

THE IDEOLOGY OF PAKISTAN

Prof. Dr. M. Yakub Mughul

ISLAMIC IDEOLOGY: Ideology in a philosophical term means the "Science of Ideas". Idea is again a very comprehensive term. But it is unnecessary to go into the details of the term. Suffice it to say that "Idea" means a basic concept and that the basic concepts on which any "System" is built constitute its "Ideology". Thus, the meaning of Islamic Ideology, is a State based on the code of Natural laws according to which the Muslim Ummah will form the Government.¹

The Ideology of a nation always reflects the State of the people's minds, their emotions, hopes, aspirations, ideals and objectives and subsisting will to realise them. The worth of any ideology depends on the extent of people's dedication to it.

Pakistan's emergence was not just the emergence of a new state, but it was created on the basis of Islamic Ideology. If Pakistan had not been created, the Muslims would have been under the militant Hindu majority in the United India and lost in the Hindu Majority.

The object of the Pakistan Movement was not to separate some provinces to save them from Hindu domination. Had it been so the Muslims of the minority provinces would never have taken the active part they did in the freedom movement. The fact is that they were the worst sufferers, both before and after the partition. They knew that if Pakistan was created they would stand to gain nothing, indeed might lose everything. In spite of this the Muslims of the minority provinces joined the Muslims of the majority provinces in their struggle for freedom simply because they believed that they were fighting not for a territory only, but for the preservation of their culture and civilization, language and literature and Islamic way of life.

In the presidential address at the Lahore Session of All India Muslim League in 1940 the Quaid-i-Azam declared:

"Musalmans are not a minority, as it is commonly known and understood. One has only got to look round. Even today, according to the British map of India, 4 out of 11 provinces, where the Muslims dominate more or less, are functioning

notwithstanding the decision of the Hindu Congress High Command to non-co-operate and prepare for civil disobedience. Musalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation, and they must have their homeland, their territory and their state. We wish to live in peace and harmony with our neighbours as a free and independent people. We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best, and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people. Honesty demands – and the vital interests of millions of people impose a sacred duty upon us to find an honourable and peaceful solution which would be just and fair to all. But at the same time, we cannot be moved or delivered from our purpose and objective by threats or intimidations. We must be prepared to face all difficulties and consequences, make all the sacrifices that may be required of us to achieve the goal we have set in front of us”.²

For the Muslims of the sub-continent the demand for Pakistan was an expression of their deepest emotions for their political & cultural identity, whose roots were embedded in the State of Medina founded by the Prophet Muhammad (Salam) and that of the Khulafa-e-Rashideen. In this sense the Pakistan movement was based on the Islamic Ideology. Pakistan thus was created as the first Islamic State after the establishment of the State of Medina in 622 A.D as an ideological state on the basis of Islam.

Before discussing in detail the Ideology of Pakistan it is necessary to explain why Hindus and Muslims could not coalesce into one nation although they lived together for centuries.

In his speech at Aligarh on March 8, 1944 the Quaid answered this question as under:

“Pakistan started the moment the first non-Muslim was converted to Islam in India long before the Muslims established their rule. As soon as a Hindu embraced Islam he was outcast not only religiously but also socially, culturally and economically. As for the Muslim, it was a duty imposed on him by Islam not to merge his identity and individuality in any alien society. Throughout the ages Hindus had remained Hindus and Muslims had remained Muslims and they had not merged their entities – that was the basis for Pakistan”.³

Discussing the philosophical difference between Islam and Hinduism the Quaid declared at the All India Muslim League Lahore Session on 23rd March, 1940:

“It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders, and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of your troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literatures. They neither intermarry nor interdine together and, indeed, they belong to two different civilisations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, different heroes, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is foe of the other and, likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be built up for the government of such a state.”⁴

In his presidential Address at the special Pakistan Session of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation, on 2nd March, 1941 discussing the ideological difference of two nations the Quaid further said:

“Our demand is not from Hindus because the Hindus never took the whole of India. It was the Muslims who took India and ruled for 700 years. It was the British who took India from the Musalmans. So, we are not asking the Hindus to give us anything. Our demand is made to the British, who are in possession. It is an utter nonsense to say that Hindustan belongs to the Hindus. They also say that Muslims were Hindus at one time. These nonsensical arguments are advanced by their leaders. They say, supposing an Englishman becomes a Muslim in England, he does not ask for Pakistan. Have you got eyes to see and don't you have brains to understand that an Englishman, if he changes his religion in England, he, by changing his religion, still remains a member of the same society, with the same culture, same social life and everything remains exactly the same when an Englishman changes his faith? But can't you see that a Muslim, when he was converted, granted that he was converted

more than a thousands years ago, bulk of them, then according to your Hindu religion and philosophy, he becomes an outcast and he becomes a malecha (untouchable) and the Hindus cease to have anything to do with him socially, religiously and culturally or in any other way? He, therefore, belongs to a different order, not only religious but social, and he has lived in that distinctly seperate and antagonistic social order, religiously, socially and culturally. It is now more than a thousand years that the bulk of the Muslims have lived in a different world, in a different society, in a different philosophy and a different faith. Can you possibly compare this with nonsensical talk that mere change of faith is no ground for a demand for Pakistan? Can't you see the fundamental difference?"⁵

An awareness of a seperate Muslim nationhood in the subcontinent can be traced back to a thousand years when it was noticed for the first time by al-Beruni. He visited India in the ninth century and wrote in his famous work "Kitab-al Hind" as under:

"For the reader must always bear in mind that the Hindus entirely differ from: us in every respect, many a subject appearing intricate and obscure which would be perfectly clear if there were more connection between us. The barriers which separate Muslims and Hindus rest on different causes.

First, they differ from us in everything which other nations have in common. And here we first mention the language, although the difference of language also exists between other nations."⁶

He further said:

"Many Hindu customs differ from those of our country and of our time to such a degree as to appear to us simply monstrous. One might almost think that they had intentionally changed them into the opposite, for our customs do not resemble theirs, but are the very reverse; and if ever a custom of theirs resembles one of ours, it has certainly just the opposite meaning."⁷

Discussing the social structure of the two nations, Hindus and Muslims, Al-Beruni further wrote:

"Secondly, they totally differ from us in religion, as we believe in nothing in which they believe, and vice versa. On the whole, there is very little disputing about theological topics among themselves; at the utmost, they fight with words, but they will never stake their soul or body or their property on religious controversy. On the contrary, all their fanaticism is directed

against those who do not belong to them – against all foreigners. They call them *maleccha*, i.e. impure, and forbid having any connection with them, be it by intermarriage or any other kind of relationship, or by sitting, eating, and drinking with them, because thereby, they think, they would be polluted. They consider as impure anything which touches the fire and the water of a foreigner; and no household can exist without these two elements. Besides, they never desire that a thing which once has polluted should be purified and thus recovered, as, under ordinary circumstances, if anybody or anything has become unclean, he or it would strive to regain the state of purity. They are not allowed to receive anybody who does not belong to them, even if he wished it, or was inclined to their religion. This, too, renders any connection with them quite impossible, and constitutes the widest gulf between us and them.”⁸

This consciousness of a distinct national identity was later stressed by Hz-Mujaddid Alf Thani (d. 1624), Shah Wali Ullah (d. 1762) Sayyid Ahmed Shaheed (d. 1831), and Sir Syed Ahmed Khan (d. 1898).

In the beginning of his career, Sir Syed Ahmed’s concept of nation was vague and confusing. Sometimes he said that the entire humanity was one nation. Sometimes he believed that people living on one land comprised a nation. But after the establishment of the Indian National Congress, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan came to adopt a correct view of nation.

The slogan of one Indian nation from the platform of the Congress did not appeal to the Muslims of the sub-continent. The Congress again and again preached the doctrine of one nation, that is to say all those who inhabited this country (the sub-continent) made one nation. It made Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and other Muslims realise that actually the Hindus constituted a separate nation, having nothing common with the Muslims and that they could not live together any more with Hindus. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had predicted this in 1867, when a few influential Hindus at Banaras, contemplated the removal of Urdu and Persian languages from courts and offices to replace them by Hindi and Deonagri script. After this incident Sir Syed expressed his views before Mr. Shakespeare, an English Officer and his friend at Banaras as under:

“It was not possible for the Hindus and Muslims to progress as a single nation and anyone to work for both of them simul-

taneously. I am convinced that both these nations will not join whole-heartedly in anything. At present there is no open hostility between the two nation. But on account of the so-called educated people it will increase in future and he who lives, will see.”⁹

The later happenings convince Sir Syed Ahmed Khan to plead two nation theory. In one of his lectures at Ludhiana he said:

“Remember a nation is nothing unless it is a nation in real sense. All individuals joining the fold of Islam together constitute a nation of Muslims. As long as they follow and practice this beloved religion, they are a nation. Remember you have to live and die by Islam and it is by keeping Islam that our nation is a nation. Dear Children, if someone becomes a star of the heaven and ceases to be a Muslim what is he to us? He is no longer a member of our nation.”¹⁰

Other Muslim leaders who often referred to the Muslim community as a nation or nationality were, Sir Agha Khan (1877-1951), Justice Ameer Ali (1849-1928), Choudhry Rahmat Ali (1895-1951) and others. Later on, in the beginning of the twentieth century, Maulana Muhammad Ali Johar (1878-1931) also declared that there were two nations in the sub-continent.

Allama Iqbal, our national poet and philosopher, went a step further and vigorously proclaimed the need of a separate state for the Muslims of the sub-continent.

In the Presidential Address at the Twenty First Session of the All India Muslim League at Allahabad on 29th December, 1930 Allama Iqbal announced:

“The Muslim demand for the creation of a Muslim India within India is, therefore, perfectly justified. The resolution of the All-Parties Muslim Conference at Delhi is to my mind wholly inspired by this noble ideal of a harmonious whole which, instead of stifling the respective individualities of its component wholes, affords them chances of fully working out the possibilities that may be latent in them. And I have no doubt that this house will emphatically endorse the Muslims demand embodied in this resolution.

“Personally, I would go further than the demands embodied in it. I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single State. Self-Government within the British Empire, or without the British empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West

Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India ... India is the greatest Muslim country in the world. The life of Islam, as a cultural force in this living country very largely depends on its centralization in a specified territory. This centralization of the most living portion of the Muslims of India, whose military and police service has, notwithstanding unfair treatment from the British, made the British rule possible in this country, will eventually solve the problem of India as well as of Asia. It will intensify their sense of responsibility and deepen their patriotic feeling. Thus, possessing full opportunity of development within the body-politic of India, the North-West Indian Muslims will prove the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion, be that invasion one of ideas or of bayonets ... the Right Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri thinks that the Muslim demand for the creation of autonomous Muslim states along the North-West border is actuated by a desire "to acquire means of exerting pressure in emergencies on the Government of India." I may frankly tell him that the Muslim demand is not actuated by the kind of motive he imputes to us; it is actuated by a genuine desire for free development, which is practically impossible under the type of unitary government contemplated by the nationalist Hindu politicians with a view to securing permanent communal dominance in the whole of India."¹

Claiming that the communal problem of India is international and not national, Dr. Iqbal argued:

"We are 70 millions, and far more homogeneous than any other people in India. Indeed, the Muslims of India are the only Indian people who can fitly be described as a nation in the modern sense of the word. The Hindus, though ahead of us in almost all respects, have not yet been able to achieve the kind of homogeneity which is necessary for a nation, and which Islam has given you as a free gift. No doubt they are anxious to become a nation, but the process of becoming a nation is kind of travail, in the case of Hindu India, involves a complete overhauling of her social structure."^{1 2}

According to Allama Iqbal a separate Muslim State within the sub-continent would not be a theocracy. It would provide, on the other hand, an opportunity for Islam 'to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian Imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilize its laws, its education, its culture and to bring them into closer contact with its

own original spirit and with the spirit of modern times.¹³ This mixture of modernism and fundamentalism which he had in mind makes hardly any provision for a secular state for Muslims.

Keeping this in view Allama Iqbal wrote, on May 28, 1937, to Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah:

“The league will have to finally decide whether it will remain a body representing the upper classes of Indian Muslims or Muslim masses who have so far, with good reason, taken no interest in it. Personally I believe that a political organization which gives promise of improving the lot of the average Muslim cannot attract our masses ... The problem of bread is becoming more acute. The Muslim has begun to feel that he has been going down and down during the last 200 years. Ordinarily he believes that his poverty is due to Hindu money-lending or capitalism. The perception that it is equally due to foreign rule has not yet fully come to him. But it is bound to come. The atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal is not likely to receive much response from the Muslims. The question therefore is: How is it possible to solve the problem of Muslim poverty? And the whole future of the league depends on the League’s activity to solve this question. If the league can give no such promises I am sure that Muslim masses will remain indifferent to it as before. Happily there is a solution in the enforcement of the Law of Islam and its further development in the light of modern ideas. After a long and careful study of Islamic Law I have come to the conclusion that if this System of Law is properly understood and applied, at least the right to subsistence is secured to everybody but the enforcement and development of the shariat of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim State or States. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India. If such a thing is impossible in India the only other alternative is a civil war which as a matter of fact has been going on for some time in the shape of Hindu Muslim riots.”¹⁴

On June 21, 1937 Iqbal again wrote to the Quaid-i-Azam:

“To my mind, the new constitution with its idea of single Indian federation is completely hopeless. A separate federation of Muslim Provinces, reformed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims.”¹⁵

Syed Ahmed Khan gave the Indian Muslims a sense of separate existence: Iqbal a sense of separate destiny.

In the entire struggle of the Muslims of the sub-continent for the separate homeland, the attitude of Hindus was one of stiff opposition and antagonism. In fact the Hindus did not reconcile to the Muslim demand for a separate state as declared in the Lahore Resolution in 1940. It was described by Gandhi as a "suicide", a "sin" and "a vivisection of mother India" which could be allowed only over his dead body.¹⁶ Gandhiji in a letter to the Quaid-i-Azam, in September, 1944, wrote that the Hindus and Muslims were not two nations but one. He further criticised that Mr. Jinnah's contention was wholly unreal. He further explained in his letter:

"I find no parallel in history for a body of converts and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock. If India was one nation before the advent of Islam, it must remain one in spite of the change of faith of a very large body of her children."¹⁷

In his presidential address at the Special Pakistan Session of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation on 2nd March, 1941 the Quaid said:

"We are a nation, (Cheers.). And a nation must have a territory. What is the use of merely saying that we are a nation? Nation does not live in the air. It lives on the land, it must govern land, and it must have territorial state and that is what you want to get. (Cheers).

The Quaid further continued:

"The only solution for the Muslims of India which will stand the test of trial and time, is that India should be partitioned so that both the communities can develop freely and fully according to their own genius economically, socially, culturally. The struggle is for the fullest opportunities and for the expression of the Muslim nation will. The vital contest in which we are engaged is not for the material gain but also the very existence of the soul of Muslim nation. Hence I said often that it is a matter of life and death to the Mussalmans and is not a counter for bargaining. Muslims have become fully conscious of this. If we lose in the struggle all is lost. Let our motto be as the Dutch proverb says:

Money is lost nothing is lost;
courage is lost much is lost;
Honour is lost most is lost;
Soul is lost all is lost.

(Loud applause).”¹⁸

During his interview on the 18th of December 1943, the Quaid told Mr. Beverley Nicholas:

“Islam is not merely a religious doctrine but a realistic and practical code of conduct in terms of everything important in life, of our history, our heroes, our art, our architecture, our music, our laws, our jurisprudence. In all these things our outlook is not only fundamentally different but often radically antagonistic to the Hindus. There is nothing in life which links us together. Our names, our clothes, our food — they are all different; our educational ideas, our treatment of women, our attitude.

Thus in Islam it is not allowed to divide humanity into groups, sects and nations. It makes no difference, if Muslims of different countries have different races, colours or languages, as all are the Members of single brotherhood. Among the believers, the white and black, the rich and poor, the master and servant, the Arab and non-Arab, stand shoulder to shoulder to enjoy equal rights and bear equal responsibilities in running the state. Before the First World War in 1914 all Arab countries were included in the Ottoman caliphate and there was no restriction on the movement of the Muslims of any part of the world to go anywhere. However, after the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate in 1924 A.D, the Ottoman Empire was disintegrated and a number of independent Arab states came into existence.

For the survival of Pakistan it is necessary that there should not be economic exploitation of any province. We should implement Islamic Law so that every Pakistani may feel that he will get justice. If we have to survive as a Muslim nation and want to translate our dreams about Pakistan and its Ideology into reality we must work on these lines.

The ideology of Pakistan should be drilled into the minds of Pakistanis. The new generation is confused about Islam, Islamic law and about Islamic way of life. It is high time that we sincerely work for the Ideology of Pakistan. For that we have to follow Islam completely. We preach Islam but we do not practice it. Our entire life is marked with hypocrisy. We have to ask ourselves: are we leading our lives in accordance with Islamic principles or we have become a nation of hypocrites? In an Islamic state the aim and

to animals — we challenge each every point of the compass. Take one example, the eternal question of the cow. We eat the cow, the Hindus worship it.”¹⁹

Now we come to the terminology of the ideology of Pakistan. The Ideology of Pakistan is basically and essentially the Ideology of Islam. Through its ideological orientation Pakistan has presented a new concept to the world: Ideological Nationalism. It is said that if religion is the basic factor that determines a nation, then the Turks, the Arabs, the Iranians and the Muslims of the other countries are but one nation. Certainly all the Muslims of the world including the Turks, the Arabs and the Iranians belong to one Muslim Ummah from the religious point of view. The Quran says:

“The believers are but a single brotherhood” (XLIX)

Also in an other verse it is said:

“The whole of humanity is a single nation” (2.213).

object of the state and individual is one and the same, namely the enforcement of the Islamic Shariah — the Islamic Law — to win the goodwill of Allah.

According to the founder of Pakistan one of the aims in the demand for Pakistan was to acquire a territory where the Muslims could progress in accordance with the Islamic traditions and cultural traits.

Discussing the aims and objects of the creation of Pakistan, in a message to the Frontier Muslim Students Federation dated June, 1945, the Quaid had declared:

“Pakistan not only means freedom and independence but the Muslim Ideology which has to be preserved which has come to us as precious gift and treasure and which we hope others will share with us.”²⁰

The Quaid-i-Azam had fully realized that there will be no room for capitalist Economic System in Pakistan.

Similarly the Quaid-i-Azam could not accept the Communist Ideology, economic theory and practice. While addressing the Punjab Muslim Students Federation at Lahore on 19th March, 1944, the Quaid proclaimed:

“I warn the communists to keep their hands off the Muslims ... Islam is their guide and complete code for their life. They do not want any isms.”²¹

The object of Islam is to establish a balanced economic order based on fundamental human rights in which no individual can exploit another.

Pakistan was demanded so that the poor and needy people could live an honourable life, free from exploitation. Addressing to the Delhi Session of the All India Muslim League on 24th April, 1943, the Quaid declared:

“Here I should like to give a warning to the landlords and capitalists who have flourished at our expense by a system which is so vicious, which is so wicked and which makes them so selfish, that it is difficult to reason with them. The exploitation of the masses has gone into their blood. They have forgotten the lesson of Islam. Greed and selfishness have made these people subordinate the interests of others in order to fatten themselves. It is true we are not in power today. You go anywhere to the countryside. I visited some villages. There are millions and millions of our people who hardly get one meal a day. Is this civilization? Is this the aim of Pakistan? (Cries of “No, No.”) Do you visualize that millions have been exploited and cannot get one meal a day? If that is the idea of Pakistan, I would not have it. If they are wise they will have to adjust themselves to the new modern conditions of life. If they don’t, God help them: we shall not help them. (Shouts of ‘Hear, Hear!’ and applause.)”²²

In his speech at the Muslim University Union, Aligarh, on March 10, 1941, the Quaid said:

“As a matter of fact, Pakistan has been there for centuries; it is there to-day, and it will remain till the end of the world (cheers). It was taken away from us; we have only to take it back. What is the title of the Hindus to it? How can we be prevented from claiming what is our own? It is really more in the interest of the Hindus themselves. What after all does the League say? Zones with clear Muslim majority are to be demarcated and allowed to establish independent states of their own with the necessary territorial readjustments. Under the scheme two-third of India goes to the Hindus where they can have their own states. They should be content with their due share. They can never have the whole of India. I can tell you that both in the British circles and the Congress circles it is being increasingly realised that the interests of the two nations would be best served by our scheme of partition “Pakistan is not only a practicable goal but the only goal if you want to save Islam from complete annihilation in this country. We have yet to go a long way. Pakistan

is there but we have to take it. It is easier to achieve freedom than to keep it.”²³

Talking to the Muslim League workers at Calcutta on March 1, 1946, the Quaid further elaborated:

“I am an old man, God has given me enough to live comfortably at this age. Why would I turn my blood into water, run about and take so much trouble? Not for the capitalists surely, but for you, the poor people. In 1936, I have seen the abject poverty of the people. Some of them did not get food, even once a day. I have not seen them recently, but my heart goes out of them. I feel it and, in Pakistan, we will do all in our power to see that everybody can get a decent living.”²⁴

Discussing the economic system based on the Islamic concepts the Quaid said:

“The economic system of the West has created almost insoluble problems for humanity and to many of us it happens that only a miracle can save it from that is now facing the world. It has failed to do justice between man and man to eradicate friction from the international field. On the contrary it was largely responsible for the two world wars in the last half century. The Western world, in spite of its advantages of mechanization and industrial efficiency is today in a worse mess than ever before in history. The adoption of Western economic theory and practice will not help us in achieving our goal of creating a happy and contented people. We must work our destiny in our own way and present to the world an economic system based on true Islamic concept of equality of manhood and social justice. We will thereby be fulfilling our mission as Muslims and giving to humanity the message of peace which alone can save it and secure the welfare, happiness and prosperity of mankind.”²⁵

In a broadcast to the people of the United States of America in February, 1948 the Quaid declared:

“The constitution of Pakistan has yet to be framed by the Pakistan constituent Assembly. I do not know what the ultimate shape of this constitution is going to be but I am sure that it will be a democratic type, embodying the essential principles of Islam, Islam and its idealism has taught us Democracy; it has taught equality of man, justice and fairplay to everybody. We are inheritors of these glorious traditions and are fully alive to our responsibilities and obligations as framers of the future constitution of Pakistan.”²⁶

To sum up, the ideological orientation of Pakistan is nothing but the Islamic Ideology and ultimate aim of it is the establishment of the Islamic Welfare State where no one is exploited. Also in the Islamic Welfare State, it is the duty of the State to see that there is none without food and clothes and every individual is provided at least with all the bare necessities of life.

REFERENCES.

1. Mughul Yakub Gohar, Concept of State in Islam, Journal of the Muslim History Society, University of Sind, Jamshoro, 1962, Pp. 65-66.
2. Sharifuddin Pirzada, ed. Foundation of Pakistan Vol. II (National Publishing House Ltd. 1970) p. 339, Jamiluddin Ahmed ed. Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah, Vol. I (Sh. Muhammad Ashraf Lahore, 1968 7th edition), p. 171.
3. Jamiluddin Ahmed, op. cit, Vol. II, p.2.
4. Ibid.; Vol. I P. 169.
5. Ibid., Vol. I Pp. 239-40.
6. Alberuni's India, an accurate description of all categories of Hindu Thought ed. by Sachau, Dr. Edward C. Vol. I (S. Chand & Co. Delhi, 1964) p. 17.
7. Ibid., Vol. I, P. 179.
8. Ibid., Pp. 19-20.
9. Altaf Hussain Hali, Hayat-i-Javid (Urdu) (Hijrah International Publishers, Lahore, 1984) p. 140. Compare Ashfaque Ali Khan, Two Nation Theory, (Royal Book Company Karachi, 1985) p. 179.
10. Quoted in Jamiluddin Ahmed. Origin of two-nation concept, Daily Pakistan Times, Lahore dated June, 1964, p. 1.
11. S. Sharifuddin Prizada, op. cit, Vol. II, p. 159; A.R. Tariq, Speeches and Statements of Iqbal, Pp. 11-12.

12. S. Sharifuddin Pirzada, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 169.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 160.
14. Bashir Ahmed, *Letters of Iqbal*, Lahore, 1978, Pp.254.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
16. Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, *India Wins Freedom*, Calcutta, 1959 p. 186.
17. Jamiluddin Ahmed, *op. cit.*, Vol. II p. 97.
18. *Ibid.*, Vol. 1 Pp. 246-7.
19. Beverley Nichols, *Verdict on India*, (Book Traders Lahore, n.d) p. 190.
20. Jamiluddin Ahmed, *op. cit.*, Vol. II p. 175.
21. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 124.
22. *Foundation of Pakistan* *op. cit.* Vol. II, Pp. 424-5.
23. Jamiluddin Ahmed, *op. cit.* Vol. I, Pp. 250-253.
24. Rizwan Ahmed, *Saying of Quaid-i-Azam*, Karachi 4th edition, 1980, p. 62.
25. Jamiluddin Ahmed, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 567.
26. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 463.