

## GENESIS OF INDO PAK DISCORD

**Alka Kumar**

Freelance Writer

Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India.

---

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jmss.v4.n1.p15>

**How to cite this paper:**

**Kumar, A.** (2016). Genesis of Indo Pak Discord. *IRA-International Journal of Management & Social Sciences* (ISSN 2455-2267), 4(1).  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jmss.v4.n1.p15>

---

© Institute of Research Advances



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) subject to proper citation to the publication source of the work.

**Disclaimer:** The scholarly papers as reviewed and published by the Institute of Research Advances (IRA) are the views and opinions of their respective authors and are not the views or opinions of the IRA. The IRA disclaims of any harm or loss caused due to the published content to any party.

---

The history of Indian Subcontinent is the history of friendship and hatred, trust and suspicion and conflict and cooperation between the two communities Hindus and Muslims. The two nation states (and later three), that were carved out of this subcontinent formed the part of the single nation which was the undivided India. The two countries India and Pakistan despite being the parts of one single civilization are generally seen as the arch rivals of one another.

In many ways there are no two countries in the world which have so much in common as India and Pakistan. Parts of the same state, India and Pakistan have more common heritage and interests than probably any other two countries in the world. Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa in Pakistan are as much part of India's history as Delhi, Agra, Ajmer and Lucknow are of Pakistan; at least four languages are spoken commonly in both the countries and the two national languages of Pakistan are two national languages of India as well; the same literary figures are held in the highest esteem – Tagore and Iqbal, Nazrul Islam and Waris Shah, Ghalib and Sarat Chandra Chatterjee; dresses are common in large parts of India and Pakistan, food habits, manners, customs and even the humor are common. Music and dancing, art and painting draw common inspirations and observe common forms<sup>1</sup>. For centuries, people of both the countries have lived on the same land mass, have faced the heat and dust, the cold and snow together have gone through the national calamities such as famine and drought and floods together. And then together they saw the rulers come from the far away land and they tasted the dust of common humiliation. And in the initial stages, they even started fighting the foreign ruler together. The bondage of history, geography and culture is too strong to be overlooked.

The foreign policy perspectives of India and Pakistan are a subject in which every Indian and Pakistani has abiding interest. People in both the countries desire peace, non aggression and non interference, mutual cooperation and co-existence. Yet this sorry state of affairs of conflict and mistrust persists and India and Pakistan have emerged as the two most antagonistic neighbors in the world.

### **Hindu Muslim Relationship In Historical Perspective**

The relationship of India and Pakistan is a complex question and is influenced by various psychological factors - both inherent and external. To understand the complexity of the behavioral attitude of both these countries, it is necessary to trace the foundation of the relationship of the two countries. Hindus and Muslims, the two bastions of the society in Indian subcontinent have a long history of interaction. The earliest Muslims came to India as conquerors and stayed on to make it their home. But they constituted a very small minority and mostly kept their distance from the rest of the Indians. It was mainly after the arrival of Moghuls that actual Hindu-Muslim interaction began, particularly during the reign of Akbar. Up to the time of Akbar the non Muslims were excluded from all jobs of responsibility and prestige. The Muslims alone formed the governing classes and all high officials were drawn from the Muslim community. Akbar threw open the doors of offices to Hindus and Muslims alike. He even abolished Jizya<sup>2</sup> after which both Hindus and Muslims became equal citizens of the state<sup>3</sup>.

But, in the later years large scale conversion of Hindus to Islam took place either by force or due to injustice rampant in the Hindu caste system. This, along with inter-community marriage, led to a substantial increase in the population of Muslims. Hence the Muslim of the subcontinent is either the offspring of an inter community marriage or a converted Hindu. "The spread of Islam in India has nothing to do with aggressive tendencies of the Muslim faith, nor was it necessitated by the political situation, as it had been during the time of Mohammed and the early Caliphs. In fact its rapid expansion was as much due to the rigid caste system of Hinduism as to the political ascendancy of the Muslims or the establishment of the Afghan kingdom<sup>4</sup>."

The advent of Europeans brought about in its wake the recession and downfall of Muslim rulers and they were relegated to the position of the common man. The initial resistance to the foreign rule came largely from those who were deprived of their status and sources of livelihood in the new Indian state. The Muslim elite of northern India became the first victims of the tremendous structural changes that the advent of British rule brought about. While the Hindus started adjusting to the new situations, it

became almost impossible for the Muslim elite to accept the status of a common man. Hindus started entering the new avenues opened by the extension of the British administration and started taking the new role of skilled professional, which used to be a privilege of Muslims in the pre British era. The Muslims kept themselves aloof from this changing social structure. This attitude of Muslims led to a wide gap between the two communities and thus fear, jealousies and rivalries started surfacing. Mohammed Noman expresses the ill feeling that the Muslims had developed against the British in the following words, “The British people had decided that for the expansion of the new power and its continuance the only course was to crush the Musalmans, and had deliberately adopted policies which had for their aim the economic ruin of Muslims and their intellectual stagnation and general degeneration<sup>5</sup>.”

Though several divisive forces such as caste, language, regional loyalty etc had always been at work in the Indian society both horizontally and vertically but under the impact of British rule the religious discord became the source of major political conflict in the subcontinent. This was because of the British policies of wooing one community at the expense of the other. This divisive policy of the British coupled with the changing social structure of the society became the basis of Muslim separateness.

*“The followers of Islam could not lose themselves in the wide waters of idolatry which splashed around them, sometimes too dangerously close and which seemed bent upon carrying away a portion, however small, of this foreign rock, which only a little while ago had stood so dominating and so impregnable. Now perhaps with the help, or at least the encouragement of the British rulers, the Hindu tradition of absorbing all kinds of alien forces and doctrines, would at least succeed in breaking the weakening ramparts of Indian Islam. The threat was dire and opened long vistas of unending gloom, at the end of which it saw the annihilation of every shred of its spiritual heritage. The conquerors of India, the proud inheritors of the Moghul court could not merge themselves in the drab grayness of the vast Indian millions and still call their past their own.”<sup>6</sup>*

Whereas on one hand foreign rule had started widening the gap between the two communities, at the same time it also became the basis of harmony and cooperation between them. After the initial shock and long period of aloofness, Muslims finally started accepting their status at par with Hindus and it was in 1857, in the First War of Independence that Hindus and Muslims worked in close cooperation. The decisive evidence showing the national character of the rebellion is the note of communal harmony it struck in both the Hindus and Muslims.<sup>7</sup>

The Muslim elite, in the following years, worked simultaneously for Hindu Muslim unity as well for the separateness of the Muslims. This separatism was followed in order to give boost to the sagging spirits of Muslims on social, cultural and educational level. But, at the same time, the spirit of patriotism also started building up. Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan was a great patriot and a fearless advocate of the Indian cause – like Maulana Mohammad Ali, Maulana Hasrat Mohani and M A Jinnah. Sayed Ahmed also started his career as an Indian patriot.<sup>8</sup> He described Hindus and Muslims as two eyes of the beautiful bride that was India and said,

“In the word nation, I include both Hindus and Mohammedans because it is the only meaning attached to it. With me it is not worth considering what is their religious faith, because we do not see anything of it.”<sup>9</sup> It was only after the Benaras Hindu Movement of 1867 and the influence of Beck<sup>10</sup> that his views started changing.

### **The Two Nation Theory**

The orthodox among the Muslims believed that the nationhood consisted of geographical boundaries but the liberal Muslims considered Islam as more than a religion – a religion in politics. They believed that the Muslim of India belonged to the Muslim community elsewhere. Thus, while the orthodox worked for Hindu Muslim unity, particularly in fighting the common enemy, the liberals among them

believed that they were a separate nation – establishing cultural and religious affinity with the Central and West Asian countries. For them Hindus and Muslims were two different nations. Particularly, after the revolt of 1857 the Muslim were crushed ruthlessly by the British and they started wooing the Hindus. The fear of losing their identity became too profound in the minds of Muslims – “Therefore, the difference must be emphasized. The separate feeling must be made conspicuous. The identity of a people must be shown to be a stark reality.”<sup>11</sup>

### **Birth of Indian National Congress And Muslim League**

The British imperialism reached its zenith at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It brought so much of discontent in the masses, particularly among the intelligentsia and the peasantry, the possibility of a nationalist uprising became a reality. To provide a safety valve for the safe outlet of this growing discontent, Allan Octavian Hume, a retired British officer of the Indian Civil Service laid the foundation of a platform where the educated Indians could discuss the social matters of the country. Hume wrote later, “The ferment was at work with a radically increasing intensity and it became of paramount importance to find for its product an overt and constitutional channel for discharge instead of leaving them to fester as they had already commenced to do under the surface.”<sup>12</sup>

The Indians who actively worked for the creation of an All India Political Organization represented new social forces that were increasingly opposed to the exploitation of India for British interest. On the call of Hume, the Indian elite came forward and the first meeting of the Indian National Union, which was subsequently renamed Indian National Congress was held in Bombay in 1885. W C Bannerjee – a leading barrister of Calcutta was elected the president. This National Congress was joined by leaders of Hindus and Muslims both such as Dadabhai Naoroji, Justice Ranade, Feeroz Shah Mehta, Rahimatullah Mohammad Sayani, Surendra Nath Bannerjee and Badruddin Tyabji etc.

With the establishment of Indian National Congress and the publishing of nationalist newspaper such as Amrita Bazar Patrika, The Indian Mirror, The Hindu, The Kesari, The Tribune, The Koh-I-Noor etc, national movement picked up momentum. As the Congress started taking the shape of mass movement, the British became more and more suspicious and this is the time that they started wooing Muslims and finally succeeded in weaning them away from Congress and the nationalist movement.

Muslim separatism in India had first taken the form of a movement in the minority community to safeguard its rights, as constitutional reforms were being introduced in British India. The discovery of the Muslim elite that their community was left behind in the early years of British rule led to the conclusion that the rectification of the situation could be sought through (a) emphasis on the separateness of the Muslims, (b) assurance to the British rulers that the Muslims would not participate in a broad national movement and (c) introduction of a process of a westernization among the Muslims. The political consequence of this was an urgency to keep away from the Congress led national struggle. As the major conflict in India began to take shape between the majority of the Indian people led by the Congress on the one hand, and the established British authority on the other, the Muslim League (first formed in 1906) became a crucial third party which could vitally affect the course of the ensuing struggle.<sup>13</sup>

### **Factors Responsible For Congress – League Cooperation**

The Muslim League in the initial years did not consider opposition to Congress as its goal and in fact worked in cooperation with the Congress. Partition of Bengal in 1905 was one of the main causes that led to Hindu Muslim unity and later harmony between League and Congress. They both fought the imperialists together for their divisive policies and finally in 1911 by their combined efforts the partition was undone and Bengal was united.

Then came the 1<sup>st</sup> World War followed by the Khilafat movement. The Indian soldiers were sent to fight as a part of the Royal Army.

“Throughout the period of fighting Indian political parties and leaders supported the war effort. They believed that for the preservation of freedom and democracy in the world, it was necessary to back the

British in their struggle, and win the war for them. The Indian National Congress pledged its unstinted support to the war effort but demanded greater Indian participation in the higher rank of army.”<sup>14</sup>

The Indian troops first fought against the Turks and Germans at Sinai and they loyally remained with the British forces, but Indians were sore with British even before 1914 for the treatment of Turkey by the European powers. The Balkan wars of 1912 – 13 weakened the power of Turkey in Europe. It appeared as if there was a kind of crusade against the Muslims in Europe. This was resented by the Indian Muslims who regarded the Sultan of Turkey as the head of Islam. As the British Government did nothing to save Turkey, the Indians became bitter. But after the war ended the plan of Europeans to totally dismember the Ottoman Empire came as a big shock to Indians. If Mustafa Kamal Pasha had not succeeded in getting the Treaty of Serves replaced by Treaty Of Lussanne, Turkish territory would have been divided by the Allied amongst themselves.<sup>15</sup> It was felt that any weakening of the Caliph’s position would adversely affect the position of Muslims in other countries which were under imperialist domination. The result was the birth of Khilafat Movement.

The Khilafat Movement brought with it a fresh wave of harmony and cooperation among Hindus and Muslims and the Congress and Muslim League. Congress leaders like Mahatma Gandhi and Madan Mohan Malviya attended the sessions of Muslim League in 1915, 1916 and 1917 and spoke from its platform in support of several resolutions. Raja of Mahmoodabad said,

“The interests of the country are paramount. We need not try to argue whether we are Muslims first or Indians. The fact is we are both. To us the question of precedence has no meaning. The League has inculcated among the Muslims a spirit of sacrifice for their country as their own religion.”<sup>16</sup>

And, Nehru said,

“.....the question of the Khilafat does not concern the Muslims only. Therefore, as you know, the Hindus are helping the cause of the Khilafat. This is why Mahatma Gandhi has become the leader of the movement and is helping this cause. He said that if need be, he is ready to give his life in the settlement of this question. Therefore, I wish that my Hindu brethren should not entertain the idea that it is not their duty to help the Musalmans at this time.”<sup>17</sup>

Mohammed Ali Jinnah, the Barrister from Bombay attended the twelfth Congress session for the first time in 1904. He was an ardent follower of Sir Pherozeshah Mehta and Dadabhai Naoroji. Later in 1912 he attended the annual meeting of Congress as well as of Council of Muslim League at Bankipur. Later, on great insistence from the League members he joined the Muslim League in 1913 but he insisted as a prior condition, that his ‘loyalty to the Muslim League and the Muslim interest would in no way and at no time imply even the shadow of disloyalty to the larger national cause to which his life was dedicated.’<sup>18</sup> In 1914 he chaired a Congress deputation to London and also seconded a Karachi Congress resolution (1913) congratulating the League for adopting the ideal of Self Government for India within the British Empire and expressing “complete accord with the belief that the League has so emphatically declared at its last sessions that the political future of the country depends on the harmonious working and cooperation of the various communities of the country.”<sup>19</sup>

The December 1915 session of Congress and the League were for the first time held within walking distance of one another. Facilitating attendance at both, by members interested in fostering Hindu – Muslim unity and hammering out a single nationalist platform. “Satender Sinha ....and Jinnah now worked together to fashion a formula agreeable to all political factions and communities.”<sup>20</sup>

At the same session, Muslim League President Mazhar-ul-Haque said, “It is said that our object in holding the league contemporaneously with the Congress in the same city is to deal a blow at the independence of the League, and to merge its individuality with that of the Congress. Nothing could be farther from the truth..... When unity is evolved out of diversity, then there is real and abiding national progress.”<sup>21</sup>

Being an ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity, Jinnah tried to bring Muslim League and Congress closer to each other. While presiding over the Bombay Provincial Conference in Ahmedabad in 1916



he said, "I believe all thinking men are thoroughly convinced that the keynote of our real progress lies in the goodwill, concord, harmony and cooperation between the two great sister communities. The true focus of progress is centered in their union."<sup>22</sup>

This was followed by the famous Lucknow Pact of 1916-17. The Congress-League scheme provided a blue print for independent India's constitution. Jinnah as the President of the Muslim League said, "United Indian demand, based on the actual needs of the country and framed with due regard to time and circumstances, must eventually prove irresistible; with the restoration of peace, the Indian problem will have to be dealt with, on bold and generous lines and India will have to be granted her birthright as a free, responsible and equal member of the British Empire. After you have adopted the scheme of reforms you should see that the Congress and the League take concerted measures to have a Bill drafted by constitutional lawyers as an amending Bill to the Government of India Act which embodies the present constitution of our country. The Bill, when ready should be adopted by the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League."<sup>23</sup>

The Congress President Mazumdar, on his part declared, "Hindus and Musalmaans have agreed to make a united demand for self Government. The All India Congress Committee and the representatives of the Muslim League who recently met in conference at Calcutta have, after two days' deliberations in one voice resolved to make a joint demand for a Representative Government in India."<sup>24</sup>

The Rowlatt Act 1919 came as a big shock to the Indians and was opposed vehemently by both Congress and Muslim League while Gandhiji started his non-cooperation movement, Jinnah wrote to Chelmsford, "By passing this Bill, Your Excellency's Government has actively negatived every argument they advanced but a year ago when they appealed to India for help at the War Conference and have ruthlessly trampled upon the principles for which Great Britain avowedly fought the war. The fundamental principles of justice have been uprooted and the constitutional rights of the people have been violated at a time when there is no real danger to the state by an over fretful and incompetent bureaucracy which is neither responsible to the people, nor in touch with real public opinion. I, therefore, as a protest against the passing of the Bill and the manner in which it was passed, tender my resignation."<sup>25</sup>

Following the Rowlatt Act and the Jallianwala Bagh massacre both Congress and Muslim League held annual meetings in Amritsar in 1919. Hindu-Muslim unity was seen by the League to be the 'secret of success', not just of the newly proposed reforms but of all work done by Indians at home and abroad and thanks to the 'Congress-league Compact of 1916' the major political obstacle to such unity had been resolved.

And yet, partition became inevitable and Pakistan – a reality. A land so rich in cultural heritage, and having so strong nationalist feeling, was divided into two. With the resumption of non-cooperation in 1920 and with the British accepting the demands of separate Muslim electorate (as proposed in the Lucknow Pact – and being the only clause accepted by the British Parliament) the goals of Congress and League started drifting apart.

According to Dr Lal Bahadur, ".....It was also an evidence of the tactful bankruptcy of the Congress leaders and their helpless lack of shrewdness. They ought to have understood that this concession to the Musalmaans would tear the nation forever into two sharply divided communities and the breach would be widened by the foreign ruling power. The British Parliament recognized the Lucknow Pact as the only agreement between the Hindus and Muslims and it made assertive provision for separate electorate was accepted, the recognition of the division of the country was inevitable. The Lucknow Pact demanded a heavy toll in the country's sacrifice and the price was paid in the formation of Pakistan."<sup>26</sup>

All of a sudden the goals of Gandhi and Jinnah became different. While Gandhi changed the constitution of Home Rule League, 'to secure complete Swaraj for India according to the wishes of the Indian people', Jinnah argued for 'attainment of self-government within the British

Commonwealth.’ Later, on the question of Simon Commission, though Jinnah did not agree with other League leaders to cooperate with Simon but could not rejoin Congress due to its direct action programme and went away to London to practice Law. During these years Muslim League and also Jinnah started thinking more and more on communal terms such as ‘full religious liberty’ guarantee to all communities, having separate electorate etc. Muslim League, under the leadership of Maulana Hasrat Mohani, Mohammed Ali Fazli Hussain and others kept drifting apart from nationalistic policies.

“The wedge of communal separation was thus driven deeper, irreversibly dividing the Muslim League from Congress even as Muslim disillusion with Gandhian methods of non-cooperation grew.”<sup>27</sup>

But again in 1937 Jinnah returned to active politics and started negotiations for cooperation between Congress and Muslim League. He said, “There is really no substantial difference, at any rate, between the League and the Congress. We shall always be glad to cooperate with Congress in their constructive programme.”<sup>28</sup>

But, the high handed attitude of Congress leaders on imposing strict conditions on Muslim League leaders for joining the ministries infuriated Jinnah and the Muslim League leaders so much that he said, “The Muslims can expect neither justice nor fairplay under Congress Government.” The Muslim land owners got afraid of agrarian policies of Congress; the middle class saw their future bleak especially in industry, profession and public service. The only way out of the difficulty was to set up separate state for the Muslims.

Sir Muhammad Iqbal is considered to be the father of the idea of Pakistan. He declared at the 1930 session of Muslim League at Allahabad, “Formation of a consolidated North West India Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims of at least North West India.”

Though, Iqbal did not mean an independent sovereign state, but a loose federation of all India. He told Edward Thompson, “The Pakistan plan would be disastrous to the British Government, disastrous to the Hindu community and disastrous to the Muslim community.”<sup>29</sup>

Later his idea was picked up by Rehmat Ali, who described the Indian Muslim as a nation, and in 1931 Jinnah demanded division of India. And, finally on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 1940, at Muslim League’s Lahore session Jinnah declared that the Musalmaans were not in minority and that they were a nation by any definition. The resolution said, “Resolved that it is the considered view of this session of All India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to Muslims....North-Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute ‘Independent State’ in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.”

Jinnah said, “If the British Government are really in earnest and sincere to secure peace and happiness of the people of this subcontinent, the only course open to us all is to allow the major nation separate homelands by dividing India into autonomous national states.”<sup>30</sup>

By now Congress had also come to accept the reality, though with a bit of optimism still being left.

Nehru said, “The Hindu Muslim problem has during the past year and a half assumed a new aspect, and is undoubtedly obstructing political progress. It is largely psychological due to an apprehension in the minds of the Muslims that, under a democratic system they might be ignored by a Hindu majority. The problem is a serious one and became its psychological basis, difficult to tackle. And yet it has no deep roots and it must not be confused with the conflicts of nationalities in Europe. For, the vast majority of Muslims and Hindus are the same races with much the same customs and languages.”<sup>31</sup>

The logic of the approach of the radical congressmen was a total aversion to the ideas and the attitudes that the Muslim League represented. To these radical congressmen, the Hindu-Muslim schism was a superficial phenomenon – superficial because there could be no inherent clash of interests between them only because religions differed. To them the real source of conflict in Indian society were elsewhere in the inequitable agrarian pattern of the country, in the miserable working

conditions of the industrial workers, in unemployment and inequality of opportunities, in the paradox of a poor people inhabiting a rich land. They did see a problem in reassuring the minorities of their political rights in free India, but the idea of organizing politics along religious lines was totally repugnant to them.<sup>32</sup>

### **Foreign Policy Formulations Of League And Congress**

With the commencement of World War II, The Indian National Congress started taking a rigid stand against the Colonialists and on 14 September 1939, Congress issued a statement saying, if the war is to defend the status quo, Imperialist possessions, colonies, vested interests and privileges, then India can have nothing to do with it. If, however, the issue is democracy, then India is intensely interested in it. A free democratic India will gladly associate herself with other free nations for mutual defence against aggression and for economic cooperation.”<sup>33</sup>

Jawahar Lal Nehru, when asked on India’s plans on any contingency that arises, said, “Obviously our sympathies are not with fascism. We are also opposed to imperialism. The Indian National Congress has repeatedly declared that it is not going to be dragged into war by the British Government, and any attempt to do so would be resisted. The only party that can decide this matter is the Indian people.”<sup>34</sup>

“However, there is very little evidence of any active participation by any Muslim League leader in the process of foreign policy formulation in the early years. It would not be irrelevant to mention here that a political party of Muslim League’s stature had never showed any evidence of an international outlook before 1947.”<sup>35</sup>

Its concern for international affairs in pre 1947 days was evidenced only in cases where the interests of some Muslim countries were involved. The horizon of the League never extended beyond the Muslim countries of West Asia and Africa. After independence the Muslim League leaders engaged themselves in the national affairs of the country. Especially, after the death of Jinnah and the assassination of Liaquat Ali, their time and energy were devoted more to the pursuits of personal power at home than to the process of foreign policy making. Only when the Muslim League went out of office in 1956, its leaders began to show interest in the country’s foreign policy. The League was the strongest critic of Pakistan’s policy towards the Suez Crisis in 1956.<sup>36</sup>

In fact, traditionally Muslim League’s emotional or intellectual commitment in international affairs was very low which carried on till the initial years of Pakistan’s history. Before independence Muslim League was all along busy fighting for the rights of Muslims and after independence got busy in generating new life in the ‘truncated and moth-eaten’ state. The problems faced by Muslim League immediately after partition were enormous. Actually, the demand for a separate homeland was basically only a strategy to secure equality with Hindus that is why League never prepared a social philosophy or set out to define its foreign policies. When this demand was conceded, both Jinnah and League were not prepared for it. The period between Muslim League’s demand for a sovereign Pakistani state in 1940 and its coming into being in 1947 was so brief, the certainty of this demand being fulfilled was so little, the internal task of the League was so difficult and absorbing as compared to that of the Indian National Congress, internationally oriented personality in the higher echelons of the League was so non-existent .... That Pakistan had little foreign affairs orientation.”<sup>37</sup>

League was really at a loss as to how to start functioning and Jinnah said, “I have done my job. When the Field Marshal leads his army into victory it is for the civil authority to take over.” But, everybody knew there was no civil authority.

Although, India was partitioned on communal basis, Jinnah had never thought of two antagonistic states in mind. At Lahore session in 1940 he said, “There is no reason why the states should be antagonistic to each other. On the other hand the rivalry and the natural desire and the efforts on the part of one to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the Government of the country will disappear. It will lead more towards natural goodwill by international pacts between them and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbors.”<sup>38</sup>



In fact, many Leaguers and Jinnah's own sister Fatima were not convinced by his philosophy of two nations. She told India's first High Commissioner to Pakistan, Sri Prakasa in 1947, "I do not know how it was that the Qaid-i-Azam thought that Hindus and Muslims could not live together. But he did so. You will please exert your influence to bring about good relations between India and Pakistan."<sup>39</sup>

Various inherent crises such as the absence of mass contact program in League's working, role of Islam in policy formulations of Pakistan and role of army in building up the state and of course the fear of insecurity have forced Pakistan to take a tough stand against India but this has generally been restricted to bilateral matters.

### **Similarities In India And Pakistan**

Despite the prevailing mistrust and suspicion that has marked bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, what can still be seen is the commonality of strategic and geopolitical problems, internal and social problems of modernism.

"This does not mean that there is eventually no common ground between India and Pakistan. It even might be true to say that the ideological conflict between the two countries is meaningless in that it corresponds to no real interests on either side, although of course its very existence does give it significance. However, among the elements which form common ground are colonialism and opposition to racial discrimination....sympathy with the struggle for freedom and to unite India with Pakistan."<sup>40</sup>

It was because of their respective world views, appreciating to somewhat geographical areas that the interests of India and Pakistan overlapped.

After achieving independence both India and Pakistan set out on the task of formulating effective foreign policies which was necessary for establishing contacts with rest of the world and also for furthering their national interests. The timing of their independence coincided with the establishing of bipolar world order. Both these countries having suffered under colonial rule had developed strong anti colonialist and anti-racial feelings and shared the interests, distress and hopes of the oppressed people and instantly became champion of the nationalist awakening of Afro-Asian countries. Their solidarity with the colonial people, coupled with their national interests, forced both India and Pakistan to keep away from either bloc and pursue independent and non aligned foreign policies. While India became the champion of Non alignment, Pakistan also pursued the policy of non commitment in the initial years.

Geographically Indian subcontinent is closer to the communist bloc but, historically it is more attached to the West. So, both India and Pakistan have maintained cordial relations with both the blocs. As long back as in 1946 Mr. Noon said, "If the Hindus give us Pakistan then Hindus are our best friends. If the British give it to us, then the British are our best friends. But if neither will give it to us then Russia is our best friend."<sup>41</sup>

In 1948 a Communist Party was founded in Pakistan and movement was set on foot for closer friendship with Russia. In Korean War Pakistan refused to brand China as the aggressor and Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan advocated friendly relations with all the countries in the world.

At the same time both India and Pakistan have friendly relations with West and they retained the membership of Commonwealth. The decisive factor in the alignment with the West have been on the one hand historical contact; language – for English is as much in use in Pakistani political circles as it can be in a country where it is not the language of the people; and economics on the other. Ideology does not seem to have played in any particular role....for just as there are similarities between communism and Islam, so there are also similarities and meeting points between the West and Islam.<sup>42</sup>

At the same time Indo-Soviet relations are a model of peaceful coexistence. These are based on equality, mutual respect and mature understanding of each other's concerns. They have stood the test

of time and have now come to be very deeply friendly and highly cooperative. Similarly India has always had cordial and friendly relations with the West. Even in the bipolar world of cold war era, when animosity and antagonism was the hallmark of international relations, India had friendly and peaceful relations even with the United States.

As Nehru stated on December 18, 1956 at Washington Radio and Television,

“Between United States and India, there had existed friendly and cordial relations even before India gained her independence. No Indian can forget that in the days of our struggle for freedom we received from your country a full measure of sympathy and support. Our two republics have a common faith in democratic institutions and the democratic way of life and are dedicated to the cause of peace and freedom.”<sup>43</sup>

Pursuing the policy of non-commitment, both India and Pakistan have cooperated with each other at the world forum of United Nations. On various world crises they have voted together whether for or against the UN resolutions. Particularly noticeable are the issues of Palestine, Red China, Korea, Indo-China, apartheid and Human Rights. They have done a great job in abetting decolonization process. Even at ECOSOC and ECAFE they have pursued similar policies and have worked laboriously against neocolonialism.

On bilateral level also, barring Kashmir they have worked in a spirit of cooperation though the fact that their relations at times have been at all time low and several times they have even picked up arms against each other, cannot be denied. But, both the countries are so inter-connected and their problems are so intermingled, their interests so intricately overlapping that there is bound to be a spirit of cooperation between the two countries. The social structure of both the countries has a striking similarity. The countries are marked by horizontal and vertical cleavages in their social structure. On the horizontal level linguistic, ethnic and regional diversities create problems for a political system; on the vertical level there is a wide gap between the westernized elite and illiterate masses, between the rich and the poor.”<sup>44</sup>

They both are marred by agitation politics, a section of society carrying on the pre-independence tactics in the field of politics. Then, both the states face the problem of modernism. While the governments want to build up modern organization of the state, there are always people who wish to preserve the old order.

These and many other common problems are faced by both the countries and may be, there are common solutions also to these problems; yet, there exists this sorry state of affairs between the neighbors. May be, this can be attributed to the fact that ‘South Asia is sometimes said to be an example of a region dominated by one power (India) whose policies determine the security of the others’. But, ‘this limited and limiting definition has given rise to a host of misperceptions on account of certain features peculiar to the region. With a country of India’s size, population and resources in the immediate vicinity, the small states are rendered even smaller in comparison’.<sup>45</sup>

Thus, it seems rather ludicrous to talk in terms of Indian hegemony in the region seeing that Nepal and Sri Lanka voted against India at UN; In 1971 Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka, getting their arms supplies from big powers and many other glaring examples of these states taking independent stand at UNO.

But, actually the fear of Pakistan stems from a massive lack of confidence on the part of Pakistan, in Pakistan as a nation and in the Pakistanis as a people. This manifests itself on one hand, in an awed admiration of things Indian, co-mingled with not a little envy and a kind of despair at Pakistan ever measuring up to that achievement..... this manifests itself in regard to the Indian political process, Indian social values (thrift, sobriety, discipline and balance). India’s economic achievement, India’s indigenous defence potential and India’s stature in the world.”<sup>46</sup>

India has always stood for peaceful and harmonious relations. As Nehru said in the UN General Assembly, “We live in this world of conflicts and yet the world goes on, undoubtedly because of the

cooperation of nations and individuals. The essential thing about this world is cooperation between countries which are opposed to each other in the political or other fields. There is a vast amount of cooperation that is going on but a great deal is said about every point of conflict; and so the world is full of this idea that the conflicts go on and we live on the verge of disaster. Perhaps it would be a truer picture if the cooperating elements in the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on cooperation and not on conflicts.”<sup>47</sup>

### **Some Positive Steps In Indo Pak Relations**

The destinies of India and Pakistan are inextricably intertwined. The security of one is linked to the other and nothing can be gained by either proving its prowess over the other. One of the most significant features is that most of the disputes were solved and rapprochement became possible at the height of their bad relations. The Calcutta Agreement was reached in 1948 when there was the danger of war. The Delhi Minority Agreement of April 1950 was concluded when both countries were virtually on the brink of war. The Canal Water Dispute was solved temporarily in early 1950 and then later the treaty was signed in 1960.

Even after the 1971 war Mrs. Indira Gandhi declared, “We want to assure them (the people of Pakistan) that we have no enmity towards them. There are more things in common than those which divide us. We should like to fashion our relations with the people of Pakistan on the basis of friendship and understanding.”<sup>48</sup>

‘One of the central concerns of India’s decision makers in the aftermath of the December war was to work for the creation of an environment which would promote the security of the countries of the region while at the same time divert their precious resources for the economic and technological development of their societies....that the imperative of building a framework of peace and cooperation with Pakistan was equally strong, is revealed by the fact that the Indian government has expressed its readiness to have talks with Pakistan at any time at any level without any preconditions.....The Simla Agreement of July 1972 and the Tripartite Agreement of April 1971 concluded by India, Pakistan and Bangladesh can be considered as efforts in the direction.’<sup>49</sup>

On Simla Agreement a veteran Muslim League leader of Pakistan said, “We have decided that all matters that today lie outstanding between us and them, we shall try our best to resolve them peacefully, that until the last avenue has been explored, the last stone has been turned, we shall go on trying the peaceful solution.”

Another important politician Sahebzada Ahmed Raza Khan Qazum said, “However small this achievement may be, it is a first step in the right direction for higher achievements to come not only to Pakistan and for India but for the subcontinent’s peace and progress.”<sup>50</sup>

In a personal letter written by late Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi to Ms. Benazir Bhutto on her first becoming the Prime Minister of Pakistan he wrote, “India has always valued its relations with Pakistan. Our people share a strong bond of friendship. Affinities of history, culture, language and religion bind us together. It is important that we build a relationship between governments which is commensurate with the affection which our peoples have for each other.... We regard the unity and integrity of Pakistan as a vital element for stability and progress in South Asia.”

In her reply the Pakistan Prime Minister said, “Your sentiments regarding the unity and integrity of Pakistan are greatly appreciated by me. Please have no doubt that I reciprocate them fully in regard to the unity and integrity of India.”<sup>51</sup>

Holding of SAARC meetings and the efforts for SAPTA at governmental level and organizing people to people contact festivals at the common man’s level are excellent examples of the working for peace and cooperation. Despite the fact that there are areas of disputes between the two countries, India and Pakistan have worked together under the policy of ‘beneficial bilateralism’, which involves – (a) personal rapport, (b) economic accommodation and political neutrality. But it is in the field of global policies that the two have cooperated with each other the most. Except for very few occasions where

national interests might have over taken other considerations, they have worked together on major world events – whether it is for independence of Afro Asian countries, maintenance of international peace; opposition to imperialism or their commitment to the cause of basic Human Rights.

A diplomat, Murat Sungar, The Ambassador of Turkey to India, who has served both in India and Pakistan observes, “Pakistan is but an extension of India, the differences are superficial, similarities go deep, what divides the countries is religion but the attitude of their people and the basic color and texture remain the same.”<sup>52</sup>

Indo Pak relations have been on a roller coaster ride ever since their independence. While concerted efforts are made time and again to build bridges and maintain a strong and healthy relationship, national interests of both the countries have prevented them from getting engaged peacefully for a long time. Pakistan’s threat perceptions of India, its frustration on a fast growing Indian economy and the humiliation of the dismemberment of its eastern wing, which became Bangladesh, all these factors have forced various wings of Pakistani establishment to take on India whenever possible. The proxy war, the Kargil intrusion and non-stop India bashing at every world forum has brought in an atmosphere of viciousness and mistrust.

Continuous supply of arms to Pakistan by America and other Western countries has created an imbalance in the subcontinent, which is a cause of great concern for India. At the same time, by the unabated support – moral and physical to the Kashmiri militants and the use of mercenaries by Pakistan in Kashmir, it is fighting a proxy war. “It is time for India and Pakistan to withdraw from the abyss and to turn to the real issue of human development. Their mutual détente can also create a better environment for reaching a settlement of many other disputes within South Asia.”<sup>53</sup>

#### Notes :

1. Gupta, Sisir, ‘Kashmir: A study In India-Pakistan Relations’ (Asia Publishing House, Bombay 1967), p.15
2. Jizya is a tax which is levied on those subjects who do not enjoy the right of citizenship. Hindus were made to pay Jizya as Muslims alone were considered the true citizens of the country.
3. Mahajan, V. D. India Since 1526 (S. Chand and Co. New Delhi 1964). P 72.
4. Hussain, Arif Pakistan: It’s Ideology and Foreign Policy (Frank Cass and Co. Ltd. London 1966), P 9.
5. Quoted in V D Mahajan’s India Since 1526. (S Chand and Co. New Delhi, 1964) P 75.
6. Aziz K.K. A History Of The Idea Of Pakistan – Vol I (Virendra and Book Ltd. Lahore 1987) prologue.
7. Mahajan, V D India Since 1526. (S Chand and Co. New Delhi, 1964), P 207.
8. Ahmad, Jamil Hundred Great Muslims, (Feroze Sons Ltd. Lahore, 1971), P 463.
9. Quoted in V D Mahajan’s India Since 1526. (S Chand and Co. New Delhi, 1964) PP 471-472.
10. Beck was the Principal of Mohammedan – Anglo – Oriental College and he successfully convinced Sir Sayed that the emancipation of Muslims lay in cooperation with the British and not in joining the national movement.
11. Rajput A B Muslim League, Yesterday And Today (Mohammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1948) P 14.
12. Quoted in Bipin Chandra, Amal Tripathi and Barun De’s Freedom Struggle, (National Book Trust India, New Delhi, 1993), PP 56-57.
13. Gupta, Sisir, ‘Kashmir: A study In India-Pakistan Relations’ (Asia Publishing House, Bombay 1967), P 2.
14. Longer, V. Red Coat To Olive Green: A History Of Indian Army 1600 to 1974 (Allied Publishers, New Delhi 1980) P 150

15. The Treaty Of Serves concluded with Turkey in 1920 provided for the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. The terms of the treaty caused great resentment in Turkey and subsequently, as a result of the resentment, led by Kamal Pasha, a new and milder settlement had to be made by the Treaty OF Lussanne. (Selected Works of Jawahar Lal Nehru Vol. I), P 179.
16. Mahajan V D India Since 1526 . (S Chand and Co. New Delhi, 1964), P 479.
17. Selected Works of Jawahar Lal Nehru Vol. I (Orient Longman Ltd. Bombay, 1972) P 179.
18. Naidu, Sarojini ed. Mohammad Ali Jinnah : His Speeches And Writings 1912 – 1917 (Madras, Ganesh 1918), P 11
19. Resolution IV Karachi Congress 1913, INC ( 1, 19 )pl. II, P. 159
20. Wolpert, Stanley, Jinnah Of Pakistan (Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1992), PP 38, 39
21. Pirzada, Sayed Sharifuddin, Foundations vol. I, PP 330 – 331
22. Saiyid, M H Mohammad Ali Jinnah (Lahore – S M Ashraf, 1945) PP 851.
23. Ibid, PP 879 – 880.
24. Wolpert, Stanley, Jinnah Of Pakistan (Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1992), PP 49.
25. Saiyid, M H Mohammad Ali Jinnah (Lahore – S M Ashraf, 1945) PP 238 – 239.
26. Mahajan V D India Since 1526 . (S Chand and Co. New Delhi, 1964), P 477.
27. Wolpert, Stanley, Jinnah Of Pakistan (Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1992), P 87.
28. Mahajan V D India Since 1526 . (S Chand and Co. New Delhi, 1964), P 480.
29. ibid, P 482.
30. ibid PP 482 - 483.
31. Selected Works of Jawahar Lal Nehru Vol. 9 (Orient Longman Ltd. Bombay, 1972) P 240.
32. Gupta, Sisir, 'Kashmir: A study In India-Pakistan Relations' (Asia Publishing House, Bombay 1967), P 4.
33. Chandra, Bipin, Amales Tripathi and Barun DE Freedom Struggle (National Book Trust India, New Delhi 1993) P 212.
34. The Hindustan Times 8<sup>th</sup> July 1938. Talk to the Indian residents in London – 30<sup>th</sup> June 1938.
35. Sayed, Khalid B. Pakistan: The Formative Phase (Pakistan Publishing House, Karachi, 1968) P 176.
36. Goswami, B.N. The Elites And The Formulation Of Pakistan Foreign Policy: The Early Years. ed. Surendra Chopra Perspectives On Pakistan's Foreign Policy, (Guru Nanak Dev University Press, Amritsar, 1983) PP 42 – 43.
37. Gupta, Sisir India And Regional Integration In Asia (Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1964), PP121 -122.
38. Mahajan V D India Since 1526 . (S Chand and Co. New Delhi, 1964), P 482.
39. Prakasa, Sri, Pakistan's Birth And Early Days, (Meerut, Meenakshi Prakashan 1965) P 181.
40. Hussain, Arif Pakistan: It's Ideology And Foreign Policy (Frank Cass and Co. London, 1966) PP 56 – 60.
41. Rajput A.B. The Muslim League: Yesterday And Today. (Mohammad Ashraf, Lahore 1948), P 109.
42. Hussain, Arif Pakistan: It's Ideology And Foreign Policy (Frank Cass and Co. London, 1966) PP 92 – 93.
43. Ghai U. R. Foreign Policy of India (New Academic Publishing Company, Jalandhar, 1988) P 104.
44. Rizvi, Hasan Askari The Military and Politics In Pakistan – 1947 to 1968( Konark Publishers Pvt Ltd. New Delhi, 1988), PP 1 – 2.
45. Acharya, Alka, 'Regional Conflict, Security In The 90s: The Case Study Of South Asia'. (Strategic Analysis Vol XIII No. 11, February 1991), P 1247.
46. Aiyar, Mani Shankar, Pakistan Papers (UBS Publishers Distributors Ltd. 1994), P 17.
47. Khilnani, Niranjana M. Realities Of Indian Foreign Policy (ABC Publishing House, New Delhi, 1984) PP 54 – 55.
48. Foreign Affairs Records, No. 97, P 387.
49. Jayaramu, P.S. India's National Security And Foreign Policy, (ABC Publishing House, New Delhi, 1987) P 175.
50. Dixit, Abha, 'The Indian Threat: Pakistan's Perceptions and Misperceptions'. Strategic Analysis Vol XII No. 6 September 1988,) P605.



51. Aiyar, Mani Shankar, Pakistan Papers (UBS Publishers Distributors Ltd. 1994), PP 53-54.
52. Saturday Times, (The Times Of India, 28 January, 1995)
53. Haq, Mahboob Ul 'Indo Pak relations – Proposals For A New Beginning'. (The Times Of India 12 February 1996).