


# **The Murder of History in Pakistan**

**by K. K. AZIZ**



*Reproduced by  
Sani H. Panhwar*

# **THE MURDER OF HISTORY IN PAKISTAN**

**A critique of history textbooks  
used in Pakistan**

**K.K. Aziz**

Reproduced by

**Sani H. Panhwar**

To

the late

Uncle Hakim Jan

of blessed memory

More than a brother to my father,

a benefactor of my family,

whose mind, lit by the flame of virtue,

was a miracle of equilibrium



## PREFACE

In this book I have scrutinized 66 textbooks on Social Studies, Pakistan Studies and History in use in the schools and colleges of Pakistan by students of classes 1 to 14, discussed their contents at full length, and explored the dimensions, implications and ramifications of their errors, faults and deficiencies.

This study has taken its rise from a series of adventitious circumstances, not all agreeable or gratifying. In 1989-90 I wrote a book on the Pakistani historian which contained one chapter of 82 pages, the longest of all, on the textbooks written by the historians of the country and in use in the schools and colleges. (The book has since been published by Vanguard under the title of *The Pakistani Historian*, and I advise the reader to look through it to understand why such books have been written by the country's historians). The typescript was handed over to a Lahore publisher on 25 March 1990, and two weeks later I went away to Cambridge for an 8-month spell of teaching and writing, with a firm promise from him that the book would be in the market before the year was out. But he bilked me and did not publish it then or ever. This unredeemed pledge led, in slow stages, to the expansion of the chapter on textbooks into the present full-length study. Blighted hopes do sometimes turn into cheerful prospects, if one has the requisite fortitude and resolve, and of course luck.

My work has never offered me the leisure to write something for journals or newspapers. But the publisher's remissness was making me impatient, and when *The Frontier Post* offered to serialize this particular chapter. I raised no objections because the material combined scholarly research and topical interest to an uncommon degree. I then believed that a study of the books which every school and college going student reads will attract the parents of these students. I thought that in a country where the average sales of serious books are abysmally low the way to the attention of the educated reader lay through the columns of a national English daily. The original chapter thus came to appear in *The Frontier Post* in eleven long installments on 17, 18, 19, 21, 25 and 26 April and 1, 3, 5, 8 and 9 May 1992. The newspaper also extended me the unprecedented courtesy of advertising the series on the front page for several days running prior to their publication. I am grateful to Mr. Khaled Ahmed, the resident editor, for this kindness.

On 11th May the newspaper carried a letter from one Professor M. I. Haq, suggesting that I should "issue a corrigenda for the plethora of mistakes and mis-statements he has so diligently compiled, because the authors [of the textbooks] would not know the correct answers themselves, and this burden of the martial law will continue to be carried by our textbook boards. God knows for how long. On the same day Mr. Khaled Ahmed telephoned me to say that he had received several calls from his readers who

now wanted to know the "real facts" of history after having read in my articles the myths and distortions contained in the textbooks. He asked me to write out a detailed statement rectifying the mistakes of the books and telling the true tale.

My immediate reaction to this request was one of shock. I had already annotated each textbook, listing faithfully all the errors it carried, but had limited my commentary to a very few remarks and an odd correction here and there. I had thought that the great majority of my readers knew their history and after perusing what I had written would respond according to their temperament and attitude to life; either laughing at the ignorance of the textbook writers or feeling concerted about what their children were being taught. And now I was being informed by the editor of a major national daily that educated people, living in big cities and reading an English-language newspaper did not know where the textbooks had gone wrong, and they needed the telling of it.

But a little reflection opened my eyes. These people who were asking for the correct version of history had been brought up on these very textbooks. Those few among them who were fond of reading had received their knowledge of history from a few popular or serious general books which had been written by the same professors who had put together these textbooks. It was then that I realized the true proportions of the disaster which had devastated the country. For me it was the moment of truth.

Mr. Khaled Ahmed's injunction was reinforced by the advice given to me by my friend Mr. Najam Sethi, who publishes the Vanguard Books and edits *The Friday Times*.

As ill luck would have it, when I received these messages I was engaged in a triple fight against the heat of Lahore to which I am not accustomed, a severe bout of influenza which had laid me low, and the aftermath of a serious accident of 7 May which had disabled me aurally for life. But you can't argue with your editor: it is not for nothing that only the royalty and the editors have arrogated to themselves the right to use the first person plural ("we") for their formidable selves. Anyway, the request was reasonable, and I owed it to my readers to supply the corrections to the errors committed by the textbooks. So, all handicaps notwithstanding, I sat down and wrote long correction slips and a short concluding lament, and this matter appeared in *The Frontier Post* in five installments on 12, 15, 19, 20 and 21 June.

By this time I had decided to publish this critique as an independent book. When I discussed its publication with Mr. Najam Sethi he made some admirable suggestions about recasting the first chapter, which were accepted and have improved it. I have thoroughly revised and expanded the matter which appeared as the second series in *The Frontier Post*; this forms the second chapter of the book. While revising, modifying and expanding the original material (Chapter 1) and the corrective redaction (Chapter 2), I had time and opportunity to give more thought to the subject and to view it in a

larger perspective. Chapter 3 and most of Chapter 4 are the results of this cogitation. These additions were not published by *The Frontier Post*.

Having studied, lived and taught abroad for most of my working life, I have learned to view the educational and intellectual needs of a society in ways which are foreign to the Pakistani mind. Therefore, in my academic innocence I expected that the publication of my study of the textbooks in a daily newspaper would or should produce the following results:

First, a flurry and a ferment among the general reader, aroused by the low quality of our textbooks and a more specific and indignant commotion among the parents on discovering what their children were being taught about national history. I was looking forward to a prolonged debate in the correspondence columns, which would include a harsh criticism of what I had dared to do, a discussion among the parents on how to dam up this flood of ignorance let loose by the textbooks, some protests in self-defence from the authors of these books, a riposte from the textbook boards in self-justification, even an angry rebuke from a "patriotic" Pakistani on my anti-national and subversive outburst. What actually happened did not amount to more than a whisper. A total of four letters appeared, only two of which were relevant to the subject. All of them are reproduced in Appendix C in order to mark and preserve the totality of national response to such a vital subject.

Secondly, considering the impact of my discoveries on every household in the country which sent its offspring to school and the interest this should arouse among the public, at least some of the English national newspapers would reproduce these articles *in toto* or in condensed form, and the Urdu press in translation; so that the maximum number of parents were informed of what their children are studying. Had any newspaper or magazine cared to copy what I wrote even without my permission, I would not have minded this at all or asked for a fee. Far from any such dissemination, no notice was taken of what I had written.

Thirdly, at least one or two papers would carry an editorial comment on the disaster to which I had pointed my finger. But the silence was total.

Lest I be accused of self-praise or my frustration be attributed to my pique on being neglected, let me make one thing clear. I know that my work was not a feat of exalted scholarship. I had not written anything of exceptionally high quality, for which I was looking for a pat on the back. But, in all modesty, I may claim that I was the first to

- (1) examine the textbooks with meticulous care,
- (2) list all errors of fact, emphasis and interpretation,
- (3) enumerate the major omissions of which they were guilty,
- (4) correct the mistakes committed by them,

- (5) discuss the contours and dimensions of the false history being taught and studied,
- (6) calculate the effects of this on the students, and
- (7) measure the implications of a distorted view of history for the people at large.

I think I had some justification in presuming that this would the educated classes and make them sit up and take notice of that was being done to them and to their progeny by the government, the scholars and the professors of the country. But my hopes proved dupes, and my fears were not liars. I discovered that L knew the textbooks in use in the country, but not the country.

The pain of this realization was exacerbated by a number of things which happened in quick succession between the appearance of the articles in April and the writing of this preface. I detail them in their chronological order:

1. By a coincidence, the publication of these articles ran concurrent with the budget sessions of both the National Assembly and the Punjab Legislative Assembly. In Islamabad questions were asked about the government's failure to issue its new education policy. In Lahore one full day was spent on debating the performance of the provincial education department and the Minister of Education was castigated for his incompetence and ignorance. But in both places not a word was uttered by the treasury or opposition benches on the textbooks. Now I knew that Pakistani legislators don't read newspapers or, if they do, don't attach my importance to their contents.

2. On 6 June, 1992, at a function held at the Lahore Museum when a retired ambassador donated a few articles of historical importance, the Chief Minister of the Punjab, Mr. Ghulam Haider Wyne, told the audience that "proper knowledge about different annals of history [*sic.*] can provide a nation with guidance for its future", that "the nations who are indifferent about their past can face problems in future", and that "people who forget their history cannot keep their geographical boundaries intact" (*The Notion*, Lahore, 7 June 1992). He did not make any reference to the textbooks which his own government was issuing and prescribing. The executive arm of the government followed the legislative branch in ignoring what the press published.

3. In its leading article of 9 June *The Nation* pulled up the chief minister in strong language. "Our rulers have been systematically distorting history to create a place for their claim and perpetuation of the same over political power [*sic.*]. We have seen enough of a conscious process of turning and twisting of historical facts and events as well as the guiding philosophies behind them ... honest and effective answers ... are impossible to get as long as the current practice of projecting only selective facts in the light of dominant political propagandist line



is not abandoned in favor of an objective and dispassionate reporting and interpretation of facts. We have to learn to separate political propaganda from history .... It is imperative that the task of writing history books for formal education is assigned to serious scholars rather than propagandists. Power politics and scholarship must find their own places in separate niches in the society."

The editorial made no reference to my articles, the first series of which had appeared a little earlier. Do our editors and leader-writers read no newspapers other their own? Or do they consider it beneath their dignity to refer the contemporary press is publishing? Had this leader-writer read my article he would have derived from them solid facts and sound arguments to reinforce the brief he was pleading.

4. In its Independence Day supplement issued on 14 August *The Frontier Post* carried an article by Professor Rafiullah Shahab on the "Genesis of Pakistan Resolution", whose first paragraph claimed that the Resolution was "adopted" on 23 March and the last paragraph repeated that it was "passed" on 23 March. The article reproduced the text of the Resolution in bold print in the centre of the page with one major error: the words "independent states" were not enclosed within quotation marks as they were in the original text. In the second series of cry articles I had given considerable space to the correction of the date, printed the true text, and criticized the writers who were irresponsible in their treatment of the document. This made another truth dawn upon me: not to speak of the readers, even the regular contributors to a newspaper don't read what that newspaper publishes on their own subject.

5. Between April and now I received over a score of visitors at my residence and all of them, either to make polite conversation or out of genuine interest, inquired about what I was then writing. As my mind was full of textbooks I told them in some detail about my discoveries, their effect on the tranquility of my mind and my frustration on having failed to arouse the interest or even the ire of my readers. Their reaction opened many doors to my understanding of the society to which we belong. Some were visibly bored with my enthusiasm and changed the topic. Others pretended to show sympathy, but their mealy-mouthed phrases were like the trivial, trite, fatuous words we use to console a neighbor who is in some slight trouble: why are you worrying yourself? don't take such a tilde thing to heart: all will be well: nothing lasts forever, do you take so seriously everything that you write about? and so on. But the true and memorable comment came from an educated couple with two school-going children who accompanied them "What else goes right in Pakistan that we should worry about these wretched in the Urdu words they used "*Pakistan men*

*aur kaun si chiz theek chal rahi hai jo ham in kambakht kitabon ki fikr karen jo ye parh rahe hain?"*

The Pakistani English press has been criticizing the current textbooks for several years. I have seen more than one editorial in *Dawn* in the last three years. On 29 April 1989, *The Nation* called them "incredibly dull" and felt that "it is time our books imparted some knowledge rather than continuously concentrating on indoctrination and creating a hostile world-view among our students". On 26 March 1992 *The Frontier Post* had complained that the textbooks "indulge in an excessively apologetic explanation of the tragedies and debacles Pakistan had to face at the hands of dictators and usurpers". The substance and nature of our social science textbooks, it had bemoaned, ensure that "our younger generation are not expected to become literate". *The Friday Times* of 19-25 March 1992 earned a full-page investigative report by Miss Aliya Inam on the oddities and follies of these books.

These editorials and reports failed to evoke any response from the quarters responsible for all the warts and foibles which disfigure the textbooks. There was not even a squeak from the establishment. Why should I delude myself with the pleasing but vain thought that my labor on this book will be rewarded with any attention?

The only people left from whom a sympathetic hearing may be expected are the parents whose children drink in the poison of these textbooks every day of the week. But they, it appears, are indifferent or unable to raise their voice, though the subject of this book could not impinge upon them more closely. They say they have greater problems to contend with and deeper worries to avoid. Probably they are right. No matter what proof or argument I bring forth, it will not agitate their mind or stir any feeling or touch them on the raw or draw a spark of anger.

History ought to be above the laws of government and the whims of paid scholars. It should present facts as if they were divine edicts beyond cavil, clear as crystal, the voice of ultimate authority, ineradicable, immovable, irresistible, hewn in granite. Even when the ashes of controversy are still hot the icy brilliance of the historian's reason should explain the conflict with humor, serenity and balance. Interpretations should be models of rational thinking with an array of arguments sound and stout, budding up and edifice of thought and analysis which has the harmony of an ancient Greek monument, the symmetry of the Taj Mahal, and the strength of the a Roman column. The various considerations should be balanced with a hand unshaken by prejudice, and into the play of ideas should be injected the vigor of intellect and through all the writings should ring the bell of justice.

But, how far is what ought to be from what actually is! But have textbooks which mislead the children and scholarly works which misguide the nation. As things are or appear to be to an open eye, will the country ever see the day when history is a

narration of facts instead of a catalogue of sweet wishes or damnable lies? Not during the lifetime of the next few generations.

It reason is on my side, the reader of this book has the right to ask me: if that is what you think, why have you written this book? I must confess that my reply will not go down well with him. But here it goes. What I have written will bring no change to our textbooks or to the education system which produces them. Few will read this book. Fewer will remember it after reading it. Our own little stubborn world will go on as it has been going on for 45 years. The top will continue spinning because it is kept in motion by blows of lash not by natural momentum; it is a whipping-top, not the ordinary toy. What I write will not matter. Who listens to a feeble, lonely voice coming from the wilderness, crying for the light like an infant in the night?

My publisher is more optimistic than I am. I admire his mettle and his tenacity. I pray he is right. I don't share his hopes. And yet I hope I am wrong.

So my answer to why I wrote this book is: I have written for posterity. (Sometimes I feel that I have written all my books for generations whom I will not see). In a hundred years' time when the future historian sets out to contemplate the Pakistan of an age gone by and look for the causes that brought it low, he might find in this book of mine one small candle whose quivering flame will light his path.

I am beholden to my wife for making certain helpful suggestions during the writing of this book, for making now working hours less tedious and more productive by offering material comforts and moral cheer, and for reading the proofs.

It is my pleasure to thank the following gentlemen for their assistance and kindnesses: Mr. Razi Abedi, Mr. Muhammad Azam, Mr. Muzaffar Ahmed Bhutta, Mr. Khaled Ahmed, and Mr. Ahmad Saeed.

Mr. Najam Sethi has taken a keener interest in the completion and publication of this book than he ordinarily does in what I write and he publishes. I stand in his debt.

Lahore  
2 February 1993

K. K. Aziz

## CHAPTER 1

### THE PRESCRIBED MYTHS

In every country the textbook is the primary implement of education at the school and pre-university stages of instruction. In Pakistan it is the only instrument of imparting education on all levels, because the teacher and the lecturer don't teach or lecture but repeat what it contains and the student is encouraged or simply ordered to memorize its contents. Further, for the young student the textbook is the most important book in his little world: he is forced to buy it, he carries it to the classroom every day, he has it open before him when the teacher is teaching, he is asked to learn portions of it by rote, and he is graded by the quantity of its contents that he can regurgitate.

The ultimate supremacy of the textbook is confined by its official provenance. Since the early 1960s the planning, preparation and publication of all textbooks for classes 1-12 are the responsibility of the Textbook Boards, of which there is one in each province. These bodies are created and controlled by the provincial Department of Education, and their personnel is recruited from the provincial education service. Their textbooks are generally written by a team of authors, then corrected and supervised by another person or a group of persons, and finally edited by another individual. Then the manuscript is submitted to the National Review Committee of the Ministry of Education of the Government of Pakistan, which checks its accuracy and approves of its "ideological" content. When the book has been published, it is prescribed by the Provincial Government as the "sole textbook" for the relevant class in all the schools of the province. Each copy of the book carries 1) the names of authors, supervisors and editors. 2) the imprimatur of the National Review Committee, and 3) the official notice that it is the only prescribed textbook. In some books there is a warning issued by the Chairman of the Board that the students must not buy or use any "additional" textbooks.

It becomes necessary to examine and scrutinize these textbooks because 1) they form the foundations of the pre-university education system, and, in one case, of the university system, 2) they are prepared with such great care and attention. 3) they are written by the country's leading college and university teachers, and 4) they are the only source of information for millions of students whose education stops at or before the 12th class.

History as a subject in the schools was abolished by the government of Field Marshal Ayub Khan. Its place has been taken by a subject called "*Mu'ashrati Ulum*" or "Social Studies" for classes 1-8 and by another subject called "*Mutala'a-i-Pakistan*" or "Pakistan Studies" for classes 9-12. Both are amalgams of bits of geography, history, economics, civics, Islamic Studies and international relations.

In the following sections I provide the reader with the major inaccuracies, distortions, exaggerations and slants to be found in each officially prepared and prescribed textbook and in a representative selection of private commercial publications which are in wide use as textbooks. As there is no library which keeps all the textbooks published since 1947 my presentation is confined, with a few exceptions, to the books which have appeared during the last twelve years and are in current use. In the annotation of the items prepared by the Textbook Boards I have omitted the statements that they were approved by the National Review Committee and prescribed as sole textbooks by the governments of the provinces; these announcements should be taken for granted.

**Primary Level: Urdu Medium**  
**Class 1**

*Jadid Mu'oshirati Ulum* by a Board of Senior General Knowledge Teachers, West Punjab Textbook Depot. Lahore. n.d., pp.16.

"Question: Who created Pakistan?"

"Answer: The Quaid-i-Azam created Pakistan"

"Question: What is the Quaid-i-Azam's actual name?"

"Answer: Quaid-i-Azam's actual name is Muhammad Ali Jinnah"(p. 3).

The first question and its answer lead to several reflections, both of pedagogics and historical substance. Is it wise to introduce a 5-year old student on his first day in school to national history through such a naive question? With his limited intelligence, little ability to grasp historical facts, and total incapacity to analyze concepts – and all these weaknesses maximized by his stepping into an entirely new world, – in what way does the answer advance his information or knowledge?

In the prevailing teaching system the student will repeat aloud the answer twenty times in as many minutes in the company of his fellows in the class, and in the resulting cacophony lose all sense of what was created by whom. If his intelligence or curiosity is above par, he would like to know the "why" of the creation after its "what" and "by whom"; but the answer to the "why" is not in the book. It would have been more logical and to the point and also more suited to his age to use the following catechism:

Question: What is the name of our country?

Answer. The name of our country is Pakistan.

Question: What does this name mean?

Answer. It means land of the pure.

Question: How is the word made up?

Answer P stands for the Punjab, A for the NWFP (Afghan province), K for Kashmir. S for Sindh, and TAN for Baluchistan.

Question: Who invented this word?

Answer. It was invented by Chaudhri Rahmat Ali.

Question: Who created Pakistan?

Answer, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah created Pakistan.

But then Rahmat Ali will appear in the book before Jinnah, and the ideological masters of the country will not sanction the order of precedence.

The problem of historical substance exists on a higher plane and eludes the comprehension of both the teacher and the writer of the textbook. The problem is: did Jinnah alone create Pakistan? The question leads directly to a sophisticated discussion of an historical and philosophical nature. Legally and constitutionally. Pakistan was created by the British Parliament which passed the Indian Independence Act of July 1947. Politically, it was created by the popular support given to the All India Muslim League by the Muslims of India and by the tripartite negotiations among the Muslim League, the Congress and the British. Morally, it was created by an urge among the Muslims to have a country of their own where they would not be subject to a permanent and unalterable Hindu majority. One could also say, with much justification, that it was created by the Hindus. Had the Hindu leaders shown greater wisdom, more flexibility and less arrogance, the Muslim League would not have insisted on a partition of India. It was Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel's declaration that India would rather live in peace without the permanent headache of a Muslim problem which tilted the balance of decision in favor of a partition and signaled Congress acquiescence in its consummation. We must remember that in May 1946 Jinnah had accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan, thus abandoning the Pakistan ideal.

Another aspect of the same problem is summed up in the academic but pertinent question: would Pakistan have come into existence if Jinnah had died in say 1945 or even 1946? Arguments can be given on both sides. Jinnah was the supreme leader, with no successors, alternatives, deputies, assistants, substitutes, proxies or replacements in sight. The Congress had a long line of well-established succession and a large group of

top-ranking leaders with rich public experience and long political braining. The League had neither. (Compare the personnel of the Working Committee of the All India Congress Committee with that of the All India Muslim League Working Committee, and the point is painfully made). Had Jinnah gone to his Maker, the League would have been a party not only without a head but also without a mind or a heart or any other vital organ. Look at the League group what negotiated with the Cabinet Mission. Consider the persons who accompanied Jinnah in his talks with Mountbatten. Contemplate the League nominees in the interim government. Was there anyone who could have replaced Jinnah even for five minutes and carried on a coherent conversation or defended a point or argued for or against a proposition? Liaquat Ali Khan? Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar? Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan? All pygmies of short public lives and even shorter statures.

What is the explanation of this absence of leadership? Did Jinnah trust none of his men? Or, did he find none worth trusting? How did this unusual and ominous phenomenon affect the progress of the Pakistan movement? Isn't this a characteristic (and tragic) feature of Muslim politics? The Khaksar movement was nothing but Inayatullah Proja Party and A.K. Fazlul Hay were interchangeable terms. The Khudai Khidmaigars were born, lived and died with Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. Were the Muslim League of the years of the Pakistan movement and Jinnah twins? The door is patent for discussion.

The other side of the coin is inscribed with equally eristic phrases. One could reasonably argue that by 1945 or 1946 the Pakistan demand had reached a pitch of excitement, enthusiasm and conviction which even Jinnah's demise could not have lowered by a hairbreadth. The impetus was too great to be reversed. The gulf between Hindus and Muslims had become too deep and wide to be bridged over. Jinnah or no Jinnah, nothing less than a partition would have satisfied the Muslims.

I have gone into these details to demonstrate the unwisdom of feeding class I students on such indigestible historical pap. A textbook should shape its contents to fit the size of the student's mind, not to fluster and confound it. Asking the students of such tender age to learn such questions and answers by mere habituation through unintelligent memory is training them in knowing everything by rote. Let us refrain from making history into a multiplication table.

*Muashrati Ulum*, Shakil Brothers, Karachi, n.d. 4: p. 24.

"Question: Who gave Liaquat Ali Khan the title of Quaid-Millat?"

"Answer. Liaquat Ali Khan was given the title of Quaid-e-Millat by the Pakistani nation."

"Question: Where is the *marzr* of Shahid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan situated?"

"Answer: The mazar of Shahid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan is situated in Karachi" (p.5).

The lesson on Mohanjo Daro does not tell the student where it is located (p.15).

The lesson on Pakistan's friends in the world contains 12 Muslim countries: the 13th name is Australia (p. 20).

The lesson on the Taj Mahal does not even hint at what the building is meant for (p. 23).

If patriotism and loyalty to the memory of Jinnah dictated a reference to him in class I textbook, there was no such compulsion in the case of Liaquat Ali Khan. Anyway the elementary stage of education should not be converted into a platform for praising dead prime ministers. I can name fifty public figures from Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Sayyid Ameer Ali to Fazlul Haq and the Raja of Mahmudabad whose individual contribution to the Muslim nationalist struggle was immeasurably greater than Liaquat Ali Khan's.

In fact, Liaquat's inclusion in the textbook is a particularly ill-suited choice. Not only ill-suited, but poignant in the light of Jinnah-Liaquat relationship. This needs some elaboration.

In 1945 Liaquat signed an agreement with Bhulabhai Desai of the Congress party, committing the Muslim League to a certain line of action on future constitutional progress of the country. He did this after telling Desai that Jinnah was a sick man and was dying and if the Congress desired a lasting and practicable solution of the Muslim problem it should deal with him (Liaquat) rather than with Jinnah. It was a secret and shady deal and Jinnah was neither consulted nor informed. When he read the news and the text of the Liaquat-Desai pact in the press he was shocked, and considered it as an act of treachery on Liaquat's part, and ordered his domestic staff not to let Liaquat enter his residence if he came to visit him. (This was told to me by Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, who was at this time acting as honorary private secretary to Jinnah in Bombay).

In 1946 the first list of Muslim League nominees on the Viceroy's Executive Council which Jinnah sent to Lord Wavell did not contain Liaquat's name but in his place Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan's. But when Ismail divulged the secret of his nomination to a journalist who carried the tale to Jinnah his name was dropped and substituted with Liaquat's. (Information given to me by Pirzada and later confirmed by K. H. Khurshid in a conversation with me).



Why didn't Jinnah expel Liaquat from the League and get rid of someone whom he considered as a traitor within the camp? The same answer was given to me by Pirzada, Khuishid, Chaudhri Muhammad Ali and Professor I. H. Qureshi. The years 1945-47 swore the most delicate in the annals of the Pakistan movement. Unity in the Muslim League ranks had top priority. Before 1945 Jinnah had publicly called Liaquat his "right hand man". Liaquat was also the General Secretary of the All India Muslim League. He accompanied Jinnah in all the negotiations with the British and the Congress during this period. He was also the deputy leader of the Muslim League parliamentary party in the Indian Legislative Assembly. Even a hint of a split in the top leadership of the League at this time would have spelt disaster for the party's public image and its standing and credibility on the political scene of the country. So Liaquat was retained and permitted to act as a League leader, but no love was lost between him and Jinnah.

I was also told by Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan that in July 1947 he had carried a message from Jinnah to Nawab Muhammad Hamidullah Khan of Bhopal asking him if he would be prepared to come over and become the first prime Minister of Pakistan. The Nawab declined the offer for personal reasons. Recently it has been reported in the Urdu press of Pakistan that a similar offer was made by Jinnah to the Nawab of Bahawalpur, but with no success. It is thus clear that Liaquat Ali Khan got his job in Pakistan by default, not on merit.

Even as Prime Minister, Liaquat did not enjoy the trust of Jinnah. How could he with this background? Chaudhri Muhammad Ali implied in his talks with me that the two men were not even on speaking terms except in public and large company.

M. A. H. Ispahani said that the Prime Minister did not take the files to the Governor General for personal discussion but sent them by the hand of his secretary.

The tragedy of this relationship is confirmed by the memoirs of Miss Fatima Jinnah (the typed manuscript of *My Brother* in the archives of the Quaid-i-Azam Papers in the Federal Ministry of Education), who writes that when Liaquat and others came to see Jinnah in Ziarat during his last illness he refused to see them and, after they had gone away, told her that they had come to see how soon he was going to die.

There are people, including Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, who suspect that Jinnah's death took place in extremely suspicious circumstances, and that the Prime Minister had something to do with the creation of these circumstances.

Thus there is sufficient evidence from authentic quarters now prove that Liaquat Ali Khan, in spite of being the first prime minister of the country, was far from being a national hero. His own record in office provides additional support to this contention. He failed to expedite the process of constitution making and died after more than four years in command without giving the country its basic law. He made a deliberate

decision to refuse to visit the Soviet Union from which he had received an invitation. Instead, he chose to go to the United States and take Pakistan into the American camp, thus initiating a slide which lead, by stages, to friendship, junior partnership, dependence, obedience, beggary and servitude. He groomed certain bureaucrats for high political offices and preferred their advice to the counsel of his political colleagues, he neglected the task of organizing the Pakistan Muslim League and making it into, a grassroots party. He chose inefficient and weak politicians and installed them at the centre and in the provinces. He did nothing to meet the needs or allay the fears of the indigenous populations of East Bengal. On the contrary, he posted arrogant, unsympathetic and self-willed Punjabi and Urdu-speaking civil servants to the eastern wing, laying the fast brick around the foundation stone of Bangladesh. He started the practice of nomination to fill in the vacancies occurring in the membership of the Constituent Assembly (which also acted as the National Assembly). He appointed members of parliament as governors and ambassadors, allowing them to retain their seats in the house.

Of course, all this cannot be told to the young school students for they will not understand it. Such detailed information should come later, preferably in classes 11-12, and in full amplitude in classes 13-14. But these facts of history will not be palatable to senior students if they have been brought up for 10 years on inaccurate and tendentious stuff.

Anyway, to present to class I students such a controversial figure as a national hero only second to Jinnah is to trespass on the national pantheon.

## Class 2

*Jadid Mu'ashrati Ulum* by a Board of Senior General Knowledge Teachers, West Punjab Textbook Depot, Lahore, n.d., pp.16.

"Question: When was Pakistan created?"

"Answer. Pakistan was created in [*men*] 14 August 1947" (p. 3). On Jinnah's educational career: he earned a degree in law in England" (p. 4).

"Question: How did Jinnah come so think of creating Pakistan?"

"Answer. The people of India were demanding freedom from the British. Pandit Nehru said that after independence there will be a government of the Hindus in India. The Quaid-i-Azam said that Muslims also lived here [and] Muslims should have a separate government [*hukumat*] (p. 4).

On all these points see Chapter 2.

One full page (5) is on Miss Fatima Jinnah. One full page (6) is on Iqbal, where it is said that he, together with Jinnah [*sath mil kar*], did much for the creation of Pakistan.

The rest of the book is on Muslim children, fruits and vegetables, our food, animals, means of transport, dresses, mountains and rivers, and good habits.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum* by M. H. Qadri, Shakil Brothers. Karachi. n.d., pp. 32.

The Quaid-i-Azam received his higher [*a'ala*] education in London. His *mazar* is guarded by the Pakistan Army day and night (p. 15).

See Chapter 2 for correction.

For the services rendered by Liaquat Ali Khan the nation gave him the title of Quaid-i-Millat and Shaheed-i-Millat. The "title" is in the singular (p. 17).

The point has been covered above in full detail.

Iqbal went to London for higher education, and after that received his doctorate in Germany. He was the first to present the concept of the creation of Pakistan (p. 18).

Both the statements on Iqbal are discussed fully in Chapter 2.

### Class 3

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*: District Lahore, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore, 5th reprint, March 1989, pp. 76. Authors: Professor Dr. Miss Mariam K. Ilahi, Dr. Miss Firoza Yasmin, Sahibzada Abdur Rasul, Mrs. Nuzhat Mansur, Maqbul Anwar Daudi, Ali Shabbar Kazmi and Bashiruddin Malik. Editor: Bashiruddin Malik. Supervisors: Hifsa Javed, Sibt-i-Hasan and Shahnawaz. Prepared by the Punjab Textbook Board and prescribed as the sole [or civil; in Urdu both words are written identically] textbook for the schools of district Lahore. Print order: 80,000 Copies.

"Raja Jaipal tried to enter the country of Mahmud Ghaznawi. Upon this, Mahmud Ghaznawi defeated Raja Jaipal, captured Lahore, and established an Islamic government [*hakumat*]" (p.8).

Does this explanation of Mahmud Ghaznawi's invasion also justify his repeated incursions into India and unprovoked pillage of Hindu places of worship? The Punjab under his rule was not an Islamic state.

Two pages on Jesus Christ do not mention the fact that he founded Christianity (pp. 70-71).

The last lesson on the "Important Personality of Our District" is in praise of Shaikh Ali Hujveri *alias* Data Ganj Bakhsh. Tomb worship is thus made a part of instruction at a very early stage (pp. 75-76).

Out of 21 lessons, one is on the history of the district of Lahore, 15 on geography, economics and administration, and 5 on Adam, Abraham, Jesus Christ, the Prophet of Islam, and Data Ganj Bakhsh. Hujveri, popularly known as Data Ganj Bakhsh, is thus firmly and unmistakably placed among the prophets. Probably a majority of Muslim students will believe that Hujveri was a prophet, and this farcical addition to their knowledge of Islam will become a part of their belief.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*: District Peshawar, NWFP Textbook Board, Peshawar, n.d., pp. 56. Authors: Professor Alauddin Khilji, College of Education, University of Peshawar (History Section), and Wali Muhammad, Lecturer, Islamia College, Peshawar (Geography Section). Revised and edited by Dr. Mumtaz Mangalori and Muhammad Halim, subject specialists at the Board. Print order. 10,000 copies.

"When the Quaid-i-Azam set out on his campaign to win an independent Islamic country the people of NWFP joined him"(p. 5). There is no mention of the Red Shirts who were in power in the province till August 1947.

Lesson No. 16 on Moses (pp. 50-51) does not mention the fact that he founded Judaism; nor does Lesson No. 17 on Jesus Christ (pp. 52-53) mention Christianity.

The last Lesson is on Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar, who thus finds himself in the company of Adam, Abraham, Moses, Christ and Prophet Muhammad (p. 56).

Thus, while the students of Lahore are liable to reckon up Hujveri in the list of prophets, those of Peshawar are faced with a more formidable task – that of accepting Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar as wearing the nimbus of a prophet

There are about 2 pages out of 56 of what could be called history.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*: Karachi, Sindh Textbook Board, Jamshoro, September 1989, pp. 76. Authors: Fida Husain Khokhar and M. F. Harald. Revised by Allauddin Khalid. Advisor: Abdul Majid Abbassi. Print order, 10,000 copies.

"Our homeland is green and fertile" (p. 5).

That is all that the book has to say about the history (?) of the country.

The personality in the book is Haji Abdullah Haroon (pp. 715-76), who thus is bracketed with Adam, Abraham, Moses, Christ and the Prophet of Islam.

#### Class 4

*Mu'ashrati Uloom*, NWFP Textbook Bound, Peshawar, n.d., pp. 92. Authors: Muthar Hashmi, Jahanzeb College, Saidu Sharif, Swat; Wali Muhammad, Islamia College, Peshawar; Muhammad Yaqub, Islamia College, Peshawar, Professor Muhammad Raza Khan, Dera Ismail Khan; Ghulam Hasan Baloch, D.I.S. [what does that stand for?], Dera Ismail Khan; Sayyud Muhammad Ali Shah, former Principal, Training School, Dera Ismail Khan; and Muhammaid Zubair Mangalori, Research Officer, Textbook Board, Peshawar. Revised and edited by Dr. Mumtaz Mangalori and Muhammad Halim, of the Textbook Board. Print order: 65,000 copies.

"The Muslims treated the non-Muslims very well [when they ruled the province]. Yet the non-Muslims nursed in their hearts an enmity against the Muslims. When the British invaded the area [*ilaqa*] the non-Muslims sided with them and against the Muslims. So the British conquered the whole country (p. 16).

According to the 1881 census of the NWFP, out of every 10,000 persons 9,184 were Muslims; when the British conquered the area some years earlier this proportion would have been even greater. Thus the number of non-Muslims in the population of the area at the time of British advent was infinitesimal. The Pathan is by definition a Muslim, like the Turk. The non-Muslims of the territory were Hindu and Sikh migrants engaged in business and commerce. They were not a martial class. Did this tiny community of money-makers fight on the side of the British with such desperate valour as to decide the final outcome? We have no evidence of such a thing having taken place. I suspect that this accusation against the non-Muslims has been made with a view to offering a pretext for the Pathan defeat: the Pathans would not have been vanquished but for the treachery and machinations of the non-Muslims group. This is an unacceptable excuse and bad history. The British not only beat the Pathans but also recruited the Maliks of the tribal territory to their payroll in exchange for loyalty to the new masters and a firm promise to keep the peace in the wild belt bordering on Afghanistan.

"The Hindus wanted to control the government of India after independence. The British sided with the Hindus. But the (Muslims did not accept this decision. Allama Iqbal and Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah said that a Muslim government should be

established in the areas where the Muslims constituted the majority of the population .... The Pakistan Resolution was adopted on 23 March 1940 in a big meeting of the Muslim League in Lahore. In 1946, before the creation of Pakistan, when the people of NWFP were asked their opinion all of them voted in favor of Pakistan" (p. 17).

To say that "the British sided with the Hindus" is only a half truth. Iqbal and Jinnah were not the only persons who asked for a Muslim state nor, in chronological terms, were they the earliest to make the demand. Iqbal argued for separation in 1937 and Jinnah in 1940. Dozens of people had suggested a solution by partition long before this. The Lahore Resolution was adopted on 24 (March, not 23, and by the annual session of the All India Muslim League, not by "a big meeting of the Muslim League". In 1946 all the people of NWFP did not vote for Pakistan. For fuller details on all these points see Chapter 2.

There are only 2 pages out of 92 on history (pp. 16-17).

The last 9 Lessons are on the Prophet of Islam, the four "righteous" *khalifas*, Sayyid Ahmad Barelawi, Hazrat Pir Baba, Malik Khuda Bakssh, and Jinnah.

On Jinnah we are told that in England he earned a superior or high degree in law, that he became a "political worker" of the Indian National Congress in 1906, and then (jumping over all the intervening years) in 1934 he returned to India from England. It is repeated that the Pakistan Resolution was passed on 23 March in a big Muslim League meeting in Lahore (pp. 90-91).

Jinnah did not earn a superior or high degree in law in England; in fact, he did not get any degree of any kind in any subject from any country. The date of the adoption of the Lahore Resolution should read 24, not 23, March. Both these points are treated in detail in Chapter 2.

*Mu'ashrati Uloom*, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore, 2nd. ed. April 1989, pp. 104. Authors: Dr. Mrs. Firoza Yasmin. Dr. Athar Hameed, Bashiruddin Malik, and Qazi Sajjad Ahmad. Editors: Dr. Mrs. Firoza Yasmin and Bashiruddin Malik. Supervisors: Hifsa Javed, Shahnawaz and Sibti-i-Hasan.

One lesson, No.12 (pp. 67-74), is on history. It begins with the invasion of Muhammad bin Qasim, attacks the Hindu religion, and describes the Muslim advent as a visit ("when the Muslims came to the subcontinent") but the British arrival as a forcible seizure of power from the Muslims; we are told that "on 23 March 1940 Jinnah held a meeting in Lahore and explained to the Muslims (*ye bat samjhai*) his idea of having a separate homeland for them, and they were very happy about it and promised to help him;" and finally, about the 1965 war with India, it is said that "at last, frightened [*dar kar*] of the Pak Army and the people of Pakistan, Bharat sued for peace".

The date 23 March is wrong. The reference to the 1965 war is groundless. See Chapter 2.

The last 8 Lessons are on the Prophet of Islam, the four first *khalifas*, Jinnah, Iqbal and Major Aziz Bhatti. On Iqbal, it is said that he went to England for higher studies; Germany is not mentioned.

*Mu'ashrati Uloom*, Sindh Textbook Board, Jamshoro, 2nd. ed., April 1989, pp. 80. Authors: Abdul Majid Abbasi, M.A., B.T., M.Ed., Mirza Ishaq Baig, M.A., M.Ed., LL.B., and Sayyid Talmiz Hasnain Rizvi, M.A., B.Ed. (Gold Medallist). Chief Editor Abdul Majid Abbasi. Print order 25,000 copies.

"During the British rule all the Muslims of South Asia joined to form a political party, the All India Muslim League. The object of this party was to win independence from the British and to create a separate country, Pakistan, for the Muslims" (p. 1).

It is natural to infer from this garbled account of the foundation of the All India Muslim League that it aimed in 1906 at winning independence and creating a Pakistan. In 1906 it only promised to be loyal to the British government, to protect Muslim interests, and to make friends with the non-Muslims.

"The Pakistan Resolution was passed on 23 March 1940" (p. 2).

23 March should read 24 March.

As soon as the partition of India took place "many Muslims began to migrate from the Hindu-majority areas to Pakistan" (p. 2).

"Many" Muslims from the Hindu provinces did not migrate to Pakistan. A very small minority came over from Delhi, the United provinces and Bihar, a tiny trickle from Bombay and the Central Provinces; and a few hundred families from South India. Had "many" Muslims left India for Pakistan the India of today would not have a Muslim population exceeding that of Pakistan.

In the section on Radio Pakistan, the student is not told that it is a department of the government (pp. 48-49). Chapter 12 (pp. 62-67) deals with the problems of the province of Sindh, but the ethnic question is not mentioned.

Jinnah went to England for higher education and passed the law examination after four years (p. 77).

He was called to the bar. See Chapter 2.

The Pakistan Resolution was passed on 23 March 1940 in Lahore (p. 77).

As noted above, the date should be 24 March. The reader should look up the accurate and exact programme of the Muslim League Lahore session in Chapter 2 below.

The personalities of Sindh whose lives are sketched in the book are Sir Ghulam Husain Hidayatullah, Abdullah Haroon and Hyder Bakhsh Jatui (pp. 78-80).

### **Secondary Level: Urdu Medium Class 5**

*Mu'arshrati Ulum*, NWFP Textbook Board, Peshawar, n.d., pp. 119. Authors: Abdur Rauf Faruqi, Government Jahanzeb College, Saidu Sharif (Convener); Muhammad Ali Shah, Principal, Training School, Dera Ismail Khan; Mahmud Ahmad Tariq, Government College, Mandan; Dilasa Khan Murawwat, Principal, Jami High School, Bannu; and Sufi Ghulam Muhammad, Headmaster, Government High School, Akbarpura. Editor: Dr. Mumtaz Mangalori, Senior Subject Specialist, Textbook Board. Revised by Muhammad Halim, Subject Specialist, Textbook Board. Print order: 55,000 copies.

There are 11 pages of history at the opening of the book under 4 headings: Differences in Muslim and Hindu Civilizations, Need for the Creation of an Independent State, The Ideology of Pakistan, and India's Evil Designs against Pakistan. The three-quarters of a page essay on Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan has no dates, but asserts that he declared that "the Muslims should organize themselves as a separate nation" (p. 7). Iqbal was the first person to present to the nation the idea of Pakistan in 1930, and his suggestion was to create an "independent and free" state made up of "all those areas where the Muslims are in majority" (p. 7). The 1971 break-up of the country is dismissed in a atrociously distorted lines: "India engineered riots in East Pakistan through her agents and then invaded it from all four sides. Thus Pakistan was forced to fight another war with India. This war lasted two weeks. After that East Pakistan seceded and became Bangladesh" (P. 11).

On Iqbal's 1930 address and the 1971 war see Chapter 2.

In the Lesson on political administration, two sentences merit notice. "When the 1956 Constitution was made, it had still not become operative when it was abrogated"; "in 1971, the task of making a constitution was given to the constitution-making committee of the country, and this committee unanimously approved a constitution in April 1973" (p. 70).



The 1956 constitution was operative from 23 March 1956 to 7 October 1958. The making of the 1973 constitution did not start in 1971 but in 1972.

The last 13 Lessons are hagiographic essays on Khadijat-ul-Kubra, Fatima-az-Zahra, Imam Husain, Muhammad bin Qasim, Mahmud Ghannawi, Aurangzeb Alamgir, Shah Waliullah, Sultan Tipu, Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Jamaluddin Afghani, Ubaidullah Sindhi, Iqbal and Jinnah (pp. 98-119). There is no mention on how Aurangzeb ascended the throne (p. 106). Jamaluddin "Afghani" is said to have belonged to Afghanistan (p. 112) and to have advocated pan-Islamism and world unity of Muslims without distinction of country or nation (pp. 112-113). The one-page essay on Ubaidullah Sindhi does not contain a single date (p. 114) (the student might well consider him an 18th-century figure). To Iqbal are attributed wrong views and wrong education, he was the first to offer the idea of Pakistan which aimed at "creating a separate independent Muslim *hakumat* wherever the Muslims were in a majority"; he took "his doctorate in philosophy from England" and along with it a "degree in barrister" (p. 115); he "wrote letters to Jinnah when the latter was in England asking him to return to India and lead the nation" (p. 116). In the essay on Jinnah, the Lahore Resolution is said to have been adopted on 23 March 1940 and to have demanded "an independent saltanat" (p. 116-117).

On Jamaluddin "Afghani", Iqbal's foreign education and his 1930 address, and be contents of the Lahore Resolution see Chapter 2. Iqbal wrote no letters to Jinnah when the latter was in England asking him to return to India.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore, 3rd. reprint. March 1989, pp. 112. Authors: Dr. Firoza Yasmin, Mrs. Zarin Ashraf and Bashiruddin Malik. Editor. Bashiruddin Malik. Supervisor: Sibti-i-Hasan. Print order: 127,000 copies.

Lesson No. 17 (pp. 85-93) is entitled "History". The word invasion is avoided scrupulously in the case of all Muslim conquerors from Muhammad bin Qasim to Ahmad Shah Abdali (p. 88). The British advent is described picturesquely: "In the beginning, the British purchased cotton cloth from the subcontinent and sold it in Britain. So they came here for the purpose of trade. Gradually they noticed the weakened state of the Muslim government and thought of taking over its territories .... To achieve this they made the Hindus join them, and the Hindus were very glad to side with the British" (pp. 88-89). The British rule gets a sharp and short shrift: "After capturing the subcontinent the British began, on the one hand, to loot to their heart's content all the things produced in this area and, on the other, in conjunction with the Hindus, to greatly suppress the Muslims" (p. 89).

In the same chapter wars with India are mentioned in patriotic not historical terms. In 1965, "the Pakistan Army conquered several areas of India, and when India was on the point of being defeated she requested the United Nations to arrange a cease-fire ... After

the 1965 war, India, with the help of the Hindus living in East Pakistan, instigated the people living there against the people of West Pakistan, and at last in December 1971 herself invaded East Pakistan. The conspiracy resulted in the separation of East Pakistan from us. All of us should receive military training and be prepared to fight the enemy" (p. 93).

For the Indo-Pakistan wars of 1965 and 1971 see Chapter 2.

The last 12 Lessons (pp. 94-112) treat with the same personalities as are included in the NWFP textbook for the same class (see above), with two changes: Aurangzeb is replaced by Ahmad Shah Abdali and Sultan Tipu is omitted.

*Mu'shrati Uloom*, Sindh Textbook Board, Jamshoro, 1st. ed., February 1989, pp. 132. Author S. Hamid Ali Jafri. Editors: Dr. Muhammad Saleh Shah Bukhari and Abdul Majid Abbasi. Print order: 80,000 copies.

"There was nothing common in religion, ways of living and customs and rites between the two nations", the Hindus and the Muslims (p. 6). "In 1857 the people of South Asia joined together to fight the British in order to win their independence; and this war is called the War of Independence" (p. 6). "Iqbal was the first to present to the nation the idea of Pakistan. In 1930 he demanded that an independent state should be created in all the areas of South Asia where the Muslims were in a majority" (p. 8). On the 1971 events: "Bharat engineered riots on a large scale through her agents and some mischievous people. Later, she attacked East Pakistan from four sides, and thus Pakistan had to fight a war with Bharat. This war lasted three weeks, and after that East Pakistan separated and became Bangladesh" (p. 11).

In Lesson No. 9 there are two pages on the armed forces of Pakistan (pp. 58-60). "At last when in 1956 a constitution was made for the country it never came into operation, and General Ayub Khan took over the government and put an end to this constitution" (p. 65). In later developments there is no mention of General Yahya Khan and his rule. Similarly, in the lesson on the administration of the country there is no mention of the *coup* of 1977 and of the Martial Law that followed for 11 years (pp. 65-69).

Jamaluddin Afghani was born in a village near Jalalabad in Afghanistan (p. 104). Iqbal was the first person to present the idea of Pakistan. He earned the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and "Barristery" from Germany and England. In 1930 he demanded that all the Muslim-majority areas of South Asia should be combined and a free Muslim government should be established there. He wrote letters to Jinnah who was then in England, requesting him to return to South Asia and lead the Muslims (pp. 108-109). The Muslim League session of 1940 held in Lahore demanded a separate independent state in South Asia for the Muslims (pp. 110-111).

All the statements made above are corrected in Chapter 2.

*Mu'asrati Uloom*, West Pakistan Textbook Board, Lahore, ed.. April 1969. pp. 160. Author: Muhammad Abdul Aziz, A. (Alig.), M.A. (London). Ph.D. (Indiana). West Pakistan Education Service (Senior). Director West Pakistan Bureau of Education. Lahore. The title page says it is published for the Board by Qaumi Kutab Khana, Lahore; the outside from cover says it is published for the Board by Pakistan Book Store, Lahore. Print order: 73,000 copies.

Part 1 (pp. 9-82) is entitled "History" and has 13 chapters or lessons: Hazrat Khadija, Hazrat Imam Husain, Muhammad bin Qasim. Hazrat Data Ganj Bakhsh. Shah Jalal Sylheti. Khushhal Khan Khattak, Shah Abdul Latil Bhitai, Nawab Salimullah Khan, Field Marshal Muhammad Ayub Khan. Chchamb and Jawrian Front. Sialkot Front, Pakistan Day, and Independence Day. The essays on Ganj Bakhsh, Jalal Sylheti and Bhitai don't give any dates at all, not even their centuries. On Slimullah Khan it is considered very important to mention that he received the title of Nawab Bahadur in 1903 (p. 44). The British divided Bengal in 1901 (p. 45) into "East Bengal and West Bengal" (p. 45).

The partition of Bengal was effected in 1905, not 1901; and the new provinces were not called East Bengal and West Bengal, but Eastern Bengal-and-Assam and Bengal.

The personality of Ayub Khan pervades the whole book. He is introduced as a person whom "everyone loves" for his piety and virtuous deeds (pp. 52-53). His ascension to power is explained in four delightful lines: "The system [*intiazam*] worked well in the early years after the creation of Pakistan. But gradually a few things went wrong [*kuchch kharabian paida ho gain*]. Black-market flourished in the country. Corruption became rampant. On this [*is par*] martial law was imposed in 1958" (p. 53). There is no reference to the political situation of the country.

The "revolution" [*inqilab*] brought about by Ayub wins the authors unqualified praise. "After the 1958 revolution new kinds of schools and universities were established. The number of factories increased very much. Thus the conditions [*halat*] of our country underwent a change (p. 54). The achievements of the Field Marshal's rule receive a fatal testimonial: "In order to refresh the memory of this revolution we celebrate the Revolution Day on the 27th of October every year. On this day there is a holiday in the entire country, and at night the buildings are lit up" (p. 54).

Chapters 10 and 11 (pp. 56-75) are detailed descriptions of the fighting on two fronts in the 1965 Indo-Pakistan war which amount to a glowing account of the Pakistan Army's achievements and feats of arms. Chapters 24 and 25 (pp. 147-160) of Part II (Geography) explain the working of basic democracies. Thus, in all, Ayub and his government have five chapters to themselves.

On the Lahore Resolution there are three factual errors on two pages (pp. 76-77): it was passed on "23 March", it was "adopted by the Muslims" (read Muslim League for the Muslims), and it demanded "a separate country". For correction of these errors see below Chapter 2.

Pakistan is said to have been created on 14 August 1947 (pp. 79-80). For the correct date see Chapter 2.

The real gem of the book appears on p. 139 in the Chapter on India, where it is stated that "previously it was a part of our country". Was Pakistan a part of India before 1947, or India a part of Pakistan? The author and the Textbook Board alone can answer this question.

The outer cover-*cum*-title page informs us that this book, though written in Urdu, is also prescribed for the English medium schools.

### Class 6

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*, NWFP Textbook Board, Peshawar, n.d., pp. 81. Authors of the History Section: Professor Alauddin Khilji, College of Education, Peshawar, Latif Mir, Chief Instructor, Education Extension Centre, Abbotabad; and Abdur Rauf Famqi, Jahanzeb College, Saidu Sharif. Author of Geography Section: Karamat Ali Shah, University Public School, University of Peshawar. Revised and edited by Professor Israruddin, Head of the Department of Geography, University of Peshawar, and Muhammad Halim, Subject Specialist, NWFP Textbook Board. Print order: 70,000 copies.

Chapters 6-8 deal with Ancient Civilization of South Asia (pp. 47-54), the Advent of the Muslims in South Asia (pp. 55-63), and British Rule over South Asia and the Pakistan Movement (pp. 64-72).

Some statements: "In 1857 the British imprisoned the last Mughal King, Bahadur Shah Zafar, and put an end to the Mughal monarchy" (p. 59). "Gradually, Urdu made so much progress that it became the spoken language of the entire South Asia" (p. 61). In northern South Asia the Hindu and Muslim dress was "nearly identical" (p. 61). "Besides King Akbar, some other Mughal princes also married the daughters of Hindu Rajas" (p. 62). The 1857 revolt was the "War of Independence" (p. 69). In the post-1857 period, "Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Allama Iqbal and other Muslim leaders began to underline the necessity of a separate state [*mamlakat*] for the Muslims" (pp. 71-72).

On the 1857 events and the importance of the Urdu language see Chapter 2. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan did not even mention the possibility of a separate state for the Muslims, far from having underlined its necessity.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore, 8th. Reprint, March 1989, pp. 80. Authors: Dr. Hasan Askari Rizvi, Nighat Naheed, Muhammad Umar and Hifsa Javed. Editors: Sahibzada Abdur Rasul and Hifsa Javed. Supervisor: Hifsa Javed. Print order: 145,000 copies.

The last 3 Chapters deal with history: The People of the Subcontinent in the Pre-Muslim Age (pp. 58-62), The Advent of Islam in the Subcontinent (pp. 63-70), and The Advent of the British in the Subcontinent (pp. 71-80).

Some statements: "The inhabitants of the subcontinent were fed up with British misdeeds. In 1857 they made an armed attempt to drive out the British and to restore the freedom of the subcontinent" (p. 76); the section is headed "War of Independence, 1857". "In 1885 the Hindus founded their own political party, the Indian National Congress" (p. 79). "In 1940 the Muslim League passed the Pakistan Resolution in Lahore" demanding "a separate free homeland" (p. 80).

In 1857 the "inhabitants of the subcontinent" did not make a bid for freedom, only a very small minority was involved in the uprising; nor was it a War of Independence. The Indian National Congress was not founded by the Hindus alone. The Lahore Resolution did not demand "a separate free homeland" but "independent states". Full details of the corrections are in Chapter.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*, Sindh Textbook Board, Jamshoro, 1st. ed., January 1989, pp. 104. Author: Edgar Victor. Print order: 90,000 copies

Some statements: "Living in one place the Hindus and the Muslims came very near to each other" (p. 86). "Muslim dress influenced the Hindus, and in a short time in South Asia the dress of the Hindus and the Muslims became almost identical" (p. 87). "Muslim food and cuisine became popular in every household ... The Hindus adopted the Islamic ways of furnishing and decorating their homes" (p. 90). The revolt of 1857 is called the "War of Independence" (pp. 99-100). "Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Alama Iqbal, Hasrat Mohani and other Muslim leaders began to emphasize the necessity of having a separate, free and independent state [*mamlakat*] for the Muslims" (pp. 102-103). The Pakistan Resolution said that "all the Muslim-majority areas of South Asia should be combined to create a free and independent state which should carry the name of Pakistan" (p. 103).

If the Hindus and the Muslims "came very near to each other" and their dress, food, houses and ways of living became identical, why did the Muslims later harp upon their

separate identity and nationalism and still later demand a state of their own? How did one culture and one civilization and a composite nationalism produce the Hindu-Muslim problem? The revolt of 1857 was not a War of Independence but a mutiny which developed into a resurrection. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan never emphasized the necessity of having a separate state for the Muslims; he did not even drop a hint about it. The Lahore Resolution neither demanded one state (it used the phrase "independent states") nor gave it the name of Pakistan. See Chapter 2 below.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum (Tarikh wa Shahriat)*, West Pakistan Textbook Board, Lahore, 1st. ed., March 1968. pp. 184. Author: Abdul Ghafur Chaudhri, B.A. (Hon's.) (London), M.A., M.Sc. (Alig.), Senior Editor, West Pakistan Textbook Board. Nazar Sani (editing, revising or supervising) by Dr. Abdul Hamid, M.A., Ph.D., Head of the Department of History, University of the Punjab, Lahore. Published for the Board by Kutab Khana Anjuman-i-Hamayati-Islam, Lahore. Print order: 170,000 copies. (The back outer cover says that it is the 4th edition published in March 1969 with a print order of 120,000. One does not know which statement to take as the correct one).

There are three parts to the book: History of India and Pakistan (pp.1-114), History of Islam (pp. 115-162), and Civics (pp. 163- 184).

Shah Waliullah and Sayyid Ahmad Bareilawi are mentioned (pp. 74-77), but contemporary Muslim developments in Bengal and elsewhere are omitted. The revolt of 1857 is called the "War of Independence" and those who fought in it "*majahidin*" (pp. 77-81). The Aligarh movement (pp. 83-86) and the Deoband school (pp. 86-87) receive adequate attention, but again Muslim Bengal is neglected.

"In 1885 the Hindus founded the Congress" (p. 85). "In 1885 an Englishman, Mr. Hume, founded the Indian National Congress" (p. 88). Now, both these statements cannot be correct. Hume was not a Hindu Englishman. In fact, neither of the assertions is true. The Congress was established neither by the Hindus (there were Muslims and Parsis in the gathering) nor by Hume (though Hume favored its emergence).

In 1930 Iqbal suggested that "the areas with a Muslim majority should be separated from the other provinces of India and made into an independent state in which Muslims are not only able to govern according to their own will [this sounds silly, but it is an exact translation of *apni marzi se hakumat kar saken*] but also promote Islamic civilization and culture" (p. 102). Iqbal said nothing of the sort in 1930; for full details of what he said see Chapter 2.

The "Pakistan Resolution" was passed "in March 1940", and it asked for the creation of "an independent Muslim State" (pp. 104-105). The resolution is given a wrong name; it should be Lahore Resolution. The exact date of its adoption is not provided: 24 March.

The resolution did not demand one state but "states". I have discussed these vulgar errors in Chapter 2.

At the Simla Conference of 1945 the "Congress leaders claimed that their party alone represents the whole of India and [said] that the Muslim League has no right to [claim to] be a representative of the Muslims" (pp. 106-107) (I have tried in my translation to make some sense out of the original obtuse Urdu). This is a dishonest version of what the Congress said. It only denied the Muslim League's claim to represent all the Muslims of India, pointed out its own Muslim membership, enumerated all other Muslim parties which did not support the League, and refused to accept the League's condition that it alone would nominate, and had the right to nominate, all the Muslim members of the planned Viceroy's Executive Council.

"The subcontinent was divided into two parts on 14 August 1947" (p. 109). For the inaccuracy of this statement see Chapter 2.

On the communal riots of 1947 the book is blatantly partial, mentioning only Hindu and Sikh massacres of "unarmed Muslims", and giving the impression that the Muslims did not even fight back in self-defence (p. 110).

In the 1965 war India "suffered great losses" and "her casualties (dead, not just wounded) were ten times those of Pakistan" (pp. 158-159). This is a poor likeness to truth. It should also be noted that the chapter on the 1965 war is included in the part on the "History of Islam", not in the one on "History of India and Pakistan", and is placed immediately after the three chapters on the Umayyads. What will the student make of this?

The last chapter of the book (pp. 176-184) is in praise of basic democracies.

Two further weaknesses of the book should be noted. It makes no reference at all to such important institutions and developments as the All India Muslim Conference and the negotiations at the Round Table Conferences. It completely ignores Muslim Bengal's political and intellectual evolution.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore, 1st. experimental edition, second reprint, March 1984, pp. 97. Authors: Bashiruddin Malik, Muhammad Aslam, Azhar Hameed and Abdul Qadeer. Editor: Bashiruddin Malik. Supervisors: Mrs. Hifsa Sayed and Sibti-i-Hasan. Published for the Board by Kutab Khana Anjuman-i-Hamayati-Islam, Lahore. Print order: 30,000 copies.

The "experimental" edition lasted a long time, because it carries a notification of approval of the Government of the Punjab dated 20 November 1974.

Professor Nazir Ahmad Awan, Chairman of the Punjab Textbook Board, issues a warning (called "appeal" in Urdu) on the inside front cover that "you are not obliged to buy any books additional to the Board's publications; if you are forced to do this, you should inform the undersigned". It is not clear whether "you" stands for the teacher, or the student.

In their preface the authors spell out the objective of the book: "Social Studies have been given special importance in the educational policy [of the Government] so that Pakistan's basic ideology assumes the shape of a way of life, its practical enforcement is assured, the concept of social uniformity adopts a practical form and the whole personality of the individual is developed" (literal translation). Presumably these goals have determined the contents of the book: the Muslim World. There are only a few scattered reference to Pakistan, but even these are muddle-headed, inadequate and misleading.

On the 1971 break-up of Pakistan: "Right from the time of the creation of Pakistan some enemy countries were bent upon separating East Pakistan from West Pakistan. The machinations of such countries bore fruit in 1971, and East Pakistan was separated from the other part of the country and was given the name of Bangladesh" (p. 78). This is the complete and exhaustive description of the crisis in three lines. For my corrective commentary see Chapter 2.

Chapter II (pp. 81-90) contains a few biographies, like those of Jamaluddin "Afghani", Muhammad Ali Jauhar, Iqbal and Jinnah. None of them carries any dates or years. In Jamaluddin's case (pp. 81-82) his visit to India is not mentioned. The 10-line note on Iqbal tells us that he "presented the idea of a separate homeland for the Muslims in 1930 in his presidential address at the annual session of the Muslim League held in Allahabad" (p. 86), which is a mockery of the truth. See Chapter 2.

### Class 7

*Mu'ashrati Uloom*, NWFP Textbook Board, Peshawar, n.d., pp. 81. Authors: Professor Dr. Muhammad Nazir Kakakhel, Government College, Nowshetra, and Professor Muhammad Nisar, Government College, Mardan. Revised and edited by Professor Israruddin, Head of the Department of Geography, University of Peshawar, and Muhammad Halim, Subject Specialist, NWFP Textbook Board. Print order: 10.000 copies.

Chapter 1-4 (pp. 1-42) deal with the Muslim world, but not with its history. Jamaluddin Afghani is "said to have been born" in Afghanistan (p.31) which was "his real home" (p. 32). See my correction in Chapter 2.



Only 4 pages (35-38) are spared for Indian Muslim history, and that is done by way of 3 essays on Muhammad Ali Jauhar, Iqbal and Jinnah. On Muhammad Ali, there is no reference at all to his career in the Congress. On Iqbal, we are told that he earned "the degrees of Barristery and of doctorate in philosophy from England" and that in 1930 he demanded "a separate Islamic State". On Jinnah, we are informed that at the age of 16 he "left for England to work for a degree in law", and that it was under his presidentship that the Muslim League passed a resolution in 1940 "demanding a separate homeland" for the Muslims of India. All these mistakes are corrected in Chapter 2.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*, Shaikh Sirajuddin and Sons, Lahore, for the Punjab Textbook Board, 10th reprint, March 1989. pp. 74. Authors: Dr. Hasan Askari Rizvi and Nighat Naheed. Editors: Sayyid Masud Raza and Sibti-i-Hasan. Supervisor: Mrs. Hifsa Javed. Prepared by the Punjab Textbook Board. Print order: 146,000 copies.

The first 4 Chapters (pp. 1-34) follow the order, organization, titles and contents of the book published by the NWFP Textbook Board (see above), but make two additional mistakes: Muhammad Ali Jauhar "received his higher education at Oxford, as a result of which he was given the degree of honors" (p.26; the subject is not mentioned); in England Iqbal, in collaboration with Sayyid Ameer Ali, organized the London Muslim League (p. 28). On the London Muslim League see below, Chapter 2.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum*, Sindh Textbook Board, Jamshoro, 1st. ed., February 1989, pp.114. Author: Sayyid Humid Ali Jafri. Print order: 90,000 copies.

Some statements: "Sayyid Jamaluddin Afghani was born in 1838 in a village called Sadabad in Afghanistan" (p. 50). Iqbal received the "degrees" of Ph.D. and "Barristery"; "he gave to the Muslims of South Asia the idea of establishing an independent government [*hakumat*] in the Muslim-majority areas" (p. 54); in March 1940 the Muslim League, in the historic resolution passed by it, demanded "a separate independent Islamic government [*hakumat*]" (p. 56).

Each of these statements is a foul-up. I deal with all of them in Chapter 2.

*Mu'ashrati Ulum (Tarikh wa Shahriat)*, West Pakistan Textbook Board, Lahore, 3rd. ed., April 1969, pp.207. Author: Abdul Ghafur Chaudhri, B.A. (Hon's.) (London), M.A., M.Sc. (Alig.), Senior Editor, West Pakistan Textbook Board. Nazar Sani (editing, revising or supervising) by Dr. M.D. Malik, M.A., Ph.D. (Washington), Professor, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore. Published for the Board by Qaumi Kutab Khana, Lahore. Print order: 55,000 copies.

The book is divided into five parts: Freedom Movement of the Subcontinent (pp. 1-100), History of Islam (pp. 101-129), Pakistan-India War (pp. 130-156), Civics (pp. 157-173), and Government's Income and Expenditure (pp. 174-207).

Distortions and misreports abound:

On 1857: "This war was a holy war [*jihad*] waged by the Muslims against the English government in which others also participated" (p. 20). In simpler language, the mutiny was conceived, initiated and prosecuted by the Muslims as a religious duty but others, that is the non-Muslims, also took part in it. It is not explained how and why the non-Muslims became partners in a holy war. I discuss the events of 1857 in some detail in Chapter 2.

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan wrote a book in "the War of Independence" of 1857 (p. 31). He did not. His book was entitled *Rasala-i-Asbab-i-Baghawat-i-Hindh*, Treatise on the Causes of the Rebellion of India. Rebellion is far removed from a war of independence. In Urdu vocabulary and usage *baghawat* is an act of illegality, contumacy and treason.

The "All India Congress was founded by an Englishman named Mr. Hume" (p. 31). It was the Indian National Congress, not the All India Congress; and it was not founded by Hume.

The Congress "enjoyed right from the start the patronage of the Government" (p. 31). There is no evidence of this. If the Government of India and Lord Dufferin looked kindly at its establishment, the same government and Lord Minto also looked with benignance at the All India Muslim League on its birth and for some years after.

The Simla Deputation of 1906 asked for "separate electorates in elections to the councils" (p. 38). That was only one of the issues raised by the Deputation. It also asked with equal emphasis for weightage in all elected bodies, and this ought to have been mentioned in the book.

The Lucknow Pact of 1916 is mentioned twice and in some detail (pp. 41, 46-47), without referring to its disastrous results for the Muslims of Bengal and the Punjab. I deal with this matter at some length in Chapter 2.

In 1930 Iqbal "demanded in clear terms that Muslims should establish their own independent state and found a new *mamlakat* by merging the Punjab, Sarhad, Baluchistan and Sindh" (p. 44). For what Iqbal actually said see below Chapter 2.

When a Hindu-Muslim agreement was not forthcoming at the Round Table Conference "the British Government announced the new reforms in 1935 on its own initiative (*apni taraf se*)" (p. 53). The presentation is warped by ignorance about the making of the

Government of India Act of 1935. It was only the Communal Award of 1932 which was given by the British Prime Minister because the Hindu and Muslim delegates could not agree on the quantum of seats for each community in the central and provincial legislatures. The reforms came about as a result of a lengthy process of inquiries, high-level talks, parleys, negotiations, exchange of views and discussions ranging in time from the Indian tours of the Simon Commission in 1928 to the deliberations of the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform in 1933. Throughout these years the Indian leaders were in close touch with the British Government.

The Lahore Resolution demanded the creation of "two independent states in the country" (p. 55). For correction see Chapter 2.

The Cripps Mission came to India in 1940 (p. 55). The year should be read as 1942.

"On 14 August 1947 the two new independent states called Pakistan and Hindustan came into being" (p. 61). Read 15 August for 14 August. The name "Hindustan" was not mentioned in the Indian Independence Act, nor has the post-1947 India ever called herself by this name.

Four pages (pp. 163-67) are devoted to a description of the deteriorating political conditions in Pakistan between 1947 and 1958 so that the student's mind is fully prepared to accept as a blessing the imposition of martial law and the advent of Ayub Khan's rule.

In 1960 Ayub Khan was elected President of the country and with this event "democracy was restored in the country". Then "Ayub served the country with such distinction that he was re-elected in 1965" (p. 68). By omitting any mention of the restricted scope and value of basic democracies, the small size of the electoral college, the growing anti-Ayub feeling in the country, the fact of Miss Fatima Jinnah's contesting the presidency in 1965 with the backing of an all-parties alliance, and the far from unanimous vote in favor of Ayub, the author has proved his loyalty as a civil servant but held back vital information from the students.

One long chapter (pp. 69-100) on the Ayub administration and a separate part of the book (p. 130-157) sing Ayub's praises as President, laud the achievements of the armed forces in the 1965 war, and assert that the Pakistan Army "is counted among the best armies of the world" (pp. 135-136).

Out of a total of 207 pages, 63 deal with the history of India and Pakistan up to 1958 and 29 with the history of Islam; the remaining 115 are allotted to Ayub Khan's reign.

## Class 8

*Mu'ashrati Uloom*, MWFP Textbook Board, Peshawar, n.d., pp. 96. Authors: Professor Timur Khattak, Department of Geography, University of Peshawar Professor Allauddin Khilji, M.A., College of Education, University of Peshawar; and Professor Muhammad Nazir Kakakhel, Government College, Nawshehra;. Revised and edited by Professor Israruddini, Head of the Department of Geography, University of Peshawar, and Muhammad Halim, Subject Specialist, NWFP Textbook Board. Print order: 55.000 copies.

Chapters 8 and 9 (pp. 72-86) deal with the Indian history between 1857 and 1947. On the 1857 event: "the British gave in the name of mutiny and called their opponents 'rebels'. But this war was the first united Indian effort [*sic*] against the British government. The Muslims were in the forefront in this war. Granted that it did not result in the winning of independence, but the failure produced a new zeal and enthusiasm in the hearts of the Muslims, and as a result the state [*mamlakat*] of Pakistan came into existence in 1947" (p. 73).

The thought of connecting the revolt of 1857 with the creation of Pakistan is a contrived caricature the absurdity of which takes one's breath away. For 1857 see Chapter 2.

As a result of the 1937 elections "the provincial governments were formed by the Congress or the Muslim League" (p. 77; the League came into power in only one province). Mountbatten came to India as Governor General "in 1946" (p. 77). "The decision to divide the subcontinent into two parts was taken on 14 August 1947" (p. 77).

Mountbatten took over as Viceroy of India in March 1947. The decision to divide India was taken on 3 June; the decision was implemented on 15 August.

"The partition of Bengal was annulled in 1911 and the province of Bengal was reunited. Now the Muslims realized that their political future could not be the same as the Hindus and that if they had to assert their separate identity they must form a separate party of their own" (p. 78; thus the Muslim League was formed after 1911). In 1930 Iqbal suggested the creation of a "separate" Muslim "state" [*manlakat*] (p. 80). "After delivering his Allahabad address Iqbal lived for only eight years; during this period he waged a magnificent campaign in favor of creating such a separate *mamlakat* through his poetry, speeches and personal correspondence" (p. 81). The "Pakistan" Resolution of "23 March 1940" demanded "one independent *hakumat* .... and one independent *mamlakat* in the north-western and north-eastern areas with Muslim majorities". (p. 83).

On Iqbal and the Lahore Resolution see Chapter 2.

On the 1971 break-up of Pakistan: "The death of the Quaid-i-Azam was followed by several political changes in Pakistan. Internal and external enemies used every method to injure it. As a result of these enmities and conspiracies in 1971 East Pakistan separated from us" (p. 86).

For a detailed discussion of the 1971 break-up see Chapter 2. *Mu'ashrati Uloom*, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore, 1st ed., March 1989, pp. 130. Authors: Qazi Abdul Qadeer, Dr. Sarfaraz Husain Qazi, Dr. Azhar Hayseed, Professor Bashiruddin Malik, Professor Ansar Husain, Munawwar ibn-i-Sidiq, Muhammad Shaft Mirza, Dr. Shahhaz Khan, and Malik Amiruddin Ahsan. Editors: Nur Muhammad Malik, Sibti-i-Hasan and Mrs. Hifsa Javed. Supervisor: Mrs. Hifsa Javed. Print order: 140,000 copies.

Chapters 8-10 (pp. 85-110) deal with the history of the years 1857-1947. The 1857 revolt was "the war of independence" (p. 85). The object of the establishment of the Indian National Congress was "to organize the Hindus politically" (p. 89). The Simla Deputation of 1 October 1906 was "led by Nawab Muhsinul Mulk" (p. 90). "The Simon Commission was boycotted by both the Congress and the Muslim League" (p. 96). "The idea of the necessity for a separate homeland [*watan*] for the Muslims was a pretty old one. Several Muslim leaders had hinted at it from time to time. But it's clear concept was offered by Allama Iqbal in his Allahabad address of 1930. In 1933 Chaudhri Rahmat Ali gave it the name of Pakistan" (p. 102).

The gaffes contained in all these statements are corrected below in Chapter 2.

*Mu'ashrati Uloom*, Sindh Textbook Board, Jamshoro, 2nd ed., May 1989, pp. 104. Authors: Edgar Victor, Professor Dr. Muhammad Hasan Shaikh and Professor Muhammad Rafique Dhanani. Print order: 10,000 copies.

Some statements: The events of 1857 were a "war of independence" (p. 81); "Allama Iqbal is called the Philosopher of Pakistan because he offered the concept of Pakistan" (p. 86); "through his poetry, speeches, and personal correspondence Iqbal struggled for the creation of a separate state [*mumalakat*] for the Muslims" (p. 87); "the Pakistan Resolution of 23 March ... demanded a separate independent state" (p. 89); "after Jinnah's death many political changes occurred in Pakistan, internal and external enemies tried to damage the country in every possible way, and as a result of these conspiracies East Pakistan separated from us in 1971 ... but now Pakistan has become so strong that the Islamic countries consider it as the fortress of Islam, and God willing soon Pakistan will be counted among the countries of the first rank in the world" (p. 92).

For correction of inaccuracies see Chapter 2. The declaration contained in the last sentence about Pakistan being "the fortress of Islam" would have been derisive even if made from the public platform of a third rate political party. Coming from three professors in a textbook it is infuriating. Assuming that the professors believe in the

purity of the claim they are making, do they also know for certain that it will pass for truth among the hundreds of teachers and thousands of students who would be reading the book? Will the readers give faith to what the book says, or will they subscribe to what they see with their own eyes happening around them? Or, are the professors telling them that corruption, cheating, terrorism, exploitation, drug-traffic, arms-smuggling, rape and looting are supreme Islamic virtues?

### Classes 9-10

*Mutala'a-i-Pakistan*, Idara-i-Firogh-i-Ta'lim Peshawar, for the NWFP Textbook Board, n.d., p. 198. Authors: Professor Dr. Muhammad Nazir Kakakhel, Department of Political Science. University of Peshawar; Professor Faizan Ahmed, Principal, Government Degree College, Kohat; and Professor Nisar Muhammad Khan. Government Degree College, Mardan. Revised and edited by Professor Dr. Muhammad Nazi: Kakakhel, Department of Political Science. University of Peshawar, and Muhammad Halim, Subject Specialist, NWFP Textbook Board. Prepared by the NWFP Textbook Board. Prin: order: 40,000 copies.

Two Chapters deal with history: Islamic Society in South Asia (pp. 7-20) and The Making of Pakistan (pp. 21-42). Statements in the latter: the 1857 events were a "war of independence" (p. 21); the Indian National Congress is called "All India National Congress" (p. 24); the Lucknow Pact of 1916 was a triumph for the Muslims (p. 26); in 1930 Iqbal clearly argued in favor of the two-nation theory and a "separate *mamlakat*" for the Muslims of India (p. 31); the "Pakistan" Resolution, passed on 23 March 1940, demanded "an independent and free Muslim state" (p. 34); as soon as independence was declared in 1947 "Hindus and Sikhs started an unhindered (*be daregh*) massacre of Muslims in India" (p. 40; there is no mention of the riots in Pakistan).

I have already noted all these illusions; they occur in nearly every book. They are removed in Chapter 2.

Statements in the rest of the book are equally misleading. The 1971 break-up is summarized in 7 lines thus: "As there were serious differences on the constitutional issue between the two major parties the first session of the Assembly could not be summoned. When the differences became grave [*sangin*] and the conditions in East Pakistan went out of control, the Martial Law government took military action there which resulted in civil war situation. Profiting from this state of affairs, India started a military action [*fauji karwai*] against Pakistan. As a result of a war between the two countries the Pakistan Army had to surrender on 16 December 1971, and East Pakistan, sundered from Pakistan, became Bangladesh" (p. 51).

For the break-up of Pakistan see below Chapter 2.

The 1977 *coup* is described and justified in 4 lines: "The Pakistan National Alliance started a movement in favor of fresh elections which gradually fumed into the Tahrik-i-Nizam-i-Mustafa. Exhaustive and prolonged talks began between the government and the opposition, but when they produced no positive result and the state of law and order deteriorated, the armed forces, under the leadership of General Muhammad Zia-ul-Huq, took over the reins of power on 5 July 1977" (pp. 54-55). Zia's decision to continue in power is defended in 3 lines: "It was announced that elections will be held within 90 days and power handed over to the representatives of the masses, but the elections scheduled to be held within 90 days were postponed for unavoidable reasons" (p. 55).

See the sections on the *Zia coup* and the *Zia years* in Chapter 2.

Two examples of destoration of historical and contemporary facts from the Chapter on culture:

"Before independence, Urdu was the language of the masses in the northern part of South Asia, and it still is"; "in the modern period Urdu is making considerable progress and books on all genres and subjects have been written in it"; "the roots of the national language lie in the national traditions, values and thinking, and it reflects them. People of all free countries feel a pride in talking in their own national language. Therefore, if we behave like people of a slavish mentality and think of making English our national language, we will be making ourselves the laughing stock for everyone. Similarly, no regional language can be given this status" (pp. 141-142). "National dress is a symbol of national identity. People of very self-respecting nation take pride in their national dress. A few years ago, in our country, a Presidential Order made the wearing of the national dress obligatory in all government offices and functions, and this is now being carried out. The national dress is *shalwar, qamis or kurta, shirwani* and Jinnah cap" (p. 147).

For both Urdu and the national dress see Chapter 2.

*Mutala'a-i-Pakistan*, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore, 9th reprint, March 1989, pp. 184. Authors: Dr. Hasan Askari Rizvi. Javed Iqbal and Ghulam Abid Khan. Editors: Professor Muhammad Aslam and Muhammad Salim Akhtar. Supervisors: Hifsa Javed and Sibti-i-Hasan. Prepared by the Punjab Textbook Board. Print order 171,000 copies.

Muslim rule in India is disposed of in 5 pages (pp. 9-13); and we are told that "in the subcontinent the Muslim rulers based their administrative system on Islamic principles, and for this reason their rule was more popular than that of the non-Muslim rulers" (pp. 9-10); that "the local people [of India] adopted the Muslim way of life in their dress and food" (p. 10); that "the British came to the subcontinent to trade with it, but they

employed methods [*harbe*] of power and cunning. After the failure of the war of independence of 1857 the period of Muslim rule came to an end" (P. 13).

Did the Hindus of India prefer the rule of foreign Muslim invaders to the rule of their own co-religionists? Was Mahmud Ghaznawi their hero? As for the Islamic nature of the Muslim rule, was Akbar's administration based on *shariat*? In cultural matters the Hindus adopted neither Muslim dress nor Muslim food. The Hindus did not wear *shalwar* or eat beef.

Twenty pages are allotted to the period 1906-1947 (pp. 15-30), and here we find the following gems of knowledge and information:

In 1930 at Allahabad Iqbal "prescribed his solution of the political problems of the subcontinent: the Muslims should have a state of their own" (p. 21).

Iqbal did not suggest any such thing. See Chapter 2 for details.

In 1937 "the Congress won the elections by chance" (p. 21). This a plain lie. I give details of the results of the 1937 elections in Chapter 2.

The Lahore or Pakistan Resolution "of 23 Mach 1940" demanded that the Muslims of the subcontinent should have "their own homeland" (p. 22).

Both the date and meaning of the Lahore Resolution are wrong. Corrections in Chapter 2.

In 1947 the British Prime Minister was "Lord Attlee" (p. 26).

In 1947 the British Prime Minister was Mr. Attlee. The professors have no legal right to bestow a peerage on a commoner, that belongs to the British monarch. They also have no right to foresee Attlee as an Earl several years later, that belongs to God.

"After the establishment of Pakistan the Hindus and Sikhs created a day of doom for the Muslims in East Punjab" (p. 27).

Didn't the Muslims create a similar day of doom for the Hindus and the Sikhs in West Punjab and Sindh? The first communal killing on a large scale took place in Rawalpindi and it was the work of the Muslims, the Sikhs being the victims.

"The Punjab played an important part in the nationalist struggle. In the beginning, some Muslim leaders kept away from the Muslim League for the sake of their personal gain and because of their links with the British, and they joined the Unionist Party and opposed the creation of Pakistan. But the masses of the Punjab gave their full support to



the demand for Pakistan, with the result that these Unionist leaders were forced to change their views" (p. 29).

The Punjab Unionist Party is discussed below in Chapter 2.

On the break-up of the country: "The military government of Yahya Khan held the first general elections in December 1970 so that the elected representatives should prepare a new constitution for the country. After the elections the country fell victim to a political crisis. Taking advantage of the situation, foreign enemies also spread a network of conspiracies against Pakistan. India created an army, made up of Bengalis and called Mukti Bahini, and through it instigated disorder in East Pakistan. Later, on the pretext of coming to the help of the Mukti Bahini, the Indian Army entered East Pakistan, as a result of which the province of East Pakistan was separated from the rest of the country: (p. 40).

I deal with the disordered vision of the 1971 crisis in Chapter 2.

"There are many countries of the world where more languages than one are spoken. In most of the countries in Asia and Africa several languages are spoken. All the languages spoken in a country are a part of its culture. But one of these is used for purposes of national contact [*rabita*]; this language is called the national language" (p. 110).

"The prominent characteristic of Urdu is that it absorbs efficiently within itself words of various [other] languages" (P. 111).

For the hollowness of the tall claims made on behalf of Urdu see Chapter 2.

*Mutala-i-Pakistan*, Sindh Textbook Board, Jamshoro. 4th ed., September 1989. p. 168. Authors Professor Sayyid Qawi Ahmad, Professor Dr. Qazi Shakil Ahmad, Professor Dr. Muhammad Hasan Sheikh, Professor Anwaar Ahmadzai, and Professor Rafique Ahmad Dhanani. Print order: 15,000 copies.

The 1857 revolt is called the "war of independence" (p. 11). Iqbal in 1930 advocated the creation of a Muslim state (p. 17). The Lahore Resolution demanded that "the Muslims of the subcontinent must have their separate homeland" (p. 27). On 1971: "After the elections the country fell a victim to a political crisis, and exploiting this situation foreign enemies spread a network of conspiracies against Pakistan, as a result of which East Pakistan separated from the country" (p. 33). On the *coup* of 1977: "In the light of the increasing political disorder, on 5th July 1977, General Muhammad Ziaul Huq, the head of the Army, imposed Martial Law on the country and took over the reins of the government" (p. 37).

All these points are covered in Chapter 2.

On the Punjabi language: "Novel, drama and short story began to be created in the Punjabi language at the beginning of the twentieth century. At the same time Punjabi journalism had its birth. After this the trend started of writing in the Punjabi language on new subjects like art, philosophy, history, linguistics, economics, geography, medicine, law, etc. And today there is a considerable collection of published and unpublished masterpieces in the language" (pp. 117-118).

On reading this I made inquiries from friends and acquaintances, contacted oriental publishers and booksellers, talked to some of the staff in the Department of Punjabi at the University of the Punjab, and visited the major academic and public libraries in Lahore. My findings amounted to this: apart from an extremely modest corpus of literary creations there is nothing available in the language. I failed to locate anything written in Punjabi on economics, philosophy, medicine, law or geography. The "considerable collection" exists in the fertile imagination of the Sindhi professors.

"Urdu is such a language that it contains words from every language [of the world]. And it is a feature of this language that when it accepts a word from any other language it makes it its own" (p. 119).

On this see Chapter 2 below.

"The national dress of Pakistan is very simple and elegant. Men wear *shalwar, qamiz* or *kurta, shirwani* and cap or turban; women generally wear, *shalwar, qamiz* and *dupana*" (p. 122).

This is discussed in Chapter 2.

*Mutala-i-Pakistan, Sawalan Jawaban*, by Sayyid Munir Ali Jafri. Gardezi Publishers, Karachi, 1st ed., 13 March 1986, pp. 176.

This is a help book or a "made easy" for the students of class 9. It carries a note by Sayyid Abdul Ghaffar Gardezi, the Publisher, which calls the author a man of letters, journalist and poet of Islam "of whom the country is proud" (p. 4).

Some statements: Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan "established a school for the Muslims at Aligarh in 1878" (p. 33). Sayyid Ameer Ali established the "Muhammadan Association" in Calcutta (p. 35).

The Simla deputation demanded that the Muslims should be given representation in the new Councils in accordance with their number; there is no mention of weightage (p. 39). The Nehru Report came out in 1938 (p. 44).

The MAO School of Aligarh opened on 24 May 1875, not 1878. Sayyid Ameer Ali's party was called the Central National Muhammadan Association. The Nehru Report was issued in 1928, not 1938.

Jinnah was a member of the Indian National Congress when Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan was asking the Muslims to keep away from it (p. 49). Iqbal presented the concept of Pakistan at Allahabad and in 1940 the Pakistan Resolution demanded "one Muslim state" (p. 49). This resolution was passed on "23 March 1940" (p. 50). The Resolution asked for the creation of "an independent country" for the Muslims (p. 51).

When Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan was asking the Muslims to keep away from the Congress, Jinnah was a 12-year old student. Iqbal did not present the concept of Pakistan at Allahabad. The Lahore Resolution did not demand one Muslim state or an independent country but "independent states". See details in Chapter 2.

"What explains the delay in the making of the constitution of the country? The politicians of our country know the reasons very well. No sooner had Pakistan been established than a network of political conspiracies was spread, and self-interested elements became busy in pursuing their own interests" (p. 60).

Were Jinnah and his colleagues in the Pakistan movement pawns of this conspiracy?

"With the coming of Muhammad bin Qasim the Islamic period of South Asia began, and it lasted about one thousand years, that is till the war of independence of 1857" (p. 144).

Muhammad bin Qasim did not conquer South Asia in 712, but only a small corner of it. And nearly 300 years intervene between him and Mahmud Ghaznawi's establishment of his rule in the Punjab. To date the Muslim rule over the subcontinent from 712 is bad geography and worse history. In 1857 there was a mutiny, not a war of independence; for this see Chapter 2. The "Islamic period" had ended several decades before 1857 when the Mughal emperors had consented to become pensioners of the British.

"Pakistan has been established on the very foundations of Islam. Therefore, the culture of the country is naturally based on Islamic values. But it is sad to see that there is still in the country one such section of people which has owned the Western way of life and is avoiding the adoption of the Western way of life and is avoiding the adoption of the Islamic way of life. Such people can only be called ignorant [*nadan*] (p. 145).

The "one such section" has not been identified. Is it the Westernized, educated elite which runs the administration, the army, the business and commerce and the colleges and universities of the country, or is it any political party?

"The people of the Punjab speak Punjabi language, and their special dress is *shalwar* and turban" (p. 145).

This is as illuminating a piece of information as the statement that the people of France speak French or the people of Greece speak Greek. If their "special dress" is *shalwar* and turban, with what do they cover the part of the body lying between the turban and the *shalwar*? I am a Punjabi, but I have never seen anyone in my province wearing a *shalwar* on his lower body and a turban on his head and leaving his trunk bare. More interestingly, this is supposed to be his "special dress". One wonders if he goes naked most of the time.

"The special feature of Urdu is that it is spoken not only in every nook and corner of South Asia but people who know and understand it are found in the whole world .... Gradually Urdu has developed to a stage where now it is considered one of the more developed languages of the world. Not only that, but next to Arabic. Urdu is the only language which has no equal in the world. The fact is that even English and French languages are losing their popularity and importance before the Urdu language" (p. 147).

Two claims deserve notice and then ridicule. First, Arabic as a language has no equal in the world (we are not told in what sense). Secondly, Urdu comes next in the order of this distinction. But the author, who is also a poet of Islam of whom Pakistan is proud, proceeds recklessly to enter another title on behalf of Urdu, and on his way in this hazardous journey gives us the great and heart-wanting news that in the world of today Urdu is leaving English and French behind in popularity and importance. He should have gone the whole hog and told us that the British and the French are giving up their languages and adopting Urdu.

*Mutala-i-Pakistan*, Sawalan Jawaban, by Muhammad Inamuddin, B.Com., B.Ed., Maktaba-i-Azmia, Karachi, n.d., pp. 152.

The book is meant for classes 9-10, and contains the following bits of information:

Iqbal in his Muslim League address of 1930 "at Lucknow" offered the idea of a separate homeland for the Muslims (p. 28). The Lahore Resolution of "23 March 1940" demanded "an independent country" (p. 28). General Ayub Khan took over power in October 1958 because the politicians and rulers of the country had been postponing general elections (p. 38). "Ayub Khan resigned because of a popular agitation against him and transferred authority to Yahya Khan .... In December 1971 the first general elections were held so that the elected representatives could make a constitution. After the elections Pakistan fell victim to a serious crisis and foreign conspiracies. In this state of disorder [*afratafri*] in December 1971 the fall of East Pakistan took place" (p. 39).

Iqbal spoke at Allahabad, not Lucknow, and he did not offer the idea of a Muslim homeland; perhaps if he had spoken in Lucknow he would have done so, for place maketh the man: Ayub Khan overthrew the government on the eve of the first general election of the country. Under which law or constitutional provision did Ayub transfer his authority as President of the Republic to the Commander-in-Chief of the Army? East Pakistan did not fall in an *afratafri*; it fell because all Bengali Pakistanis were fed up with Pakistan, the Pakistan Army was playing the tyrant in the most atrocious manner, and the Pakistan armed forces were defeated by India. *Afratafri* is too feeble a word even to act as a euphemism for defeat, humiliation, chaos, civil war and national disaster.

"Urdu is a part of our cultural heritage. Urdu is the only language which is still spoken from Peshawar to Raskumari. Urdu is not older than Arabic, English and Sanskrit, but it has a unique capacity for accepting words from other languages" (p. 106).

I have discussed these fairy tales about Urdu in one of my previous notes and I do it again below in Chapter 2. Here I only ask one question: is Urdu a part of the cultural heritage of the Baluchis, the Sindhis, the Pathans and even the Punjabis? Why can't Mr. Inamuddin of Karachi accept the fact that the Urdu-speaking portion of Karachi is not the whole of Pakistan?

"In the beginning of the twentieth century modern Punjabi literature was born, and novel, drama and short story began to be written. After 1920 many books were written in Punjabi on art, philosophy, history, linguistics, economics, geography, medicine and law; today we have a large collection of these writings, and the literary productions of the language are on the increase" (p. 108).

This point has been covered in one of my earlier comments.

### **Higher Secondary Level: Urdu Medium**

*Mutalia-i-Pakistan*, Sindh Textbook Board, Jamshoro, first ed., August 1989. By various authors. Editors: Muhammad Salim Akhtar, Senior Subject Specialist, Mrs. Hifsa Javed, Subject Specialist, and Sibti-i-Hasan, Subject Specialist. Approved by the Government of Sindh for use in the territories covered by the Boards of Intermediate and Secondary Education of Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkur. Print order: 10,000.

It is identical with the NWFP textbook that follows.

*Mutalia-i-Pakistan*. NWFP Textbook Board, Peshawar, n.d., pp. 183. Each chapter written by a different author. Editors, Muhammad Saleem Akhtar, Senior Subject Specialist. Mrs. Hifsa Javed, Subject Specialist, and Sibti-i-Hasan, Subject Specialist. Print order: 15,000 copies.

Chapter 1, The Establishment of Pakistan, by Professor Sahibzada Abdur Rasul (pp. 1-32), contains such statements as: "Muslims are by nature lovers of freedom. They don't accept anyone's slavery. During British rule they were continuously struggling for the achievement of independence" (p. 7); there is no mention of the Red Shirts or the Congress in the account of the modern history of NWFP (p. 11), nor of the Unionist Party with reference to the Punjab (pp. 13-14); "Iqbal was the first person to present the idea of an independent Muslim state" (p. 14); "with the failure of the 1857 war of independence Muslim power in India came to an end" (pp. 15-16); the Indian National Congress "strove for the rights of the Hindus" (p. 16); in the list of the aims and objects of the All India Muslim League, as laid down in 1906, the item on loyalty to the British is omitted (p. 17); and the Lucknow Pact "increased the importance" of the Muslims (p. 18).

If the Muslims don't accept anyone's slavery, how do we explain to the students the historical and very well-known fact that for long years the entire Muslim world save Turkey was under European imperial rule? This leads to another question. If the Muslims don't accept anyone's slavery, why have they, throughout their history, imposed or tried to impose such slavery on other peoples? Does a different moral code govern Muslim behavior? The statement on Iqbal has no basis. The 1857 revolt was not a war of independence. The Congress strove for the rights of the majority of the Indian people, not of the Hindus exclusively. The Lucknow Pact, far from increasing the importance of the Muslims, made it possible for Bengali and Punjabi Muslims to rule over their own provinces. See also below Chapter 2.

Chapter 2, History of Pakistan, by Dr. Professor Yar Muhammad (pp. 32-55), offers us the following information: the Lahore Resolution was passed on "23 March 1940" (p. 33); at the end of the war the Labour Party came into power in Britain under "Lord Mice" (p. 35); "after the partition of the subcontinent the Hindus and Sikhs started a properly planned campaign of exploiting [*istishal*] the Muslims generally in the whole of Bharat and particularly in East Pakistan, as a result of which the Hindu and Sikh enemies of mankind killed and dishonored thousands, nay hundreds of thousands, of women, children, the old and the young with extreme cruelty and heartlessness" (pp. 40-41).

The date of the Lahore Resolution should be read as 24 March. Attlee was not a peer when he became prime minister of Britain in 1945. The Hindus and Sikhs were not the only aggressors in the riots of 1947; Muslims also killed and raped and looted wherever they had the opportunity.

Chapter 3, Establishing an Islamic State, by Dr. Hasan Askari Rizvi (pp. 56-71), glides over the major turning points of the country's history with spurious glibness: "The 1956 constitution lasted only two years and a half. On 7 October 1958 the Army, led by General (later Field Marshal) Muhammad Ayub Khan, assumed power" (p. 59): Ayub

"resigned on 25 March 1969 and handed over his authority to the Commander-in-Chief, General Muhammad Yahya Khan" (p. 61); "before the major political parties which had been successful in the elections could draw up a new constitution, some internal and external elements collaborated to create the situation of a civil war in East Pakistan, which later assumed the shape of an India-Pakistan war, with the result that on 16 December 1971 East Pakistan separated from us and became the *mamlakat* of Bangladesh" (p. 62); "when no agreement could be reached between the Government and the Pakistan National Alliance and the political situation of the country began to deteriorate, on 5 July 1977 the Army, led by General Ziaul Huq, assumed power" (p. 65); "during the Nizam-i-Mustafa movement of 1977 it had become clear that the people of Pakistan wanted a speedy implementation of a complete Islamic system" (p. 66).

He has nothing to say on the immorality and illegality of the methods used by Ayub to gain power, nor of his transferring his own constitutional authority to General Yahya Khan in 1969. The explanation of the making of Bangladesh is tendentious. He does not conceal his partiality for the Nizam-i-Mustafa movement and General Ziaul Huq.

Chapter 5, Pakistan's Culture, by Professor Sahibzada Abdur Rasul (pp. 98-122), while describing the founders of our culture enumerates the names of Muhammad Ali Jauhar, Shaukat Ali, Muhsinul Mulk, Waqarul Mulk, Sayyid Ahmad Khan. Shibli, Zakaullah and Hali, and refers to the Aligarh movement, the Jainia Millia Islamia and the Nadwat-ul-Ulema, but the only non-U.P., and Delhi person mentioned is Iqbal (pp. 109-110); the contents of Iqbal's 1930 Allahabad address and his letters to Jinnah of 1937 are confused with each other (p. 111); the "national dress of Pakistan" comprises "*shalwar, qamiz* or *kurta, shirwani* and cap or turban for men and *shalwar, qamiz* and *dupata* for women" (p. 113); "in Islam marriage has the status of worship [*Ibadat*]" (p. 118).

With the single exception of Iqbal, all the founders of Pakistani culture are said to have come from Delhi and the United Provinces. The areas forming Pakistan and Bengal made no contribution to our past. This arid zone was ungraced by any literary creation, social advance, educational progress or intellectual activity. Baluchi folk poetry and classical stories, Pathan poetry and Pashto literature and Khushhal Khan Khattak, Sindhi letters, Islathia College of Peshawar, Sindh Madrasa of Karachi, Khudai Khidmatgars' social revolution in NWFP, Anjuman-i-Hamayyat-i-Islam of Lahore, Anjuman-i-Islamia of Amritsar, the Punjab Urdu press, Shaikh Sir Abdul Qadir, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan. Oriental College of Lahore, Halqa-i-Arbab-i-Zauq of Lahore, Ahmad Shah Bokhari Patras. Government and Islamic Colleges of Lahore, the entire modern Urdu school of poetry of the Punjab, Saadat Hasan Manto's fiction, distinguished Urdu journals of Lahore, Mian Bashir Ahmad of Humayun, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, Punjabi classical poetry from Waris Shah to Ustad Daman, Persian poetry of Sindh of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries – all this and much more is hidden from the eyes of the author. Such total blindness cannot be an act of nature. It is

inspired and not from above. If the professor chose to write such arrant nonsense, why did the three "subject specialists" who edited the book let it pass?

We can draw another conclusion from the unanimous approval given to this statement by the editors, the Textbook Board, the Government of the NWFP, and the Federal Ministry of Education: the government upholds and propagates the view that the culture of Pakistan has been imported in *toto* from outside and imposed upon the country. The land and the nation have nothing to do with it. British imperialism has been replaced by U.P imperialism. We are living in a colonial age under an alien culture. The Government of Pakistan has aimed at and achieved what the British masters of the subcontinent did not even attempt.

For some reason this textbook was considered so good that the Sindh Textbook Board adopted it as it stood for itself. The only change was that the Sindh Textbook carries a date, August 1989 while the NWFP book did not carry any date.

Some students, probably a good number of them, do not use even these brief textbooks. They prefer to use guides, "made easy" helps, and question-answer compilations. These are based on the material contained in the textbooks examined above. As a specimen of this historical literature, I now turn to one such work.

*Universal Model Test Papers: Islamiat (Lazmi) wa Mutala-i-Pakistan (Lazmi), barai Intermediate Students 1987-1988*, compiled by Education Specialists and Examiners, Board of Secondary Education of Pakistan, published by Kashmiri Kitab Ghar Educational Publishers, Lahore, n.d., pp. 296. Author: S.A. Bukhari, M.A. Prepared in strict accordance with the latest syllabus of the Board(s) of Intermediate Secondary Education of Lahore, Multan, Sargodha, Bahawalpur, Rawalpindi, Azad Kashmir, Peshawar, Hyderabad, Quetta and Gujranwala.

Part 2 (pp. 156-276) deals with *Mutala'a-i-Pakistan*. Examples of its contents follow:

"In 1940, in a meeting in Lahore, the Muslims of the subcontinent demanded for themselves a separate *mamlakat*" (p. 161). It was a meeting of the All India Muslim League, not of the Muslims; and it did not demand a separate state. See Chapter 2 for full details.

In the paragraph on the NWFP there is no mention of the Red Shirts or the Congress (p. 162).

In the paragraph on the Punjab the Unionist Party's name does not appear (p. 164).



"In 1885 an Englishman, Mr. Hume, founded the [Indian National] Congress. This party strove for the [protection of the] rights of the Hindus" (p. 165). The Congress was not founded by Hume, nor was it an exclusively Hindu body.

The list of Muslim League aims and objects of 1906 omits the item on loyalty to the British Government (p. 165).

Under the Lucknow Pact, "the Muslims certainly lost in the matter of the allotment of seats [in the provincial legislatures], but gained so far as the Congress, by conceding separate electorates to the Muslims, acknowledged them as a separate nation. This was a great victory for the Muslim League" (p. 170). By signing the Lucknow Pact the Congress did not recognize the Muslims as a separate nation. See Chapter 2.

In 1930 Iqbal suggested that "India should be divided into various semi-independent territories" (p. 173). Iqbal did not say anything of the sort. For details see Chapter 2.

"Here is it necessary to state that the [Lahore] Resolution of 1940 had presented the concept of the establishment of two Muslim states in north-west and north-east. Later, in the Muslim League annual session held in Delhi in 1946, another resolution decided that the Muslim League wanted only one state named *mamlakat-i-Pakistan*" (p. 115). The Lahore Resolution did not demand two Muslim states. The Delhi meeting which amended (illegally) the Lahore Resolution was not an annual session of the All India Muslim League, but a gathering of the members of the Indian Legislative Assembly, Indian Council of State and provincial councils and assemblies who had been elected on the Muslim League ticket. It had no right or authority to change the Lahore Resolution. Full details of the Convention in Chapter 2.

"The Lahore Resolution was passed on 23 March 1940" (p. 182). Read 24 March for 23 March.

In 1945 the Labour Party came into power in Britain under "Lord Attlee" (p. 183). Attlee was at this time a plain mister.

The *coup* of 1958 is attributed to 9 factors, but the role of the army and the ambition of Ayub Khan are not mentioned (pp. 194-195).

After the 1970 general elections, "political negotiations between the two majority parties were still in progress when, at Indian instigation, some mischievous elements created disorder in East Pakistan. When Pakistan took steps to bring the situation under control, the Indian Army, on some pretext, attacked East Pakistan in November 1971, and thus East Pakistan separated in December 1971" (p. 200).

"Before the major political parties which had emerged successful from the elections could prepare a new constitution for the country, some internal and external elements [*andrun-i-mulk our bairuni anasar*] conspired to create a situation of a civil war in East Pakistan, which later assumed the form of an India-Bahar war, and as a result of this, on 16 December 1971, East Pakistan was separated from us and became Bangladesh" (p. 201).

See Chapter 2 for the factors responsible for the break-up of Pakistan in 1971.

On General Ziaul Huq's Islamic achievements: "Strict laws have been promulgated to put an end to nudity [*uriani*], obscenity, and other social vices. The protection of honor and privacy [*chadar aur chardiwari*] has been promised. Radio, television, cinema industry and the press have been instructed to propagate Islamic trends and values. A regular series of call to prayer, recitation of the Quran, teaching of Arabic and Islamic and ethnical programmes has been introduced in radio and television. Prayers are said regularly in congregation in government offices .... The Government has made special efforts to ensure that no person or group, exploiting the name of Islam, fans the flame of communal, linguistic or regional prejudices. Strict action is being taken against biased writings and speeches with a view to promoting Islamic tolerance. Necessary changes are being effected in the governmental system and election procedure to bring them into line with Islamic principles: the Majlis-i-Shura has been established to attain this object .... In short, every effort is being made to enforce a complete Islamic system in the country, and in this connection valuable [*qabil-i-qadr*] steps have been taken, and in the near future further steps will be taken which will result in the implementation in the country of the Islamic system dreamed by the founders of Pakistan" (pp. 208-207).

For the Zia era see Chapter 2.

In 1920 the Muslims of India "felt a great need for the promulgation and propagation of Islamic teachings on a very large scale. To achieve this, the Jamia Millia Islamia was founded" (p. 232).

When Mawlana Muhammad Ali and his pro-Congress friends, egged on by the Hindus, tried to take over the Aligarh University on behalf of the non-cooperation movement, which would have put it under Gandhi's influence, and the University refused to be coerced into an unwise and hasty decision, a group of Muslim leaders founded the Jamia Millia in Aligarh as a "nationalist" and "patriotic" rival of Aligarh. Later it was shifted to Delhi. It continued to be the intellectual centre of pro-Congress Muslims. Its founding had nothing to do with the "promulgation and propagation of Islamic teachings". In parentheses, it should be recorded that Gandhi and the Congress non-cooperators did not try to take over the Hindu University of Benares. Their aim was to destroy Aligarh in the name of Indian nationalism and on the pretext of giving life to

the Khilafat agitation. At this juncture Mawlana Muhammad Ali and company acted as agents of the Congress.

It will be noticed that the *coup* of 1977 is not even mentioned in the book.

With such books as the material on which the students are fed it is no wonder that examines ask questions like "Why did the British establish the Indian National Congress in India?" (History question paper, Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education, Multan, 1987).

It must be noted here that Pakistan Studies (in company with English and Islamic Studies) is a compulsory subject for students of the higher secondary or intermediate classes in all groups: arts, humanities, pre-medical, pre-engineering, etc.

History is an optional subject on the Intermediate level. I have not seen any textbook on the subject prepared by a Textbook Board. I have selected at random the following three books in the field which I have found to be relatively better in quality and more comprehensive than most others in the market or which are used more widely than others. They have been prepared in accordance with the syllabus laid down by the various Boards of Secondary and Intermediate Education (which are in charge to all aspects of education, from determining the curriculum to awarding fit diplomas, in the last 2 years of school, 9th and 10th class, and the first 2 years of college, the first and second years).

*Tarikh-i-Pakistan: 1708-1977* by Muhammad Abdullah Malik, M.A., Head of the Department of History, Islamia College (Railway Road), Lahore, published by Qureshi Brothers, Lahore. 1988-89 ed., pp. 458.

The various periods are given unequal space: 1708-1857 gets 138 pages, 1858-1947, 178 pages, and 1947-1977, 142 pages.

If one were to write an adequate review of the book it would have to be based on a critique of the following points: the 1857 revolt was nothing if not a war of independence (pp. 125, 138); it is proper to call Sayyid Ahmad Khan the "real founder of Pakistan" (p. 146); a full chapter is devoted to Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the Aligarh movement (pp. 139-153); in 1905 John Morley was appointed "Secretary of State for India and Pakistan" (p. 171); the Lucknow Pact is rated high as a Muslim achievement (pp. 183-184); the Treaty of Serres is written throughout as Mualda Saiwray (p. 192. etc.); the Hindu-Muslim unity engendered by the Khilafat movement was destroyed by the "conspiracies of the British and the animus of the Hindu *tafraqah-pasand* groups" (p. 198); when Iqbal presented his scheme of "an independent Muslim *mamlakat*" in 1930, "the Muslims made it their goal and owned Iqbal as their leader" (p. 218); in 1937 "there existed Muslim ministries in the Punjab, Bengal and Sindh; the Congress wanted to

drive the Muslim League out of power in these provinces; therefore it conspired continuously against the Muslim League and as a result these Muslim ministries fell" (p. 224); in 1896 Jinnah returned from England "with the degree of Barrister-at-law from Lincoln Inn" (p. 228); Jamaluddin Afghani was the first person to think of a "Muslim democratic state" [where?], and once he wrote that "India should be divided between Hindus and Muslims, the Muslims getting the territory north of the Vindhial and the Hindus the territory south of it" (quoting Sharifuddin Pireada) (p. 244); Abdul Halim Sharar suggested a division of India "between Hindu and Muslim provinces" (p. 224); "the earliest expression of Muslim separatist sentiment from a political platform was made at Allahabad in 1930 when "Iqbal called for a separate independent *riyasat* for Muslims of the subcontinent", he wanted "a separate *mamlakat*" (p. 245); Chaudhri Rahmat Ali "issued a newspaper called Pakistan" (p. 246); "a Muslim delegate to the Round Table Conference" dubbed the Pakistan scheme as nothing but the plan of a student (p. 246); the Muslim League Working Committee and the Council met in Delhi in February 1940 and decided that "Ore demand for the creation of a separate *mamlakat* for the Muslims should be made at the Lahore session" (p. 248); the Lahore Resolution was "passed on 23 March" (p. 250); Iqbal "received the degree of Bar-at-Law from the University of Cambridge" (p. 293); Rahmat Ali was in government service after resigning from the Aitchison College and he took his degree of LL.B. from the Law College, Lahore (p. 304); eight reasons are listed for the Ayub *coup* of 1958, but the army's or the General's ambition to rule is not among them (pp. 352-353) and the *coup* is called a "revolution" [*inqilab*] (p. 353); in the 1965 war, "Pakistan inflicted ignominious defeats on India on all fronts and broke its back"; at last "India's American and Soviet friends. after a great deal of strenuous effort, arranged cease-fire on 23 September through the United Nations" (pp. 351-362); all the reforms effected by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's Government were aimed at "enriching the workers of the People's Party" (pp. 382-383); the 1977 elections were rigged blatantly by the ruling party, the people reacted angrily, the resulting agitation overwhelmed the whole country and the situation of a civil war obtained; "to deal with this situation with responsibility, on 5 July the Pakistan armed forces dismissed the Bhutto government and took power in their own hands" (p. 383); "the entire Pakistani society was shaken by the mass movement against the Bhutto government .... the entire nation came out on the streets to put an end to Bhutto's dictatorship; the ruling party then made up its mind to push the country into the murderous bonfire of a civil war, and there were clear signs that the ruling party, in collaboration with the fifth columnists, was bent upon putting the ideology of Pakistan at stake in order to keep itself in power. In these circumstances, had Bhutto succeeded in prolonging his dictatorship through the forces of his oppression and the moves of his deceit and cunning, who knows what the nation would have been reduced to today! Realizing this danger, the armed forces of Pakistan dismissed the Bhutto government on 5 July 1977 and took power in their own hands" (p. 433); "The Supreme Court, guided by the constraint of circumstances and the theory of necessity, validated the army's action. The nation also breathed a sigh of relief at this change in the national scene" (p. 434); the new Army leadership was determined to hold fresh elections within

90 days of the *coup*, but "the great majority of the people insisted on the accountability of the malpractices [literal translation of unreadable Urdu] of the dark days of Bhutto's rule before the holding of any elections, so that all those criminal elements could be exposed who, behind the Facarie of democracy, had drunk the blood of the country and the nation. On this, the new leadership, which was intoxicated with the necessity [literal translation of unreadable Urdu] of safeguarding the ideology of Pakistan and believed in justice, postponed the holding of elections and started the process of accountability with all its might and main" (p. 434): "the foreign policy followed before 5 July 1977 had suffered from many weaknesses of shortcomings. The nations of the world had lost faith in Pakistan because of her continuous lying and deceit and cheating. With one or two exceptions, all Muslim countries were angry and fed up with Pakistan. The present Army government, under the leadership of General Muhammad Ziaul Huq, turned the national foreign policy in the right direction, exactly as required by the interests of the country and the nation" (p. 440).

Most of the mistakes contained in these statements have been corrected in Chapter 2. I attend to the rest here. It is not explained why we should accept Sayyid Ahmad Khan as the "real founder" of Pakistan. In John Morley's time at the India Office (1905-10) there was no Pakistan, so he could not possibly have carried the title of Secretary of State for India and Pakistan. In 1937 there was no Muslim ministry in the Punjab, it was a Unionist ministry made up of and backed by all the three communities of the province. Jamaluddin "Afghani" never suggested a partition of India on religious lines. Abdul Halim Sharar wanted a division between Hindu and Muslim districts, not provinces. Chaudhri Rahmat Ali never issued a newspaper called Pakistan; and his scheme was not rejected by a Muslim delegate to the Round Table Conference but by some of the Muslim witnesses appearing before the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform. The Muslim Leagues reported decision in favor of a partition of India taken in February 1940 is not to be found in the official text of the resolutions of the pony published by its office. Rahmat Ali did not take his law degree from the Law College, Lahore; he attended the College for some time but left without appearing in the examinations. The news that the nation "breathed a sigh of relief" at General Ziaul Haq's coming to power is not historical information but blatant and false propaganda.

*Tarikh-i-Pakistan* by Professor Sheikh Muhammad Rafique, Head of Department of History, Islamia College (Civil Lines), Lahore, in collaboration with Professor Sayyid Masud Haider Bukhari, M.A. (History and Persian), Government College, Sahiwal, and Professor Chaudhri Nisar Ahmad, M.A. (History and Urdu), Government College, Faisalabad, published by Standard Book House, Lahore, new ed. 1989, pp. 560. Written in accordance with the syllabi of the Boards of Intermediate and Secondary Education of Lahore, Rawalpindi, Sargodha, Multan and Gujranwala.

The period 1707-1857 is given 184 pages, that of 1858-1947 220 pages, and that of 1947-1977 171 pages.

Chapter 8 (pp. 169-191) is entitled "The War of Independence, 1857". Chapter 9 (pp. 192-220) is devoted to Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the Aligarh movement. On the Lucknow Pact: under it "the Congress accepted the Muslims as a separate nation and the Muslim League as its [sole] representative" (p. 253): "with much cunning the Hindu put an end to Muslim majority in [the legislatures of] the Punjab and Bengal and procured a majority for himself" (pp. 253-254). The Treaty of Serves is written as Mu'aida-i-Saiwray (p. 261). Chaudhri Rahmat Ali developed further Iqbal's 1930 scheme by establishing a Pakistan National Movement in 1933; "in 1935", in 4-page pamphlet, "he demanded the separation of Muslim India from the rest of India" (p. 521). "The Unionist Party leadership did not allow any other Muslim party to emerge in the Punjab and, in collaboration with a few prejudiced Hindus and Sikhs, inflicted irreparable damage on Muslim unity .... This party could not play any positive role in the war of independence because its moving spirits were landholders of the variety of knights, Khan Bahadurs and toadies of the British; obedience of the British was in their nature .... Call it the change wrought by time or a misfortune for the nation that after independence these Unionist leaders, the enemies of the Muslims, imposed themselves on this *mazlum* nation" (p. 344).

Under the Lucknow Pact the Congress neither accepted the Muslims as a separate nation nor acknowledged the Muslim League as their sole representative; and if the Pact, because of Hindu cunning, deprived the Punjabi and Bengali Muslims of their majority in the provincial legislatures, why did Jinnah and the Muslim League accept the forfeit? Was it Hindu cunning or League shortsightedness? Rahmat Ali did not "develop further" Iqbal's 1930 proposal; his scheme was totally different from Iqbals; and his plan was issued in 1933, not 1935. For the Unionist Patty see Chapter 2.

Iqbal took his "Ph.D. and Barrister degrees from Trinity College, Cambridge" (p. 361). He "was the first leader in the subcontinent to present the two-nation theory with great vehemence [*puri shiddat*] . . . and in his Allahabad address of 1930 offered a clear concept of Pakistan" (p. 365).

On all these *ipse dixit* about Iqbal see Chapter 2.

Chapter 18 on "Famous Muslim Leaders" reveals a characteristic imbalance: Sayyid Ameer Ali has 2 pages, Nawab Salimullah of Dacca, 1 page, Muhammad Ali Jauhar 5, the Aga Khan 3, Iqbal 4½ Sir Fazl-i-Husain 2½, Zafar Ali Khan 3, A.K. Fazlul Haq 1, Sir Abdul Qayyum Khan 1½, and Abdullah Haroon 1 (pp. 351-374).

The post-independence period is treated with equal carelessness, ignorance and bias.

"As soon as the division of the country was announced bloodshed on a large scale [*khun ki holi*] followed .... Muslim localities were attacked. Their villages were set on fire.

Extreme cruelties were inflicted on them. Till they were forced to abandon their homes and leave for Pakistan" (p. 395). He is quick to put all blame for the 1947 massacres on the non-Muslims, but does not explain why the non-Muslims living in West Pakistan were attacked, forced to migrate to India or murdered.

The Ayub Khan *coup* of 1958 is called a "Revolution" and 10 causes of it are listed, but no reference is made to the army's ambition to rule (pp. 448-451).

The 1971 break-up of the country is treated in detail and with blatant bias. The only parties to emerge unscathed from the account are the army and the Jamaat-i-Islami (pp. 476-492).

Chapter 23 on the years of Bhutto's prime ministership is frankly partisan and reads like a press release of the Ministry of Information under General Zia's rule. It ends by offering thanks to God for having accepted the sacrifices made by the nation during the anti-Bhutto agitation and for crowning the efforts of the people with success (pp. 493-514).

Some other statements: Ayub issued the Muslim Family Laws Ordinance to please some educated women of the country (p. 471), and it played a major part in creating hatred against the Ayub regime (p. 472).

In the 1971 India-Pakistan war, "the Pakistan armed forces created new records of bravery, and the Indian forces were defeated everywhere" (p. 483). If in 1971 the Pakistan Army showed such bravery and the Indians were beaten everywhere, why did the victorious Pakistan Army surrender to India in Dacca? The astounding contradiction is as inexplicable as it is irresolvable.

"The Hindus of East Pakistan engineered anti-Urdu demonstrations during Jinnah's time and at last the federal politicians accepted the humiliating situation and declared Bengali as the second national language. This movement sowed the seeds of hatred" (p. 487). Why was it humiliating for the Government of Pakistan to accept Bengali as the second national language? Demography, democracy and morality dictated that Bengali should be made the only national language of the country, and if West Pakistanis protested too much Urdu would have been given the second place to placate and please them.

Bhutto's most important achievement was the declaration of the Qadiani as a non-Muslim minority" (p. 506).

In 1965, the military superiority of Pakistan forced India to accept a cease-fire (p. 534). In 1965 Pakistan did not force India to accept a cease-fire. The honors of war were almost equally divided. But Pakistan was short of arms and ammunition and spare

parts for which it depended on the United States of America, and was incapable of lighting beyond 30 days. The cease-fire was arranged at the intervention of the United Nations.

In 1971. India, "with the connivance of the major powers and with the open help of Russia, intervened militarily in East Pakistan and separated it from Pakistan" (p. 534). This is fully dealt with in Chapter 2.

*Tarikh-i-Pak-o-Hind* by Anwaar Hashmi, M.A.. Karachi Book Centre, Karachi. 5th ed., June 1984, pp. 600.

It has been written in accordance with the syllabus prescribed by the Boards of Secondary and Intermediate Education of Hyderabad. Multan, Lahore and Sargodha. The author has written several other books in Urdu and English.

The section on the period 1857-1974 contains the following statements:

The revolt of 1857 is called the "war of independence" (pp. 478-487); the Lucknow Pact of 1916 was "in reality an agreement between the Hindus and the Muslims, in which the Hindus practically admitted the separate identity of the Muslims and the status of the Muslim League as their representative party" (pp. 511-512); both "the Hindus and the Muslims boycotted" the Simon Commission (p. 516); Iqbal "took the degree of Barristry from the Oxford University" (p. 519); during the third Round Table Conference "some Muslim students studying at the University of Cambridge published a pamphlet called Now or Never" (p. 521); Chaudhri Rahmat Ali died "in 1948" (p. 523); the Pakistan Resolution was adopted "on 23 March 1940" (p. 528); Jinnah "was elected the first Governor General of Pakistan" (twice on p. 537); in 1958 "the country was preparing for the general elections, the politicians were trying for their success. and a proper democratic government was expected to be established after the elections, but on 8 October Martial Law was imposed, the 1956 constitution was abrogated, and on 27 October a military government came into office" (p. 543); on a date and in a year which are not mentioned, "President Muhammad Ayub Khan resigned and handed over the administration of the country to the army" (p. 558).

The contents of the provisions of the Lucknow Pact have been fabricated here. The one-half of the All India Muslim League, the Shafi portion, cooperated with the Simon Commission; the other half, Jinnah's faction, boycotted the British inquiry. Now or Never was not the work of "some Muslim students" studying at Cambridge; of the four signatories to it only one, Rahmat Ali, belonged to Cambridge. Ramat Ali died in 1951, not 1948. Jinnah was not elected Governor General of Pakistan because it was not an elective office; he was appointed by the British King. Other points are covered in Chapter 2.



The Break-up of East Pakistan is described in these words: "In East Pakistan a great deal of propaganda was already being carried on against West Pakistan, and after the announcement of the postponement of the session of the National Assembly great disorder began in the province in which peace and quiet disappeared. Elements which were enemies of Pakistan took advantage of this situation and utilized it for their own poisonous goals. These people had already been inciting the simple folk of East Pakistan to demand separation, and now they assured the Bengalis that the West Pakistani leadership did not want to transfer power to East Pakistan. After this the Bengalis were given the impression that a conspiracy was being hatched against them. Thus the movement of subversion and secession became strong in East Pakistan, and at last things went out of control. West Pakistanis and Biharis were massacred and the province was openly looted ... When things were completely beyond his control. Yahya Khan ordered an army action. Within one month the army, to a great extent, cleared every part of East Pakistan of rebels and miscreants and also all the enemies of Pakistan and their agents .... After the military action Yahya Khan did not pay any attention to a political solution of the real problem. Therefore the rebel elements once again became active. At last in November 1971 the Indian army invaded East Pakistan in full force (and in December also attacked West Pakistan) and things took such a turn that by the middle of December East Pakistan went into the hands of India" (pp. 579-580).

For a proper account of the 1971 break-up see Chapter 2.

It should be noticed that in the last part of the book, which deals with the modern period, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan has a chapter (pp. 494-502) to himself, while the role of Bengal in the national politics or the Pakistan movement is not brought out.

### **English Medium Textbooks**

The Textbook Boards do not publish textbooks for all the classes in the English medium schools. There are a few exceptions, which I will notice below. In this section I deal with the books in common use in the government and private schools which teach through the medium of the English language.

#### **Class 1**

*Social Studies* by Qulabuddin Khan, B.Ed., Rchbar Publishers, Karachi, n.d., unpaginated.

Pakistan "was founded on 14th August, 1947" (lesson 2); Iqbal "was the first Muslim to give the idea of Pakistan" (lesson 4). Police is the only department of government described in the book in lesson 14, and no reason has been given for making this singular choice.

## Classes 1-2

*Social Studies*, Iqbal Book Depot, Karachi, n.d., pp. 16.

"Our Pakistan was founded by Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah on 14th August 1947. Pakistan is one of the biggest Muslim Country in the world" (p. 3); Iqbal "was the first Muslim to give the idea of separate Motherland for Muslims called Pakistan. He took his Primary Education at Sialkot and higher education in England and Germany .... He was buried in front of Lahore Shahi Masjid"; the question at the end of the lesson runs: "where he took his education?" (p. 6); Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan "founded Muslim University of Aligarh" (p. 7); Muhammad Ali Jauhar "got his education at Aligarh University" (p. 8). "Karachi has many beautiful places where the children enjoy during the visit" (p. 11).

Sayyid Ahmad Khan founded the MAO College, Aligarh; the University of Aligarh was established more than twenty years after his death. Mawlana Muhammad Ali was educated at the MAO College, Aligarh (it was not yet a university) and at the University of Oxford.

## Class 2

*Social Studies* for Elementary Classes by Qutabuddin Khan, B.A., B.Ed. (Alig.) (with some other Diplomas and Certificates which cannot be deciphered), Haroon Brothers, Karachi, n.d., pp. 25.

Iqbal "was the first Muslim Leader to visualize Pakistan" (p. 3); Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan "founded Muslim University Aligarh" (p.4).

Sayyid Ahmad Khan founded the MAO College, Aligarh; not the Aligarh Muslim University.

*Social Studies* by Qutbuddin Khan, Rehbar Publishers, Karachi, n.d., pp. 24.

Pakistan "came into being on 14th August, 1947 .... Pakistan has been carved out for Islamic ideology" (p. 5); the Pakistan Resolution "was passed on 23rd March, 1940" (p. 6). Lesson No. 8 deals with Hazrat Data Ganj Baldish, No.11 with Major Raja Abdul Aziz Bhatti, an army officer who was killed in the 1965 India-Pakistan war, and No. 15 with King Faisal of Saudi Arabia.

Pakistan came into being on 15 August, not 14 August. The asseveration that Pakistan "has been carved out for Islamic ideology" is bad English, twisted history, and unsound pedagogy. While European and American philosophers and professors are still

wrangling about the precise connotation of the concept of ideology our author expects class 2 students not only to grasp the meaning of the word but also to understand its connection with the creation of Pakistan. It is such fuddled and widest statements which drive the forlorn student to memorize a sentence without comprehending it.

### Class 3

*Social Studies* by Qutbuddin Khan, Rehbar Publishers, Karachi, n.d., pp. 48.

"Millions of Muslims came from India and settled in Karachi. They established here plenty of mills, factories, offices, colonies, and grand buildings" (p. 8); Quaid-i-Azam's mausoleum "at night shines in the flash light" (p. 10); "courts keep order and peace in the district" (p. 29); "the police keeps order and peace in the district" (p. 30); television "is the most effective media of mass communication .... It is gifted with hearing as well as seeing" (p. 36). The lesson on the Pakistan Resolution reads "the Muslims of South East Asia awoke from their sleep. They all wanted a Separate Muslim State. The Muslim League representing the whole of Muslim India, met in Lahore and passed a resolution on 23 March, 1940, demanding a Separate State for the Muslims of India. This resolution is now known as the Pakistan Resolution. The Muslims succeeded in their struggle on 14 August, 1947. The Ideology of Pakistan rests on Islam" (p. 37).

On the founding of Pakistan by Jinnah see my note on the first book in Urdu for class I with which this chapter opens. Television is a medium, not a media. Pakistan is in South Asia, not South East Asia. The Muslims League did not represent "the whole of Muslim India" in early 1940. The Lahore Resolution did not ask for a state but for states. Once again, the young students have been confronted with the word "ideology".

The language in which the book is written is hardly recognizable as English.

*A Beginner [sic.] History of Indo-Pakistan [sic.]* by A.Q. Qureshi, M.A. (Islamic Studies and History), Punjab; Post-Graduate Certificate in Education (Cantab); Senior Housemaster and Head of the Department of Social Studies, P.A.F. Public School, Lower Topa, Murree Hills, Imperial Book Depot. Lahore, first published in 1964. revised edition, March 1983 (but actually this book has been brought up to date till September 1986), pp. 104.

The outer cover carries photographs, in this order, of Jinnah, Iqbal, Ayub Khan, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Muhammad Ali Jauhar. The title creates a new area or country or subcontinent called "Indo-Pakistan". In his Foreword, P.H. Harwood, the Principal of the authors school, commends the book as "a novel and important addition to the textbooks already in use" (p. iv).

"The people of West Pakistan spoke a number of languages, but chose Urdu as their national language. The people of East Pakistan spoke Bengali and that was their national language. As time passed, the people of East Pakistan thought they would have a separate country of their own and call it Bangla Desh. So in 1972, East Pakistan became Bangla Desh and West Pakistan was called PAKISTAN" (pp. 2-3); "we have good relations with all our neighbors including India" (p. 4); "men and women wear *Kamees* and *Shalwar*" (p. 4); "India is also called Bharat. Bharat is the country of non-Muslims .... There are crores of Muslims in India" (p. 11); Mahmud Ghaznawi "came to India many times" (P. 12); in 1857 the people of India fought a "War of Independence" (p. 14); "the Indian National Congress wanted the English to go away from India, leaving the rule of India in their hands" (p. 15); the leaders of the Muslim League "wanted a separate Home-Land for the Muslims of India" (p. 15); on 14th August, 1947, they [the English] divided India into two free countries" (p. 16); Rahmat Ali "made this word [Pakistan] by taking letters from the names of some Muslim Provinces of India" (p. 17); "if you are asked who was the greatest Muslim ever born in Indo-Pakistan, you may say Hazrat Shah Waliullah of Delhi" (p. 19); Shah Waliullah obtained degrees in the Quran and Hadith "from Arabia" (p. 20); his translation of the Quran into Persian "was the first translation of the Quran into any other language" (pp. 20-21); "Urdu was the spoken language of the common people" of the subcontinent (p. 21); as a result of the 1857 revolt "the British Government turned against the Muslims, who were martyred" (p. 29); "Muhammad Ali felt that the Hindus wanted to make the Muslims their slaves and since he hated slavery, he left the Congress" (p. 34); Muhammad Ali "founded Jamia Millia Islamia at Delhi to spread the Teachings of Islam" (p. 35); his "pen-name was Jauhar" (p. 35); Iqbal "got higher education at the Cambridge and London Universities. He also went to Germany and returned as Dr. Muhammad Iqbal" (pp. 38-39); "in a speech at Allahabad, he said that the Muslims of India should have a separate country of their own. Thus he was the first man to give the idea of Pakistan" (p. 40); "the Congress was actually a party of the Hindus. The Muslims felt that after getting freedom the Hindus would make them their slaves. But Jinnah did not feel like that. He wanted the Hindus and the Muslims to work together for their freedom. At about this time Iqbal gave the idea of Pakistan" (p. 47); "in March, 1940, Pakistan was demanded at a meeting in Lahore" (p. 49); Ayub Khan "was a soldier. He did not want to take up the government of the country. But the conditions forced him to do so. The people in power were ruining the country. He did not bear all this. He thought that he should come forward the set things right" (p. 56); Ayub Khan "took away land from the big landlords and gave it to the farmers. The people of Pakistan were very pleased with President Ayub. They gave him a higher army rank" (p. 58); "in a public meeting held at Lahore on 23 March, 1940 we demanded Pakistan" (p. 60); "the Muslims of India got their separate homeland after a long struggle under the leadership of the Quaid-i-Azam" (p. 62).

The people of West Pakistan were never given a chance to choose their national language. Urdu was imposed on them by an unrepresentative assembly and later by

military dictators. The spectacle of the people of East Pakistan thinking, as time passed, of having a separate state of their own is a unique description of the 1971 civil war and the war with India; it is the work of a moron. The declaration of Pakistan's good relations with India makes nonsense of the several wars fought between the two countries and described with splendid partiality in most of the textbooks (remember, the author teaches at a school run by the armed forces of Pakistan). If Bharat is a country of non-Muslims. how does one explain the presence of about 120 million Muslims there. Mahmud Ghaznawi did not come to India, he invaded it. The British did not divide India on 14 August 1947, but on the following day. Shah Waliullah's translation of the Quran into Persian was not the first translation of the Book into any language; a few Latin translation of the Book had appeared in the 17th century. The Jamia Millia was not established to spread the teachings of Islam but to serve as a centre of "nationalist" pro-Congress Muslim propaganda. Iqbal never studied at the University of London. I have coveted the other points in Chapter 2 below.

So much for the knowledge that the author is passing at to the students. As for the language in which the communication is carried out the following specimens should suffice: "Are not you proud that you have a country of your own?" (p. 4); "we hope to have better relations with India when she settle all disputes with us" (pp. 4-5); "there are crores of Muslims in India but non-Muslims are more in numbers" (p. 11); Shahabuddin Ghauri left his general, Aibak, in India, and then "the rule remained in his family for several years" (p. 12); Sayyid Ahmad Shahid "came to know that the Sikhs were being cruel to the Muslims in Punjab" (p. 22); Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan's mother "did all her duties regularly" (p. 27); Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan was "very fond of swimming and arrow-shooting" (p. 28); Ayub Khan "started many reforms in the country (p. 57); on the birthday of Iqbal "We say good words about him" (p. 61); during the reign of Shahjahan "all the crops died in the Deccan" (p. 91); "when you see these buildings you will come to know how great were the Moghuls" (P. 97).

#### Class 4

*Social Studies*, published by Ilm-o-Amal Book Depot. Karachi, for the Sindh Textbook Board, Hyderabad, March 1978, pp. 95. Authors: Mirza Ishaque Baig and Sayyid Tilmeez Hasnain Rizvi. Convener [sic.]: Abdul Majeed Abbasi. Translated by Mirza Ishaque Baig. Print order: 10.000 copies.

"During the British rule all the Muslims of South Asia formed a political party. The name of that party was the All India Muslim League. The aims of this party were to get freedom from the British and to get a permanent homeland for the Muslims. The name of this new country was proposed as Pakistan" (p. 5); the Pakistan Resolution contained the names of the "Muslim populated areas" which were to form Pakistan; it was passed on 23 March 1940 (p. 6); after 14 August 1947, "all the Muslim British Indian Government servants who had opted for Pakistan began to reach Karachi. Other

Muslims who were living in the Hindu majority areas also migrated to arrive in Sindh" (p. 6); although Sindh was under martial Law in 1978, yet a 3-page lesson on the Sindh Assembly describes the working and functions of the legislature (pp. 67-69).

The All India Muslim League, when formed in 1906 and for a long time after that, neither spoke for all the Muslims of India (look at the 1937 election results) nor fixed its goal as the freedom of India (this was much later) nor aimed at the creation of a Muslim homeland (that was in 1946, not even in 1940 when the demand was that for "states"). The Lahore Resolution did not contain the names of the areas claimed for Pakistan. All the Muslims living in the Hindu-majority areas did not migrate to Sindh in 1947; had they done so Sindh today would have had a population of about 140 million and India would have had no Muslim inhabitants.

### Class 5

*Social Studies* published by Ilm-o-Amal Book Depot, Karachi, for the Sindh Textbook Board, Hyderabad. February 1982, pp.120. Author: S. Humid Ali Jeffery. Translated by Edgar Victor. Print order. 10.000 copies.

In 1857 "the Muslims rose against" the British. "The uprising is known as the First War of Independence" (p. 3); "under the patronage of the British the Hindus made a political party of their own which was called the Indian National Congress" (p. 3); Iqbal "for the first time presented the concept of a separate homeland for the Muslims ... in 1930 at Allahabad ... he suggested that the Muslim majority regions of South Asia may be declared as independent Muslim State" (p. 4); "in the year 1940 . . . the Muslims of South Asia demanded an independent Muslim State" (p. 5); about the 1971 break-up: "through its agents and other self-seekers Bharat at first caused great troubles in East Pakistan and then attacked it from three sides. This was in the year 1971. Pakistan was forced to fight with Bharat in order to defend its eastern wing. The war continued for 3 weeks and ended in the creation of a separate state called Bangle Desh" (p. 8). One full chapter of 10 pages deals with the armed forces; another deals with the constitutional and political system of the country, but does not mention Martial Law under which the country was living when the book was published.

The Congress was not a Hindu party, and it was not established under British patronage. On the other hand, the British did support the MAO College, Aligarh, and the All India Muhammadan Educational Conference of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan; facts which are deliberately omitted from every textbook.

*Social Studies for Pakistan* by Farida Syed and Asma Ibrahim, FEP International Pak (Private), Limited, 1987, pp. 97.

Pakistan "came into being on August 14, 1947 as an independent state for the Muslims of Indian Subcontinent. The name 'Pakistan' was chosen by Chaudhri Rahmat Ali. It comprises words from every province and means 'the land of *Paks*' – the spiritually clean and pure. The ideology of Pakistan is Islam and the country's constitution is democratic" (p. 34); at some date which is not given, "Muslims, fearing that their culture and religion would be submerged, started a political movement demanding a separate Muslim state. All politically conscious Muslims of the Subcontinent such as Allama Iqbal, Sir Syed and many others were in the favor of this idea. The struggle for Pakistan started in the 1930s. It had the full support and cooperation of the Muslims. The movement for Pakistan was getting stronger day by day, and then our great leader Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah also joined hands with the Muslims ... the Pakistan Resolution was passed on 23 March, 1940 ... This resolution demanded two independent states in the Subcontinent ... after the Pakistan Resolution was passed, communal riots broke out in many cities of the Subcontinent" (pp. 35-36). This book is exceptionally well produced.

Pakistan came into being on 15 August 1947, not 14 August (for full details see Chapter 2). Rahmat Ali coined or invented the name Pakistan; he did not choose it. If the ideology of Pakistan is Islam, what is her religion? In 1987 the constitution of Pakistan was certainly not democratic, the country was being ruled by a General who had usurped power through an act of treason (as defined in the Constitution), got himself elected President through the fraud of a referendum, and who had tinkered at the 1973 constitution through personal fiat, arrogated to himself unprecedented powers, and who was still in uniform. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan is not known by anyone to have been in favor of creating a separate Muslim state. The struggle for Pakistan began in 1940, not in the 1930s. The Lahore Resolution did not demand two states; the number was not specified. No communal riots broke out after the adoption of the Lahore Resolution or because of it.

## Class 6

*Social Studies*, published by Sh. Shaukat Ali and Sons, Karachi, for the Sindh Textbook Board, Hyderabad, 1st. ed., March 1982, pp. 78. Author: Syed Hamid Ali Jaffery. Translated by Edgar Victor. Print order: 12,000 copies.

The revolt of 1857 is called the "First War of Independence" (p.65); "The Hindus ... established Congress in the year 1885" (p. 66); in a year which is not given, Iqbal is said to have "openly demanded that Punjab, Sindh, NWFP and Baluchistan which have Muslim majority may be made an independent Muslim State" (p. 68): the Pakistan Resolution, passed on 23 March 1940, announced that "the Muslim areas were to form an independent and sovereign state" (p. 69); chapter X on Civil Life in Pakistan (pp. 72-78) does not mention Martial Law which was then in force in the country.

All statements about Iqbal and the Lahore Resolution are false. For corrections see Chapter 2 below.

### Class 7

*First Steps in Our History* by Dr. Kh. A. Haye, M.A., Ph.D., Diploma in Archivism [sic.], Ex. G.C.S. Class-I (Senior), Retired Head of Department of Modern Subjects, Pakistan Military Academy, Kakul, Ferozsons, Lahore, new edition, n.d., pp. 167.

In his foreword, Major General Shaukat Ali Shah, Commandant, Pakistan Military Academy, says: "History is the record of Man in quest of his daily bread. As such the record to human conflicts is bound to contain the elements of human prejudice and interest to perpetuate. The advantage of the master over the subject .... In this book a beginning has been made to record the events without external fear (p. 6). In the preface, the author claims: "This book has been written for young children reading in Public schools. It differs from other similar books which too often mix facts with fiction and give a rather clouded view of our history. This book aims to give a sound knowledge of our proud heritage" (p. 8).

The English who conquered India were "clever and crafty", and they "by guile and craft made themselves the masters of our country. For a hundred and fifty years they remained in power till we decided to become independent" (p. 13); "clever and crafty as these Englishmen are ..." (p. 129); in 1857 we "fought the War of Independence" (p. 133); "one of the great thinkers of Pakistan" was Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan (p. 141): "the first Muslim to have put in words the idea of Pakistan" was Iqbal (p.155); in 1930 Iqbal "for the first time gave the idea of separate States, for the Muslims and the Hindus of the sub-continent. He had come to believe that the two-nations could not peacefully live together in one State" (p. 158); "on August 14th 1947, the Indian subcontinent was divided, and ... the grateful Nation made the Quaid-i-Azam the first Governor-General of Pakistan" (p. 164).

How does Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan become a great thinker of Pakistan when he died nearly fifty years before the creation of the country and he did not belong to its soil? India was divided on 15, not 14, August. The Pakistani nation played no part at all in making Jinnah the Governor General of the country. He selected himself for the office and his appointment was made by the British King.

*A Junior History of Indo-Pakistan* by Sayyid Fayyaz Mahmud, Oxford University Press, Karachi, first published 1961, second edition 1972, third edition 1988. pp. 72.

"In December 1971 the eastern part separated from Pakistan and was called Bangladesh. The western part alone is now known as Pakistan" (p. 1); the revolt of 1857 is called "the



War of Independence" (pp. 50-51); "some fourteen years later. Indo-Pakistan was declared to be an empire of the British ... the governor-general was now called a viceroy" (p. 52): photographs of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Iqbal and the Aga Khan appear with the postscript "Leading figures of the Pakistan Movement" (p. 56); "for twenty years Hindus and Muslims worked together in Congress"; the Muslims formed the Muslim League "in 1905" (p. 57); in 1947 "Pakistan chose Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah as her Governor-General" (p. 59); in 1958 "Martial Law was declared, the Constitution was abolished, and government by corrupt and incompetent political parties brought to an end" (p.61); on 25 March 1969 "President Ayub handed over the government to General Agha Mohammad Yahya Khan, Commander-in-Chief of the Army, and retired" (p. 62); "over 4 crore" of the population of East Pakistan was Hindu and it was "not loyal to Pakistan" (p. 63): the account given of the break-up of Pakistan in 1971 is extremely misleading (pp. 63-65); on the 1977 *coup*: "the Army Chiefs thought it was high time to strike and they arranged a *coup*" (p. 68): the chapter on the Martial Law of General haul Haq does not contain a single word of criticism of the military rule (pp. 69-72): the book ends with the sentence "The future waits to see how and when an eagerly sought, complete democracy returns to Pakistan" (p. 72).

There is no evidence for the observation that in 1874 or thereabout India was declared to be an empire of the British. If that is so, what was India before that date? The Governor General of India was also made the Viceroy in 1858 when the control of India was transferred from the East India Company to the British Crown: since then the same person was both Governor General and Viceroy. Viceroy means the deputy or representative or agent of the King or the Queen. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan was not, and could not have been under natural dispensation, a leader of the Pakistan movement; he died over forty years before the movement began. Nor did the Aga Khan play any part in the movement for Pakistan because he was living in Switzerland between 1940 and 1945 and his asylum stipulated that he abstained from all political activity, local or foreign. There were very few Muslims in the Indian National Congress in the years 1885-1905. The All India Muslim League was found in 1906, not in 1905. Jinnah was not chosen by Pakistan as her first Governor General in 1947; Jinnah had chosen himself before the country came into existence. The author of the book who was a Group Captain in the Pakistan Air Force, ought to know that there can be at any one time only one Army Chief. Then, how did the "Army Chiefs" stage the 1977 *coup*?

*Social Studies (History and Civics)* West Pakistan Textbook Board, Lahore, 2nd ed. April 1970, pp. 131. Author: Abdul Ghafur Chaudhri, B.A. (Honours) (London), M.A., M.Sc. (Alig.). Senior Editor, West Pakistan Textbook Board. Editor: Dr. Din Muhammad Malik. M.A.. Ph.D. (Washington). Professor, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore. Translator: Dr. Shaikh Asghar Ali, M.A., Ph.D., Director, Audio Visual Aids, Lahore. Print order: 5,000 copies.

The Urdu original of this book has already been listed and annotated in the section on Urdu books. Two points about this English version ought to be mentioned. The five pages (pp. 64-68) of the Urdu original have been omitted here because they praised Field Marshal Ayub Khan, and substituted with half a page (p. 46) or muted criticism of the 1958 *coup*. Besides, Chapter 10 of the Urdu book has been dropped completely.

The message is clear and loud. The fortunes of the persons who rule the country and the contents of the textbooks run in tandem. When Ayub Khan was in power in 1969 and the Urdu book was published it was right and proper that the bulk of it should be in praise of him. When, in 1970, he was no longer on the scene and this English translation was published it was meet that the book should ignore him. All the books published during Zia's years of power followed this practice. The conclusion is inescapable: the students are not taught contemporary history but an anthology of tributes to current rulers. The authors are not scholars or writers but courtiers.

The dishonesty of the author and the editor lies in their failure to notify these changes in a preface or a foreword, which entitles us to hold them culpable.

### Class 8

*Social Studies*, published by the Ilm-o-Aural Book Dept. Karachi, for the Sindh Textbook Board. Hyderabad, 1st ed. January 1983, pp. 192. Author. S. Hamid Ali Jaffery. Translated by Hanif Khan and Karim Baksh Channa. Print order 10,000 copies.

The revolt of 1857 is called "the War of Independence" (pp. 113-118); Iqbal in 1930 "conceived of separate Muslim states in the north-western and north-eastern parts of India where they were in a majority" (p. 135); the Pakistan Resolution demanded that "the north-western and the north-eastern parts of India where the Muslims were in a majority should be joined together to constitute an independent and sovereign Muslim State" (p.138); the break-up of Pakistan is described in four lines: In 1970 general elections were held throughout the country. People's Party won majority of seats in the National Assembly from West Pakistan; while Awami League won majority from East Pakistan. In December 1971 the eastern part of the country was detached" (p. 150); the account of the current political system in the country does not contain any reference to Martial Law (pp. 150-154).

For correction of all these statements see Chapter 2.

*Social Studies: Geography, History and Civics (Compulsory) for English Medium Schools*, Sindh Textbook Board, Hyderabad-Sindh, first ed. date of published [repeated twice], June 1972, pp. 266. Authors: Mian Muhammad Aslam (Chapter 1 on Land and People) and Dr. Abdul Hameed (the rest of the book). Revised by S.H.A. Jaffery, West Pakistan Education Service, Class I (Senior) (retired). Translators: Chaudhri Abdul Ghafur, West

Pakistan Education Service, Class I, Senior (retired), Shaikh Abdul Haq, and Muhammad Ahmad Khan. Published by Nafees Academy, Karachi, for the Board. Print order. 3,000 copies.

The foreword makes the following statements: "Social Studies was [*sic.*] introduced as a separate subject after 1960 and it replaced the subjects of history, geography and civics. The object of introducing the new subject was to break the artificial boundaries between history, geography and civics and to coordinate their different aspects in such a manner that the students may understand their inter-dependence. Formerly books on social studies were so written that different parts of the subject stood isolated and before long they called for a revision. In view of its situation, the Education Department of the Government of West Pakistan decided in 1966 that the syllabus for social studies should be reorientated. The present volume has been written in accordance with the new syllabus" (p. iii). "It may also be borne in mind that the object of making a study of this subject is not only to give factual information to the students but also to make them conscious of their future responsibilities and to instil in them a sense of solving the problems of their country" (p. iv).

The preface is dated 6 March 1967, but it is attached to a book whose first edition appeared in June 1972.

Only the first chapter deals with geography; the rest of the book treats of history, current politics and administration. One point should be recorded right away instead of being pointed out repeatedly in my commentary: throughout the book East Pakistan is considered, referred to, mentioned and discussed as if it were still a part of Pakistan. No notice has been taken of the terrible crisis which overwhelmed the country in December 1971 and broke it. As the book is meant to be studied during the two years of classes 9 and 10, it means that at least till 1974 the two highest classes of the school were not told of the break-up of the country whose history they were studying.

Now for what the book tells us about history:

"Our homeland, Pakistan came into being in 1947. But its name had made history a few years earlier. Some people consider Pakistan to be a new country. But this is not true." (opening sentence of the part on history. p. 63).

Can anyone make out what the author is trying to convey in these four short sentences? The advent of Islam in India reformed Hindu society. Shaikh Ali Hujveri, Khwaja Muinuddin Chishti, Bahauddin Zakria, Bakiniar Kaki. Baba Farid Shakar Ganj, Nizamuddin Auliya and other holy men "won over the people" (Hindus) of India. "Their teachings dispelled many superstitions of the Hindus and reformed their bad practices. Thereby Hindu religion of the olden times came to an end" (p. 73).

I have not read any book on Hinduism or Indian history which tells me that the old Hindu religion disappeared because of the efforts of these Muslim *pirs* and *Sufis*.

"During the Muslim rule, there was no set rule for ascension to the throne. It was not obligatory that on the death of a king, the son must succeed the father. The Nobles and the *Ulema* at the capital took part in the selection of a king" (p. 75).

There is absolutely no evidence in the history or contemporary chronicles of the Delhi Sultanate and the Mughal Empire of the royal succession being determined by the *Ulema* or the courtiers. In most cases it was the personality of the contender or heir which settled the issue. It was not uncommon to see the rivals to the throne fighting among themselves, murdering each other, and even killing the regnant father to make room for the ambitious or the impatient claimant. Which *Ulema* did Aurungzeb consult before dethroning and imprisoning his father and murdering his brothers?

There is one page on Haji Shariatullall of Bengal (108-109), and nearly four pages (110-113) on Sayyid Ahmad Barelawi. In this the book follows the standard practice of underplaying Bengali contributions to our history and religion.

On 1857: "The British call it a 'mutiny' and their opponents, 'rebels'. Pakistanis, on the other hand, call it the War of Independence" (p. 113). The point is not argued. We should recall: that Sayyid Ahmad Khan also called these fighters in the war of independence *baghis*.

The Aligarh movement is given eight pages (120-127), the Deoband school two and a half (128-130), and the Anjuman-i-Hamayat-i-Islam of Lahore another two and a half (135-137). But only four pages are spared for the post-1857 Bengali movements.

The "Muslims got the right of separate electorates in 1906" (p. 134). They petitioned for the concession in 1906 at Simla; it was given to them in 1909 under the Minto-Morley reforms.

The Simla Deputation of 1906 demanded that the Muslims should be given representation in elected institutions "according to their population" (p. 152). He is wrong. The Deputation asked for weightage, that is more seats than the Muslims were entitled to under population figures.

"The founder of the Congress was Allen Hume" (p. 154).

He was not. I have covered this point already.

In connection with the making of the 1919 reforms he makes no reference to the Lucknow Pact (p. 169).

The Lahore Resolution demanded "an independent state" (p. 178). For correction see Chapter 2.

"The word Pakistan was first used for the Muslim homeland by Chaudhri Rahmat Ali when he was a student at Cambridge" (p. 178). The sentence appears immediately after an account of the Lahore Resolution, and therefore gives the natural impression that Rahmat Ali invented the word for the state allegedly demanded by the Resolution. As no date is given to Rahmat Ali's coinage the wrong conclusion gains firmer support.

"Pakistan came into existence on the 14th August, 1947" (p.185).

Read 15 August for 14, and see Chapter 2.

"Both wings of the country were treated equally in matters of economic development .... East Pakistan was given a larger share in the allocations" (p. 197). This is the typical West Pakistani claim and has no elements of truth in it See Chapter 2.

"The Parliamentary form of government requires two things to succeed ... organized political parties ... [and] leaders of selfless and sacrificing nature" (p. 205).

This is a shallow and unperceptive remark coming from anyone, but it is anserine in the mouth of a senior professor of political science. It makes two crass mistakes. First, it pays no attention to factors like periodical and honest elections, free press, collective responsibility of the cabinet, tolerance of minority views, willingness to resign if the house shows its lack of confidence in the government, accountability of the government to the house in daily operation, a strong and respected opposition, and absence of ordinances and other executive fiats which bypass the parliament. Secondly, the two pre-requisites about leadership mentioned by hint are equally necessary in the presidential form of government.

"The new constitution which was promulgated on 23rd March 1956 could not be put into operation" (p. 208).

In fact, it was in operation till 7 October 1958. For full details see Chapter 2.

Ayub Khan's abdication in favor of General Yahya Khan is mentioned (pp. 217-218), but its illegality and its disastrous consequences for the future of the country are not even hinted at.

The 1971 break-up of Pakistan is disposed of in six lines, without a word about the civil war, its causes, the war with India, and the reasons for the secession of East Pakistan.

As expected, keeping in view the date of the publication of the book, there is one paragraph welcoming Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's rise to power and paying the standard homage to the new government (pp. 218-219).

The 1956 constitution "was enforced on 23rd March" (p. 222); but on p. 208 above he has declared that it was not put into operation. In which of the two statements will the student put faith and repeat it in the examination script?

On the 1965 war: "When the Indian attack had been stopped and the Pakistan forces began to advance, efforts were started by India for a cease-fire" (p. 259). The prescribed Pakistani diet for the wretched students. See Chapter 2.

The "basic policy followed by our country in foreign affairs is to maintain friendly relations with the three Great Powers, Russia, China and the U.S.A." (p. 265).

To put Russia and the U.S.A. in the same category *vis a vis* Pakistan's foreign relations is a travesty of truth. For Russia read the Soviet Union.

Even the concerted labor of three professors (presumably of the English language) have failed to give the book a style which does not jolt the reader on every page. It is impossible to list all the howlers. A few examples will illustrate the ineptitude and ignorance of the translators: Liaquat Ali "toured throughout the length and breadth of the country" (p. 193): after Jinnah's death "there was a break-up of unity among the political leaders of Pakistan" (p. 194): Ayub Khan "enforced a new constitution" (p. 224): "the judges are appointed by the President but he consults also Governor" (p. 239): "in 1965, the relations of India and Pakistan once again deteriorated" (p. 256).

### Classes 9-10

*Pakistan Studies for Secondary Classes*, Jamal Book Dept, Lahore. for the Punjab Textbook Board, 1st ed. March 1987, pp. 214. Author: Professor Saeed Osman Malick. Supervisors: Sibti-i-Hasan and Hifsa Javed. Produced by the Punjab Textbook Board with reference of [sic] the Education Department, Government of the Punjab, Lahore, circular letter NO.SO (c) Edu. 10-25-72 dated 15-7-75. Reviewed and approved by the National Review Committee, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education and Provincial Coordination. Print order: 5,000 copies.

The inside front cover of the book carries an appeal from the Chairman of the Board addressed to the parents and students not to buy pirated editions of the Board's books and an advice to the students "not to purchase any additional books other than those prescribed by the Education Department and published by the Board". There are five elementary grammatical errors in the appeal.

I submit the following string of direct quotations from the book for the reader's attention and amusement:

"Man's mission on earth is to follow and establish God's instructions to His commands" (p. 21). The sense of the sentence has been buried deep under the debris of the grammar,

"The Muslim rulers [of India] based their governments on Islamic principles .... Muslim rulers introduced the principle of consultation in governmental matters. The rulers consulted the nobles concerning secular affairs and religious scholars and Sufis with regard to religious matters" (p. 9). Contemporary histories and narratives do not support this claim.

"From Akbar's rule onward, the standard of the Muslim army went down .... the commanders became so ease-loving that they would go to the front in *palki* (cradle)" (p. 12).

"The British came to power in the sub-continent after the failure of the War of Independence, 1857" (p. 12). The British had exercised power in most parts of India long before 1857. Has the author never heard of the Regulating Acts? The British even controlled Delhi since 1803 and gave a pension to the Mughal emperor.

"Shah Waliullah's most well-known book is Hijjatullah-hil Baligha" (p. 16). For "most well-known" read best known. The book's correct title is *Hajjat Allah al Baligha*.

"Nawab Abdul Latif carried on Sir Syed's movement in Bengal" (p. 20). The Nawab did not do any such thing. His movement flowed from an independent Bengali initiative and owed nothing to Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan. Why does every author trace all Muslim movements back to Aligarh?

"The Simla Delegation demanded separate representation for Muslims" (p. 23). Read Deputation for "Delegation". It also demanded weightage, besides separate electorates.

"The [Khilafat] movement was at its peak in the sub-continent when Mustafa Kamal Ataturk declared Turkey a republic and put an end to the Caliphate" (p. 24). The movement had passed its peak two years before the Khilafat was abolished. On 27 February 1924 Vasyf Bey moved in the Grand Assembly that the Khilafat be abolished. On 1 March Ataturk supported the proposal. On 2 March the proposal was endorsed by the People's Party. On 3 March the Assembly adopted it. Sultan Abdul Majid, the last Khalifa, left Constantinople at dawn on 4 March, arrived in Territel in Switzerland on 7 March, and thereafter lived in Switzerland till his death. As from 1 July he accepted a pension of £300 a month from the Nizam of Hyderabad.

"Iqbal wanted a separate State for them [the Muslims of India]" (p. 29). He did not. See Chapter 2 for details.

"It is my wish that the Punjab, the Frontier Province, Sindh and Baluchistan be combined so as to make one State — The setting-up of a North Western Muslim State (of the entire subcontinent) is the destiny of at least the Muslims of the north west regions" (p. 29).

[This is supposed to be a quotation from Iqbal's Allahabad address].

"The Indian leaders could not come to any agreement at the Round Table Conference). The British Government. therefore introduced a new Constitutional Act — The Government of India Act, 1935. The Act gave more powers to the provinces" (p. 30). The Government of India Act, not the "Constitutional Act", was the result of six years (1928-34) of British-Indian inquiries, talks, collaboration, deliberations, discussions and conferences.

"Many Muslim leaders in the past had supported the concept of a separate State for the Muslims. Allama Iqbal was the most prominent among them. Chaudhri Rahmat Ali had even named this State as PAKISTAN. However, the Muslim League made a formal demand for an independent State for the Muslims of the Sub-continent in 1940. A federation of united India was no longer acceptable. The Pakistan Resolution was passed by the Muslim League in a meeting held at Minto Park (now Iqbal Park) in Lahore on the 23rd March, 1940. It demanded ... an independent State" (pp. 31-32). There are 4 factual mistakes and one vital omission in the passage. See Chapter 2.

"The elected Muslim members of the Central and Provincial Assemblies held a Convention at Delhi in 1946" (p. 32). It should be Muslim League members, not Muslim members.

Radcliffe gave to India "Muslim majority areas like Ferozepur, Jullundher and Gurdaspur" (p. 33). Jullundher was solidly Hindu-majority district. Only one tidbit in Ferozepur and two tahsils in Gurdaspur had a Muslim majority and were allotted to India.

"The East Pakistan Tragedy in 1970 ..." (p. 36). Read 1971 for 1970.

In 1970 East Pakistan "broke away from the mother country" (p. 38). East Pakistan broke away in December 1971, not in 1970. Was West Pakistan a "mother country" of East Pakistan, though a majority of the country's population lived in East Pakistan? It was such fatuous proprietorial arrogance that led to the break-up. Pakistanis learn nothing even from recent historical calamities.



"General Muhammad Yahya Khan, the then Commander-in-Chief of Pakistan Army, succeeded him [Ayub]" (p. 45). General Yahya Khan did not succeed Ayub Khan; he usurped Ayub's place through force and blackmail, and the fact should be told to the students. They should also be told that on taking over power Yahya called himself Chief Martial Law Administrator and Commander-in-Chief *not* the President of the country. It was only after a few weeks that his advisers in the Foreign Office persuaded him to add the title of President to his other honors and offices and ranks; were he to refuse, it might create problems of international recognition of the new regime. The General condescended to accept the office of the Presidency of the Republic. An eye-opening reminder of the debasement of the Presidency of the Republic by Ayub Khan and his army. The Generals preferred their rank to the highest office in the country!

"In December 1970, Pakistan's first general elections were held under the Legal Framework Order (LFO) for electing people's representatives to frame a new constitution. After the elections, unfortunately, the country fell a victim to political crisis and foreign conspiracies. Pakistan's neighbor Bharat attacked Pakistan. The result was the separation of East Pakistan in December, 1971" (p. 46). For details see Chapter 2.

In 1977 "the Opposition Parties alleged the ruling Peoples Party for rigging in the elections. It created a great resentment and the Opposition Parties launched a movement against the government. The law and order situation was totally out of control. The army took over and imposed Martial Law in the country on July 5, 1977. Federal and provincial governments, and the legislative bodies were dissolved. The Constitution of 1973 was partially held in abeyance. The President and the Chief Martial Law Administrator (CMLA) nominated the members of Majlis-i-Shura in December, 1981. The first session of this body was held in Islamabad in January, 1982. The Chief Martial Law Administrator and the President of Pakistan, General Muhammad Ziaul Huq, promised on 12th August 1982, that there shall be complete Islamic Democratic System in the country by March, 1985. As a step towards this goal, the President secured a vote of confidence in his favor through a nation-wide referendum held in December 1984. After that, elections to the National and Provincial Assemblies were held in February 1985. Elections to the Senate and for the special seats for women and minorities etc were completed in March, 1985 and this finalized the composition of the Parliament. In the mean-time, the Constitution of 1973, with some amendments was reinstated. General Muhammad Ziaul Huq took the oath as elected President of Pakistan on 23rd March, 1985. The same day, the Prime Minister also took the oath, and in this way Islamic Democratic System started functioning in the country" (pp. 57-58). For a full discussion of the Zia *coup* and his misrule see Chapter 2 below.

"... the Muslims came to this country bringing with them a clean and elegant culture and civilization. The Hindus were influenced by the Islamic civilization. The Hindus are indebted to Muslim culture and civilization today" (p. 172). What is a "clean" culture?

Was the Indian or Hindu culture "unclean"? As for the borrowing, didn't the Muslims also take much from the Hindu way of life, which is a part of today's Pakistani culture?

"Urdu is the only language, which, with minor variations, is spoken and understood in the subcontinent right from Peshawar (Pakistan) to Ras Kumari (Bharat) even today" (p. 175).

"The syntax of Urdu language is such that the words of other languages included in it do not appear alien. Instead, they look as if they originally belonged to Urdu" (p. 176).

"Urdu literature has a vast treasure of poetry and prose and more is being added to it daily. It is quite suited to become the official language" (p. 176).

"It is necessary that stories, dramas, songs and essays about every region of Pakistan should be written in Urdu so that the people of these regions may get satisfaction in reading them" (italicized in the original) (p. 180). For the vacuity of his claims for Urdu see below Chapters 2 and 3.

"Before the creation of Pakistan, Saudi Arabia had great sympathy for the freedom movement of the Muslims in India" (p. 204). The students are entitled to a proof and some examples of this "great sympathy". Abject flattery of a country which backed General Zia's illegal government should have no place in a textbook, in fact in any book. The author was the Head of Department of Political Science at the Government College, Lahore, when he wrote this book, and holds a Master's degree from the London School of Economics. This egregious book has also been prescribed by the Sindh Textbook Board as a textbook for secondary school examination within the areas covered by the Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education, Hyderabad, and the Board of Secondary Education, Karachi. Presumably it was on the strength of the authorship of this book that Professor Malick was appointed, in January 1990, on the Board of Advisors of the Heritage School System of Lahore, and after retirement from government service was made principal of the Lahore College of Arts and Sciences, a private English-medium elite institution.

*Pakistan Studies, IX and X: Solved Papers, Short Answers, Descriptive Answers, Objective*, Azad Publishers, Karachi, n.d., pp.128.

"Iqbal was the first important public figure who gave the idea of a separate Muslim State from the platform of the Muslim League" (p. 11); Iqbal "did Bar-at-Law and went to Germany for his Ph.D. Degree" (p. 55); "in fact, it was Allama Iqbal who gave the idea of separate homeland for Muslims of the subcontinent", and his 1930 Allahabad address "contains the first conception of the two-nation theory and demand for a separate homeland for the Indian Muslims. Allama Iqbal further explained his point in third Round Table Conference, in 1932" (pp. 55-56); Jinnah "went to England for Bar-at-Law" (p. 56);

the Pakistan Resolution "stated that the north-western and north-eastern areas of south-Asia which had a majority of Muslim population should be funned independent state" (p. 57); "it may be said that Pakistan represents the true picture of Islamic Culture" (p. 98); "Urdu is the national language of Pakistan and an important language of the world. Urdu got its currency from the beginning of the Muslim rule. The chief credit for its popularity goes to mystics and saints, who wrote in Urdu ... by the advent of the British it had been adopted by the Hindus and the Muslims alike" (p. 98); the causes of the popularity of Urdu are summed up as follows: "it has great power of mixing up with other languages"; "it is spoken and understood all over the country"; "saints, Sufis and poets had written a lot in Urdu. So it had become popular among the Muslim masses who am very religious-minded"; "various parts of the country claim their own province as the cradle bed of Urdu" (pp. 98-99).

Iqbal did not utter a word about Pakistan at the Round Table Conference. All the Muslim mystics and saints wrote in Arabic or Persian or in both languages, not in Urdu. If Pakistan is a true picture of Islamic culture, this culture should be given a new meaning and a new definition: there must be a limit to which the students can he made fools of. Other mistakes in the paragraph are corrected below in Chapter 2.

### Classes 11-12

Pakistan Studies (Compulsory) for Intermediate Classes, published by Sh. Shaukat Ali and Sons, Karachi, September 1983. pp. 112. Prepared under the supervision of the Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad, Approved for the Departments of Education of the Punjab, Sindh, NWFP, Baluchistan, Federal Area and liberated Kashmir vide Federal Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan. Islamabad, Notification No. F. 11-16/8 I -HST, dated 2nd November, 1981, as the sole textbook for intermediate classes. Authors: Dr. Safdar Mahmood. Dr. Aminullah Vaseer, Saeeduddin Ahmad Dar. Iqbal Bakht and Dr. Azhar Hameed. Editor: Dr. Azhar Harmed.

We are told by the Education Secretary of the Government of Pakistan in the Foreword that "this textbook on Pakistan Studies which is a faithful translation of the Urdu edition produced earlier by the Education Ministry has been published because there was a persistent demand for an English version" (p. v).

"In his famous statement (Allahabad 1930) Allama Iqbal strongly advocated the creation of an Islamic state in order to maintain the separate identity of the Muslims of the subcontinent" (p. 4); the Indian National Congress was founded by "Lord Hume" in 1885 (p. 27); Bankim Chandra Chatterji's novel *Anandamath* is called "Anand Sukh" (p. 28); in 1930 "Allama

Iqbal emphasized that it was essential for the Muslims of the subcontinent, if they desired to live in accordance with their cultural traditions and social values, to establish a separate state for themselves" (p. 36); Rahmat Ali "proposed 'Pakistan' as the name of the country which was to be formed" by the Lahore Resolution; which clearly implies that Rahmat Ali did so after 1940 (p. 39): "the Muslims of the subcontinent waged their last war for freedom in 1857" (p. 82); "the origin of Pakistani languages can be traced to religious topics, for Islam serves as the fountain-head of all Pakistani literature" (p. 85); "historically it [Urdu] is the language of the Muslims of the subcontinent and the symbol of our national identity ... [it] is understood and spoken in all parts of the country" (p. 86); the 1971 break-up is described like this: "By early 1971 the law and order condition in East Pakistan had deteriorated seriously. Bharat, taking advantage of the situation, infiltrated her agents who provided arms to saboteurs and anti-state elements who were trained and financially assisted to step up their efforts. Not contented at that, Bharat attacked East Pakistan in November, 1971. The Pakistan Armed Forces, despite internal communications being cut off and no reinforcements reaching them from West Pakistan, waged a gallant struggle. As the odds were overwhelmingly against them, they were asked in mid-December to lay down their arms and cease all resistance" (p. 97-98).

Hume was not a peer, and he did not establish the Indian National Congress. For other inaccuracies and oddities see Chapter 2.

*History of Pakistan* by Professor Rallullah Shehab, published by Sanger-Meel Publications, Lahore, 1989, pp. 262. Actually this is a new edition, but the fact is not mentioned, nor are the dates of the previous editions given.

The author teaches Islamic Studies or Arabic at the most prestigious college of Lahore. The book is used by the better groups of intermediate students and also by some degree students.

"Many of the European and Hindu writers have tried to paint him [Aurangzeb] as a religious zealot, which he was not. He ... followed most of the policies which were really originated during the reign of Akbar . . . . Even his enemies admit that he was tolerant, large hearted and accommodating" (p. 33): a "War of Independence" was fought in 1857, and "during the period following the War of Independence, the British remained nervous" (p. 63): at the same time the army fighting the British is referred to as "rebel soldiers" (p. 69); the name of the Secretary of State for India 1917 is misspelt as "Montague" (p. 78): the Round Table Conferences were held in "1913" (p. 78); the Pakistan Resolution was passed on 23 March 1949 (p. 83): Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan laid "the first brick of the foundation of Pakistan" when he founded the Aligarh College (p. 83), and "this school is rightly considered as a first-brick laid in the foundation of Pakistan" (p. 88); Iqbal gave his Allahabad address on "29th December, 1931", and a passage from the address is wrongly quoted (p. 92); in 1860 "Urdu was the language of

the Subcontinent" (p. 102); at Allahabad Iqbal "discussed at length the scheme for the partition of the sub-continent, a resolution to this effect was also passed in that session of the All India Muslim League" (p. 113): "the British Government under the Government of India Act of 1935 granted self-govt. to the people of the Subcontinent" (p. 113); the Lucknow Pact was "a landmark in the political history of the Sub-continent" (p. 117); the Simon Commission "was boycotted by both the Congress and the Muslim League" (p. 118); the Nehru Report was submitted "in 1926" (p. 118); in 1930 Iqbal "demanded for a separate homeland for the Muslims of the Sub-continent" (p. 122); the Lahore Resolution demanded "a separate Muslim State comprising of North-Western and Eastern Zones of India where the Muslims were in majority" (p. 124).

Certain facts must be brought to the notice of the author. Is it or is it not sate that Aurangzeb Alamgir destroyed Hindu temples, enforced a harsh version of the Islamic law of one particular school (the Hanafi), dispossessed and incarcerated his father, murdered his brothers, proscribed all liberal thinking, banned music and painting, and drained off the military and financial resources of the empire in trying to liquidate the Muslim Shia kingdoms of South India while abandoning western and northern India to Marhatta, Jat and Sikh depredations? In what possible sense was he tolerant, large-hearted and accommodating? It is impossible for any historian to notice the slightest resemblance between his policies and those of Akbar. Read Montagu for "Montague". The Round Table Conference met in 1930-32, not in 1913. Iqbal's Allahabad address was given in 1930, not in 1931. The Government of India Act of 1935 did not give India self-government it established a close type federal system in which the central government controlled by a non-elected and unaccountable Governor General, was to hold the provinces in leash (though in fact the federal pan of the Act was never implemented). The Nehru Report was issued in 1928, not 1926. For the correction of other mistakes see Chapter 2.

The Khilafat agitation died out in 1922 when the Sultan of Turkey was deposed (p. 170); in 1926 the Muslim League and the Congress decided to draft a constitution for India "in reply to the humiliation heaped on India by the appointment of Simon Commission" (p. 170); the Indian National Congress is called the "All India National Congress" (p. 171); the Pakistan Resolution was "passed on 23rd March" (p. 172); "an All-India Muslim League legislators convention was held at Delhi on 9th April 1949" (p. 202).

The Muslim League did not join the Congress in drafting a constitution for India in 1926. The All India Muslim League did not boycott the Simon Commission; only a part of it under Jinnah did so. The Nehru Report was submitted in 1928, not in 1926. See also Chapter 2 for more corrections.

"The present Martial Law Government ... decided to enforce honestly the Islamic system of government as promised by the Quaid-i-Azam to the nation" (p. 207); "June 27, 1947. Pakistan State takes its birth" (p. 211); "July 19, 1947. Two free Dominions are born" (p.

212); the NWFP is called "North-Western province" (p. 212); Yahya Khan postponed the National Assembly session scheduled to be held in Dacca on "March 1, 1970" (p. 214).

Was the Islamic system which was enforced by General Zia the one promised by Jinnah to the nation? Can any speech or writing of Jinnah be quoted in support of this contention? If for a moment we assume that Zia's Islam was Jinnah's goal, did the father of the nation want that goal to be imposed on the people against their will by a military ruler who had usurped power and had no sanction, legal or moral, for the ways in which he turned his whims into ordinances? Pakistan took its birth on 15 August, not 27 June. The two Dominions of India and Pakistan were born on 15 August, not on 19 July.

"Criticism of the Supreme Court's decision which upheld the assumption of power by Ayub Khan on the doctrine of an effective revolution thereby legitimizing force similarly fails to take into account the political culture of the country and the shifting balance of forces in which the courts operated" (p. 221); "it was General Yahya Khan's tragic lot to preside over the disintegration of Pakistan to which his folly had made a signal contribution. His ignominious fall from power in the aftermath of the disastrous war with India in 1971 paved the way for the rise of the People's Party to power" (p. 222); Bhutto proved to be a dictator and showed it in the 1977 elections. "The smoldering discontent found a powerful outburst in the general election of 1977 and turned into an extraordinary mass movement of pretest precipitating the imposition of Martial Law on July 5, 1977" (p. 223); this Martial Law "by contrast was the grim deposit of the clash between the political party in power and the parties in opposition which had brought the country to the brink of a civil war" (p. 223).

Does the political culture of the country demand from the Supreme Court that it ratifies and upholds every military overthrow of a constitutional movement? For the break-up of 1971 and the Zia *coup* of 1977 see Chapter 2.

"The regional languages, Punjabi, Pashto, Sindhi and Baluchi, are the products of the same cultural factors and ideologies which brought Urdu into existence. This ensures to a large extent the cultural unity of Pakistan, if by culture we do not mean a drab uniformity of language and emotional pattern" (p. 226); "Urdu is understood all over the country; in fact it was the lingua franca of the Sub-continent and may perhaps even now be serving India as such. Next to Urdu, Punjabi is understood and spoken over most parts of the country" (p. 227); "many games and sports are played in Pakistan which reflect our cultural identity. These games include wrestling, hockey, cricket, football, squash, and kabbadi" (p. 228).

According to the 1981 census of Pakistan, Punjabi is spoken by the largest segment of the population of the country and Urdu by 7.60 per cent of the people. In what way do the games of cricket and football reflect our cultural identity? We borrowed and learnt

both from the British. By the same logic. the English language and Western dress should also reflect our cultural identity. Do they? For other points see Chapter 2.

One foil chapter (pp. 80-88) deals with Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the Aligarh movement and there are references to them in other chapters also, but there is no mention of the part played by Bengal in the nationalist or the Pakistan movement.

The bibliographies given at the end of each chapter and the general bibliography appended at the end of the book are extremely defective. For example, J.M. Keynes's *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* is said to have been published in 1957. Books don't carry their full titles, nor is it indicated whether the person named as the author is the writer or the editor. The most astonishing statement is that D.P. Singhal's *A History of the Indian People* is the work of a British historian; and passages from this book are quoted in *extenso* in chapter after chapter to prove that a "British historian" is critical of British rule (pp. 41, 64, 71, 73). The author is not aware that Dr. Singhal was an Indian Hindu scholar.

The English used in the writing of this book may be illustrated by a few examples chosen at random: "Many of the problems he had to encounter, were brewing for some time" (p. 33); "As a result he did not adopted it as the official code of the empire" (p. 33); "throughout his life Sahu acknowledged his greatness and always visited his grave to pay respect and indebtedness. This even negates the propaganda that he converted the Hindus to Islam under threat of power" (p. 33); "ministers took over the reign of the governments" (p. 33); "the struggle for Pakistan culminated in the establishment to Pakistan in August 1947" (p. 113); and "it is unfortunate that the Quaid soon parted us on September 14, 1948" (p. 196).

### **Degree Level**

General Ziaul Huq's military regime decided that a course called "Mutala'a-i-Pakistan" should be devised and that it should be taught in all colleges (arts, science, law, engineering, technology, medicine, etc.), and no boy or girl would be deemed to have passed his or her degree examination until he or she had been examined, and declared successful, in this course. A very special textbook for this course was prepared by the joint effort of several committees and sub-committees of the Federal Ministry of Education, the University Grants Commission, the Allama Iqbal Open University and a few other official bodies.

In the preparation of the course advice was given by Professor Muhammad Ismail Sethi, Member of the University Grants Commission, and Dr. Sher Muhammad Zaman, a former Vice-Chancellor of the Allama Iqbal Open University. The late Dr. Abdul Hamid, a former Director of the Research Society of Pakistan, was the guiding spirit in the meetings of the Course Committee and the Course Team. Dr. Ahmad

Muhayyuddin, the then Vice-Chancellor of the Allama Iqbal Open University, also played an important part in the preparation of the book.

**The Course Team was as follows:**

Coordinator Dr. Azhar Hameed.

Members Professor Sharif-al-Mujahid (Director, Quaid-i-Azam Academy, Karachi).

Dr. Muni ruddin Chughtai (Head of the Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore).

Dr. Abdul Hamid (Former Director, Research Society of Pakistan. Lahore).

Dr. Safdar Mahmood (Deputy Director General, Pakistan Sports Board, Islamabad).

Khwaja Saeeduddin Dar (Head of Department of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad).

Professor Iqbal Syed.

Mrs. Muzaffri Qureshi.

Abdul Hamid Rathor.

Dr. Muhammad Siddique Khan Shibli.

Jalil Qazi.

Course Editor Dr. Azhar Hameed.

Senior Editor Bashir Ahmad.

The chapters of the book with their authors are as follows:

1. The Pakistan Ideology by Dr. Azhar Hameed (revised by Professor Sharif-al-Mujahid) (pp. 1-28).
2. The Land of Pakistan by Dr. Azhar Hameed (revised by Dr. Muhanimad Sa'd) (pp. 29-56).



3. The Shaping and Evolution of the Muslim Society in the Subcontinent by Professor Muhammad Aslam (revised by Khwaja Saeeduddin Dar) (pp. 57-80).
4. The Pakistan Movement by Dr. Muniruddin Chughtai (revised by Dr. Safdar Mahmood) (pp. 31-32).
5. The Struggle for Pakistan by Muhammad Jahangir Alam (revised by Dr. Inamul Huq) (pp. 133-168).
6. The Role of the Ulema, Religious Leaders, Writers, Journalists, Students and Ladies in the Pakistan Movement by Hakim Aftab Hasan Qarshi (revised by Professor Muhammad Aslam) (pp. 169-208).
7. The Establishment of Pakistan by Dr. Azhar Hameed (revised by Dr. Rafique Afzal) (pp. 209-238).
8. Efforts for the Implementation of the Islamic System in Pakistan by Professor Zakria Sajid (revised by Karam Hydari) (pp.239-272).
9. Pakistan and the Islamic World by Khwaja Saeeduddin Dar (revised by Dr. Rafique Maul) (pp. 273-302).

This book was published by Izhar Sons, Lahore. for the Allama Iqbal Open University under the title of *Mutala'a-i-Pakistan (Compulsory)*, n.d. The second edition carries a Foreword by Dr. Ghulam Ali Allana, Vice-Chancellor of the Allama Iqbal Open University, in which we are told that the text being now presented has been completely revised, corrected and supplemented. The book also includes the Foreword of the first edition by Dr. Ahmad Mohayyuddin, the Vice-Chancellor of the Allama Iqbal Open University at the time when the first edition was published: it claims that the ablest teachers and experts of the country cooperated in the preparation of the book.

The historical knowledge contained in this book is reflected in the following statements and assertions:

In 1930 at Allahabad Iqbal presented the idea of a partition of India "with great clarity and detail", Foreword by Dr. Ghulam Ali Allana (p. ix).

On Iqbal and the idea of Pakistan see Chapter 2.

"The British were extremely proud of their power and wealth and their racial arrogance was great. They tried every weapon against the Muslims, put restraints on writing and speech, deprived them of their rights to employment and tried their best to keep them

educationally backward .... In short, throughout their rule the British treated the Muslims as step-children" (p. 8).

This is a gross exaggeration. The Muslims of India (along with other Indians) were more free to write and speak their mind under the British than Pakistanis have been since 1947 under their own governments. The British extended much help and patronage to the MAO College, Aligarh, and to the All India Muhammadan Educational Conference which was founded by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan. In Bengal the Calcutta Muhammadan Literary Society received official aid and help.

"The Muslims never in their heart accepted British rule" (p. 9).

Really! Then, how did they persuade themselves to live under this rule for nearly two hundred years, and some of their leaders and rulers fought on their side against other Muslim kingdoms and principalities and unties? And, apart from some exceptional times like the post-Mutiny decade and the Khilafat movement years. they lived happily and cooperated willingly with the Government. In fact, loyalty permeated Muslim publics and especially the Muslim League. The balanced historian should not feel embarrassed in admitting these facts of history. From 1906 to 1947 the great majority of the leaders of the Muslim League, the Bengal United Party, the various Sindh Muslim parties, the Punjab Unionist Party and of course all the Muslim groups in the United Provinces, were Nawabs, Knights, Khan Bahadurs, *ta'aluqdars*, *zamindars*, pensioners, *darbaris*, business magnates of Madras.

Bombay and Calcutta, and prominent urban professionals with close links with the establishment. Look at the Muslim members of the Viceroy's Executive Council, Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conferences, member of the Muslim League working Committees and of the All India Muslim Conference Executive Boards and other such representative bodies, and the commoners are thin on the ground. Iqbal wrote a fawning elegy on the death of Queen Victoria, in the 1914-18 war he participated in the recruitment meetings, composed a verse eulogizing Sir Michael O'Dwyer, the masterful Governor of the Punjab, and ended up as a Knight. Before him Sayyid Ahmad Khan had stood firmly against the "*mujahidin*" of the "War of Independence". Even the revered *Ulema* of Nadwa indulged in such base flattery on the occasion of the opening ceremony of their dar-ul-ulum that the reader of the official proceedings may well believe that these were the officials of the Church of England and not the doctors of Islam who were making these speeches. The Aga Khan was a great friend of the British Empire, and made no secret of his feelings or his attachment. There were many like him in Muslim public life.

The play of loyalty is too pervasive a feature of Muslim politics to be swept under the carpet. Original sources of history show it up. Contemporary newspapers publish its public expressions. Books are full of it. Scholars are aware of it. It is only the

government and its paid minions who act like ostriches. That would not matter much but for the fact that the government is telling lies to the students and thus standing between them and tom history.

"This country is an overwhelmingly Muslim country and was created on the basis of an ideology, and this ideology is the Islamic religion of the Muslims. This is the generally understood meaning of the ideology of Pakistan" (p. 16, this is a literal translation of the Urdu sentence which is not clear).

Even a dullard could not have written a more Mane sentence. Ideology equals Islam, then why indulge in tautology? The ideology of Pakistan is "the Islam religion of the Muslims". The apparent meaning being that the Muslims adhere to some other religion also besides Islam!

Among the persons who are listed as the founders of the ideology of Pakistan are Mawlana Mahmud Hasan and Mawlana Abdul Ala Maududi; it is not even mentioned that they were opposed to the Muslim League and Maududi was against the creation of Pakistan (pp. 19-20).

For a detailed comment on this see Chapter 2.

"Allama Iqbal was the first thinker to offer the idea of a separate Muslim state in the subcontinent on positive and ideological grounds" (p. 22).

Iqbal was not the first thinker to do so. He did not offer the idea of a separate state in 1930. When later in 1937 he argued in favor of separatism he did so on religious and economic grounds, not on "ideological" grounds.

The section on Muslim revival in India confines the treatment to Shah Waliullah, the Deoband school, the University of Aligarh, the Nadwat-ul-Ulema, the Jamia Millia Islamia of Delhi, and the Anjuman-i-Hamayat-i-Islam of Lahore. No person or institution from Bengal is mentioned (pp. 75-79).

The events of 1857 are referred to as "the War of Independence" (p. 90).

On this see Chapter 2.

The Lucknow Pact is presented as a victory of the Muslim League, but no mention is made of the fact that the Muslims of Bengal and the Punjab lost their right to rule the provinces (pp. 95-96).

The Lucknow Pact is fully discussed below in Chapter 2.

It was Mawlana Muhammad Ali who convened the All-Parties Muslim Conference in Delhi on 1 January 1929 (p. 99). For the correction of this see Chapter 2.

"From 1930 onwards the idea of dividing India on the basis of Hindu-majority and Muslim-majority areas and the creation of a separate Muslim state began to gain popularity. At this time an open expression of this idea was give by Allama Iqbal in his Allahabad address" (p. 102).

In 1890 Abdul Halim Sharar demanded that "India should be divided into Hindu provinces and Muslim provinces" (p. 102). For "provinces" read districts.

"Some Muslim students who were living in England contacted Iqbal during the Round Table Conference and with his advice they, led by Rahmat Ali, started in early 1933 a Pakistan National Movement" (p. 105).

We have no firm evidence of such a meeting having taken place. Rahmat Ali did not start his movement under Iqbal's advice: he could not have done it because his plan of a Pakistan was totally different from Iqbal's proposal of a large Muslim province inside the Indian federation.

After the 1937 elections "in the Muslim-majority provinces the local Muslim leaders joined the non-Muslims in their own interests and formed provincial parties" (p. 109).

Where was this done? Which parties were formed in this way? In the absence of any information in the book no commentary is possible.

The Pakistan Resolution was passed "amid shouts of joy and congratulations and with unanimity" on 23 March 1940 (p. 117). Read 24 March for 23 March. See also Chapter 2.

"The Unionist Party was founded in 1924. It was a party of big landholders .... It created a spirit of hatred in the province which continued till the creation of Pakistan" (p. 119).

It was not a party of men of broad acres. Among its founders and leading lights were Iqbal, Shaikh Abdul Qadir, Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, Mian Fazl-i-Husain and Mian Abdul Hayee. None of these was a landlord, big or small. Among whom and against whom did the party create hatred? Not against the British, under whom it served. Not against the Hindus and Sikhs, who were a part of it. Not against the Muslim League, which courted it and entered into a pact with it. Against the people, who voted for it. It is a crazy statement as it stands.

In 1890 Abdul Halim Sharar wrote in his journal that "the subcontinent should be divided into Hindu and Muslim provinces" (P. 139).

Read districts for "provinces".

"On 23 March 1940 the Muslim League adopted a resolution asking for the creation of a separate state for the Muslims" (p. 140).

Read 24 March for 23 March. Read "independent states" in place of a "a separate state".

"In its annual session held in Madras in April 1941 the All India Muslim League amended its aims and objects so that now its goal was fixed as the establishment of a separate *mamlakat* for the Muslims of the subcontinent" (p. 141).

If the Muslim League wrote the Lahore Resolution into its constitution at the Madras session, as it actually did, the goal could not have been fixed as "the establishment of a separate *mamlakat*" because such a goal found no mention in the Resolution.

In the history of the NWFP the Khudai Khidmatgars are not mentioned (pp. 145-146).

The Sindh Provincial Muslim League Conference met under Jinnah in Karachi "in October 1936" (p. 156).

Read 1938 for 1936.

"At the beginning of this century the great philosopher Allama Muhammad Iqbal gave the Muslims the lesson of freedom and Islamic identity and then suggested the creation of a separate *mamlakat* as a political solution of the problems of the subcontinent" (p. 160).

There is no evidence at all that early in this century Iqbal suggested the creation of a separate Muslim state.

"On 23 March 1940 ... Pakistan was declared to be the goal of the Muslims" (p. 161).

Read 24 for 23 March. The word "Pakistan" does not appear in the Lahore Resolution.

"Chaudhry Rahmat Ali was basically a man of letters and journalist" (p. 184).

Not even remotely is this true. He created no literature and worked for or edited no newspaper or journal. He was a political thinker and a pamphleteer.

Mian Kafayet Ali's book *Confederacy of India* is referred to as *Wafq-i-Hind* (p. 184).

Fazi Karim Khan Duman is called "Farzand Khan" (p. 185). *The Eastern Times*, the Muslim newspaper of Lahore, is called *Western Times* (p. 180).

The account of the Hindu-Muslim riots and killings of 1947 is blatantly one sided, and all the blame is put on the non-Muslims (pp. 233-234).

"One aspect of the history of Pakistan is not enviable: it has not achieved political stability and till now, in spite of the experiments of parliamentary system, presidential system and military rule, we as a nation have not found agreement on the system suitable for an ideological state like Pakistan. We have also not decided on the political system which can help us in the implementation of Islamic *sharia* and Islamic way of life. But it is a matter of satisfaction that all sections of the country, despite their differences, are unanimous on the point that Pakistan was achieved in the name of Islam, and therefore it must exist as a fortress of the Islamic system" (pp. 247-248).

There is a sharp contradiction between the contents of the first seven lines of the passage and those of the remaining four lines. A good try at stupefying even the intelligent students.

"The Constitution of 1956 had just become operative when differences arose among the political parties of the country. At this juncture, in October 1958, General Muhammad Ayub Khan imposed Martial Law and saved the administration from disorder" (p. 259).

For "just" read two and a half years. Ayub Khan saved the country from democracy, not from disorder.

"In 1969 after disturbances and political disorder in the country General Muhammad Yahya Khan took the reins of government in his own hands" (p. 260).

Yahya Khan usurped the President's powers, though with Ayub's consent (which was obtained by use of force and threats).

"In the elections of December 1970 Mujibur Rahman's Awami League won a success in East Pakistan on the basis of its 4-point programme. The Pakistan People's Party won 87 seats, and the Awami League won 167 seats. The movement for the secession of East Pakistan from Pakistan received powerful support when the Indian Army, on the pretext of coming to the aid of the Mukti Bahini, invaded East Pakistan and forced the Pakistan Army to surrender in Dacca" (p. 261).

The election results are confused up. The first sentence refers to East Pakistan, the second to the centre; but the difference is not made clear. For the secession of East Pakistan see Chapter 2 below.

"The P.P.P. government failed to establish an Islamic system in the country, did not treat the provinces equally, and created a feeling of deprivation in the NWFP and

Baluchistan. For these reasons a movement was started in 1977, which resulted in a change of government" (p. 262). Throughout the book Bhutto is not mentioned.

The 1977 anti-government movement was not started for these reasons, but as a protest against alleged rigging in the elections.

"In March 1977-all the opposition parties joined together and adopted the *Nizam-i-Mustafa* as their election manifesto .... During the election campaign because of the awakening of the sentiment of faith [*iman*], the movement later started by the opposition became a revolutionary movement. Thus it was proved that this agitation against the Government in power was not a simple political action but a means through which the masses of Pakistan were providing a proof that they had accepted in every way and from their hearts the election programme of the opposition, that is the *Nizam-i-Mustafa*, and under no conditions would they allow the movement to be ignored" (pp. 264-265).

See Chapter 2 for the *Nizam-i-Mustafa* campaign.

"The change which came on 5 July 1977 in the shape of the imposition of Martial Law might have been on the surface a political incident, but in reality it was the starting point of an Islamic revolution" (p. 265).

To call an act of treason (as defined in the country's constitution) and usurpation the starting point of an Islamic revolution is neither political nor virtuous.

There are several unofficial textbooks covering the same course. Seven of these are examined below.

*Mutala'a-i-Pakistan (Lazmi)* by Professor Abdul Qayyum Natiq, Fazil Dars-i-Nizami (Nasiria), Honours in Persian (Punjab), Advance in Urdu (Allahabad) [*sic.*], former Honorary Professor, Allama Iqbal Open University, Professor in the Department of Islamic Knowledge, Government College for Women, Karachi, etc., etc., Tahir Sons, Karachi, first published March 1982, this edition October 1989. pp. 191.

"It is not only self-deception but an act of cheating and lying to say that at the time of the demand for Pakistan the leaders had in mind the problem of the division of India and they had no outline of the future constitution of the country" (p. 16); "it was in 1910 that due to the efforts of Muhammad Ali Jinnah the Muslim League and the Congress held their sessions at the same time in Lucknow" and signed a pact (p. 170); as soon as the partition of India was announced the Hindus started a killing of the Muslims which has no parallel in history (pp. 131-133); "it was unfortunate for the country that Chaudhri Muhammad Ali could not continue as Prime Minister and he was forced to resign, and therefore the 1956 Constitution could not be operative" (p. 142); the 1962

Constitution had several clauses which were opposed to the "sacred *shariat*, for example, polygamy, divorce, *khula'* and inheritance by the grandson" (p. 143); "whoever came into power failed to implement Islam in the country because his own mind was incapable of understanding the blessing of the law of God. The blessed day on which the law of God was imposed on the country of God came on Saturday, 10 February 1979, and General Ziaul Huq was chosen by destiny to be the person who achieved the distinction of implementing Islamic law" (p. 146); "in short, the real objective of the creation of Pakistan and the demand of the masses was achieved when the Islamic Ordinances were issued" by the Martial Law Government of General Zia (p. 158); "after having been a part of our country for a long time, East Pakistan separated from us in December 1971. This was a very great tragedy for Pakistan. In fact, it was the result of an international conspiracy in which the U.S.S.R. openly and the U.S.A. indirectly proved that they were the enemies of Pakistan. India used her armed and political force for this purpose. Some Pakistani leaders also made serious mistakes, and the Big Powers took full advantage of it, and the situation went out of control. Anyhow, Bangladesh came into existence" (p. 179).

If the leaders were in possession of an outline of the future constitution of the country, why did it take Pakistan nearly nine years to make a constitution? The Lucknow Pact was signed in 1916. not in 1910. Communal riots had started several months before the announcement of the partition which was made on 3 June; and in these riots Hindus and Muslims killed each other: Hindus were not the only killers. The 1956 constitution did operate, and Chaudhri Muhammad Ali's resignation had nothing to do with its abrogation by Iskander Mirza. For Zia's Islamization and the secession of East Pakistan see Chapter 2.

This book contains long references to Aligarh (pp. 47-59), Deoband (pp. 60-71), Nadwa (pp. 72-78), Anjuman-i-Hamayat-i-Islam (pp.79-88), Sindh Madrasa (pp. 89-91), Islamia College, Peshawar (pp. 94-95) and Sayyid Ahmad Khan (pp. 97-104). There are virtually no references to any Muslim activity in Bengal or to Muslim political developments in that province.

*Mutala'a-i-Pakistan* by Professor Muhammad Bashir Ahmed, M.A. (History, University Gold Medalist, Arnold Gold Medalist). M.A. (Political Science), Diploma in International Affairs. Diploma in Journalism, Diploma in Library Science; Department of History, Government College, Baghbanpura, Lahore; published by Ilmi Kitabkhana, Lahore, 1989 edition. pp. 288.

The Preface dated 14 August 1988, makes it very clear that the author's sympathies and commitment lie with the Martial Law Government of General Ziaul Huq.

"The Muslims knew that if they won the freedom in the subcontinent their new *mamlakat* would prove to be the centre of the hopes of the Muslims of the entire world



and also a fortress to protect Islam. This country would smite the Muslims of the East and the West, and thus the Muslims would become so strong that they would be able to liberate those Muslim areas which were still under the non-Muslims" (p. 12); in December 1930 Iqbal presented the idea of "a separate and independent homeland for the Muslims of the subcontinent", and then the author gives a quotation from the Allahabad address which is not to be found in any text of the address (p. 18); "the Lucknow Pact increased the political stature of the Muslim League because the Congress clearly accepted it as the representative party of the Muslims. It also impressed upon the Hindus the solidarity and strength of the Muslims"; but there is no mention of the fact that the Punjab and Bengal suffered under the provisions of the Pact; Montagu's name is misspell (pp. 88-89); the Treaty of Sevres is called in Urdu "Saiwray" (p. 91); the Lahore Resolution was "passed on 23 March 1940" and it demanded "a separate homeland" (p. 122); Jamaluddin Afghani "presented a scheme for creating an independent Muslim State in the northern part of the subcontinent; he wanted to create an independent *Jamhuriyya* made up of the present-day Pakistan, Afghanistan and the Muslim-majority areas of Central Asia" (p. 155): in his pamphlet Now or Never Rahmat Ali "demanded the immediate separation of the Muslim-majority areas of the subcontinent" (p. 159); this scheme was rejected by "the delegates to the Round Table Conference" (p. 160); "in 1930 Iqbal demanded a separate independent homeland for the Muslims for the first time from a political platform" (p. 161); in 1938 "a committee appointed by the Karachi Muslim Conference" said that the establishment of a separate Muslim State was the "only solution of the rights" of the Muslims (p. 161); on 9 April 1946 a meeting of "five hundred Muslim members of the central and provincial assemblies revised the Lahore Resolution" (p. 170); the communal killings of 1947 are totally and exclusively attributed to the non-Muslims (p. 202); "the 1956 Constitution had been in operation for only two years when the country was overwhelmed by serious crises, disorder in every walk of life, economic decline, inflation and poverty. Iskander Mirza was greatly responsible for the creation of these conditions. In order to save his own Presidentship, on 7 October 1958, going beyond his authority, he abrogated the Constitution and imposed Martial Law .... On 27 October Iskander Mirza's resignation was accepted and he was allowed to leave for England. General Muhammad Ayub Khan, the Chief Martial Law Administrator, took over the office of the Head of State" (p. 221); "as a result of the general elections of 7 December 1970 discontent increased in the country, and under Shaikh Mujib-ur-Ralunan the movement for the separation of East Pakistan under the name of Bangladesh was started. At last in December 1971 East Pakistan separated from us" (p. 223): the agitation against the Bhutto Government reached a stage where a nation-wide conflict appeared possible and the patriotic Pakistanis were troubled by the fears of the future. In these conditions General Ziaul Huq took over power. On 19 December 1984 President Zia, in accordance with his promise to the masses of restoring democracy, held a referendum (p. 227); "unfortunately, irls the past verbal promises for the implementation of the Islamic way of life had been made, but no practical steps were taken because of selfishness and political disorder .... One should be grateful that now serious efforts are being made in

this connection" (p. 232): "in 1971 East Pakistan parted from us and because Bangladesh because of internal and external conspiracies and India's open aggression" (p. 238); "Indian aggression and an international conspiracy separated the eastern part of Pakistan from the country" (p. 283).

The Indian Muslim world had no idea that the creation of Pakistan would lead to Islamic world unity and to the liberation of all Muslim areas under colonial rule; there is nothing about this in the speeches and writings of the years of the Pakistan movement. The plan attributed here to Jamaluddin "Afghani" has no basis in history. In *Now or Never* Rahmat Ali demanded the separation of the Punjab, Sindh, NWFP and Baluchistan (along with the state of Jammu and Kashmir), not of all the Muslim-majority areas of India. His scheme was not rejected by the delegates to the Round Table Conference but by the Muslim witnesses appearing before the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform. The 1946 Delhi meeting was attended by the Muslim League legislators, not by Muslim legislators; the two don't mean the same thing. On other points see Chapter 2.

Like all other textbooks, this one also dismisses the contribution of Bengal to the nationalist movement in just one page on the Faraizi Tahrik (pp. 55-56); but there are eleven pages given to the Aligarh movement (pp. 57-68) and there are several more references to Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and his followers.

*Mutala'a-i-Pakistan (Lazmi) barai Degree Classes*, written by Dr. Muhammad Din, Department of Islamic Studies, University of Peshawar, under the supervision of Dr. Qazi Mujibur Rahman al-Azhari, Dean, Faculty of Islamic Studies and Arabic, University of Peshawar, published by Taj Kutab Khana, Peshawar, December 1984, pp. 218.

In 1930 Iqbal "presented a scheme for the creation of an independent Islamic *riyasat* in India or outside it" (p. 19).

For Iqbal's Allahabad address see Chapter 2.

He can't decide whether to call the Aligarh College an "institution" or a "movement", but he is sure that many of its graduates led the nationalist movement and, after 1947, rendered great services to Pakistan (p. 47).

"The services of the Dar-ul-Ulum of Deoband in the cause of the Pakistan movement are unforgettable" (p. 51).

The role of Deoband in preaching an illiberal version of Islam and in opposing the creation of Pakistan is discussed in Chapter 2.

"The Muslim rulers of India did not make a colony of it like the British" (p. 70).

Refinements of usage span (a discussion of which will be beyond the comprehension of the students and the textbook writers), in common parlance colonialism and imperialism are synonymous terms, though they should not be. Muslim rulers were foreigners, they invaded and conquered India by force or arms, and ruled over the local population. The native subjects sometimes fought the alien masters, but more often collaborated with them in their own interest, learnt their language (Persian), and served in their administration. Now read "the British" for "Muslims" and "English" for "Persian" in my last two sentences, and the parallel between Muslim rule and British rule runs smooth. Add to it the fact that the religions of the two imperial rulers were different from the faith of the conquered Indians. Further, both tried to proselytize: the first through Sufis, the lure of material advancement, the attraction of equal social status (in theory), the temptation of being counted among the ruling class, the psychological fear of the foreign invader, and at times coercion; the second through missionaries, and all other inducements mentioned above. The Muslim rulers won more converts because their tenure of power was longer than that of the British. In both cases it was the lowest stratum of Hindu society which embraced the state religion. The Hindus presented these attacks on their fold. Afghan and Mughal periods were full of Hindu-Muslim battles and Hindu revolts. In the nineteenth century there were some Hindu-Christian riots in South and West India, but they did not spread because the number of Christians was too small to act as an irritant, the British rulers announced a policy of religious neutrality, and the Christian Indians shared the religion of the rulers. But Hindu-Muslim riots continued and multiplied because there were many more Muslims and, without official protection, they were easy victims.

The Hindus hated the two imperial powers in equal degree. For them both were *malachchas* (religiously or ritually unclean), cruel outsiders, pitiless invaders, despoilers of their country, oppressive rulers, and therefore unwelcome intruders. They wanted to get rid of both, and this attitude was perfectly natural.

In all these respects Muslim and British rules fall in the same class. But there was one vital difference. The Muslims made India their hoarse while the British did not. Five factors dictated this decision: climate, geography, history, size, and numbers. The British found India too hot to live in permanently. Were India a salubrious place they might have considered making another Canada of it. Geography favored the Muslims. They had come from contiguous or nearby lands whose climate was, by and large, not very different from that of most parts of India. They did not find it a trial to live here. History, too, was on their side. Waves of foreign invaders had been washing the Indian land for several centuries and leaving behind deposits of varying sizes, like the Greeks and the Huns. Some of them had not receded, like the Aryans. If the people from Central Asia decided to stay on, they were only adding one more ingredient to a pre-existing brew. The huge size of India was beyond the colonizing capacity of Britain. No

matter how many people from England, Scotland and Ireland chose to migrate to India they would always be a tiny group among the millions who populated her vast spaces. The same was true in the numerical sense. While the British would be an unmentionable handful in the subcontinent, the Muslims made up a respectable minority which could not rule the country and yet make its presence felt in decision making.

But it is not true to say that the Muslim rulers did not make a colony of India. They were settlers in a new country, forming a separate community among themselves, and looking back nostalgically to their erstwhile motherlands (*re. Tuzk-i-Baburi*, Humayun's memoirs, Gulbadan Begam's reminiscences, *Tuzk-i-Jahangiri*). That is exactly what a colony means. Further, the alien ruling class did not merge with the local converts, rarely recruited them to higher posts, refused to marry into them. and generally looked down upon them. It is not a matter of chance or accident that up to and including Aurungzeb's reign the great majority of the *mansabdars* was of foreign origin. At the end of 500 years of continuous Muslim rule only a minimal number of local Muslims had managed to climb high on the ladder of preferment.

Here I may add an interesting footnote to the sociological history of modern Muslim India and Pakistan. Almost every Muslim of any importance claimed (and still claims today) in his autobiography. reminiscences. memoirs, journal and bio-data that his ancestors had come from Yemen, Hijaz, Central Asia, Iran, Ghazni or some other foreign territory. In most cases this is a false claim, for its arithmetic reduces the hordes of local converts to an insignificant number. Actually it is an aftermath and a confirmation of Afghan and Mughal exclusiveness. It is also a declaration of disaffiliation from the soil on which these shimmers have lived for centuries and to which, in all probability, they have belonged since history began. If all the Wastis, Qureshis, Siddiquies, Hashmis, Khans, Sayyids, Bukharis, Ghaznawis, Fatimis, Zaidis, Mashhadis, Faruqis, etc., etc.. have foreign origins and their forefathers accompanied the invading armies or followed them, what happens to the solemn averment that Islam spread widely in India? Are we expected to believe that the local converts, whose number must have been formidable, were all nincompoops and the wretched of the earth – incapable over long centuries of producing any leaders, thinkers or scholars?

"The British captured power in India through trade and deceit". The paragraph heading reads: "British usurpation of the subcontinent". The -Muslim conquerors are not called usurpers (p. 72).

"The Muslim League Working Committee, in its meeting in Delhi held on 4 February 1940, decided that the Muslims should make a clear demand for the creation of a separate *mamlakat*" (p. 90). In 1947, "the Hindus in order to wreak their vengeance for the partition of the country and to punish the Muslims for having demanded Pakistan, indulged in large-scale looting, rapine, arson. murder and destruction" (p. 105).

If any such decision was taken on this date it is not recorded in the resolutions published officially by the Muslim League office. The point about the communal riots has been covered in earlier pages.

"Soon after the creation of Pakistan, authority passed into the hands of the people who were not sincere in enforcing Islam, and they tried to turn the country's ideological direction [*pahlu*] towards secularism [*la-diniyat*] [my translation appears to have no meaning, but it is an exact rendering of the original Urdu] .... In this heinous [*mazmum*] action these people were guided by some foreign powers" (p. 136).

For the gravity and the stupidity of this accusation see below Chapter 2.

"History cannot show the parallel of the national *Nizam-i-Mustafa* movement launched in March 1977 against the former government. It fully reflected the wishes and desires of the masses that now they were not prepared to spare any effort in [the achievement of] an Islamic way of life. The present government is well aware of these sentiments of the people .... Today considerable progress has been made towards the enforcement of the Islamic system" (p. 137).

I have discussed the nature and scope of this Islamization in Chapter 2.

"After the elections of 1970, when the crisis of [caused by the issue of] the transfer of power in Pakistan turned grave. India not only instigated the East Pakistani leaders to revolt but, acting the aggressor, sent her army into East Pakistan. This storm of the enmity [*mukalafat*] and misunderstanding of our own people and of foreigners at last cut Pakistan into two pieces" (pp. 204). The secession of East Pakistan is dealt with in Chapter 2.

*Tamir-i-Mutala'a-i-Pakistan Lazmi: BA., B.Sc., Medical, Engineering, Commerce aur Maqabalay ke tamam Imtahanon ke lie mustanad Kitab*, written by Professor Saeed Osman Malick, Head, Department of Political Science, and Muhammad Ikram Rabbani, Department of Political Science, both of the Government College, Lahore, published by Polimar Publications, Lahore, 1987, preface dated January 1985, pp. 224.

Some examples of its contents:

"Iqbal took his degree in law from England" (p. 20).

Iqbal was called to the bar. He did not take any degree in law from England or elsewhere.

"The Aligarh movement made the Muslims economically affluent" (p. 44).

The Aligarh movement established the MAO College, and the graduates of this College entered government employment and independent professions. But the opportunities granted to a few hundred persons to earn a respectable living does not make the entire community of millions affluent.

"The greatest significance of the Lucknow Pact lies in the fact that at least the Hindus, for the first time, acknowledged the Muslims as a separate nation .... The British policy of divide and rule lost its effectiveness .... With this Pact was founded Hindi-Muslim unity in India" (pp. 74-75).

The Lucknow Pact is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

In the Allahabad Address "Iqbal presented the demand for [the creation of a separate *mamlakat*" (p. 106).

He did not. See Chapter 2.

Chaudhri Rahmat Ali left for England for higher studies "in 1927", where he took his M.A. degree from the University of Cambridge and "his Bar-at-Law from the Dublin University"; in January 1933 he and his three friends published "an article" entitled *Now and Never* (p. 107).

Rahmat Ali left Lahore for England on 30 or 31 October 1930, not in 1927. He was not called to the bar at the University of Dublin. Prospective barristers do not study at a university, but an inn of court. *Now or Never* was not an article which appeared in any journal or newspaper, but a leaflet issued independently.

"The 1956 Constitution was cancelled on 8 October 1958 and Martial Law was imposed on the country" (p. 169; no mention of a *coup*).

The Ayub constitution "was in operation from 1962 till 25 March 1969, while General Yahya Khan promulgated another constitution in the country" (p. 170).

General Yahya Khan did not promulgate a new constitution on or after 25 March 1969.

He ruled the country through martial law till his departure from office in December 1971.

"Between 1969 and 1971 the country lived under Martial Law. In this period a separatist movement emerged in East Pakistan at the instigation of India, and using it as a pretext Bharat invaded Pakistan in December 1971, which resulted in the breakup of Pakistan, and in the separation of East Pakistan which now emerged as Bangladesh" (p. 170).

For the creation of Bangladesh see Chapter 2.

"In 1977 the Nizam-i-Mustafa movement shook the Bhutto government, and on 6 July 1977 Martial Law was once again imposed under the leadership of General Muhammad Ziaul Huq" (p. 172).

The Nizam-i-Mustafa movement is discussed below in Chapter 2.

"It was a great misfortune that after the Partition there was no one in Pakistan, except Hazrat Quaid-i-Azam and some of his old companions, who wanted to enforce an Islamic system in the country. The overwhelming majority [*bharmar*] of the Constituent Assembly wanted to make Pakistan a *ladini* [irreligious] state" (p. 173).

This libel against Jinnah and his colleagues is dealt with in Chapter 2.

"The situation in East Pakistan deteriorated with the arrest of Shaikh Mujibur Rahman, and, exploiting the situation in East Pakistan, India attacked Pakistan. Indian aggression resulted in the separation of East Pakistan from the country" (p. 173).

See Chapter 2 below.

"In 1977 the present military government took over the administration of the country under General Muhammad Ziaul Huq. Normally, a military government is not bound by any law or constitution, but the present Government created a new precedent by maintaining the 1973 Constitution, and this had good results for the country. The present Government has, for the first time, sincerely taken practical steps for enforcing an Islamic System in the country, and has laid the foundation of a very great revolution. The present Government issued various Martial Law regulations to promulgate the Islamic system. General Ziaul Huq's Government has, in all sincerity, taken effective steps to [the Urdu word used here is *jari*, to issue, which makes no sense, and I have not tried to translate it] Islam. He deserves congratulations" (p. 174).

General Ziaul Huq did not maintain the 1973 constitution. It was "put in abeyance", and later changed out of recognition to suit his whims and ambitions. For the compliments to Zia see Chapter 2.

"Unfortunately, after the establishment of Pakistan, during the first few years of independence the country was full of elements and forces which did not want to see Pakistan as an Islamic society. The greatest misfortune was that these elements succeeded in entering the first Constituent Assembly of the country, where they tried their best to achieve their despicable objectives .... Today, 36 years after becoming free, we are still far from our goal ... The present military Government came into power in

1977. Reading alight the real aim of the country, it is treading the correct path and has made valuable efforts to establish a complete Islamic system. For taking these steps the government of General Ziaul Huq deserves congratulations: it has taken solid steps to bring the Islamic system to the country, and, unlike the previous governments, it has not just used the name of Islam as an empty formality" (pp. 179-180).

Both parts of the passage are commented upon in Chapter 2.

*Mutala'a-i-Pakistan Lazmi barai Talaba BA., B.Sc., M.B.B.S., Agriculture University wa digur muqabalay ke imtahanat ke lie*, written by Zahid Husain, M.A. (Political Science), M.A. (History). Government Degree College, Qasur, revised by Professor Anwaarul Huq Qureshi, Government College. Gujranwala. and Professor Muhammad Saleem Sahib, Government Degree College. Mandi Bahauddin, published by Amin Book Dept, Lahore, November 1989. pp. 164.

Some of the statements and "facts" presented in it:

The Hindus wanted the Urdu language to disappear from the subcontinent. But "the elimination of Urdu was tantamount to the elimination of the entire [Muslim] nation, and the Indian Muslims realized this very well. Therefore, one of their primary objectives was the protection of Urdu; in this way, the creation of Pakistan emerged as their demand" (p. 14).

See Chapter 2 below for the tendentious character of the statement.

"Till Iqbal's Allahabad address the Indian Muslims believed that if the Congress accepted their separate entity and agreed to protect their economic, cultural and political rights the two nations could live together in a united India" (p. 21).

The Indian Muslims did not believe in this. Dozens of people proposed some kind of a division of India before Iqbal's misreported suggestion.

"Though several schemes of a division of India had been presented prior to the Allahabad address, yet Allama Iqbal offered the idea of a new State" (p. 21).

This statement contradicts the one made immediately before it.

"It will not be wrong to say that the Allahabad address was a milestone of the Pakistan movement; because all the earlier concepts of a division of India were individual [made in an individual capacity] and incomplete. But Atlanta Iqbal, speaking for the first time from the political platform of the Muslim League, rejected the idea of a shared nationality with proper arguments, and then, with reasoning, made it clear that the Hindus and Muslims were different in respect of religion, politics, civilization and



culture .... [He proceeded to suggest that] the Punjab, Sindh, NWFP and Baluchistan could be separated from India and made into a separate homeland [*watan*]" (p. 23).

At Allahabad Iqbal did not argue for a two-nation theory; on the contrary he spoke of "unity in diversity". He also did not demand a separate homeland. The point has been covered at many places in earlier pages. Full details in Chapter 2 below.

"The Lucknow Pact is of great historical importance. Under its terms, the Congress for the first time acknowledged the Muslims as a proper [*ba qaida*] separate nation, which was a great triumph for the Muslim League .... The Pact demonstrated not only to the British but also to the whole world that the Muslims were a separate nation" (p. 54).

Far from being a triumph for the Muslim League the Lucknow Pact was a proof of the party's shortsightedness, total lack of consideration for the future and interests of the Muslims of Bengal and the Punjab (the majority of the community in the subcontinent), and complete subservience to a handful of leaders of the United Provinces. Full details are given in Chapter 2 below.

In 1930 Iqbal demanded "a separate homeland [*watan*]" (p. 85).

He did no such thing. I have dealt with the point in earlier pages but will furnish full details in Chapter 2.

"Chaudhri Rahmat Ali went to England to do his bar .... He published his *Now or Never* on 18 January 1933 .... He died in Europe in 12 February 1951. He is buried in Woking" (p. 87).

Rahmat Ali was called to the bar, but his primary purpose in going to England was to study at a university, which he achieved by taking a degree at Cambridge. To say that he died in Europe is like saying that Jinnah died in Asia. He died on 3 February, not 12. He is buried in the Market Road Cemetery, Cambridge, not in Woking.

The use of the "states" in the plural in the text of the Lahore Resolution was corrected "at a Muslim League session held on 9 April 1946" (p. 101).

The All India Muslim League did not hold any session at Delhi in April 1946 or throughout that year. He is confusing the Convention summoned by Jinnah of all the Muslim League legislators with an annual session; a very serious mistake, considering that this gathering amended the Lahore Resolution which it had no right to do. Full details in Chapter 2.

On the Ayub *coup*: "Because of the wrong policies and responsibilities of the self-styled political leaders the country stood at the brink of a disaster, and the need of a strong

government was greatly felt. In these circumstances, General Muhammad Ayub Khan *marhum* imposed Martial Law in October 1958 and assumed power and abrogated the 1956 Constitution" (p. 120).

For the correction see below Chapter 2.

In the 1977 anti-government *Nizam-i-Mustafa* agitation "the masses supported the opposition parties in a great way [*zabardast tariqe se*]. The people of the country were clearly split into two sections .... Things were getting out of hand. The other major power of the country, the armed forces, decided to take over the administration of the country" (p. 125).

If the masses supported the *Nizam-e-Mustafa* movement "in a great way", why were the people "split into two sections"? Are the masses and the people two different entities? For the antics of the movement see Chapter 2.

*Rahbar-i-Mutala'a-i-Pakistan (Lazmi) barai Tulaba era Talibat Degree Classes Engineering wa Medical no Commerce aur Zar'i University*, in accordance with the syllabus of all Pakistani Universities, written by Professor Ghulam Sarwar Cheemah, Department of History, Government College, Lahore, Professor Rafique Chaudhri, Department of History, Government College, Faisalabad, and Professor Naseer Ahmad Chaudhri, Department of Political Science, Government Murray College, Sialkot. published by Qureshi Brothers Publishers, Lahore, 1985. pp. 280.

The Preface opens with this sentence: "Pakistan is the embodiment of the wishes of Sir Sayyid Ahmnad Khan, the fulfillment of the dreams of tribal, the fruit of the leadership of Quaid-i-Azam, and the martyr-place of the hundreds of thousands of Muslims" (p. 1).

Sir Sayyid Abroad Khan did not wish that India should be divided and a Muslim state created. "Hundreds of thousands of Muslims" did not die in Pakistan in 1947: they died in India. "Martyr-place" is a meaningless word, even in its Urdu original.

Other examples of historical knowledge:

"The fact is that it was the Aligarh movement which gave a new life to the Muslims of the subcontinent .... It prepared the Muslims for the task of freeing themselves from the yoke of both the British and the Hindus" (p. 81).

"The Muslims of the entire subcontinent always looked to Aligarh [for guidance] ... Whenever there was any problem the Muslims looked to Aligarh for leadership" (p. 83).

Most of the leadership that guided the nationalist and Pakistan movements was the gift of the Aligarh movement" (p. 84).

The wild praise of Aligarh has little basis in fact. This exaggerated emphasis on Aligarh also ignores the contribution made by the Muslims of the rest of India.

"The sons of the Deoband not only imparted religious training to one whole generation ..." (p. 87).

Deoband trained not "one whole" generation but, unfortunately, three generations. For what Deoband stood for and did see Chapter 2.

The 2½ page account of the Jamia Millia of Delhi is silent on its pro-Congress policies (pp. 104-106).

Mawlana Muhammad Ali "took his honors degree in English Literature from Oxford" (p. 106).

He took his degree in Modern History, not in English Literature.

The Indian National Congress is called "All India National Congress" (p. 109).

"Under the Lucknow Pact the All India National Congress for the first time acknowledged the Muslim League as the sole Muslim organization. Secondly, constitutionally and democratically, it accepted Muslims as a proper [*bagaida*] separate nation .... The Government's divide and rule policy received a great blow" (p. 125).

All the statements about the Pact are incorrect. See Chapter 2.

In 1930 Iqbal presented "the concept of the necessity of an independent Muslim State" (p. 157).

In 1930 Iqbal offered "a scheme for the division of India" (p. 172).

He did not suggest a division of India in 1930. See Chapter 2 for full details.

The 1939 confederacy scheme of "A Punjabi" is said to be the work of Nawab Sir Muhammad Shahnawaz Khan of Mamdot (p. 174).

It was the work of Mian Kafayet Ali, who wrote under the pseudonym of "A Punjabi", not that of Nawab Sir Shahnawaz Kilian of Mamdot.

"The population of the eastern wing of Pakistan was larger than that of the western wing. Therefore, the idea was put [by whom?] in the mind of the Bengalis that the language of the majority area should have the status of the national language. Keeping

in view the delicate situation then obtaining in Pakistan, such problems should not have been brought to the public view [*manzar-i-am par*]. But it provided a golden opportunity to the Hindus, who wanted to see another problem added to the already existing ones. Even if we consider the demand of the Bengalis as reasonable, this was not the opportune time to put it forward; moreover, sometimes national requirements demand self-sacrifice" (p. 223).

On 1971: "Shaikh Mujibur Rahman wanted to enforce a constitution of his own liking and insisted on convening the Assembly. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto wanted the Assembly to meet after some agreement had been reached. In these circumstances, an open revolt erupted in East Pakistan, [the policies of the] foreign powers and the Indian military intervention turned the scales in favor of Mujibur Rahman and his clique, and the Pakistan Army was forced to surrender. East Pakistan became Bangladesh" (pp. 233-234).

See Chapter 2 on the secession of East Pakistan.

On 1977: "The Government negotiated with the Pakistan National Alliance. It was declared that the talks had ended in an agreement. At the last moment, Air Marshal Asghar Khan refused to accept the agreement. The anti-Government movement grew more intensive. At last, on 4 July 1977, the brave and patriotic army of Pakistan once again stepped forward to save the country and the nation, took over the government, and announced the imposition of Martial Law. The Assembly and the Senate were dissolved. Parts of the 1973 Constitution were suspended. With a view to maintaining its neutral position the military government promised to hold fresh elections within 3 months and transfer power to the representatives of the people. But soon the new government realized that conditions were worse than they should have been [*zarurat se ziada kharab*], and therefore its first duty was to attend to putting things right" (p. 235).

For the Zia *coup* see Chapter 2.

*A Textbook of Pakistan Studies for B.Sc., B.Com., M.B.B.S., M.A. and B.E.*, by Sayeeduddin, Lecturer in Pakistan Studies, Mehran University of Engineering and Technology, published by Farooq Kitab Ghar, Karachi, 1st ed. 1986, pp. 204.

Dr. S. Riawan Ali Riavi, Professor of Political Science. University of Karachi, gives his opinion, which is included in the book, that "it is really a bold step to meet the growing demand of the literature on the subject .... This book will serve a lot to all concerned with the subject" (p. xi).

Rahmat Ali "was a post-graduate student" at Cambridge (p. 3); "the first and the foremost aim of the emergence of Pakistan was the establishment of an Islamic State. The founders of Pakistan had made a pledge to the Muslims of the sub-continent to

make Pakistan an Islamic State" (pp. 5-6); "ideology of Pakistan meant [*sic.*] to achieve a separate homeland where the Muslims could rule according to their own code of life and according to their own cultural growth, traditions and Islamic Laws" (p. 10); Iqbal was "the first important public figure in the United India to profound [*sic.*] the idea of a separate homeland for the Muslims of the sub-continent .... As Iqbal is the ideal dreamer of the very conception of Pakistan, therefore, his thoughts could be the Ideology of Pakistan" (p.11); in 1930 Iqbal "formulated conception of an Islamic State in India and outlined its physical boundaries" (p. 13); the Lahore Resolution was passed on 23 March 1940 (p. 89).

Rahmat Ali was an undergraduate at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He did not read or work for a post-graduate degree.

The founders of Pakistan did not promise the people an Islamic State, certainly not of the kind the book means. The definition of the ideology of Pakistan conveys no sense or meaning. How can a people rule "according to their own cultural growth"? School-boy English. Iqbal did not demand a separate state. What is an "ideal dreamer"? Now we are given a new definition of the ideology of Pakistan: the thoughts of Iqbal. For other errors in this passage see Chapter 2 below.

He discusses Muslim educational and cultural institutions of India: Aligarh (pp: 33-51), Deoband (pp. 52-55), and Nadwa, Anjuman-i-Hamayat-i-Islam, Sindh Madrasa and Islamia College, Peshawar (pp. 56-57). There is no mention of Bengal's contribution to Muslim Indian politics, education or culture. The break-up of 1971 finds no place in the book, nor is there any discussion at all of democracy or military rule or the various *coups*.

All the above books aimed at providing a text for the compulsory paper. In the early 1980s the Atlanta Iqbal Open University decided to offer Pakistan Studies as a full-length optional course for its degree classes. An elaborate syllabus was drawn up by a "Course Team", which drew up the curriculum, wrote the contents of the textbook, translated parts of it (Ron-which language is not known), edited the body of the book, and coordinated the entire exercise.

The personnel responsible for this academic exercise ought to be mentioned. The coordinator was Abdul Hameed Rathor (antecedents or qualifications not mentioned). The authors were: Khwaja Saeeduddin Ahmad Dar (Head of the Department of International Relations, and Dean Administration, Islamia University. Quaid-i-Azam University (?)) (presumably he wrote in English because his name is followed by the translator, Professor Karam Hydari), Dr. Abdul Harmed (a former Professor of History at the University of the Punjab), and Dr. Muhammad Aslam Sayyid (Assistant Professor of History, Quaid-i-Azam University). Editors: Iqbal Sayyid and Anwarul Huq (no details about them given). Parts of the book were revised [*nazar sani*] by: Dr.

Muhammad Yusuf Abbasi and Dr. Riaz Abroad (Department of History, Quaid-i-Azam University).

The Course Committee consisted of: Dr. A.H. Dani (Professor Emeritus, Quaid-i-Azam University), Dr. Sarfraz K. Qureshi (Director of Research, Pakistan Institute of Development Economics), Dr. Muhammad Aslam Sayyid (Assistant Professor of History, Quaid-i-Azam University), Professor Iqbal Sayyid, Dr. Khwaja Muinuddin Jamil, Abdul Hameed Rathor, Muhammad Rashid and Faruq Solangi.

The first volume of the book, dealing with History, was published as *Mutala'a-i-Pakistan, B.A. (Tarikh)* by the Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad in 1984 in 4,000 copies. It is a work of 404 pages of larger than usual size. Some of its assertions are quoted below:

The 1857 revolt is called "The War of Independence" (p. 67).

On the "War of Independence" see Chapter 2.

I. H. Qureshi's *The Muslim Community of the Indo-Pakistan Sub-continent* is cited as *The Muslim Community of India and Pakistan* (p. 107 fn.2).

"Mawlawi Abdul Huq's statement that the Urdu language was the first brick of the foundation of Pakistan is perfectly correct" (p. 159).

This would make Muslim nationalism a purely linguistic nationalism and Pakistani patriotism an ethnic chauvinism. Pakistan was neither demanded nor achieved by the Muslims of Delhi and the United Provinces alone. None of the top leaders of the Pakistan movement are on record as having equated the preservation of Urdu with the creation of Pakistan. The All India Muslim League did not pass any resolution to the effect that Urdu shall be the official or national language of Pakistan, and in this it was wiser than the rulers of Pakistan: for had such a declaration been made many Bengalis, Sindhis, Baluchis and Pathan, and at least some Punjabis, not to speak of the prospective migrants from Western and Southern India, would have abandoned, or at least weakened in their enthusiasm for, the ideal of Pakistan. Remember that when this "first brick of the foundation" was hurled at the Bengali Pakistanis the act sowed the first seeds of alienation and secession. That should be enough of a warning to a people who are capable of teaming from history.

In 1930 Iqbal suggested the creation of "an Islamic *mamlakat* in the north-west of the subcontinent" (p. 234).

Iqbal did not do so. See Chapter 2 below.

Sir Theodore Morison is repeatedly called "Marlin", and his book, which is quoted but whose title is not mentioned even once, is said to have been published in 1818 (p. 248).

For this unbelievable mistake see Chapter 2. All the leading historians of the country working collectively did not know the name of a former principal of the MAO College, Aligarh, did not consider it appropriate to mention the title of the book they were quoting, and were ignorant even about the century in which it was published. For details see Chapter 2.

Rahmat Ali, in his "booklet" called *Now or Never*, "presented a plan for dividing India: (p. 252).

Rahmat Ali's *Now or Never* was a 4-page leaflet, not a booklet.

On the Ayub *coup*: "on 7 October 1958 everybody heard that a Presidential Order has been issued suspending the constitution" (p. 366).

On the Ayub *coup* again: "In the night of 27 October 1958 Iskander Mirza was relieved of all his authority, and then under the leadership of General Muhammad Ayub Khan, the Army gained complete control of the administration of the country, and so began in the country a new era of political stability, strong administration and peace and quiet" (p. 372).

If martial law, suspension of citizens' rights, political oppression, abolition of direct elections, military rule, and concentration of all powers in one person amount to stability, peace and quiet, then it must have been the stability, peace and quiet of the graveyard. The dead neither move nor howl.

In the 1965 war with India Pakistan "defended her frontiers with success" (p. 390).

On the 1965 war see Chapter 2.

In 1969 different political groups were making different demands. "This *silsila* of demands assumed the proportions of disorder. As a result the President [Ayub Khan] asked the Commander-in-Chief, General Muhammad Yahya Khan, to look after the administrative conditions [*Sadar ne . . . Yahya Khan ko intizami halat chalanay ke bare men kaha*]" (p. 395). The reader will notice how stupid the statement is both in Urdu and in its literal translation.

President Ayub Khan did not ask General Yahya Khan to "look after the administration" of the country. He made the Commander-in-Chief, a sodden soldier and an infamous womanizer, who was glad to saunter over the destinies of the nation with one hand on the gun and the other around the whisky glass, the master of the land. Yahya Khan did

not succeed Ayub; he threw the Field Marshal out. Under the constitution then in force the only person who could succeed Ayub was the Speaker of the National Assembly. But Ayub was either afraid lest a civilian legitimate government might be formed by him for his misdeeds, or anxious to please the army which had been technically out of power since 1962 and was feeling restless at this deprivation, or bent upon revenging himself on the people of Pakistan who had agitated against him. The country had called him a "dog"; he retaliated by handing it over to a dog-handler who lost no time in breaking up the country. Ayub's pique cost the nation a terrible price. None of these things are mentioned in the textbooks. See also Chapter 2 below.

On the 1971 events: "Enemy forces were busy in Pakistan. The Hindu elements did not want any proper agreement to be arrived at between the two wings of the country .... [On 23 March] the army intervened. It was asked to restore law and order. Mujibur Rahman was arrested. Many seats won by the Awami League were declared vacant. The army succeeded in restoring peace and order. But these steps created intense hatred between the two wings. India was studying the developments carefully ... and by the end of November she had completed her preparations for a war against Pakistan. Pakistani leadership lacked both diplomatic skill and an organized propaganda machinery which could explain her position on the international level. The result was that when hostilities commenced between the two countries India profited from having neutralized the so-called pro-Pakistan lobbies in the different countries. In the first week of December India invaded Pakistan from both directions. The Pakistan Army possessed fighting quality, but it lacked qualified, experienced and quick-to-react leadership. The Indian naval blockade separated the Bay of Bengal from the western wing. Thus the [Pakistan] forces were hemmed-in in this area [which area?]. They were left to fend for themselves. Of course, our armed forces fought valiantly. They had to surrender to the Indian forces which had captured Dacca on 16 December" (pp. 400-402).

On the break-up of Pakistan see Chapter 2.

The bibliographies of the end of each part of the book are defective on three counts: they are inadequate, no information beyond the author's name and the book's title is given, and at places the English publications are listed in Urdu transliteration which makes it difficult to identify them.

The second volume of this work was prepared by a team which contained some new names. The coordinator was still Abdul Hameed Rathor. The authors: Saeeduddin Ahmad Dar (Head of Department of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University), Dr. Muhammad Zafar Ahmad Khan (Principal, Government College, Asghar Mall, Rawalpindi), Dr. Makhdum Tasaddaq Husain (a former Professor of the University of the Punjab), Parvez Iqbal Chemah (Associate Professor, Department of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University), Tauseef Ahmad (Research Associate, Institute of



Manpower, Islamabad), Sajjad Haider Mallick (Assistant Professor, Gordon College, Rawalpindi), Khalid Hayat Chaudhri (Research Associate, Institute of Manpower, Islamabad), Nazir Siddiqui, and Iqbal Ahmad Bakht (Assistant Professor?). Translators: Professor Karam Hydari, Hussain Hamdani, and Anwaarul Huq. Editors: Professor Iqbal Sayyid, Bashir Mahmud Akhtar, and Anwaarul Huq. Portions of the book were revised by Dr. Muhammad Riaz (Department of Iqbaliat?) and Saeed Shafqat (Head of the Department of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University).

Their handiwork was published in 1983 (why was the second volume published before the first one?) by the Mama Iqbal Open University under the title of *Mutala'a-i-Pakistan, B.A. Kitab Doim*, in the same format as that of the first volume, with 393 pages, and a print order of 3,000 copies. It dealt with the economics, civilization (*tamaddun*) and international relations of Pakistan.

Among other things it contains the following opinions, comments and statements:

"In the post-1947 Pakistan very thoughtful religious literature has appeared. Ideologically, there is a great deal available on Pakistani nationalism and Pakistan's relations with the Islamic World" (p. 175).

It is impossible to admit this claim. Very little has been written on Islam which is scholarly, non-sectarian, thoughtful and readable. The only books commanding academic respect are those by Aziz Ahmad and Fazlur Rahman; these were written and published abroad: except for a few years when he was Director of the Islamic Research Institute and was then hounded out of the country, Fazlur Rahman taught in Britain, Canada and the United States; Aziz Ahmad worked in England and Canada. On Pakistani nationalism there is absolutely nothing. As for Pakistan's relations with the Islamic world, there is not a single volume on relations with Egypt or Turkey or Saudi Arabia or Iran or any other country, although we have a well-established Institute of International Affairs in Karachi and at least two study centres at the universities specializing in North Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia. Professors should not make wild statements which can be proved to be lies by anyone who visits a library.

On the 1971 break-up: "Yahya Khan tried to bring about a consensus among all leaders and parties. But Mujibur Rahman's opposition [*mukhalafat*] did not allow this. He began to demand the secession of East Pakistan, and this led to a series of riots and processions in East Pakistan. The Army intervened on 21 March 1971. Many Hindu refugees left for India. A civil war began in the country. India provided training to the volunteers and refugees. This continued till 4 December 1971. Then India began a full-scale invasion of East Pakistan, which led to a war between the two countries. As a result of this, in December 1971, East Pakistan separated from the country" (pp. 350-351).

For the 1971 break-up see Chapter 2.

The bibliographies of this book are worse than those of the first volume.

All the books examined above relate to the compulsory course on Pakistan Studies. There is no space for an equally derailed scrutiny of the books used by the B.A. students of history as an optional and major subject. Purely as an example I now look at only one textbook of history which has been in use during the last thirty years or more, and is written by a Professor of History in East Pakistan. The edition in current use is dated 1989, without any information on the years of the earlier editions or reprints.

*A New History of Indo-Pakistan Since 1526* by K. Ali, published by Naeem Publishers, Lahore, 1989, pp. 186-393.

We are concerned here with the second part of the book which covers the history of India and Pakistan from the advent of the British till 1970. All page references are to this second part.

In Chapter VIII, entitled "The War of Independence", in the text the event is throughout referred to as "the revolt of 1857" (pp. 126-137).

The Secretary of State for India, E.S. Montagu, is repeatedly called "Lord Montague" (pp. 192-193).

No one called Lord Montague existed who was also Secretary of State for India. The man referred to was Mr. Montagu (without the e).

"It was Sir Muhammad Iqbal who first dreamt of a separate homeland for the Muslims of India .... He felt the need of a separate land for the Indian Muslims"; the passage quoted from the Allahabad address is inaccurate (p. 252).

Iqbal was not the first to have this dream; in fact, he did not have this dream at all till 1937, by which time a hundred other persons had seen the vision.

"In 1933, Chowdhury Rahmat Ali, a young thoughtful politician, was the first man who prepared the word 'Pakistan'" (p. 252).

Rahmat Ali was not a politician. The professor should know, while writing in English, that the word Pakistan is not a curry or an omelet which you "prepare"; you coin or invent or devise or think up or contrive or put together or make up or create or suggest or conceive or hit upon or discover or imagine a word, you never prepare it.

"On 23 March 1940 the Muslim League laid claim to a separate homeland. i.e., Pakistan for the Muslims" (p. 254).

Three errors in eighteen words: read 24 March for 23; read "independent states" for a "separate homeland"; read nothing for "Pakistan" (the word was not used on the occasion).

"Mawlana Muhammad Ali also stated that there were two nations in India. It was this idea which was given poetic expression by Allama Muhammad Iqbal" (p. 261).

In which book did Iqbal give "poetic expression" to the two-nation theory? I have been reading Iqbal for 45 years but have not come across any poem on the topic.

"By the historic Lahore Resolution of March 23 1940 ... The Muslims demanded a separate homeland" (p. 269).

Read 24 March for 23 March, and "independent states" for "a separate homeland".

Urdu "remains her high-level lingua franca, still the working instrument for most Government affairs and for inter-connection between the two wings in [1989]" (p. 287).

Three mistakes require correction. First, my dictionary tells me that historically lingua franca (which has been naturalized into English and does not need the italics) is a mixture of Italian, French, Greek and Spanish, used in the Levant; and in its wider meaning, any language serving as medium between different peoples (*The Concise Oxford Dictionary*). Did Urdu serve as a medium of communication between West Pakistanis and East Pakistanis? The answer is no. English was used for this purpose. The adjective "high-level" for the lingua franca is meaningless. Secondly, Urdu was not in 1989 or before that at any time "the working instrument for most Government affairs". Administration and higher judiciary and army used English; as they do today. Thirdly, it is impossible to believe (even for the bigwigs of the Tahrik-i-Takmil-i-Pakistan, which aims fondly at uniting Bangladesh and Pakistan) that in 1989 Pakistan had two wings; that is, East Pakistan was still a part of Pakistan. The description is out of date by a mere 18 years.

"The Revolution of October 1958 was unique in the sense that it was entirely bloodless and it had the backing of the people" (p. 302).

The *coup* of 1958 was not a "Revolution". It might have been bloodless because the nation was spineless, but the people did not back it. They accepted it because they were afraid of what the army would do to them. Submission or acquiescence dictated by fear is neither support nor approval.

"Finding no other alternative President Ayub in a letter addressed to General A.M. Yahya Khan, Commander-in-Chief, Pakistan Army requested him to take over reins of the country as he had failed to tackle the grave situation" (p. 327).

The alternative, nay the prescribed constitutional requirement, was to transfer power to the Speaker of the National Assembly. Ayub did not do it, probably because, apart from other reasons mentioned earlier, the Speaker happened to be a Bengali.

Iqbal "proceeded to England for higher studies where he obtained his Banister-at-Law" (p. 350).

"Obtained his Barrister-at-Law" is as asinine a statement as "obtained his lawyer or engineer or doctor". To become a banister is not to complete one's higher studies. There are many examples of mere matriculates becoming banisters, like Jinnah.

Jinnah "received his degree in Law" from England (p 351). Jinnah did not receive any degree in law from England. He was called to the bar, and that was all.

"Allama Iqbal stressed the need for a separate homeland for Muslims in his address of annual Session of Muslim League at Allahabad in 1930. Finally in the 1940 annual session of the Muslim League held at Lahore in the Minto (now Iqbal) Park, a demand for the division of the sub-continent into two independent states was made" (p. 356).

Iqbal did not even mention a separate homeland at Allahabad, not to speak of stressing the need for it. In the second sentence, read "independent states" for "two independent states".

The Lahore Resolution was passed "on 23rd March 1940. By this resolution the Muslims of the sub-continent demanded a separate homeland" (p. 359).

Read 24 March for 23 March. The resolution did not demand "a separate homeland" but "independent states".

After the 1970-elections "unfortunately the country fell a victim to political crisis and foreign conspiracies. Bharat attacked Pakistan with the blessings of Russia. The result was the fall and succession of East Pakistan in December 1971" (p. 380).

See Chapter 2 for the 1971 break-up of Pakistan.

The 1973 Constitution "is still in force (June, 1979)" (p. 380).

Even General Ziaul Huq did not claim that. The constitution, in his own words, was "in abeyance", whatever that meant.

Chaudhry Rahmat Ali's "name is known in History the word 'Pakistan' for giving it to the Muslim State in the Sub-continent [*sic.*]" (p. 387).

The professor's English has gone berserk here.

"Sir Fazal Husain was a member of the Round Table Conferences" (p. 390).

Sir Fazl-i-Husain was neither a delegate to nor a member of the Round Table Conferences. Throughout the years of the Conferences he was Member for Education of the Viceroy's Executive Council and lived in New Delhi and Simla, and for a few months in Abbotabad on sick leave. He did not even visit London during this period.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE CALAMITY OF ERRORS

#### The Catalogue of Mistakes

At the end of my perusal of these textbooks I compiled a list of the errors they contained. The number of the items crossed the century mark. On reflection I decided not to present to my reader a straight and bare list: empty repetition may be an efficacious means of brainwashing, but it dulls the impact. To underline the significance and gravity of the situation I have re-arranged the more serious transgressions under the following rubrics.

**Wrong Dates.** The Lahore Resolution was passed on 23 March 1940. Pakistan came into being on 14 August 1947. The Muslim League was founded in 1905. The Round Table Conferences met in 1913. Iqbal gave his Allahabad address in 1931. The Nehru Report was submitted in 1926. The All India Muslim League Legislators Convention met in Delhi in 1949. Pakistan State took its birth on 27 June 1947. (The last five statements occur in one book, that by Rafiullah Shehab). The Sindh Provincial Muslim League Conference met in Karachi in October 1936. The Lucknow Pact was signed in 1910.

**Wrong Assertions.** Jinnah received a degree in law in England. Jamaluddin Afghani belonged to Afghanistan and was born there. Iqbal took his Doctorate in Philosophy in England. Iqbal received his "degree of Bar-at-Law" from the University of Cambridge. Iqbal took his "degree of Barristery" from the University of Oxford. Iqbal was educated at the University of London. In north-India Hindu and Muslim dress was the same. Sayyid Ahmad Khan demanded a separate Muslim State. Nawab Muhsinul Mulk led the Simla Deputation. The Simon Commission was boycotted by both the Congress and the Muslim League. The men of Pakistan wear *shalwar*, *qamiz* and *shirwani*. Before 1947 Saudi Arabia had great sympathy for the freedom movement of the Muslims of India. The Punjab Unionist Party opposed the creation of Pakistan. In 1945 Lord Attlee became the Prime Minister of Britain. Rahmat Ali gave the name Pakistan to Iqbal's 1930 scheme. Rahmat Ali took his "*Barrister ki degree*" from the University of Dublin. Rahmat Ali is buried in Woking. Rahmat Ali's plan was rejected by the Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conference. In the 1971 India-Pakistan war the Indian forces were defeated everywhere. In 1969 General Yahya Khan promulgated a new constitution for the country. The Lahore Resolution was amended by an All India Muslim League annual session held in Delhi in 1946. Mawlana Muhammad Ali took his honours degree in English Literature from the University of Oxford. Sayyid Ahmad Khan stayed in England for nine years, from 1869 to 1878. Jinnah was elected Governor General of Pakistan by the people of the country. Sayyid Ahmad Khan founded the Aligarh

Muslim University. The people of Pakistan were so pleased with Ayub Khan that they gave him a higher army rank. E.S. Montagu is generally spelt as Montague, and occasionally called Lord Montague. Mawlana Muhammad Ali convened the All India Muslim Parties Conference in January 1929. *The Eastern Times* of Lahore is called *The Western Times*. Rahmat Ali was a man of letters and a journalist. *The Confederacy of India* by "A Punjabi" is translated as *Wafaq-i-Hind*. Fazl Karim Khan Durrani is called Farzand Khan Durrani. The Treaty of Sevres is always written in Urdu as the Treaty of Saiwray. In 1933, Rahmat Ali demanded the separation of all Muslim-majority areas from India. The Muslim League legislators convention of 1946 is said to have been a meeting of all Muslim legislators. Mian Fazl-i-Husain was a member of the Round Table Conference.

*Wrong and Biased Assertions.* In 1965 India-Pakistan war India sued for peace after having been defeated soundly by Pakistan. In 1947 the Hindus and Sikhs massacred many Muslims (without any mention of similar riots in Pakistan). Urdu was the spoken language of the entire South Asia. Urdu is the only language which is spoken or understood today from Peshawar to Raskumari. It is a special characteristic of Urdu that the words of other languages included in it do not appear alien but look as if they belonged originally to it. Urdu is understood all over the country; in fact, it was the *lingua franca* of the subcontinent and may perhaps even now be serving India as such. Bharat (India) is the country of non-Muslims. Liaquat Ali Khan was given the title of Quaid-i-Millat by the nation. The British captured India by deceit and cunning.

*Confused and Confusing Assertions.* There was nothing common or shared between Hindus and Muslims in India (Sindh, Class 5); living in one place Hindus and Muslims came very close to each other and mixed together well (Sindh, Class 6). Pakistan is the fortress of Islam. The courts of law keep order and peace in the district; (on the next page) the Police keeps order and peace in the district (Class 3). Sayyid Ahmad Khan is the greatest thinker of Pakistan.

*Ignorant, Biased and Confusing Assertions.* Shaikh-ul-Hind Mahmud Hasan and Maududi were among the founders of the ideology of Pakistan. The revolt of 1857 was a War of Independence or the first War of Independence.

*Completely Incomprehensible Assertions.* The Lahore Resolution demanded one Muslim State. The Lahore Resolution demanded two Muslim States. The 1956 Constitution was abrogated before it could become operative.

*Errors of Omission.* The Red Shirts Movement of the NWFP and the Unionist Party of the Punjab are not mentioned in chapters on these provinces. The 1971 break-up of Pakistan is dismissed in a few lines or one paragraph, and is always made out to be the result of an Indian invasion. The All India Muslim Leagues original aim and object of encouraging loyalty to the British Government is generally omitted. The Bengalis' role

in the political, educational and cultural history of Muslim India is ignored. There is no mention of martial law in most of the school books. The fact that the Simla Deputation demanded weightage is not told to the students; only the demand for separate electorates is mentioned.

*Errors of Commission.* In 1930 Iqbal demanded a separate and independent Muslim State in the north-west of India. In 1930 Iqbal demanded a separate and independent Muslim State made of all Muslim-majority areas of India. The Indian National Congress was a Hindu political party. The Lucknow Pact was a great triumph for the Muslims, the Muslim League and Jinnah. The 1977 *coup* is justified and the resulting military rule is praised. In 1937 the Indian National Congress won the provincial elections by chance. All credit for the political and intellectual awakening of Muslim India is given to the Aligarh movement. The Ayub Khan coup of 1958 is called a Revolution. The Sarnia Millia Islamia, Delhi, was founded to promulgate and propagate Islamic teachings (its pro-Congress and anti-Muslim League role is not even hinted at). The services of Deoband in the cause of the Pakistan movement are unforgettable. The Aligarh movement made the Muslims economically affluent.

### Corrections

These eight categories of errors open our eyes to the various ways in which history has been manipulated polluted ill-used and trampled underfoot. Every means of destruction has been employed to achieve the purpose. There are plain lies, things which have absolutely no existence in reality or fact. There are deviations of all kinds: lapses, flaws, self-deception, wishful thinking, subjective views, warped notions, loose arguments, pre-conceived ideas, parochialism, superficiality, misjudgment, misbelieve, oversight, slips of pen, inattentiveness, and aberrations of every variety. There are mists of errors and eccentricity which conceal the facts. There is a general blankness of mind which wallows in ignorance. The adult reader of these textbooks can only stand and stare at the drift, shift and swing away from the truth, and slowly sink into a state of mental numbness. To imagine the effect they have on the plastic, inquisitive, observant, alert mind of the young student is to contemplate dark despair.

What the books lack are judgment, knowledge, perception, understanding, learning, scholarship, consistency of thought, rigor, attention to truth, precision, accuracy, validity, high fidelity to fact, exactitude and clarity – in short, every quality that a textbook should possess. If any attempt has to be made to improve, revise and correct them, to restore them to a state of usefulness, and to heal the wounds they have inflicted on the students, the task of recasting and remodeling them has to be taken in hand. Before any remedial steps are planned we must scrutinize their ways of errancy. In other words, we must point out where they have gone astray and which true paths they have missed in their journey to disaster.



In the last chapter. while annotating each textbook, I listed the errors found in each volume, and in several cases also corrected them. But there are certain mistakes, both of fact and presentation, which occur so often that had I tried to rectify them on the spot I would have repeated myself *ad nauseam* to the boredom of my readers. Then there are other faults which are related to the interpretation of historical developments, and they require a longer treatment, not just a change of date or name.

I have written this chapter to put the record straight; to balance the destructive criticism of Chapter 1 with the constructive correction of the present one. What I have done is this. I have selected the most vulgar and flagrant mistakes and addressed myself to two tasks: to point out the dimensions and implications of the error made, and to supply the correct version. In doing this, at some places I have gone into details because without them the gravity of the statement made in the textbook cannot be gauged; at others I have provided the correct version in brief so that it can be compared with what the book says; and at still others I have confined my remarks to a short rebuttal of the book's argument.

I have borrowed one technique from the books under examination: repetition; but with a different goal in view. I don't want to brainwash my readers, but to make my comments as clear as possible. I don't want to leave open any avenue which might lead to misunderstanding or misconstruction. Therefore, some of the corrections marked in Chapter I are iterated or elaborated here. I ask the reader to bear with this repetition in the interest of clarity.

In what follows I have used a uniform method in arranging the material. In each of the sections the first paragraph contains direct quotations from or literal paraphrases of the matter published in the textbooks (there is no need to enclose them within quotation marks; this should be taken for granted), the succeeding paragraphs make up my corrections and commentary.

### **The Events of 1857**

It was the war of independence (all provinces, Federal Government, private authors, Urdu and English. all classes). It was the first war of independence (Sindh, English, class 5). It was the Muslims' last war for freedom (Federal Government, English, intermediate).

To understand the nature of the mutiny or uprising we must survey briefly the years 1759-1857. Shah Alum II came to the Mughal throne in 1759. Disappointed with the disloyal and selfish policy of the Nawab Vizier of Oudh. Shuja-ud-Dawla, the Mughal emperor, appealed to the East India Company for help in regaining his sovereignty. His letters to the British make a painful reading. He was afraid of the Marhattas and too weak to face them alone. He applied to Clive for aid: when this was refused he begged

for asylum in Calcutta. The request was turned down. After waiting for a more favorable reply in Allahabad and realizing that it would never come, he finally joined Mir Qasim against the British. But he took no part in the Battle of Buxar of 1764. He himself gave away in bits and pieces the sovereignty which he had asked the British to safeguard. He confirmed British properties in Bombay, Madras and the Northern Sarkars, and awarded the *diwani* of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to the British under the Treaty of Allahabad of 1765.

In 1787 Shah Alam wrote personal letters to Lord Cornwallis, the Governor General, addressing him affectionately as "my son" and seeking his help in crushing his own nobles who were making his life difficult. Cornwallis ignored the pitiable appeals. Then Shah Alam turned to Afghanistan, and in 1796 wrote to King Zaman Shah, inviting him to India to chastise the Mughal nobility. There was no response to the letter. Ultimately, it was a Hindu, Sindhia, who came to the rescue, marched to Delhi and dealt with Ghulam Qadir Rohilla.

The new Governor General, Lord Wellesley, realizing the weakness of the Mughal Empire, decided to put it in its place. He ordered General Lake to conquer the north in 1803. Sindhia was defeated and Shah Mans was brought under British control. The Mughal emperor spent his last days as a British pensioner in Delhi, where he died on 19 November 1806.

When Akbar II came to the throne he knew that he was a king only in name. Even his capital's administration had passed on into the hands of the British Resident. The next Governor General, Warren Hastings, put an end even to the fiction of Mughal sovereignty. His seal did not carry the phrase proclaiming the Governor General as a servant of the Mughal Emperor. When the Emperor asked for an interview with the Governor General, he was granted one on the condition that all ceremonial betokening his sovereignty over the British would be waived. In 1827 the Emperor received the new Governor General, Amherst, without any ceremonial. In 1835 the British withdrew the old coins issued by Shah Alam in 1778; the new coins bore the British monarch's image and superscription. Already, in 1807 Akbar II had requested the British for a raise in his pension.

When Bahadur Shah Zafar ascended the throne in 1837 he knew who was the master. He lived in the palace whose walls marked the boundaries of his rule. He was not even free to select his heir-apparent. When in 1856 Mirza Fakhruddin died, the Emperor wanted to nominate Jiwan Bakht as his successor, and sent a petition to the British for their approval of his choice. No reply was received. During the events of 1857 he adopted an ambivalent attitude and at first refused to lead the rebels, and offered to negotiate with the British. It was later that he agreed to associate himself with the uprising.

Hakim Ahsanullah Khan and Mahbub Ali Khan, both of whom enjoyed the Emperor's confidence, were in alliance with the British. When the rebels appealed for food, money and equipment, the two nobles refused to oblige them. Ahsanullah Khan maintained correspondence with the British officers in Meerut till the last week of May 1857.

What happened in 1857 certainly began as a mutiny, but later developed into something which may be called an insurrection (rising in open resistance to established authority), incipient rebellion, rising (insurrection), uprising (rebellion), revolt (rising, insurrection), or *emeure* (first "e" accented, popular rising). A mutiny is an open revolt against constituted authority, especially of soldiers against their officers. All definitions are from the *Oxford Concise Dictionary*.

The main threats of the revolt were Delhi and parts of the United Provinces. Sporadic, casual and unorganized activity occurred in some other areas. The rest of India stayed calm, loyal and indifferent. Most of the native princes, including the Nizam, supported the British by word and deed. The Sikhs stood steadfast on the British side, as did the vast majority of Punjabi, Pathan and Sindhi Muslims.

Leading Indian historians are not convinced that the revolt can be called national in any sense. Surendra Nath Sen, in his *Eighteen Fifty Seven* (Calcutta, 1958), says, "Outside Oudh and Shahbad there are no evidences of that general sympathy which would invest the Mutiny with the dignity of a national war". R.C. Majumdar, in his *The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857* (Calcutta, 1963), declares that "it cannot be regarded as a national rising, far less a war of independence, which it never professed to be". The Pakistani historian, S. Moinul Haq, in his *The Great Revolution* (Karachi, 1968), not only calls it a revolution and a war of independence but also "the first major attempt of an eastern people to throw off the domination of a western power". History supports the Indian view.

General Bakht Khan, the rebel commander and a descendant of the Mughal royal family, was serving in the British army as a subahdar in the artillery at the time of the uprising. In Bengal the British were in complete control. Mutinies by the sepoys at Barrackpore and Berhampore in February 1857 had been suppressed without much difficulty. There was no further trouble. The Muhammadan Association of Bengal, which represented the well-to-do educated of the community, issued a *fatwa* in favor of the British. Sayyid Ahmad Khan refused to side with the rebels, and extended his full support, verbal and practical, to the East India Company which employed him. Mirza Ghalib, the poet, did not hide his pro-British leanings. In his *Dastambu* he was critical of those who conducted the hostilities. Naturally, because since 1806 he had been in receipt of a pension from the British. During the mutiny he gave up the use of the titles which had been bestowed on him by the Mughal court. He also wrote a number of *qasidas* in praise of the British rulers: one addressed to Lord Hardinge on the conquest of the Punjab (regretting that his old age did not allow him to take part in the fighting),

another to Lord Ellenborough, another to Lord Canning, another to the Government for taking over the control of India from the East India Company, and a long one to Queen Victoria begging for an appointment as a court poet in London (request turned down). He described the rising as a *rastkhez-i-beja*, denounced the "natives" who revolted against the British, calling them "rebels" and "disloyal elements". He thought the British were fully justified in killing even the dogs and cats of the "natives" (*Dastambu*). In his *taqriz* (a kind of a foreword) to a new edition of *Ain-i-Akbari* brought out by Sayyid Ahmad Khan he lauded British culture and institutions.

Other great figures of Urdu poetry had been admirers of the British. Mir Taqi Mir, in his last days, was an applicant for a job at the Fort William College, Calcutta, but was not selected. He also agreed to publish the first edition of his collection of verses under the auspices of this College. Momin Khan Momin received Rs. 25 a month as a stipend from the British.

Thus there was a general pro-British sentiment both among the educated classes and the common man almost everywhere. A war of independence presupposes unity, planning, forethought, organization, mass support and an agreed goal. All these attributes were lacking in the India of 1857. The titular head of the revolt, and by implication the prospective ruler if the British were thrown out, was the Mughal emperor who was a reluctant recruit to the uprising and a pensioner of the British. His relationship with the British, like that of his two predecessors, was one of slave and master. When a slave chooses to disobey and stand up against his owner, the ensuing fight is not a war of independence, though it might be a struggle for manumission. Anyway, would he have been acceptable as the supreme lord of the subcontinent to the Marhattas and the Jata and the Rohillas and the Sikhs who had been breaking up the empire since the middle of the eighteenth century, and to the King of Oudh and the Nizam of Hyderabad who had revolted against him and created their own little kingdoms?

Here is a conundrum for the textbook writers. If it was a war of independence waged by the Muslims against the hated British foreigner, how can Sir Sayyid Ahrnad Khan, who sided with the British and condemned the native rising, be presented to the students as a "great hero" and "the greatest thinker of Pakistan"?

The catchwords "first war of independence" and "last war for freedom" are beneath serious notice.

### **Indian National Congress**

In 1885 the Hindus founded their own political party, the Indian National Congress (Punjab, class 6). The object of the establishment of the Indian National Congress was to organize the Hindus politically (Punjab, class 8). The Hindus established the INC in

1885 (Sindh, English, class 6). INC was founded by Lord Hume (Federal Government, English, intermediate). INC is called All India National Congress (NWFP, classes 9-10; private. Lahore, English, intermediate; private, Lahore, B.A.).

Apart from giving the Congress a wrong title, the assertions commit three mistakes of substance. Indians, not Hindus exclusively, organized the Congress. Nowhere in the report of the proceedings of the inaugural session is it said that its aim was to bring the Hindus together on one political platform. Nor was it founded by "Lord Hume", nor was Hume a peer of the realm.

No doubt the Congress was predominantly a Hindu body, partly because the Hindus were in a majority in India, and partly because it followed policies (mainly fashioned or inspired by Tilak and Gandhi) which were not palatable to many Muslims. Yet to call it a Hindu body is political abuse, not historical verity. Throughout, it had Muslims on its roll. More importantly, several top ranking and highly respected Muslim figures occupied for many years leading places in the counsels of the party: Rahmatullah M. Syani, Badruddin Tayabji, Abul Kalam Azad, Mawlana Mohammad Ali. Hakim Ajmal Khan. Mazharul Haq. Sir Ali Imam, Dr. M.A. Ansari, Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew, and, above all, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah. Were these eminent persons cat's-paws, tools and agents of the Hindus? Cheap political slogans should have no place in textbooks. They falsify history and poison the young minds.

### **The Simla Deputation**

It was led by Nawab Muhsinul Mulk (Punjab, class 8).

In fact, it was led by the Aga Khan, who was specially summoned back to India from Aden. while on his way to Europe, to head the deputation.

Most books confine themselves to the statement that the deputation demanded separate electorates. without mentioning the equally important petition for weightage. To see the demands of the deputation in clearer light it is necessary to look at its background.

In the elections of 1892, out of the candidates recommended by the various electoral bodies for the Central Council the Muslims obtained only about half the number to which their numerical strength entitled them. For the Council of the United Provinces not a single Muslim had been recommended. When, therefore, it was known that the British Government was contemplating reforms for India which would introduce a larger element of representation, the Muslims took a deputation to the Viceroy. Lord Minto, to argue their case for separate representation on all local and provincial elected bodies. This claim was based on three grounds. (1) In the existing state of tension between Hindus and Muslims, no Muslim who sincerely represented the opinions of his community could secure election in a general electorate, since in all but two

provinces Muslims were a minority of the population. (2) If the two communities were not kept apart at the polls, every contested election would result in communal riots, accompanied by bloodshed, and would leave bitter memories which would retard the political integration of the country. (3) Where the system of a separate electorates had been established, as in municipalities and district boards, it had worked well and secured peace.

Simultaneously, the deputation also made a plea for weightage, *i.e.*, the concession of more seats to the Muslims than their population figures warranted. This demand was supported by another set of three arguments: (1) Muslims still owned much of the landed property in India. (2) They constituted a very large proportion of the Indian Army. (3) They were, geographically speaking, the gatekeepers of India.

### **All India Muslim League**

It was established at some time after 1911 (NWFP, class 8). It was established in 1905 (private, Lahore, English, junior classes). It was established in December 1906 in Dacca.

There is a dishonest suppression of truth in at least one book (NWFP, intermediate) in recording the aims and objects of the All India Muslim League as adopted at the time of its foundation. The League, say the textbooks, was organized to bring the Indian Muslims together on one political platform. But this was only one of the three original objects. The League document listed the ideals and aims as follows:

"(a) To promote, among the Musalmans of India, feelings of loyalty to the British Government, and to remove any misconceptions that may arise as to the intention of [the] Government with regard to any of its measures.

(b) To protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Musalmans of India, and to respectfully represent their needs and aspirations to the Government

(c) To prevent the rise, among the Musalmans of India, of any feeling of hostility towards other communities, without prejudice to the other aforementioned objects of the League."

### **London Muslim League and Iqbal**

Iqbal, in collaboration with Sayyid Ameer Ali, organized the London Muslim League (Punjab, class 7).

There is no evidence to support this claim in the papers of the All India Muslim League and the London Muslim League. Iqbal was a member of the LML and also served on its committee, and that is all. He was not even an officer-bearer. Ameer Ali was the

president. C.A. Latif ordinary vice-president, Ibn-i-Ahm ad honorary secretary, Abdul Ali Anik honorary treasurer, Zahur Ahmad joint secretary, and Masudul Hasan assistant secretary and assistant treasurer.

We must remember that Iqbal only a student when LML was established on 6 May 1908, and within four months of the event he left England for India. The wording of the textbook claim is an attempt to make us believe that Iqbal was the real founder and Ameer Ali a mere collaborator. Such absurd and puerile efforts to paint Iqbal greater than he was do no service to him. Iqbal was a great man and does not need stilts. It will be an act of kindness to him, and also of some benefit to history, not to burden him with unnecessary honors.

### **Lucknow Pact**

It was signed in 1910 (private, Karachi, B.A.). It was a triumph for the Muslims (NWFP, classes 9-10); it enhanced their importance (NWFP, intermediate); it was a victory for the Muslim League (Federal Government, B.A.); under it the Congress accepted the Muslim League as the representative party of the Muslims (private, Lahore, B.A.); under its terms the Hindus accepted the Muslims as a separate nation (private, Lahore, B.A., in three different textbooks).

The Lucknow Pact has an interesting history. The terms on behalf of the Muslim League were first considered by the League Council in its meeting in Lucknow on 21 August 1916. Only nine men attended the meeting, all belonging to Lucknow. The terms were finalized at another Council meeting held on 11 October in which only eight men were present, seven from Lucknow and one from Allahabad. The Congress-League Joint Reform Committee met in Calcutta on 17-18 November. The total attendance was 71; there were 20 from the League (12 from Bengal, 4 from U.P., 1 each from Bihar, NWFP, Madras and 1 -unknown). Representation quotes were settled for all provinces except Bengal and U.P. (Punjab's fate had been decided without any Punjabi being present). The pending cases were sorted out in a meeting held on 25-28 December, in which Bengali Muslims were not present in strength and the U.P. Muslims dominated the proceedings. The Congress and League concurrent sessions at Lucknow which ratified the agreement showed incomprehensible membership figures. Of the 433 Muslims who went to the Congress session, over 400 were stooges from Lucknow. At the League session, there were few delegates from Bombay except the President himself (Jinnah), Madras was almost entirely unrepresented. Bengal had a few spokesmen and so had the Punjab. The U.P., or rather its "Young Party", soled the roast.

Under the Pact the Muslims received the following representation in the provincial councils:

| Province          | Percentage of Muslims in Population | Muslim Percentage of Seats in Councils |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Bengal            | 52.6                                | 40.0                                   |
| Bihar and Orissa  | 10.5                                | 25.0                                   |
| Bombay            | 20.4                                | 33.3                                   |
| Central Provinces | 4.3                                 | 15.0                                   |
| Madras            | 6.5                                 | 15.0                                   |
| Punjab            | 54.8                                | 50.0                                   |
| United Provinces  | 14.0                                | 30.0                                   |

The figures speak for themselves. Any sensible politician should have seen that they heralded the doom of the two largest Muslim-majority provinces. Contemporary newspapers show how strongly same Bengali and Punjabi Leaguers reacted to the injustice meted out to their provinces. Weightage of the heaviest variety given to small Muslim minorities in Bihar and C.P. and Madras and U.P. did not in any manner help the Muslims of India: it did not even help the recipients except to give them a hollow confidence. On the other hand, the deprivation imposed upon the Punjab and Bengal sealed their fate. In Bengal there were unstable ministries, political uncertainty and the weird spectacle of a Muslim League-Hindu Mahasabha coalition. The Punjab was saved from such hazards by the establishment of the Unionist Party.

At no time or place during the protracted negotiations for the Pact did the Congress or the Hindus accept, even through an oblique NM the Muslims as a separate nation.

Far from being a victory of the Muslims or the Muslim League the Pact was a disaster for Muslim India for all the years until 1947.

### **The Punjab Unionist Party**

The Punjab played an important party in the nationalist struggle. In the beginning, some Muslim leaders kept away from the Muslim League for the sake of their personal gain and because of their links with the British, and they joined the Unionist Party and opposed the creation of Pakistan (Punjab, classes 9-10). Other textbooks don't even mention the Unionist Party.

The Punjab National Unionist Party was established in April 1927. Among its founding fathers were Sir Muhammad Iqbal, Malik Firoz Khan Noon, Sir Rahim Baldish, Chaudhri Zafrullah Khan, Sardar Sikandar Hayai Khan, Shaikh Abdul Qadir, and Nawab Shahnawaz Khan of Mamdot. The inspiration came from Mian Fazl-i-Husain. The party was a child of the Lucknow Pact: with even one seat lost to the Congress, no Muslim party could tom a government in the province. It ruled the Punjab for 20 years with skill, efficiency and stability. In 1937 Jinnah, after two years of courtship,



persuaded Sikandar Hayat to enter into an agreement with the Muslim League on Sikandar's terms. This pact was broken by the League much later when Khizr Hayat Tiwana (Sikandar's successor) was asked to side with the League in contravention of the terms of the agreement. They party did not oppose the creation of Pakistan till after Khizr Hayat's expulsion from the League. If all these Unionist Muslims were selfish stooges of the British why did the League go to humiliating extremes in cultivating them and enlisting their support in the Punjab?

It was the supreme Unionist leader, Sir Fazl-i-Husain, who virtually dictated to the Viceroy the names of Indian Muslim delegates to the three sessions of the Round Table Conference, and we must remember that these spokesmen of Muslim India included such names as the Aga Khan, Sir Muhammad Shafi, Iqbal and Jinnah. Nobody then or even after that doubted the wisdom, political acumen and representative credentials of these delegates. Pakistan owes much more to the Unionist Muslims than her textbook writers and historians are aware of.

### **Boycott of the Simon Commission**

The Simon Commission was boycotted by both the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League (Punjab, class 8; private, Lahore, English, intermediate).

The Indian Statutory Commission, to give it its proper title, was appointed by the British Government on 26 November 1927. It toured India twice: first, from 3 February to 31 March 1928, and again from 11 October 1928 to 13 April 1929.

The All India Muslim League was split into two factions on the issue of cooperating with the Commission. One group, led by Jinnah and popularly known as Jinnah League, decided in favor of a boycott. The other, led by Sir Muhammad Shafi and known as Shafi League, voted in favor of cooperation. The nineteenth annual session of the All India Muslim League was consequently bifurcated. The Jinnah League held it in Calcutta on 30 December 1927 - 1 January 1928, with the Maharaja of Mahmudabad in the chair. The Shall League held it in Lahore on 1 January 1928, with Shall himself as president. From contemporary newspaper reports and lists of delegates it is very difficult to decide which faction better represented the Muslim sentiment. Leaving the League alone, a very large number of Muslim political, social and religious groups and parties met the Commission and submitted memoranda to it; their names, representatives interviewed and submissions are listed in the relevant white paper.

It is, therefore, not true to say that the All India Muslim League boycotted the Commission. The wrong claim is apparently tailored to fit the desired image of the League as an anti-British body.

## Nehru Report

It was submitted in 1926 (private, Lahore, English, intermediate). Several other textbooks refer to the Report in passing, without underlining its relevance to the emergence of the sentiment of political separatism among the Muslims.

How could a report written to challenge the appointment of the Simon Commission be published before the Simon Commission was named?

The Commission's appointment was announced on 26 November 1927. In his speech in the House of Lords on the appointment of the Commission, the Secretary of State for India, Lord Birkenhead, explained why no Indian had been put on the panel and asserted that no unanimous report could be expected from a body with Indian representation. This was resented by the Congress leaders, who immediately decided to draft a constitution to confound the India Office.

In December 1927, in its annual session held in Madras the Congress asked all other parties to join hands with it in preparing a constitution. As a result of this call an All-Parties Conference met in Delhi in February-March 1928, with the Jinnah League present and the Shafi league absent. Two committees were appointed, but they had nothing to report when the Conference met in Bombay on 19 May 1928. Then the Conference appointed a committee to do the work. This was the so-called Nehru Committee named after the chairman, Pandit Motilal Nehru. Two Muslims were put on it, Ali Imam and Shoib Qureshi. Both were unrepresentative of their community and had long ago been repudiated by the great majority of the Muslims. Shortly afterwards the Sikh member of the Committee was disowned by the Sikh League. The Indian Christian Conference also dissociated itself from the principles adopted by the Report on the protection of minorities.

The Committee published its report in August 1928. It recommended a fully responsible system of government in which the majority (the Hindus) would be sovereign. Muslim electorates were to be immediately abolished. The Muslims were shocked and almost all Muslim parties protested against it.

The All-Parties Conference met in Lucknow on 28-31 August to consider the report, and decided to convene an All-Parties Convention in December in Calcutta to elicit public opinion. On 28 December the Convention rejected every single argument and demand put forth by Jinnah in a forceful speech. Jinnah was chastened by the experience and hastened to make peace with the Shafi League which had kept aloof from the deliberations of these conferences and committees.

The significance of the Nehru Report lies in the fact that it united the Muslims as nothing else could have done at that time. All political differences and rivalries were hushed. From this moment onwards there was nothing that could be called "Indian nationalism".

Another consequence of the disillusionment with the Nehru Report was the establishment of the All India Muslim Conference. Except Jinnah, every prominent and influential Muslim figure attended the opening session of the Conference, and the resolution passed by the session on the rights and demands of the Muslims served as the basis for all negotiations with the British and the Congress at the Round Table Conference and after.

### **Muhammad Ali and the All India Muslim Conference**

Mawlana Muhammad Ali convened the All-Parties Muslim Conference in Delhi on 1 January 1929 (Federal Government, B.A.).

The date is wrong. It met on 31 December 1928 and 1 January 1929. In the official report of the Conference Muhammad Ali's name does not appear as a signatory of the persons who initiated the idea of convening such a conference and issued a manifesto from Simla arguing in favor of the idea on 10 September 1928. Nor was Muhammad Ali an office-bearer in the Conference. The Aga Khan was the president, Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan and Fazl Ibrahim Rahimtoola secretaries, Khwaja Ghulam-us-Sibtain financial secretary, and Muhammad Shafi Daudi working secretary. Muhammad Ali was merely one of the nineteen-member Working Committee. Nor did he ever preside over one of its annual sessions.

I am not aware of any All-Parties Muslim Conference called in Delhi on 1 January 1929 by Muhammad Ali.

### **Round Table Conference**

The Round Table Conferences were held in 1913 (private, Lahore, English, intermediate). There are other vague or confusing dates and years in some textbooks.

The Round Table Conference met in London in three sessions. The first was held from 12 November 1930 to 19 January 1931. the second from 7 September to 1 December 1931, and the third from 17 November to 24 December 1932.

### **Iqbal's Allahabad Address**

Iqbal's Allahabad Address: 1930: Date: This address was delivered on 29 December 1931 (private, Lahore, English, intermediate).

The year 1931 should read 1930.

Every textbook (federal or provincial or private, Urdu or English) from class 2 onwards (congratulations to class 1 on their escape) asserts that in 1930 Iqbal demanded a separate state for the Muslims. Before exposing this myth it is instructive to look at the variations rung on the distortion; it might help to read the mind of the brainwashers. All statements should be read as direct quotations.

Iqbal was the first to present the concept of the creation of Pakistan (private. Karachi. class 2; NWFP, class 5; Sindh, class 5). He was the first Muslim to give the idea of Pakistan (private, Karachi, English. classes 1-2). He was the first man to give the idea of Pakistan (private, Lahore, English, class 3). He demanded that the Muslim-majority regions of South Asia may be declared as an independent Muslim state (Sindh, English. class 5). He proposed the creation of an independent and free state made up of all those areas where the Muslims were in a majority (NWFP, class 5; Sindh, class 5). He demanded a separate Islamic state (NWFP, class 7). He demanded a separate Muslim state (NWFP, class 8). He demanded a separate *mamlakat* for the Muslims of India (NWFP, classes 9-10). He demanded a state for the Muslims (Punjab, classes 9-10). He demanded a Muslim state (Sindh, classes 9-10). He was the first Muslim to put in words the idea of Pakistan (private, Lahore, English, class 7). He conceived of a separate Muslim state in the north-western and north-eastern parts of India where they were in a majority (Sindh, English, class 8). He wanted a separate state for the Muslims of India (Punjab, English, classes 9-10). He was the first person to present the idea of an independent Muslim state (NWFP, intermediate). He strongly advocated the creation of an Islamic state (Federal Government, English, intermediate). He discussed at length the scheme for the partition of the subcontinent, and a resolution to this effect was also passed in that session of the All India Muslim League (private. Lahore, English, intermediate). He was the first thinker to offer the idea of a separate Muslim state on positive and ideological grounds (Federal Government, B.A.). At the beginning of this century he gave the Muslims the lesson of freedom and Islamic identity and then suggested the creation of a separate *mamlakat* as a political solution (Federal Government, B.A.). He presented the idea of a separate and independent homeland for the Muslims of the subcontinent (private. Lahore, B.A.). He demanded a separate independent homeland for the first time from a political platform (private. Lahore, B.A.). He presented a scheme for the creation of an independent Islamic *riyasat* in India or outside it (private, Peshawar. B.A.). He presented the demand for a separate *mamlakat* (private, Lahore, B.A.). He demanded a separate homeland (private, Lahore, B.A.). He offered a scheme for a division of India (private, Lahore, B.A.). He suggested the creation of an Islamic *mamlakat* (Allama Iqbal Open University, B.A.). He was the first to dream of a separate homeland for the Muslims of India (private, Lahore, English. B.A.).

First, a few silly points ought to be disposed of. Iqbal was speaking in English. To attribute to him in the Urdu translation the use of the word *mamlakat* is wrong on two counts. First, he did not use it. Secondly, the root of the Urdu term connects it with

*malukiat*, which is monarchy or kingship. I am aware of the popular phrase Mamlakat-i-Khudadad-i-Pakistan which is in much use among "patriotic" Pakistanis and *Islampasand* Urdu writers of doubtful ability or knowledge. Iqbal was talking about a modern political state, not about a monarchical institution.

Secondly, the textbook writers use the adjectives "Muslim" and "Islamic" as if they mean the same thing. They do not. A Muslim state is one whose population is Muslim by faith; there may be no religious minorities in such a state or some or many; but a clear majority of the people should be Muslims. An Islamic state is quite a different thing, but unfortunately impossible to define or describe. Every school and sect, and it seems that even every *'alim*, has its or his own concept of an Islamic state. Even Pakistani army generals have strong views on the point.

Thirdly, Iqbal's proposal amounted to this: the Punjab, NWFP, Sindh and Baluchistan should be merged to form one province of the proposed Indian federation. Nothing more than this was suggested. His own letter published in *The Times* on 12 October 1931 confirms this. This is reinforced by his letter in Urdu sent to Raghbir Ahsan. (Full details and documentation in my *A History of the Idea of Pakistan*, Vanguard, Lahore, 1987, Vol. 1, Chapters 4, 5 and 6, pp. 184-327).

Fourthly, Iqbal did not even refer to Bengal. His proposal was confined to the north-west of India. There is no warrant at all for saying that in 1930 he wanted a Muslim state embracing all Muslim provinces or Muslim-majority areas.

Fifthly, even if it is presumed that he was proposing a division of India on religious lines, three false claims have been made: (1) he was the first person to do so. (2) he was the first person to do so from a political platform, and (3) he was the first Muslim to do so. Answers: (1) exactly 64 such suggestions, vague or definite, were made between 24 June 1858 and 31 December 1929. (See the table in my *A History of the Idea of Pakistan*, Vol. 3, pp. 671-680). (2) Nawab Zulfikar Ali Khan demanded a separate country for the Muslims in the north-west and north-east of India in his address as Chairman of the Reception Committee delivered at the All India Khilafat Conference session held in Lahore on 31 December 1929. (3) Twenty-eight Muslims had made such proposals before Iqbal's address (see the table referred to above).

Sixthly, the All India Muslim League session held in Allahabad at which Iqbal gave this address did not pass any resolution about, on, for or against his proposal. It ignored

him completely. The Muslim League official proceedings of the session confirm my statement.

### **The Making of the 1935 Reforms**

The Round Table Conferences were held in 1913 (private, Lahore, English, intermediate). Several other books give vague or confusing dates. Besides, a large number of books declare that as a result of disagreement at the Round Table Conferences the British imposed a new system on India in the shape of the Government of India Act of 1935.

The Round Table Conference met in London in three sessions. The first was held from 12 November 1930 to 19 January 1931, the second from 7 September to 1 December 1931, and the third from 17 November to 24 December 1932.

The statement that the 1935 reforms were enforced by the British against the will of the Indians is a serious misrepresentation of facts. Consider the following developments.

The Simon Commission published its report in May 1930. In the fullness of its study, the depth of scope of its observations, the lucidity of its argument, the realism and reasonableness of its approach, it is a commendable essay in constitution making. The Report was followed by the Round Table Conference. In the first session the Congress was absent because it insisted that the Conference must not discuss whether India should or should not receive responsible self-government but must shape a constitution on the basis of a free India. All other parties attended, and most of the work was done through the Federal Structure Sub-Committee. and gradually the federal plan took shape and substance.

In the second session, which was attended by the Congress. the communal issue was seriously tackled. The Aga Khan, Jinnah, Sir Muhammad Shaft and Zafarullah Khan negotiated with Gandhi. But Gandhi, the sole Congress delegate to the Conference, refused to consider any compromise until the Muslims accepted the Nehru Report in its totality. Upon this all the minorities except the Sikhs drafted a joint demand of claims and presented it to the British Government as their irreducible minimum. Muslim demands were based on the resolutions passed by the All India Muslim Conference at Delhi on 4 and 5 April 1931. In summary they were: residual powers with the provinces: separation of Sindh from the Bombay Presidency; full autonomy for the NWFP: reforms in Baluchistan; transfer of power direct to the provinces: separate electorates; special Muslim weightage in all political bodies: constitutional sanction for the enforcement of basic rights; safeguards against communal legislation; adequate Muslim representation in public services; and amendment of the constitution with the concurrence of the provinces.

But the Hindu-Muslim problem remained unsolved, and it became clear that the British Government would have to assume the difficult task of arbitration. It was impossible to make any progress in constitution making without first determining the proportion of Hindu and Muslim shares in the proposed legislatures.

The Congress was again absent from the thin] session. Some more discussions took place. Most of the work was done through committees. Loose threads were tied up.

The results of the long labors of the three sessions were collected, sifted and summarized in a White Paper issued in March 1933. It faithfully translated the measure of agreement reached at the Conference. But the chief Muslim objection was that it created a strong centre. A Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament was appointed to consider the White Paper. Constitutionally this body was exclusively composed of members of Parliament, but twenty representative Indians from British India and seven from the States were appointed as assessors to the Committee. The five Muslim co-optees were the Aga Khan, Sir Zafrullah Khan, Sir Abdur Rahim, Sir Shafaat Ahmad Khan and Sir A.H. Ghuznawi. The Committee was at work from April 1933 to November 1934, and finally reported to Parliament on 22 November 1934. The report was debated in the House of Commons on 10-12 December 1934, and the House of Lords on 18 December. The second reading took place in February 1935, and after the third reading the India Bill finally reached the statute book on 24 July 1935.

Never before had the British Parliament taken so long and worked so hard on a colonial constitution. Never before had India figured so prominently and so consistently in *Hansard*. Never again was British to lavish so much care and ability on India.

But the federation set up by the Act was of the closer rather than the looser type. Hindu unitarianism prevailed, particularly in the composition of the federal legislature. The Muslims objected to it because, to them, a strong centre meant an increase of Hindu strength. The Muslim League found the federal scheme to be "fundamentally bad", "most reactionary, retrograde, injurious and fatal", and rejected it. However, it undertook to work the provincial part of the constitution "for what it was worth". The Congress tamed down both the parts of the Act, but decided to contest elections and to wreck the constitution from the inside; but later, tasting power for the first time, formed provincial ministries.

### **The Elections of 1937**

The Indian National Congress won the elections by chance (Punjab, classes 9-10).

The Congress score was as follows: Bengal Legislative Assembly, 54 out of a total of 250; Bihar, 91 out of 152; Assam, 32 out of 108; Bombay, 87 out of 175; Madras, 159 out of 215; U.P., 134 out of 228; Punjab, 18 out of 175; NWFP, 19 out of 50; Orissa, 36 out of 60;

Sindh, 8 out of 60; C.P., 71 out of 112. Total: 762 out of 1,771. The Muslim League won 54 seats out of 250 in Bengal, 4 out of 108 in Assam, 18 out of 175 in Bombay, 9 out of 215 in Madras, 26 out of 228 in U.P., 2 out of 175 in Punjab, 5 out of 112 in C.P., and none in Bihar, NWFP, Orissa and Sindh (source: official white paper).

How this result can be attributed to "chance" passes my understanding. The Congress was at this time a 52-year-old, well-established, disciplined, self-sacrificing and superbly led party. In fact, it won less seats than public opinion and the party itself expected.

Why can't Pakistani professors take election results as good, honest facts? Is it because they live in a country where rigging or allegations of rigging are by now *de rigueur*? Even the All India Muslim League or Jinnah did not utter a word which could be interpreted as attributing the Congress victory to gratuity. All elections were honest under British rule, and the League knew it.

### **Sindh Provincial Muslim League Conference**

It met in Karachi in October 1936 (Federal Government, B.A.). A committee of the Karachi Muslim Conference demanded a separate Muslim state (private, Lahore, B.A.).

It met on 8-13 October 1938; and it was not the Karachi Muslim Conference but the conference convened by the Sindh Provincial Muslim League. As for what it demanded, the following details should be a part of what the students learn.

In his address as Chairman of the Reception Committee Sir Abdullah Haroon said that unless the communal problem was solved to Muslim satisfaction it would be "impossible to save India from being divided into Hindu India and Muslim India, both placed under separate federations". Jinnah, who was presiding, in his speech did not endorse, ratify, confirm or support Haroon's idea. Notwithstanding Jinnah's snub, the Sindh Muslim League leadership drafted and moved a resolution in the Subjects Committee threatening that if the Congress did not behave the Muslims "would have no alternative but to fall [back] on the Pakistan scheme", and spelling out the concept of a separate Muslim federation. The Committee rejected this portion of the resolution, omitting all references to a division of India; and the redrafted text was passed by the session. The original draft had been prepared by Haroon and Ali Muhammad Rashdi in collaboration with Shaikh Abdul Majid Sindhi. Not taking kindly to Jinnah's rebuke, they released to the press the two texts of the resolution: the original and the revised. Further, Abdul Majid Sindhi introduced the original resolution in the next All India Muslim League session in Patna; it was thrown out.



## Lahore Resolution: The Date

Every textbook, irrespective of its origin, language and class, says that the Lahore Resolution was passed or adopted on 23 March 1941); often repeating the inaccuracy more than once.

The simple matter of the date on which the resolution was passed has been constructed into a national and historical falsehood. All contemporary newspapers and compilations of current developments and facts and figures agree on the following timetable of the All Muslim League's 27th annual session held in Lahore.

The proceedings opened on 22 March at 3 P.M. The Nawab of Mamdot delivered his address as Chairman of the Reception Committee. Then Jinnah gave his long extempore speech. That was the end of the first day. On 23 March the session began at 3 P.M. Fazlul Haq introduced the Lahore Resolution and made a speech on it. Chaudhri Khaliquzzaman seconded it and spoke for a while. Then Zafar Ali Khan, Sardar Aurangzeb Khan and Abdullah Haroon made short speeches in support of the Resolution. The proceedings were then adjourned to the following day. On 24 March the session began at 11.15 A.M. Speeches on the Resolution were delivered by Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan of the United Provinces, Qazi Muhammad Isa of Baluchistan, and Abdul Hamid Khan of Madras. At this stage Jinnah arrived, who had been engaged elsewhere that morning, and occupied the presidential chair. Speeches on the Resolution continued with Ismail Ibrahim Chundrigar of Bombay, Sayyid Abdur Rauf Shah of the Central Provinces, and Dr. Muhammad Alam of the Punjab expressing their enthusiastic support. Then Jinnah intervened and let Abdur Rahman Siddiqui introduce his resolution on Palestine. Sayyid Raza Ali and Abdul Hamid Badayuni spoke in support of it, and it was adopted by a bare majority. The session adjourned to meet again at 9.00 P.M. The night meeting opened with the two remaining speeches on the Lahore Resolution by Sayyid Zakir Ali and Beguni Muhammad Ali. It was then put to the vote and declared to be unanimously carried. Two more resolutions (on the Khaksars and on amendments to the party constitution) were quickly moved and adopted. Finally, the session elected office-bearers for the ensuing year. Jinnah made a short speech winding up the proceedings, and the session concluded at 11.30 P.M.

Thus there is no room for the slightest doubt about the fact that the Lahore Resolution was passed on 24 March. But no notice of the correct date has been taken by anyone in Pakistan, including the Government which makes the nation celebrate the "Pakistan Day" on the wrong date. I cannot think of any plausible explanation for such massive repudiation of an historical fact.

### **Lahore Resolution: The Occasion**

The resolution was adopted on 23 March 1940 in a big meeting of the Muslim League in Lahore (NWFP, class 4). On 23 March Jinnah held a meeting in Lahore and explained to the Muslims the idea of having a separate homeland for them (Punjab, class 4).

Don't the writers feel obliged to tell the tots in their charge that it was not an ordinary meeting called by Jinnah but the annual session of the All India Muslim League?

### **Lahore Resolution: The Meaning**

By far the most important document of the entire Pakistan movement has been misquoted, misconstrued, misinterpreted and distorted by all textbooks whether ordered by the government or written by teaching professors. The more serious examples of this tampering must be quoted in order to assess the depth of the confusion instilled into the minds of the students. My quotations are direct:

It demanded two independent states in the subcontinent (private, Karachi, English, class 5). It demanded a separate independent state in South Asia for the Muslims (Sindh, class 5). It demanded a separate free homeland (Punjab, class 6). It demanded a free and independent state which should carry the name of Pakistan (Sindh, class 6). It demanded a separate homeland for the Muslims of India (NWFP, class 7). It demanded a separate independent Islamic government [*hakumat*] (Sindh, class 7). It demanded one independent *hakumat* and one independent *mamlakat* (NWFP, class 8). It demanded a separate independent state (Sindh, class 8). It demanded an independent and free Muslim state (NWFP, classes 9-10). It demanded a homeland for the Muslims of the subcontinent (Punjab, classes 9-10). It demanded their [Muslims'] separate homeland (Sindh, classes 9-10). It announced that the Muslim areas were to form an independent and sovereign state (Sindh, English, class 6). It demanded an independent and sovereign Muslim state (Sindh, English, class 8). It demanded a separate Muslim state (private, Lahore, English, intermediate). It asked for the creation of a separate state for the Muslims (Federal Government, B.A.). It demanded a separate homeland (private, Lahore, B.A.). It laid claim to a separate homeland; it demanded the division of the subcontinent into two independent states (private, Lahore, English, B.A.).

Let us look at the original source before commenting on the nonsense quoted above. The operative section of the Lahore Resolution, as it was officially published by the All India Muslim League office, runs as follows:

"Resolved that it is the considered view of this session of the All India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principles, *viz.*, that geographically

contiguous *units* are demarcated into *regions* which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the *areas* in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority, as in the North-Western and Eastern *zones* of India, should be grouped to constitute 'Independent *States*' in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign." (The italics are mine).

The text is badly worded, clumsily drafted and employs five territorial terms of vastly different shades of meaning without any attempt at defining them. It is incredible that a country was demanded and won on the basis of a document of such vague, nebulous, ambiguous, confused and fuzzy character. The words "Independent States" are put within quotation marks. Why? Could there be a state which was not independent? There are more puzzles. The last ten words announce that the constituent units of each of these States "shall be autonomous and sovereign". The word "Shall" makes it a definite and binding declaration. How can a state be made up of sovereign units? Are autonomous and sovereign synonymous terms? The word "federation" is not used in the Resolution. Were the north-western and north-eastern States to be unitary structures? The demand is for States in the plural. No figure is given. Were the two zones to become two states or more?

I have posed these questions because I find no reference to these points in any textbook. At least on the college level, it was the duty of the writers to provide some textual criticism of the Resolution and discuss the difficulties in the way of understanding it. But this assumes that the authors had read the Resolution. They had done nothing of the sort. This judgment is made on the basis of what they declare to be the contents of the Resolution.

The text of the Resolution is now before my readers. Do they, or can they with all the effort at their command, find in the words of the Resolution the following nine statements made by the various textbooks along with the assertion that they are contained in the body of the Resolution? The Resolution demanded, they say:

- (1) two independent states,
- (2) a separate independent state,
- (3) a separate free homeland.
- (4) a free and independent state to be called Pakistan.
- (5) a separate independent Islamic *hakumat*,
- (6) one independent *hakumat* and one independent *mummlakat*,
- (7) a homeland for the Muslims of India,
- (8) a separate homeland,
- (9) a division of India into two independent states

Evidently the books are not referring to the Lahore Resolution but to some other unnamed declaration.

This treatment of the Lahore Resolution raises a fundamental question. If the textbooks can fabricate facts in the course of paraphrasing a definite, published, easily available document, what atrocities on the truth they must have perpetrated in the field of Pakistan's political developments where there are no original sources, where conflicting opinions abound, and where patriotic, sectarian and ethnic interests jostle against each other and cloud the horizon of history? What our children are being told is not even half-truths. Exaggerations, understatements, terminological inexactitudes. Perversions, disinformation, evasions, garbling and mutilations: they are falsehoods. Whoppers, concoctions, pious frauds, fables, fibs and fisherman's yarns. A moment to ponder, dear reader, a moment to ponder, and to mourn the death of what we profess to live by – *haqq*, the TRUTH which is the first teaching of Islam.

### **Lahore Resolution: Ignoramus**

The following sentence is submitted to my readers as ready-made epitome of all the errors one can possibly make, with some effort: The Pakistan Resolution was passed by the Muslim League in a meeting held at Minto Park in Lahore on the 23rd March 1940: it demanded an independent state (Punjab, English, classes 9-10). The author has a research degree from the University of London; he retired honorably as a full professor at the Government College, Lahore; and is at present principal of an elite English-medium college in Lahore.

His feat of having assembled five mistakes of fact yet remains unsurpassed in the annals of ignorance. There are no prizes for adult readers for spotting the inaccuracies; though if I were an examiner I would quote this sentence and then ask the students appearing in their M.A examination in history or political science to point out and rectify all the mistakes in it, and I guarantee that a majority would not score passing marks. I suspect that the same test given to our college and university teachers (forget the poor school teachers) would produce similar results.

Now for the mistakes. (1) It was not the Pakistan Resolution but the Lahore Resolution. (2) It was not a meeting, or even a special or extraordinary meeting, but the annual session. (3) It was not passed by the Muslim League but by the All India Muslim League, the parent body, the central organization. Even an above-average student of the 9th class (for whom the book has been prepared) might notice the words "Lahore" and "Muslim League", and live with the impression that the resolution was passed by the Punjab Muslim League or even the Lahore Muslim League. (4) It was not passed on 23 March, but on 24 March. (5) It did not demand an independent state; the word "States" was used in the plural.

The resolution is so clumsily drafted that in the opinion of some careful scholars it is debatable whether it demanded independent states or suggested some kind of a

confederation between the Indian state and the Muslim "States". But I will give the author the benefit of the doubt and not press this point. His other mistakes are enough to convict him.

### **Muslim League Legislators' Convention**

The elected Muslim members of the Central and Provincial Assemblies held a convention at Delhi in 1946 (Punjab, English, classes 9-10). The All India Muslim League Legislators' Convention was held in Delhi on 9 April 1949 (private, Lahore, English, intermediate). On 9 April 1946 a meeting of 5th Muslim members of the central and provincial assemblies revised the Lahore Resolution (private, Lahore, B.A.). The Lahore Resolution's "States" in the plural was corrected at a Muslim League session held on 9 April 1946 (private, Lahore, B.A.).

Each of the four statements made above are false. (1) They were not elected "Muslim members", but Muslim members elected on the Muslim League ticket (2) The year was 1946, not 1949. The exact dates were 7-9 April, not just one day. (3) The same mistake as in number 1. (4) It was not a Muslim League session, but a convention of Muslim League Legislators.

Statements 3 and 4 also let pass the fact that the Convention committed a legal offence in amending the Lahore Resolution. According to the constitution of the All India Muslim League all resolutions and decisions of a session could only be changed or rescinded by another session, not by any other body. The Convention had no right or title to amend the Lahore Resolution. Surprisingly, the infringement was the deed of an assembly of law-makers.

As the resolution passed by the Convention in supersession of the Lahore Resolution is little known I reproduce below the first paragraph of the preamble and the opening paragraph of the body of the text:

"Whereas the Muslims are convinced that with a view to save [*sic.*] Muslim India from the domination of the Hindus and in order to afford them full scope to develop themselves according to their genius, it is necessary to constitute a sovereign independent State comprising Bengal and Assam in the North-East zone and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sindh and Baluchistan in the North-West zone."

"That the zones comprising Bengal and Assam in the North-East and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sindh and Baluchistan in the North-West of India, namely Pakistan zones where the Muslims are in dominant majority, be constituted into a sovereign independent State and that an unequivocal undertaking be given to implement the establishment of Pakistan without delay."

## **Jawaharlal Nehru's Statement of 1946**

In 1946 Jawaharlal Nehru said that after independence there will be a government of the Hindus in India (West Punjab, class 2).

He never said this, in 1946 or any other year. Probably the textbook is referring to his statements about the Cabinet Mission plan. What Nehru actually said was this. In winding up the proceedings of the All India Congress Committee on 6 July 1946 in Bombay, he declared that "so far as I can see, it is not a question of our accepting any plan, long or short. It is only a question of our agreeing to go into the Constituent Assembly. That is all, and nothing more than that. We will remain in the Assembly so long as we think it is good for India, and we will come out when we think it is injuring our cause and then offer our battle. We are not bound by a single thing except that we have decided for the moment to go to the Constituent Assembly".

Again, On 10 July, in a press conference he amplified his speech of 6 July and said that the Congress had agreed to go to the Constituent Assembly and to nothing else. He added, "What we do there, we are entirely and absolutely free to determine". (Both statements reproduced in The Indian Annual Register, 1946, Vol. 11).

Contemporary newspapers and other accounts and later studies of the period do not contain any statement by him to the effect that after 1947 Indian will have a government of the Hindus. It must be remembered that this lie is being told to class 2.

## **The NWFP Referendum**

All the people of NWFP voted for Pakistan in 1946 (NWFP, class 4).

The assertion is vague. It is also grossly inaccurate whatever he means by "1946".

If the reference is to the 1945-46 elections, the facts are as follows. In the election of one member from the province to the central legislature the Muslim League abstained on the excuse that it was held under the joint electorate system. The Congress candidate, Abdul Ghani Khan, received 8,159 votes; the Khaksar candidate, Muhammad Akbar Qureshi, polled 5,386 votes. Many Muslim Leaguers must have voted for the Khaksar candidate, because his score was out of all proportions to the actual following of his party in the province. In the provincial elections, out of a total of 50 seats the Congress won 30, the Muslim League 17, and the Jamat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind 2. The total Muslim seats were 38; the Congress won 19, and the Muslim League 17. The total votes cast in the 38 Muslim constituencies were 355,246; out of these the Muslim League received 147,940 (41.65%) and the Congress 136,201 (38.34%). 41.65% is not 100%. So much for "all the people" of the textbook.

If the reference is to the referendum held on 6-16 July 1947, the actual figures are like this. It is important to remember that the Congress and the Red Shirts boycotted the poll. The total number of votes cast were 292,118; those for Pakistan were 289,244. But the total electorate on the rolls was 572,798. Thus the turn-out was only 51.00%. If the votes cast for Pakistan are computed as the percentage of the total Muslim electorate in the province it comes to 58.28. This again is not "all the people" of the textbook.

To tell lies is bad; to tell them to 4th class students is worse; to tell them in a textbook is unforgivable.

### **Date of the Creation of Pakistan**

Pakistan was created on 14 August 1947 (West Punjab, class 2). The decision to divide the subcontinent into two parts was taken on 14 August 1947 (NWFP, class 8). Pakistan was founded on 14 August 1947 (private, Lahore, English class 1). Pakistan was founded by Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah on 14 August 1947 (private, Karachi, English, classes 1-2). Pakistan state took its birth on 27 June 1947; the two free Dominions of India and Pakistan were born on 19 July 1947 (private, Lahore, English, intermediate).

The dates 27 June and 19 July are obviously the results of an attack of amnesia, and their author, though a professor of a prestigious college, should be pitied.

The general impression, confirmed and reinforced by the official celebration of independence, that Pakistan became free on 14 August is not correct. The Indian Independence Bill, which was introduced in the British Parliament on 4 July and which became law on 15 July, laid down that the two new Dominions of India and Pakistan shall become free at the midnight of 14-15 August. The power had to be personally transferred to the new countries by the Viceroy who was the British King's sole representative in India. Lord Mountbatten could not be present in person in Karachi and New Delhi at the same moment. Nor could he transfer power to India on the morning of 15 August and then rush to Karachi, because by that time he would have become the Governor General of the new Indian Dominion. So the only practicable thing was for him to transfer power to Pakistan on 14 August when he was still the Viceroy of India. But that does not mean that Pakistan gained its independence on 14 August. The Indian Independence Act did not provide for it.

### **Pakistan Constituent Assembly**

The overwhelming majority of the Constituent Assembly wanted to make Pakistan a *ladini* [irreligious] state; unfortunately, after the establishment of Pakistan the country was full of elements and forces which did not want to see Pakistan as an Islamic society. The greatest misfortune was that these elements succeeded in entering the first

Constituent Assembly of the country, where they tried their best to achieve their despicable objectives (private. Lahore, B.A.).

The first Constituent Assembly lasted from 1947 to 1954. It had 76 members: 62 from the Muslim League, 10 from the Pakistan National Congress. 3 from the Azad Pakistan Party, and one independent. The 62 Leaguers included M.A. Jinnah. Liaquat Ali Khan, Abdur Rab Nishtar, I.I. Chundrigar, Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Khwaja Shahabuddin, Dr. A.M. Malik, Khwaja Nazimuddin, Dr. Mahmud Husain, Dr. I.H. Qureshi, Shoib Qureshi, A.K. Brohi, Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, and Khan Abdul Qayyum Khan. Most of these were old companions of the Quaid-i-Azam and leaders of the Pakistan movement. In March 1949 the Assembly passed the Objectives Resolution. In December 1952 it published the Basic Principles Committee Report. The 1956 constitution, though made by the second Constituent Assembly, was largely based on these two documents, and even the Jamaat-i-Islami welcomed it and called it an Islamic constitution.

What the textbook has done is to paint in the blackest colors all the founding fathers of Pakistan, called them enemies of Islam, ascribed "despicable objectives" to them, and characterized their presence in the Constituent Assembly as "the greatest misfortune" for Pakistan – all this to truckle to a ruling General, Ziaul Huq. And this libel is being fed to the B.A. classes.

### **The 1956 Constitution**

It had still not become operative when it was abrogated (NWFP, class 5). It never came into operation and General Ayub Khan took over the government (Sindh, class 5). It had just become operative when differences arose among the political parties of the country. At this juncture, in October 1958, Ayub imposed martial law and saved the administration from disorder (Federal Government, B.A.). Because of the resignation of Chaudhri Muhammad Ali as prime minister the 1956 constitution never became operative (private, Karachi, B.A.).

The Draft Bill of the 1956 constitution was presented to the Constituent Assembly on 9 January. The final debate took place on 29 February. The Constitution came into force on 23 March. Chaudhri Muhammad Ali resigned on 12 September 1956, and was succeeded by H.S. Suhrawardy (12 September 1956-11 October 1957), I.I. Chundrigar (18 October-11 December 1957), (18 October-11 December 1957), and Sir Feroz Khan Noon (16 December 1957-7 October 1958). General Muhammad Ayub Khan forced President Iskander Mirza to abrogate the Constitution on 7 October 1958. Two weeks later Ayub Khan ousted Mirza and made himself the supreme ruler of the country. Thus the 1956 Constitution, far from never having come into operation, was the fundamental law of the land for just over two and a half years. from 23 March 1956 to 7 October 1958.



## General Ayub Khan's Coup

He took over power to save the administration from disorder (Federal Government, B.A.). Because of the wrong policies and responsibilities of the self-styled political leaders the country stood at the brink of a disaster, and the need of a strong government was greatly felt. In these circumstances, General Muhammad Ayub Khan *marhum* imposed martial law (private, Lahore. B.A.).

This is a special piece of pleading on behalf of General Ayub Khan, and by implication a defence of all military *coups*. There was some disorder, democratic norms were not being followed to the full, the Muslim League, under Khan Qayyum Khan. was vociferous and insistent on demanding elections. There was unruly behavior in the assemblies. People in power were not behaving with responsibility. Political waters were ruffled. (All this has been a common feature of Pakistani political culture). But the country certainly did not stand at the brink of a disaster. Neither Iskander Mirza nor Ayub has any reasonable plea to enter in his defence. Ayub has himself told us in writing that he had been contemplating a military take-over since 1954.

## General Ayub's Rule

The people of Pakistan were very pleased with President Ayub. They gave him a higher army rank (private, Lahore, English, class 3).

The poor people were never given an opportunity to show their pleasure or displeasure. Ayub distrusted them so much that he abolished directly elected assemblies and substituted them with "basic democracies" – a recession to the good old British days of Lord Ripon. Ayub was promoted from Generalship to the rank of Field Marshal by his own Cabinet winds was not only appointed by himself but contained some Generals.

## The 1962 Constitution

It had several clauses which were opposed to the sacred *shariat*. e.g., polygamy, divorce. *khula*, and inheritance by the grandson (private. Karachi. B.A.).

My copy of the 1962 Constitution, an official publication, does not contain any mention of these elements of "sacred *shariat*". These matters were dealt with in the Family Laws Ordinance issued by Ayub Khan and later given protection by the National Assembly. Had they been a part of the 1962 Constitution they would have lapsed with it: but they are still a law of the land in spite of the 1973 Constitution and what came later.

## The 1965 War

India, frightened of the Pakistan army and the people of Pakistan, sued for peace (Punjab, class 4). When India was on the point of being defeated she requested the United Nations to arrange a cease-fire (Punjab, class 5).

There is no evidence whatsoever that India was on the point of being beaten by Pakistan or that it begged for peace or that it asked the United Nations to arrange a cease-fire. The war ended when the Big Powers intervened.

### **Ayub's Transfer of Power to Yahya**

In 1969 different political groups were making different demands. This *silsilah* of demands assumed the proportions of disorder. As a result the President asked the Commander-in-Chief, Yahya Khan, to look after the administrative conditions [literal translation of meaningless Urdu] (Allama Iqbal Open University, B.A., Vol. I).

The prolonged, widespread, spontaneous, genuine and in later stages uncontrollable anti-Ayub campaign cannot be dismissed by such vague explanations. The weaknesses of his rule have to be enlisted and analyzed. Ayub Khan broke the Constitution by handing over power to the army chief instead of to the Speaker of the National Assembly. This fact finds no mention. We don't know what happened in the last Ayub-Yahya meeting; the general impression is that the General put a pistol to the head of the Field Marshal.

### **The "Yahya Constitution"**

In March 1969 General Yahya Khan promulgated another constitution in the country (private, Lahore. B.A.).

No such constitution was promulgated. He got a constitution drafted (I understand ex-Chief Justice Cornelius was associated with the work); it was even printed by the Government press; but it was never made public, issued or enforced.

### **The Break-up of Pakistan in 1971**

A standard, repetitive, false, spurious and monotonous description of the break-up of Pakistan appear in every textbook from class 5 to B.A. Long quotations are not required here. The composite picture that emerges bears the following essential features: it was imprudent and mischievous of the people of East Pakistan to oppose Urdu as the national language; the Hindu population of East Pakistan was disloyal; there were internal enemies who conspired against the country; India engineered riots in East Pakistan through her agents: when conditions were ripe, India invaded East Pakistan from all four sides, and the Pakistan army had to surrender, East Pakistan became Bangladesh.

This telegraphically brief list of charges against the Bengalis and the excuses in favor of West Pakistan is a cruel travesty of facts. The tale is too long to be told in a short commentary or even in one or two chapters. But in any balanced account of the breakup the following factors ought to be mentioned (the list is not exhaustive):

- (1) The 1947 decision to have one state covering both wings was shortsighted. It made a mockery of federalism, and with a hostile India lying in between it made East Pakistan indefensible. Geographical forces are permanent. Historical necessity is transitory. And there was no historical necessity.
- (2) The deep cultural differences between the two wings militated against the making of a nation.
- (3) The imposition of Urdu (a small minority language even in West Pakistan) on a country where the majority spoke Bengali was unwise, doubly so in the light of the Bengali peoples' passionate attachment to their own language – a perfectly natural sentiment (look at the Arabs, the French, and nearer home the Urdu-speaking muhajirs).
- (4) Right from August 1947 onwards the Bengalis were deprived of political power. In ministry-forming, in constitutional arithmetic and in decision-making they were ignored. Centralization aggravated it. Supreme power alternated between the Governor General/President and the Prime Minister according to the ethnic affiliation of the person, not by the authority inherent in the office (vide Ghulam Muhammad and Khwaja Nazimuddin).
- (5) East Pakistan was not given adequate funds. Far from enough was spent on its development. Even its jute earnings were mostly expended on West Pakistan.
- (6) The federal capital was located in West Pakistan, with all the benefits and privileges flowing from the decision. This advantage was multiplied several times when a new capital was built in Islamabad.
- (7) Bengalis were given a grossly inadequate share in the civil administration of the country. Their number in the superior services was unfairly small. A Bengali in the inner circles of the federal secretariat was a curiosity. Nearly all important decisions which affected East Pakistan as much as they affected West Pakistan were taken without any Bengali participation.
- (8) The Bengalis had virtually no share in the army. They had some representation in the navy and the air force; but it is the army which overthrows governments

and rules the people. The Bengalis knew it with Ayub's ascension to power they rued it.

- (9) Geography and Bengali exclusion from the army made it clear that for their security against foreign invasion the East Pakistanis were totally dependent on the pleasure and attention of West Pakistan (as the 1965 war proved). Are we really independent and free? They were bound to ask themselves. The question came up for an immediate and imperative answer in 1971 when their "own army" tried to conquer them. They gave the answer by claiming separate nationhood. Secession was the reply forced out of them by West Pakistan's ineptitude.
- (10) The West Pakistani businessmen and civil servants domiciled or posted in East Pakistan behaved with arrogance, boorishness, impertinence and shameless audacity. They ensured that the Bengalis were made aware of their colonial status. They forgot that one day Old bills would arrive to be paid – with blood (again of the poor Bengali) instead of interest.
- (11) In nearly twenty-five years of her existence Pakistan had failed to create a party system which crossed over to the other wing. The Muslim League was weakening fast and died in East Pakistan in 1954. After that every party was either East or West Pakistani in origin, membership and local loyalty. To rule a federation divided by a thousand miles without the instrumentality of one or more national parties would have been beyond the wit of art Aristotle. though not beyond the machinations of a Machiavelli. There was no shortage of Machiavellis in West Pakistan.
- (12) Yahya Khan mishandled the situation grievously, but he was under tremendous pressure from the army. His action in East Pakistan killed Pakistan.
- (13) The Pakistan army was in no shape to fight a war. Now that the Hamood-ur-Rahman Report has been published in the United States and a summary of its findings and recommendations has appeared in Pakistani newspapers, there should be no embarrassment or rear in telling the truth.
- (14) Indian intervention should not be made much of. Everybody expected it. India herself gave fair notice. Even if India had not made a move, could the Pakistan army defeat the Bengalis, capture the province, and maintain its hold in a state of siege? And, for how long?
- (15) In spite of the voting in the General Assembly of the United Nations, world public opinion was against Pakistan. Let Europe and the Americas alone; not one

single Muslim country recalled its ambassador from New Delhi. It was a complete breakdown of foreign policy.

- (16) East Pakistan's secession was inevitable. Besides, or because of, the above factors, West Pakistanis had created such resentment and haired among the Bengalis that no other solution was in sight.

### General Ziaul Huq's Coup

The textbook account of how and why General Zia threw out an elected government is as simplistic, partial and misleading as the description of the 1971 events. Six propositions are drummed into the ears of the students of all ages: (1) there was no government-opposition agreement; (2) this led to political disorder in the country; (3) law and order situation was becoming impossible; (4) anyway, Z.A. Bhutto was a dictator and his government had done nothing to satisfy public aspirations; (5) the *Nizam-i-Mustafa* movement was a mass movement; and (6) the anti-government agitation reflected the determination of the Pakistani nation to have the Islamic order implemented in the country. In these circumstances, the armed forces had no options open to them; the coup was unavoidable and the right solution of the problem.

Each of the statements made above begs the question. Let me deal with them seriatim.

(1) Several politicians who were actors in these negotiations have published their versions. The majority says that an agreement was reached, it was repudiated by Asghar Khan, fresh negotiations were planned, everybody was getting ready for talks – and then suddenly the army struck in the person of General Ziaul Huq. There is considerable circumstantial evidence that the anti-government agitation was either engineered by Zia or at least surreptitiously supported by him. His own statements, given after the *coup* in public, repeatedly and in strong accents, are on record in which he praised the motives, ideas and sacrifices of the so-called *Nizam-i-Mustafa* movement. Later he invited all the component groups of the Pakistan National Alliance to become his ministers; most of them accepted the offer. After Bhutto's execution he asked them to get out of the government; all obeyed. This does not leave any doubt who was the master and who were the willing servants. Had they been democrats protesting against allegedly rigged elections they would not have tolerated a military dictator, not to speak of becoming happy tools of an army junta –and this in spite of Zia's repeated postponement of elections.

(2) Political disorder was not the result of the failure of the government-opposition negotiations. Disorder and agitation are synonymous terms in street politics. Disorder had appeared the moment the PNA started its movement.

(3) The law and order situation never became impossible. Martial Law was imposed at a few places. Processions were becoming unruly. Life was disturbed. Similar things had happened in the anti-Ahmadiyya agitation of 1953: but no General had overthrown the government. Zia's assertion that the country was at the brink of a civil war must be taken as his excuse invented to justify his coup.

(4) It is very difficult to substantiate or corroborate the charges that Bhutto was a dictator and that his government had done nothing for the people. He was the elected leader of the majority party in the country and the parliament. He was the most popular and the only charismatic figure since Jinnah. He had many weaknesses. He was an autocrat, intolerant of criticism, suspicious of the word "credibility", over confident, at times arrogant, and unwilling to make friends with his rivals. Some of his policies were either wrongly conceived or badly implemented. He did much for his countrymen, though not as much as they expected. Yet, he had the biggest popular following in the country, and those loyal to him did not waver when he fell and died. But even if he was not a perfect prime minister and his policies were not good, is that a sufficient ground for the army chief to overthrow his government?

(5) The *Nizam-i-Mustafa* movement represented a minority of the minority of the people. Many urban areas stayed quiet. The countryside stood silent and unaffected. Had it been a mass movement it would have forced Zia to hold elections instead of selling itself to him in exchange for a few temporary seats in the Cabinet.

(6) The agitation was a move against allegedly rigged elections and nothing more. The demand for an Islamic order was an afterthought and was aimed at winning the support of the uneducated masses who did not comprehend the finer points of the electoral machinery but were susceptible to any slogan shouted in the name of Islam. The agitation was not the voice of the nation. It used the nation's religious sentiment for its own purpose.

### **General Zia as Ruler of Pakistan**

Textbooks aimed at students from class 9 to B.A. give their verdict on General Zia's military ode in five glowing testimonials: (1) his repeated postponement of elections was the right decision taken for unavoidable reasons; (2) he honestly tried to enforce the Islamic system of government as had been promised by the Quaid-i-Azam to the nation; (3) his Islamic ordinances at last achieved the real objective of the creation of Pakistan; (4) he was chosen by destiny to be the person who achieved the distinction of implementing Islamic law; and (5) naturally, he deserves our thanks and congratulations.

Since Zia's death in 1988 much has been written on his dark years in Pakistani newspapers and general books, most of it castigating him for what he did to the country. I will limit my comments to the five gushing compliments listed above.

(1) He promised elections again and again and broke his promise each time. Heads of state who make false promises are rejected by the people; but he knew that he was irremovable because his hand was always on his power base (the gun), not on the pulse of the nation (public opinion). The Quran enjoins on every Muslim to keep his word, but the *mard-i-momin* preferred political expediency to the call of faith. The only "unavoidable mason" for not holding elections was the fear that he would lose power and probably his head to boot. Usurpers quail before accountability.

(2) [a] For him the heart of the Islamic system consisted of its penal laws, which he enforced with unremitting rigor. Dozens of other Quranic injunctions which make for a civilized society, a humane polity, an exploitation-free economy, and a just community did not form a pan of his vision of Islam. This was hardly an honest effort to make Pakistan an Islamic state.

[b] The Quaid-i-Azam had never given his promise to the nation that the country would be not by the armed forces, that the people would live in fear by day and in dread by night, that citizens would be sent to prison for criticizing the ruler and whipped for shouting a slogan, that women would be beaten up by the police, that the press would be terrorized, that books would be banned, that public opinion would be denied expression, etc., etc. Jinnah was a democratic liberal. Even if the textbook writer insists on burning incense to the General in power he should at least spare the Father of the Nation such noisome slander.

(3) The real objective of the creation of Pakistan was not to take the people of the area back to medieval notions of governance and distorted and unwarranted practices of faith. I have covered the point in the above paragraph.

(4) If destiny chose Zia for the unique distinction of bringing Islamic laws to Pakistan it must have been in a playful mood when it made the choice, and inebriate enough to mix up joke with disaster.

(5) Zia deserves and receives the congratulations and thanks of the textbook writer. Gosh! I am lost in wonder.

### **Jamaluddin "Afghani"**

He belonged to Afghanistan (NWFP, class 5; Sindh, class 5). He was born in Afghanistan (Sindh, class 7). Several books connect him with the idea of Pakistan, call him a great pan-Islamist, emphasize his interest in and sympathy for the Indian

Muslims, and portray him as a radical critic of imperialism in general and the British Empire in particular.

Modern research done in Iran and the West has exploded the myth woven by Jamaluddin around himself about his origin. Now we know that he was an Iranian Shia, not an Afghan Sunni, and was born in Asadabad in Iran. (See Iraj Afshar and Asghar Mandavi (eds.), *Documents inedit concernant Sayyed Jamal-al-Din Afghani*, Tehran. 1963; H. Pakdaman, *Djamal-Ed-Din Assad Abadi din Afghani*, Paris, 1969; and Nikki R. Keddie's two books: *An Islamic Response to Imperialism*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968, and *Sayyidlamal al-Din "Al Afghani" A Political Biography*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1972).

If the textbooks have to mention Jamaluddin they should, if they aim at truth, tell the following facts to the students.

First, Jamaluddin's views on India and Indian Muslims. He was in India between 1854 and 1857, again in 1869, and once again in 1880-81. During these visits he delivered several speeches and wrote some articles; some of these were collected and published as *Maqalat-i-Jamaliyyeh* from Calcutta in 1884. This is the only original and definite record of his views on India. In it there is no mention of pan-Islam or of any scheme to unite the Muslims behind one leader, or in one state or grouping or commonwealth or what you will. Even the defence of Islam usually comes in only as a part of an attack on Sayyid Ahmad Khan. The three main themes of these writings are, advocacy of nationalism of a linguistic or territorial variety, meaning a unity between Muslim's and Hindus of India (who in Jamaluddin's knowledge spoke one language), and with nothing on the unity of the Indian Muslims with foreign Muslims; emphasis on the inestimable benefits of philosophy and modern science; and attacks, strong-worded and virulent, on Sayyid Ahmad Khan as a hateful tool of the British.

Far from speaking of Indian Muslim unity or community of interest, at one place he says, "There is no doubt that the unity of language is more durable for survival and permanence in this world than unity of religion, since it does not change in a short time in contrast to the latter." Nowhere does he address himself to Muslim affairs. In fact, he is unable to distinguish between Muslims and non-Muslims in India. In a lecture at Calcutta on 8 November 1882, he said, "Certainly I must be happy to see such offspring of India, since they are the offshoots of the India that was the cradle of humanity. Human values spread out from India to the whole world. ... These youths are also the sons of a land which was the source of all the laws and rules of the world. If one observes closely, one will see that the 'Code Romain', the mother of all Western codes, was taken from the four sodas and the Shastras."

In his Paris journal, *al-Urwa al-wuthqa*, he wrote. "A religious bond does not exclude national links with people of various faiths. In countries like Egypt and India Muslims should cooperate with the non-Muslims and there ought to be good relations and



harmony in affairs of national interest between the Muslims and their co-patriots and neighbors of different religions." His belief in Hindu-Muslim unity, not in separate Muslim action or identity, is clearly expressed in one of his articles published in *L'Intransigeant* of Paris ("Lettre sur l'Hindoustan", 24 April 1883).

He made a mean and intemperate attack on Sayyid Ahmad Khan's ideas and person in his essay "Refutation of the Materialists". He did not criticize Sayyid Ahmad for his educational or social or religious views, but for his pro-British and pro-imperialism attitude. He called Sayyid Ahmad a dog and named him Nasatuda-i-Marg Khan (one rejected or unglorified even by death). (The essay was published in two installments in the *Muallam-i-Shafiq* of Hyderabad Deccan in September and October 1881).

What he preached in India was in tune with his general ideas about religion and nationalism. He was a great believer in the cementing power of language. Even a religious community could be stronger if it had a common language. Nationalism took priority over religion. (Muhammad al-Makhzumi, *Khatirat Jamal al-Din*, Beirut. 1931; Mehdi Hendessi, "Pages peu connues de Djamal al Din al-Afghani". *Orient*. no. 6 (1958); Sati al-Husri, *Mahiya al-qawmiyya?* Beirut, 1959; and Rashid Rida, *Tarikh al-ustad al-imam al-Shaikh Muhammad Abduh*, Cairo, Vol.1, 1931).

His views on imperialism are riddled with contradictions. In 1878 he penned a bitter attack on the British, which first appeared in the *Misr* of Alexandria, containing stinging words and sparing nothing. In 1885, in an interview with the editor of *La Correspondence Parisienne*, he employed terms like "perfidy", "cruelty" and "barbarism", for British rule. But in the same year he suggested to Randolph Churchill, the Secretary of State for India, a bold scheme for an alliance between the British, the Afghans, the Persians, the Turks, the Egyptians and the Arabs, to drive the Russians out of Merv (W.S. Blunt, *Gordon in Khartoum*). Ten years later he was writing to the British Government from Constantinople, seeking British protection against the Cayman Sultan. (British archives). The myth that Jamaluddin foresaw some kind of a Pakistan in the north-west of India has been upheld by I.H. Qureshi, Sharif al Mujahid and Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, and repeated by several popular writers. There is absolutely no original evidence in favor of this oft-repeated tale. Unless new documents come to our hand, Jamaluddin can be called the originator of the idea of Pakistan only by the wildest strength of imagination which is obsessed with seeking the origin of Pakistan in the most unlikely places.

### **Abdul Halim Sharar**

In 1890 he demanded that India be divided into Hindu provinces and Muslim provinces (Federal Government. B.A.).

This demand was made in the editorial of his Urdu weekly magazine *Muhazzib* dated 23 August 1890. He used the word *azla* (singular. *zila*), districts, not *subeh*. Dr. A. S.

Khurshid was the first to discover this statement by Sharar, but committed the mistake of translating *aria* as provinces; yet insisting that in those days a *zila* meant a province, a contention that finds no sanction in the Urdu dictionaries of that age. The error should be corrected.

### **Sir Theodore Morison**

His book (which is quoted but no identified) was published in 1818; he is throughout called Marlin (Allama Iqbal Open University, B.A.).

Sir Theodore Morison (1863-1936) was Principal of the MAO College, Aligarh, 1899-1905; Member, Viceroy's Legislative Council, 1903-04; Member, Council of India, 1906-16; etc. etc.

The book which is being quoted is *Imperial Rule in India: Being an Examination of the Principles proper to the Government of Dependencies*. which was published by Archibald Constable from London in 1899, not 1818. It contains 147 pages.

### **E. S. Montagu**

He is spelt as Montague, with an "e" added (private, Lahore, English, intermediate). He is repeatedly mentioned as "Lord Montague" (private, Lahore, English, BA.).

Montagu and Montague are two different names in English, like Brown and Browne, Austin and Austine, Savil and Savile, etc. Both the authors have never read an English book (though one writes in it); hence the misspelling.

Montagu (1879-1924) was never raised to the peerage; to call him a Lord is to exercise an authority which is only vested in the British monarch.

### **Sir Muhammad Iqbal**

He took his doctorate in philosophy in England (NWFP, classes 5 and 7). He received his higher education at the Cambridge and London Universities (private, Lahore, English, class 3). He took a degree in Barristery in England (NWFP, class 5; Sindh, class 5; NWFP, class 7). He took his degree in law in England (private, Lahore, B.A.).

In the order in which wrong information is imparted:

- (1) He took his doctorate in philosophy from the University of Munich in Germany.
- (2) The University of Cambridge gave him a Certificate of Research, which is not a degree. He never studied at the University of London.

- (3) To be called to the bar at an inn of court is not to earn a degree. A barrister is neither a graduate nor the holder of any other degree.
- (4) He did not take any degree in law in any country. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1908, and that was that.

### **Chaudhri Rahmat Ali**

He gave the name of Pakistan to the state proposed by Iqbal in 1930 (Punjab, class 8). He proposed the name Pakistan for the state to be established by the Lahore Resolution (Federal Government, English, intermediate). His Pakistan National Movement was started under Iqbal's advice (Federal Government, BA.). He was basically a man of letters and a journalist (Federal Government, BA.). In his *Now or Never* he demanded the separation of the Muslim-majority areas of India (private, Lahore, B.A.). His scheme was rejected by the delegates to the Round Table Conference (private, Lahore, B.A.). He left for England for his studies in 1927 (private, Lahore, BA.). He "took his Bar-at-Law" from the Dublin University (private, Lahore, BA.). He published his article entitled *Now or Never* in January 1933 (private, Lahore, B.A.). He died in Europe on 12 February 1951 (private, Lahore, B.A.). He is buried in Woking (private, Lahore, B.A.).

There is absolutely no evidence that he christened Iqbal's 1930 proposal as Pakistan or gave this name to what the Lahore Resolution demanded (he invented the name in 1933, the Resolution was passed in 1940). He started his movement independently, not under Iqbal's advice. He was neither a man of letters nor a journalist, but a political thinker and pamphleteer. His 1933 proposal covered the north-west, not all Muslim-majority areas of India. His plan was rejected by the Muslim co-optees and witnesses before the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform, not by the delegates to the Round Table Conference. He left for England on 30 or 31 October 1930, not in 1927. He took his LL.B. degree from the University of Dublin, not his "Bar-at-Law". *Now or Never* was a pamphlet, not an article. He did not die in Europe but in Cambridge, England, and on 3 February at 1 PM, not 12 February. He is not buried in Woking but in the New Market Road Cemetery in Cambridge.

For the evidence and sources of correct information see my *Rahmat Ali: A Biography*, Vanguard, Lahore, 1987.

### **Muhammad Ali Jinnah**

He earned a degree in law in England (West Punjab, class 2: NWFP, class 7; private, Lahore, English, BA.). He earned a superior and high degree in law in England (NWFP, class 4: Sindh, class 4). He received his higher education in England (private, Karachi,

class 2). In August 1947 a grateful nation made him the Governor General of Pakistan (private. Lahore. English, class 7).

Corrections:

- (1) He did not take any degree in law, in England or elsewhere.
- (2) The "superior and high degree in law" is a figment of the textbook's imagination.
- (3) He did not receive his "higher education" in England. He was merely called to the bar at the Lincoln' Inn in 1896. Why can't Pakistani professors understand that to become a barrister is not to earn a degree?
- (4) The grateful nation did not make him the Governor General either through nomination or by election. He selected himself for Me office, and he was appointed by the British King.

### **Liaquat Ali Khan**

He was given the title of Quaid-i-Millat by the Pakistani nation (private, Karachi, class 11. He was given the titles of Quaid-i-Mina! and Shahid-i-Millat by the nation (private, Karachi, class 2).

Both statements are incorrect. The nation did not bestow any title or honor upon him. Some newspapers and a few Muslim Leaguers (mainly from the United Provinces) started calling him by these honorifics.

### **Lord Mountbatten**

He came to India as Governor General in 1946 (NWFP, class 8).

Mountbatten's appointment was announced by the British prime minister in his by-now famous statement of 20 February 1947. The new Viceroy reached India on 22 March 1947.

### **C. R. Attlee**

In 1947 the British prime minister was Lord Attlee (Punjab, classes 9-10). In 1945 the Labour Party came to power in England under Lord Attlee (NWFP, intermediate).

Clement Richard Attlee became the prime minister on 26 July 1945 and was succeeded by Winston Churchill on 6 March 1950. Throughout these years he was plain Mr. Attlee. He was created an Earl several years later, as most former prime ministers are.

## "A Punjabi"

The confederacy scheme of 1939 is the work of the Nawab of Mamdot (private, Lahore, B.A.).

Mian Kafayet Ali wrote the book Confederacy of India and Nawab Sir Shahnawaz Khan of Mamdot paid the expenses of its publication. Kafayet Ali used a pseudonym because he was then employed in the secretariat of the Punjab Legislative Assembly and as such was a government servant who was not allowed by service rules to publish what he wrote. The Nawab of Mamdot did not write the book.

## There are no Muslims in India

Bharat is the country of non-Muslims (private, Lahore, English, class 3).

I don't have exact figures available to me as I write this, but I am sure the number of Muslims in India is larger than the total population of Pakistan; which makes India a bigger "Muslim country" than Pakistan. I don't understand the logic or necessity of making this statement, except to convince class 3 students that India is an enemy state.

## The NWFP Misnamed

The North-West Frontier Province is called the North Western Province (private, Lahore, English, intermediate).

The two provinces were entirely different units and are now located in two different countries. As this mistake is not uncommon in Pakistani historical scholarship let me spell out the development of the North-Western Provinces.

Soon after the British conquest of north India, the administrative unit of North-Western Provinces was created on 1 June 1836 and put under a Lieutenant-Governor. Oudh was joined to it on 15 February 1877. The province was re-named North-Western Provinces of Agra and Oudh on 22 March 1902. It was again re-named the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh (popularly just the United Provinces or U.P.) on 3 January 1921, and put in charge of a full Governor. This arrangement lasted till 1947.

The historian should remember to note that in NWFP there is "West", but in the old U.P. there is "Western", and that in NWFP the "Province" is in the singular while in the old North-Western "Provinces" it is in the plural.

## Deoband and the Pakistan Movement

The services of Ore Dar-ul-Ulum of Deoband in the cause of the Pakistan movement are unforgettable (private, Peshawar, B.A.).

The staff, students, associates and *ulema* of the Deoband school believed in, taught, propagated and upheld a most illiberal interpretation of Islam. They fought a running battle with the Aligarh School, university and movement. They were critical of the Bengali modernistic trends of thought as these were expressed by the Calcutta Muhammadan Literary Society, Nawab Abdul Latif Khan and Sayyid Ameer Ali. They encouraged sectarianism of the worst variety, so much so that the Deobandi-trained Muslims refused to pray behind a Barelawi *imam*; the Barelawis paid back the compliment. Deoband was the first home of religious particularism and clannishness in Indian Islam. When other schools and sects emerged they perpetuated this schismatic tendency. The result was the snarling sectarianism which is with us till today, teaching exclusiveness, encouraging intolerance, suppressing dissent, ridiculing non-conformity, and using excommunication as an instrument of coercion.

In politics, the Deobandis believed in a composite Indian nationalism, sided with the Congress as against the Muslim League, opposed separate electorates for Muslims, founded the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind which was loyal to the Congress, and in later years put up a stiff resistance to the Pakistan movement. (For details see Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan*, London and Bombay, 1963, which is a fully documented justification of Deoband's anti-Muslim League stand).

In general, Deoband injected a conservatism of the deepest dye into Indian Islamic thinking, in which tradition took precedence of reason, the letter vanquished the spirit, prescription outlawed personal or collective exertion (*ijtihad*), theocracy took the place of a modern democracy, narrow approach strangled liberalism, the gloss overwhelmed the Book, classical codes of law were awarded permanent and immutable validity, ritual was allowed to stand supreme in all practices of the faith – and *fatwa* were issued generously and imperiously to enforce this brand of doctrinal *parti pris*. When the stalwarts of the school migrated to Pakistan they brought with them all their pre-conceived notions and theologian bitterness, and muddied the political waters of the country.

The textbook says that Deoband's services to the Pakistan Movement are unforgettable. Unforgettable indeed!

## Founders of the Ideology of Pakistan

Among the founders of the ideology of Pakistan were Mawlana Mahmud-ul-Hasan and Mawlana Maududi (Federal Government, B.A.).

Mahmud-ul-Hasan (1851-1920) is said to have been the first student to join the Dar-ul-Ulum of Deoband in 1867, from where he graduated in 1873. Then he joined its teaching staff, and was the Principal (succeeding Rashid Ahmad Gangolli) from 1905 till 1915. In 1920 he asked the Muslims to join the Congress civil disobedience movement; and in the same year presided over the second annual general session of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind held in Delhi, and also presided over the inaugural function of the lamia Millia Islamia. He was a typical product of Deoband with which I have dealt in my last note.

Abul Ala Maududi (1903-80) left his school education incomplete, worked for a while on the staff of *Medina*, a "nationalist" and religious journal of Bijnore. then edited the *Taj of Jubblepur*, then served on the staff of *al-Jamat* of Delhi (the official organ of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind), and in 1928 went to Hyderabad Deccan to own and edit *Tarjuman-ul-Quran*. He taught theology at the Islamia College, Lahore, in 1938-39, and then moved to Dar-ul-Islam in district Gurdaspur where he established his party, the Jammam-i-Islami. in 1941. He fled to Pakistan in 1947 where he lived till his death.

In Hyderabad he won the goodwill of the Nizam by asserting the right of the small Muslim minority to rule over the overwhelmingly Hindu state. He was impressed by the rise of the Nazis and Fascists in Europe and borrowed from their writings in commenting upon Indian politics (e.g. *Tarjuman-ul-Quran*, December 1934). He was not interested in the proposition that where the Muslims were in a majority they should have the right to form their own government. If Pakistan was going to be a state where Western democracy prevailed, it "will be as filthy (*na-Pakistan*) as the other part of the subcontinent. "Muslim nationalism is as accursed in the eyes of God as Indian nationalism." He accused Jinnah of not knowing the rudiments of Islam and condemned him for misguiding the Indian Muslims. Nationalism was incompatible with Islam, (*Process of Islamic Revolution*). Islam forbade the practice of imitation, and the adaptation of Western nationalism was nothing but imitation. "'Muslim nationalist' is as contradictory a term as 'chaste prostitute'." (*Nationalism and India*). Accordingly, he not only kept away from the Pakistan movement but missed no opportunity to give his judgment against it. He called the Muslim League leaders "morally dead": they had no right to call their movement "Islamic" (*Musalman our Maujuda Siasi Kashmaksh*. Vol. III), This was before 1947.

His views and convictions about Islamic order and the state of Pakistan stand thus in summary: Oath of allegiance to Pakistan by her civil servants. is not permissible until the system of government becomes "fully Islamic" (*Nawa-i-Waqt*, 12 September 1948).

The war in Kashmir is not a *jihad* (May 1948; quoted in M. Sarwar, *Mawlana Maududi ki Tahrik-i-Islami*, Lahore, 1956, pp.331-332). Islam does not put any limit to the area of land to be owned by an individual (*Mas'ala-i-Milkiat-i-Zamin*); thus no land reforms. The idea of nationalizing the means of productions "fundamentally opposed to the Islamic point of view" (*ibid.*). Liaquat Ali Khan's and Mumtaz Daultana's programme of agrarian reforms is un-Islamic (*Dawn*, 7 June, 25, 28, 29 and 30 July, and 9 August 1950). Neither the executive, nor the legislature, nor the judiciary can issue orders or enact laws or give judgments contrary to the *sunnah*. Politics and administration are no concern of the women. Mingling of men and women and co-education are evils. Islamic constitution has four sources: the Quran, *sunnah*, conventions of the four righteous caliphs, and the rulings of the great jurists. Party system is not allowed. The head of state must be a Muslim. Only Muslims can be full citizens. No women can be elected to the assembly. (*Islamic Law and Constitution; First Principles of the Islamic State*). "No doubt the Islamic State is a totalitarian state" (*Political Theory of Islam*). It is prohibited in Islam to be a member of assemblies and parliaments which are to be a member of assemblies and parliaments which are based on the democratic principle of the modern age. It is also prohibited to vote in elections to such bodies (*Rasail-o-Masail*, Vol. I).

Only men of "erudition and learning" can interpret the Quran. If a Muslim wants to become non-Muslim he must leave the Islamic state; if he stays, he is to be tried for high treason (interview to Freeland K. Abbot, *Muslim World*, Vol. XLVIII, Nm I). Polygamy is sanctioned by the Quran as long as a husband does "justice" to all the four wives; and justice means "justice in treatment of rights", not "equal attachment" (*ibid.*).

If anyone believes that these opinions make up an ideology of Pakistan which would have been shared or approved by Jinnah and other makers of Pakistan he ought to get his head examined.

### **Pakistan's National Dress**

The national dress is *shalwar*, *qamiz*, or *kurta*, *shirwani* and Jinnah cap (NWFP, classes 9-10; Sindh, classes 9-10; NWFP, intermediate). Women generally wear *shalwar*, *qamiz* and *dupatta* (Sindh, classes 9-10; NWFP, intermediate).

If by national dress is meant a very special dress worn on very formal and official functions and ceremonial occasions, then the first part about men will pass muster. If the everyday attire is meant, it is very misleading. Anyone who has passed through the countryside of Sindh, the Punjab and the Punjabi-speaking Hazara area of NWFP knows that the great majority of men wear *tahmind* (or *tahmit*) or *dhoti* around the lower body and a *kurta* on the upper body. Even the *zamindar* or the *wadera* uses this dress; he wears *shalwar* and *qamiz* when he visits the city or attends a function. *Shirwani* is rarely worn, and that only in the cold season. The Jinnah cap is mentioned, but not the much more ubiquitous *pagg* or *pagree* or turban.



The rural women generally wear a *lhang* or *lacha* or *tahmind*, not *shalwar*, with a *kurta*, not *qamiz*. In Karachi and in some towns *sari* is in use.

In any case, the discussion of a national dress in a textbook looks like an attempt at regimentation.

### The Urdu Language

Those textbooks which choose to touch the subject make amusing reading. Wild and impossible claims are entered on behalf of the language. Three categories sum up the case:

(1) *Wide use.* Urdu was the spoken language of the entire South Asia (NWFP, class 6). Before 1947 it was the language of the masses in the northern parts of South Asia, and it still is (NWFP, classes 9-10). It was the spoken language of the common people of the subcontinent (private, Lahore, English, class 3). It is the only language which, with minor variations, is spoken and understood in the subcontinent right from Peshawar (Pakistan) to Ras Kumari (Bharat) even today (Punjab, English, classes 9-10). It is understood and spoken in all parts of the country (Federal Government, English, intermediate). It was the language of the subcontinent (private, Lahore, English, intermediate).

All these statements are dogmatic, ignorant and rash. They don't provide facts but impetuous and reckless assumptions. Official patriotic fervor inspires the assertions. Each claim bears witness to the vacuity of mind of the writer(s). The students may be credulous and gullible, but to exploit this natural weakness and pile lie upon lie do not benefit a teacher.

Urdu was not the spoken language of the entire South Asia at any time. Nor was it ever the language of the masses of north India; nor is it so at present. The common people of the subcontinent who are reported to have had Urdu as their spoken tongue included Madrasis, Bengalis, Mahamshtrians, Sindhis, Pathan, Baluchis and Malabaris. Even in Pakistan it is not spoken as a rule anywhere except in places (which are few) where the Urdu-speaking migrants have settled.

(2) *Absorbing power.* Urdu is such a language that it contains words from every language [of the world]. And it is a feature of this language that when it accepts a word from any other language it makes it its own (Sindh, classes 9-10). Its prominent characteristic is that it absorbs efficiently within itself words of various [other] languages (Punjab, classes 9-10). Its syntax is such that the words of other languages included in it do not appear alien, instead they look as if they originally belonged to it (Punjab, English, classes 9-10).

- (1) I have not seen any Swedish, Swahili, Thai or Filipino words in Urdu.
- (2) Urdu's ability to make borrowed vocabulary "its own" is not only an inane statement but also an absurd one. Every language of the world can do it and does it. In English alone there are words from Arabic, Persian, Hindi and other oriental languages which it has made its own, e.g., alcohol, divan, garble, chintz, tulip, swastika.
- (3) How syntax (sentence construction) makes foreign words look native is beyond my comprehension. Whatever the grammatical arrangement of words (syntax), do the following words wear the local dress in Urdu: engineer, digest, refrigerator, cricket, college, colony, township, fiat, coat, board, committee, council. assembly, budget. boot, nib. cake (all in common everyday use).

(3) *Foundation stone of nationalist struggle.* The Hindus wanted the Urdu language to disappear from the subcontinent. But the elimination of Urdu was tantamount to the elimination of the entire [Muslim] nation, and the Indian Muslims realized this very well. Therefore, one of their primary objectives was the protection of Urdu; in this way, the creation of Pakistan emerged as their demand. (private, Lahore, B.A.).

The Muslims of India felt to be vulnerable in several walks of life. In politics, they desired safeguards, more and reserved seats in all elected bodies, separate electorates, greater representation in the public services, bigger quota in all decision-making centres, etc. In religion, they wanted freedom of practice and preaching, no music before mosques, religious studies in schools, Islamic history in university syllabi, etc. In culture, they demanded protection for their social customs, daily life, equal citizenship, and Urdu as a Muslim language.

Apart from the distorting exaggeration in equating the elimination of Urdu with the disappearance of the Muslim nation, the author's attempt to make the protection of Urdu the foundation of the Pakistan demand makes nonsense of both history and logic. The Bengalis and the Sindhis and the Pathan would not have cared for Urdu. The Punjabis alone stood with the U.P.- walas in defence of Urdu. Urdu was one of several items on the agenda of Muslim-British and Muslim-Hindu negotiations and it figured fairly down the list. The Muslim League passed several resolutions demanding safeguards for Urdu, but it refrained from adopting one in favor of making it the national language of Pakistan.

## Origins of Pakistani Languages

Apart from the general trend of singing the praises of Urdu, two textbooks for the intermediate class written in English give us the benefit of their research on the history and evolution of all the Pakistani languages. The Federal Government announces *ex cathedra* that the origin of Pakistani languages "can be traced to religious topics" (Federal Government, English, intermediate); while a professor of Arabic wants us to believe that Punjabi, Pashto, Sindhi and Baluchi are the products of the same cultural factors and ideologies which brought Urdu into existence (private, Lahore, English, intermediate).

The Federal Government, as it speaks in this book, knows neither English nor any of the Pakistani languages. "Traced to religious topics" is a meaningless jumble of words.

The professor of Arabic does not explain how Urdu took its birth from an ideology. Urdu was born out of an unavoidable interaction between the languages (Turkish and Persian) of the Muslim conquerors and the various tongues in use in north India. Punjabi, to take one of his examples, is a much older language and there is much controversy among historians and linguists about its exact origins. But there is no doubt that Islam had nothing to do with its genesis, nor with the rise of Balochi and Pashto. Can he explain to which ideology does Arabic owe its first appearance? Languages originate and evolve slowly and painfully under the pressure of several factors: history, geography, migrations, meeting of two or more peoples, popular need, antecedents, cultural requirements, etc.

Our textbook writers have ideology on their brain.

## CHAPTER 3

### THE ROAD TO RUIN

Thus far the exercise of scrutinizing the history textbooks has been undertaken on two levels: pointing out their errors, and correcting the mistakes; what may be called the specific and distinct task. But a broader and more general undertaking calls for attention. The textbooks must now be viewed in a larger perspective.

If we step back and look at the cast and grain, the properties and potentialities, of these books, as we survey a valley from the higher slopes of a mountain. Some questions of approach, historiography, child psychology, general acceptance and wide impact lease the mind. These misgivings may be phrased in the following interrogative terms:

1. Why is so little attention paid to the get-up of the book, and how does this affect the mind of the student?
2. Why is the book written so atrociously, be it in Urdu or in English?
3. What signals and warnings do the contents of the book send to the nation?
4. What are the lessons to be learnt from what the book omits or passes by with a cavalier glance?
5. On whom does the burden of responsibility fall for all these faults and failings?
6. Why has no one cared to protest against the pouring out of these vials of poison into our educational system?
7. How does the use of the book endanger the moral and intellectual integrity of the student?
8. In what diverse ways does the knowledge disseminated by the book act as a leaven on the people at large?

I have tried to seek answers to these eight questions in this and the following chapters.

#### Get-up

The failure of the makers of the textbooks to understand child psychology results in two defects in the reading material: get-up and style.

From the minister of education to the supervisor in the Textbook Board no one realizes that the impressible mind of the child is an empty vessel, made up of feelings and sensitivities even more delicate than the finest crystal, into which first information and then knowledge are to be poured in graduated quantities. This process demands that right from the beginning the child is made to fall in love with books. Love is inspired by beauty, whether the object is a woman or a painting or a flower or a book. If the first book in the child's life is made up of a sheaf of off-white sheets stapled together with the sharp ends of the pins jutting out to scratch his fingers, or glued so badly that after one reading the binding disintegrates, he is going to hate books all his life and look at them as ephemeral things of passing use. But if it is a finely-produced, attractive, well-bound primer nicely printed on thick white paper and embellished with colorful pictures, he will take to it with enthusiasm, keep it company, pour over it, treasure it and save it. He might become a book lover for the rest of his life. That is how much the finish of the book matters in the world of school education. But such a simple thought eludes the mind of the minister of education and of everyone below him in the long order of precedence, though all of them must have children who go to school.

The paper and printing of our textbooks are of such poor quality that the cheapest newspaper of a civilized country would blush to appear in this shape. The paper is either "newsprint" in use among the Urdu newspapers and therefore has the same lasting quality, or a better white paper which looks nice but folds easily and then crumbles. We forget that the child uses (with emphasis on every dimension of the verb) the book every day. He carries it, opens and shuts it, throws it about, lets it drop to the floor, folds it back to the limit of the holding power of the spine, rolls the corners of the pages, writes his name and many other things on every available space on it, even tears it up when he throws a tantrum. To give to this young animal in human form a Pakistani textbook is to reduce its life to one week. I have in my possession four textbooks on social studies in Urdu produced by the West Pakistan Textbook Board in the 1960s which fell apart during my first reading of them. I wonder if every parent had it bound at extra expense to his pocket, or bought ten copies to last the academic year, or beat up the child at regular intervals to teach him how to preserve the unpreservable. But that is only one part of the cheerless tale. Maybe the parent could afford repeated purchases or new bindings, or got used to the painful but unavoidable task of belaboring the loved one, or made the child study separate pages rather than the book in one piece, or just did not care. What is more important, and is big with graver consequences, is the thinking of the child about the book. Instead of looking at it as a repository of knowledge, a new world of information to be explored with wide-eyed excitement, a superior kind of toy to be played with, and a source of pleasure, he gives it as much importance as his parents do to the daily newspaper. He gives it neither respect nor love. Habits and attitudes formed in childhood often become lifelong.

Briefly, this disappointment of the child with the textbook leads to the following results. First, as there is no love of books there is no love of reading. He may pass his examinations without difficulty and then enter a profession or become a civil servant, but he will never read a book for the sake of pleasure. He will die as an uneducated man.

Secondly, as he is not used to reading, he will be a bad parent. How can he instill in his child a love to which he himself is a stranger? Thus one ignorant generation will succeed another ignorant generation, and in 20 years the men and women with degrees will not be the educated part of the nation.

Thirdly, in his own profession he will always remain blinkered, not even reading what his duties and requirements demand. If a civil servant, he will know nothing of the problems of the country beyond what his office files and administrative reports contain. If a lawyer, he will be a narrow-minded legal expert with no knowledge of the outside world; elevated to the bench, he will carry his light luggage with him. If a college or university teacher, he will read the minimum number of books without which he cannot lecture on his subject. but remain unaware of any other discipline. however closely related to his own.

Fourthly, as he is not fond of reading he does not need a library; hence the absence of public libraries in the country. (The college and university student who defaces library books and tears out the pages and chapters he needs for examination purposes is the developed species of the small child who used a book which fell apart during its first reading).

In its final incarnation the badly got-up textbook appears as an uncultured nation whose students are terrorists; whose teachers are pillars of ignorance; whose colleges and universities are moral wildernesses; whose educated classes prefer television to poetry, cricket to prose, and fireworks to theatre, and whose ignorance is therefore like the twilight that neither rises nor sets, neither fades nor disappears, but slicks to them like the tar of infamy; whose elite wears a coat of many colors and has an athletic ability to leap aboard any passing band-wagon; whose men of letters are not too proud to mouth base panegyrics to every tyrant who wears the raiment of authority. and whose highest ambitions are to become members of the official academy of letters or edit official journals or head official institutions of research and culture; whose intellectuals are bribed according to their measure of eminence and degree of greed, because they believe with Mephistopheles that "Dear friend, all theory is grey. And green the golden tree of life" (Goethe); whose doctors of religion subscribe to the dictum *regio eius religio* (whoever runs the country decides which church you go to): whose thinkers are so intolerant that they look at every difference of opinion as a barricade which has to be pulled down, and for whom consequences are more important than the truth; and whose rich classes have not acquired a fortune. the fortune has acquired them.

## Style

If the outer look of the textbook annoys the child, its inner constituents repel him. Of course, the junior students are no judge of the quality of prose they read. But they have their own unerring yardstick of what is good and what is bad; like quality of clarity. If they can quickly understand what the book says, they relax and want to read on. If they cannot make out what is being said, they are tense and refuse to go further. The senior students demand more because they deal with ideas and concepts. If things are not explained to them in clear terms they falter and fumble and at the end of the year fail for no fault of theirs. Even in a straight narration where an event is described or an historical figure portrayed, they want the description to be evocative so that they can see things happening on their mind's screen, and the portrayal to be chiseled in marble so that the man stands forth before them in noonday light.

These are requirements of comprehension. But there is a further dimension of style which makes the printed page a piece of literature. Of all the disciplines history alone can become literature, partly because of its descriptive content and partly because of its appeal to the heart.

The best book on economics or geography can never attain the sublimity of literature, because these subjects touch the mind not the heart. History is closer to our life and to what we hold dear. It tells of our origins, our past, the strange twists and turns which have brought us to where we stand today, the quirks of fortune, the pranks of chance, the play of accident, the fortuity of destiny, the role of heroes in the story of mankind, the mistakes some of our forefathers made and the good luck which saved the others from falling into the pit of disaster, and so many other things. Man has a natural interest in his journey through time. History takes him by the hand and shows him the landmarks of his past. How good a guide history is in unfolding the mysteries of his existence depends on the historian.

In all civilized countries history is the most widely read subject, next to literature. Even people of ordinary education who have no pretence to teaching read general histories, ancient and modern, national and foreign. Historical biography attracts them like a magnet because it stuns up the history of an epoch in the individual life of one person. It has great personal appeal for the reader: man calling to man, the living knowing the dead, the present seeing the past.

One of the principal reasons for the large audience history books command in the West is their readability. On the whole, historical works are written with an elegance rare in other fields, as if the subject itself brings out the best in the writer. And that is how it should be.

A good historian will remember that the world is his oyster and that syllables govern the world. He will be read if he can carry the people along with him. If he has a perfect command of the language he can make the long sweep of events into a vivid, moving, pulsating piece of prose. Words should come like water bubbling from a silver jar. And each word shall take its proper place in the sequence and order of the narration, to draw a scene, or describe the tumult of a revolution or the commotion of a riot, or emphasize the inner significance of an event, or paint the character of a personage. The vocabulary is large, felicitous and varied; and the words, particularly the adjectives and the adverbs, stand at attention waiting to be summoned to duty. The sinews of the prose are strong and supple. The story spins itself out with unimpeded ease and lulling fluency. The fertility of phrase is such that veil by veil the mystery of events unwinds itself. Long sentences run with a natural effortlessness, with one clause following another in magnificent succession. The sifted purity of the prose idiom merges with the lyrical surge of argument. Everything is clear, unambiguous, stark, meaningful. The reach is long, the descriptive power unruffled by the change of scene, the portrayal revealing, the analysis of motives penetrating and balanced, the impact shattering. In sum, a quick, glinting style like a stream over rocks; limpid, rapid, revealing, flashing, sparkling, hiding nothing, distorting nothing, making dulcet music out of history.

I wish I could say that there are just a few, very few, books on history written by Pakistanis which are a pleasure to read and are of respectable scholarship. To mention European and American works along with our own is a waste of breath. Historical scholarship as such does not exist in Pakistan. and has never existed. It does not, cannot, exist because the present generation of historians is a product of the textbooks I have examined in this volume. It has not existed in the past, because some of these books were written by our senior historians, and this fact alone suffices to uphold my contention.

I am talking about style, and that is where the textbooks provide an unchallengeable proof of abject failure. If a historian writes badly, well, no one will read him, and his book will rest on library shelves gathering dust and inviting vermin – a deserving end to an ignominious act. But if the same historian. or another one of the same ilk, writes a textbook which is painful to read. he inflicts a permanent and deep injury on the mind and soul of a whole generation, and through it of all the succeeding ones. The student is not only forced to read the book (the adult reader has no compulsion to persist with a badly written work), but to do so every day, and further to memorize it in order to be promoted to the next class. But success in examination gives him no respite. In the next higher class he has to struggle with another book of exactly the same degree of denseness in style. And so it goes on, year after year, until the child of yesteryears is a young lecturer eager to write the kind of book he has been reading all his academic life. The model is copied faithfully. History (in both senses) repeats itself Evil is vouchsafed a new lease of life. The art of writing disgustingly is perpetuated.



In the first chapter I gave some examples of the low quality of English used by those writers who chose this language as their medium of communication. I wish I were writing in Urdu so that I could quote in the original the sentences and passages from textbooks written in Urdu to show how often the language has been smirched and defiled. Translation cannot tell what new heights of imbecility have been scaled.

Briefly, grammar and syntax disappear in the flood of excitement and passion. Rules of composition are flouted. The choice of words is an exercise in apathy and bad taste. There is no connection between the phrase used and what the writer wants to say. The language is an opaque forest of jargon substantives. Sentences vanish disconcertingly in a mist of subordinate clauses, verbs oscillate from singular to plural without warning, and paragraphs end in syntactical chaos. The subject is separated from the object by two full lines (as in German) of confusing verbosity. One has to shoulder one's way through this flood of words. Arguments sink and swoon under the weight of verbiage. The meaning has to be rescued by paraphrasing the text. Sense can only be discovered by reconstructing the passage.

Why are the textbooks so badly written? Because they have to be written in some language (words are the only means of communication, except for the deaf and dumb), and the country has not yet found or evolved a language of its own on the national level. Any discussion of language as medium of instruction loses itself in several blind alleys or circular arguments. Why write in Urdu if you don't know it well enough to express yourself in it? Because it is the "national" language, and because the government has decided to make it the principal medium of teaching. If it is the "national language" and the principal medium of instruction, why are professors unable to handle it properly? There is no satisfactory answer to this. Blind alley number one.

Several years ago the government decided to give up English as the medium of instruction for two reasons: it was not right for an independent country to teach its children in a foreign language, especially the language of the hated imperial masters of yesterday; and the country had a national language in Urdu which ought to be used for the purpose.

The first reason was sound and honorable, but clearly hypocritical and illogical. Hypocritical, because the government which took this decision not only did its own business in English but encouraged or at least permitted the army, the commercial classes, the higher judiciary, the universities of science, medicine, technology and agriculture, and some other sectors of the nation to do the same. In addition, the very people who ordered Urdu into schools and colleges lived a life which could only be called a black or brown version of the good old colonial days. They dressed in European clothes, spoke English with friends and colleagues and children, saw English films, visited Britain and the United States on holidays (not the next-door Muslim neighbors), and their wives wore their hair bobbed, tried to converse in English of some sort, and

were proud to entertain foreign English-speaking visitors or guests. All of them loved the ways of the hated Englishman who had gone away. These two sentences can be read in both the past and the present tenses.

It was also illogical, in theory as well as in practice. A language should not be judged by your relationship with the people to whom it belongs. English is bad because the Englishman spoke it and the Englishman ruled over us. Persian is good because the Mughal spoke it and the Mughal also ruled over us. Where is the logic? English is bad when students are taught in it at school. English is good when army officers speak it in their messes. Is that logical? Nationalism and patriotism demand that we hate the English language; but the national interest demands that we beg for British and American military supplies and the national need demands that we beg for American wheat. Strange logic! So much for the theoretical weakness of the argument.

In practice, too, material ambition clashes with patriotism and wins the day. Two realities of Pakistani life illustrate this. All the affluent Urdu-speaking families of Karachi, the keepers of the linguistic and cultural conscience of the nation, the clamorous supporters of Urdu as the national language, the very people who protested violently when Bengali was made the second language of the country – all of them send their children to English-medium schools and, when questioned on this behavior, argue shamelessly that they want their children to do well in the world and they won't do well if they go to Urdu-medium schools. Between conviction and money they have made a choice, and are not embarrassed by what they have chosen. The non-Urdu-speaking elite of all the provinces follows this practice. Further, students of Islam and of Arabic and Persian languages who want a foreign degree to enhance their career go to British and American universities, not to Tehran, Baghdad, Cairo or Istanbul. (Of course, they are right. Let us not talk of the Pakistani universities of today. Not in another hundred years will any university be able to give a degree comparable to that from an obscure Western university).

An interesting thought enters the mind here. The politicians and political activists of the Left in Pakistan think highly of their old toasters. During Ayub Khan's and General Ziaul Huq's regimes when they found their life at risk or their freedom in jeopardy they left the country and went abroad as exiles, refugees or asylum seekers. Where did they go? Not to the Soviet Union or any country of the Eastern Block of those days, not to any other Socialist or Communist country, not even to an African or Arab satellite of Moscow. Their Socialist convictions did not run that far. They went and lived in the United States, West Germany and Britain. Even Faiz Ahmad Faiz, the greatest Communist intellectual and poet of the country and a Lenin Peace Prize winner, preferred London and Beirut to Moscow for his voluntary exile. Blind alley number two.

No. The case against English on the basis of its imperial parentage and association cannot be won. We love the hated colonial master and his ways as no other people do in the former British Empire. The only parallel to this cultural loyalty that I can think of is French North Africa. Some years after independence the Algerian foreign minister attended an Arab summit conference accompanied by an Arab-speaking interpreter! The things have not changed since then. In the photographs carried by newspapers of anti-government rallies in Algiers in July 1992 we see women and girls with placards written in French.

The second leg on which the argument in favor of Urdu stands (or rather is propped up), namely, that it is the national language of the country, is also lame. Nowhere in the world is the national language of a country the mother tongue of and in everyday use by a mere 7.60 per cent of the nation (1881 census figure). And this percentage was about 2 when Urdu was declared the only national language in 1948.

This oddity is a child of our history. In British India the All India Muslim League was dominated throughout its life by a handful of leaders from the United Provinces, and its decision making machinery was overwhelmed by this small group. The provincial branches of the League in Baluchistan, Sindh, NWFP and the Punjab either did not exist till just before independence or were weak and timid. The Lucknow Pact of 1916, which put an irretrievable end to the prospects for Muslim self-rule in the Punjab and Bengal, is one proof of the League's subservience to the Urdu-speaking U.P.-wala. In the years immediately following the creation of Pakistan about half a million people from U.P. migrated to Karachi, an equal number to the interior of Sindh, and a slightly smaller group to the Punjab. (As this migration continued in diminishing numbers till the 1980s, with the great bulk of it going to Sindh, the indigenous Sindhi is now in danger of becoming a minority in his own province). These migrants brought in their luggage two attitudes of mind: the right to decide things in and about Pakistan because it had been created by the Muslim League which had been their party, and the title to impose their own culture and language on the people of Pakistan because these were superior to anything the natives of the country could offer. Two developments helped them on their way to realizing these ambitions: the first prime minister was an Urdu speaker who believed in promoting the interests of his community (his only constituency in Pakistan) with vigor and without scruples: and the generality of the Punjabi politicians sided with the migrants in order to achieve the twin objectives of suppressing the smaller provinces of West Pakistan and denying equal (or any) decision-making power to East Pakistan.

In this way, the political scene of Pakistan came to be ruled by people who either spoke Urdu (the migrants) or were willing to embrace Urdu for reasons which are still unclear (the Punjabis).

That is how historical imbalanced, cultural ambiguities, ethnic ambitions. inferiority complexes. misdirected patriotism, official dictation and thoughtless planning combined to make Urdu the language of these textbooks. But practice has failed to improve the writing of them. The change-over from English to Urdu as the main medium of instruction has not made the professors proficient in Urdu. They write like ill-educated people who are struggling with a foreign tongue (which in reality it is). If the teachers show such poor knowledge of the language in which they write and teach, they lose their reputation. But that is a vain thought. When everyone writes badly, with what will you compare their work? Pernicious uniformity kills discernment and judgment.

But what effect do these books have on the students? The young susceptible mind, awake, alive and alert, is faced with studying and grasping a new subject in a language which is unclear, confused and repetitive. The written word is obscure and offers no aid to understanding. The spoken word of the teacher is a replica of the printed page, because the teacher more often than not knows nothing outside the textbook. Even an ordinary statement or an elementary idea expressed and explained in bad language brings the student to a standstill. Sometimes he feels that he is not called upon to understand, only to recite and repeat and memorize. To give this impression to the sensitive impressionable child is to make a joke of education. Curiosity is snuffed out. Desire to learn is extinguished. Rote takes the place of knowledge.

General insensitivity to this state of affairs. even the unawareness of it. may be related to another practice rampant in the society. Almost every child, boy or girl, begins to learn how to read the Quran at the age of 5 to 6. The skill is imparted by a private tutor who visits the home of the child for half an hour or by a *mawlawi* in the mosque of the locality where the child goes in the afternoon. Recently the government has ordered that this art should be taught in all schools.

Now the important point about this coaching is that it is strictly confined to learning how to read the original Arabic text without understanding a word of what is being read. This is called *nazira*, reading with the eye (*nazar-sight*), not with the mind. When one comes to think about it, it is a strange proceeding. Arabic is a foreign language. To read it means to learn how certain letters unite with other letters to make a word and these words combine with other words to form a sentence. It is far from easy to learn even for an adult. But the child is made to learn it because the ritual of the faith demands it. Not only that. The child gradually advances to *ayats* or verses, that is, a combination of sentences. After that he is asked to memorize a few short *surats* or chapters which come at the end of the Quran: again without knowing their meaning. There would be no harm in telling the child what the words mean. Not much labor is involved in it. But this is not done.

The ritual continues in adult life in the form of two religious duties performed every day. In early morning or sometimes in late afternoon most Pakistani Muslims read or recite the Quran, without knowing the meaning of what they are mouthing and without looking at the interlinear translation which every copy of the Quran carries. Then, five times a day they say their prayers with regularity and devotion, but again without understanding what they are uttering. The two fundamental duties enjoined by their religion are performed in a state of imperceptiveness. A tragic commentary on the old maxim that "faith is blind"!

Even those who don't pray or read the Quran make it a point to attend the Friday congregational gathering in the mosque. The *khutba* delivered by the *imam* is in Arabic, as of course is the prayer itself. Few understand any of the two. The same is true of the funeral prayer, the wedding ceremony (the religious part of it), the verses pronounced on the occasions of the rites of death (*qul* and *chehlum*) and on death anniversaries. The Arabic recited at the various *khatmas* held to please God and supplicate for his mercy and blessings.

These things have been going on since Islam came to the subcontinent. People have not learnt Arabic, not even as much of it as would suffice to understand what they are reading, reciting, uttering or hearing. Nor have they taken the radical step of using translations of the passages used in the prayers and other rituals (even the thought of this is a heresy to the pious: thus knowledge becomes heresy).

Now let us come back to the Urdu textbook and its young reader. The student's difficulties with Urdu and his parents' ignorance of the Arabic text are not exact parallels: the child knows more Urdu than the elders know Arabic. But the underlying principle is the same. Whether it is religion or education, the external trappings are more important than the inner understanding. Ceremonialism and routine must be observed. The essence and the spirit and the substance are less important.

We have reached this stage of acting without understanding our lines (there is no prompter in this play) for one simple reason. We have forgotten the basic educational truth that a child must be educated (at least in his earlier years, preferably throughout his academic life) in his mother tongue. But prospects for this appear to be bleak, and the children of Pakistan are condemned to receive their schooling in bad Urdu, and to grow up without a language which they know tolerably well, and without knowledge which is acceptable to others, and without the ability to express what they know in a language which is readable. Expression, knowledge and communication – the three fundamentals of education – have been abrogated by the law of national necessity which commands that we must have a national language. The law of universal necessity which demands that we have a good educational system has been repealed in the "national interest".

What crimes do we commit in the name of patriotism!

## Contents

The two main channels through which the planners and authors of the textbooks destroy the educational system are natural ignorance and contrived strategy. The first is the result of intellectual lethargy, lack of knowledge, refusal to search for facts, failure to distinguish between right and wrong, and an impenetrable self-complacency that what they know is the truth. If this were pure ignorance, a kind of perverted innocence, it could be removed by compelling them to take a cure and improve their reading. (That a need should arise of sending the professors of a country to school for basic knowledge appears to be a jest: but some truths do strain our credulity). But there is something more than simple artless, stark, dull ignorance which is at work here. Had it been just that the government might have found other professors to do the job or books by private authors would have supplanted the prescribed texts. Neither of this has come about.

It has not come about because ignorance has been specially sought after and then deliberately harnessed to plough, seed and water the young mind with a planned objective in view. The goal, it seems, is to produce a generation with the following traits: docility, inability to ask questions, capacity to indulge in pleasurable illusions, pride in wearing blinkers, willingness to accept guidance from above, alacrity to like and dislike things by order, tendency to ignore gaps in one's knowledge, enjoyment of make-believe, faith in the high value of pretences.

I am aware of the gravity of the accusation I am making. I will now substantiate the charge, not by exploring the motives and compulsions which drive the authors of these books (a task which can be very interesting, but may lend itself to subjective treatment: and that would weaken my case), but by offering to the reader a list of items which the books contain or attitudes which they adopt and disseminate and also a list of items which the books don't mention with a malicious intent.

In this section I will consider what the books contain and preach: their positive contribution (in the derogatory sense). In the following section I will survey what they omit and fail to mention: their negative contribution.

The textbooks send the following messages to the students, and through them to the nation:

### **I. Follow the Government in Office**

The stuffing of the textbook is closely associated with the regime in power under which it is produced and published. This intimate connection with the pillars of the State

(bureaucracy and political or military rulers) is inevitable when the book is planned by the functionaries of the government, written and edited by teachers who are government employees, approved by a committee in the federal ministry of education, and issued by a board which is an official institution. Thus it is easy to understand the nature of the prescribed book.

But what about private books brought out by commercial publishers. They, too, follow the general pattern. Why? There are four good reasons:

1. The authors of these books are college or university teachers, and as such they are under government control and not free to write against the official line.
2. It is the government which prepares the curriculum for classes 1-12 and the universities for classes 13-14 (B.A.). These curricula go beyond defining the topics or fields of study; they mark out the exact boundaries of the treatment and destine the methods of presentation. Ideology dictates this. If a private author writes a book in accordance with the curriculum, his work is not different from the official texts. If he produces an independent book disregarding the prescribed instructions and telling the truth, no school or college would allow its use. (I have already quoted chairmen of textbook boards who have warned all concerned against buying any book not issued by the board of that province).
3. If by a miracle a school were to prescribe a private book the entire class would fail the examination for writing in its scripts something not found in the government curriculum and the official book. (This is what a school teacher told me when I pointed out to her the errors in the class 8 book which my niece was studying. If the girl said in the examination script that the Aga Khan led the Simla Deputation, not Nawab Muhsin-ul-Mulk, the examiner would fail her, because the Punjab Textbook Board said it was Muhsin-ul-Mulk. The matter could not be debated). That shows the extent to which the government's education policy proscribes true history.
4. No one writes an independent book simply because (a) he is afraid of the government. When the rulers confuse the government with the State they consider dissent as an act of treachery or at the best of subversion of which they make the law take notice. Fear makes cowards of us all. History can go and hang itself; (h) he will not get a publisher for a book which would not sell a hundred copies. Nobody reads history in the country except the students.

This official attitude produces such amusing oddities as the omission of the name of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto from all books published during General Ziaul Huq's rule. That means that the millions of students who went to school during the eleven years of his dictatorship did not know what happened in the country between East Pakistan's secession in 1971 and Zia' *coup* in 1977.

What are the results of this textbook-government tieup? The following is an incomplete list:

1. The students are misled by the distorted history they are made to read.
2. The textbooks change when the regime changes, entailing considerable loss to the national exchequer and much confusion to the students. But it also provides the textbook boards an opportunity to find new authors, with all the corruption involved in the process.
3. The government comes to look at the textbooks as an official propaganda machinery rather than a means of education.
4. The academic community which supplies the authors for the book is corrupted financially and intellectually, as it makes easy money and learns to write without a conscience.
5. The students are brainwashed to accept one particular ruler, whom the book extols, as a hero: when they are still in school and a new government comes into power, they are given another hero whose praises must be sung. Confusion is a feeble word to describe their state of mind.
6. The professors who write these successive paeans to the lords of Islamabad develop the mindlessness and speed of an automation, turn back writers of expanded press notes from being historians, and end up as morons.
7. The world laughs at us; in particular the American "experts" on whom we depend for the formulation of our education policy and World Bank advisers and the whole lot of donors and lenders of money who are invited by the government to come to Pakistan and study our educational system. Being well aware that Mrs. Thatcher is not mentioned in British school books even after her retirement and President Mitterand's name does not occur in any French textbook even when he is still in office, and so on, they quickly form an opinion about the government and people of Pakistan which they do not express when they are in our country.

## **2. Support Military Rule**

The textbook-government nexus does not stop at mere inter-dependence. Its implications go further. For 26 years in its 45-year history Pakistan has had governments which were run by the military or put into office and sustained by the army. It is not a matter of surprise, therefore, that the government-textbook connection



has developed into an armed forces-textbook bond. Whatever I have said above about "Follow the Government in Office" applies in equal measure to the military. But there are further implications which must be considered.

It becomes the duty of the textbook writer to bring its need of tribute to the General in power. The result is not pleasant to read in any kind of book. In texts meant for young students it is distressing. When submissive and pliant professors phrase the flattery in abject terms it becomes despicable. Under Ayub Khan's reign the students were told that the General was known for his piety and virtuous deeds, and that people loved him for this and promoted him to the rank of Field Marshal and re-elected him as President to mark their happiness and gratitude. Under Ziaul Huq's ride both School and college students were taught to believe that the General was a pious, God-fearing, kindly man who brought Islam to the country for the first time, thus fulfilling the promise made by Jinnah during the Pakistan Movement years, and made Pakistan the fortress of Islam, and that God Himself had chosen him for the task; the last claim puts him firmly in a category only a little lower than that of the prophets.

Several lessons for the students are implicit in this approach of the textbooks:

1. National leadership is incompetent, maladroit, inept, undependable and bad in every way. It is unqualified to rule the country.
2. People who elected or supported the failed politicians are unfit for democracy.
3. The modern democratic system itself is a Western importation which finds no sanction in Islam (but no alternative model is suggested or offered, and the student is left breathless with frustration).
4. The armed forces have a supra-constitutional right to overthrow a civilian government whenever they think it is not performing its task satisfactorily, *i.e.*, to the satisfaction of the armed forces. (And each time the superior judiciary justifies the seizure in the name of a vague, undefined, indefinable and borrowed from abroad "law of necessity" which it is impossible for the students to understand. Try to propound and explain Kelsen's theory to a schoolboy or an undergraduate and you will see where the supreme court decisions have landed us).
5. The military has a right to rule the country for many years because the return of the bad old politician would harm the land. (Once again, the superior judiciary ratifies the military decision in the name of the good of the country, and the students are left in the lurch asking questions which nobody answers).

In the process, the students are also learning a different set of lessons:

1. It is a good habit to obey the authority without challenging its *locus standi*. The courage to question a given situation is not an admirable feature of character.
2. Dictatorship is a form of government which suits Pakistan better and makes it stable and prosperous.
3. The citizens should not object to losing their rights and surrendering their wills to the pleasure of one man who has all the power which he has' captured by force and is determined to keep by force.

In brief, the textbooks provide no education in democracy, do not train the students for self-rule, fail to mould them into prudent voters, do not tell them how to become good citizens, and ensure that no civilian-political leadership would emerge from this generation of students. The educational system is geared to the production of millions of "educated" slaves instead of responsible citizens. It put blind obedience in the place of civic virtue.

### **3. Glorify Wars**

This factor flows from the two listed above. When the textbook is the mouthpiece of the government and the government is often one of soldiers, it is inevitable that war should win a prominent place in it. The praetorian state cannot be by its nature an advocate of international peace. Here, too, the authors are not content with providing a brief reference to the wars fought by the country. They spend several pages and sometimes even a chapter or two in a short book on describing the details of fighting on certain fronts. Apparently they think that these full accounts of warfare are more relevant to the needs of the student and more important generally than the country's economic and social conditions and system of administration. Moreover, the treatment is selective. The 1948 war on Kashmir is hardly mentioned, because it was fought when a civilian government was in power. The 1965 war with India receives special and long mention because it came when General Ayub was the ruler. On the whole, from several of the books the students learn more about the wars with India than about the country's constitution, politics and economy.

What are the implications of this marked emphasis on and special attention to the topic of war? Consider the following:

1. A tribute is paid to the armed forces, thus reinforcing the message of factor 2 ("Applaud Military Rule").

2. Civilian form of government is played down, because the 1965 war was fought when a General was in power and the 1971 conflict occurred during General Yahya Khan's interregnum.
3. The emphasis on wars diverts the interest of the students from political problems and prospects to international security.
4. The underlying but never clearly pronounced point is rammed home that it is only the armed forces which can be saviors of the people, implying that civilian governments and politicians are of no use in moments of national danger.

This strategy leaves deeper marks on the minds of the students than the textbook writers realize. First, the students begin to believe in violence as the sole instrument of solving international problems. The book contains little about diplomacy, negotiations and peace-making. This glorification of wars can help in attracting recruits to the armed forces but in little else. Secondly, the 1965 and 1971 wars are presented as victories for Pakistan, which they were not. This creates self-complacency and false self-confidence, which can be dangerous in minds which are still growing.

#### **4. Hate India**

Either to rationalize the glorification of wars or for some other reasons(s), the textbooks set out to create among the students a hatred for India and the Hindus, both in the historical context and as a part of current politics.

The most common methods adopted to achieve this end are:

1. To offer slanted descriptions of Hindu religion and culture, calling them "unclean" and "inferior".
2. To praise Muslim rule over the Hindus for having put an end to all "bad" Hindu religious belief and practices and thus eliminated classical Hinduism from India (both claims being false).
3. To show that the Indian National Congress was a purely Hindu body, that it was founded by an Englishman, and that it enjoyed the patronage of the British Government. From this it is concluded that Indian nationalism was an artificial British-created sentiment. This is done with a view to contrasting the alleged false colors and loyalty of the Congress with the purity and nationalistic spirit of the All India Muslim League (of this more later).

4. To assert that the communal riots accompanying and following the partition of 1947 were initiated exclusively by the Hindus and Sikhs, and that the Muslims were at no place and time aggressors but merely helpless victims.
5. To allot generous and undue space to a study of the wars with India.

Much can be said to demonstrate the unwisdom and wastefulness of this attempt. I will mention only four principal points:

1. If an enemy has to be identified, why pick on India alone? Why not the Soviet Union, which has always been hostile to Pakistan, sided with India on all international issues involving Pakistan, and played a crucial part in breaking up Pakistan in 1971 by entering into a mutual defence treaty with India just before the crisis? Why not Afghanistan, which alone among the states of the world voted against Pakistan's entry into the United Nations in 1947, and which till the Soviet invasion of 1979 hated Pakistan and wanted to annex a part of its territory? Why not the United States, which holds up all military supplies when Pakistan is fighting for its life and has always treated Pakistan as a vassal? Why not Egypt, which in the 1971 war sent military supplies to India?
2. If India is an enemy country, why does the Pakistan government encourage and allow Pakistani sports teams and troupes of artist(e)s to tour India and permit and welcome return visits? Why were Indian (Hindu) film stars received as honored guests of General Ziaul Huq and lodged at the President's palace? Such friendly gestures are never exchanged between enemy countries. British and South Africa were not enemy countries, and yet for several years Britain banned her cricket team from playing against South Africa on her territory or elsewhere.
3. India has a very large Muslim community as a part of its population; today it exceeds the total population of Pakistan. This group shares its faith, its culture and its history with the Muslims of Pakistan. Can a country with such a large Muslim population which is closely connected with us ever be presented as an enemy country?
4. From 1947 till very recently a stream of Indian Muslims has been coming to Pakistan to live here permanently. Once the partition riots were over there was no danger to their lives in India, and yet the migration continued. Some of the arrivals might have been spies. (Repeated official statements that all troubles and disorders in Pakistan, even the sectarian riots, are engineered by a "foreign hand" and by "Indian agents" give credence to such suspicions). In normal times, the Urdu-speaking migrants now settled in Pakistan are free to visit their relatives living in India. There are a few million families divided by the international frontier. A country does not allow citizens of an enemy country to walk over the frontier and adopt its citizenship.

Once again, the students are flabbergasted when they read one thing in the books and see and experience another in life. In the classroom they learn that India is our greatest enemy. Outside, they see Pakistanis going mad over buying tickets for a cricket match between Pakistan and the visiting Indian cricket team, they know their parents' addiction to Indian films which they watch every evening on their VCR, they hear of Pakistani film actresses working in Indian films in Bombay, and every other day they read of Mehdi Hasan, Nur Jahan, Reshman and others going to India to sing songs.

Seeing all this, the students are bound to grow up with a love-hate sentiment for India, with a contempt for their elders who claim one thing and do another, and with the seeds of hypocrisy sown deep in their character. They should be told also of the necessity and desirability of peaceful neighborly relations, of the means of achieving them, and of the obstacles standing in the way. A sane educational system does not train students in hate. Whatever the justification for it or the compulsions of patriotism, hatred corrupts the mind, more so if it is still tender, and retards its healthy growth.

## 5. Fabricate an Anti-colonial Past

With motives which will become transparent after we have looked at the scene, the textbooks give to modern Indian history and the Muslim nationalist struggle a complexion which even the most cunning make-up will not enable to stand a whiff of historical reality. This fantasy is created through several measures of commission and omission:

1. The revolt of 1857 is said to have been a "war of independence". Some books add the frill that it was a *jihad* undertaken by the Muslims alone, and later some non-Muslims joined in.
2. The end of Muslim rule in India is fixed at 1857, without realizing that Muslim sovereignty over the subcontinent had ceased soon after Aurungeb's death a hundred and fifty years ago.
3. The information is withheld that from the time of Shah Abdul Aziz onwards the great majority of the *ulema* did not issue a *fatwa* against British rule, and that most of the poets and intellectuals from the middle of the eighteenth century till independence supported and admired British authority and culture.
4. The students are not told of the debt owed by Muslim renaissance to the efforts on its behalf by the British government. The Calcutta Madrasa, the Calcutta Muhammadan Literary Society, the All India Muhammadan Educational Conference, all societies and associations formed by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the Aligarh College, the Anjuman-i-Hamayat-i-Islam, the Nadwat-ul-Ulema and many other institutions were obliged to British initiative, encouragement, support, funding, or aid and help.

5. No mention is made of the fact that the foundation manifesto of the All India Muslim League declared, as its aim and object, Muslim loyalty to the British government.
6. The long history of Muslim loyalty to the British in public life is omitted from all textbooks.
7. Complete silence is observed on the large number of Muslims who joined the British Indian Army, even during World War I when they went abroad and fought against the Turks.
8. There is no reference to the fact that every concession or safeguard received by the Muslims was granted by the British, not by the Congress.
9. It is concealed from the students that a large number of eminent Muslims were not in the Muslim League mid did not participate in the Pakistan movement. Intellectually these nonparticipants were far superior to the League leaders.
10. It is kept secret from the students that the All India Muslim League courted the Punjab Unionist Party effusively and earnestly, and entered into a pact with it on its (Unionist) terms.
11. It is wrongly asserted by every textbook that the All India Muslim League boycotted the Simon Commission, forgetting that one part of it (probably the better part) cooperated with the Commission.
12. It is declared that the Muslims of India made "tremendous" sacrifices to win their freedom. The fact is that, apart from the brief years of 1858-60 and 1920-22, Muslims suffered little hardship between 1857 and 1947. It is forgotten by everyone that Muslim League's search for protection and safeguards (in the early years) and its struggle for an independent country (in the later years) were strictly constitutional efforts, peaceful campaigns and political fights, conducted through petitions, memoranda, requests, discussions, elections, parliamentary debates and negotiations. The balder were fought and ultimately won on the hustings. No Muslim League leaders languished in prisons. No Muslim masses faced British bullets. The many people who died or suffered horribly in 1947 were running away from their homes because their life was in danger, not because they were fighting for the creation of Pakistan. They were casualties of communal riots, not of anti-British warfare.

The principal motive of this large-scale falsification of modern history now emerges. As the Congress has the popular and rightful image of an anti-British, fiercely nationalistic, self-sacrificing movement, the Muslim League too ought to be bedizened in a similar

garb. The Muslim nationalist struggle must be presented as an equally fervent, flaming, heroic, self-denying phenomenon. The League must be put on display as a rabidly anti-British body. Alas! History is not on our side in this pretence. The entire nationalist struggle in the subcontinent, Hindu and Muslim, was a constitutional fight in which propaganda and processions and elections and debates were the chief weapons and negotiations the ultimate arbiter. During the course of this struggle the Congress challenged the British on a number of occasions and suffered for doing so, the Muslim League never.

## **6. Give the entire Credit to Aligarh and the United Provinces**

One infirmity from which every textbook suffers is its attempt to trace back to the Aligarh movement every political, social, intellectual, religious and educational development that took place in Muslim India. Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan is called the "greatest thinker of Pakistan". The Aligarh movement is said to have made the Indian Muslims affluent. Every textbook from class 1 to class 14 has a few or several pages on Aligarh. Some have a short or long chapter on it. This claim is not confined to the Urdu-speaking writers living in Karachi. The Punjabis and the Pathans writing for their own provinces show equal zeal in the matter.

It is impossible to deny the significant role played by Aligarh in our history. Every historian is aware of and acknowledges its contribution to the Muslim renaissance. But there is no warrant to allot Aligarh the monopoly of everything beneficial and progressive which happened in Muslim India. Those who hold an all-encompassing brief for Aligarh as the centre of Muslim revival and the fulcrum of the freedom movement should answer the following questions:

1. Did Sir Sayyid Ahmad or did he not support the British in the 1857 uprising? If he sided with the foreign masters and the hated colonialists in this "war of independence", is it logical to call him the father of Muslim nationalism or a hero of Pakistan?
2. Was the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College of Aligarh or was it not established with the blessings and support of the British? Was it not run for a long time by British principals, most of whom were appointed on official recommendations?
3. Was the Aligarh movement or was it not inspired and headed and administered by a group of titled aristocrats who had reaped their laurels in the service of the British or at the court of the Nizam of Hyderabad? Was it not an incorrigibly loyalist band?
4. Did Sir Sayyid Ahmad or did he not ask the Muslims to keep aloof from politics at a time when the Indian National Congress had been established, the Indian political age had begun, and the constitutional struggle for a place in the sun had commenced?

Was the advice prudent when Muslim parties had already been formed in Bengal, and men like Nawab Abdul Latif Khan and Sayyid Ameer Ali had entered the political arena?

5. Could Sayyid Ahmad Khan's radical interpretation of Islam have been acceptable or even tolerable to the great majority of Pakistani men of religion who welcomed General Ziaul Huq's retrogressive Islamization as a message from heaven? If Sayyid Ahmad was the "first" or "greatest" thinker of Pakistan, why has his version of Islam found no place in our books?

6. Did not the domination of the U.P. leaders over the All India Muslim League produce the following results? (a) It inhibited the League from growing its roots and gaining popularity in the rest of India, even in the Muslim-majority provinces. Leaders of other provinces did not like to be ordered about by the U.P. masters of the party. (b) It did not allow the League to open its branches and maintain them in good shape in Bengal, Punjab, NWFP and other provinces, for the same reason as above. (c) It focused all political attention on the interests and prospects and problems of the Muslims of the minority provinces, leaving the others to fend for themselves by forming their own political parties. (d) It produced the disastrous Lucknow concordat of 1916 which was the ruin of the Punjabi and Bengali Muslim for all time to come.

7. Is it true or is it not that this emphasis on the role of the United Provinces evolved into the claim that it was the only or chief source of Muslim culture in India and later of Pakistani culture? (This point is elaborated in the following feature, number 7).

8. Is it a fact or is it not that most of the schismatic tendencies and religious particularist movements in Indian Islam originated in the United Provinces? From where else did the Deobandis, the Barelawis, the Ahl-i-Hadith, the Ahl-i-Quran and other more minor sects emerge?

9. Doesn't the argument in favor of making the United Provinces the only centre of revival and political awakening keep the students in the dark about the great deal that was happening in other parts of India? Especially, didn't this extremely biased attitude lead to the disenchantment of our East Pakistani co-religionists and fellow-citizens and ultimately to the emergence of Bangladesh? Didn't this ramming of a false doctrine down the throats of Pakistanis break Pakistan? (I pursue the matter further in the next section on "Non-Contents"). And more recently, isn't this attitude alienating the Sindhis and creating another crisis like that of 1971?



## 7. Impose a New Culture on Pakistan

Most of the textbooks, on both school and college levels, persist in preaching that the United Provinces was the home of Pakistani culture. The clear message is that Pakistanis should accept this culture; but nobody explains what it is, beyond the Urdu language. In practice this culture is being imposed upon us through the very effective means of the textbook.

This raises many problems and some issues of substantial importance?

1. The fact is that the United Provinces was the home of a decadent, brittle, pale, nostalgic reflection of the Mughal culture that had passed away, not a developing, strong, healthy, indigenous culture. It was owned only by the upper crust of the society; the home-grown, common-man, *bhayya*, way of life was looked at contemptuously by the "cultured" classes. The crust was hard, and did not contain much within it. This superficially aristocratic culture was not shared by any class in the rest of Muslim India, nor would it have been acceptable to Pakistanis unless it were imposed upon them through state machinery.
2. The influence of the MAO College and the Aligarh University has been grossly exaggerated. Only a handful of students from other 'provinces attended them. There were several other educational institutions situated nearer home and producing more graduates.
3. In religious terms, this culture was characterized by sectarianism and (excepting Sayyid Ahntad Khan) a conservative interpretation of Islam, which made it divisive vertically and horizontally.
4. This culture had a very strong element of loyalty to the British and, by extension, to any master of liege lord. In this respect, but in no other, it shared the value system of the Punjabi culture. But other cultures in India and later in Pakistan were less inclined to call their political masters their *mai bap* (mother and father).
5. The political culture of the United Provinces was littered with anti-Muslim League and anti-Pakistan movement spokesmen and organizations. and this did not endear it to Pakistanis. It had produced the pro-Congress Deoband school, the "nationalist" Muslim clique, the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind and the Jamia Millia. It is true that NWFP had its Red Shirts and the Punjab its Ahrars, both of whom opposed the creation of Pakistan. But the triumph of the Muslim League in 1947 weakened the former and virtually eliminated the latter. Borrowing the U.P. political culture would have introduced into Pakistan several elements which had no place in her public and historical ethos.

6. The principal, central and vitalizing force in the U.P. culture was its language, Urdu. The unifying advantage of Urdu in Pakistan has been offset by four serious developments: strangling the Punjabi language, and accelerating its disappearance (details in the next section); obstructing the development of Baluchi as a written language; creating great resentment in Sindh; and driving cast Pakistanis out of Pakistan. Has the price paid been commensurate with the convenience of having a so-called "national" language?

Three further questions trouble the mind:

1. Why did the leaders of the United Provinces run away to Pakistan in 1947, leaving their followers unprotected and extremely vulnerable at an hour when their need for guidance and protection was greater than ever before in history? Was this a part of U.P. culture?

2. Why did so many people from the United Provinces migrate to Pakistan? They formed by far the largest group of new entrants to the country. They were not refugees, like people from East Punjab whose province had been divided. They were not turned out of their homes, looted and hounded out like the Punjabis. Why did they choose, without any political compulsion or hazard to their life, to travel to a new country and settle there? They still continue to come when the opportunity arises.

3. Most importantly, why did these U.P. migrants look with unconcealed and vitriolic contempt at the culture or cultures of the country which had welcomed them, given them jobs, allotted them lands and property, and offered them valuable opportunities in trade and commerce?

There is a double contradiction in this attitude. If the culture of the areas forming Pakistan was, as it was claimed, a child of the U.P. culture, then these migrants had no right to feel so superior, or to refuse to learn the local languages, or to talk incessantly of their own glorious past, or to look at their countrymen as an uncouth, ill-bred and uncultivated rabble. On the other hand, if the U.P. culture was so refined and superior that they felt it uncomfortable to live among the boorish Sindhis and Pathans and Punjabis, then this low culture of their adopted country could not have been a child of the U.P. culture. In both cases, why did they forsake their homes and their high culture for the sake of living among the riff-raff of Pakistan? No, the explanation has nothing to do with culture. They came in search of fresh fields and pastures anew, to make money, and to live in greater comfort than was possible back home. The recent revelations about the way the Muhajir Qaumi Movement conducted its affairs does not speak well of their superior culture. Few Pakistanis would like to be seen to share it or to admit that it is the progenitor or begetter of their own culture.

## 8. Tell Lies

Throughout these pages I have quoted with chapter and verse several hundred examples of fabrication of history with which our textbooks are replete. Easily verifiable dates are given inaccurately. Distortion of facts, which are or should be known to every educated person, litters the pages. Interpretations which offend common sense abound. All these things can be explained, but certainly not excused, by the writer's ignorance or prejudice.

But there are certain statements which fall in the category of plain lies, and in no other category. Several professors of long teaching experience and high formal qualifications say that Pakistan is not only an Islamic State but the "fortress of Islam", and shut their eyes tight to where they live. Another professor tells the students that world languages like French and English are retreating before the popular appeal of Urdu, and feels proud of the sight. A professor with an M.A. degree from London and a doctorate from Indiana (not India) asserts that before 1947 India was a part of Pakistan, and his pleasure knows no bounds at this demolition of both history and geography in one magisterial sentence.

These are not distortions or slants or misconstructions or exaggerations, or other venial faults. They are untruths, invented deliberately to deceive, cheat and misguide the students who attend school to increase their knowledge and build their character. When they hear and memorize these lies, and later discover that they were lies, what do they feel? They react in the following manner:

1. They teach to tell lies themselves when they find that the habit of lying is a part of their education. Teaching from these textbooks is an excellent mode of producing little devils with twisted minds. By the times these children have grown up to be "responsible" citizens they are well trained in the art.
2. They begin to look at their teachers and the authors of the books as liars. They lose all trust in the textbook, and in later adult life are liable to suspect that every book is a collection of lies. Instead of creating in them a love of books we have ingrained in them a revulsion from them. As these lies are taught and explained and elaborated by the teachers, the students lose all respect for them. Instead of a guide, an oracle, a fount of truth, the teacher becomes for them a purveyor of lies. But the school discipline and the necessity of passing the examination force them to hide their true opinion of the teacher. For the time being he must be obeyed out of fear. This experience makes them hypocrites. In adult life they continue to apply the lesson learnt at school: to bow before the boss or the party leader or the bureaucrat as an unavoidable formality, while slicking to the belief that he is a liar.

In 45 years the educational system has made every Pakistani a hypocrite and a liar. The habit of not telling the truth has entered the mind of the student, the psyche of the individual, and the character of the nation. The textbook has done its duty well. The education of the people is complete.

Why do the textbooks lie? The answer to this takes us to a consideration of some permanent traits of Pakistan character and culture.

The common Pakistani is a creature of emotions, and lives by them. Sentiment and a compulsive expression of it at all times mark his private and public existence. Look at his daily life. He quarrels at home, he laughs uproariously and talks at the top of his voice among friends, he is hilarious and loud-mouthed at parties and pleasure gatherings, he bellows at his office colleagues, he mourns and wails with abandon at deaths and funerals, and so on. His political life is a mirror-reflection of his social life. Look at the noisy processions, the shouts that rend the skies, the sloganeering, the street brawls, the political debate ending in fulmination and an exchange of hot words and scurrilous abuses. the fury of words cascading from the lips of the leader when he is addressing a meeting, the inter-party riots, sectarian killings, political terrorism, unseemly pandemonium in the assemblies, hurling of charges of treachery and treason and subversion and unpatriotism at the members and leaders of the other party.

Look at our religious life. The *mulla* in the mosque delivers his sermon as if he is roaring, though his words are being magnified by six loudspeakers fixed on the roof. The leader of the religious party addresses his gathering as if he were fighting the devil himself: the veins of his neck bulge out, the face reddens, the beard oscillates, the eyes sparkle, the mouth foams; the audience applauds, shares the blaze of the outburst, shouts slogans, goes wild. Look at the colleges and the universities. Teachers are self-opinionated and bad tempered, students are rode and carry guns, lectures are interrupted, seminars deteriorate into slanging matches, examination halls are centres of iniquity, barefaced cheating and open corruption backed with violence.

Look at our men of letters. They quarrel and use the language of the gutter, they write abusive literary criticism as if the author under review is a personal enemy, they issue learned journals to lambast those who don't share their opinions, they split old and respectable literary associations (like the Halqa-i-Arab-i-Zauq) into factions to satisfy their overgrown egos. And thus life goes on at a fast pace, volatile, unbalanced, unmoored, furious, ill tempered, capricious, unsafe.

Another national characteristic, which is relevant to this discussion, is self-praise. The ordinary Pakistani thinks a great deal of himself and takes too many airs. He holds himself in high esteem. But he does not extend the right of this indulgence to anyone else. He is a whole man; all others are incomplete, imperfect, tainted. I have never met a humble Pakistani.

The natural result is intolerance. Views other than one's own are unwelcome, unpalatable, not worth a consideration. Argument or logic plays no part in his life. Self-righteousness conquers all. Even when he is found out cheating, there is no embarrassment. He has not teams to blush. Insist that you are right and go on insisting, and all will be well.

This description of our way of life is not mere rhetoric. It establishes a direct connection between our daily existence and our textbooks. The circumstance works both ways, and ends in a vicious circle. The national characteristics portrayed above are a result of the textbooks on which people have been brought up. The textbooks are written by people who want them to suit the temper of the nation. One produces the other. The non-textbooks do not, cannot, show a different quality or standard. The same attitude of mind determines the contents and style and thrust of the school books, college books, and all popular and scholarly historical works. As every educationalist knows, the school is the nursery of the nation. Pakistani textbooks will produce Pakistanis, not Frenchmen. As ye sow so shall ye reap. The stories thou idlest to thine offspring shalt one day become thine history.

Barthold Brecht once said that the past had to be bared to settle all accounts, so that then one could proceed further. He was right. To know our past is the first step towards understanding our present and planning our future. But Pakistanis seem to believe in covering their past with fumes of falsehood and make-believe which no wind of reality can blow away. Their view of history is made up of principled forgetfulness, willed oblivion and purposeful silence. When they choose to recall their past they write as they live: declaiming, emphasizing, canvassing, affirming, trumpeting, preaching, haranguing. Their work resembles the speech by Lord Care on which Grattan passed this famous judgment: "Great generosity of assertion, great thrift of argument— fury in the temper and famine in the phrase."

### **Non-Contents**

What the textbooks say and the way they say it, the theme of the last section, constitute the ingredients of the information they want to pass on to the students. This is their *positive* contribution to the sociology of ignorance: the kind of knowledge they are imparting. But they add to the unenlightenment by withholding what should be told to the students. This is their *negative* contribution. There is much in our history which is not to be found in our textbooks. I am not talking of fabrication or distortion, but of omission. There are several matters of grave import pertaining both to the past and to contemporary times which fail to find mention in the books. In this section I will indicate only three major gaps, though the thoughtful reader can add some more to the list.

## 1 . Culture and Inferiority Complex

The double claim that the people of the United Provinces were in the forefront of the struggle for the creation of Pakistan and that their culture is the source or foster-mother of Pakistani culture has produced problems of identity for the indigenous population of Pakistan. Space does not permit a full treatment of its impact on the various provinces taken separately. I will concentrate on the Punjab as a case-study because I am more familiar with it.

The mind of the largest province of the country has been put to total confusion by the following factors born of the claim:

1. An inferiority complex of the severest kind has struck the Punjabi. He is told that his own role in the freedom movement was marginal and inappreciable. For many years he had supported the Unionist Party, which was an enemy of the Muslim League and an obstacle in the path leading to independence. He voted for the partition only in 1946. Therefore he was a latecomer to the ranks of the patriots. He was a laggard, and he should be made aware of it. His own culture is also inferior, and the better parts of it are borrowed from Delhi and the United Provinces. He sided with the Urdas' in rejecting Bengali as a national language; when the concession was made with great reluctance, he mourned it loudly in company with them. In doing so, he made bitter enemies of the people of East Pakistan, but he did not care.
2. By accepting Urdu in his schools, literature, journalism and everyday life he let his own tongue be thrown on the dunghill of history. By supporting the cause of Urdu in Sindh he alienated the Sindhis who then bracketed him with the Urda usurpers of their province.
3. By failing to challenge the Urda claim of the superiority of the U.P. culture he made a confession that he had no culture of his own, thus disowning his own past and its contribution to this life.
4. In politics he was very happy to make common cause with the Urda-dominated federal government in (a) creating the One Unit of West Pakistan, thus angering Sindh, Baluchistan and NWFP. (b) allowing the identity of his own province to be lost, and (c) lending support to the rest of West Pakistan in opposition to East Pakistan (the raison chore of the One Unit scheme). By thus playing into Urda hands, he made two grievous mistakes: he made the Bengalis look at him as their chief enemy, and, as the largest component of the West Pakistan province, dominated the smaller partners and

alienated their sympathies. In sum, he made himself thoroughly unpopular with every other group in the country to please the tiny 3 percent (1950s' figure) Urdu population.<sup>1</sup>

5. By continuing to concentrate on producing Urdu literature, he denied the Punjabi language a chance to revive itself, thus sending a message to the Urdas that he was at one with them in rejecting Punjabi as a respectable language and considering Punjabi literature a something unworthy and low.

This self-abnegation is probably unique in the history of the nations anywhere. But was it self-abnegation? I can see no element of denial or self-sacrifice in it. The Punjabi did what he did with pleasure, confidence, pride, almost glee. He went further than any other Pakistani group in adopting Urdu as his everyday spoken tongue, even within his home. There was no compulsion for the change. The Pathan student studied through Urdu medium but spoke Pashto at home. The Sindhi went to Urdu-medium schools but stuck to his own language in his domestic and social life. The argument that Urdu-medium schooling results in Urdu-speaking home life is a false one. The Punjabi had gone to Urdu-medium schools since 1855 but had not made himself Urdu-speaking. The trend started in the 1960s under political pressure from Karachi and Islamabad and because of the anti-Bengali feeling in which the Punjabi decided to support the Urdas. Yet, his decision was made of his own free will and without demur.

He chose Urdu because he was convinced that his own culture was either inferior or non-existent. The propaganda which had its beginnings with Muhammad Husain Azad and Altaf Husain Hali and others brought to the Punjab by the British to found the province's school system now bore fruit. A century of insidious effort had not gone waste. But by thus flattering the Urdas the Punjabi intelligentsia ensured the demise of their native tongue which their fathers and forefathers had spoken for over a thousand years.

The Punjabi was happy at the thought that, by owning Urdu as his language, he added one more weapon to his armory of domination over the rest of Pakistan. He already enjoyed an unalterable majority in the population of the country, an overbearing majority in the national army, and an unchallengeable majority in the civil service. With the Urdu language in his pocket his victory was complete (though, in fact, he had put himself in the pocket of the Urdas; but preferred to shut his eyes to this reality). Now he also became the dominant linguistic and cultural group in the land. Did he realize that his victory was engineered by people who looked at him with overt and deep contempt and, in private conversation, called him a Punjabi *dhagha* (ox; a symbol of stupidity)? It did not matter. He had at last been accepted as a civilized person speaking the

---

<sup>1</sup> I have borrowed this delightful new word from the columns of *The Friday Times* of Lahore. I use it to mean the migrant who came from Delhi, the United Provinces, Bihar and Hyderabad, who speaks Urdu as his mother tongue. and who views indigenous Pakistani culture with knitted brows. He has nothing in common with the other *muhajirs* whose original home lay in East Punjab, Kashmir, Rajistan, Bombay, Gujerat and other areas now in India.

"national" language. It did not occur to him that he had achieved respectability by alienating himself from his own history and culture. I suggest that he reckons the price he has paid, even if the account is made up in Urdu.

## 2. Exclusion of Bengal from National Consciousness

If I were asked to pick out from all the weaknesses of the textbooks the one most damaging and completely unforgivable, I would unhesitatingly name the virtual absence of Muslim Bengal. Whether these books were written before 1971 or after, they are unanimous in giving Bengal no place at all in the history of modern Muslim India; in a very few cases it is mentioned but put squarely on the outer periphery of the narration, almost at the edge of nothingness.

I must first offer to the reader a bird's-eye view of the developments in Bengal in the nineteenth and twentieth century's to make him aware of the role of the Bengali Muslim in our recent history. Only then will he be able to recognize the monstrosity of the injustice done by the textbook writers.

The religious reformers of Bengal of the nineteenth century were actively engaged in anti-British activity on the one hand and in trying to establish an Islamic state on the other, the only exception being Mawlana Karamat Ali who was a pure reformist. They might have been inspired by the Wahabi thinking of Arabia or by the so-called Mujahidin movement of Sayyid Ahmad Barelawi, but they had no direct political connection with either. They emerged from local roots and local conditions. In contrast to the near-unanimous practice of the *ulema* of northern India, they declared Bengal under British rule to be a *dar-ul-harb* (the house of war, a state in which the Islamic community is being ruled and oppressed by a non-Muslim government, and in which it is the prescribed duty of every Muslim to fight for his faith and freedom).

Haji Shariatullah (1781-1840) united the Muslim peasantry in his Faraidi or Faraizi movement (the word is derived from the Arabic *fard* or Persian *farz*, meaning duly enjoined by religion). Declaring British-governed Bengal as a *dar-ul-harb*, he said that Friday and Id congregational prayers could not be held in the area. He called upon his followers to launch a holy war or jihad against both the British rulers and the Hindu landlords who were oppressing them. The seeds of political regeneration were thus sown by him for the first time. Under his instructions, the Muslims boycotted British courts and government schools.

Shariatullah's mission was developed and taken to its logical culmination by his son and successor, Muinuddin Ahmad *alias* Dudu Mian (1819-1862). He organized his followers into a compact, well-knit, disciplined and hierarchical system known as the *khilafat*. East Bengal was divided into a number of circles, each headed by an agent who held the members together, strengthened the organization, collected contributions and



promoted the work of proselytization. He opposed the levying of illegal taxes. By these and other steps he aimed at creating a state within a state. In 1841 and 1842 he led two campaigns against the Hindu landlords, both successful. Later in 1847 he was arrested along with 63 of his followers, tried and sentenced, but acquitted on appeal by the Nizamat Adalat of Calcutta. He was again arrested in 1857 but released in 1859; on his release he was detained in Faridpur.

The Faridis were more revolutionary than the *mujahidin* of Sayyid Alunad Beralawi in so far as they did not hide their aims and sentiments behind the veil of vague pronouncements. They fought openly against the British on the British territory, not against another non-Muslim community (the Sikhs) from bases in British territory.

The last of this Bengali band of fighters was Mir Nisar Ali *alias* Tilu Mir, who struggled on behalf of the peasant and the lower middle classes, and died on 19 November 1831 in a battle against the British. The principal goals of all these leaders were to effect reform in the Muslim community, to improve their economic position by releasing them from the slavery of the Hindu landlords, to eradicate un-Islamic practices from the Muslims of all classes, and to drive the British out of the territory so that Muslims could live in freedom in an independent state of their own. They failed to achieve their major aims, but left a deep mark on the life and thinking of the lower classes of Bengali Muslims. Their gifts to them were a spirit of revolt, readiness to suffer for a cause, realization of the value of social and religious reforms, radicalism, and the ability to challenge the established authority. The character molded by these influences was to influence Bengali Muslim politics through all succeeding years.

Nawab Abdul Latif (1828-1893) founded the Muhammadan Literary Society of Calcutta in 1863, which did a great deal of work in improving education among the Muslims and persuading the British to give greater attention to Muslim education and provide more facilities and opportunities to the community.

Simultaneously, Mawlawi Karamat Ali (1800-1873) of Jaunpur was concentrating on religious reform and uplift. He spent 50 years of his life as a public religious preacher, touring the province, especially its eastern districts, combating Hindu customs and practices which had corrupted Muslim religious and social life, renewing the call of pristine Islam, and arguing for orthodoxy in the interest of unity. He enjoyed great respect and wielded tremendous influence among the Muslims. After his death his work was carried on by his son, Mawlana Hafiz Ahmad, who died in Dacca in 1899, and after Hafiz Ahmad by a nephew of Karamat Ali, Abdul Awwal.

Sayyid Ameer Ali (1849-1928) was a pupil of Mawlawi Karamat Ali, and was educated in Calcutta. Called to the bar in London in 1873, he was the first Muslim barrister to practice law at the Calcutta High Court and to teach law at the Presidency College, Calcutta. He was a member of the Bengal Legislative Council in 1878-79 and 1881-83

and of the Imperial Legislative Council in 1884-85, the first Muslim judge of the Calcutta High Court from 1890 to 1904, and the first Indian to be appointed member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1909. For the political training of Indian Muslims he founded the National Muhammadan Association in 1877, and was its secretary for over 25 years. He presided over the All India Muhammadan Educational Conference's first session to be held in Bengal in December 1899. In 1908 he founded the London Muslim League and ran it single-handedly during the crucial years of the making of the Minto-Morley reforms. He was elected president of the All India Muslim Leagues Delhi session held in January 1910, though he could not come to India and his address had to be read out by someone else.

He was not only a great Indian Muslim but also a prominent activist and thinker of the world of Islam. An ardent pan-Islamist, he was deeply concerned with the fate of the khilafat, of the Ottoman Empire and of Turkey. During the Balkan Wars he organized the Red Crescent Society, and in other ways and at other times also arranged for the aid and succor of the suffering Muslims in several lands.

With such a busy professional and public life he yet found time to write three books on law between 1880 and 1904, which survive to this day as university textbooks and references, two books on Islam which the passage of a century has failed to outdate or render irrelevant, and several articles in British learned journals which are of permanent value. He was the first Muslim in the history of Islam to present to the Western world in its own language an explanation and exposition of Islam, not as an apologia of a religion but as a challenge to the Christian-Judaic civilization. He did what he could do to remove many Western prejudices and assumptions about Islamic teachings on women, slavery, humanism and rationalism, and to inform the Christian peoples of Islam's contribution to philosophy, literature and the fine arts. A distinguished interpreter of his faith to his own co-religionists and to others, he argued his credo from a firm base of positive assurance, liberal principles and a radical impulse. He wielded a persuasive pen and wrote fluently in the nineteenth century style of long, smooth-running sentences which was then in vogue.

Bengal's role in Indian Muslim politics from 1906 onwards is better known to the *cognoscenti* and needs no repetition here, except to draw special attention to the following developments: it was mainly on the initiative of the Bengali leaders that the All India Muslim League (AIML) was established in Dacca in December 1906: between 1905 and 1911 the Bengali Muslims faced the Hindu and Congress agitation and anger because of the partition of Bengal without much political or moral support from the rest of Muslim India; on the annulment of this partition in 1911, they face the music in lonely suffering without any sympathy, verbal or practical, from other Muslims; in 1916 the Lucknow Pact wrenched away from them their natural right to a majority of seats in the provincial legislature, and their protests went unheard: in the 1937 elections they were the only Muslim group to show a respectable result in favor of the Muslim

League, when the League had not put up any candidate in Sindh and NWFP and had won only two seats in the Punjab (one of these two was lost to the Unionists immediately afterwards); in the 1945-46 elections they again stood with the Muslim League more steadfastly and in greater numbers than any other Muslim province; and between 1945 and 1947 Bengal was the only Muslim province to have a stable Muslim League ministry.

Nor was Muslim Bengal behind the other areas in competent leadership. Its long roll of heroes contains such eminent names as Nawab Abdul Ghani Mian (d. 1889 or 1896), Mawlawi Abdul Karim (1863-1943), Sir Abdul Rahim (1867-1947), Mawlawi Abul Kasem (d. 1936), Sayyid Nawab Ali Chaudhri (1863-1929), A.K. Fazlil Haq (1873-1962), Sir A.K. Ghuznawi (1872-1939), Sir A.H. Ghuznawi (1876-1953), Nurul Amin (1897-1974), Nawab Sir Sayyid Shamsul Huda (1862-1922), Mawlawi Tamizuddin Khan (1889-1963), the extended line of the Nawabs of Dacca, and the brilliant Suhrawardis.

The Aligarh movement of the United Provinces and the political-*cum*-intellectual milieu of Delhi, reinforced by the uncritical support of the Punjab, succeeded in presenting the Muslim renaissance of the second half of the nineteenth and early years of the twentieth centuries as a monopoly of north India and offering Urdu as *the* language of Muslim India. It is true that Urdu was read and understood (and upheld as a Muslim language during the Urdu-Hindi controversy) in northern parts of the subcontinent. But by identifying Urdu literature with Indian Muslim literature these north Indian stalwarts had the face to contradict honest truth. And by singing this canticle to Urdu as the only Muslim language of India they banished from political and literary history the tongue of the majority of Indian Muslims.

The spell which Aligarh and Delhi cast on the minds of the Muslims of northern India blinded them to the existence of a Muslim literature in Bengal and in south India. Even the educated classes, nay even the intellectuals and men of letters, of the north were unaware of the Islamic and Muslim writings which had been produced and were being produced in the Bengali language. A general impression ran current that Bengali was a purely Hindu language, rooted in Hindu culture and written in a "non-Islamic" script. That was enough to eject Bengali literature from the consciousness of the northern Muslim mind. This deliberately nurtured illusion not only belied the reality but led, in time, to disastrous consequences for Islamic unity, Muslim nationalism and Pakistan's integrity. But of this snore later. First let us cast a passing glance at Bengali Muslim literature.

In the second half of the nineteenth century the two outstanding figures of Munshi Mihrullah and Munshi Zaimiruddin instilled the spirit of Islam into Bengali Muslim literature and influenced many writers to evolve a Muslim Bengali language and to produce a literature which was inspired and molded by their faith. They set the bells a ringing, but lacked the time to establish a movement to promote and popularize their

ideas or organize their followers into a group. This task was taken up by their friends and sympathizers at the end of the century.

In 1889 this band of litterateurs began to publish a weekly called *Sudhakar* (Moon). In 1892 Shaikh Abdur Rahim issued his own weekly under the name of *Mihir* (Sun). A little later the two magazines merged and the new amalgamated weekly was christened *Mihir-o-Sudhakar* (The Sun and the Moon). Among the prominent members or what soon came to be known as the Sudhakar group were Mawlawi Mirajuddin Abroad. Riazuddin Ahmad Mashhadi, Munshi Shaikh Abdur Rahim, and Muhammad Riazuddin Ahmad. Working severally and collectively, these writers produced Islamic literature in pure Bengali, and brought the Bengali intelligentsia and readership back to Islam.

Outside this group but sympathetic to its aims and approach were men like Sayyid Ismail Husain Shirazi, a protagonist of Muslim revival; Muazzaniul Haq (1860-1933), poet, novelist, biographer, translator of several books from the Persian, founder of the monthly *Lahari* (Waves) in 1900, and the illustrated monthly Muslim Bharat (Muslim India) in 1920: and Shaikh Fazio' Karim (1882-1936), most of whose works of history, drama, poetry and fiction are based on Islamic culture and annals.

These trends were helped forward by a number of journals, e.g., *Ahrnadi* of Mawlawi Abdul Hamid Khan Yusufzai, Tangail, founded in 1886; *Islam Pracharak* (Preacher of Islam) of Riazuddin Ahmed, issued in 1891, suspended in 1893, and revived in 1899, an advocate and upholder of pan-Islamism; *Koh-i-Nur* of S.K.M. Muhammad Raushan Ali, Faridpur, founded in 1898; and *Naha Nur* (New Light) of Sayyid Imdad Ali, Calcutta, established in 1903.

This shocking dismissal of the entire literature of the largest single and compact Muslim community of India was not an isolated case of passing amnesia or transient bias. In perspective it emerges as a part of an intentional campaign to keep Muslim Bengal out of the mainstream of Muslim Indian history, culture and politics. The truth of this observation is confirmed by the way the Aligarh movement and AIML treated the Bengali Muslim.

The All India Muhammadan Educational Conference was established by Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan to attend to the educational needs, expand the educational facilities and opportunities, and define and promote the intellectual ideals, of the Muslims of India. Sir Sayyid was not only its founder and prime mover but also its indefatigable permanent secretary till his death. But he had his attention fixed on north India. Though throughout his public life he spoke in the name of the whole of Muslim India his activities and interests contradicted this claim. His voice was hardly heard in Bengal.

Prior to 1898 no Bengali Muslim had taken part in the proceedings of the Conference; Muhammad Siddique was the first to attend the Lahore session of that year. The leaders of the Conference were not even shamed into looking at Bengal as a part of Muslim India when Sayyid Ameer Ali wrote in favor of a Muslim university in Aligarh in December 1898. Some Bengali voices were raised in protest. On 31 December 1898 the *Moslem Chronicle* complained in an editorial, "Far off in Bengal very little in reality appears to be known of the teachings of the sage of Aligarh even by persons who ought to know better." At last when the Conference held its first session in Bengal in December 1899, Justice Shah Din (the Punjabi president of the organization in 1894 and again in 1931) conceded "that so far this Conference has had little influence over the Mussalmans in the Bombay and Madras Presidencies and in the Central Provinces. Behar and Bengal proper, will hardly, I think, admit of a doubt."

However, those who ran the Conference from the United Provinces did not give ear to such "foreign" complaints. They did not even take notice of the Bengali sighs and groans and moans.

In 1903 the constitution of the Conference reconstituted the Central Standing Committee on the basis of the following provincial and territorial representation: Bombay 10, Sindh 3, Bihar 5, Assam 3, Madras 10, Mysore 2, Travancore 2, United Provinces 10, Punjab 10, Peshawar 3, Kashmir 3, Baluchistan 3, Burma 10, Hyderabad 10, Bengal 10. The Muslims of Bengal were thus given as much weight as those of Burma or Madras or Hyderabad. The *Moslem Chronicle* passed strictures on the decision on 21 November 1903, but to no purpose.

Thwarted by Aligarh's obduracy, the Muslims of Bengal organized an educational conference of their own in Rajshahi on 2-3 April 1904. Mawlana Sayyid Shamsul Huda presided over the proceedings, and 4,000 delegates came from all over Bengal.

In non-educational affairs, too, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan showed no respect for Bengali sentiment. In 1877 when Ameer Ali founded the National Muhammadan Association he tried to persuade the Sayyid of Aligarh to cooperate with him, but he got nowhere. Eleven years later, still unrepentant and rigid in his opinion, Sayyid Ahmad wrote to a friend, "Ameer Ali himself came to me and had argued and insisted that I should join the National Muhammadan Association. But I think it is not wise on the part of the Muslims to adopt political agitation" (letter to Ghulam Niaz Khan, dated 10 December, 1888). By this time the Indian National Congress had been in existence for three years, and the National Muhammadan Association had set up its branches in Karachi and in several towns in the Punjab.

When the Muslim noblemen of the United Provinces made arrangements for a Muslim deputation to see the Viceroy in October 1906 they again put the Bengalis in what they thought was their proper place. Out of the 35 leaders who made up the deputation there

were only 5 from Bengal and one single figure from the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam. Of the 5 "Bengalis" from Bengal, only 2 belonged to the province (Nawab Bahadur Sayyid Amir Husain Khan and Abdur Rahim); the other 3 (Shahzada Bakhtiar Shah of Mysore, Nasir Husain Khyal of Calcutta and Khan Bahadur Shujaat Ali Beg, the Persian Consul General in Calcutta) were Urdu-speaking non-Bengalis domiciled in the province. The new Muslim-majority province of Eastern Bengal and Assam spoke through one lone voice, that of Sayyid Nawab Mi Chaudhri from Mymensingh.

In spite of this rebuff the Bengalis played a prominent part in the establishment of AIML in Dacca in December 1906. The initiative came from Nawab Salimullah Khan of Dacca. More than half of the delegates present at the inaugural session were from Eastern Bengal and Assam: 38 out of a total of 68. The United Provinces sent only 16 delegates, the Punjab 5, Bihar 4, West Bengal 3, Bombay 1, and Delhi 1. Yet, when the Provisional Committee of the new party was named, lo and behold! There were only 4 members from Eastern Bengal and Assam; the United Provinces had secured 23 seats. In addition, both the joint secretaries were from the United Provinces: Nawab Muhsin-ul-Mulk and Nawab Vigar-ul-Mulk.

Even greater humiliation was in store for the Bengalis. During the hectic years of the Simla deputation and the emergence of AIML the most important issue which touched the heart and life of every Bengali Muslim was the partition of Bengal. It was by no means a mere provincial matter. The Hindu agitation against the splitting up of Bengal and the creation of a new Muslim-majority province had the solid backing of the Indian National Congress. This raised the controversy to an All-India level where it stirred deep passions and led to frequent and bloody Hindu-Muslim riots.

The Bengali Muslim naturally expected the new party to take up his case and give him full moral and political support. The right was on his side: but the Muslim League was not. The north Indian leaders had already shown their hand when the Simla deputation was in the making. Nawab Salimullah and Sayyid Nawab Ali Chaudhri had insisted that the deputationists should seek an assurance from the Viceroy that the decision to partition the province shall stand in spite of Hindu pressure. Because of the objections raised by some non-Bengali members the demand was not incorporated in the Simla address.

From the moment of its birth AIML demonstrated its indifference to Bengali feeling on the partition issue. In his presidential address at its inaugural session Nawab Vicrar-ul-Mulk made no reference to it. The Aga Khan, who was the permanent president of the party, declared that he was opposed to the partition, thus choosing to side with the Hindus and the Congress. Between 1906 and 1911, AIML passed 46 resolutions (not counting those on party organizational matters). Only 2 of these were in support of the partition, one passed at the Dacca inaugural session in 1906, and the other at the

Amritsar session of 1908; the latter was first dropped from the agenda, but restored on the strong insistence of Nawab Ali Chaudhri who then moved it.

For these reasons the leaders of the Eastern Bengal and Assam provincial Muslim League lost their enthusiasm for the activities and policies of AIML. It is difficult to blame them for adopting this attitude.

With the annulment of the partition in 1911 and the consequent reconstitution of the province of Bengal, a Bengal provincial Muslim League came into existence. It cooperated with the parent body from 1912 onwards till the stunning blow of the Lucknow Pact hit it in 1916. The Pact, negotiated and signed by AIML with all its wits around it but the Bengali leaders absent, shocked the Bengalis. In April 1917 at its third annual session the Bengal Muslim League urged the AIML Council to give further consideration to the interests of the Muslims of Bengal as regards their percentage of representation in the provincial legislature. There was no response to the request. Local disillusionment led to a large number of defections from the provincial party. The rebels then established in September 1917 a separate organization of their own, the Central National Muhammadan Association, for the "effective protection of Muslim interests" in the province. Sayyid Nawab Ali Chaudhri was elected its president. The name chosen for the new party recalled Ameer Ali's revolt of 1877 against the injunction of Sayyid Ahmad Khan. It is not known if the name was adopted to bring back to memory the events of 40 years ago.

The formation of the Central National Muhammadan Association did not mean that the rump of the Muslim Leaguers which now constituted the provincial League had accepted the wrong done at Lucknow or forgotten it. On 30 January 1920 the Bengal Muslim League Council passed a resolution urging AIML to move the Government to increase Muslim representation in Bengal to 50 percent in the provincial Legislative Council. The central Muslim League took no action on this proposal. Tired of their 6-year-old vain struggle against the Lucknow Pact and disappointed with their own party, the Bengali Muslims now turned to the Hindus. The result was the C.R. Das-Abdur Raisins agreement, commonly known as the Bengal Pact. (The scenario was to be reproduced in 1971 when East Pakistanis, disgusted with the attitude of the Government of Pakistan and the West Pakistanis, would turn to India for help).

Even then the significance and gravity of Bengali discontent failed to move AIML, whose leaders persisted in defending the Pact in public to the chagrin of the Bengalis. In December 1924, in his presidential address to AIML Bombay session, Sir Raza Ali, who had been one of the negotiators of the Pact, declared, "I the other party [the Hindus] had faithfully abided by its [Lucknow Pact's] terms ... strong and just though the complaint of the Punjab and Bengal is. I would have had considerable hesitation for a reconsideration of its terms". In 1926 Jinnah still described the Pact as "the finest temporary solution of the difficulty".

The fact was that AIML, finally under the control and direction of the U.P. politicians, was not inclined to reopen the question settled in Lucknow, simply because any revision of the proportion of representation might lead to a decrease in the exaggerated weightage enjoyed by the Muslims of the minority provinces. Jinnah's offer, made in 1927 at the Delhi Muslim Conference, of a joint electorate with reservation of seats fixed in proportion to the population in the Muslim-majority provinces was not made in response to Bengali resentment. On the contrary, it was a bargaining counter used against the Hindus for a series of reforms including largely the interests of the Muslims of the north and, of course, retaining the special privileges given to the Muslims of the minority provinces under the Lucknow Pact.

Still the Bengalis went on drawing the attention of AIML to their complaint, though the League remained lion in acting as a brick wall. On 9 July 1930 A.K. Fazul Haq, Abul Kasem and several other leaders of the Bengal Muslim League issued a joint statement emphasizing the need for revising the Lucknow Pact, calling it "perpetual dependency", and stating in clear terms that they were "no longer willing to adhere to that agreement". To mark its displeasure the provincial League did not send any delegate to the AIML session of 1930 held in Allahabad. Nor did any representative of it attend any meeting of the AIML Council during the consideration of and debate on the electorate issue and the Communal Award of 1932. In the May of the same year, the Bengal League charged the parent body with adopting an "unconstitutional procedure" in the election of Bengali members to the AIML Council. On 10 December 1932 The Musalman reiterated this accusation. The Bengalis were wasting their breath.

In October 1933 a section of AIML met in Howrah to hold its annual session. The Bengal League as a body boycotted it because, among other things, AIML had not deigned to consult it about the holding of a session in the province.

Jinnah's return to India from England and the consequent revival of the League made no difference to the sour relationship between the central organization and the Bengal branch. But now an important and dangerous new strategy was fashioned to bring the Bengalis into line. Instead of ignoring them, it was now decided to deal with them through the provincial Muslim League, but to control this League by imposing on it a non-Bengali Urdu-speaking leadership.

The task of digging the foundations of the future state of Bangladesh had begun – though the consummation was 35 years away.

The Bengal Muslim League did not attend the 1936 Bombay session of AIML. The boycott carried an ominous message, because it was at this session that the League decided to contest the coming provincial elections under the new constitution.



A month later, on 21 May, Jinnah announced the personnel of a 54-member Central Parliamentary Board. Bengal was given 8 seats on it. Neither the president nor the secretary of the Bengal Muslim League was nominated. The appointees were: Nawab Khwaja Habibullah of Dacca, Akram Khan, H. S. Suhrawardy, A. K. Fazlul Haq, Abdul Momin, Abdur Rahman Siddiqui, M. A. H. Ispahani, and Mujibur Rahman. Four of the eight were non-Bengali speaking. On 8 June Jinnah called a meeting of the Board in Lahore. Only 2 members from Bengal attended: Siddiqui and Ispahani: both were non-Bengalis. A still more hazardous step was taken a few days later when Jinnah appointed these very two non-Bengalis as organizers of the new Bengal Muslim League.

In August, Jinnah appointed a 33-member Bengal Parliamentary Board. The membership was divided among the various parties as follows: 15 for the United Muslim Party, 7 for the New Muslim Majlis, 7 for the Bengal Muslim League, and 4 for his own nominees. Later Faziul Haq's Krishka Proja Party joined the Board with 15 members, but Jinnah rejected its demand for the abolition of zamindari. All the four nominees of Jinnah were non-Bengalis: Adam Haji Daud, Faizullah Ganjee, Abdul Aziz Ansari, and Ahmad Ispahani.

In September, the Krishka Proja Party appointed its own 26-member Parliamentary Board, which included 6 to 15 office-bearers of the provincial Muslim League (including its president, secretary, 3 vice-presidents, and one assistant secretary). Simultaneously, the Bengal Muslim League Council formally dissociated itself from Jinnah's Parliamentary Board. This made the Bengal Muslim League an ally of the Krishka Proja Party, rather than a branch of AIML, and it now proceeded to form its own Parliamentary Board, with Nawab Habibullah of Dacca as president, Suhrawardy and Ispahani as joint secretaries, and Adamjee Haji Daud as treasurer. All the office-bearers were Urdu-speaking, and 2 out of the 4 were non-Bengali traders of Calcutta.

In the 1937 elections the Bengal Muslim League won 39 seats (6 urban, 29 rural), the Krishka Proja Party 36 (all rural), and independents 43 (2 urban, 41 rural).

On 26 October 1937, Jinnah appointed a 20-member Organizing Committee to set up a new Bengal Muslim League. Six of these were non-Bengali businessmen (Hasan Ispahani, Ahmad Ispahani, A. R. Siddiqui, Abdul Aziz Ansari, Mohsin Khan, and Mulla Jan Muhammad). Another 4 were from the Urdu-speaking Dacca Nawab family (Habibullah, Nazimuddin, Shahabuddin, and Nuruddin). Fazlul Haq was elected its president, and Suhrawardy secretary. But on 20 December Jinnah appointed a 10-member Working Committee of the Bengal Muslim League, with Akram Khan as chairman, to organize the party. It included 2 non-Bengali businessmen (Ispahani and Mohsin Khan) and 2 Dacca Nawabs (Shahbuddin and Nuruddin). Neither Suhrawardy nor any other provincial ministers who were members of the Organizing Committee were nominated to the Working Committee.

Bengal's representation in the League's central organization was far from what its strength and importance demand. The following figures bear this out.

The League had 3 permanent presidents: the Aga Khan, 1908-1913; the Maharaja of Mahudabad, 1915-1919; and Jinnah, 1919-1930. None was a Bengali.

Between 1906 and 1947 the League held 38 annual sessions, each session electing its own president. Province-wise these 38 presidents had this affiliation: Bihar 2, Bombay 12 (2 plus Jinnah for 10 times), Madras 1, NWFP 1, Punjab 6, Sindh 1, and U.P. 12. Thus the Muslim provinces supplied 11 presidents, the minority provinces 27. There were only 3 presidents from Bengal: Salimullah in 1912, Failul Haq in 1918, and Abdur Rahim in 1925.

As for the venues of the sessions, only 5 of them were held in Bengal: those of 1912, 1917, 1920, 1927 and 1928. One of these was a "broken" session; the League was split into Jinnah League and Shafi League, and the Jinnah League met in Calcutta while the Shah League met in Lahore (1927). So in fact Bengal was chosen as a meeting place only 4 times.

With one single exception, all the secretaries, honorary secretaries and joint secretaries of AIML were from the United Provinces. The exception was of Dr. Saifuddin Kilchlew who held the office from 1928 to 1934.

In 1938-40, out of 23 members of the AIML Working Committee 14 came from the Muslim-minority provinces. At this time the total Muslim population of these provinces was 29.87% of the whole Indian Muslim population, but they were given 225 seats (48.39%) out of 465 elected membership of the AIML Council: whereas the Muslim-majority provinces were allotted 240 members (51.61%) against 70.13% of their population strength.

As Dr. Harun-or-Rashid puts it: "Bengal was never given its due weight in the affairs of the All India Muslim League and the more the League movement was heading towards the ultimate goal the more Bengal was deprived."

The same story of neglect reproduces itself in the matters of annual sessions, office-bearers and other elections and nominations during the later period when Bengal was in the forefront of the Pakistan movement.

Between 1936 and 1943 AIML held eight annual sessions; none met in Bengal. The session held in Calcutta in 1938 was a special session, not an ordinary annual session. No session of any kind was called between 1943 and 1947.

In spite of repeated requests from Bengal, no meeting of the Working Committee or of the Council of AIML was held in Bengal between 1936 and 1947. The province's representation among the office-bearers of the central party was nil, with the single exception of Khan Bahadur Abdul Momin of Burdwan who was elected a joint Secretary in 1941 for one year. From 1937 to 1947, Jinnah (Bombay) was the president, Liaquat Ali Khan (U.P.) the general secretary, and the Raja of Mahrnudabad (U.P.) the treasurer. They were re-elected every year at the annual session. The 23-member Working Committee (the supreme decision-making organ of the party) had only 3 Bengalis. From 1938 onwards all of them were Urdu-speaking: Khwaja Nazimuddin (1938-47), Akram Khan (1940-47), and Hasan Ispahani (1941-47). Even when Suhrawardy was the only Muslim League chief minister in the subcontinent he was not included in the Working Committee. Although Khwaja Nazimuddin was in political wilderness in 1945 and 1946, yet he did not lose his seat in the Committee.

Bengali excommunication extended to all other committees and commissions appointed by AIML. On 27 December 1943, Jinnah appointed a Committee of Action to deal with organizational matters, including the direction, regulation and control of the provincial branches. It was also given the powers to suspend, dissolve or disaffiliate any provincial League, and further to take disciplinary action against any office-bearer of the party. This powerful Committee with such sweeping authority consisted of Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan (U.P.) (chairman), Liaquat Ali Khan (U.P.), G. M. Syed (Sindh), Sattar Ishaq Seth (Madras), Nawab Ifiikhar Husain Khan of Mamdot (Punjab), and Qazi Muhammad Isa (Baluchistan). There was no Bengali on the panel. Simultaneously, a Central Parliamentary Board was named, whose wide jurisdiction covered the supervision and control of the League parliamentary parties in the provinces: it was also to act as the "final court of appeal" in cases of the party's nominations in by-elections and other local elections. It consisted of Liaquat Ali Khan (U.P.), Chaudhri Khaliqzaman (U.P.) and Husain Imam (Bihar).

In August 1944, Jinnah announced the appointment of a Planning Committee to survey the conditions of the areas expected to form parts of Pakistan and to draw up plans for their commercial, agricultural and industrial development. Out of its 23 members only 2 were from Bengal: Ahmad Ispahani and Khwaja Shahabuddin. Both were Urdu-speaking; Ispahani was a non-Bengali; Shahabuddin had no knowledge of economics.

In April 1946, during the Muslim League Legislators' Convention held in Delhi, a sub-committee was appointed to draft a resolution for the consideration of the Convention. Its membership consisted of Nawab Ismail Khan (U.P.) (chairman), Hasan Ispahani (Bengal), Abdul Matin Chaudhri (Assam), I. I. Chundrigar (Bombay), and Chaudhri Ithaliqzaman (U.P.). The only representative of Bengal was an Urdu-speaking non-Bengali businessman of Calcutta.

In October 1946, when the League decided to enter the so-called interim government the party's nominees on the Viceroy's Executive Council were Liaquat Ali Khan (U.P.), Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar (NWFP), Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan (Punjab), I. I. Chundrigar (Bombay). and J.N. Mandal (Bengal). The only Bengali representatives of Muslim India was a Hindu scheduled caste leader. This was the ultimate insult hurled at the Bengali Muslims by the AU India Muslim League in its 41-year history.

Not content with suppressing the Bengalis in the political field, the north-Indian Urdu-speaking Muslims made several attempts to dominate them in the cultural sphere. I will give one example. An All-Bengal Urdu Association had been formed in 1926 by a group of Urdu-speaking Bengalis and north Indian Muslims living in Bengal. Its office was in Calcutta. It held its first provincial conference in Calcutta in July 1933, and adopted resolutions urging the teaching of the Urdu language to Muslim students in all schools and colleges of the province. The Conference characterized Bengali as a "Hinduized and Sanskritized language", and declared that "in the interests of the Muslims themselves it is necessary that they should try to have one language which cannot but be Urdu", without which any cultural rejuvenation of the Bengali Muslims was "next to impossible", M. Tauhid, the founder-secretary of the Association, claimed that "Bengali was as much foreign to the Muslims of Bengal as any other foreign language". Several letters appeared in the *Star of India* in 1933 and the following years protesting against these attacks on the language and culture of the Bengali Muslims.

The Muslim Bengali also felt wronged in the commercial field. The politically aware young section looked upon the Muslim Chamber of Commerce of Calcutta as a non-Bengali concern. Its records were kept in the various languages of upper India, not in Bengali, and the factories set up by the members were staffed by non-Bengali Muslims. Resentment against the Chamber was first voiced in early 1933, and the complaints continued till 1947.

(This bare summary of modern Muslim Bengali history and culture is based on facts drawn from the following works, to which the doubting or curious reader may turn for full details and documentation from original sources, especially the All India Muslim Papers: E. Haq, *Muslim Bengali Literature*, Karachi, 1957; M.N. Islam, *Bengali Muslim Public Opinion as reflected in the Bengali Press, 1901-1930*, Dacca, 1977; Sofia Ahmed, *Muslim Community in Bengal, 1884-1912*, Dacca, 1974; Harun-or-Rashid, *The Foreshadowing of Bangladesh: Bengal Muslim League and Muslim Politics, 1936-47*, Dacca, 1987; Humaira Momen, *Muslim Politics in Bengal: A Study of Krishka Praja Party and the Elections of 1937*, Dacca, 1972; M. A. Rahim, *The Muslim Society and Politics in Bengal, 1757-1947*, Dacca, 1978; Shila Sen, *Muslim Politics in Bengal, 1937-47*, New Delhi, 1976; Muinuddin Ahmad Khan, *The Faraidi Movement*, Karachi, 1965; A.R. Mallick, *British Policy and the Muslims in Bengal, 1757-1856*, Dacca, 1961; and Benoy Gopal Ray, *Religious Movements in Modern Bengal*, Viswa Bharati, 1965).

All this has been virtually omitted by our textbook writers. There is an odd one-sentence reference to Nawab Salimullah Khan in one or two books. A few mention that the All India Muslim League was established in Dacca. One might spot Sayyid Ameer Ali's name among the prominent Muslim figures, but only in 2 or 3 books. A. K. Fazlul Haq makes only one appearance when he moves the Lahore Resolution in 1940. A couple of books contain a paragraph on the Faraizi movement. That is about all that we hear about Bengal, a province which contained the largest single gathering of Muslims in the subcontinent, and in 1947 was to form the most populous part of Pakistan. This deliberate neglect is the result of the standard thesis, propounded in every book, that Aligarh was the centre of Indian Muslim culture (and later Pakistani culture), and the United Provinces was the powerhouse which generated All Indian Muslim political energy. The facts of Bengali history contradict this hypothesis.

Consider the following features of Bengali politics:

1. The Bengali Muslim was less loyal to the British than the U.P. or Punjabi Muslim.
2. He fought the British in three wars (without any help from outside) and suffered much at a time when the Nawabs of Oudh were wallowing in luxury and the grandees of Delhi were either conspiring with the Marhattas and the Rohillas or cultivating the British and receiving pensions from them.
3. Apart from a small number of aristocrats living in Dacca or Calcutta, he had no protectors to speak on his behalf to the British or gain for him the enjoyment of his rights and dues. There were no *taluqdars* and *nawabs* and knights of proven fealty to the British who could intercede for him or use their influence to save him from the predacious Hindu landlord and businessman.
4. He was far poorer than the Punjabi or U.P. Muslim, but more democratic in spirit and more ready to struggle for his rights. The character of his campaigns against the British administration and his fight with the oppressive Hindu *zamindars* proves this. It is also borne out by the fact that he let more of his leaders emerge from the middle class than was the case in any other province. This democratic radicalism was born of his poverty and his education. Bengal had come under British rule long before north India. The Calcutta Madrasa had been founded in 1781 and had introduced the Muslim to modern education.
5. As a result of the above, he was the first to enter politics and form political groups. The earliest Muslim party in India, the Muhammadan Association, was established by Bengali Muslims in Calcutta on 6 May 1855. This was the year when Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan was posted to Bijnore as Sadr Amin, a minor judicial functionary of the East India Company. More groups followed later. Sayyid Ameer Ali, who could see further than Sayyid Ahmad Khan, founded his National Muhammadan Association

in 1877, and when the oracle of Aligarh was preaching abstention from political activity Ameer Ali was opening branches of his organization in Sindh and the Punjab.

6. The educated Bengali had the intellectual and religious advantage of being familiar with Ameer Ali's writings on Islam, which presented an interpretation which was not a whit less radical than Sir Sayyid's but was less verbose and better argued. By writing in English Ameer Ali influenced British and European opinion more than did the Aligarh movement. Later he founded the London Muslim League and, using it as his platform and exerting his personal influence, he was able to persuade the British Government to concede separate electorates to the Muslims of India in the Minto-Morley reforms of 1909. He achieved this not only single-handedly but in the face of all kinds of obstructions and intrigues of the U.P. leadership of the All India Muslim League. A few years later, Mawlana Muhammad Ali and Sayyid Wazir Hasan, both young activists of the Muslim League from the United Provinces, humiliated the grand old man and destroyed the London Muslim League.

7. The Bengali Muslim leadership played an important part in the formation of the Muslim League in 1906 and in its history during the later years. But AIML failed to acknowledge this, by and large ignored the Bengali Leaguers, then imposed them non-Bengali and non-Bengali speaking leaders, and at the last stage of the Pakistan movement threw them overboard. In the 5 nominees of the League in the interim government of 1946-47 there was no Bengali Muslim. Was there no League leader in Bengal even of the status of the nonentities like I. I. Chundrigar, Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar and Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan?

Several more features of Bengali history can be brought forth to underline the importance of the province and the treatment meted out to it by the north Indian Muslims. To conserve space I have listed only a few to make my point that Muslim politics under British rule was not confined to north India, as the textbooks pretend to prove.

The consequences of omitting or belittling the role of the Bengali Muslim in the textbooks may be summed up like this:

1. It is a deliberate and planned suppression of a significant part of the history of India and of Pakistan, and as such it distorts our past and misguides the students.
2. Before 1971, it was criminal negligence to ignore the majority of the population of the country; after 1971, it is even more so, because it conveys to the students the information that East Pakistan was never a part of the country whose history they are studying.

3. The omission played a major role in alienating the Bengali Pakistanis. If Bengal was not a part of Indian Muslim political awakening and cultural renaissance, and acted but a minor part in the Pakistan movement, and it was an unimportant portion of the country, then it had no place in Pakistan. This feeling, created and nursed by the textbooks, first produced tension and conflict, then a civil war, and finally the secession of 1971.

4. The student's mind is being prepared diligently to accept (almost expect) the secession of East Pakistan. It can react in either of two ways: accept the break-up as a desirable development (I know East Pakistan was disloyal and troublesome and not really worth keeping) or treat it as a non-event (I don't know anything about East Pakistan, so I am not interested in its secession). In other words the students are taught to take no notice of the pre-1971 history of the country. Here the devilish intentions and plans of the pre-1971 governments are revealed, and also of West Pakistani authors, scholars and teachers who were accessory to the crime.

5. The secession of East Pakistan destroyed the two-nation theory on which Pakistan was claimed and won. First, because the country based on this theory split apart. Secondly, because the seceder sought help in its war of secession from India which had always, before and after 1947, rejected the major premise on which the theory stood. This aspect of the 1971 crisis is kept secret from the students.

6. The secession demonstrated the falsity of the claims made by our leaders and *ulema* that Islam was the driving force behind the Pakistan movement and the determinant of Pakistani nationalism. When the students, even the senior ones among them are denied the opportunity to gain detailed knowledge of the event and to discuss its implications, they begin to doubt if Islam was really the *primum mobile* of the Pakistan movement. But every book insists and reiterates that Islam was the fast premise of the syllogism of the Pakistan demand: Islam cannot co-exist with Hinduism; therefore, Muslims must separate from India; *ergo*, Pakistan must be created. In the school the student hears a lot about the syllogism, but nothing about its application to the 1971 break-up. That is where he misses his way.

### 3. Desiderata of History

In a short note here I wish to draw the attention of whoever is interested in the teaching of history and the writing of textbooks to some of the major topics which are not dealt with at all in the teaching material, with the reasons which make their study imperative:

1. The Indian National Congress, because it is a part of our joint history, several leading Muslims played important roles in it, Jinnah was a member of it for several years, and the Muslim League negotiated and entered into a pact (at Lucknow) with it.

Even if it is considered an enemy and nothing more, common sense demands that we know our enemy well.

2. The Khudai Khidmatgars, because they were an important Muslim party, they brought political awakening to the NWFP, and they rated the province for 8 out of the 10 years of provincial autonomy.

3. The Punjab Unionist Party, because it was a major party and ruled the largest province of what was to be the post-1971 Pakistan, it supported the Pakistan demand at the all-India level (under the Sikandar-Jinnah Pact), it was wooed by the Muslim League which was keen to win its support, and many post-1946 Muslim Leaguers were former Unionists.

4. The Khaksar movement, because it was popular among a portion of Punjabi middle classes, it had some original features like simplicity, humility and discipline, and its leader, Inayatullah Khan Mashriqi, was a thinker of some standing (though few are aware of it).

5. The Ahrar party, because it was the mouthpiece of a strong-minded religious sentiment, it had some support in the middle and lower middle strata of society, and it was indigenous to the Punjab.

6. The "nationalist" or pro-Congress Muslims, because they were Muslims, they persuaded the Congress to reject Muslim League demands and thus made a Hindu-Muslim entente impossible, and they counted in their ranks some of the ablest men of the modern period.

7. Historiography of India or at least of Muslim India (for senior classes), because it helps in understanding the way history has been viewed and chronicled by various writers in various periods.

8. Theory and philosophy of history (for classes 13-14), because without it the meaning, significance and lessons of history cannot be grasped.

9. Economic, social, intellectual and literary history, because without a knowledge of it the study of political history is a statement without a context. Of course, careful planning is necessary so that parts of this history are taught at various levels according to the age group involved.

10. Modern Islamic thought (from Shah Waliullah to the present day), because the ideas and opinions of Shah Waliullah, Shah Abdul Aziz, Haji Shariatullah, Dudu Minn, Sayyid Ahmad Barelawi, Titu Mir, Karamat Ali Jaunpuri, Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Ameer Ali, Iqbal, Abul Kalam Azad, Abul Ala Maududi, Ghulam Ahmad Pervez and others



have molded the thinking and therefore the politics and culture of the last few generations, and to communicate to the students the results (politics) without telling them about the causes (thought) is to pass on half-baked knowledge and to refuse to answer basic questions. The contents and scope of this topic should be varied keeping in view the ages and classes of the students.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE BURDEN OF RESPONSIBILITY

In the last three chapters we have been dealing with a hair-raising array of logical fallacies, biased statements, irrational distortions, misleading affirmations, hypocritical and self-righteous pronouncements, leaps of imagination and plain inaccuracies. The ephemeral and dubious authority of hearsay and third-hand reports has been given greater permanence and a spurious credibility by the hectoring authority of the written and printed word of the (in most cases) officially prepared textbook.

The variety, outrageousness and ubiquity of the mistakes in these books raise the question: who bears the responsibility for the contents and the quality of the matter presented?

#### The Establishment

The burden of responsibility rests on the official Establishment, the authors and the teachers, in this order.

The government machinery is in action on all levels. It makes the education policy, creates, mans, runs and controls the Textbook Boards, orders the compilation of the books, provides the guidelines to be followed, appoints the authors, revises, checks and corrects the manuscripts, approves the final draft, and publishes and sells the books. All institutions and organizations involved in the long and expensive operation function under the control of the Federal Ministry of Education – the University Grants Commission, the National Review Committee, the Allama Iqbal Open University, and the Quaid-i-Azam University. The federal and provincial governments control jointly all the universities in the country whose teachers are among the authors of these books. The various Textbook Boards are under the administrative control of the provincial governments, but in the matter of textbooks they receive instructions from Islamabad and they are obliged to send each manuscript to the federal capital to be checked, corrected and approved by the review committee. The Government Colleges which supply many of the authors are branches of the provincial education department, and their teachers are civil servants in the fullest sense of the word.

The consistency and frequency with which the errors appear in every book and the uniformity of the bias which makes the writing of it create the suspicion that a master script was prepared by one individual or a small team, and all authors were ordered to follow its contents. The language and details of the prescribed themes and topics were

then tailored to suit each class. This suspicion gains strength from the fact that the exaggerations and distortions of the books relied the official mind.

### **Authors and Teachers**

The authors may have two excuses to offer: that they are employees of the government and therefore not free agents, and that anyway they agree with what they have written. The first excuse is inadmissible. because they offered their services not only voluntarily but backed with entreaties and the pulling of wires. The second is self-incriminatory, because thus they confess to owing allegiance to and spreading lies, and thus misleading the young minds of the country. In both cases, they have made truth an apprentice to expediency. They are more frightened of their superiors than of appearing ridiculous. By thus poisoning the well of knowledge from the bottom upwards they have betrayed the education they received, the profession to which they belong and the trust which have reposed in them.

The teachers are blameworthy on three counts. First, all the authors are from that class. Secondly, their acquiescence in teaching, year after year, what they know to be wrong is a proof of a total lack of probity. Thirdly, they have put themselves in a self-made cleft. If they know that what they are teaching is nonsense they are guilty of being a party to an intellectual crime of immeasurable dimensions. If they believe that they are teaching the right things their "minds know nothing, nothing care to know".

A discussion of the role of the authors and teachers leads to some further considerations.

The authors divide themselves into two classes: serving or retired teachers and educationists. The first category is remarkably representative of the people who have joined, voluntarily or unwillingly, the profession of molding the minds and advancing the knowledge of the young generation. It comes from the major universities (Punjab, Peshawar, Quaid-i-Azam, Allama Iqbal Open) and the best-known colleges of the country as well as from several obscure and third-rate colleges situated in out-of-the-way towns like Saidu Sharif, Kohat, Mandi Bahauddin and Qasur. It includes people with doctorates and other degrees from good Western universities, those with local research training, and those with master's degrees from Pakistani universities (some in two or three subjects, some with gold medals and other distinctions to their credit). Its membership ranges all the way from well-known university professors and directors of research institutes and academies through, heads of departments in good colleges to obscure lecturers in inferior colleges. Similarly, the second category of educationists stretches from vice-chancellors and registrars through senior civil servants to employees of textbook boards. (A complete list of these planners, authors, editors and supervisors is given in Appendix B).

In formal terms both categories are highly qualified, with proper home or foreign degrees, long experience in teaching or administration, and directorship of research institutions. Several of them have been full professors at universities and post-graduate colleges, but without having produced any scholarly work; there are examples of men with degrees from the best universities of the world becoming professors, deans, pro-vice-chancellors and vice-chancellors without even getting their doctoral thesis published. In the textbook boards themselves there are advisers, senior editors, editors, senior subject specialists, subject specialists, and supervisors.

It seems that the makers of the textbooks have every merit except integrity. They have knowledge, otherwise (at least) foreign universities would not have declared them successful. They enjoy some standing in the profession, otherwise they would not be holding respectable academic appointments. They have a reputation of a kind, otherwise the government would not have asked them to write these books. They are neither ignorant nor simple.

But, alas! They have no integrity. I make this accusation on two grounds. First, they have put in the books what they know to be wrong. The young generation of textbook writers (particularly those of it who have had no foreign education) may have one excuse to plead in its defence: that it has been brought up on these books since the 1960s and knows nothing written outside them. But it is a bad excuse, not an explanation or justification. Hundreds of books written by foreign and Pakistani scholars which contain correct information are available in our libraries. The young textbook writer and his editor should have read them. They did not. The older generation (especially those among it who have foreign qualifications in history and allied disciplines) has absolutely nothing to say in self-defence. They know the facts. They have been trained to find out facts. They were taught how to distinguish between true and false evidence. They have forgotten all that they learned. If that is so, they have no right to teach. Or, they remember well what true history is but write something else in the textbooks. They have no right to be authors. That is my first charge: that they tell lies to the students.

The second accusation is even more serious (if anything can be more heinous than telling a lie). By agreeing to write textbooks (in fact, most of them insisted or begged or used other means to be able to do so) they have usurped the right of the school-teacher.

All over the world school-books are written by those who teach in schools. It is their *metier*. They know the mind of the school student. They understand his psychology, his capacity to comprehend new facts, his needs, his absorbing power, his ability to see through a deception. They are aware of the damage a bad book can do to his personality. They are familiar with the natural growth of his brain, and can judge what should be taught to him in this year and what should be added to it in the following year. Graduating and apportioning the teaching material is their job.

There is more to be said for the schoolmaster. He teaches. He alone knows how to feed his flock. He communicates with his class. He establishes a *rapport* with it. He explains what the book says. He amplifies the text. He passes on what he knows to those put in his charge. He answers their questions; he solves their difficulties; he sets the question papers; he examines the scripts; he passes or fails them. He spends 35-40 years of this life among them. They are his living, his focus and hub, his pith and fibre, his mind and breath. They are his life. And he looks after their moral and intellectual welfare at a wage which will be unacceptable to the woman who sweeps our house every looming.

But the school-teacher has nothing to do whatsoever with the preparation of the book from which he teaches every day. He has not written it. He cannot change or amend its contents. He cannot use a different textbook. He has not been consulted about the book which he uses. He cannot suggest changes: nobody would entertain them. He cannot complain: nobody would listen to him. He is not asked for his opinion: nobody is interested in that. He is in a position worse than the student's. The student can refuse to read the book, fail his examination, and leave the school. The teacher has no such option. He will go hungry if he refuses to use the book. The book rules over him.

And who plans and writes and edits this almighty book? The professor of history at the University of the Punjab or the Head of the Department of Political Science at the Government College, Lahore, or an Associate Professor of International Relations at the Quaid-i-Azam University, or the Deputy Director General of Sports of the Government of Pakistan, or the Director of the Quaid-i-Azam Academy, or the Director of the Research Society of Pakistan, or some "subject specialist" of a Textbook Board, or the principal of a college.

None of these learned and highly-placed authors has ever been inside a school since he passed his matriculation examination, which may have been 40 years ago. He has never talked to a schoolmaster, professionally (there is nothing in common) or socially (how insulting even to suggest it!). He has forgotten his schooldays and the books which he read. His own interest in teaching is limited to the salary he receives, the promotion he hopes in get, and the extra money he wants to make. This interest is pursued through occasional lecturing based on old notes. His reading is severely limited. His writings are inspired by greed. If he is studious and fond of seeing his name in print, he writes for the newspapers (but even such a professor is a *rara avis*). If he is diligent and does not want his name to be publicized, he prepares guidebooks. "made easics", notes, guess papers with answers, and solved examination papers of past years; all this brings in money. If he has influence or can borrow somebody's influence, he writes textbooks. But in most cases he writes nothing.

Why is the schoolmaster kept away from writing the textbooks? There are two answers to the question, each illustrative of the society in which we live.

1. The school-teacher is placed so low boils in the civil service hierarchy and in the social scale that he does not count for anything. The primary school-teacher is bracketed with gardeners and drivers. The high school-teacher's salary and conditions of service almost equate those of a WAPDA *chapراسى*. Domestic servants and municipal sweepers have greater freedom of negotiation and, within their own class, more respect than the teacher commands in the community at large. He is only fit "to teach boys and girls" – a phrase in common use in Pakistan to describe the dregs of society. He is not worth even considering as a possible author of a book which every student will read.

2. Textbook writing is a lucrative business. When a book sells a hundred thousand or more copies a year the contract to write it is a prize wools fighting for; even if, as is often the case there are two or three joint authors, It takes about a month to write the book. Set this time against the money that rolls in, and you know why university professors with foreign degrees and senior college lecturers and principals of colleges vie with one another in the field of authorship. Influence is mustered, recommendations are collected, wires are pulled, friendships are used, favors are promised, threats are held out, bribes are given – the competition is tough and the goal a great temptation. Where does the schoolteacher stand in this race? Nowhere. The best qualified person is not even allowed to try. He is only forced to teach from the nonsense written up by a D.Phil. from Oxford or a Ph.D. from Washington or an M.Sc. from London.

It must be said, in passing but with emphasis, that this offers a further explanation for the poor quality of our school education. The schoolmaster, already overburdened with the tensions, disappointments, poverty, inferiority complex and other frustrations of his vocation, now suffers a new chagrin of having no say in the preparation of the book which is his only professional tool and channel of communicating knowledge to his students.

It must also be said, again in passing but with equal emphasis, that the complaints of the college and university professors about the poor standard of the "matriculates" and graduates who clamor for admission at their portals are completely unjustified. They blame the school-teacher for sending them ignorant louts. They forget that these bumpkins were brought up on the stuff written by themselves to make money. Both the professor and the schoolteacher are at the receiving end. The first gets the cash, the second the stick. In each case what is given is undeserved. The professor gets a salary which is larger than his merit, and supplements it with textbook writing, preparation of notes, examinerships, invigilation (which is a gold mine these days) and private illegal tuition (often given within college hours). The school-teacher receives meagre wages, is maltreated by his superiors in the education department, teaches long hours, and cannot afford to house, feed and clothe his family.

It is a strange world in which the unscrupulous and the incompetent professor, not content with what he has, fattens himself at the expense of the already poor school-

teacher, and in his rapacious greed destroys the educational system. I have more evidence to give strength to this conviction.

I wish I had an opportunity to interview the writers of the textbooks and to ask them one straight and hard question: why did you write what you wrote? I am glad to report that at least one answer to this question is on record. To this very inquiry made by Miss Aliya Inam, Dr. Hasan Askar Rizwi, author or co-author of textbooks for classes 6, 7, 9-10 and intermediate, responded with gruff frankness and naive charm. He said that if he had not done it someone else would have. "I just thought I would do a better job than some rigid ideologue." He added that he worked according to a set of guidelines provided to him (by whom?). "We were told what to stress and what to avoid. And even after that, my draft was edited by a federal committee which took out names of people and lines it didn't like". (Aliya Inam, "Telling it Like It Wasn't", *The Friday Times, Lahore*, 19-25 March 1992). And even after that Dr. Rizwi allowed the book to be published under his name. One of the readers of his apology was revolted, called it spurious and dishonest, and made the telling point that "he who subjects innocent and impressionable children to such falsehood would not hesitate to cheat his God" (Barrister Baccha, from Peshawar, letter, *The Friday Times*, 9-15 April 1992).

Ah! Watery consciences do our academic community make.

And the academic community also does not know what it says. Professor Mehdi Raza Beg retired on 5 July 1992 after having taught political science for many many years at the Government College, Lahore, and three days before bowing out gave the world the benefit of his views. "Teaching is not a respectable profession" because there is no rapid upward mobility; he himself had got promoted only twice in 35 years. Nor was he happy with the syllabi "which are based on distortion of facts. We are teaching false things to our generation". He was also scathingly critical of the standard of education. "I hold heads of departments responsible for this. They are least interested in the educational standard of their departments. They have assigned themselves more important tasks like making arrangements for picnic parties and extra-curricular functions. Above all, their most important duty seems to celebrate birthday parties of female students."

And yet Professor Beg is a brazen-faced optimist. There is nothing wrong with the system, he says in the same breath. "The system is all right. It is this very system that has produced so many great people. The same system operated before Partition. The majority of the Indo-Pak intellectuals and leaders were product of this system. Our present intellectuals are a product of the same system." (M. A. Zaidi, "Interview: 'There is nothing Wrong with our Education System—', *Nation*, Lahore, Friday Magazine, 3 July 1992; exactly half the space given to the article is occupied by a nice color photograph of the professor).

The teaching profession is no longer respectable, indeed!

### **History for the Elite**

We must now briefly look at a parallel but different education system and its teachers to find out if money can buy a better knowledge of history.

Private English-medium schools are of two kinds. The great majority matches the official school in quality, premises, facilities, teachers and methods of instruction. Their number tens into thousands in each province. There are said to be 2,000 of them in Lahore alone. They offer nothing different from the government schools except the medium in which they teach, though their standard of English is as low as elsewhere. The only reason for their existence and proliferation is the ambition of the middle class to be seen to belong to the upper middle class. For the fulfillment of this desire it pays at least ten times more in fees and funds.

Then there is a small category of the so-called elite or prestigious schools in big cities, with high-sounding European names, large buildings, prosperous clientele, highly paid teachers, and fees and charges which are exorbitant by any standard and outrageous by Pakistani standards. As there is a lot of money in the pockets of a certain class, they are crowded and bring in huge incomes to their owners. The average teacher is paid three to six times more than the government school teacher. But this does not mean that the staff is qualitatively superior. The teacher's connections are better than his qualifications, and his qualifications better than his abilities. He is a product of the local educational system with a degree from a local university.

Most of these "elite" schools prepare candidates for the British General Certificate of Education which is awarded by the Local Examinations Syndicate of the University of Cambridge. I don't know which special textbooks are used by these schools, but the reports of the chief examiner reflect badly on both the books and the teachers, and fully bear out my criticism of the textbooks.

In the years 1988-90, according to the report of the chief examiner in the paper of Pakistan Studies, a "considerable proportion" of the examinees had a "very unsound" understanding of Pakistani history and culture. Many candidates wrote about the nineteenth century when they were asked a question about the eighteenth. Some confused regional and national languages. The standard was generally low. The candidates failed to distinguish satisfactorily between "ideology" and "history". They "lacked factual knowledge" about the lives of Muhammad bin Qasim and Mahmud Ghaznavi. A few confused Sayyid Ahmad Barelawi with Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan. On Chaudhri Rahmat Ali the answers were "on the whole unexpectedly weak" and "many were very inaccurate": this illustrates "the dangers of cramming too closely from the textbook". In all previous examinations also the candidates showed ignorance about



Bengal in the decision of 1947 and also about the factors leading to the creation of Bangladesh. The examiners were also "surprised that many candidates showed very inaccurate knowledge about the stages in the Quaid-i-Azam's life and political career". Many could not distinguish between the Lahore Resolution and the Objectives Resolution. In questions on education in Pakistan "very few were able to distinguish adequately between the 'quantity' and 'quality' of education".

After making these specific points the chief examiner has some general comments which ought to be quoted here. "Teacher should encourage their pupils to develop a sound and critical approach to the events preceding the foundation of Pakistan, and a factually accurate understanding of the evolution of the country between 1947 and the present day. Candidates for this, and earlier entries, often let themselves down on the 'historical' aspects of the syllabus by showing only a vague, and sometimes inaccurate knowledge of the evolution of Islamic government and institutions in South Asia. On the 'cultural' side candidates seem too easily satisfied with repeating platitudes on matters of tradition and custom without showing any close knowledge of the specific national, regional or local context in which they are being discussed, candidates should therefore be advised to prepare themselves thoroughly by consulting not only the textbook for the course, but also by using other works of reference such as encyclopedias and standard historical texts. They should also be advised to avoid an overtly polemical tone in answering historical questions. Candidates do, of course, hold very committed views on some of the subjects included in this syllabus, but while the examiners welcome the reasoned exposition of all viewpoints, one of the main reasons for the rather poor performance of a large number of candidates reflects a failure to provide supporting evidence for some of the views expressed." (*Islamiyat, Pakistan Studies, School Certificate/GCE, Ordinary Level, Chief Examiner's Report on the November 1989 Examination*, Local Examinations Syndicate, University of Cambridge, Cambridge).

These remarks on the performance of the candidates sent up by our "elite" schools prove that low quality education is being sold at a very high price. And yet the market is booming.

Why do parents send their children to such schools? First, they have more money than they know what to do with. Investing it in the child's education is probably the only sensible use they make of it. Secondly, they belong to the highly Westernized class which prizes fluency in spoken English above the contents of the knowledge received. Thirdly, a GCE facilitates the child's admission to the best local colleges, or enables the above average child to proceed to the advanced level examination, and if he does well in that he may find it possible to enter a British university. Thirdly, in spite of their "good" education, the parents are not aware of the quality of education being given to their child. How many of them read the chief examiners report on the subjects their child studies? Finally, and this is the most important factor, educating your child in

these schools is a status symbol required to prove your credentials for membership of the elite class.

Superficially, there are several advantages of this school system. The student gains confidence, and can express himself in English with some ease (though the quality of his written English is low, as witnessed in the passages from his scripts quoted by the chief examiner; but in our society it is the spoken word which stamps and grades a person, not his ability to write). He is credited with a good background for the simple reason that he went to this kind of school. The most highly respected and admired attribute in this society is the possession of wealth (no questions asked about its origins). That is why these schools flourish. He does better than other candidates when he is interviewed for a job. Family connection, school background and the sound of GCE are enough to predispose any selection board in his favor. This is another reason for the appeal these schools have for the more ambitious parents.

Yet, these "elite" schools fail the final test of the ability to provide sound education. How is their product different from that of the ordinary English-medium school or even of a government school? Only in social status (which the student brought with himself, the school did not bestow it on him), and oral expression in English (which is uncommon but not rare among students of other kinds of schools). Otherwise his mental and intellectual equipment is on a par with that of other students. At least, as far as the compulsory subject of Pakistan Studies is concerned, his knowledge is faulty and inaccurate, his ignorance of elementary facts wide-ranging and profound, his understanding of the question asked slight, his dependence on memorizing without grasping patent, his addiction to sweeping platitudes ineradicable, his preference for ideology over truth conspicuous, and his written English pedestrian if not downright unreadable. These failings are mentioned again and again by his chief examiner.

The textbook is once again the chief culprit. I assume that for British history or physics or mathematics the GCE candidate uses foreign textbooks. But for Pakistan Studies (history and culture) he has to read the local books. It does not matter what fees the school charges or how fluently the teacher lectures or what library facilities are available. As long as the student depends on the Pakistani textbook (and the chief examiner complains that he reads nothing else), his knowledge of history is exactly the same as that of any other student-who goes to a third-rate government school. All the wealth and care lavished on his education are a dead loss because of the textbook.

### **Without Demur**

If the textbooks are as bad as I have demonstrated them to be, why don't Pakistanis speak out against them? Part of the question has been answered by the observations I have made in earlier pages. But let us consider the point further.

Who is going to raise his voice, and why? Usually protest arises from need or ability or courage, or any combination of these three. Are these factors present in our society or in the system under which we live?

Need emerges from want and awareness. If there is something missing in my life and the deficiency angers me, I feel the need to protest. Even then, I may not be able to protest because I don't care or I know that the expostulation will be useless or for some other reason. Even if driven by need and ability, I may still refuse to protest because I am a coward or I fear reprisals or I am weak or I have been asked to keep quiet.

Coming from the abstract to the concrete, who should or can or is going to protest? Not the educational bureaucracy, which has sired these textbooks. Not the historian or social scientist, who has concocted them. Not the teacher who uses them every day, for the reasons given already. Not the student, who can't know the poison he is being fed.

That only leaves us with the parents, the minds of whose children are being damaged systematically, pitilessly and irreparably. But, who are the parents? They are civil servants, military officers, business executives, traders, teachers, doctors, engineers and other professional men and women – all of them products of the same educational system and memorizers of the same textbooks. They do not remonstrate because they don't feel the need to do so. Or, they are the petty shopkeepers, factory labourers, transport drivers, peasants and other members of the proletariat class – all without the advantage of education, who have sent their children to school in the hope that the next generation might be better placed in life than their own. They are eager and enthusiastic and anxious and self-sacrificing. But they know nothing of what their children are being taught. They don't protest because they don't have the ability to do so. As for the mythical abstraction, so greatly favored by the statistician and the demographer and the imprudent social scientist, the "common man" or the "man in the street", such a convenient type does not exist. Or, if he does exist, his mind has been impaired by the radio and the television and the newspapers and the digests as completely and effectively as his child's is being dislocated by the textbook. He does not protest because he does not care.

Thus it has come to pass that the game of educating the child is being played with a reckless abandon which leads straight to disaster because the players, the umpires, the onlookers and the crowd outside the ground have neither the interest in improving the system, nor the knowledge of what is wrong with it, nor the ability to devise a better one, nor the courage to shout a word of warning – not even the strength to shout.

### **The Bitter Fruit**

The indifference of the adults is distressing. But even more grievous is the effect these textbooks have on the mind of the student and, over the years, on the character of the

citizen. It may well sound as an exaggeration to the uninitiated, but as a teacher and a historian I am convinced that most of the ills from which the country has suffered in the past and is still suffering have their root cause in the textbooks in use. The failure of democracy, the long spells of military dictatorship, corruption, moral laxity, deterioration in character, decline in moral values, sense of irresponsibility, terrorism, sectarian strife, inefficiency, cynicism, indifference to what the future holds for us – all this is the bitter harvest from the seeds we use in the cultivation of the minds of the young.

Let me explore the dimensions of the injury inflicted by the textbook on the student's mind. Briefly speaking, the textbooks are training and bringing up the students in ignorance, bias and false logic. Ignorance and bias travel together because one reinforces and encourages the other. Through them the textbooks elevate the prejudice of the society into a set of moral absolutes. They offer carefully chosen prejudices and lies and distortions in carelessly chosen words. The sound of the authors' grinding axes come loud and clear. always adding up the pros, always dismissing the cons, always giving a partial view, always presenting a glorious past and a healthy present and a rose-hued future.

As for arguing logically or telling the truth or facing the reality, the authors of these books, far from pursuing the subjects, do not even stroll in their direction. They are too busy in assaulting common sense. Their dialectic is unruffled by any self-questioning. Have they ever tried to arraign themselves before the bar of intelligence?

Such writers leave a permanent mark on the mind of the student. A generation reared on this stuff is doomed to several crippling disadvantages throughout its life. The student is invited to share the confusion of the author. One example will do. The textbooks go on repeating, presumably in the cause of "national ideology" and under official instructions, that Pakistan is a "fortress of Islam". The school-going student is taught this by his teacher and memorizes the sentence for examination purposes. But from the same teacher and from his parents and other relatives he hears every day complaints about corruption. black-marketing, hypocritical behaviour, police torture, breakdown of law and order and oppression by the government. His mind cannot relate what he reads in the book with what he hears from everyone he meets. The result is confusion past speaking. We offer him only three options: to stop thinking and live in an imaginary world, to equate Islam with all the evils of society, or to develop a split personality. A young, healthy. growing mind has been turned into a schizophrenic.

Secondly, the student is trained to accept historical misstatements on the authority of the book. If education is a preparation for adult life, he learns first to accept without question, and later to make his own contribution to the creation of historical fallacies, and still later to perpetuate what he has learnt. In this way, ignorant authors are leading

innocent students to hysterical conclusions. The process of the writers' mind provides excellent material for a manual on logical fallacies.

Thirdly, the student is told nothing about the relationship between evidence and truth. The truth is what the book ordains and the teacher repeats. No source is cited. No proof is offered. No argument is presented. The authors play a dangerous game of winks and nods and faints and gestures with evidence. The art is taught well through precept and example. The student grows into a young man eager to deal in assumptions but inapt in handling inquiries. Those who become historians produce narratives patterned on the textbooks on which they were brought up.

Fourthly, the student is compelled to face a galling situation in his later years when he comes to realize that what he had learnt at school and college was not the truth. Imagine a graduate of one of our best colleges at the start of his studies in history in a university in Europe. Every lecture he attends and every book he reads drive him mad with exasperation, anger and frustration. He makes several grim discoveries. Most of the "facts", interpretations and theories on which he had been fostered in Pakistan now turn out to have been a *fata morgana*, an extravaganza of fantasies and reveries, myths and visions, whims and utopias, chimeras and fantasies.

How does he react? There are several possibilities. He accepts the new knowledge and rejects everything he had learnt at home, while cursing his native teachers. Or, he hangs between doubt and belief, unwilling to hold his Pakistani teachers to have been liars and cheats, but at the same time unable to reject all that he is now reading. Or, he finds that long years of brainwashing have taken their toll and deprived him of the capacity of independent thinking; he completes his studies as an intellectual non-person, a scholar in limbo, because he does not want to go back without a degree; but he lives a tortured life.

Whichever way he takes out of his predicament, his mind is disturbed and his power of coherent thinking weakened. He carries the mark of quandary with him all his life – neither believing nor disbelieving, not knowing what is wrong and what is right, without convictions or firm opinions, without assurance or faith, without peace of mind, without life's certainties. Our textbooks have reduced him to a tremulous mass of jelly instead of a stable human mind, in a permanent state of perplexity, always caught in a dilemma. His mental and intellectual destruction is completed, past cure, past remedy. He will spend his life repeating *je rte sais gum* like a parrot.

Finally, the textbooks are giving an education in suppressed self. They should have provoked the students, not blindfolded them; created curiosity and inquisitiveness, not brainwashed them: shown the wounds on the body politic, not praised the tyrant who inflicted them: shouted a warning to the young, not sung a siren song. They are producing persons who obey orders, not those who think for themselves. The school

students have become mannequins. Masters bark orders like drill sergeants and demand ready and instant obedience. Instead of citizens with awakened minds, they have given us robots without a mind and without a conscience. In the long run they have given us an ignorant nation which has no care in the world.

### **The End of the Road**

I am sure that the mess that I have discovered in my dismal journey through the textbooks on history, Social Studies and Pakistan Studies is not limited to these subjects. If a few qualified private scholars were to make a detailed and systematic scrutiny of the books prescribed or prepared for the students of Islamiyat, Political Science and English (to take only three important Fields) they are bound to find that the authors have made a similar muddle of things. Then we would know what kind of Islam is being preached in the classroom, what novel political theories and notions and values are being passed on to the young, and which type of English is being taught to our children. Similarly, a study of our textbooks on science would reveal some terrifying facts. Is it too much to hope that someone will extent the scope of my inquiry and dig into other disciplines?

My suggestion is rooted in the vastness of the dimensions of the wrong being done to the nation. Let me explore the size of the area affected by the injury.

By a rough reckoning there are about 25 million students on the rolls of classes 1-14. Add to these the following categories:

1. Private students, who don't attend schools and colleges but study these books and appear in the examinations, approximately a quarter of a million.
2. Students preparing for degrees in law, medicine, science, agriculture, engineering, fine arts, etc., who are obliged to take up Pakistan Studies, say one hundred thousand.
3. Candidates appearing in the competitive examinations held by the Federal and all provincial Public Service Commissions to recruit civil servants of various levels, and more recently the competitive tests devised by the banks to recruit their officer class. These candidates re-read the textbooks or come to them for the first time; all of them prepare for the compulsory paper on Pakistan Studies. Thai is another one hundred thousand.
4. Students studying in the Pakistani schools opened abroad; number unknown.
5. There may be some other categories which I have missed.

With these new figures added to the number of regular students we get a grand total of over 25 million. It is past enduring to contemplate that on every working day of the week 25 million young minds are assailed with inaccurate facts, wrong dates, misrepresentation of confirmed and well-established truths and events, and blatant official propaganda of such crude character.

The assault does not stop here. About one hundred thousand teachers, tutors and professors consult these books every evening in preparation of the next morning's lesson. They read with more attention and care than do their pupils because they have to teach from and out of them. This daily duty done over a length of time becomes a harrowingly efficient engine of brainwashing. That is not all. The trouble spreads to unsuspected places. Other members of the staff, who may be teaching zoology or physics or mathematics, but are interested to varying degrees in national history and current politics, team the "facts" from these colleagues. The staff room pollution touches, say, another half a million men and women.

Assuming that three students come from one nuclear home, we have at least eight million households where these books are in daily use. Many parents take some interest in their children's studies; some coach them; a few read these books casually to kill time or to know what the little ones are being taught at school. Even illiterate parents in the villages and small towns and the slums of the cities learn from the books in their conversations with the children round the homestead hearth. Eight million homes amount to eight million parents (father plus mother), not counting other family members like grandparents, uncles, aunts and older brothers and sisters. In his way the nonsense written in the books is conveyed to another sixteen million persons.

The damage goes still further. Some of the people bred on these books become journalists, columnists and editors of popular magazines and digests. The editors approve for publication the contributions they receive. The writers write according to their lights (lights which have been set burning by these books). About half a million people feed themselves on these magazines and digests and (especially Urdu) newspapers. If each copy of this "literature" is read by four persons on an average, the number of recipients of this distorted information jumps to two million.

Thus millions enter the pen of ignorance without knowing what they are doing.

Of course, there is much overlapping in my figures. The same people are parents as well as digest-readers. Teachers are also parents. And so on. Yet, making all possible allowances for the margin of duplication, we are still left with a very conservative figure of say *thirty million* people being told what they should not be told and hearing what they should not hear. When we recall that this group contains within itself the social and intellectual elite and the actual or potential leadership of the country, we have nothing but stark despair staring us in the face and promising rack and ruin.

Is anybody listening?



## APPENDIX – A

Textbooks examined by Class, Language and Number

| Class          | Number of Urdu Books | Number of English Books |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1              | 2                    | 2                       |
| 2              | 2                    | 2                       |
| 3              | 3                    | 2                       |
| 4              | 3                    | 1                       |
| 5              | 4                    | 2                       |
| 6              | 4                    | 1                       |
| 7              | 4                    | 2                       |
| 8              | 4                    | 2                       |
| 10-Sep         | 5                    | 3                       |
| 12-Nov         | 6                    | 2                       |
| 13-14          | 9                    | 1                       |
| Total          | 46                   | 20                      |
| Grand total 66 |                      |                         |

## APPENDIX - B

### The Makers of Textbooks

List of planners, advisers, authors, editors, revisers and supervisors of the 66 textbooks examined in this work. The first set of parentheses encloses their degrees and ranks, wherever known; the second encloses the classes for which the textbooks were prepared.

Abbasi, Abdul Majid (M.A., B.T., KEd.). (Adviser for 3; convenor, author and chief editor for 4; editor for 5).

Abbasi, Muhammad Yusuf (M.A., Ph.D.; former professor of history at various universities). (Adviser for B.A.).

Afzal, Muhammad Rafique (M.A., Ph.D.; Associate Professor of History, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad). (Reviser for B.A.).

Ahmad, Bashir (Senior Editor for B.A.).

Ahmad, Chaudhri Nisar (Professor of History, Government College, Faisalabad). (Author for F.A.).

Ahmad, Faizan (Principal, Government Degree College, Kohat). (Author for 9-10).

Ahmad, Muhammad Bashir (M.A., History. Gold Medallist: M.A., Political Science; Diploma in International Relations; Diploma in Journalism; Diploma in Library Science; presumably all from the University of the Punjab; Professor of History, Government College, Baghbanpura. Lahore). (Author for B.A.).

Ahmad, Qazi Sajjad (Author for 4).

Ahmad, Tauseef (Research Associate, Institute of Manpower, Government of Pakistan. Islamabad). (Author for B.A.). Ahsan, Malik Amiruddin (Author for 8).

Akhtar, Bashir Mahmud (Editor for B.A.).

Akhtar, Muhammad Salim (Senior Subject Specialist). (Editor for 9-10 and F.A.).

Alam, Muhammad Jahangir (Author for B.A.).

Ali, K. (Professor). (Author for B.A.).

Ashraf, Zarina (Mrs.). (Author for 5).

Aslam, Mian Muhammad (Author for 9-10).

Aslam, Muhammad (Professor). (Author for 7; Editor for 9-10; Author and Reviser for B.A.).

Azhari, Qazi Mujibur Rahman al (Ph.D.; Dean, Faculty of Islamic Studies and Arabic, University of Peshawar). (Supervisor for B.A.).

Aziz, Muhammad Abdul (Ph.D.; Director, West Pakistan Bureau of Education, Lahore: M.A., Aligarh; M.A., London; Ph.D., Indiana). (Author for 5).

Bakht, Iqbal Ahmad (Assistant Professor). (Author for F.A. and B.A.).

Baloch, Ghulam Hasan (of Dera Ismail Khan). (Author for 4).

Beg, Mirza Ishaque (M.A., MEd., LL.B.). (Author for 4).

Bukhari, Muhammad Saleh Shah (Ph.D.). (Editor for 5).

Bukhari, S.A. (M.A.). (Author for F.A.).

Bukhari, Sayyid Masud Haider (Professor, Government College, Sahiwal). (Author for F.A.).

Chaudhri, Khalid Hayat (Research Associate, Institute of Manpower, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad). (Author for B.A.).

Chaudhri, Naseer Ahmad (Professor of Political Science, Murray College, Sialkot). (Author for B.A.).

Chaudhri, Rafique (Professor of History, Government College, Faisalabad). (Author for B.A.).

Cheemah, Ghulam Sarwar (Professor of History, Government College, Lahore). (Author for B.A.).

Checma, Parvez Iqbal (Associate Professor of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad). (Author for B.A.).

Chughtai, Muniruddin (M.A., D.Phil., Oxford: Professor of Political Science, University of the Punjab). (Author and Adviser for B.A.).

Dani, A.H. (Ph.D.; Professor Emeritus of History, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad). (Adviser for B.A.).

Dar, Khwaja Saeeduddin Ahmad (Head of the Department of International Relations. Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad). (Author for F.A.; Author, Adviser and Reviser for B.A.).

Daudi, Matibul Anwar (Author for 3).

Dhanani, Muhammad Rafique (Professor). (Author for 8).

Din, Muhammad (Ph.D., Department of Islamic Studies, University of Peshawar). (Author for B.A.).

Faruqi, Abdur Rauf (Professor. Government Jahanzeb College, Saidu Sharif). (Convenor for 5; Author for 6).

Ghafur, Chaudhri Abdul (M.A.; M.Sc., Aligarh; B.A. Honours, London; Senior Editor. West Pakistan Textbook Board, Lahore). (Author for 6 and 8).

Halim, Muhammad (Subject Specialist). (Editor for 3 and 4; Reviser for 5; Reviser and Editor for 6 and 7; Editor and Supervisor for 8; Editor and Reviser for 9-10).

Hamed, Azhar (Ph.D.). (Author for 4, 7 and 8; Author and Editor for F.A.; Author and Adviser for B.A.).

Hamid, Abdul (M.A.; Ph.D.; Professor of History and Political Science, Government College, Lahore; Professor of History, University of the Punjab; Director, West Pakistan Textbook Board, Lahore; Director, Research Society of Pakistan, Lahore). (Reviser for 6; Author for 9-10; Author and Adviser for B.A.).

Hamid, M.F. (Author for 3).

Haq, Anwaarul (Editor for B.A.).

Haq, Inamul (Reviser for B.A.).

Hashmi, Anwar (Author for F.A.).

Hashmi, Mutahir (Professor, Government Jahanzeb College, Saida Sharif). (Author for 4).

Haye, Khwaja A. (Ph.D.; former Head of Department of Modern Subjects, Pakistan Military Academy, Kakut). (Author for 7).

Husain, Ansar (Professor). (Author for 8).

Husain, Makhdum Tassadaq (Ph.D.; former Professor at the University of the Punjab). (Author for B.A.).

Husain, Zahid (Professor, Government Degree College, Qasur). (Author for B.A.).

Hydari. Karam (Professor). (Reviser for B.A.).

Ibrahim, Asma (Author for 5).

Ilahi, Mariam K. (Miss; Ph.D.; Professor of Geography, University of the Punjab, Lahore). (Author for 3).

Inamuddin, Muhammad (B.Com.; B.Ed.). (Author for 9-10).

Iqbal, Javed (Author for 9-10).

Israruddin (Professor of Geography, University of Peshawar). (Editor and Reviser for 6, 7 and 8).

Jaffery, S. Hamid Ali (West Pakistan Education Service. Senior Class I, retired). (Author for 5, 6, 7 and 8; Reviser for 9-10).

Jafri, Sayyid Munir Ali (Author for 9-10).

Jamil, Khwaja Muniruddin (Ph.D.). (Adviser for B.A.).

Javed, Hifsa (Mrs.; Subject Specialist). (Editor for 3; Supervisor for 4; Author. Editor and Supervisor for 6, 7 and 8; Supervisor for 9-10; Editor for B.A.).

Kakakhel, Muhammad Nazir (Ph.D.; Professor of Political Science, University of Peshawar). (Author for 7 and 8; Author, Editor and Reviser for 9-10).

Kazmi, Ali Shabbar (Author for 3).

Khalid, Alauddin (Reviser for 3).

Khan, Ghulam Abid (Author for 9-10).

Khan, Muhammad Raza (Professor, Government College, Dora Ismail Khan). (Author for 4).

Khan, Muhammad Zafar Ahmad (Ph.D.; Principal, Government College. Asghar Mall, Rawalpindi). (Author for B.A.).

Khan, Nisar Muhammad (Professor, Government Degree College. Mardan). (Author for 9-10).

Khan, Quibuddin (B.A.; B.Ed.. Aligarh). (Author for I, 2 and 3).

Khan, Shahbaz (Ph.D.). (Author for 8).

Khan, Yar Muhammad (M.A.; Ph.D., London; Professor of History, University of the Punjab). (Author for F.A.). Khattak. Timor (Professor of Geography, University of Peshawar). (Author for 8).

Khilji, Alauddin (Professor. College of Education, University of Peshawar). (Author for 3. 6 and 8).

Khokhar, Fida Husain (Author for 3).

Mahmood, Safdar (Ph.D.; Deputy Director General, Pakistan Sports Board, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad). (Author for F.A.; Adviser and Reviser for B.A.).

Mahmud, Sayyid Fayyaz (Group Captain, retired, Pakistan Air Force, Education Branch; former Director of a literary research project, University of the Punjab). (Author for 7).

Malick, Saeed Osman (M.A.; M.Sc.. Econ., London School of Economics and Political Science; Professor of Political Science, GOVERNMENT College. Lahore). (Author for 9-10 and B.A.).

Malik, Bashiruddin (Professor). (Author and Editor for 3, 4 and 5; Author for 7 and 8).

Malik, Din Muhammad (M.A.; Ph.D., Washington; Professor. Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore). (Editor and Reviser for 8).

Malik, Muhammad Abdullah (M.A.; Head of the Department of History, Islamia College, Railway Road, Lahore). (Author for F.A.).

Malik, Nur Muhammad (Editor for 8).

Mallick, Sajjad Haider (Assistant Professor, Gordon College, Rawalpindi). (Author for B.A.).

Mangalori, Mumtaz (Ph.D.; Senior Subject Specialist). (Editor for 3.4 and 5).

Mangalori, Muhammad Zubair (Research Officer). (Author for 4).

Mansur, Nuzhat (Mrs.). (Author for 3).

Mir, Latif (Chief Instructor, Education Extension Centre. Abbotabad). (Author for 6).

Mirza, Muhammad Shafi (Author for 8).

Muhammad, Sufi Ghulam (Headmaster, Government High School, Akbarpura, NWFP). (Author for 5).

Muhammad. Wali (Lecturer in Geography, Islamia College, Peshawar). (Author for 3 and 4).

Muhayyuddin, Ahmad (Ph.D.; Vice-Chancellor, Allama Iqbal Open University). (Adviser for B.A.).

Murawwat, Dilasa Khan (Principal, Jami' High School, Bannu). (Author for 5).

Naheed, Nighat (Author for 6 and 7).

Natig, Abdul Qayyum (former Honorary Professor, Allama Iqbal Open University). (Author for B.A.).

Nisar, Muhammad (Professor, Government College, Mandan). (Author for 7).

Qadeer, Qazi Abdul (Author for 7 and 8).

Qadri, M. H. (Author for 2).

Qarshi, Aftab Hasan (a *hakim* of Lahore). (Author for B.A.).

Qazi, Jalil (Adviser for BA.).

Qazi, Sarfraz Husain (Ph.D.). (Author for 8).

Qureshi, A.Q. (M.A.; Post-Graduate Certificate in Education. Cambridge; Head of Department of Social Studies. Pakistan Air Force Public School, Murree). (Author for 1, 2 and 3).

Qureshi, Anwaarul Haq (Professor, Government College, Gujranwala). (Reviser for BA.).

Qureshi, Muzaffari (Mrs.; Registrar, Allama Iqbal Open University): (Adviser for B.A.).

Qureshi, Sarfraz K. (PhD; Director of Research, Pakistan Institute of Development Economic, Islamabad). (Adviser for B.A.).

Rabbani, Muhammad Ikram (Department of Political Science, Government College, Lahore). (Author for B.A.).

Rafique, Shaikh Muhammad (Professor of History, Islamia College, Civil Lines, Lahore). (Author for F.A.).

Rashid, Muhammad (Adviser for B.A.).

Rasul, Sahibzada Abdur (Professor). (Editor for 6; Author for F.A.).

Rathor, Abdul Humid (Coordinator and Adviser for B.A.).

Raza, Sayyid Masud (Editor for 7).

Riaz, Muhammad (Ph.D.; Department of Iqbaliat, where?). (Reviser for B.A.).

Rizvi, Hasan Askar (M.A.; Ph.D.; Associate Professor of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore). (Author for 6, 7, 9-10 and F.A.).

Rizvi, Sayyia Talmiz Hasnain (M.A.; B.Ed., Gold Medallist). (Author for 4).

Sa'd, Muhammad (Ph.D.). (Reviser for B.A.).

Sadiq, Muhammad ibn-i- (Author for 8).

Sajid, Zakria (Professor). (Author for B.A.).

Saleem, Muhammad (Professor of History, Government Degree College, Mandi Bahauddin). (Reviser for B.A.).



Sayeeduddin (Lecturer in Pakistan Studies, Mehran University of Engineering and Technology). (Author for B.A.).

Sayyid, Javed Iqbal (Professor). (Editor and Adviser for BA.).

Sayyid, Muhammad Aslam (Assistant Professor of History, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad). (Author and Adviser for BA.).

Sethi, Muhammad Ismail (Professor, Member, University Grants Commission, Government of Pakistan). (Adviser for B.A.).

Shafqat, Saeed (Head of Department of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad). (Reviser for B.A.).

Shah, Karamat Ali (University Public School, University of Peshawar). (Author for 6).

Shah, Muhammad Ali (Principal, Training School, Dera Ismail Khan). (Author for 4 and 5).

Shahnawaz (Editor for 3; Supervisor for 4).

Shaikh, Muhammad Hasan (Ph.D.; Professor). (Author for 8).

Sharif-al-Mujahid (M.A.; Ph.D.; Director, Quaid-i-Azam Academy, Karachi). (Author and Adviser for BA.).

Shehab, Raflullah (Professor, Government College, Lahore). (Author for F.A.).

Shibli, Muhammad Siddique Khan (M.A.; Ph.D.). (Adviser for B.A.).

Sibt-i-Hasan (Subject Specialist). (Editor for 3; Supervisor for 4 and 5; Editor for 7 and 8; Supervisor for 9-10; Editor for F.A.).

Siddiqui, Nazir (Author for BA.).

Solangi, Faruq (Adviser for B.A.).

Syed, Farida (Author for 5).

Tariq, Mahmud Ahmad (Professor, Government College, Mardan). (Author for 5).

Umar, Muhammad (Author for 6).

Vaseer, Antinullah (Ph.D.). (Author for F.A.).

Victor, Edgar (Author for 6 and 8).

Yaqub, Muhammad (Professor, Islamia College, Peshawar). (Author for 4).

Yasmin, Firoza (Miss; Ph.D.). (Author for 3; Author and Editor for 4; Author for 5).

Zaman, Sher Muhammad (M.A.; Ph.D.; former Vice-Chancellor, Allama Iqbal Open University). (Adviser for B.A.).

### **Note**

The title of "Professor" in this list should not mislead the foreign reader. In most cases it does not mean anything. In Pakistan, every teacher at a college calls himself by this title, and the authorities have taken no step to stop this practice.

## APPENDIX – C

### Public Reaction

#### Letters to The Frontier Post

**Mrs. Alys Faiz: 7 May 1992**

I follow Mr. K.K. Aziz's "Textbook series" with a great deal of interest and recall a personal experience.

Some few years back, Faiz decided to "take a look" at his second grandson's textbooks, it was early 1984.

The boy was in his 10th Class. They decided to have a get-together daily and go through the text necessary for passing that heinous examination. I can remember some laughter coming from the verandah.

After a while my grandson came into the kitchen and said, "Mama, I shall have to become a hypocrite."

"Well, Nana says if you want to pass your examination reproduce this book. You have no choice. But I have given you an alternative – the truth keep that in mind."

Grandson. I remember, heaved a sigh, then he said, "But what of those who will never have a choice?"

I remember this incident when I read Mr. Aries articles. What of those who live their lives out, unwittingly, as hypocrites, and what of those who make them so?

**Professor M.I. Haq: 11 May 1992**

Your esteemed daily deserves the gratitude of the whole nation for serializing Mr. K.K. Aziz's insightful and painstakingly-written articles (FP, April 17 to May 2) on the howlers, cheap propaganda, disinformation and hypocritical statements contained in our officially compiled and prescribed textbooks, particularly in the compulsory subject of Pakistan Studies, and History at the elementary and secondary levels.

At last someone had the courage and thoughtfulness to forthrightly tell, albeit, warn the parents and the ruling junta what disastrous results will follow from feeding the younger generation on falsehoods, half-truths, slogans, statements tailored to the needs of the martial law regimes and stuff cooked up by faceless panels of writers selling their consciences for the promotion of the designs and short-sighted policies of military regimes.

The cumulative effect of these shoddy textbooks, as summed up by Mr. Aziz, is horrifying and stunning. The inbreeding's from these repetitive, incoherent and subjective books compulsorily prescribed in all schools and colleges of the country generate hypocrites, blindfolded zealots, fundamentalists, intriguers, timeservers and ignoramuses with the highest degrees. Can the nation afford to consign basic education permanently to the vagaries, expediencies and biases of the martial law regimes?

To wake up the bulk of our uneducated parliamentarians, teachers caught in the race for commercialism and tuitions subverting the educational system and, above all, to educate the baffled parents, someone should come forward and collect these articles in the form of a pamphlet, both in Urdu and English, and circulate it widely before constituting a national committee, with Mr. Aziz as the chairman, to probe into the matter and immediately initiate wide-ranging reforms.

I repeal that there has been a simmering against these poorly and hastily written books over the past 25 years, but never has an onslaught been so well-expressed, so incisive and so concrete as the series produced by Mr. Aziz.

I wish Mr. Aziz could issue a corrigenda for the plethora of mistakes and mis-statements he has so diligently compiled, because the authors would not know the correct answers themselves, and this burden of the martial law will continue to be carried by our textbook boards. God knows for how long.

As a teacher of science I know what monstrosities and plagiarisms have been committed in this country in the fair name of the modernization of science textbooks. Most of our science textbooks, right up to intermediate and B.Sc., are wholesale reproductions of discarded American and British books, and the mistakes in these have persisted over the past 22 years. Perhaps I will someday muster courage to follow the example of Mr. Aziz and set the record straight for the prescribed textbooks.

**"Rahnaward": 27 May 1992**

I have studied the series of articles written most diligently and painstakingly by historian and venerable teacher Dr. K. K. Aziz (FP, April 17 to May 4). I have been able to understand the errors pointed out by the learned historian in the prescribed school/college textbooks which have appeared during the last 12 years and fully share

his compassion over the national degeneration on account of their myopic and obscurantist approach.

But on one point I feel rather confused, *i.e.*, the revolt of 1857. No doubt Dr. K.K. Aziz is correct, but my problem is that I should comprehend the idea. Right from article II to article X. the statement "the 1857 events were a War of Independence" is labeled as erroneous. In article X, the learned historian has classified "the revolt of 1857 was a War of Independence or the first War of Independence" as an ignorant, biased and confusing assertion.

To write the history of "national defeat and humiliation" is a very tortuous exercise. The sense of national humiliation disfigures the national psyche. The events of 1857 was not the first War of Independence. In the perspective of world history it was a war of resistance against foreign domination. it was saying "no" to subjugation by the Indian people. It was started with the battle of Plassey and with glorious landmarks of Haider Ali and Tipu and 1857 it reached a climax in 1947 and is still going on.

The British rule in India was not a national government. The British were imperialists and what else could the revolt against them be, if not "War of Independence"? The position of descendants of Taimur (erroneously called Mughal by British historians) was not identical with the British. From the very beginning, the British had no intention of settling down in India, whereas the Mughals assimilated in Hindu society and Persianized it.

In the first half of 19th century India was feudal. There was no idea of western type political parties. Therefore, the success of the revolt would have resulted in the restoration of Mughal Court at Delhi. At that time Muslims or Hindus could have no idea of national liberation movements on the 20th century pattern.

Here I venture to quote a sentence from the book titled *Britain and Muslim India* by Mr. K.K. Aziz:

"They (Indians) witnessed the departure of the East India Company through the haze of their frustration at losing the "War of Independence", and their sullenness was only aggravated by the thought that the British had now come to stay", (p. 24). Perhaps here the learned author has been compelled with a bit of cynicism to express the events in popular parlance.

Had the British not occupied India, the evolution of society would have taken place on quite a different pattern. No doubt our history books reflect a contradiction when they request [*sic.*] the same events as a "Revolt" and 'War of Independence. Therefore, as a student of history I deserve to be enlightened by Dr. Aziz on the subject.

### M. Iqbal Malik: 21 June 1992

You need to be congratulated for rendering yeoman's service in publishing historian K.K. Aziz's views (FP, April 17-May 9 and June 12, 15). He should be complimented for the courage of his convictions.

He, however, has omitted some obvious facts which would allow readers to see 1930 Allahabad address in true perspective without any difficulty. That fact is that Muslim League Session of 1930 was called simply to lend support to the All Parties Muslim Conference resolution passed on 1-1-29.

Allama Iqbal in his historic address said, "I have no doubt that this House will emphatically endorse the Muslim demands embodied in this resolution (1-1-29). Personally, I would go further than the demands embodied in it. I would like to see the Punjab, NWFP, Sindh and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state ... The proposal was put forward before the Nehru Committee. They rejected it on the ground that, if carried into effect, it would give [*sic.*] a very unwieldy state. This is true so far as the area is concerned ... The exclusion of Ambala and perhaps of some districts where non-Muslims predominate, will make it less extensive and more Muslim in population ..."

Allama Iqbal on his own only proposed partition of the Punjab. It is abundantly clear that Allama Iqbal merely expressed liking for the proposal placed before the Nehru Committee. This proposal was originally (talking of only political leaders) made by late Maulana Shaukat Ali submitted it to the Nehru Committee (Zinda road, pp. 323 and 386).

With regard to the proposal and its rejection by the Nehru Committee, the Report says ... [here follows a long discussion on Iqbal, which is not relevant to the subject of textbooks. Then he continues].

The above quoted letter of Allama Iqbal is repeatedly held forth to prove that Allama Iqbal had selected Quaid-i-Azam to lead Muslims. Director of Iqbal Academy says (p. 16 of *Dimensions of Iqbal*), "One thing more. It was Allama Iqbal who called upon the Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah to lead the Muslims of India to their cherished goal. He preferred Quaid-i-Azam to all other Muslim leaders."

The Director then quotes Allama Iqbals letter on 21st June. I most respectfully say that Allama Iqbal of blessed memory had to write this because Quaid-i-Azam did not show interest in corresponding with Allama and the meeting requested by Allama did not take place. Quaid-i-Azam replied only two of the 13 letters (dated 28-5-37 and 21-6-37).

Textbooks, on the other hand, have no qualm in attempting to show that Quaid-i-Azam was politically a tenant at will of Allama Iqbal who after laying plans for establishment of a state conferred leadership of Muslims on Quaid-i-Azam (may Allah bless him).

A textbook article on the life of Quaid-i-Azam profusely praises Iqbal who is credited to have mainly played up (uch-chala) the themes of Iqbal and that Iqbal wrote him a letter to persuade Quaid-i-Azam to return to India and that other leaders were not worthy of trust.

No government agency, not even the powerful Wafaqi Mohtasib has taken cognizance of the blasphemous writing (*Qawaid-i-Insha Urdu* for Class X). Quaid-i-Azam's own letters to late Choudhry Abdul Matin are conveniently ignored. No efforts are spared by Iqbal Academy to belittle Quaid-i-Azam to upgrade Allama Iqbal as prescient politician.

Quaid-i-Azam is not spared even on 11th September and 25th December articles. One of these articles was read and published during Quaid-i-Azam's centenary celebrations.

Who will expurgate the blasphemous writings; sanctity of the sacred Pakistan freedom movement is holier than any individual. Let us save *Quaid-i-Azam to save Pakistan*.