Iqbal was a poet, religious philosopher, political activists, and supporter of autonomy to Muslim majority provinces in British India, but cannot be regarded as the ‘main’ architect of Pakistan. His basic concern was over the falling status of Muslims of India during British rule and ways to arrest the situation. His speech in 1930 at Allahabad session of the All India Muslim League is being always cited as his support to Pakistan, but later on he never made his position very clear over the issue of partition of British India. Yet his contribution to the formation of Pakistan cannot be entirely ruled out because he was speaking out the minds of the Muslim minorities who, by 1920s, not only raised the demand, but started whispering about having a separate socio-political space. He was a towering figure of Islamic modernism, a great poet and also a religious philosopher, whose thinking still has considerable significance. His writings are still being read and researched in India and Pakistan.

Why was British India partitioned? Was the partition of India inevitable? These two and many more questions still haunt the historians and people from India and Pakistan. In the past many reasons have been explained, discussed and debated, still the research puzzle remains unsolved. For the time being, even if one seals the debate over reasons for the partition, another pertinent question is: Who was an architect of Pakistan? This is related to the above question, and has been equally debated. For this there is a list of claimants, who some way or the other are regarded as an architect of Pakistan, but the front runners for this coveted status in Pakistan are: Mohammad Iqbal popularly known as “Allama” Iqbal, and Qaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah. The debate started soon after the demise of Jinnah in 1948. Sayyid Abul Ala Maududi, leader of Jammat-i-Islami, who was against partition of British India and called Jinnah as Kafir-i-Azam, became powerful in the country he opposed to be formed. He wanted to replace Jinnah with a different nationalist icon with which the Jammat could more easily claim affinity. It settled on Muhammad Iqbal, though Iqbal’s religious views were in glaring contrast with those of Maududi’s. Iqbal was a towering figure within the Muslim modernist movement in late colonial India, but his investment in pan-Islamic Muslim identity and politics made him easier to co-opt than the uncompromisingly secular Jinnah.

Obviously, the role of Mohammad Iqbal cannot be entirely ignored, but it was Jinnah who made Pakistan a territorial reality. In this paper an attempt is being made to look into the following questions: How much did Iqbal’s philosophy on Islam boost a sense of separatism among the Indian Muslims?
Was Iqbal in favour of partition of India into two separate sovereign countries? It will also talk about the context in which Iqbal was writing and conditions of Muslims in colonial India. This paper has relied on published letters of Iqbal, his translated works, and a number of works analysing his poems, politics and philosophy. On the issue of partition of British India in 1947, the author does not support the bargain theory but did believe that the population played a role, at least in the last hours of the partition of British India.

Islam in Indian sub-continent

As the conditions of Muslims and Islam in pre-partitioned India provided a context in which Iqbal’s religious-cum-political ideas germinated, it is important to understand both. In contradiction to what is taught in school textbooks, the first connection of Islam with the sub-continent was through trade and commerce. Arab traders came first, their religion followed. Trade brought them to India’s southern sea coasts and coasts of Sri Lanka, where small Muslim communities were established at least by the early eighth century. These traders played key economic roles and were patronised by non-Muslim kings like the Zamorin of Calicut (Kozhikode) who welcomed diverse merchant communities. In many kingdoms Arab and Jewish merchants not only sojourned on the Arabian Sea littoral of the sub-continent, but some were even granted special protection to practise their faiths, and were relieved of taxation.

As connected through land, when the situation in the Arab peninsula turned worse and a race to spread Islam through power of the sword started, the sub-continent could not remain fully untouchable. Attacks on the sub-continent were made by central Asians and Arabs but the year 711 A.D is prominently considered as the founding year of Muslim rule in this part of the world. In reality, Muhammad bin Qasim’s conquest seems to have been taken for granted at the time and in no sense turned into a watershed in subcontinent history. Instead, it was Turko-Afghans, who began to establish settled kingdoms in the northern heartlands of the sub-continent in the early thirteenth century by contract, and also began to imagine inaugurating an era of continuous Muslim rule. Hence Muslim rule in a true sense began with advancements made by Turko-Afghans rulers and ended when the British took charge of Delhi after crushing the rebellion of 1857.

With the arrival of Muslim rulers Islam spread in the sub-continent in many forms and for various reasons. Some people converted to Islam because its noble principles attracted many in its fold; at certain places, it was the religion of victors, imposed upon the vanquished and many converted to Islam to gain political patronage from the local Muslim rulers. Because of wide regional variations the impact of Islam on India is difficult to summarise. In the south and the east, Muslim rule was relatively benign, and inclusivist. In Hyderabad-Deccan and Bengal, Muslim rulers presided over vast Hindu populations; and conversion was extensive and peaceful. However, some regions experienced the militant and exclusivist side of Islam, with the destruction of Hindu
temples, and attacks on the Brahmin-dominated Hindu social order taking place in such renowned pilgrimage destinations such as Multan and Somnath.\textsuperscript{53}

Muslims constituted about one-quarter of India’s population around the time the British arrived.\textsuperscript{18} Under the Mughals, the Muslims were ruling elites, but this changed with the establishment of colonial rule. The change in status also changed their community practices. After Shah Alam II, the practice of reciting the name of the Ottoman Caliph, and no longer the Mughal emperor, as the defender and protector of the Muslim community in India started. Another significant change was that with the eclipse of the political authority of the Mughal emperor, the Ulema began to represent themselves as the protectors and custodians of the interests of the community.\textsuperscript{19} Their socio-political situation further aggravated during the colonial rule, after the introduction of English as an official language, and changes made by the British. They forced them to be relegated to the bottom of the power ladder. Change in position, and status irked the earlier Muslim landlords and nobles. It was this group who was vociferously in favour of a separate state to re-gain their lost status. Once they felt subjugated they raised the slogan of existence of “two nations” in India.\textsuperscript{20} Not only Nawabs and landlords but also the Muslim middle class became restive due to their lost status. To overcome that support of Pan-Islamism and Khilafat by the Indian Muslims was the emotional need of the growing Muslim middle class, which was in search of an identity. In the first phase of the history of Muslim rule, the fact that the Muslim elite was in power kept Muslim religious consciousness dormant. It was invoked only when its grip on power was threatened.\textsuperscript{21}

Differences between Hindus and Muslims were there in the past also but during the British rule this sharpened. Communal competition between Hindus and Muslims began. G.D. Khosla writes that desiring to re-capture self-esteem, Indian minds harked back to ancient Hindu and Muslim cultures. Hindus sought solace in constructed memories of the Golden Age of Hindu imperialism and the Vedas. Muslims took recourse to the glory of the Prophet, the Khilafat and the Muslim conquest of Mediterranean countries. These sentiments were exploited by imperial rulers and communal groups in the twentieth century, eventually leading to partition in 1947.\textsuperscript{22} Another crucial factor was the process of ‘symbol selection’; and the fact that Muslim elites chose divisive rather than composite symbols. ‘Muslim leaders in north India in the late nineteenth century’, Paul Brass writes, ‘did not recognise a common destiny with the Hindus, because they saw themselves in danger of losing their privileges as a dominant community’. So they chose to emphasize ‘a special sense of history incompatible with Hindu aspirations and a myth of Muslim decline into backwardness’.\textsuperscript{23} The use of religious symbols by leaders, in the long term, had political impact on the masses.\textsuperscript{24} In addition to lost status and religious revival, economic divide between the two communities encouraged communal polarisation. Though the economic gap between Hindus and Muslims were not very much, in certain region and some sectors of economy the balance was sharply one-sided due to various reasons.\textsuperscript{25} All these factors
together created division between Hindus and Muslims, which was encouraged and exploited by the colonial rulers to serve their purpose.

In 1906 the Muslim League was formed. One of the major reasons for its formation was that the Muslim leadership lost their trust in the Congress leadership, whom it considered a representative of Hindu interests. Though slammed for being a ‘communal’ organisation, which started the process of partition of India, the League was opposite to many such allegations. Until 1937 the League was a paper organisation. The branch in Bombay, Jinnah’s home ground, could only boast of 71 members in 1927. The 1929 session was adjourned because of lack of quorum. When Iqbal spoke at Allahabad in 1930 the meeting failed to muster the required quorum of 75 members. The Congress decision in the summer of 1937 to not include Muslim League members in its government in United Province (UP) created a space for the League’s revival and offered Jinnah a chance to establish his hold in a province that had spurned his initial overtures. Congress opposed the idea of coalition despite Azad’s assertion to the contrary. Afterwards under the leadership of Jinnah the League gained support from Muslims and became a powerful force representing their voices. The political environment changed so much that until 1920s English speaking Muslims who were not too much concerned about seeing Hindus, Buddhists and followers of such religions converting to Islam, in fact their presence was considered as a political liability, began to welcome the converts. Later on, this awam provided population to fight for Pakistan, which they got in 1947.

Mohammad Iqbal on the Muslim Community

Sir Mohammad Iqbal (9 November 1877 - 21 April 1938) was born in Sialkot, in British India (presently in Pakistan). His grandparents were Kashmiri Pandits, who were converted into Islam. He received his early education at Scotch Mission College (now Mayo College), and then moved to Lahore to study English literature, Arabic and Philosophy at Government College, Lahore. Afterwards, he went to London to obtain his higher degrees. In London, he studied at Lincoln’s Inn to qualify for the Bar; and also enrolled as an undergraduate at Trinity College in Cambridge University. Due to his intellectual and political engagements in multiple activities, Iqbal cannot be compartmentalised into a single category. He was a poet, philosopher, and also preached Islamic values to his followers. For him all three are engaged with questions about the universe and man’s place in it. For him, philosophy is purely rational, free, and critical; it questions assumptions which are uncritically accepted in religion.

His productive life can be divided into two phases: pre-1908 and post-1908. In the early part of his life, until Iqbal went to Cambridge in 1905, his poetry was imbued with a burning passion for Indian nationalism, and its heterogeneous culture. His poems expressed his eclectic outlook, his respect for Hindu gods, his profound feelings for the rivers, the hills, and the landscape of India. In 1902 Iqbal wrote “Aftab”, an Urdu version of Gayatri
Mantra, which was published in *Makhzan* along with an introduction. Then in *A Temple for Mankind*, he wrote:

Lift all these thicksome, hugesome veils  
That God’s little earth obscure, divide.  
Let’s bring together again  
Our parted brethren at one place.  
Let there no walls remain.

During this phase, he wrote *Taranah-e-Hind* (*Saare-jehan se accha Hindustan Hamara*). In 1904 this song of India he recited at the Young Men’s Indian Association in Lahore at the request of Lala Hardyal. It extols the glories of his vision about Hindustan.

But after his return from Europe, in 1908, Iqbal was a changed man. He acquired a new world view. It is his post-1908 ideology which has its deep influence or legacy on the minds of his admirers who defend his ‘tarana-hindi’ as a product of the time when he followed "a wrong political ideology". Now he began to reflect on religious issues in the wake of the European aggression against Muslim countries, including Turkey and Persia. To the western challenge, he, like his contemporaries Maulana Azad, the Ali brothers, and Hasrat Mohani, advocated ‘Pan-Islamism as the political goal of the Islamic world.’ He noted that the European countries, in their hectic struggle for power, were treating the Moslem countries (Iran, Egypt, Sudan, Turkey, Morocco), rather shabbily. He was deeply moved by it, and arrived at a conclusion that their emancipation lay in unity, and unity needed a spiritual relationship to string them together.

He also challenged the secular ideas in *Bandagi Namah*. He writes about secular ideological subjugation of the nations of the East and their lure away from religion and in turn religious national identity. He writes, it is better to live for a millennia in a dangerous desert infected with scorpions, ants, venomous snakes and fiery winds, than to live for a minute in servitude. He wrote: “I have no prejudice against any community or nation in the world. All I want to see is Islam return to its pristine simplicity. I wish to see Indians living in peace and I am convinced that such a thing is possible even while every community retains its culture and individuality”.

Talking about cultural differences between East and West and glorifying the eastern civilisation, Iqbal said East is the world of *man*, heart, while the west is the world of *tan*, body. Also the driving force of the East is *ishq*, love, while the driving force of the west is *aql*, the intellect. On Islamic culture he said that only through the process of ‘self-discovery’ that Muslims could be free from ideological domination and any other impediments, thereby developing truly a true national identity. While conceding that the Arabs, who gave birth to Islam, contributed to its political evolution, he also took a note of the valuable contribution of non-Arabs in the field of arts and sciences, philosophy and medicine. He considered Iran as the single greatest factor in the growth of Islamic culture and civilisation. But his concept was not
universal enough to include, say, African Islam or Indonesian Islam. He also talked about the persisting racialism in Islam, which is supposed to be a non-discriminatory. He called for deracialisation of Islam to attain pan-Islamic identity. He also noted that the international ideal of Islam had been hitherto overshadowed or rather displaced by Arabian imperialism of earlier centuries of Islam.

Iqbal, a supporter of the Ash’ariyya school, regarded himself as Islam’s messenger or Shair-I-Islam, and his poetry became a vehicle of Islamic thoughts. He took up a missionary challenge to compose poetry for the moral regeneration of the ‘fallen Muslim community’. That does not mean Iqbal was against reforms in Islam or in favour of establishing the puritanical form of Islam. He rather, condemned, ‘traditional’ or ‘obscurantist’ Islam. By giving a rational interpretation of the Quran, he reinterpreted some of the essential Islamic ideals. He sought to revive a dynamic and radical element within Islam by restoring the freedom to use Ijtihad, a means of exercising independent judgment, as a necessary instrument of Muslim politics. But on specific issues, especially those relating to women whom he wanted to lead a ‘pure’ life, subject to men, and the Islamic restrictions of eating and drinking, he had a conservative view. He warned the reformers against moving too fast in introducing radical changes in the ‘old institutions’ and practices followed in Muslim countries. He was not happy with the reforms initiated by Kemal Ataturk in Turkey. In Javid Nama, (1120 and 1125) speaking through Sa’id Halim Pasha he writes:

Mustafa Kemal, who sang of a great renewal,  
Said the old image must be cleansed and polished;  
Yet the vitality of the Kaaba cannot be made new  
If a new Lat and Manat from Europe enter its shrine.  
No, the Turks have no new melody in their lute,  
What they call new is only the old tune of Europe;  
No fresh breath has entered into their breast,  
No design of a new world is in their mind.

Criticizing the reforms in Turkey, further, in Javid Nama (3285) he writes:

The Turks have departed from their own selves, drunk with Europe,  
Having quaffed honeyed poison from the land of Europe;  
Of those who have abandoned the antidote of Iraq  
What shall I say, except ‘God help them’?  
The slave of Europe, eager to show off.

In Shikwa and Jawab-i-Shikwah (Complaint and the Answer) Iqbal explains the situation of Muslims. Shikwa is shaped as a complaint against God, accusing him of having ceased to bestow His grace on the Muslims, who had propagated the faith of the Quran and spread God’s name on earth. He writes

---
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The kafir gets all good things
(easements) free, full, fine
-uncultured brute he gets
Wealth, women, wine
Whilst Muslims’ fasts,
Privations, life sublime
Win him but words, sweet words!
We don’t complain
(my, why should we?)

When this poem was first published, it produced two different reactions. While thousands of Muslims felt that the poet had expressed their innermost thoughts, in stirring verse, and thousands of tongues took up its refrains, the more orthodox were scandalised that God should be “accused of injustice”. Both were wrong. Iqbal did not share the ‘complaint’ nor did he accuse God. He merely put into language the feelings of his generation, feelings which he knew were based on that perversity of human nature which blinds self-analysis and rationalises its own misfortunes by blaming the injustice of others. The Shikwa summed up the accumulated bitterness in the minds of Muslims who subconsciously shrank from uncomfortable introspection and blamed “Fate” for the ills which they had become heirs to. When he had thus effectively focused attention on the degradation of the Muslims, for which they were holding the caprice of Providence responsible, the poet produced his Jawab-i-Shikwah, pricking their bubble of complacent self-delusion.

Like all religion, reforms in religious practice, introduction of modern values, and rationality have been debated from a long time in Islam. In this debate Iqbal, like Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, sided with religion. He rejected secular and material foundation of democracy and batted for the Islamic concept of Tauheed (oneness of God or monotheism), the unity of Allah and the unity of life. Tauheed for Iqbal is the unifying force which joins material and spiritual aspects of life into the simple and united entity of life. The most important feature of Muslim society is its faith in the unity of God (Tauheed). God alone is the ultimate source of all power and authority in the material as well as the moral world. Without full faith in this aspect, the doctrines of Tauheed would be imperfect and meaningless. It is this lesson and this implication of the doctrine which in his view the modern age needs. In The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam he writes that a careful study of the Quran and various schools of scholastic theology that arose under the inspiration of Greek philosophy very much broadened the outlook of Muslim thinkers. However, on the whole, it obscured their vision of the Quran. The spirit of Quran was essentially anti-classical, and the result of this perception was a kind of intellectual revolt, the full significance of which has not been realised even up to the present day. The main purpose of the Quran is to awaken in man the higher consciousness of his manifold relations with God and the universe. Giving precedence to God over science he writes “if God cease to create accidents, the atom ceases to exist as an atom”. This does not
mean that Iqbal was not receptive to new ideas, rather he was. In Reconstruction he remarked: “It must however be remembered that there is no such thing as finality in philosophical thinking. As knowledge advances and fresh avenues of thought are opened, other views, and probably sounder views than those set forth in these lectures are possible. Our duty is carefully to watch the progress of human thought and to maintain an independent critical attitude towards it.”

Although he glorified Islam, Iqbal remained an unrelenting critic of ranting Mullahs who distorted religion and spread hatred. Instead of heeding the Mullahs, Muslims must listen to their own hearts. Ijtihad, the jihad of the mind, was the moving principle of Islam. Without an inner struggle Muslims could not recover the ethical virtues embodied in the Quranic revelation. In Reconstruction Iqbal believes that the idea of Ijtihad has its origin in the well-known verse of the Quran—“And to those who exert We show Our path”. His basic concern was the Muslim community. In order to meet its growing needs, he even attempted a ‘revision’ and ‘reconstruction’ of religious thought in Islam. “Even the most orthodox mullah has no right to expel anybody from Islam as long as he has faith in its two basic principles: Tauheed and Risalat (finality of Mohammad’s prophethood).” He declared the Ahmiedahs being outside the fold of Islam, as they rejected the second principle by revering their leader, Ghulam Ahmad Mirza, as a prophet of God. He insisted on the need of Ijtehad (innovation in religious thought), and of satisfying cultural urges of its followers. “For being a live member of the Muslim Community unconditional faith in Islam is not enough. One must imbibe its culture as well”. For Iqbal, Islam was not merely a religious system, but also a political system to be subscribed to by all members of the Muslim Millat (community), which denotes a supra national ‘nation’ of believers. The greatest service that modern thought has rendered to Islam, and as a matter of fact to all religion, consists in its criticism of what we call material or natural—a criticism which discloses that the merely material has no substance until we discover it rooted in the spiritual. There is no such thing as the profane world. In the Reconstruction he further writes “The essence of Tauheed as a working force is equality, solidarity and freedom. The state from Islamic standpoint is an endeavour to transform these ideal principles into space time forces, an aspiration to realise them in a definite human organisation”.

Also, committed to the notion of Millat, he repudiated the British constitutional measures, such as separate electorates and weightage for resolving the communal disease. He felt that the Congress brand of nationalism posed a threat to the protection of Muslim cultural and political aspirations. By demanding a separate identity for Muslims, he thought that communal tension would be contained, and Hindu communal forces would be held at bay. He wanted the merging of Muslim nations into a universal commonwealth on the basis of Shari at - a conception that was central to his poetic vision. Iqbal was not an admirer of Mughal ruler Akbar because of his propagation of Din-e-Illahi, instead he was for Aurangzeb who had faith in Shari at. On Millat, like many other pre-partition and post-partition scholars,
Iqbal failed to recognise that Muslims are not a single entity, instead divided on the basis of many hierarchical identities.\textsuperscript{77} It is non-recognition of these differences that led to the emergence of conflicts based on primordial identities in Pakistan, since the 1950s.

Iqbal was an admirer of strong leadership; and praised men of a dynamic type who are self-possessed, and of firm determination. He called them sometimes \textit{Mard-e-Qalandar}, sometimes \textit{Mard-e-Hur}, and sometimes \textit{Mard-e-Mumin}.\textsuperscript{78} That does not mean he was a supporter of Fascism. He declared himself against all forms of state worship, whether Fascistic or Communist.

He gave the individual the right to differ from the views of the state. This argument is also supported by the statement of Iqbal in which he says, “Islam as a system of emotional unification recognizes the worth of the individual as such, and rejects blood-relationship as the basis of human unity”.\textsuperscript{79} In contradistinction to Nietzsche’s, who is a character in \textit{Javid Nama}, superman who mocks at religion and spring exclusively from the aristocratic stock to ride roughshod over the demons, Iqbal’s perfect man is adorned with the attribute even of God.\textsuperscript{80}

For Iqbal political ideology of a country should primarily be composed of two basic elements, namely: Quranic concept of Universal \textit{Millat}, and his concept of \textit{Khudi}(self).\textsuperscript{81} Iqbal wants the ‘self’ of the individual integrated into the ‘self’ of the \textit{Ummah} without any intermediate stage in between.\textsuperscript{82} His concept of \textit{khudi}, of a creative individuated selfhood, is articulated against mystical notions of \textit{fana}, or the annihilation of the individual self in the presence of God. He defines it as a sense that “all feeling of separation is… ignorance; and all “otherness” is mere appearance, a dream, a shadow- a differentiation born of relation essential to the self-recognition of the Absolute”.\textsuperscript{83} In a speech delivered in Tehran on the occasion of the First International Conference on Iqbal, March 10-12, 1986, the then president of Iran, Sayyid Ali Khameni, stated that the Islamic Republic of Iran is ‘the embodiment of Iqbal’s dream’. He added that our people have translated into action his doctrine of selfhood’.\textsuperscript{84} Linking the individual with attainment of the self in \textit{Javid Nama} through The Martyr-King (3335) Iqbal writes:\textsuperscript{85}

\begin{quote}
How man grows from a handful of dust
With a heart, and with desire in that heart!
His concern is to taste the delight of rebellion,
Not to behold anything but himself;
For without rebellion the self is unattainable,
And while the self is not attained, defeat is inevitable.
\end{quote}

Iqbal, definitely, suggested that the power of \textit{Ijtihad} be transferred from Ulemas to the legislature. But he was aware of the difficulties this suggestion might create in a country like India where the legislature would include non-Muslims also. While discussing the issue in another context, he conceded that “the concept of separation of church and state is not altogether unknown to Islam.” But this separation, he hastened to add, was essentially that of
functions and not of beliefs. He insisted that Church State should not be more dominant, and rule all other ideas embodied in the system of Islam. According to Iqbal, the spiritual and the temporal domains were not distinct in Islam since “the nature of the act, however secular in its import, is determined by the attitude of mind with which the agent does it”. Iqbal’s philosophical reconstructions of Islamic thought made plain was the gaping chasm between a view of Indian nationalism based on keeping religion out of politics and the normative Muslim conception of treating the spiritual and temporal domains in non-oppositional terms.

As capitalism and communism were two leading thoughts of that period or any period, Iqbal was critical towards both. He was for a society based on Islamic ideals and values. In Javid Nama (1070) he writes:

The soul of both is impatient and intolerant,
Both of them know not God, and deceive mankind.
One lives by production, the other by taxation
And man is a glass caught between these two stones

He also tried to use Islam as a tool against socialism. In a letter to Jinnah he writes: “…. but as I have said above in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve these (communal) problems it is necessary to redistribute the country and to provide one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities. Don’t you think that time for such a demand has already arrived….Perhaps this is the best reply you can give to atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal Nehru”. This shows he wanted Jinnah to raise the demand of Muslim India to fight against the socialism of Nehru.

Iqbal’s Idea and Pakistan

Does Iqbal’s thought, discussed above, influence the partition of India? Yes it influenced partition, but it did not lead to the partition of India. More or less similar views had been expressed by Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan and a few other scholars during those days. He never declared that as Muslims were a different nation, which Sayyid Ahmed Khan and later on Jinnah expressed, a different country is needed for them. Indeed, as Ayesha Jalal marks out, it was not until 1946 that Pakistan became a realistic option. The demand for Pakistan should be viewed as a bargaining position on the part of Jinnah and the Muslim League, which did not exclude other possible political arrangements. In this context Iqbal can be seen as working within an open-ended context of a spectrum of possibilities. Ideologically, he was against the idea of nation and nationalism. For him, if it is not geographic nationalism, which was anti-thetical to the universalising aspects of Islam. He associated nationalism with jahiliyat and described the conception as having the same role as the rejection of the finality of Muhammad’s prophethood in the beliefs of Qadianis.
He first encountered active politics when, during his student days in London in 1908, he was chosen as a member of the executive council of the newly established, British branch of the Indian Muslim League. The appointment of the Simon Commission in 1927 split the Muslim League into two factions, one led by Sir Muhammad Shafi and the other by Mohammad Ali Jinnah. In 1929, Iqbal joined the Shafi group, and for four years (1926-30) he was president of the Punjab Muslim League.

It was a part of his speech at the Allahabad session of the All India Muslim League’s conference, in 1930, which draws controversy, and tags him as “spiritual architect” of Pakistan. In first part of that historic speech he stated: I would like to see the Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state......formation of a consolidated North-West Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North West India”. In a later part he said “The idea need not alarm the Hindus or the British. India is the greatest Muslim country in the world. The life of Islam as a cultural force in this country very largely depends on its centralisation in a specified territory.....I demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim State in the best interests of India and Islam. For India, it means security and peace resulting from an internal balance of power; for Islam an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilise its law, its education, its culture and to bring them into closer contact with its own original spirit and with the spirit of modern times.”

This vision of Iqbal reached its territorial fulfilment in the post-1971 Pakistan with its boundaries almost what he had in mind. The part of the speech was published in The Times on October 3, 1931 by Dr. Edward Thomson, who called it a ‘demand’ for a Muslim state. To clarify his stand, Iqbal wrote a response to that piece: I would like to see the Punjab, North-West......may I tell Dr Thomson, in this passage I do not put forward a “demand” for a Moslem state outside the British Empire, but only a guess at the possible outcome in the dim future of the mighty forces now shaping the destiny of the Indian sub-continent. No Indian Muslim with any pretence to sanity contemplates a Moslem state or series of States in North-West India outside the British Commonwealth of Nations as a plan of practical politics......I am all for a redistribution of India into provinces with effective majorities of one community or another on lines advocated by the Nehru and the Simon Reports. Also, in a letter dated 6th March 1934 to Raghib Ehsan of Calcutta, Iqbal wrote: ‘I am enclosing two copies of Edward Thompson’s review of my book. It is interesting in many ways, and you may like to publish it in your paper....... Please note that the author of this review confuses my scheme with Pakistan. I propose to create a Muslim province within the Indian federation; the ‘Pakistan’ scheme proposes separate Federation of Muslim provinces in the north west of India outside the Indian federation directly related to England.”

Iqbal’s proposal was set firmly within an all India context. He wanted those regions to be within India, and demanded one third representation to Muslims
of the rest of the country in the federal legislature. His statement was more in sense of giving more autonomy to these regions.\textsuperscript{103} In that historic speech, Iqbal further said “I do not put forward a “demand” for a Moslem state outside the British empire……No Indian Moslem with any pretence to sanity contemplates a Moslem state or series of states in North Western India outside the British commonwealth of nation as a plan of practical politics”.\textsuperscript{104} His recommendation was on similar lines and reasons that had prompted the Nehru report to recommend the separation of Sindh from Bombay presidency and to constitute the NWFP into an “independent” administrative unit.\textsuperscript{105} Also, his intention was to pull the Punjabi politicians out of their small corner, their ‘ruralism’, into a wider context related to India’s other Muslims. In this he was not widely supported by Sind or NWFP and in Punjab also his idea was not well received.\textsuperscript{106}

Also in a letter to Jinnah, Iqbal wrote on 28\textsuperscript{th} May 1931: “….After a long and careful study of Islamic law, I have come to the conclusion that if this system of law is properly understood and applied at least the right to subsistence is secured to everybody. But the enforcement and development of the shariat of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India. If such thing is impossible in India, the only other alternative is a civil war which as a matter of fact is going on for some time in the shape of Hindu-Muslim riots……But as I have said above in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve these problems it is necessary to redistribute the country and to provide one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities.”\textsuperscript{107} In this letter he has used the word state or states. In his conception of state(s) he did not include Bengal and Muslim minority regions, before 1937. In his advice to M.A. Jinnah he stated “I think that the Muslims of North West India and Bengal ought at present [to] ignore Muslim minority provinces. This is the best course to adopt in the interests of Muslim majority and minority provinces”.\textsuperscript{108} By state or states he meant federal division of power with autonomy to Muslim states, and not partition of India.

To clarify more, in one of his poems in \textit{Javid Nama} written in 1932 Iqbal has used the word ‘India’, and talked about two traitors (Mir) Jafar of Bengal and (Mir) Sadiq of Deccan, due to whom their kingdoms were colonised. Not in similar letters and spirit, but the full poem does evoke Iqbal’s tarana-i-hind. This contradicts all those who find him an architect of Pakistan after his speech in 1930. He writes (2565):\textsuperscript{109}

\begin{verbatim}
A nation, which had loosed the bonds of every nation,
Thus lost its high sovereignty and its faith.
Do you know that the land of India,
Dear to the heart of every sensitive soul,
A land whose every manifestation lit up the world,
Now grovels amid dust and blood?
Further in 2635 he writes:\textsuperscript{110}
\end{verbatim}
His (Jafar’s) treachery divided the people’s unity;
His nation is demeaned by the fact of his being.
Whenever a nation is devastated
The root to its ruin is a Sadiq or a Jaafar.
God save me from the spirit of Jaafar,
Save me from the spirits of the present time.

In this stanza he talks about treachery and people’s unity, which means while writing Javid Nama in 1932, he was for unity and not separation or partition.

The idea of a separate Muslim state was a bargaining point mooted by Iqbal, as a political alternative in case the leaders of the All India National Congress did not concede the demands made at the All-Parties Muslim Conference, which still sought a federal solution to the Hindu-Muslim conflict. After his famous lecture in 1930, in 1931 and 1932 he represented Muslims of India at the Round Table Conference in England to discuss the political future of India. In a statement issued on 6 December 1933, Iqbal contended that the Aga Khan had offered Mahatma Gandhi Muslim cooperation, if the Congress agreed to accept the Muslim demands and regarded Mahatma Gandhi’s condition that the Muslim should not support the claims of the depressed classes as “inhuman”. Pandit Nehru refuted both charges. On Iqbal’s question how India’s problem could be solved if the majority community was prepared neither to make concessions nor to accept the award of a third party, Pandit Nehru writes that Iqbal thought that there were only two alternatives, either to allow British imperialism to continue permanently or to redistribute India on the basis of religious, historical and cultural affinities. Nehru writes: “I do not think that these are the only two alternatives he mentions. There are many other avenues. In any event he ought to know full well, that if any community, majority or minority, seeks an alliance with imperialism, it will have to face the unrelenting and continuous opposition and hostility of Indian nationalism. As a matter of fact, no community or minority can do so. Only a few leaders and upper class people may do so, for every community as a whole suffers from it. The masses can never compromise with imperialism for their only hope lies in freedom from its shackles. Nor do I believe in the religious redistribution of India. Such divisions are most undesirable and cannot take place in the modern world. But I am not against redistribution or reshaping of different provinces which will give different cultural groups the fullest opportunity for self-development”.

Addressing Iqbal, about post-Khilafat agitation, which ended in the end of Khalifa rule in Turkey by Kemal Ataturk, Nehru wrote: “The old feudal leaders who had laid low crept back into prominence, helped by British policy, which had always supported them. But they could not come back to old position because time had changed. The Moslem were also throwing up, rather belatedly, a middle class, and the very experience of a mass political movement, under the leadership of the National Congress, had made a vital difference. Though the mentality of the Moslem masses and the new growing middle class was shaped essentially by events, Sir Mohammad Iqbal, played an
important part in influencing the latter and especially the younger generation. The masses were hardly affected by him. He was influenced by the circumstances then prevailing and mass feeling among the Moslems, and he himself influenced and added intensity of these sentiments. Yet he was very far from being a mass leader, he was a poet, an intellectual and a philosopher with affiliation to the old feudal order.\textsuperscript{115} Iqbal’s first Persian work, \textit{Asrar-i-Khudi}, published in 1915, on its first appearance took by storm the younger generation of Indian Moslems.\textsuperscript{116} The admirers and supporters of Iqbal’s role as an architect of Pakistan cite a statement of Jinnah to Mr Matloob Sayyed, his Secretary after the Muslim League passed the Pakistan Resolution: “Iqbal is no more amongst us, but had he been alive he would have been happy to know that we did everything that he wanted us to do”.\textsuperscript{117} Then in a foreword to Iqbal’s letters, the Quaid-i-Azam wrote, in 1943, about Iqbal’s part in the creation of Pakistan: “His views were substantially in consonance with my own and had finally led me to the same conclusion as a result of careful examination and study of the constitutional problems facing India and found expression in due course in the united will of Muslim India as enumerated in the Lahore Resolution of the All India Muslim League, popularly known as Pakistan Resolution passed on 23rd March 1940.\textsuperscript{118} In the Pakistan Resolution the word is ‘states’, which Iqbal also supported but within British India and not as a separate sovereign country or countries.

In \textit{Pas Chih Bayad Kard Ay Aqwam-I Sharq} (What Should Then be Done O People of the East), published in 1936, Iqbal has written \textit{Lament on the differences among Indians}. In the first section he dealt with the problem of the Muslims vis-à-vis the Hindus of the subcontinent. He has written “Freedom of the country from the British bondage was the ideal before all, but the Hindu leaders seemed to behave as if they wanted to inherit from the British Government the authority to rule the country without sharing it with other communities.”\textsuperscript{119} What percentage of Indian Muslims favoured an independent Pakistan is still unclear, but there is no doubt that the most prominent community leaders wanted a separate state - or at least staked out a claim for Pakistan in the hope of winning concessions in the final round of negotiations.\textsuperscript{120} Iqbal’s position was on this line.

\textbf{Conclusions}

In the modern world Iqbal’s poems played a crucial role in the successful Iranian revolution of 1979. After the revolution, Ayatollah Khameni stated that in its conviction that the Quran and Islam are to be basis of all revolutions and movements, Iran was following the path shown by Mohammad Iqbal.\textsuperscript{121} Another leader, Dr Ali Shariati, who has been described as core ideologue of the Iranian revolution characterised Iqbal as a figure who brought a message of ‘rejuvenation’, ‘awakening’ and power to the Muslim world.\textsuperscript{122} He defined Iqbal’s work as a \textit{jihad}, salvation, awareness and liberation in the Muslim World.\textsuperscript{123} But the situation has changed since the USSR and USA’s
misadventure in Afghanistan. Post 11 September 2001 attack on twin towers in New York, followed by the so called Global War Against Terrorism, have further exacerbated violence in West and South Asia.

At present, Islam, as a religion is drawing a lot of attention because radical groups are using it to support their deeds and cover up their heinous acts. In such a situation both reforms and rational interpretation of religion are needed. In this Iqbal can be of a help, but this cannot be in a very significant amount. Iqbal criticised the reforms in Turkey but never talked about the obscurantist values followed in other parts of the Arab world. As a result of those reforms, today except in Turkey (and even there, according to many accounts) religious radicalism is on a high rise in all other Islamic countries and there is a growing intolerance on alternative ideas among the people.

In my personal interaction with Pakistani middle and upper class, I have found out that they have developed a negative portrait of Jinnah. I found three reasons for this. Firstly, the majority members of these classes always look towards India for various reasons, including, “unity of Pakistan”.124 They think that if Pakistan had not been formed, they too would have been reaping the benefits of development and growth like their class counterparts in India. It is their class interests which make them critical towards Jinnah. The rise in militancy and violence too makes them question Jinnah’s rationality for a religion-based state. Secondly, the conservatives among these classes find Jinnah not suitable to propagate and promote their dogmatic religious ideas. Hence, Iqbal is an ideal for them. Thirdly, what some scholars terms Punjabisation of Pakistan,125 is also a reason. Iqbal was from Punjab, while Jinnah was a non-Punjabi, so an outsider.
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