christians; but on the other hand constitutes a Civic Church which lays down a code of conduct to be observed by their adherents from birth to death.

If we, the Muslims of Pakstan, 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 to four. It is this which sounds the death-knell of the Muslim nation in India forever. To realise the full magnitude of this impending catastrophe, let us remind you that we thirty million constitute about one-tenth of the whole Muslim world. The total area of the five units comprising PAKSTAN, which are our homelands, is four times

that of Italy, three times that of Germany and twice that of France; and our population seven times that of the Commonwealth of Australia, four times that of the Dominion of Canada, twice that of Spain, and equal to France and Italy considered individually.

These are facts—hard facts and realities—which we challenge anybody to contradict. It is on the basis of these facts that we make bold to assert without the least fear of contradiction that we, Muslims of P A K S T A N, do possess a separate and distinct nationality from the rest of India, where the Hindu nation lives and has every right to live. We, therefore, deserve and must demand the recognition of a separate national status by the grant of a separate Federal Constitution from the rest of India.

In addressing this appeal to the Muslims of India, we are also addressing it to the two other great interests—British and Hindu—involved in the settlement of India's future. They must understand that in our conviction our body and soul are at stake. Our very being and well-being depends upon it. For our five great Northern states to join an All-India Federation would be disastrous, not only to ourselves, but to every other race and interest in India, including the British and the Hindu.

This is more especially true when there is a just and reasonable alternative to the proposed settlement, which will lay the foundations of a peaceful future for this great sub-continent; and should certainly allow of the highest development of each of these two peoples without one being subject to another. This alternative is a separate Federation of these five predominantly Muslim units—Punjab, North-West Frontier Province (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan. The Muslim Federation of North-West India would provide the bulwark of a buffer state against any invasion either of ideas or of arms from outside. The creation of such a Federation would not materially disturb the ratio of the Muslim and Hindu population in the rest of India. It is wholly to the interest of British and Hindu statesmanship to have as an ally a free, powerful and contented Muslim nation having a similar but separate Constitution to that which is being enacted for the rest of India. Nothing but a separate Federation of our homelands would satisfy us. This demand is basically different from the suggestion put forward by Doctor Sir Mohammad Iqbal in his Presidential address to the All-India Muslim League in 1930.

While he proposed the amalgamation of these Provinces into a single state forming a unit of the All-India Federation, we propose that these Provinces should have a separate Federation of their own. There can be no peace and tranquillity in the land if we, the Muslims, are duped into a Hindu-dominated Federation where we cannot be the masters of our own destiny and captains of our own souls.

Do the safeguards provided for in the Constitution give us any scope to work for our salvation along our own lines? Not a bit. Safeguard is the magic word which holds our leaders spellbound, and has dulled their consciences. In the ecstasy of their hallucinations they think that the pills of safeguards can cure nation-annihilating earthquakes. Safeguards asked for by these leaders and agreed to by the makers of the Constitution can never be a substitute for the loss of separate nationality. We, the Muslims, shall have to fight that course of suicidal insanity to death. What safeguards can be devised to prevent our minority of one in four in an All-India Federation from being sacrificed on every vital issue to the aims and interests of the majority race, which differs from us in every essential of individual and corporate life? What safeguards can prevent the catastrophe of the Muslim nation smarting and suffering eternally at the frustration of its every social and religious ideal? What safeguards can compensate our nation awakened to its national consciousness for the destruction of its distinct national status? However effective and extensive the safeguards may be, the vital organs and proud symbols of our national life, such as army and navy, foreign relations, trade and commerce, communications, posts and telegraphs, taxation and customs, will not be under our control, but will be in the hands of a Federal Government, which is bound to be overwhelmingly Hindu. With all this, how can we, the Muslims, achieve any of our ideals if those ideals conflict—conflict as they must—with the ideals of Hindus?

The history of the last century, in this respect, is full of unforgettable lessons for us. Even one who runs may read them. To take just one instance: Despite all these safeguards and guarantees we have enjoyed in the past, the very name of our national language—URDU, even now the *lingua franca* of that great sub-continent—has been wiped out of the list of Indian languages. We have just to open the latest census report to verify it. This by itself is a tragic fall. Are we fated to fall farther? But that too is dust in

the scales by comparison with the tremendous national issues involving our whole future as a nation and a power not only in India but also in the whole of Asia.

In the face of these incontrovertible facts, we are entitled to ask for what purpose are we being asked to make the supreme sacrifice of surrendering our nationality and submitting ourselves and our posterity to Non-Muslim domination? What good is likely to accrue to Islam and Muslims by going into the Federation is a thing which passes our understanding. Are we to be crucified just to save the faces of our leaders, or to bolster up the preposterous falsehood that India can be a single nation? Is it with a view to achieve a compromise at all costs, or is it to support the illusion that Hindu nationalism is working in the interests of Muslims as well as Hindus? Irony is flattered to death by a mental muddle of such a nature and on such a scale. We have suffered in the past without a murmur and faced dangers without demur. The one thing we would never suffer is our own self-strangulation. We will not crucify ourselves upon the cross of Hindu nationalism in order to make a Hindu-holiday.

May we be permitted to ask of all those statesmen–Muslim or British or Hindu–supporting the Federal Constitution, if it is really desirable to make our nation sacrifice all that Islam has given us during the last fourteen hundred years to make India a nation? Does humanity really stand to gain by this stupendous sacrifice? We dare say that still in Islam the ancient fire glows and promises much for the future, if only the leaders would let it live. Whilst in Europe, excluding Russia, in about the same area as that of India and with about the same population, there live and prosper as many as twenty-six nations, with one and the same religion, civilisation and economic system, surely it is not only possible but highly desirable for two fundamentally different and distinct nations, i.e., Muslim and Hindu, to live as friendly neighbours in peace and prosperity in that vast sub-continent. What bitter irony is it that our leaders have not the courage to stand up and demand the minimum for our political salvation.

We are face to face with a first-rate tragedy, the like of which has not been seen even in the long and eventful history of Islam. It is not the question of a sect or of a community going down; but it is the supreme problem which affects the destiny of the whole of Islam and the millions of human beings who, till quite

recently, were the custodians of the glory of Islam in India and the defenders of its frontiers. We have a still greater future before us, if only our soul can be saved from the perpetual bondage of slavery forged in an All-India Federation. Let us make no mistake about it. The issue is now or never. Either we live or perish for ever. The future is ours only if we live up to our faith. It does not lie in the lap of the gods, but it rests in our own hands. We can make or mar it. The history of the last century is full of open warnings, and they are as plain as were ever given to any nation. Shall it be said of us that we ignored all these warnings and allowed our ancient heritage to perish in our own hands?

MOHD. ASLAM KHAN,
(Khattak).
President, Khyber Union.

RAHMAT ALI,
(Chaudhary).

SHEIKH MOHD SADIQ,
(Sahibzada).

INAYAT ULLAH KHAN,
(of Charsaddah).
Secretary, Khyber Union.

APPENDIX 3
WHAT DOES THE PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT STAND FOR?

Note

In those vast and varied spaces of South Asia, which are often erroneously called the Sub-continent of India, the Pakistan National Movement is the only political movement that has a creative and consolidating message, not only for the future of the people of Pakistan itself, but also for that of all peoples living in their historic lands. That is to say, that while the Indian National Congress wholly concentrates its ambitions upon imposing "Indian" nationality on the non-Indian peoples and most of the other political organisations mainly confine their aspirations to the narrow limits of the interests of their own communities, the ideology of our Movement essentially activates and embraces the right of every nation to its national life and liberty in its own homeland, now incorporated in "India."

We are, therefore, justly proud of the fact that the birth of the Movement in 1933 and its work since that year have heralded the dawn of a new epoch, marking the renaissance of the nations of South Asia. I mean the nations that, for long centuries, have suffered the domination of "Indianism" which is at once the most primitive, the most pervasive, and the most pernicious domination in the world.

How far the struggle of the Movement has spread and succeeded may be judged from the fact that, morally, it has already startled the East, staggered "Indianism," and stirred the submerged races and religions of South Asia; nationally, it has already won the active allegiance of 100 million Muslims to its cause of the distinct nationhood of Muslims in their lands which I named Pakistan, Usmanistan and Bang-i-Islamistan; and, internationally, it has already revived the national hopes of the Dravidians, of the Sikhs,

of the Rajpoots, and of the Mahrattas in their respective strongholds, the first two of which, for want of any other designation, I personally call Dravidia (to define the domain of the Dravidians) and Guruistan (to describe the land of the Gurus, enshrining the sources of the Sikh religious scripture, Garanth Sahib, and of their national script, Gurmukhi) and the last two of which are universally known as Rajistan and Maharashtar.

This pamphlet attempts to deal with the fundamentals of the political ideology of the Movement which, in the fullness of time, are destined to recast the Sub-continent of "India" into South Asia and thereby restore the right to nationhood of the peoples who are, at the moment, condemned by "Indianism" to the mean position of minority communities in their own fatherlands. I hope and trust that it will help the public to understand and appreciate more fully than ever that the struggle of the Movement is as much for the liberation of other victims of the domination of "Indianism" as it is for that of Pakistan, of Usmanistan, and of Bang-i-Islamistan.

12th July, 1942. C. Rahmat Ali.

If you read the history of South Asia and review the vicissitudes through which its peoples have passed, you will be struck by the grim fact that, throughout the ages, one force has, above everything else, dominated them all and defeated their efforts to improve the lot of their countries.

This force I call "Indianism." Born and bred before the dawn of history, it became dangerous in the Dark Ages. And, since those distant times, it has spread far and wide and, growing into a destructive dominium, has victimised men and millats, crippled creeds and countries, and enslaved at least half the continent of Asia.

Yet such is the tragic irony of fate that, despite this gruesome record, its victims have always played into its hands. For even if you ignore the remote past and think only of recent times, you will find that they have again subordinated both their heritages and their destinies to its supremacy.

I will explain.

When, in the current period of the history of South Asia, "Indianism," under the auspices of British Imperialism and through the hands of a British citizen in the service of that Imperialism,

established in 1885 its first political institution, it cleverly called this institution the All-India National Congress. I say cleverly, because by the subtle, but none the less unmistakable, implications of this nomenclature, it first designated as India all the lands of South Asia incorporated into the British Empire; secondly, denied the right of the non-Indian nations therein to distinct nationhoods of their own; and, thirdly, asserted its pretentious claim to stamping Indian nationality on the peoples living in those lands which, through such dubious devices, it has made known to the world as the Sub-continent of India.

Indubitably, therefore, this nomenclature was a trap cunningly set by "Indianism" for non-Indians – a trap which, with the clarity of vision born of suffering, they should have avoided. But, blindly enough, they all fell into it. For, in the course of time, when even the great, historic peoples like the Muslims, the Sikhs, and the Rajpoots, started their own organisations, they apishly called them All-India Muslim League, All-India Muslim Conference, All-India Sikh Conference, and All-India Rajpoot Conference, etc.

Now this preposterous prefix of "All-India" to the names of their organisations meant, if it meant anything at all, that though they were Muslims, Sikhs, or Rajpoots, yet they all were "Indians". Little did the founders of these political bodies realise that, in adding the high-sounding title of "All-India" to their names, they were fastening the fetters of "Indianism" on their peoples and handing over their lands to its political hegemony.

Is it any wonder then that this blundering policy cost them dear? To the apostles of "Indianism", always in league with British Imperialism, it came as a great opportunity and naturally they made the best of it. By a mixture of bribing and bullying, they played off the Muslims against the Sikhs and the Sikhs against the Muslims, the Rajpoots against the Mahrattas and the Mahrattas against the Rajpoots, and pinned them all down to this "Self-Indianising" policy throughout the past half century.

Again, in this period, while its victims slept, "Indianism" itself remained wide awake. Gathering power and prestige for itself, in 1930 it made a supreme bid for establishing an All-India Federation.

But why Federation?

Because, of all the constitutions known to the law, Federal

Constitution alone could enslave for ever the non-Indian peoples and ensure both the permanent renunciation by them of the remaining vestiges of their distinct nationhood and their formal acceptance of Indian nationality.

This was the central idea underlying the proposal for Federation. But fortunately for the non-Indians, the All-India Federation, as passed by the British Parliament in 1935, came to nothing. It was thwarted by the forces of opposition, inspired, fostered, and led by the Pakistan National Movement, which was the first to reject the incorporation of Muslim nations and of their territories into the Federation.

Thus the federal move by "Indianism" failed, but its age-old motive to perpetuate its hegemony persisted. This finally convinced the Movement that only a sustained crusade against it would liberate South Asia from its domination and give the nations a chance to live in freedom in their national homelands.

Hence the following programme of the Movement, which speaks for itself.

I. The Pakistan National Movement stands for the *spiritual liberation* of the nations of South Asia from the *secular thraldom* of "Indianism."

Why?

Because, in the past 3,500 years of its grip on South Asia, "Indianism" has systematically opposed all religions and ceaselessly worked for their disintegration. The sombre results of its cruel campaign against religion can briefly be summed up in the statement that, in its long career, it has banished Buddhism and absorbed Jainism; it has menaced Islam and stifled Sikhism.

Now religion is the anchor of life—both individual and national. If you weaken the hold of this anchor, you vitiate the very purpose of life. It is, therefore, no exaggeration to say that the anti-religious activities of "Indianism" have grievously retarded the spiritual emancipation of mankind and dwarfed the moral development of half the population of the continent of Asia. In view of these stark realities, the Pakistan National Movement is leading a struggle to remove the stranglehold of "Indianism" from South Asia and to liberate the nations living therein from its secular thraldom so that they can recover their spiritual freedom.

II. The Pakistan National Movement stands for the *cultural liberation* of the nations of South Asia from the *barbarian influence* of "Indianism."

Why?

Because, in the past three millenia, while "Indianism" itself has contributed next to nothing to the cultures of South Asia, it has corrupted almost everything created by the non-Indian nations. This means to say that it has debased the Saracenic civilisation of the Muslims, the chivalrous code of the Rajpoots, the knightly creed of the Sikhs, and the martial tradition of the Mahrattas, and, in the end, attempted to "Indianise" them all, body, mind, and soul.

This record of its barbarity towards the cultural patrimony of the peoples of South Asia not only deserves the severest condemnation at the hands of all, but also demands from the aggrieved nations the strongest measures of self-defence against its future encroachments. For only if, and when, an impregnable defence is created against it, can they revert to their original conception of life and regenerate their respective cultures in their national strongholds. So the Pakistan National Movement is determined to confine "Indianism" to its historical and national sphere –India (Hindoostan), and thereby provide an opportunity for the non-Indian nations to achieve their cultural liberation from its barbarian influence.

III. The Pakistan National Movement stands for the *social liberation* of the nations of South Asia from the *caste tyranny* of "Indianism."

Why?

If you turn to any faith–whether monastic or civic–or take any philosophies of life–whether social or political–you will find that one and all of them honour, accept, and act upon, the basic principle of brotherhood of their own followers. To this universal principle, "Indianism" provides the sole exception.

It rejects this principle *in toto* and preaches and practises instead the cult of the inequality of man before man and his Maker. Thus it institutes and perpetuates divisions among the people and disqualifies them from integrating themselves as nations fit enough

to take their places in the comity of nations.

The Pakistan National Movement maintains that this caste tyranny is a curse to South Asia that must be removed. Hence the Movement's fight to sweep away the age-old disabilities imposed by "Indianism" upon the peoples, and to restore their social status to them so that they can rise again to their fullest stature in the world.

IV. The Pakistan National Movement stands for the *economic liberation* of the nations of South Asia from the *impoverishing capitalism* of "Indianism."

Why?

Because, in the past hundred and twenty generations, "Indianism" has callously exploited the 400 million people living in South Asia and left a trail of destitution and desolation in its wake. And no wonder. For, from the first day of its descent on these lands until today, it has, throughout the Dark Ages, throughout the Middle Ages, and throughout the Modern Age, forced countless millions of men, women and children to live, labour, and perish in the service of its own material aggrandisement.

This is not to deny that, right through the centuries, despots have looted, dynasties have plundered, and imperialisms have preyed upon South Asia. It is simply to stress the fact that "Indianism" has surpassed them all.

To grasp the full significance of this statement, one has only to remember the plight of Pakistan. In this land of peasants, already denuded by the demands of British Imperialism it has been established by the highest authorities on the subject that for every rupee a peasant pays to the Government as land revenue, he pays no less than eighteen as interest to the money-lending institutions and agents of "Indianism."

So it is clear that, from its groaning victims, "Indianism" is, even today, receiving in interest, in compound interest, and in usurious exactions, a tribute that is more exorbitant than that ever extorted by the worst mammonist known to mankind.

It being the solemn belief of the Pakistan National Movement that this crippling capitalism which, for its own greed for gold, has so inhumanly treated the people and created mountains of misery for them, has no right to function any longer, it is resol-

ved to write "finis" to the impoverishing capitalism of "Indianism" so as to ensure the economic liberation of the nations of South Asia.

V. The Pakistan National Movement stands for the *national liberation* of the peoples of South Asia from the *destructive domination* of "Indianism."

Why?

Because, in the past thirty-five centuries of its domination, "Indianism" first nearly exterminated physically a civilised and ancient race–the Dravidians; secondly, it reduced socially to the position of mere serfs, a peace-loving and industrious people, now commonly known as the Depressed Classes; thirdly, it ruined politically four great nations–the Muslims, the Rajpoots, the Mahrattas, and the Sikhs; and, lastly, to buttress its own wrongful position, it dragooned them all into subjection to British Imperialism in South Asia.

It can, therefore, hardly be gainsaid that the present degradation of South Asia is, in the ultimate analysis, due to the destructive policy of "Indianism." To defeat this policy and to defend the national existence of the peoples of South Asia, the Pakistan National Movement has, since its foundation in 1933, made it a principle to admit the birthright of each and every nation which is under Indian domination to a nationhood of its own in the territory wherein it may form a majority of the population; further, to support by all legitimate means the actual realisation of this right by all such nations; furthermore to acknowledge this right even in the case of the Sikhs, of the Christians, of the Dravidians, and of the Depressed Classes, who, though morally and numerically qualified to form distinct nations of their own, cannot at present do that because they are so scattered that they can neither possess a majority in any province nor claim a part of a province as exclusively their own. In each of these cases the Movement, in order to enable them to recreate their nationhoods and to achieve their national liberation from the destructive domination of "Indianism," concedes their right to as much of the area of the land of their birth as may correspond to the numerical ratio of their people to the total population of the province concerned.

Thus it will be seen that the Pakistan National Movement is the only political movement in South Asia that stands for the birth-right of all nations to their national existence, even if that birth-right may have to be satisfied, as in the case of the Sikhs, at the expense of Pakistan itself.

VI. The Pakistan National Movement stands for the *inter-national consolidation* of the nations of South Asia against the *de-nationalising dangers* of "Indianism."

How?

Standing as it does for the "Asianisation" of the non-Indian nations and their countries now caged within "India," for the elimination of the forces maintaining the domination of "Indianism," and for the creation of the spirit of inter-national solidarity among the peoples of South Asia, the Pakistan National Movement holds that, to realise these common purposes, the nations concerned must first recognise and guarantee the integrity of one another in such a manner that, without let or hindrance, they can all develop along their own lines and achieve their national ideals in their own ways; and then, on the basis of voluntary and mutual co-operation, they must consolidate themselves inter-nationally by entering into alliances with their neighbours so that they can for ever offer a united front against the de-nationalising dangers of "Indianism."

In the firm conviction that that way alone lies the salvation of all—of Pakistan, Usmanistan and Bang-i-Islamistan; of Guruistan, Hindoostan and Rajistan; of Maharashtar and Dravidia—the Pakistan National Movement is working to enlist the sympathy and support of these countries for the success of its campaign against "Indianism," a success that will open a new chapter in the history of South Asia.

VII. The Pakistan National Movement stands for the creation of a *new order of "Asianism"* to take the place of the *old order of "Indianism"* in South Asia.

How?

From time immemorial most of the nations of South Asia have in one way or the other, been controlled by the callous spirit

and by the crude system of "Indianism". It is true that, in the days of their power, they have defied and defeated both its spirit and its system, but the fact remains that, in the end, they have all, one by one, passed under its influence, parted with their freedom, and met their fate.

This is one of the most instructive lessons taught by their tragedies of the past and the Pakistan National Movement, having taken it to heart, asks the nations of South Asia to remember it and to realise once and for all that, so long as the old order of "Indianism" remains in force, there is no hope either for the Muslims or for the Sikhs, for the Rajpoots or for the Mahrattas, for the Dravidians or for the Depressed Classes.

So, inspired by its devotion to the present good and future greatness of Pakistan, Usmanistan and Bang-i-Islamistan, and to those of other nations of South Asia, the Movement invites and urges all of them to join together to evolve a new order of "Asianism" that will replace the old order of "Indianism", protect their national life and liberty in their fatherlands, and perpetuate the moral entity and political integrity of South Asia.

These, in brief, are the seven cardinal principles and purposes inspiring the programme of the Pakistan National Movement and it is our belief that they symbolise the seven dirges of the doom of "Indianism" and the seven trumpets of the dawn of "Asianism."

Long live the Faith!

Long live the Fatherland!

Long live the Fraternity!

APPENDIX 4

PAKISTAN AND PAKISH NATIONALISM

by

MUHAMMAD YUSUF KHAN

Pembroke College, Cambridge
1938

The history of the present century is a remarkable chronicle of the Muslim struggle for self-determination and power, as opposed to European onslaughts of imperialism and aggression. The Muslims being challenged in their homes, retaliated by exercising the inalineable right of every free people to defend the integrity of its fatherland. This extensive and protractive war entailed a thorough mobilisation of the nation's resources, both material and moral, and consequently an amazing co-ordination of the national forces was effected, which immediately rallied all diverse elements under its banner, and aroused in every Muslim heart a burning consciousness for future security and national greatness. We have seen with our own eyes, the staggering sacrifices and dazzling achievements of Turkey in her life and death struggle for national independence and general reconstruction. Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and Egypt have followed in the footsteps of Turkey toward the same goal. We have before us today, the issues hanging over Palestine, where the Arabs have taken up their fight for independence in right earnest, after being threatened with absorption and extinction by the alien forces. It is well within their grasp to regain control of their homeland, where their ancestors had been supreme for the greater part, nay the whole, of the last twelve centuries. Pakistan contributes her share to this general wave of re-awakening in the Muslim world, through the Pakistan National Movement.

For a fair understanding of the Pakistan National Movement,

it is essential to retrace the history and origin of Pakish nation, which has been living in Pakistan for over a thousand years, after having come and settled there as early as 712 A.C. Pakistan as it stands is divided into five provinces, namely, Punjab, Afghan Province (N.-W.F.P.), Kashmir, Sind, and Baluchistan. Muslims conquered Sind and Baluchistan in 712 A.C. under Mohammad bin Qasim, and it was then that the first stream of Muslim settlers adopted the western part of Pakistan as their homeland, by right of conquest, and opened a new chapter in their history. Muslim immigration hailing from Central Asia and Arabia continued in western Pakistan at a rapid rate. In the meantime, in about 998 A.C., Mahmood of Ghazni after a march of about three months, over mountains and across rivers, swept over the whole of Eastern Pakistan, taking Kashmir and Punjab in his stride as he made his irresistable way southward, ending up with the annexation of Punjab to the Sultanate of Ghazni. The establishment of his suzerainty over Kashmir, and the extension of his realm to Punjab, opened the gates of the rich and picturesque valley of Kashmir and the fertile plains of Southern Pakistan to hordes of Muslims from Central Asia belonging to Afghan, Turkish, Mongol and Tartar stocks. The Afghan Province bordering the Khyber pass was already in Muslim hands, consequently by now the whole of Pakistan had come under Muslim sway. Muslims from Central Asia continued to come and settle in all parts of Pakistan, from Sind, and Baluchistan in the West, to Punjab, Afghan Province, and Kashmir in the East, till the population in Pakistan became predominantly and overwhelmingly Muslim. These Muslims continued to flourish under the hegemony of Ghazni after Mahmood's death, till his son's (Masood) time. After Masood the hold of Ghazni gradually weakened, and independent Muslim states were set up in Pakistan, which lasted till about 1170 A.C., when Mohammad of Ghor brought about a reunion of the Pakistan states under his inspiring leadership. While the foundation of Muslim power in Pakistan was laid by Mahmood of Ghazni, it was left to Mohammad of Ghor to consolidate and strengthen it. He accomplished this task of consolidation, with remarkable wisdom and courage, and raised Muslim power and efficiency to a degree which they had never reached before.

Toward the end of Mohammad's (of Ghor) reign began a new

chapter in Pakish history; so far the Paks had concentrated their attention on building, strengthening, and fortifying their homeland, having successfully accomplished this, they turned their eyes southward, toward the Hindu power in Hindustan, that is India proper. In short, while in Pakistan they were in their homeland, they looked towards India as their prospective empire, and it was thus, by embarking on this strong policy of empire-building that Moḥammad of Ghor ushered a new phase into the history of Pakistan.

Pakistan under Mohammad fought India under Prithi Raj near the historic plain of Panipat, which Providence had set apart as the arena where succeeding generations of Pakistan Muslims might fight the Hindus, time after time, for complete and decisive supremacy. Mohammad was successful and the Hindu army was routed. Thereafter is a tale of Muslim conquest penetrating into the interior of India, inch by inch, mighty empire-building exploits of Pakistan heroes, who continually extended the boundaries of the Muslim Empire of India to the remotest corners of the sub-continent, leaving behind them a rich and unparalleled store of national history, which is the most cherished possession of the Paks today. Muslim power shone with all its glory at the time of the Moghals, who played a very prominent part in the empire-building schemes of Pakistan. Aurangzib, the last and the greatest of that great line of Muslim Emperors, extended his Empire to all the four corners of India, and aptly consummated the great imperial scheme initiated by Mohammad of Ghor and pursued with such remarkable success by his (Mohammad's) invincible successors.

Then set in the last phase in the history of Pakistan, the gradual weakening and tottering of Muslim power in the Imperial Dominions, until at last it fell, and the Muslims lost everything in 1857 A.C.

So great was the confusion following this catastrophe, so profound was the consternation, that the Muslims failed to distinguish between their Homeland and their Empire; Pakistan was confounded with India, and the majority of Muslims began groping in the dark, now backing one thing, and the next moment another; so much so that Pakish history witnessed an unparalleled spectacle of an extremely deplorable waste of national energy. If in 1857, there had appeared a leader with foresight and

courage, the inviolability of the Pakish homeland would have been guaranteed; but this was not to be, the fall was too great to raise such a leader. During the 80 years following 1857, the fateful years when the Muslims were without a national leader of vision, they were sinking lower and lower every day. Each day brought them closer to their doom. The past appeared like a dream, the present still more a dream, because they kept drifting according to the caprice of any political wave that chose to approach them; their iron will, which had once given them glory, victory, had forsaken them. The remnants of a virile race had fallen so low. The slender ray of hope lit up by the prospect of gain through the Round Table Conferences of 1930-33 in London, vanished immediately. Dejection was complete. Despair was supreme. But as it often happens, the darkest hour comes before the dawn. While the young Paks were writhing under despair, a man whom Providence had chosen to lead the destinies of Pakistan was, tirelessly working in a modest-looking house in London, from morning till evening, and from evening till the small hours of morning. This man was Al-Mudjahid Rahmat Ali, the Founder-President of the Pakistan National Movement. He had seen the truth himself, and it was his greatest passion to proclaim it to his nation. At last the momentous hour arrived. On the 28th. of January 1933, the Declaration was made. The Pakistan National Movement was founded. The Muslims found an ideal, worthy of the greatest dedication.

Here begins a new chapter in Muslim history. The Round Table Conferences had proposed to put into practice a form of "Indian" Federation, which was to include Pakistan as a mere administrative unit, the Paks were to be reduced to a minority community belonging to the Hindu nation, in short it was proposed to strangle Pakistan. It is against such acts of unwarrantable aggression that the Pakistan National Movement stands firm and determined: resolved, to defend to the last man, the honour of its Fatherland.

The truths on which the Pakistan National Movement is based, are clear as day, but foreign statesmen, British or otherwise, have been so used to regarding Pakistan and India as one country, as a national unit, that this startling disclosure of fundamental facts might take them by surprise. But no grave student of practical politics, who approaches the subject with an un-

biased mind, will fail to recognize and appreciate the claims and demands of the Pakistan National Movement.

The Pakistan National Movement maintains that "India", as it is constituted today, is not a single country, but that it is a bi-national sub-continent, comprising Pakistan and India; Pakistan being the Fatherland of the Muslims, as India is the mother-country of the Hindoos. Pakistan is not Hindoo soil, nor are its inhabitants Indian citizens. The Pakish homeland has been the stronghold of Muslim civilization and culture, ever since the conquest of these territories by Muslims over twelve-hundred years ago; and in the course of these historic times the Paks have always possessed a historical, spiritual, territorial, cultural and national individuality of their own. This is an extract from the Declaration made by Al-Mudjahid, the Founder-President of the Pakistan National Movement on the 16th of November 1936.

"We, the Pakistanis (Paks), have lived, from time immemorial, our own life, and have sought our national salvation along our own lines. Pakistan has retained, during the whole of its existence, its own laws, and has cherished its own religious, spiritual, and cultural ideals, which are basically different from those of Hindustan (India). We, as a nation, have nothing in common with them; nor they with us. In individual habits, as in national life, we differ from them as fundamentally as from any other civilised nation in the world. The very basis and content of our national life is founded on fundaments essentially different from those on which Hindooism lives and prospers. Our agelong social system and our ancient national tradition have given us a civilisation with a philosophy, a culture, a language, a literature, and an art basically and fundamentally different from that of Hindustan (India). . . . . This supreme distinction between Pakistan and Hindoostan is ineffaceable, as it is based on eternal truths. Our consitution-makers must reckon with Nature's decrees." The above extract speaks for itself, it needs no commentaries, it needs no explanatory notes, because in it, the writer has only sought to bring together under one rallying point, a number of basic realities, hitherto ignored and neglected. His method of approach to this vital question of inter-national relations between the Muslims and the Hindoos, has been determined by a remarkable insight into politics: that system of practical politics, which stands on eternal truths, which has the

unqualified support of reason, justice and equity, and which recommends itself to every genuine seeker after peace between two nations, and every sincere advocate of lasting inter-national cordiality, who wishes to proceed on lines equally honourable and equally acceptable to both sides.

Even in these days of vastly improved means of transport and communication, there prevail distorted and misconceived notions regarding the so-called points of similarity and affinity between the Muslims of Pakistan and the Hindoos of India; it will be of interest to quote a few lines here, for the benefit of the reader, so that he may collate these facts with the version which has reached him. "We do not inter-dine: we do not inter-marry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different." These realities are irrefutable, and their conclusions and implications equally so. It is impossible to deny the comprehensive and far-reaching nature of these fundamental facts, the sooner we realize their moment and magnitude, the better. The Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms, appointed by the British Parliament, supports our unquestionable claim on the first page of its Report (Session 1933-34; Volume I; Part I), in the following words:–

"India is inhabited by . . . races . . . often as distinct from one another in origin, tradition and manner of life as are the nations of Europe. Two-thirds of its inhabitants profess Hindooism in one form or another as their religion; over seventy-seven millions are followers of Islam; and the difference between the two is not only one of religion in the stricter sense, but also of law and of culture. They may be said indeed to represent two distinct and separate civilisations. Hindooism is distinguished by the phenomenon of caste which is the basis of its religious and social system, and save in a very restricted field, remains unaffected by contact with philosophies of the West; the religion of Islam, on the other hand, is based upon the conception of the equality of man."

The racial unity and solidarity of any country, which is a determining factor in the national life of that country, goes a long way towards harmonising its discordant elements, co-ordinating its struggling units, and mobilising its resources, moral as well as material, which is so essential for the strength and existence of the nation. Pakistan affords a splendid example of the amazing way in which this racial solidarity first took shape, and endured lustily

till the present time, gaining in strength and tradition with the lapse of each century. A short sketch of racial history is contained in some of the following paragraphs.

An unbroken range of insurmountable mountains beginning with the Himalayas and the Kara Koram mountains in the east, joining with the Hindoo-Kush branch along the Afghan frontier, and ending up with the mountains and deserts of Eastern Iran, to form a semi-circular mountainous ring round Pakistan, managed for a time to check or put off the influx into Pakistan of Central Asian adventurers, coming from Turkistan, Iran and Afghanistan. This mountainous barrier, however, was first scaled and subverted from the northern side by Mahmood of Ghazni, who emulated with great success the remarkable example of Mohammad bin Qasim, who had forged ahead from the west in 712 A.C. The tales of adventure, gallantry, and romance which grew round these intrepid adventurers, gradually reached their homelands, and attracted irresistably their kinsmen beyond the border, who, not to be outdone by their fellow-countrymen, marched unceasingly across the mountains, in large re-inforcements, and continued to join their brethren in Pakistan. As a result of this, Pakistan became the confluence of three mighty human streams, issuing from their inexhaustible sources in Iran, Afghanistan, and Turkistan. These three peoples who arrived in Pakistan from different countries, had their real racial origin in Central Asia, whence they had migrated to several countries, firstly to look for some rich and prosperous land outside, and secondly, in response to their insatiable lust for travel and adventure. During the Great War, it was demonstrated and established beyond doubt, that a common racial origin alone, cannot guarantee mutual good will and understanding between two peoples, who have lived for centuries in two different countries. Common blood alone does not stand for immunity from warfare between two peoples, something is needed still. This something was bestowed on Pakistan in the shape of Islam.

Islam had been established in Iran in the 7th century, at the time of the second khalifa, who strengthened Iran with a view to using it as the eastern stronghold of Islam in the struggle for power further East. And so it did happen. Emerging from Iran as focus, Islam spread very rapidly to Afghanistan, and to the whole of Turkistan, whence it wended its way toward Pakistan, in three

distinct streams. It was the deep-rooted and warmly cherished sentiment of Muslim brotherhood, that taught the inrushing conquerors to welcome each other spontaneously and with sincerity; it was the firmly-established idea of the equality of man, as envisaged by Islam, which enabled them to accept without complaint, their assignment of toil, and to share without grudging, the trophies of victory. The three gallant peoples, who were one originally, became one again, and bequeathed to Pakistan a gift of all gifts, the gift of a close-knit nation, homogeneous to the core.

Next in importance comes the question of linguistic unity. In all parts of Pakistan, Urdu is unquestionably the national tongue, though there exist side by side, certain dialects which are in use in certain districts of Pakistan. The Muslim Press employs the medium of Urdu for the propagation of its ideals, and it can boast of a number of daily, weekly and monthly newspapers and journals with a wide circulation. The incorporation in our literature, by translation, of all contributions to modern knowledge, is proceeding at a rapid rate, and in this respect certain Muslim literary institutions in India are contributing substantially to the efforts of the men of letters in Pakistan. We are the proud possessors of a very rich literature, which comprehends all spheres of literary activity, from history, drama and fiction, to politics, science and poetry. Dr. Mohammad Iqbal, the man with a world-wide fame, is our national poet; it was his inspiring poetry, mainly historical and nationalist, which instilled a new spirit into our nation, and thus became the harbinger of a new epoch in Pakistan.

We support Pakistan with the greatest resolution and the strongest determination, but this does not mean that we bear any animosity toward the Hindoos; on the contrary, we regard them as our neighbours, with whom we shall always strive to maintain honourable and neighbourly relations. But, our Fatherland is as dear to us as their Motherland is to them, and in the interest of neighbourly peace, we deprecate all attempts, by whomever they are made, attempts which try to encroach on our national rights and which strive to assail the integrity of our Fatherland. These unjustifiable attempts seem all the more deplorable when seen alongside the course and verdict of history. Every one nation, which deserves to be called as such, must have its heroes and great men, who inspire the same amount of respect and admiration in all hearts who belong to that nation; we have not got in common with

the Hindoos, even a single hero, a single man in the past who occupies any respectable position in our Temple of Fame. Is it possible for these two peoples to shed their agelong history, and to repudiate their immortal heroes? Has such a thing ever happened before, or is it likely to happen hereafter? Our clothes, our modes of dress are as distinct from those of the Hindoos as are our hsitories; our diet is based on principles fundamentally different from those on which the Hindoos are brought up, even our ways of exchanging greetings and citivilities are different.

Coming next to the geographical position of Pakistan, we have a frontier in common with India on two sides only, namely, the eastern and south-eastern sides. On the eastern side, river Jumna is the dividing line between the two countries, and on the south-eastern side, the Rajputana desert marks the beginning of Indian territory. There is only one point where the two countries meet, and that is the historic plain of Panipat. Paks and Indians have mingled on that plain on more occasions than one, but always in battle, always to settle with the sword the supreme right of suzerainty over the sub-continent.

It is not out of place in this connection, to refer to the national anthems of the two nations, namely that of the Paks and the Hindoos, because the national anthem of any nation, invariably represents, that which is highest in that nation. Coming to India first, the following few lines give a literal translation of the Indian National Anthem, "Vande Mataram":–

"Thou art Durga with ten arms,
And thou art Lakshmi, lotus ranging,
And thou art Saraswati, that giveth knowledge,
I salute thee."

Durga is a goddess which has ten arms; Lakshmi is the lotus-goddess, which controls wealth and the good things of life; Saraswati is another goddess which controls knowledge.

The National Anthem of Pakistan runs as follows, it is the Sura "Al-Fat-ha":–

"In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.
Praise be to Allah, Lord of the worlds;
The Beneficient, the Merciful;
Owner of the day of Judgement.
Thee alone we worship: Thee alone we ask for help.
Show us the Straight Path,

to the non-Muslim minorities in Pakistan, all those rights and privileges which will be granted to the Muslim minorities in India.

In these pressing and difficult times, it is a great encouragement to see the nobler spirits among the Muslims outside Pakistan, volunteering their services in the cause of Pakistan. They have begun to realise the significance of our claim, and some of these generous men have deservedly worked their way to the very side of our first-rank comrades and workers. In matters of courage, faith and sacrifice they are second to none; and they fully agree that Pakistan is as vital to them as it is to us, if "for us it is a national citadel, for them it is a moral anchor."

One of the most important aspects of this discourse, is the consideration of the self-sufficiency of Pakistan as a modern state; that is, whether the Pakish needs and requirements are conformable to its resources in men and material, and if so, to what extent.

"Out of a total number of fifty-four nations who are members of the League of Nations, no fewer than fifty-one are smaller than Pakistan, both in population and in area. Our area is four times that of Italy, three times that of Germany, and twice that of France; and our population seven times that of Australia, four times that of Canada, twice that of Spain, and equal to France and Italy considered individually." The strength of Pakistan in population is apparent, but in order to estimate the true calibre of the people it is just sufficient to look up their past record. Their history bears ample testimony to the fact that the nation of 42 million Paks, stands for solidarity, strength and an unlimited store of national reserve in every field.

Economic self-sufficiency, within reasonable bounds, is a vital factor of national strength, and we must reflect on this question, with reference to Pakistan. Before we form any judgement, we must diagnose the various economic cankers which have crippled our economic system, and thus rendered it inefficient. These can be classified under two heads, namely, British Imperialism and Hindoo Capitalism. Both are taking heavy toll of our economic well-being; and instead of a healthy economic system helping the state, there exists a fleecing system of economic control, which is so regulated that the state is subservient to the Imperialists and the Capitalists. With the disappearance of these two foreign products, the economic stability of Pakistan will be restored, and all the services, administrative or otherwise, will be made to work for

the state. The enormously-fed bureaucracy will make way for reasonably-remunerated national service, and thus the poor tax-payers and the penniless peasants will be relieved of their cruel burdens. With all hands pulling together and for the state, our economic structure will improve considerably, bringing into being a genuine economic stability of the first order.

In Karachi we have a first-class port, and there is a beautiful coastline, extending over 500 miles, remarkably suited for a string of excellent harbours. Pakistan is rich in mineral resources, and her industries and commerce are progressing favourably; cotton and woollen factories are already flourishing there, and backed up by agricultural advancement in the fertile plains of southern Pakistan, the most fertile soil in the sub-continent, Pakistan may well expect an era of bounty and prosperity, after a long period of foreign exploitation. Revenue collected by post, telegraph, customs, excise, income-tax, land revenue and railways (which under the present system goes to the Government of India) would help to enrich the nation still further. In this field as in others, we are as proud of our possessions as we are confident of our future.

Many persons interested in the Pakistan National Movement, have asked several questions about the form of government Pakistan will have after the realisation of its ideal. At the moment, this subject is of pure academic interest, because the complete and total attention of the Pakistan National Movement and its standard-bearers, is absorbed in re-instating their country in her rightful place in the comity of nations. All other questions are thrown into the back-ground, when compared with this basic question of life and death. The time for a detailed discussion will come later. In the present circumstances only broad statements are available: the form of government will be basically and fundamentally both democratic and socialistic. The spirit of democracy and liberty, which was given to us thirteen centuries ago and which is the underlying and all-pervading principle of our creed, will be the basis of government in Pakistan. Whether the government will be federal or unitary is too sweeping and too early to state, the voice of the nation will decide this issue.

We have the fullest faith in the fairness of our national demand, and an unshakable confidence in the destiny of our Fatherland; we enter this grim struggle unflinchingly, and throw in our lot with the Movement with the clearest conscience; we are fully aware

that justice and right are on our side, and we will continue our fight until victory is in our hands. Our future existence, our dignity, and our self-respect as a nation lie in Pakistan. We realize the gravity of our present situation, we also realize that the opportunity we have today of serving our Fatherland, is the greatest boon that Allah has conferred on us; we also realize that we hold in our hands the fortunes of the coming generations of Pakish citizens, and we are grimly determined to defend our Fatherland in this momentous struggle. This struggle may be long and trying, it may entail privation and sacrifice, but no suffering can be too severe and no sacrifice too great in the service of the Fatherland.