

CHAPTER IV

INDO-PAK RELATIONS :

India achieved independence, under the Indian Independence Act, 1947. The country was divided, partitioned, and rather vivisected on the bases of the two-nations theory on the basis of religion. The people who were supporters of Partition belonged to the hinterland. After partition most of such people appear to have reconciled with secular India and had stayed back. During the exchange of population, i.e., Hindus to India and Muslims to Pakistan, most of the Muslims stayed back in India and their counterpart, who left Pakistan for India, were primarily not received as Hindus but as Pakistani refugees. Similarly, the Muslims from India to Pakistan were, basically and primarily not received as Muslims but as Indian refugees or 'Mohajirs', though the country was partitioned on the basis of two-nation theory - Hindus and Muslims. Thus, the outcome of partition, so far as two communities are concerned, was a strange phenomenon. Both Hindus and Muslims became strangers in their own country.

The Partition is not only an evil but also a sin. We could not avoid it earlier and now it is, may be, an accomplished fact, but by mutual dialogue on the people to people basis, the partition can be annulled to bring prosperity, happiness and peace in the Indian sub-continent. India and Pakistan have been at odds during almost the last 50 years. In all this time, the security and socio-economic imperatives have been ignored with the result eminently manifest to one and all. Notwithstanding, there is a broad consensus amongst the people of the two countries at the mass level.

What were the real causes that led to the partition, who was responsible for breaking up the integral unity of India; it may not be difficult to find answers to such questions. But it was not necessary to concede the demand for partition and creation of Pakistan that would have avoided so much of bloodshed and wholesale destruction of properties. G.D. Khosla in "Steps Reckoning" states :

There are, and always been differences between the beliefs, habits and outlook of the Muslim and the non-Muslims. But these differences were no more than

an expression of individual personality. Such as may be observed in members of one family where the peculiar traits and features of one branch may be marked enough to distinguish it from another branch, but do not give rise to temperament incompatibility or open hostility.¹

For over a thousand years Muslims and non-Muslims had lived as neighbors and friends, despite these differences, and it was not till the impact of British imperialism that forced them to raise mental and moral differences around themselves and consciousness of their distinctive character was forced upon them. This consciousness was accentuated and exploited by the British rulers. It may not be possible to make an accurate estimate of the total loss of life of Hindus and Muslims and the extent of damage of the property caused by riots immediately preceding partition and soon thereafter. But this was a heavy price and the memory of this painful and costly transaction will linger for years till eternity and continue to embitter the people of the sub-continent, till the very partition itself is annulled by mutual consultation and cooperation. Under whatever circumstances the country might have been partitioned and whosoever might be responsible for the division, it is a curse. As such it, it is the bounding duty of the successors of the persons responsible for such partition to undo the same so that our brethren living in Pakistan, are united with us, as a part and parcel of Indian Nation. We need to remind ourselves what Benjamin Disraeli long ago said :Finality is not the language of politics. And Jawahar Lal Nehru said :Political wisdom consists in anticipating events and guiding them :

The country is in need of such a statesman who can accomplish the job-annulling partition with a view to bring Hindu-Muslim unity and Indo-Pak amity besides restoring peace, tranquility, progress and happiness in the Indian subcontinent. We need to sort out our problems across the table, in consonance with the spirit of Simla. Agreement. And ultimately aim ought to be the annalment of Partition and re-unification of India, Bangladesh and Pakistan with the same bound arise as those at the time of partition.

The Partition was a fraud played on the Muslim by their leaders. Some became governor general, someone else rose to be the Prime Minister and so on. Their financiers became big industrialists. Of the 22 big (industrial) 16 were Gujarati

speaking and who had migrated from Mumbai (like the Habibs) or Kolkata (like the Adamjis). What had the average Gujarati Muslim to gain from the partition, nothing, but the businessman could flourish with Punjabi farmers as competitors. In Mumbai and Kolkata, he had to compete against the Bania, the Marwari, the Parsi, etc. The Politician like M.A. Jinnah had the crown of Pakistan to wear.

Pakistan was a paradoxical absurdity for the Muslim masses although an advantage for the classes to whom the leaders belonged. The sub-continental ummah was divided and in 1971 went on to be bifurcated. Islam was not sufficient to hold the two wings of Pak, together.²

However, the unrealistic Two – Nations theory stood falsified by the efforts of the then Prime Minister Indira Gandhi who got East Bengal to emerge as sovereign country-Bangladesh. According to a well-known scholar Mushirul Hasan, the bitter and violent contest over power sharing culminating in the partition, gives out the real mind of the leaders responsible for the vivisection of India. What was the use of remorse ? The damage, which was irreparable, was done.

The principal problem facing the leadership of India's partition and the American Civil War, was identical, in as much as should a nation be divided on the basis of religion or colour ? President Lincon refused and our leadership accepted partition. Both decisions led to widespread bloodshed.

However, even during such a situation, it was the great depression that stopped most of the growth, and consumer demand. But World War II restarted the great American industrial machine, and soon, half the country was engaged in production for war, bringing full employment; but because of the scarcity of consumer goods, Americans saved their money for the future and emerged as a great power. America emerged as a great nation while Indian peninsula remains fractured, weak and poor, as such one can see the land of plenty co-existing with poverty.

India is not really a poor country, though most economists say so. India is no a poor country, it is Indians who are poor. We are all like a poor village Brahmin who can recite Vedas and Puranas in flawless Sanskrit but has to beg for food everyday. This is the mismatch that haunts, as, mismatch between knowledge and resources,

between theory and practice, between knowing and how to do things and the wherewithal to get things done. And of course, it is double talk that has given birth to partition and the problems associated with it.

We people of India are born of the many vicissitudes of a long history, each of the many strands adding to its own special note of colour, of a sudden flash of gold; to the intricate pattern of national life. Out of this pattern emerges our multi-coloured population, with its race mixtures, its various languages and its groups at all stages of social evolution yet all knowing no other home than India. We the people of India include them all, both Hindus and Muslims, as they belong to the same stock. It is the same blood that courses in all our veins and not that of Mongols, Arabs or Turks. The Muslims are only Hindu converts. We are not Arab, Turks or Mongols. We can no longer afford to permit partition of country as a springboard for further aggression and further partition. The partitioned India deserves to be united.

Historians will one day declare that the masses of united India both Hindus and Muslims timidly sleepwalked into the partition of India. They were only vaguely conscious of the real consequences of the two-nation theory. The Congress opposed this theory but yet finally allowed the break-up of the country precisely on the basis of this theory. And tacitly accepting that we are not one but two people. But everything was done in half measures.

Theoretically, India could have accepted the full consequences of the two nations theory and allowed total transfer of populations. Partition did take place at a cost no other people on earth have paid before. Pakistan had driven out most of the Hindus from its territory. On this issue, it was true to its declaration. It wanted a pure Islamic state. The advocates of the two-nation theory lacked the insight of the ultimate reality that they must learn to co-exist with others. The Partition of India was no solution to war problem and it deserves to be annulled.

It is crucial to have friendly relations with each other, and to change the unhappy context of the relation. Then, imagines the kind of change that would come about if India and Pakistan pooled their material resources. A formidable force, not industrial infrastructure of India becomes part of Pakistan's Strength and Pakistan's geo-strategic location as well as defence potential becomes as expansion

of India's strength. A subcontinent saw conflict would become a power fact or of great significance on the world scene.

On the basis of Two-Nations theory, India for Hindus and Pakistan for Muslims, India had accepted partition of this great ancient country in good faith, much against its will, spirit's ideal, and the very grain of its people, simply to accommodate wishes of our brothers, who had somehow come to believe that they will be happy and secure, if they lived separately. It was visible, known and clear that it was mistaken concept and theory, that had two distinct religious groups cannot live peacefully and happily in the same land. As a matter of fact true religion does not divide man from man, or separate humanity, there religion, rather provides human bond of love, faith and unity between different people to the way of brotherhood.

Muslim ethics is mainly social. Hospitality is one of the greatest virtues that Islam teaches. It also preaches the Ethics of brotherhood of man and service of humanity.³ Despite the belief in the brotherhood of humanity, the country was divided on the basis of religion. India was partitioned. Pakistan was created on the basis that Hindus and Muslims are different people and cannot live in peace. Muslim majority areas were carved out for believers of Islam. Religious perception helps to unite, man to man. No Rishi, no Buddha, no Mahatma, no Christ, no Prophet, ever tried to establish a religion.

Pakistan resembles the lost, twin of India and they look like. In Partition of India, millions had to leave their homes and hearths because of the compulsions of circumstances and that too beyond their control. The terms of independence were such that perhaps, without accepting partition, some believe that Independence would not have come. Division is over, but its scars are still hurting the body politic of both countries. However, the wise of the three countries India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, realize that the neighbours can hardly remain constantly in a state of eyeball-to-eyeball animosity. And a new chapter of understanding and goodwill has to be initiated. A wider perspective has to be taken. The time has come to realize that Indo-Pakistan animosity soon acquired a new exploitative element of politics. Realistically enough, neither India nor Pakistan can destroy the other. The utmost

they can do is to inflict serious injuries on each other in the State of War. To the contrary, as Nikhil Chakravarty⁴ puts it :

"It is ~~not difficult~~ to visualize that given the necessary goodwill, all the ~~problem~~ ~~ming~~ ~~on the way of~~ friendship can be settled without any rancour or ill-feeling, but in ~~the~~ fullest of understanding as between two friendly countries. Friendly confederations South Asia comprising the huge landmass of India and Pakistan will be a ~~weighty~~ assertion of world peace. As the understanding progresses on its new path of friendship, it is bound to attract the neighbouring states who would ~~understanding~~ the value of amity instead of animosity.

The very basis of healthy community existence is recognition of human rights. Our scriptures have not hesitated to emphasize the prime importance of the principle of common world family, brotherhood of the mankind.⁵ Humanity as a whole is one extended family, with all the obligations of family membership.⁶ History bears evidence to the fact that United India sent missions of love preaching universal brotherhood, a belief in the common brotherhood of mankind. Indians traveled out imbued with the spirit of common brotherhood as envisaged by Guru Nanak: "None is my enemy, none an outsider, all are mine, my brotheren's . And consequence the hearts of people. Let us toil to wipe out not only physical poverty but also the spiritual."⁷

Timeless motto of universal happiness and peace is the heritage of this ancient Indian civilization, which assumed the character of Bharatvarsha in Bharat Khand. Here a nation, which Megasthenes noted "never invaded others and was never invaded", existing long before the ideas of civilization evolved elsewhere.

Thus, the Partition of India and creation of Pakistan, on the⁴ basis of two-nation theory is an outcome of the British diplomacy – "divide and rule", and we were ready and willing to be divided for individual selfish gain. After more than five decades of partition, it is evident that initially people of Punjab and NWFP were ~~opposed~~ to the creation of Pakistan but now having ~~been benefited~~ by its creation ~~want to annex more~~ and more area to it.

Indian sub-continent is being destabilized. The people who may have been responsible for creation of Pakistan belonged to hinterland and perhaps how

reconciled to secular India and have stayed back. Then there appears to be no justification for continuing with India and its extension – Pakistan. At least amicable relations, co-operation, mutual understanding between the two, is must for permanent peace in the sub-continent and also for correcting the past mistakes.

This unfortunate division has unleashed a plethora of misfortunes, which spared us no respite to look for the hope. Still under the lid of the legendary Pandora box, hope lies in unification of the two States; may be in any form. Once it is achieved not only Kashmir problem would wishes way but also a buffer independent Tibet may not be a remote dream.

Sardar Patel soon after partition had emphasized that : "if Pakistan does not change her ways, there may soon be a flare up. The nation must be quite prepared for any emergency. As far as India is concerned, she wants Pakistan to grow into a strong and prosperous country. Some people had talked of a possible reunion just now, atleast not until those who had elamoured for a separate homeland had reaped the harvest they had sown."⁸

Four and a half decades are the sufficient time for realization that the partition of India on the basis of religion was a curse and deserved to annulled. The answer to Kashmir problems lie in the unification. Primarily the Muslims belonging to Bihar and Uttar Pradesh were for creation of Pakistan, bt most of them have not preceded to Pakistan and have stayed back. They appear to have reconciled to secular India during these 55 years. For cooperation, co-ordination and for establishing cordial relations and ultimately unification of India and Pakistan, it is the responsibility of Muslims the hinterland to build bridges of understanding.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad preferred Hindu Muslims unity, even to Swaraj, when he said : "If an angel descends from the heaven today and proclaims from the Kutub Minar that India can attain Swaraj within twenty four hours provided I relinquish my demand for Hindu Muslim unity, I shall retort to it : No my friend, I shall give up Swaraj, but not Hindu Muslim unity, for it Swaraj is delayed, it will be a loss for India, but if Hindu-Muslim unity is lost, it will be a loss for the whole mankind."⁹

Unification may not be just a far cry. Nature demands it. It is also in consonance with the dream of the great Yogi Aurobindo Ghosh, K. Natwar Singh is justified when he says: "

This is in the hands of cosmic master, unseen yet all-powerful. The really spiritual is beyond science and superstition. Somebody, out march to folly might cease; in the meanwhile, let the cocksure shed claims to the infallibility of science of reason. The bell tolls for them too."¹⁰

Our relationship with our neighbour is paradoxical in countries, one remain sworn enemies, but on the people-to-people basis one exude warmth and bonding. The common belief that the Muslim community as a whole subscribed to the two-nations theory is far from the truth. That the Muslims did not demand Pakistan as a monolithic and homogenous community is evident from the simple fact that 35 million of them preferred to stay back in India and have continued to live in this country after partition.

What is even more relevant are the Mahatma's words, "The first thing is that politics have divided India today into Hindus and Muslims. I want to rescue people from this quogmere and make them work on solid ground where people are people. Therefore, my appeal here is not to the Muslims nor to the Hindus as Hindus, but to ordinary human beings, and take many other steps so that they can make life better."

The unification of the human world is underway; there is an imperfect initiation organized but struggling against tremendous difficulties. But the momentum is there and it must inevitably increase and conquer. Here too India has begun to play a prominent part. And if she can develop that larger statesmanship which is not limited by the present fact and immediate possibilities but looks into the future and brings it nearer, her presence may make all the difference between slow and timid and a bold and swift development. A catastrophe may intervene and interrupt or destroy what is being done, but even then the final result is sure. For unification is a necessity of Nature, and inevitable movement. Its necessity for the nations is also clear, for without it the freedom of the nations may be at any moment in peril and tap life even of the large and powerful nations insecure. The unification is therefore

to the interest of all. And only human imbecility and stupid selfishness can prevent i.e. but these can not stand forever against the necessity of Nature and Divine W.I.

The Partition of India must go and the greater India, the land of the 'Indu, Bharat, be learn again. The reunification of India and Pak will be only the first step, because ultimately the goal is the reunification of all that was once the greater India and which is today only small fragmented countries with no soul, no direction, no sense.

Pakistan was learn out of the partition of India. Historically speaking this process of creation of Pakistan contains some of principal attributes of Islamabad's foreign policy postures vis-à-vis India. The Muslim League waged a battle against the Indian National Congress for the political liberation of the Muslims¹¹ who, according to its leadership, were unable to attain their collective self-realization so long as they did not have a separate homeland. A general feeling of insecurity was so firmly embodied in the minds of the leadership of the Muslim League that it ultimately accounted for the establishment of Pakistan.¹² This insecurity after partition got strengthened on account of several disputes which India and Pakistan experienced on account of the partitioning process.

Pakistan – a Muslim State emerged from partition of British – India on August 14, 1947 in pursuance to the idea of Separate State for Muslims on the subcontinent. The idea was the part of the theory that Muslims, by virtue of their religion – Islam and cultural distinction, constituted a separate nation. Poet, Philosopher, Barrister, Dr. Muhammad Iqbal a Saproo Kashmiri Pandit convert, articulated the concept of Pakistan in its basic form in 1931, urban he proposed a separate State comprising Muslim majority areas in North Western India. The All India Muslim League under the leadership of Jinnah adopted the concept in 1940.

We never believed in a Muslim nation, but unfortunately, a Muslim Nation was carved out of Indian Nation. We believe that converts do not make a nation, but we have an Islamic nation of converts. Partition is the out of hypocrisy and has paved way for great violence and is likely to end in a bloody war. Gandhiji remind Jinnah in September, 1944 when he said : "I find no parallel in the history for a body of converts and their descendents claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock.

India was one nation before the advent of Islam, it must remain one in spite of the change of faith of very large body of her children." The partition was forced by religious-biggest, ignoring that religion unites and not divides. Thus, the genesis of the India's problem lies in the partition.

Only chaos followed the partition of India, neither the Hindus nor the Muslims, have benefited from the Partition. The people as a whole have suffered – economically, internationally and spiritually.

B.N.Jog¹³ in his book, "Threat of Islami Indian Dimensions", writes :

Islam was born out of war, bloodshed, atrocities, desecration of idols, etc., and though decades and centuries had elapsed, it had become more barbaric rather than civilized. Religion sublimates the instincts of hate, revenge or enmity but Islam tended the fires of base human instincts. The question may be rightly raised about how can Islam be held responsible for the politically motivated directed action programmed of the Muslim League. However, Pakistan had been demanded as a separate Islamic state and the fires of the direct action movement were being stroked by the Mullamaulavis in mosque.

England had promised Independence to India and the Cabinet Mission Plan had been prepared to achieve this end but had become the cause for conflict and statements. The atmosphere in India had reached ignition point and Hindus and Muslims were drifting further apart and the fitting reply Hindus had started giving to Jinnah's direct action had marked the beginning of a civil war. Maintenance of law and order with the help of police and array was becoming more and more difficult and almost impossible. After above mentioned press interview by Sardar Patel, the British government took a momentous decision and Prime Minister Attlee made the relevant pronouncement in the British parliament in 20th February 1947 about total transfer of power to Indian hands. He declared, "the British government has decided to totally withdraw its power from India before June 1948. To ensure this final transfer with the concurrence of all concerned, Lord Mount batten is being appointed as the Last Viceroy of ~~India~~.

In a few years after the creation of separate country for Muslims, the Pakistan government got Mr. Wheelan, archeological adviser of Pakistan to write a booklet

called '5000 years of Pakistan'. It describes the greatness of the Pre-Pakistan and Pre-Islam life; its culture is praised and it has lauded Pakini, If the stream of this culbos glory starts flowing again, the Muslim community will find it easier to identify itself with it and unity can be forged again. India should certainly encouraged such thoughts. The future of India and its children, both Hindus and Muslims is interlinked. Rafiqh Zakaria advised his Muslim brothern : it is time the Muslims in India understand that their future is linked with Hindus; they will have to co-operate with them and live in peace and amity. They will have to be friend them in every cry. Muslims are as much rooted in India as Hindus. G.M.Sayid of Sing movement said:¹⁴

"Since we are the product of the plains of Ganga-Jamuna we are bound to associate with it. What are we to do with Iran or Iraq."

When the idea of Pakistan was still unborn. Md. Iqbal, a versatile poet capable of touching Olympic heights, described India as the earliest country, and said : Religion does not teach us to be enemy to each other. We all Indians belong to one country, and India is ones". But when he propounded the two-nations theory, Iqbal limited himself to narrow confines of religious bigotry and short himself out from a wide world to proselytize Islam. When this dire of Pakistan found that Pak is likely to be created he confided in his English friend Mr. Thomson and confessed "The Pakistan Plan would be disastrous to the British Government, disastrous to Hindus and disastrous to the Muslim Community."¹⁵

Pakistan was a paradoxical absurdity for the Muslim masses although an advantage for the classes to whom the leaders belonged. Those who might have needed the partition even it for illusory reasons, were deprived. Those who needed nothing more were given a separate country. The subcontinental ummah was divided and in 1971 went on to be bifurcated. Islam was not sufficient to hold the two wings of Pakistan together.

Iqbal lying on his deathbed conveyed similar sentiments to Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, when he went to see him during his visit to Pakistan. This dilemma has been expressed by A Beg : "The Muslim dilemma is this. Is it better for Muslims to assimilate and thereby lose their identity or are they bound by Islam to preserve their identity and thereby suffer the mental, physical, social and economic

consequences of non-assimilation.”¹⁶ In fact, the first seed of Pakistan was planted when the first non-Muslim was converted to Islam in India. “Neither Islam, nor Muslims, were responsible for the creation of Pakistan. Pakistan was the result of a very complex interplay of forces. If one can say anything with certainty it is that vested interests on both sides that played crucial role in urging about vivisection of the country. Communalism is not the product of religion as many people think, but the product of misuse of religion by vested interest”. Pakistan was not a creation of religious history, it was a creation of the modernists among Muslims. A highly westernized Muslim, Md. Ali Jinnah raised the demand for Pakistan. Jinnah was hardly a believe or a practising Muslim. Jinnah did not have even an elementary knowledge of Islam.”¹⁷

Infact Iqbal saw the vision, M.A.Jinnah gave it a concrete shape, so goes the popular story about the creation of Pakistan, perhaps the only modern nation other than Israel that owe its existence to a nationalism inspired by religion.

India on its part objected to the division of the country on the basis of religion. Gandhi was against in the beginning that he used to say that the partition of the country would be possible only over his dead body. He bled profusely. Marks can be traced from his statement to Lord Mountbatten, when he explained that he did every thing in his power to ‘keep India United’.

Pakistan was a divided nation at birth. Islam provided it with its life force but it could not promote national solidarity. This is the Central paradox in Pakistan’s story and it holds as much significance today, as it did fifty five years ago. As Governor General of the new state and the people’s great leader Jinnah insisted that Pakistan’s primary concern must be the promotion of principles of equality and social justice for all its citizen. His Pakistan may have been realized through religious expression but he believed that it could be sustained through secular procedures. Before his death in September 1948, he acknowledged that the job of holding Pakistan would be far more difficult than the one that made independence possible.

Partition and the basis on which Pakistan was carved out of United India in 1947 instead of settling them in their own Status quos exposed to them the explosive

quality of religious symbols as the basis of nation building in converting the group rivalry before partition into international rivalries in the sub-continent national rivalries in the sub-continent.

Lack of reconciliation to the partition and a settled fact on the part of India and Pakistan's advocacy of a two-nation theory explain largely the hostile relationship between the two countries. Even Jinnah said : "We maintain and hold that Muslims and Hindus are two major nations by any definition or test of nation we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilization We have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life."¹⁸

The perception of India's agony over the partition in Pakistani rulers, created the impression that India would one day achieve its wish to rewrite all its lost territories. As President Ayub Khan once said : "The Indian leaders have often stated that their true border extends from the Hindu Kush mountain to the Mekong river, that is to say, wherever the influence of Hinduism had existed in the past."¹⁹ This fear of India's ambitious nationalism may not be without any basis. There was a strong current of opinion in India totally disregarding the fact of partition as a grave blunder. Nehru said on 28 No. 1947, "India cannot and will not remain divided. This is my conviction no matter how much I am criticized for having accepted the partition."²⁰ Many Indians felt that "the creation of Pakistan was a tragic mistake which might still be corrected, at least as far as East Bengal is concerned."²¹

Coming to the struggle against English Raj in India, Jinnah was earlier a third rank leader, the first ranks being occupied by Gandhi and other, the second by Muslims like Maulana Asad. During Quit India movement in 1912, when the first two ranks went to 'Jail, Jinnah was able to depict himself as the sole leader of Indian Muslims. He fully exploited the fanaticism of the illiterate followers and could gather enough support for division of the country into India and Pak. Lord Mountbatten, the negotiating Viceroy of India tried to dissuade him arguing that in care of Partition Pak would consist of two inconvenient and vulnerable landmasses or the extreme west and east of India.

The Partition proved to be the biggest political crisis in India since the Battle of Plassey. Due to Partition, the unity of the country was thwarted and it had created

problem both at the national and the international ends. It was an utter failure of Statesman step resultint in mortgaging the future of the country.

Partition was the biggest tragedy of the 20th century. A perusal of the statement issued by Altuf Hussain, leader of Pakistan Muttahian Qaumi Mahament (MQM), issued to IA new service at London on 17 September 2000 shows that the Mohammeden community in Pakistan are repentant about their instance on partition of India. The relevant portion of the statements reads :

"The division of the Indian sub-continent was the biggest blunder in the history of mankind. The dramatic statement is the first by a leader of the Mahajins, who worked the most for the Partition and migrated to Pakistan."

These were primarily the Mahajion who were on the forefront of the separatist movement and creation of the State of Pakistan. Most of them willingly migrated to the Holy Land but today they have no destination and hence no destiny. They are condemned to languish in a tunnel sealed at both the ends. This is due to their misconceptions, which still persist with them. They have not reconciled to the Partition of the country. They want to remain in Pakistan and at the same time wish to meet their relatives kith and kin in India. They aspire to be Pakistanis without identifying themselves with Punjabis, Baluchir Pakhtuns and Sindhis. Even today if the skin is scratched underneath it is not difficult to find that in the heart of their hearts they believe that both India and Pakistan belong to them.

To note that Karachi, the commercial capital of Pakistan, has been in great turmoil during the closing decade of the 20th century, there were thousand killings. The thing to note is that this is not Hindu-Muslim killings, they are Muslim-Muslim killings. More important, though there had been Hindu-Muslim tension in Sindhi it had not been bitter. The truth is that Pakistan is receiving the price of its own Sius Pak has been nurturing, terrorism and waging a proxy war against India, ignoring that the guns can never solve the problems and can only complicate the issues.

It will never be known whether Jinnah really said on his deathbed that partition was the biggest mistake of his life, but there is no surer indication than Pakistan's present plight of how its founder's objective has turned into a nightmare. And even after the emergence of Bangladesh in 1971 had buried the two

nation theory, Pakistan is now coming increasingly under pressure from various costive communities. The future of Pakistan looks bleak and that should be a matter of concern to India. Of course, the idea of Pakistan had come unstuck in 1971 itself when Bangladesh became an independent country. The same idea is under attack from another quarter with Sheika Hasina asking General Parvez Musharaf to apologise for the atrocities committed by Pakistan in Bangladesh before it became free. If he decides to apologise, he should do it fast because time may not be on this side.

The Partition was a far more complex issues than it had been understood to be. A detailed study of the event, along with the implication of the far-reaching decision, should show that the actual impact of the event still lingers.

And the events followed proved that it was right. In these decades of its history every major political change has been witness to nerve-racking twists and turns. Smooth transition has hardly been the rule there.

Questions, debates and mistrusts of a shared social vision by its leaders arose in Pakistan from the outset. Muhammad Ali Jinnah and other Western Oriented professional envisioned a multiethnic, pluralistic and indubitably democratic country, free from the hegemony of any one group. In his inaugural address to the constituent Assembly of Pakistan three days prior to independence, in his capacity as its first President, Jinnah implored, "If we want to make this great state of Pakistan happy and Prosperous we should wholly and solely concentrate on the well-being of the people, and especially of the masses and the poor.²² His vision of Pak was one of a profession of groups working together for the overall well-being of the state regarding of ethnic or religious division.

Leaders from varying backgrounds recognized the substanting political and economic challenges confronting the new state, and most shared the conviction that a popular consensus existed on its necessity, viability, and structured.

But other views also evicted. Some factions initially wanted no part of Pakistan for diverse reasons. Supporters of the Punjab Unionist Party placed their loyalties with the British, their successors still do, as they educate their children in

British – style schools, speak English among themselves and value indigenous aesthetics only as quaint historic relics.

Alternatively, many Islamist groups initially recoiled from the demand for Pakistan on the grounds that Islam could not be bounded by the borders of a nation-state. After partition, however, many with Islamist views migrated out of necessity, to Pakistan. To them, the Pakistan of 1947 was a rough diamond; the possibilities of creating a dar-ul Islam were new boundless, once their message was understood by their new compatriots.

Indeed, despite the assumptions of the Two-Nations theory, Pakistan's formidable Muslim population came from diverse practices and heritages. Jinnah, pluralistic view of Pakistani society was shaken somewhat in the mid-1960, and 1970s as divisions and distinctions between different ethnic and class grouping became more conspicuous. And the 1971 secession of East Pakistan also contributed to unease because not all voices may have a place to be heard in Pakistan.

Robert Laparte, Jar's assessment of Pakistan's political development since 1947 paints an uneasy and troubled picture. Pakistan is a state, Laaporte concludes, which after fifty years is "Still in the making", still striving to find a stable and effective form of government. He sees the two and a half decades from 1947 to 1971 as a time in which ordinary citizens were denied a role in public policy making, regular military intervention in politics began, and efforts to reconcile the political and economic interests of Pakistan's two wings collapsed and led to civil war and division of the country.²³

Fifty years ago, when Pakistan came into existence, constitutional experts, economists, politicians and administrators were almost unanimous in questioning the justification of a separate homeland for the South Asian Muslims. Even those who had a keen sense of history and had watched the evolution of the idea of Pakistan, regard it impracticable. The strongest criticism came from the congress leaders who were joined by the British Statesmen like Amery, the Secretary of State for India, Mountbatten, the last Viceroy of British India, and Sir Regional Coupland in voicing their apprehensions about the new state. These who had fought for it were

also aware of the heavy odds against which a new country was created. But then there were those who perceived a paradise in the contours of history which had given birth to the largest Muslim state in the world.

It was against this background that the post-independence developments in Pakistan were judged. The Pakistanis were supposed to justify their existence not only by merely surviving as an independent entity but also to demonstrate political acumen in fulfilling the objectives laid down during their freedom movements. The logic of history that had created this nation was destined to serve as a reminder as well as a yardstick for the social and economic uplift of the people for whom this territory was sought from the departing British Colonialists.

Thus the burden of historical legacies remained active in shaping the intellectual evolution of Pakistan. Freedom for Pakistan was not considered an aim in itself; they had to explain the rationale of its existence to the west, to the Indians and even to the posterity. The west conceived it 'a crime against civilization' because it had exposed the fragility of the British claim that colonial administration had inculcated the idea of unity and brotherhood amongst different religious and ethnic groups of the subcontinent. The congress leadership equated Pakistan with a sin that was committed against the 'holy' and 'sanctioned' unity of Mother India. The strongest of all these paradoxes was that a nation-state which was created in the name of Islam was opposed by the Islamicists who felt cheated by the secularist like Jinnah. With no administrative infrastructure and without a sizeable middle-class, Pakistan started its journey in 1947.

However, democracy created Pakistan, the poor man's budget rang the bell for independence and Jinnah's formula of August 11 where state stands beyond the faith and the gender of its citizens gave this fifty years old nation a direction. We cannot be free of history, its glories and disasters always sneak into our contemporary affairs but the vision of a better tomorrow is hameased by the lessons from history and not by dreaming of the past. And there are plenty of lessons that can be learned from half a century's experience. If Pakistanis understand that the inner logic of historical events is judged not by the success of an event but by the welfare of the people involved in it, than the road to many more golden jubili is clear,

otherwise history loses its essence and becomes just a burden on weak shoulders or a past time for day dreaming.

India-Pakistan relations defy reason and rationality. The objectives of a country's foreign policy are considered to be the promotion of a country's defence and economic interests. In case of Pakistan ideology takes precedence over all other interests in the 'two nation theory' approach to Indo-Pakistan relations. Though some would attribute this approach to fundamentalists alone but this equally applies to those in the Pakistani Establishment who believe in the so called ideology of Pakistan. 'The two-nation theory' was the *raison de etre* of Pakistan. This was the basis on which the partition of India was demanded in the pre-independence days. The demand for Pakistan was based in the name of Islam but even after more than fifty years after independence apart from some cosmetic measures Islamic state is nowhere in sight even the Shariat Bill proposed by the former Prime Minister of Pakistan Nawaz Sharif in 1998 could not be passed by the National Assembly. He had done this exercise earlier also in 1991 with the same result. There was never any debate in the councils of the Muslim league before independence on the political system, or what would be the security problems etc. of the new state. The very fact that Pakistan would be divided into two wings separated by one thousand miles of Indian territory and the security problems it would be confronted with were scarcely given any attention. The bitter controversies that the two-nations theory sparked between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim league were later translated into the foreign policy of the two countries particularly of the later. These were compounded by the problems generated by the way the partition was implemented. Thus India became the 'enemy country' which had not accepted Pakistan and was out to undo it. India was the only and the main threat to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Pakistan. The idea that a country has a foreign enemy is easy for the mass of the people to understand, and it also provides a powerful stimulators to national unity. For Pakistan, India has filled this role. Consequently the primary objective of Pakistan's foreign policy has been to strengthen her position vis-à-vis India.

Thus the only determinant of Pakistan's foreign policy has been its attempt to equality and parity with India if not superiority over it. From the early years of

seeking military alliance and addurence to U.S. sponsored military pacts like the South East Asia Treaty Organisation and the Central Treaty Organisation. The treat perception from India and the desire to get even with it for the grievance based on the two-nation there over its claim for Kashmir has to the obsession of the Pakistan Establishment for the Indian State. That was the reason for that country to go to war with India to seize the state by force. To give this obsession a veneer of ideology it is called the unfinished agenda of partition.

The Muslim League was formed in 1906 to represent the interests of the Islamic minority in British India in the movement for freedom from colonial domination. Its leaders became convinced through the years of struggle with the British Raj that their people would become oppressed and even destroyed in an independent, Hindu-dominant India. In 1940 the League voted to demand a separate state for the Muslim population of South Asia. Through the persistent, answering leadership of its President Jinnah, this objective was realized when the British Raj, in departing in 1947, set the mechanism, to establish two nations instead of one.

This division created two wints, a smaller but more populous East Pakistan, and a larger, dominant West Pakistan, separated by 900 miles of India. It also created a number of disputes over the appropriate process for occasion of the princely States of British India into the new nations. The most strenuous of these disputes has been over Kashmir; a former princely state on the border between India and Pakistan that had a Muslim majority but a Hindu Maharaja. The dispsute over which country it belongs to has led to three wars between India and Pakistan and an unresolved resolution for a plebiscite even today.

The main thing was to split up a state. As Jinnah made an amendment to the British policy of "Divide and Rule", whereas Gandhi called upon the British to 'Quit India' and he said 'Divide and Quit'. Thus, not to split up a state but to split up a nation, and Jinnah, are of the Indian national Congress, discovered in his old age that the Hindus and Muslims were not two communities, but two nations, coexisting under foreign rule. He held that upon the British withdrawal each nation should separately exist in its own homeland. He even went so far as to suggest an exchange of population but did not mention it a second time. But once was enough to rouse elemental suspicious and apprehensions between friends and neighbours

of a thousand years. In consequence of its intensive propaganda the league won the 1946 elections on the Pakistan issue, defeating the congress Muslims and Unionist Muslims and Krishak Praja Muslims all over India, barring a few exceptions. When Congress insisted on including Mr. Asaf Ali in the Viceroy's Interim Government and the British Prime Minister intervened in favour of Congress Jinnah rejected the Cabinet Mission Scheme and his Muslim League embarked on a two-pronged "Direct Action" against the British authorities and the Congress leaders. In practice, it was a call to the Muslims to resist Hindu Raj in succession to British Raj. Terrible riots broke out though the League was persuaded to join the 'Interim Government' by the Viceroy its aim was not to work but to work. Since the Cabinet Mission Scheme failed the British fixed on deadline for withdrawal, leaving India United or divided as the parties desired. This ultimatum led to division by consent is not in the way that Jinnah contemplated but as modified by Nehru and Patel. Bengal and Punjab were also divided. Lord Curzon was dead, but his policy went marching on.

Thus Congress, an inclusive organization of Indians of all communities, got India, an inclusive homeland of all India's minus those who accepted Pakistan as their homeland willingly or unwillingly. On the other hand, the Muslim League, an exclusive organization of Muslims only secured Pakistan, an exclusive homeland of Muslims where the Hindus and Sikhs and Christians were treated with discrimination, suspicion and hostility, just because they were 'unbelievers'. Though Jinnah personally made no discrimination on religious grounds the fanatical forces he had unleashed by his campaign for Pakistan and 'Direct Action' compelled him to make Pakistan an 'Islamic State' where Christians might live as Zimmies but idolators had either flee, be converted or die. Almost the entire Hindus and Sikhs population of West Pakistan was eliminated by massacre or flight. In East Pakistan some Hindus were killed and one-third of the Hindu population fled, while two-thirds remained, thanks to the friendly attitude of their Muslim neighbours. That unfortunate phrase 'exchange of population' gave a handle to the Hindu fanatics in India who took the law into their own hands and brought about a limited exchange of population by force. This was contrary to the Congress Policy of a secular State. For a time it looked as if India was not a composite nation but a Hindu nation where no

Muslim was safe. Gandhi fasted on this issue. He gained his object but lost his life at the hands of a Hindu fanatic. Sweets were distributed at various places in India by the assassin's supporters. We are not yet out of the wood. As long as Pakistan remains an Islamic monopoly the Hindu fanatics of India will go on threatening the Muslims including Congress Muslims and Communist Muslims. In Pakistan, the Muslims themselves are under pressure of 'Islamisation' recalling the early days of Islam, while India is marching forward into the 21st century Pakistan is marching backward into the 6th century. She has lost all sense of Nationalism and Democracy. East Pakistan has broken away to preserve both.

The Indo-Pak relations have not yet become normal and are not likely to become normal until there is a reversal of the policy of exclusion on religious grounds. Even in Bangladesh where the Founding Fathers established a secular State, there is a reaction. The Bengali Muslims fought the non-Bengali Muslims with Bengali Hindus as their comrades. Now all that comradeship has been forgotten. In the result the Muslims of Bangladesh too have lost their battle for democracy. It will take Pakistan a long time to realize that Pakistan got her independence because India got hers, thanks to the struggle carried on by the Congress. If India loses her independence Pakistan will also lose hers. Democracy is also a fruit of the Congress struggle. Pakistan was a gainer thereby. If she has not it the reason is her isolation from the mainstream. If she ever regains it this will be due to her sacrifice and suffering on the Congress model. She needs someone like Frontier Gandhi to lead her in her struggle for democracy. Lord Mountbatten closed to be Crown Representative on the 15th August 1947. On that date every Indian Prince was legally free to decide for himself whether his State would accede to the Dominion of India or the Dominion of Pakistan what is called Pak today was the site of the Indus valley civilization 5000 years ago. It is a source of Pride to India. If it is the same to Pakistan this common heritage should unite them at heart. Most of the Muslims of the sub-continent live in India and Bangladesh and share a common medieval and modern heritage. The Muslims of Pakistan are only 20 percent of the total. Acquisition of Kashmir will make little difference to their percentage. An arms race will never give them parity or weightage or veto in Indo-Pak affairs. The sooner they recognize the common interests the better. Economically and militarily this

subcontinent is an indivisible unit as the British found it and Nehru made it. The division is religious and political.

Relations with Pakistan have come to represent the core interest of India's Foreign Policy. This pre-eminence in four decades existence as an independent nation has been sustained by an over-deepening feeling of mutual mistrust of each other's intentions, roles and actions. This phenomenon has seen them through (four/three) declared wars, and have not been able to prevent at least another three undeclared ones – Siachen, Kashmir and Punjab – from being pursued without remorse. Religion, distorted history and adversarial posturing for personal gain have led to the ingraining of mutually exclusive ideologies upon the people. This in turn, has taken a heavy toll on a region which suffers from serious challenges to its national building activities and socio-economic development projects.

The partition of the subcontinent into two countries merely confirmed an incorrect and historically untenable position that for religion to prosper in the subcontinent it required separate homelands. The use of religion by the intellectual and political elites led to the unfolding of a trauma where 15 million people, caught in a passionate maelstrom, cross migrated and over a million died in the process. The resultant psychological sear on the general populace was exploited by political elites, mainly in Pakistan, to create a legacy of suspicion and mistrust that has continued to be devil bilateral relations.

In India, partition along communal lines was sought to be countered by promoting a secular society whose function was to tackle the ills afflicting ridden masses. In Pakistan, however, the converse was being attempted by trying to foster a nationalism that was exclusively based on religion. But, within years of promoting the "official ideology", sub-national, cultural and pluralistic identities in the new country began resisting the uniformity sought to be enforced under the guise of religion. The peculiarity of this race validating their respective ideologies comes into sharper focus when India's secular model is compared with other countries in the region. A Hindu Nepal, predominantly Buddhist Sri Lanka and Myanmar, Muslim Afghanistan and Maldives have never felt threatened by this projection.

The ideological race suited Islamabad ruling elites well. They were effectively able to project the Indian secular model as a challenge to the creation of Pak., which gave them the necessary excuse to raise the bogey of an Indian threat to their independent existence. The ruling elite in Islamabad had adopted the ideology of 'Two Nations' essentially to build new bases of public support for themselves. Apart from Mohammad Ali Jinnah and to some extent Liaquat Ali Khan, no Muslim League politician had an identifiable support base within the new state. Pakistan itself was a unique experiment where a political leadership that claimed support in Muslim minority areas of undivided India by heightening their fears of being submerged by the majority community, had abandoned them dearing partition, and were now looking for new support structures on an alien terrain.

For this elite, creating pockets of support in a country that was never exposed to the fears of being swamped by a numerically superior community, meant that the tenuous thread of a common religion had to be strengthened by playing up the Two-Nation theory, and the threat that Indian policies posed to it. This 'threat perception' went well with a people still traumatized by the horrors of partition, but it did not prevent the mushrooming of grassroot movements that sought inclusion of local elements in the ruling elite. By 1971, the once dominant Muslim League was reduced to an insignificant party and the ruling elite was controlled by the Punjabi Pathan combine which accounted for 75 percent of the top military posts in 1968, and 56 per cent of the ruling elite. This, however, did not end the anachronistic perception of the Indian threat within the public. To the new ruling elite, the same misperceptions of the Indian threat within the public. To the new ruling elite, the same misperceptions already prevalent among the people were furthered for their own survival.

The result of the erroneous propaganda efforts by Islamabad had led to a stereotyping of Indian intentions vis-à-vis Pakistan. The in the threat from India may have undergone subtle change to keep pace with changing realities, but the threat has created an 'India - Phobia' among the Pakistani politicians, making it impossible for any Pakistani leader to publicly talk peace with India without being dubbed a traitor to the cause. At one time or another, virtually every imported non-Punjabi leader - be it Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Asghar Khan, Khan Abdul Wali Khan, Quai

ym Khan, Benazir Bhutto, Jam Sadiq Ali or Gulam Mustafa Khar – have had their credentials doubted.

Bhutto, who sent a quiet message to Mrs Gandhi whilst flying back to Pakistan after the Simla Accord that was intended to reassure the Indian leadership of Islamabad's genuine desire for peacefully solving vexed political issues, changed times while addressing a rally in Lahore immediately upon arrived. He expounded to the public his rationale for signing the Simla Agreement which did not speak of the need for peace with India. The Simla Agreement was the only face saving option available to him after the humiliating defeat which was 93,000 soldiers taken as POWs in India.

The costliest misjudgment of India foreign policy was to bite the bait that the Pakistani leadership offered by throwing of to two-nation theory as the alternative model for the region. Ever since, India has been embroiled, despite its global outlook, in a regional acrimony that has plagued every aspect of bilateral relations with Pakistan. Islamabad's ruling elite was able to create a feeling of vulnerability vis-à-vis India and successfully externalize this exaggerated sense of insecurity to achieve its goals.

India's Pakistan Policy was always been reactive and New Delhi is constantly engaged in a policy of denial. It has allowed Pakistan's ruling elite to use issues of its choosing like the communal situation in India for domestic gain, while Indian reference to happenings inside Pakistan on issues like human rights, rights of women, children and minorities, are touted as examples of Indian interference whose end goal is the destruction of Pakistan itself. The resultant threat misperception on both sides of the border is always viewed from a worst case scenario angle.

The process of complete mistrust and suspicion began with Kashmir, where Pakistan preferred using force rather than dialogue and diplomacy to wrench a state. It hardened attitudes regarding Pakistan's motivations and led to the withholding of the transfer of military stores and each balances by India to Pakistan. This, in turn, led to Pakistan dragging its fact over evacuee property and in giving active assistance to the Razakars of Hyderabad.²⁷

To this may be added India's disapproval of Pakistan's advocacy of the 'two-nation theory' based on religion. "It was perfectly clear" said Jawaharlal Nehru, that it was quite impossible to divide it on the basis of separating religious groups on one side of the other."²⁸ To accept Pakistan's 'two-nation thereof' would mean a collapse of the secularistic policy on which the Indian Union rests and a reopening of the condemns of separatism through various religious sensitized groups.

Accordingly, the two-nation theory, which formed the ideological basis for the partition of 1947, had as its corollary a built-in assumption that after independence India and Pakistan would possess not only juridical equality but also equality in power terms and that this should be recognized by the world at large and particularly by the dominant powers. The 'two nation' theory was thus transformed into Independent Pakistan's drive to achieve and enjoy power-parity with India. A perceptive western scholar of Pakistan Affairs has stated :

In large measure, Pakistani feeling towards India has been a continuation of the political struggle before partitionMr Jinnah had never agreed to constitutional formula which would have denoted lesser status for the Muslim League. India contained two nations; one sovereign nation is the equal of any other sovereign nation Many political leaders and most of the articulate section of the population have reacted with emotional intensity to any suggestion of Indian superiority on any field.²⁹

Pakistan's President Ayub, almost verifying this, wrote :

The world today is fighting for equality – equality amongst individuals as among nations, regardless of whether they are big or small. This requires an unequivocal recognition by the world that every nation is entitled to equal rights and opportunities. The degree of a country's sovereignty and self-respect is not determined by the size of its territory or its resources. This sounds simple enough Yet there are no means to enforce it. It is a world of the Big Two, Big Three or four or more. It is they who preside over the destiny of the world and determine its direction. The smaller countries, particularly those in the early stages of industrial development, belong to a lower stratum of existence we too have to establish our identity and fight for a position of equality and honour.

He continued in the same vein :

The cause of our major problem is India's inability to reconcile herself to our existence as a sovereign independent nation At the back of it all was India's ambition to absorb Pakistan or turn her into a satellite.³⁰

However, even after partition of the subcontinent, the state in India still had to contend with not only a large and disoriented Muslim minority but also a multi-ethnic and multi-linguistic society. So the political elite in India naturally persisted with secularism as the glue that could hold in its modernization. The raison deters idea that only a Muslim majority state in the subcontinent could ensure a fair deal to the Indian Muslim. Even after the creation of Pakistan with a Muslim majority, the Pakistani elite found it expedient to reiterate Islam as the binding factor. This, they thought, could not only keep its two wings, separated by a thousand miles of Indian Territory intact but also keep in check potentially centrifugal forces stimulated by ethnicity and language.

Implicit in these two approaches was the assumption that secularism in the case of India and Islam in the case of Pakistan would help ensure political justice to their respective citizens. India and Pakistan, therefore, sought their ideological security in secularism and Islam respectively. In other words, these two states adopted not only different but also opposing strategies of state building, which by itself created certain tension in their bilateral relations. It was, perhaps, irresistible that Kashmir would become a symbol of this ideological tension that underlay the political foundations of the two states.

Pakistan's sense of insecurity stems from the fact that the creation of Pakistan with a Muslim majority failed to impart the necessary cohesion to the Pakistani state. The fear of Hindu domination submerged the differences among Muslims temporarily and they threw their collective weight behind Jinnah's demand for Pakistan. One Pakistan was created, as the ethnic, linguistic and sectarian differences among the Pakistani Muslims, naturally surfaced again. Jinnah, who relentlessly pursued his two nation theory on the sole ground that Hindus and Muslims constituted two nations, was aware of this problem and its implications for Pakistan. So, he found it expedient to make a political volte-face once Pakistan

was conceded. Addressing the Pakistan Constituent Assembly on 11th August 1947, Jinnah's exhortation to the Prospective Pakistani citizen was, "You are free; you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go your mosques or to any other place of worship in the state of Pakistan. You may belong to any religion or caste or creed that has nothing to do with the business of the state. We are starting with this fundamental principle that one are all citizens and equal citizens of one state."³¹ However, the creation of Bangladesh, the movements for separation/autonomy in Sind, North West Frontier Province and Baluchistan, the struggle of the Maharajon, the sectarian violence between Sunnis and Shias and the treatment meted out to the so-called 'Azad Kashmir' itself demonstrate that Islam has failed to ensure political justice to these communities in spite of the fact that they are all Muslims in an avowedly Islamic State. Ironically, the father of the so called 'Islamic Bomb of Pakistan' Dr. Abdul Qadir Khan belongs to the Ahmadiya sect, which has been declared a non-Muslim minority in Pakistan.

It was the two-nation theory of Jinnah which was supposed to provide the ideological and philosophical foundation to Pakistani Muslims in India, it was argued, were so much different culturally and ethnically that they constitute a separate nation altogether. Bhutto described the struggle for Pakistan on the "glorious freedom struggle of the Muslims of the South Asia Sub-continent."³² Way back in 1051 the then Prime Minister of Pakistan, Liaquat Ali Khan had said :

Pakistan came into being as a result of the urge felt by the Muslims of the sub-continent to secure a territory, however, limited, where the Islamic Ideology and way of life could be practiced and demonstrated to the world. A cardinal feature of this ideology is to make Muslim brotherhood a living reality."³³

That Pakistan was founded on Islam was also stressed by Ayub Khan, he said :

We in Pakistan cannot ignore the fact that our country is the product of the ideology of Islam. This is the foremost justification of its existence and we cannot be true to Pakistan without being true to its ideology."³⁴

The Islamic character of Pakistan has been exploited time and again in order to uphold her distinct identity from that of "Hindu" India. Ever since 1949 when the Objectives Resolution was adopted by the constituent Assembly of Pakistan the

Islamic thrust had been a determinant of Pakistan's foreign policy in one form or the other.

Ideologically speaking Islamic Pakistan goes asymmetrical with secular India. But it has also produced a definite strain in Indo-Pak relations. As an Islamic State Pakistan considers it her sacred duty to extend her protectionist role to all the Muslims in the sub-continent including those who are living in India. For her "the Muslims inside Pakistan and across the border in India..... from one nation, though citizens of two states Pakistan therefore still considers the Muslims across the borders as her special responsibility and pressure."³⁵ Therefore whenever there are some communal clashes in India, Pakistan media and also the political leaders find it an occasion to ventilate with the Hindus does clearly negate. Two Nation theory on which Pak was founded. "The fact that many millions of Muslims to live in India", Wave anti-Muslims and Hindu as Imperialists. Therefore at the global level or particularly at the Islamic meets such events are highlighted by Pakistan in order to mobilize diplomatic support against India.

The Islamic base of Pakistan State manifactets itself in yet another form while shaping her relations with India. The orderly coexistence of the Muslims seem perfectly content to live in India, raises the basic question of the identity of Pakistan itself as homeland for persecuted Indian Muslims. It raises a question in secret moments of self-doubt, was Pakistan some kind of cosmic error."³⁶

Infact, Pakistan identity, history, geography and culture are all interwoven with India. Therefore, their problem is how to hold themselves distinct from those of India. Any intimacy with India threatens Pakistan's identity. Hence anti India posture is almost a national compulsion with Islamabad.

For the same reason forces pulling Pakistan away from the sub-continent have been active. Since her inception in 1947. Her special bonds of friendship with the Muslim countries in the neighbourhood, like Iran and with those in the Middle East and in the gulf region can very easily be explained in this framework of analysis. These countries are regarded as the "diplomatic territory" of Pakistan. Any efforts on the part of India to strike special bonds with these countries are looked upon as trespass on Pakistan, natural sphere of interest. Mrs. Gandhi visit to

Saudi Arabia, with which Pakistan has traditionally had very intimate relationship, was regarded by some in Pakistan as "a part of a concerted effort to isolate Pakistan diplomatically."

Pakistan also tried in 1950s to float an alternate model of international relations, when Indian approach of non-alignment and Panchsheel model of world relations seemed to have caught the imagination of several Third world countries. Pakistan sought to build up an international Islamic Group with Pakistan as its epicenter. By hosting and organizing Islamic Conferences Pakistan on the one hand hoped to assume the leadership of the Islamic World but at the same time they tried to mobilize world public opinion on the issue of Kashmir. Viewing international relations as a collection of religious constellations Ayub Khan dreamt that one of the pillars of these constellations will definitely be Pakistan.

The cultural diversities in Pakistan is yet another detrimental of her foreign policy. Though predominantly Muslim State, the regional, ethnic and cultural diversities in Pakistan have been as, if not more, strongly entrenched in her society as in India.

The prevalence of two different types of political systems in India and Pakistan is in itself a source of friction between the two. Pakistan's military projects and programme ever since Islamabad decided to follow alliance and military aid strategy in order to attain "parity" with India have been suspected in the political perceptions of New Delhi. In the context of the hostile exchanges in the past these perceptions have not only hardened but have become firm convictions. The divergence and divide in security perception, can to a large extent be attributed to the pre eminent role which the military factor plays in Pakistan and a fairly strong popular support which the democratic process enjoys in India. Any moves or initiative to restore democracy in Pakistan is convinced to be a threat by the military leadership and the easiest way to discredit such moves will be by proclaiming that they are inspired and supported by India. India baiting seems to have acquired a permanent place in the Foreign and defence policies of Islamabad.³⁷

Indian Democracy in fact, rejects the "Two - Nations' Theory". The 'two - nations' theory is legally and constitutionally unsound and socially and

sociologically reactionary. This theory was never accepted by the Congress prior to independence and has been totally rejected by the Indian constitution. The 'two-nation' theory proceeds on the fallacious and irrational assumption that religions makes a nation. The presence of several multiracial, multi religious, multi lingual nation in the world is a standing territory to the fact that the concept of 'nation' has not direct relation with the concept of religion.

Gandhiji revolted against this 'two – nations' theory, and he expressed his emphatic disapproval of the pernicious doctrine of the 'two-nations' which came to be preached in support of the creation of Pakistan prior to 1947, by declaring that Pakistan would be born over his dead body. Gandhiji's solicitude for the poor and humble of this earth needs no mention. Throughout his life he was a champion of the downtrodden and their saviour. History has naturally acclaimed him as one of the nobled of men. In Gandhiji's philosophy and practice difference in religion was altogether immaterial.

When Gandhiji expressed his whosehearted condemnation of the attempt to create Pakistan on the attempt to create Pakistan on the theory of 'two-nation-what Gandhiji meant was that this permi doctrine would ultimately mean disaster both for India and Pakistan, and that was proved to be true when both India and Pakistan celebrated the birth of the two respective Dominious with great acclaim and celebrations Gandhiji was engaged in the significant though tragic task of quenching the fire of communal fray, which had overwhelmed Bengal. In the address, which he delivered at Calcutta on 14th August, Gandhiji called upon his countrymen to celebrate the accession by a fast and prayer. It is not difficult to imagine how the aftermath of the division must have caused great anguish to Gandhiji . He had always looked upon India as one and invisible . He had never believed in Jinna's two-national theory and never change Nationality. He considered himself as much of Pakistan as of Hindustan. So far as he was concerned, nationalism transcended religious differences. It is also necessary to remember that the formation of Pakistan and India did not, in fact, proceed on and such theory. If the division of India was based in the basis of Muslims being a nation separate from the Hindus and the rest, it would follow on a matter of constitutional law that the

Muslims who remained in India would be alien and that is a proposition which is entirely unthinkable.

Every single provision of the constitution totally rejects the theory of two nations and proclaims that in India Hindu and Muslim, Christian, Sikhs, Parsis and Jews and all them, whatever their religion, are citizens who are equal in their rights and in their obligations. Besides, it the basis of Partition was that the Muslim form a separate nation, why was it necessary to hold a plebiscite in the North-West Frontier Province where 90 percent of the population was Muslim, why again were the legislatures consulted in Bengal and in the Punjab, which has Muslim majorities. It is true that in the result the provinces which had Muslim Majorities formed Pakistan; but this is very much different from saying that the division of India into two Dominions was then made on the basis that the Hindus and Muslim formed two different nations. The presence of over fifty million Muslims in India who are and are entitled to be treated on citizens is a standing and effective answer to this reactionary and unsound theory of two nations. India thus totally and unreservedly rejects the theory of two nations and regards it as medieval, irrational and unscientific.

The genesis of two-nations theory was purely political. The movement for creation Pak., came into existence not because Muslims could not live with the Hindus but because a section of modern English education, westernized Muslims felt that they will not get their due share of political and economic power. And that in the Independent India they will be dominated by Hindus. It was poverty of the masses, as an important to which the partition of Indian may be traced. Poverty is equal though curable. But it can be cured by economic pragmatism, and by no other ideology secularism can not mean an anti-religion, all religions are given respect and freedom of activity, presided of course they do not impinge upon each other and presided further that foreign help, funds are not allowed to be channelled through Ostensibly religious organization for political purposes.

The theory of Pakistan was based on the concept of Hindus and Muslims of two nations. Hindus and Muslims might be intermingled all over India and in every region of India; Hindu and Muslims might be having common ancestors, but they were proclaimed to be two Indians – two nations. This premise to base nationality

an religion was contrary to the every accepted historical definition. A Nation is a historically evolved stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make up manifested in a community of culture. None of the above characterized by itself is sufficient to define a nation.

On the other hand, it is sufficient for a single one of the characteristics to be absent and the nation ceases to be a nation. By this test, it is evident that the Muslims of India could not be called one 'nation'. Their languages are different. Ethnically, they are different. Between the Pathan and the Bengali Muslims, the only common feature is religion. But this is hardly sufficient to constitute a nation,

Majorities of the Muslims in India are converts from Hinduism or descendents of converts. How could they constitute themselves into a separate nation, converts never constitute a separate nation. The Hindus and Muslims have lived together for centuries and are destined to live so for times immemorial. They share similar customs and social behaviours and the difference of social practices has never been greater than those of Hindus of Punjab and those living in Madras or in Bengal. They have been one and are destined to remain one.

Has the partition solved the problems for which it was accepted? The obvious answer is :

It has not solved the problem. Rather the problems have been aggravated.

Aurabindo, predicted that in year ahead, India and Pakistan would ultimately come closer and stand united. In the words of Aurobindo, "Unity may finally come about under whatever from the exact form may have a pragmatic but not a fundamental importance. But by whatever mean, in whatever way, the division must go, unity must and will be achieved, for it is necessary for the greatness of India's future."¹²⁶

The ideology of two nation theory began to collapse immediately after Partition. Indo-Pak problems cannot be effectively solved until the partition is annulled, for the partition has solved no problems. It has neither brought peaceful coexistence of the two states – India and Pakistan – nor has it resulted into desired Hindu-Muslim amity. India has always stood for cooperation and friendship with all

and entertains malice towards none. The past unfortunate incidents of armed struggles of 1947, 1965, 1971 and 1999 are unfortunate events.

The last more than 50 years of continued hostility between the two countries, are all harbingers of the end of partition and unification of what nature has created as one inevitable unit – United India. The Partition indeed was an evil. Millions of people were uprooted and yet it did not end in 1947 and for many it was a long drawn unending process. The partition went on for many years, with Partition, the birth places of many, their old homes became foreign land, to them.

From the above discussion, it became clear that the ideology of the Two-Nation Theory is a 'cure'. Most of Pakistan's problems with India are the outcome of the former's adherence to the ideology of the two-nation theory. That ideology is contradictory to that of India Pakistan is a monolithic theocratic state with one religion, one language and one mind. On the other hand, India is the opposite – with many religions, many languages, many communities and many minds. The divergences between the two countries are of a fundamental and multiple nature and they have outstripped any prospect of convergences between them. The foundations of the two countries are not only distinct but different. India achieved independence and nationhood as result of the freedom struggle against the age old British colonialism. On the other hand, Pakistan was the first country in the twentieth century born as a result of the demand by a religious community. It was founded on the basis of the two nation theory, holding that the Hindus and the Muslims were separate nations. The Father of the Nation, Quid-i-Azam, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, had visualized it in 1947 itself that the role of religion in the governance of the country was dangerous and, therefore, he warned that the newly born country was not going to be a theocratic state to be ruled by religious priests. Advocating equal citizenship to all communities and hinting at religious freedom which would unshackle any kind of religious identity, he in his inaugural address to the constituent Assembly said, "..... in the course of time, Hindus will cease to be Hindus and Muslims will cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense because that is the personal faith of the individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the nation."³⁸ He further said, "..... change your past and work together in the spirit that everyone of you, no matter what community he belongs to, is, first, second and last a citizen of the state

with equal rights.³⁹ he confessed on his death – bed that he committed a 'blunder' by creating the state of Pakistan.⁴⁰ as he foreseen that his successor were not going to uphold the values he strived for. The foregoing secular statements of Jinnah amounted to the contradiction of the two-nation theory. Recently Ayesha Jalal, the distinguished is based Pakistan scholar said that Jinnah was against Partition of the Indian Subcontinent.⁴¹ he did not grant a separate country for Muslims. In fact the demand for Pakistan was a bargaining card for securing better deals for the Indian Muslims.

The secession of Bangladesh and Pakistan's humiliating military defeat at the hands of India were the two defining events that continue to haunt Pakistan even today. The emergence of Bangladesh not only exposed the absurdity of the two-nation theory, the very *raison d'être* for Pakistan but also repeatedly reiterated the fact that religion alone was inadequate for Pakistan as a nation-state.

The founding fathers of Pakistan proposed the political idea on the basis of the two nation theory as a homeland for South Asian Muslims. It suited then initially in order to mobilize the Indian Muslims in the struggle to ward's nationhood. After the nationhood was achieved a controversy erupted. Pakistani Muslims of secular mindset believed that religion was not the basis for nationhood and only common territory defines a nation. Their opponents argued that their common religion of Islam was adequate to form a nation. They ultimately prevailed. Thus, Jinnah's successor's finally flouted the secular values he preached. Islam has remained a dominant factor influencing the political destiny of Pakistan. It ensured the survival of the two nation theory. But, unfortunately, Islam has failed to unite the Muslims of Pakistan, create a national ethos and prevent the fractured nature of internal politics. The wish of the founding fathers of Pakistan to create a homeland for the South Asian Muslims proved to be a nightmare. The initial setback came from the decision of a large section of the Indian Muslims to stay away in India. In the process they disapproved the thesis that Muslims in India were ill treated or exploited by the Hindus. Today India commands the second largest Muslims population among the countries of the world. Thus over 120 million Indian Muslims, almost equivalent to the total population of Pakistani Muslims, are firmly loyal to the Indian nation despite frequent provocation and allurements from abroad. Pakistan's former Army Chief

General Jahangir Karamat has also confirmed it by saying, "Indian Muslims remain loyal to India even after the formation of Pakistan as the home for the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent."⁴² India, since time immemorial, has welcomed Islam and continues to be a heaven for Islamies. It is one of the few non-Muslim majority countries that allows Muslims to conduct their life in accordance with Islamic personal laws. India is the biggest centre of Islamic literature in the world even after partition when Muslim-majority areas broke away to form Pakistan. On the contrary, Pakistan has not become the country of even all of its Muslim inhabitants. Quite narrowly, it is primarily the country of dominant Punjabi Muslims. Thus, it represents only a section of its Muslim population ignoring the hopes and aspiration of the people of Sindh, Baluchistan and NWFP.

The ideology of two-nation theory now popularly known as the clash of civilization in the light of Samuel P. Huntington's thesis first developed in his essay "A clash of Civilization" published in Foreign Affairs and later expanded into a full-fledged book published in 1996 under the title of A Clash of Civilizations and Remarking of World- Order has been at the root of the 54 years old conflict between India and Pakistan. It is the real core issue between the two countries. The most significant fact is that the Pakistani army is the guardian of the ideology to two-nation theory,⁴³ which never hopes to abandon it.

"The most dangerous country" these are words used by Seymour Hersh in an article published in the Statesman. The words are a description of Pakistan. The question how did Pakistan, founded on 14th August 1947, grow into a dangerous state. It is true that Pakistan created by M A Jinnah on the foundation of an irrational two-nation theory, was crippled at its birth. Jinnah himself called it a "moth-eaten Pakistan". The Boundary Commission did not give it what it wanted, the whole of the Punjab and the whole of Bengal, Delhi and Calcutta and corridor from Karachi to Calcutta.

Mr. Radcliff's award created in Pakistan an anger against India which it could never shed. Actually, it has been steadily on the increase since it came into existence. Perhaps the Bombay barrister realized that his two-nation theory was untenable in the modern world. In his presidential address to Pakistan's Constituent Assembly in Karachi on 11 August 1947. Jinnah declare: "We are starting with this

fundamental principle that we are all citizens and equal citizens of one state In course of time Hindu would cease to be Hindus and Muslim would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense but in the political sense as citizens of the state. (M-A Jinnah, speeches and statement, 1947-1948 (1989) where was this idea of separation of religion from politics when he enunciated his two nation theory in his demand for partition. It is the USA which encouraged Pakistan to become a dangerous state even in those days when its armed forces were busy liberating South Vietnam from Communist rule. America has pampered Pakistan and made it an Alaler Gharer Dulal, a spoiled child, even when it was ruled by a dictator.⁴⁴

Notes and References

1. Dr. Kedar Nath Tiwari, Comparative Religion, Motilal Benarasi Das, (1983, Reprint – 1987), p. 168.
2. Nikhil Chakraborty, 'After 50 years of Animosity : time for India Pak understanding', The Tribune, August 19, 1997, p.10.
3. Nagendra Singh, "Human Rights and the Future of Mankind, 1981.
4. Nani A, Palkhivala, We, the Nation, 1994, p.25.
5. Ibid, p. 222.
6. D G Tendulkar, Mahatma, V. 8, 1990, pp. 235-236.
7. Rajmohan Ganmdhi, Muslim Mind, 1966, p. 230.
8. K. Natwar Singh, *A spirited Fighter even at 74*, The Sunday Tribune Book, February 6, 1994, p.10.
9. See kalim Bahadurm, *Islamic Fundamentalism and Indo-Pak Relations* in V.D. Chopra, ed. Studies in Indo-Pak Relations (N. Delhi, 1984), pp. 251-252.
10. Keith Collard, Pakistan : A Political Study (London, 1957), p.11.
11. B.N.Jog, Threat of Islam : Indian-Dimensions, 1994, p. 319-325.
12. Chithara, M.G. , Indo-Pak Relation Challenges before New Millennium, page 52, 2001, a.P.H. Pub Corporation, or Delhi..
13. Ibid, p. 52-53, p. 52-53.
14. Ibid, p. 53.
15. Asghar Ali Engineer, in an article, India at fifty, Fault Lines in an article, "India at Two nation Theory", in M.G.Chitkara, in Peace and Social Well-being', pp. 38-39.
16. The Gandhi Jinnah Talks, Delhi, 1944, p.16, in "World Community and Indo-Pak Relations" edt. by Grove Arona, Deep & Deep Publications Pvt. Ltd., 1999, New Delhi.

17. Md. Ayub Khan, "Pakistan-American Alliance : Stresses and Strain", Foreign Affairs, Jan, 1966, p. 199.
18. Michael Breacher, Acher : A Political Biography (London, 1959), pp. 3778.
19. Keith Collard, P's Foreign Policy, New York, 1959, p.14.
20. C.M.Naim, ed, Iqbal, Jinnah and Pakistan : The Vision and the Reality, South Asian Series, 1979, p. 212.
21. India & Pakistan, The First Fifty Years, ed. Selig S. Harrison, Paul H. Kreisberg, and Dounis Kux, 1999, New Delhi, p.4.
22. H.N.Braisford, Subject India, London 1943, p. 42 in Liberal Times, 2/97.
23. Grover & Arora – World Community & Indo-Pak Relations, pp. 477-478.
24. Nehru's speech in Parliament, Parliamentary Debates, vol. iii, no. B, 50/821, 17, March, 1950, , Vol. 1700, Aslam Siddique, N. 6, p. 17.
25. British Collard, Pakistan : A Political Study (Institute of Pacific Relations, London, 1957), p. 304.
26. Md. Ayub Khan, Friends not Master (OUP, New York, 1967), p. 115.
27. Stanlay wolpert, Jinnat of Pakistan, New York, OUP, 1984, p. 339.
28. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, The Third World : New Directions (London, 1977), p.15.
29. Pakistan News, (Karachi), Feb. 18, 1951.
30. Field Marshall Ayub Khan, Speeches and Statements, Vol. III, (Karachi), p.52.
31. Stephen Phillip Cohen, "Identity, Survival, Security, Pakistan's Defence Policy", in Surendra Chopra ed, Perspectives on Pakistan's Foreign Policy (Amrisar, 1989), p. 53.
32. South Asian Studies, "Domestic Determinants of Pakistan's Foreign Policy and Here Relations with India" by Manorama Kohli, p. i-9.
33. N.A.Palkhivala, We, The People (1984), p. 261.

34. Quoted in Sisir Gupta, "Constitution Making in Pakistan" in Verinder Grover and Ranjana Arora (edt), Political System in Pak. Vol. 2. Constitutional Development in Pak, New Delhi, 1995, p.119.
35. Ibid
36. Time Dec, 20, 1996.
37. The Hindustan Times, March 7, 2001.
38. The Hindustan Times, Jan, 25, 01.
39. The Times of India (editorial), Jan. 20, 2000.
40. Monday 3 March, 2003 (editorial) – Danyerous State I by R. K. Dasgupta.
41. India Today International , May 31, 1999, pp. 20-21, June 7, 1999, pp. 12-18; June 14, 1999; p. 13-23, July 12, 1999, pp. 12-24, July 19, 1999, Pp. 13-24
..... (Asian Profile, vol. 300 No.1, Feb. 2002).
42. K.P.Mishra, The UN Role in Indo-Poakistan Conflicts 1971, Delhi, 1973.
43. Surendra Chopra, "US Foreign Policy in Kashmir", I JPS, Vol.2, No.21, 1978, p. 141.
44. Ibid.