

PAKISTAN AND THE MUSLIM WORLD

Author(s): Mohammed Ahsen Chaudhri

Source: *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (September, 1957), pp. 156-166

Published by: Pakistan Institute of International Affairs

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41392316>

Accessed: 05-04-2020 07:23 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*Pakistan Institute of International Affairs* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Pakistan Horizon*

of a people, takes into account the eugenic as well as euthenic improvement of the population.”<sup>1</sup>

Every under-developed country should take care of its own population. The United Nations, however, should help and encourage the countries that make a sincere and determined effort to bring the population growth under control. Arrangements may be made to encourage sterilization laws. Every country should realize the need for the adoption and enforcement of appropriate marriage and reproduction qualifications. Though it is not worthwhile for the people of under-developed countries to rely on American aid, it is, no doubt, worthwhile for the American people to find an opportunity to prove their leadership in the new field of international relations by making arrangements for the establishment of a world population organisation. This organisation, as Ferenczi puts it, “should build a real, generous and durable peace enlisting the loyalties of free men and encouraging the adherence of subjugated nations.”<sup>2</sup>

---

## PAKISTAN AND THE MUSLIM WORLD

Mohammed Ahsen Chaudhri

Pakistan came into being because the millions of Muslims of the sub-continent felt that as a minority their culture and religion would suffer a great set-back. Having established their independent state after many years of struggle, it is natural for the people of Pakistan to wish zealously to safeguard its territorial integrity. This is the most important factor in Pakistan’s foreign policy. The next is culture. As Muslims, the majority of the people of Pakistan have strong religious and cultural affinities with Muslims in other lands. In fact, the same urge which brought Pakistan into being binds its people with ties of irresistible fellow feeling and affection to other Muslim peoples. As the late Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan declared: “In fact, one of the main objects of the All-India Muslim League, which brought Pakistan into existence, was to cement and strengthen fraternal ties between Muslims of the subcontinent and those of other parts of the world. The underlying idea of the movement for the achievement of Pakistan was not just to add one more country to

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul Meadows, ‘Toward a Socialized Population Policy’ in *Population: Theory & Policy*, edited by J. J. Spengler & O. D. Duncan, The Free Press, Glencoe, 1956, p. 450.

<sup>2</sup> Imre Ferenczi, ‘Freedom from Want and International Population Policy’, *American Sociological Review*, October 1943, p. 542

the conglomeration of countries in the world, or to add one more patch of colour to the multi-coloured global map. Pakistan came into being as a result of the urge felt by the Muslims of this sub-continent to secure a territory, however limited, where the Islamic ideology and way of life could be practised and demonstrated to the world. A cardinal feature of this ideology is to make Muslim brotherhood a living reality. It is, therefore, part of the mission which Pakistan has set before itself to do everything in its power to promote closer fellowship and cooperation between Muslim countries.”<sup>1</sup>

Muslims all over the world, as is well known, have a common outlook and a common cultural heritage, which binds them together. Indeed, what happens in one Muslim country has its repercussions in the others. In the words of Khwaja Nazimuddin, “Islam is a body and the Muslim states represent the limbs of that body. Pain inflicted on any one part of the body gives pain and anguish to the whole body.” Even before Pakistan came into existence, the Muslims of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent always felt a deep concern about the Muslims living in other countries. For instance they felt outraged at the treatment meted out by the Allies to defeated Turkey after World War I. They protested against the terms of the Treaty of Sevres, which aimed at dismembering the Ottoman Empire. Consequently, the British Government of India was compelled to urge upon the Government in London the necessity of Indian Muslim sentiment being taken into account in peace making with Turkey.

The founder of Pakistan, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, repeatedly declared that Muslims all over the world should follow the path of mutual consultation and cooperation, because only thus would they be able to make rapid progress. “If the Western democracies can enter into pacts to protect their way of life, if the Communist countries can form a bloc on the basis that they have an ideology”, declared Liaquat Ali Khan in 1951, “why cannot the Muslim people get together to protect themselves and show to the world that they have an ideology and a way of life, which ensures peace and harmony for the world.”<sup>2</sup> He strongly felt the need for promoting the economic development of the Muslim countries and of raising the standard of living of their people.

The first International Islamic Economic Conference, held in Karachi in November 1949, provided an opportunity to the representatives of the Muslim world in the field of trade, industry and finance to get together to discuss matters of mutual interest. The Muslim countries are rich in

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pakistan News*, Karachi, 18 February 1951, pp. 66-67

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 15 July 1951, p. 269.

natural resources, which, due to lack of technical knowledge, they cannot exploit fully to their advantage. On account of this well-known handicap, it was not expected that the first International Islamic Economic Conference would produce any spectacular results. After eleven days, the Conference ended with the declaration that the participating countries would cooperate amongst themselves for cultural and economic purposes. The Conference gave a stimulus to Pakistan's policy of strengthening friendship between the Muslim countries.

Two years later, the World Muslim Conference, or the Motamar-e-Alam-e-Islam, as it is called, met in Karachi. The object of this gathering was to link the Muslims of the world socially and culturally and to inculcate in them the true spirit of Islamic brotherhood. The Motamar enjoyed the blessings of the Pakistan Government. After a long discussion, the delegates dispersed with the resolve that, in order to achieve their goals, it was necessary that Muslims all over the world should first attain their freedom. This already was an article of faith with Pakistan.

Pakistan was determined not only to safeguard her own freedom but also to strive for the liberation of all Muslim communities that were under foreign domination. For instance, Pakistan resolutely opposed the partition of Palestine, and the creation of a Jewish state. Speaking in the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Zafrullah Khan had warned the Western powers of the consequences which would flow from the partition of Palestine. He said: "Remember, nations of the West, that you may need friends tomorrow and allies in the Middle East. . . . In the hearts of the population of all the countries from the North African Atlantic coast to the steppes of Central Asia, you sow doubt and mistrust of the designs and motives of the Western powers. You take the greatest risk of impairing, beyond the possibility of repair, any chance of real cooperation between East and West, by thus forcibly driving what in effect amounts to a Western wedge into the heart of the Middle East."<sup>1</sup>

Pakistan's resolute support of the cause of the Palestine Arabs was widely appreciated in all Muslim countries. The Egyptian newspaper, *El Misri*, in its issue of 16 April 1949, wrote that the name of Zafrullah Khan, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, deserved to be mentioned with deep appreciation for his support of the Arab viewpoint. "This noble attitude", it added, "is a link in the chain of similar attitudes of this Islamic country, which is tied with the Arab East with most durable and strong relations."

---

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the Second Session of the General Assembly, Plenary Meeting, p. 1367.

So far Pakistan has not recognised the state of Israel; nor does she intend to do so. The Government of Pakistan has throughout taken the stand that the partition of Palestine was legally wrong and morally unjust. The 1947 Resolution of the General Assembly which created the Jewish state was of course opposed to the principle of self-determination.

Apart from supporting the Arabs on Palestine, Pakistan championed the cause of the independence of Indonesia, Libya, Somaliland, Eritrea, Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria. In 1949, when Dutch forces attacked Indonesia, Pakistan reacted to it as if she herself was the object of their attack. Dutch aeroplanes and ships carrying troops, arms and other material for the war against the Indonesians were debarred from using any airfield or port in Pakistan. Pakistan joined in the efforts that were successful to persuade the Great Powers to put pressure, inside as well as outside the United Nations, on the Netherlands to stop hostilities in Indonesia.

In 1951, the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies came before the General Assembly. Pakistan immediately lined up with the other smaller nations against the Western powers, who wanted to hand the colonies back to Italy. Pakistan strongly pleaded for the immediate unity and independence of Libya. Pakistan also opposed Italian or French trusteeship over any part of that country. Eventually, the General Assembly decided that the whole of Libya should become independent by January 1952. The General Assembly also appointed a Commission, with Pakistan as one of its members, to prepare the ground for the setting up of a National Assembly to frame the constitution for Libya. This development was welcomed in Pakistan with satisfaction and relief.

As regards Eritrea, Pakistan was against its incorporation into Ethiopia, and proposed that it should be made an independent state by 1 January 1953. The Western Powers, however took the view that an independent Eritrea would not be viable economically. This argument was merely an excuse to deny to the people of Eritrea their right of self-government. "An independent Eritrea", the representative of Pakistan told the General Assembly, "would obviously be better able to contribute to the maintenance of peace than an Eritrea federated with Ethiopia against the true wishes of the people. To deny the people of Eritrea their elementary right to independence, would be to sow the seeds of discord and create a threat in that sensitive area of the Middle East."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the Fifth Session of the General Assembly, *Ad Hoc* Committee, p. 346.

As regards Italian Somaliland, Pakistan was keen on securing the independence of that colony. However, this was not agreed to and it was decided that Italian Somaliland should for ten years be under U.N. Trusteeship with Italy as the administering power.

Pakistan's sympathy for North African Arabs struggling to be free found manifestation in mass meetings and demonstrations against France. In 1951, the French attempted to crush the Moroccan liberation movement by repressive means. This added to the unrest in Morocco. The nationalists turned to the United Nations for the reparation of their grievances. But France declared that Morocco was no concern of the United Nations. At that stage the Foreign Minister of Pakistan strongly urged the General Assembly, which was then meeting in Paris, to put the Moroccan question on its agenda, pleading that France was violating the provisions of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.<sup>1</sup> But nothing was done about this question, affecting six million people because the United Kingdom and the United States were unwilling to annoy France. The same thing happened when the problem of Tunisia came before the United Nations.

Lately, deep concern has been felt in Pakistan for the Algerian situation. All political parties in Pakistan have condemned French atrocities in Algeria and demanded independence for Algeria. Some of these parties, it was reported, even sent delegations to the United States Ambassador in Karachi, requesting him to urge his Government not to allow United States arms to be used against the Algerian patriots.

The leaders of Tunisia and Morocco, which are now independent countries, no doubt remember the support given by Pakistan to their struggle for freedom. In their turn, they are now supporting Pakistan on the Kashmir issue. In February 1957, the Prime Minister of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba, wrote a letter to the Prime Minister of India, urging him to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir under the supervision of the United Nations. It is regrettable, however, that Pakistan has not yet established a diplomatic mission either in Morocco or Tunisia.

Pakistan's closest cultural relations, in an active sense, are with Iran, Iraq and Turkey. The ancestors of many of the people of Pakistan came from these countries. Iran is an immediate neighbour of Pakistan and the two countries have had constant intercourse for ages. The influence of Iranian art, literature and social customs is still very strong in Pakistan.

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the Sixth Session of the General Assembly, Plenary Meeting, p. 243.

In 1951, when the Shah of Iran paid a state visit to Pakistan, he was received with great enthusiasm by the people which demonstrated how close are the two countries to each other.

There are in Pakistani culture distinct traces of Turkish influence, derived from central Asian Turks, who for centuries ruled over the sub-continent. In the contemporary period there has been deep sympathy for Turkey. Consequently no one was surprised when in April 1954, Pakistan entered into an agreement with Turkey for friendly cooperation in the defence, political, economic and cultural spheres.

Pakistan's pact with Turkey which led to the Baghdad Pact was not liked by the Arab League or by Egypt which was playing the role of the leader of the Arab world. In 1952, Pakistan had suggested a meeting of the representatives of the Arab states and Afghanistan, Indonesia, Iran, Libya and Turkey for the purpose of "discussing a system of consultations on matters of common interest." But most of the Arab states gave a cold shoulder to the proposal. This greatly disappointed the people of Pakistan. The Arab states were far too occupied with disputes *inter se* to be disposed to hold such a conference. Moreover, with the exception of Iraq, they were not prepared for alignment with non-Arab states. In April 1951, Turkey had proposed a treaty to Iraq recalling the Sadabad Pact of 1937 and the Turco-Iraqi Treaty for Friendship of 1947. The Arab states opposed the idea of an Iraq-Turkey Entente and it was eventually dropped. The Arab opposition to an alliance with Turkey could be attributed partly to Turkey's recognition of Israel and partly to Turkey's long standing dispute with Syria over Hatay Province, which was transferred from Syria to Turkey under the French mandatè.

The Arab states themselves did not seem to be interested in strengthening their defences. In January 1954, the Prime Minister of Iraq, Fadil-Jamali, had offered to the Arab League Council a plan for the political unification of the Arab states. He had also expressed Iraq's readiness to contribute from her oil revenue heavily to the maintenance of an Arab army. As nobody, with the exception of Jordan, responded favourably, the proposal was shelved. The attitude of most of the Arab League states, led by Egypt, was one of neutrality. However, Egypt, before the Turco-Pakistan agreement was signed, had declared that so long as her dispute with Britain over the Suez Canal zone lasted, she would not join any defence pact. This had led to the assumption that Egypt, after the settlement of the Suez Canal dispute, might join a pact. But this assumption

turned out to be wrong because the Egyptian President described it as “a manoeuvre to split up the Arab world.”<sup>1</sup>

Iraq was the only Arab country interested in regional security; she did not oppose the Turco-Pakistan Pact. Ten days after the signing of this Pact, King Faisal of Iraq paid a state visit to Pakistan. After his return to Baghdad, it was reported that the King and his Prime Minister had agreed that an alliance with Turkey and Pakistan was the best alternative to the proposal turned down by the Arab League in January 1954. But Iraq’s entry into this alliance was also opposed by Egypt. On March 22, 1954, the Foreign Minister of Egypt informed the American Ambassador in Cairo that Egypt would resist “by every means” Iraq’s joining the Turco-Pakistan Pact, because it “tended to weaken Egypt and her cause.”<sup>2</sup>

Despite Egypt’s opposition, Iraq, on 24 February 1955, formally signed a defence pact with Turkey. One month later, Britain joined the Turco-Iraqi Pact. On 23 September 1955, Pakistan joined the Turco-Iraqi Pact, which then became known as the Baghdad pact. Shortly afterwards, Iran also joined it.

The Baghdad Pact was conceived as a step for strengthening its Muslim members economically, politically and culturally. In fact, the Pact represented an attempt to maintain peace and stability in the Middle East and to put an end to subversive movements aimed at overthrowing established governments in the area. Besides, it guaranteed increased economic and technical aid for the development of natural resources of the member countries.

However, the critics of the Baghdad Pact could not reconcile themselves to Britain being its member. They vehemently argued that the threat to peace and stability in the Middle East always came from Britain. Therefore, Pakistan should not have joined a Pact, of which Britain was also a member. Even Radio Mecca, commenting on Pakistan’s accession to the Pact, expressed surprise and astonishment in these words: “Is it . . . possible for any person to believe that an Islamic state as that of Pakistan should accede to those who have joined hands with Zionist Jews.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Dawn*, Karachi, 2 February 1954.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 22 March 1954.

<sup>3</sup> *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, 26 September 1955.

Despite Egypt's opposition to the Baghdad Pact, there was no anti-pathiness in Pakistan towards Egypt. In 1954, when the Suez Canal Company was nationalised, Pakistan supported Egypt against the Western powers, who had decided to take concerted action to meet what they called Cairo's threat to international navigation. "Egypt has every right to nationalise the Suez Canal Company," declared the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. "But", he added, "we are vitally interested in the freedom of the use of the Suez Canal by ships carrying goods for all nations."<sup>1</sup>

It was a fact that the closing of the Suez Canal would interfere with the flow of goods to Pakistan from the West, and vice-versa, causing serious repercussions on Pakistan's long-term plans of industrialization and development. Despite that, Pakistan opposed any solution being imposed on Egypt against her will, and insisted on a solution which should be peaceful and satisfactory to all. During the first London Conference on Suez, which was attended by 28 nations, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan proposed that the nationalization of the Canal Company by Egypt be accepted as a *fait accompli* and that the problems of financial settlement and compensation be considered separately by the parties concerned. An effective machinery, he further proposed, should be set up in collaboration with Egypt to ensure the efficient, unfettered and continuous freedom of navigation to all nations. Pakistan succeeded in persuading the Western powers to accept her proposals, which were finally incorporated in the Dulles Plan, that was later renamed as the Five-Power Plan.

But after the failure of the mission of Mr. Menzies, who visited Cairo to present the Five-Power Plan to President Nasser, the Western powers formed a "Users' Association" to run ships through the Suez Canal. Pakistan refused to associate herself with the Users' Association, because it ran counter to the resolve of the first London Conference to obtain a peaceful settlement of the Suez dispute by negotiations. Furthermore, at the second London Conference on Suez, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan insisted that the Western powers should abandon the Canal Users' Association. Instead, he proposed that the Users invite Egypt to negotiate with them.

In October 1956, Egypt was invaded by Britain, France and Israel. Pakistan lost no time in condemning aggression against Egypt. Prime Minister Suhrawardy, who had just returned to Karachi from a trip to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Dawn*, Karachi, 3 August 1956.

China, immediately sent for the British High Commissioner and told him that if Britain did not stop aggression against Egypt, Pakistan would withdraw from the Commonwealth, and that, the Baghdad Pact would be liquidated.<sup>1</sup> Besides, the Muslim members of the Baghdad Pact, who met in an emergency meeting in Teheran, unanimously called on Britain and France to cease hostilities and to fully respect Egypt's sovereignty. The strong pressure brought on Britain by Pakistan and the Muslim members of the Baghdad Pact was one of the contributory factors in the cessation of hostilities against Egypt.

The Baghdad Pact thus proved its usefulness, however, limited. Encouraged by it, the President and the Prime Minister of Pakistan, in November 1956, made a tour of the Middle Eastern countries. They not only visited Iran, Iraq and Turkey, but also the Lebanon and Saudi Arabia. Their aim in visiting the Lebanon and Saudi Arabia it seemed, was to invite them to join the Baghdad Pact and to evolve a common policy to meet future dangers in the Middle East. Their efforts did not go in vain. They succeeded in helping the Lebanon and Saudi Arabia to have a better understanding of the aims and objectives of the Baghdad Pact and in persuading Turkey to break off diplomatic ties with Israel.

During his tour of the Middle East, Prime Minister Suhrawardy expressed his desire to visit Cairo to meet President Nasser. But President Nasser turned down the request. This deeply hurt the people of Pakistan. Following this incident, President Nasser refused to accept from Pakistan any contribution to the United Nations' Emergency Force in Egypt. It caused great annoyance to the people of Pakistan, who only a few days before, were offering to fight on the side of Egypt. The leading newspapers of Pakistan came out with editorials accusing President Nasser of playing into the hands of India and the Soviet Union.

President Nasser, it appeared, was wrongly advised at least on some matters relating to foreign affairs. On 24 April 1957, Prime Minister Suhrawardy, while on a visit to Tokyo remarked: "If Egypt had joined the Baghdad Pact in the first place, she would not have had to fear Israeli aggression, as the United States and Britain would have guaranteed Egypt's security,"<sup>2</sup> But the desire of Egypt to pursue an independent foreign

---

<sup>1</sup> *Dawn*, Karachi, 1 December 1956

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 25 April 1957.

policy, which as a matter of fact had an anti-West taint, seemed to open the way for Communist penetration into the Middle East. To avert this danger, it became more than ever necessary to strengthen the Baghdad Pact. Pakistan, Iran, Iraq and Turkey, therefore, requested the United States to join the Baghdad Pact and to take some concrete steps to improve the situation in the region. The United States, although she refused to join the Baghdad Pact, declared on 29 November 1956, that "she would view with the utmost gravity any threat to the territorial integrity or political independence of Pakistan, Iran, Iraq and Turkey."

Following this, President Eisenhower proclaimed his famous Doctrine for the Middle East, which provided for the use of American military force to "protect the territorial integrity and political independence" of any Middle Eastern state requesting such aid against communist aggression. The United States, through the Eisenhower Doctrine, underwrote the continued freedom of the Middle Eastern countries. A similar policy in South East Asia and Western Europe, through NATO and SEATO, has not been challenged by the Soviet Union so far. That explains why Pakistan and the other members of the Baghdad Pact welcomed the Eisenhower Doctrine. Thus, in the final communique, issued at the end of their conference in Ankara in January 1957, it was stated that the principles embodied in the Eisenhower Plan "were best designed to maintain peace in this area and advance the economic well-being of the people".<sup>1</sup> It was also noted that the Doctrine was not designed to create a sphere of influence or to enslave the people of the Middle East.

Apart from what has been discussed already, Pakistan was convinced that the Muslim countries could not afford to remain neutral or sit on the fence without harming their national interests. They needed economic and military aid to gain strength, in order to live safely in this dangerous world and to resume their forward journey. Only the West, particularly the United States, could supply such aid. The critics of the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower Doctrine argue that the Soviet Union could also provide economic and military assistance. But it is a question of choosing an ideology. Once a country has received aid from Russia, Russian influence and even Communism are bound to seep through.

The United States has decided to transfer to the Middle East, without any strings attached, \$200 million under the Eisenhower Doctrine, to

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, 22 January 1957.

assist any nation or group of nations in the development of their economic strength. The Muslim members of the Baghdad Pact, who have their programmes of economic development of the region, are bound to benefit from it. In June 1957, the United States, during the Baghdad Pact Council meeting in Karachi, announced an allocation from the Eisenhower Doctrine funds of \$12.5 million for tele-communications and other projects approved by the Council. The United Kingdom quadrupled her offer of technical assistance and raised it to £1,000,000. Besides she agreed to spare an eminent scientist, Sir John Cockcroft, to act as Chairman of the Pact's Nuclear Training Centre at Baghdad. Without this assistance from the United States and the United Kingdom, it would be impossible to execute the plan for highway and railroad construction or for the development of tele-communications between the Muslim countries of the Baghdad Pact.

Pakistan makes no apologies for the policies she is following. It is a matter of regret to her people that these policies are not acceptable to several other Muslim states and are even resented by some of them. But Pakistan is guided by considerations that are of importance to her. However, in matters of common concern to the Muslim world Pakistan does not hesitate or falter in cooperating with other Muslim countries.

---

## THE TUSSLE ABOUT WEST NEW GUINEA

Aziz Ahmed Khan

The significance of the conflict over West New Guinea lies in the fact that it indicates the dangerous nature of the situations which have arisen or may arise out of the clash between Asian nationalism and Western nations. The respective positions of Netherlands and Indonesia in this controversy are so far apart, national feelings on the question in both countries so strong, the interests of some outside powers in the matter so great, and the implications of a possible armed clash so far reaching, that West New Guinea has become the crucial trouble spot in South East Asia.

The island of New Guinea is situated between Eastern Indonesia and Australia. It is divided almost equally between East New Guinea and West New Guinea. Prior to 1947, the eastern portion of the island was administered in two sections. Paupa and the mandated territory of New Guinea, was administered by Australia under a U. N. trusteeship. The