



RESEARCH PAPER

Factors Pushing Pakistan into a Federalist State: Mapping the Pre and Post-Partition History

¹Fayyaz Ahmad Hussain, ²Dr. Abdul Basit Khan and ³Hira Arshad

1. Former Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Government College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Visiting Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Government College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Corresponding Author: abdulbasit@gcuf.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The British was the only power that maintained effective control and unity over the entire subcontinent, but instead of establishing a single national government at all-India level, the British government preferred to rule over various provinces of India in isolation to each other owing to the socio-political, economic, linguistic, religious and cultural diversification present in length and breadth of this vast territorial region hence Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru believed that the unity infused by the British was only an administrative unity to maintain effective control over the territory and the region lacked true political unity. Mr. Jinnah too believed that India was never a country or a nation but a subcontinent of different nationalities hence diverse affiliations must be acknowledged and handled by all sides as a reality. Alongside, among the five provinces which constituted Pakistan in 1947, only Bengal was a Regulation Province and the rest were Non Regulation Provinces whereas Balochistan was not even a province but comprised of different types of territories, including a Chief Commissioner's Province. Other than having a common colonial ruler, these provinces did not have any common identity, except religion, and lacked an experience of living together which could be helpful in the process of nation building in the sovereign independent state of Pakistan. In the absence of such qualifications for nation building, it seemed desirable that the federal solution could be the best to create these with a passage of time hence the state moved forward accordingly, nevertheless, the separation of East Pakistan in 1971, and the resentment and unrest in the smaller provinces of the present day Pakistan, is viewed from the perspective of the problem of federalism. Based on this background, the instant study revisits the circumstances which were inherited by the state of Pakistan in 1947 and which necessitated that Pakistan ought to opt the federal form of government. It concludes that the failure to apply a well-designed and effective federal mechanism in the multiethnic state of Pakistan was responsible for many of the political upheavals and the ever-persistent problem of national integration in Pakistan.

KEYWORDS British India, Federalism in Pakistan, All India Muslim League, Pakistan Resolution

Introduction

Ever since Pakistan came into being in 1947, there has been a persistent demand that Pakistan should form a federation, providing maximum powers to the constituent units so that they may look after their individual and local interests, nevertheless, being a part of a federal government at national level. If we go through the political and constitutional history of Pakistan it appears that the demand of maximum powers for the provinces was either not responded to at all, or was not as highly regarded as the

provinces wished. In 1955, the different constituents of the western zone were amalgamated into a single province of West Pakistan thus losing their individual identities and were governed by a central authority in Lahore. Besides this, there have been long periods of Martial Law in Pakistan and under these Martial law regimes, the country was governed as a unitary state by a single authority from top to bottom. The 1962 constitution of Ayub Khan provided for a federal form of government while concentrating all the powers in the hands of the President at the national level and the Governor at the provincial level who was an agent of the President, appointed by him and served at his pleasure. The National and Provincial Assemblies had little powers thus practically reducing this federal constitution into a unitary form of government.

The Ayub regime was succeeded by the Martial Law regime of Yahya Khan which ended with the dismemberment of Pakistan. Replacing Yahya in 1971, Z. A. Bhutto ruled under Martial Law and a provisional constitution till he managed to get approved a constitution from the Assembly in 1973, which remained in force till 1977. During Bhutto period, Pakistan did not enjoy smooth experience of federalism; Balochistan never had a provincial government under this constitution and was governed directly by the central government under the provisions of Presidential rule. In North-Western Frontier Province (NWFP now Khyber Pakhtunkhwa), the opposition accused the central government either of forming a minority government in the province or forcing the members of the Provincial Assembly to support it through the means they called "Gold or Guns" (Interview of Mr. Abdul Wali Khan, the President of the defunct National Awami Party (NAP), with Fayyaz Ahmed Hussain, one of the authors of the current study (London, September 1982). The NAP was in power in Balochistan and NWFP when Z. A. Bhutto dismissed their ministry in Balochistan and they resigned in the NWFP as a protest).

Literature Review

While keeping this early history under consideration, the current work looks into those factors which suggest that Pakistan in 1947 should have formed a federation with such amount of powers for the units which could satisfy their demands on one hand and could be acceptable to all the units on the other hand. There is a wealth of literature suggesting that Pakistan should adopt a federal form of government, but we have a limited space to discuss the leading arguments (Sayeed, 1967; Choudhry, 1969; Choudhry, 1974; Callard, 1969; Chaudhri, 1968; Ahmad, 1970). This literature argues that the geographical, economic, social, and cultural factors of Pakistan demand that the state ought to be a federation.

Geographical, Social and Cultural Factors

Geographically, the two zones of Pakistan (i.e. East and West) were separated by Indian territory. The distance from the nearest points was 700 miles. While referring to this fact, Sir Frederick Burrow, the last Governor of Bengal before the partition of India, argued in a meeting with the Viceroy that Bengal could form a link with the state of Pakistan but could not effectively be a part of Pakistan as such (Mansergh & Moon, 1977: Vol. X: Document 264:507). Tayyeb Ali has suggested the same in his detailed analysis of this geographical factor in his well-documented study of Pakistan's political geography (Ali, 1966:4).

Culturally, there was very little in common between the people of the Western and Eastern zones of Pakistan; nevertheless, they had a common religion. If culture be

defined as the manifest aggregate of a people's language, religion, customs, manners, dress, art, economy and outlook, then it appears that Pakistan's Eastern zone had a different culture from the Western zone. Culturally, the Western zone maybe considered a continuation of the Near East and, to some extent, of Central Asia. Continuous influxes of people from the Near East and Central Asia have left their stamp on the ethnic composition, languages and above all, on the religious and social structure of this zone. The Eastern zone was culturally a younger area than the Western zone. In early times, it served mainly as refuge for those Indian aboriginals who fled from the Middle Ganges Plains to escape capture and enslavement by the Aryans. Later, the Buddhists from Bihar also took shelter in the delta to escape retribution at the hands of the militant Hindus. This factor has played a very significant role in the history of Bengal and it is perhaps for this reason that the people of this land suffer from "Centro phobia" and believe in "agitational politics" which have a remarkable impact on the political culture of Bengal.

The Muslims arrived in Bengal in the 13th century AD and the bulk of the people embraced Islam, but remained culturally distinct from their rulers. While religion set them apart from the Hindus, their language and culture separated them from the Muslims of the other parts of the subcontinent which, afterwards, hindered the development of a closer synthesis with the people of the Western zone in United Pakistan. Had the start in 1947 not been that of a mutual mistrust, suspicion and fear of domination of the West by the East or *vice versa*, and instead it would have been based on mutual trust, agreement, cooperation and interdependence, then, a common identity and political culture would have been developed through the years of experience of sharing power and responsibility. This could best be done under a federal arrangement as widely acceptable as possible to the Eastern zone and the different units of the Western zone of Pakistan.

Historical Factors (Pre British)

In this section, we have to discuss how the different provinces which constituted Pakistan in 1947 had maintained their separate identity through the history of the Indian subcontinent. Though some (Smith, 1958:10) students of Indian history, geography and politics, credit the Indian subcontinent with a fundamental unity so compelling that it eclipses all other factors of diversity, some even suggest that the political and economic unity of India is natural because it is a logical response to its geography (Coupland, 1944: Part III:101) while Lord Amery (the Secretary of State for India in Churchill's Cabinet) recommended that if not present then some sort of Indian unity must be invented (Amery, 1942: 46-7). But if we carefully go through the history of the subcontinent, it appears that a political disunity has remained a fundamental feature of this vast region; nevertheless, there were periods when certain rulers enforced their rule over the whole or bulk of India (during the Maurya, Tughluq and Mughal Empires), but these periods were either too short or marked by frequent rebellions. Chronologically, Indian history is essentially a story of alternating periods of schism and union between the various parts of the country. Geographically, it is an account of a recurrent struggle between the central parts of the Ganges basin and the areas on its margin. The former has perpetually sought to subdue the marginal areas which in turn have bitterly resisted the attempts and have asserted their independence at every available opportunity. From 400 BC, i.e. the beginning of the recorded history of India, to 1947, India has seen nine small and large Empires, of which only four are believed to have exercised control over these marginal areas. These were the Maurya, Tughluq, Mughal and British Empires.

A study of the rise and fall of each Empire indicates that although the circumstances of their respective regimes and the degree of their political control were different, their decline and disintegration followed a surprisingly similar pattern and, in each case, it resulted in the essential separation of the marginal areas from central control. It is interesting to note that, invariably, at such occasions, Bengal and northwestern India were the first to rebel and claim their independence. One historian suggests that Bengal and Indus Plains remained largely independent for almost 1500 years, from the death of Ashoka in 232 BC to the rise of the Delhi Sultanate in the 13th century AD, except for occasional and partial subjugation; nevertheless, at no time during these subjugations did these two areas belong to the same Empire (Ali, 1966:45-7). This historical fact is shared by the two zones of Pakistan that they always have preferred local rule and rebelled against any central authority from outside. This common factor had significant repercussions in the subsequent history of Pakistan. Sir Penderel Moon, who had served the Indian Civil Service and had a first-hand knowledge of the Indian Problem, had suggested in 1945 that "Bengal was for practical purposes an independent kingdom in the 18th century and would be so again (Moon, 1945:31)." In an interview with one of the authors of the instant study (Mr. Fayyaz Ahmad Hussain) in 1983, Mr. Moon said that he still believed in his statement, and that the establishment of Bangladesh in 1971 had proved his prediction to be a truth.

Historical Factors (The British Period)

Although, scholars like Hicks believe that the British was the only power that maintained effective control and unity over the entire subcontinent (Hicks, 1978:60) but this unity was essentially an enforced administrative unity rather than a true political unity (Nehru, 1948:13). Accordingly, we shall now discuss the conditions of different provinces (which later constituted Pakistan) under the British Empire to explain how these provinces lacked political unity and a sense of common identity except religion and a common fear of Hindu domination in a free, democratic, united India.

A brief discussion of the working of the British government under the Government of India Act of 1935 will help to show that these provinces were governed as separate entities by the British and did not have much in common except foreign rule. Part one of the Act, which provided for the reconstruction of the central government on a 'federal' basis never came into force. Part two conferred the said Act on the provinces which were granted limited provincial autonomy in 1937 and they enjoyed the status of separate entities. Nevertheless, they were under a common central government which was run by neither of them but by a foreign power. For instance, the British government had different policies towards the All India Muslim League in different provinces. They supported the Unionists against it in the Punjab, helped it against the Congress in NWFP, established it in Sindh and had a soft corner for it in Bengal. To explain how the British government maintained the principle of provincial autonomy under the Government of India Act, 1935, we shall refer to some instances supported by the official documents of the British government.

- 1) In 1944, the Viceroy complained about the difficulties arising from provincial autonomy under the Government of India Act 1935 when the Punjab, "the province with the largest surplus (of wheat) saw no reason to be generous to the rest of India with surplus, and was prepared to drive the hardest bargain in its disposal (See letter from Wavell to His Majesty the King Emperor dated 4, January 1944, India Office Library no. MSS. EUR. D/977/1)."

- 2) In 1945, when the Punjab and Sindh had a dispute over the distribution of the waters of the Indus, the British Government advised the two provincial governments to reach an agreement between themselves whereas it chose for itself only the role of an arbitrator, if the amount of payment by the Punjab to Sindh toward the cost of the new Sindh barrages was not agreed among the parties (See letter from the Viceroy to the Secretary of State for India dated 5 Nov. 1945, India Office Library IOR L/PO/10/22).
- 3) In 1945, when the Punjab government planned the construction of the Bhakra Dam, the Secretary of State for India was not happy that the Punjab should go to the United States for designs, etc. for the dam; but when the Punjab government had decided to do so, the Viceroy did not consider it sensible and proper to intervene any further (See letter from the Viceroy to the Secretary of State for India dated 20 Aug. 1945, India Office Library IOR L/PO/10/22).

The British government had ruled different provinces of India which formed Pakistan and India in isolation to each other as there was no national government at the federal level (All-India level). Among the five provinces which constituted Pakistan in 1947, only Bengal was a Regulation Province and the rest were Non Regulation Provinces. Balochistan was not even a province and consisted of many different types of territories, including a Chief Commissioner's Province. There was no inter provincial relationship except that they had a common ruler at All-India level. So they did not have any common identity, except religion, and lacked an experience of living together which could be helpful in the process of nation building. In the absence of such qualifications for nation building, it seems desirable that the federal solution could be the best to create these with a passage of time. On the one hand, through federalism the provinces would be able to maintain their separate identity, and on the other hand, through the experience of living together for some time within an overall political framework, they would develop a common political culture which helps the process of nation building in new state like Pakistan.

The British government had maintained the separate entities of the provinces in such a manner that it seemed desirable to Sir Penderel Moon that the Dominion Status should be granted to individual provinces rather than to a United India, and these Dominions should be subject to an overall supervision of the British Empire (Moon, 1945; also see letter from Wavell to H.M. the King Emperor dated 24 Feb. 1947. India Office Library No. MSS. EUR. D/977/1). Besides this, the Simon Commission and Joint Select Committee on India were convinced that India could not have a majority controlled executive at the centre. The Secretary of State for India in 1945 also held the same opinion expressed in his letter to the Viceroy that India could not have a majority-administered executive at the centre, for that would at once involve Pakistan, and certainly within Pakistan, further secessions (See letter from the Secretary of State for India to Wavell dated 24 January 1945. India Office Library IOR L/PO/10/22).

Different Constitutional Proposals for the Muslims of India during the Freedom Movement

Proposals

In November 1906, Khawaja Salimullah of Dacca proposed the establishment of a political party under the name of the All-India Muslim Confederacy keeping in view that the different Muslim majority areas of India had their separate entities and would

be better united under a confederation or a federation. Later on, when this political party was established, the organization was named as the All-India Muslim League. After its establishment, the first proposal came from Sir Muhammad Iqbal in 1930 wherein he outlined a Muslim state in North West India and excluded Bengal from this scheme, but in 1937, he had improved on his scheme and this time he was clearer on all the aspects of the future of Muslim India. On 21st June 1937, he wrote to Jinnah that, in the then prevalent circumstances, it was apparent that the only approach to peaceful India was a rearrangement of the country on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affiliations. To Iqbal's mind, the new constitution was entirely hopeless; a separate federation of Muslim Provinces, restructured on the lines as recommended by him was the only course by which they could secure peaceful India and protect Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims. In the words of Iqbal: "Why should not the Muslims of Northwest India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are (Pirzada, 1966:162-3)?"

It is significant to note here that Iqbal suggested a federation and reorganization of the state on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affinities and, moreover, he considered the Muslims of different provinces as different nations which could live together under a federation.

The second constitutional scheme came from Choudhry Rahmat Ali which was published in 1933. In this scheme, Pakistan had to have a separate federation of Muslim provinces. He published a map of India which presented three sovereign Muslim nations forming a tripartite alliance. They were Pakistan in the northwest, Bang-i-Islam comprising Bengal and Assam in the northeast and Usmanistan in the south constituted by the Hyderabad state (Ali, 1978:225). This scheme also treated northwest India and Bengal as different nations and proposed a federation for an independent Muslim India.

The third scheme was that of Dr. Latif of Hyderabad who proposed an Indian federation consisting of four Muslim and eleven Hindu cultural zones. This scheme provided for a weak centre limited to defense, foreign affairs, commerce and communications with residuary powers conferred upon the provinces. The fourth scheme from Aligarh Muslim University was made by Professor Hasan and Dr. Qadri which envisaged the division of India into three independent sovereign states. The Muslim state of northwest India was to be a federation known as the Pakistan federation, whereas Bengal was to establish an independent Muslim federation and the rest of British India was to constitute a Hindu state to be known as Hindustan (Gwyer & Appadorai, 1957: Vol. II:444-5).

The fifth scheme was conceived by Nawab Mamdot, President of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League. The scheme, known as the confederacy of India, was published in 1939 (Coupland, 1944: Part II:203-4). In his scheme, Mamdot, divided India into what he called five countries. Each country was to constitute a federation and there would be a confederation embracing all the five countries.

The sixth scheme was published by Sir Sikander (Gwyer & Appadorai, 1957: Vol. II:455-62) who suggested for a two-tier federation i.e. a regional and an All India federation. India was to be divided into seven zones. Each zone was to establish a regional federation and would have a legislature consisting of representatives of both British India and Indian states comprising that zone. The representatives in the various regional legislatures were to jointly constitute the central Federal Assembly. The Federal

Government was to be allocated subjects like defense, external affairs, communications and currency, while the residuary powers were to rest in the units.

Relative Importance of these Proposals

Each scheme provided for a federation of the Muslim majority provinces, though some of them proposed a separate federation for the Muslim province, while others proposed two-tier federation, a regional federation of the Muslim province and an overall federation on India level. Another point of difference was the number of Muslim zones in the case of an Indian federation or number of Muslim states in the case of independent and sovereign federation for Muslims. They all agreed on a federal form of government with a weak centre and maximum powers for the provinces. Now we have to examine which schemes were taken more seriously than the others by the All India Muslim League for the adoption as its official policy regarding the future constitutional arrangement for the Muslims of India.

A resolution was approved at the annual sitting of the All India Muslim League arranged in Patna in 1938 which authorized the President of the League to adopt such course as might be necessary with respect to exploring an appropriate substitute to the Government of India Act, 1935, which would safeguard the interests of Muslims and other minorities. Subsequently, the working committee of the All India Muslim League appointed a subcommittee to scrutinize and report on the various draft schemes regarding the constitutional development of India. This subcommittee examined all such proposals and it appears from the subsequent events and the official policy of the All India Muslim League that none of these schemes was adopted by the League in total. The official policy proved to be a combination of the main features of these schemes. The League rejected the idea of a two-tier federation and went for separate independent federations for the Muslims. The League demanded (in 1940) the establishment of more than one federation, not giving the exact number thus leaving room for future bargaining and adjustment. It is believed that the original 1940 Resolution was drafted by Sir Sikander (in his speech in the Punjab legislative assembly, Sikander admitted that fact. See the Punjab Legislative Assembly Debates, 11 March 1941), who incorporated his own scheme of two tier federation; but, later on, it was amended to the effect of independent Muslim federations and was passed in an open session at Lahore. However, that resolution provided for a federal form of government for the prospective Muslim states with a weak centre and maximum powers for the provinces.

All India Muslim League's Official Policy and Commitment regarding the Constitutional Arrangement in a Free and Independent India

Before Independence

Before we discuss the official policy and commitment of the All India Muslim League regarding the future constitutional arrangement in India, it shall be useful to explain Jinnah's personal observations about it as he was the President of the organization and widely acknowledged as the Sole Spokesman of all Indian Muslims. Jinnah was personally in favor of a strong central government (Jalal, 1985:10) but his centralist strategy was swamped by the concerns of the Muslim Provinces (particularly Punjab) in favor of a maximum provincial autonomy. It is believed that his prominent fourteen points were merely a replication of the demands raised at the Punjabi-dominated All-India Muslim Conference of December 1928 (Aziz, 1972: 44-7; Afzal, 1966: 302-5). By 1940, after carefully watching the working of the congress ministries (1937-39)

in Hindu majority provinces, Jinnah was convinced that no other formula than the federal one could solve the Indian problem. In these circumstances, the famous Lahore Resolution of 1940 came forth.

The Lahore Resolution of 1940 is the most important official document of the All India Muslim League which was considered to be the basic creed of the League, both by the League leaders and the British government in India. The British government took it seriously while drafting their constitutional proposals offered by Sir Stafford Cripps in 1942, which provided for one or more federations with respect to the Muslim provinces if they opted to stand out of an Indian federation.

The Lahore Resolution demanded that the zones lying in northwestern and eastern parts of India should be grouped to constitute independent states wherein the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign (Ahmad, 1970:382).

There is a great deal of controversy regarding the interpretation of this Resolution, on whether the Resolution was intended to form more than one federations instead of one as it emerged in 1947 but this controversy is not relevant to the instant study. The only point which is important here is that the constituent units (provinces and princely states) were to be autonomous and sovereign. The expression "sovereign" appears to be misleading here and it is a matter of speculation what qualifications and reservations the framers of this resolution had in their mind when they used this term for the constituent units. At least, the Resolution does suggest that it intended to create one or more independent states in which the constituent units were to form one or more federations. However, in 1946, the Lahore Resolution was amended at the All India Muslim League legislators' convention, demanding that the Muslim majority zones of Bengal and Assam in the northeast and the Punjab, the northwest Frontier province, Sind and Balochistan in the northwest of India be constituted into a sovereign state (Ahmad, 1970:491-3).

This Resolution removed the confusion about the number of independent states but it also established that the Muslim majority provinces shall constitute the future Muslim State while retaining their separate entities as units of that state, which clearly amounts to a federal constitution. This argument is further supported by the following terms of offer submitted by the League for the acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan in 1946:

- 1) The Six Muslim Provinces (Punjab, NWFP, Balochistan, Sindh, Bengal and Assam) shall collectively form one group which will deal with all subjects other than foreign affairs, defence and communication necessary for defence; these subjects may be dealt with by the joint sitting of the constitution making bodies of the two groups of provinces--Muslim provinces (to be named hereinafter as Pakistan group) and Hindu Provinces.
- 2) There shall be a discrete constitution making body for the abovementioned Six Muslim Provinces, which will frame the constitution for the group and the constituent provinces and will determine the list of provincial and central subjects (of the federation of Pakistan) with residuary sovereign powers assigned to the Provinces (Ahmad, 1970:507-14).

The foregoing terms of offer extended by the All India Muslim League for acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan establish that the League not only claimed self-rule for the Muslims of India forming a group against the Hindu group in an All India federation, but was also committed to self-rule by every province which would constitute the Muslim majority group. If it would not have been desirable, the Muslim majority group as a self-governing unit against the Hindu group could adopt any other constitutional arrangement within its own jurisdiction.

This discussion suggests that whether a part of an All India federation or out of it, Pakistan, according to the constitutional commitments of the League, was destined to adopt a federal constitution with residuary powers vested in the provinces. Further evidence, that the League was committed to the separate identity of the provinces, is that the League, on the eve of partition, agreed in principle that the provinces must have the right to give their consent to go to Pakistan or India.

As regards the Indian states, the League had categorically declared that they were free to negotiate agreements with Pakistan or Hindustan as consideration of contiguity or self-interest dictated, or they might choose to assume complete and separate sovereign status for themselves (See Statement of Liaquat in the Daily Dawn, April 22, 1947 and Jinnah's press statement of June 18, 1947, published in the Daily Dawn, June 19, 1947). This again confirms that those states which had to join Pakistan would have the opportunity to maintain a separate entity which is possible only in a federal structure.

After Independence

In this section, we will discuss what constitutional commitments the Muslim League made after independence. In 1949, while moving the Objectives Resolution, Liaquat Ali, the first Prime Minister of Pakistan, mentioned that the resolution envisioned a federal form of government because such was the dictate of geography of their country and it would be idle to think of a unitary government when the two parts of the state were separated by more than one thousand miles (Chaudhry, 1967:27). After the passage of this resolution by the Constituent Assembly, a Basic Principles Committee to formulate a draft constitution was appointed by the Assembly. This committee presented two reports on the draft constitution and both of them provided a federal form of government and in 1956, when the Muslim League enforced the first constitution in the country, that constitution promised a federal form of government. The subsequent constitutions of 1962 and 1973, though not given by the Muslim League, nevertheless, provided a federal form of government for Pakistan. What sort of federation Pakistan experienced under these constitutions and the success or failure to fulfill the commitment by the League to give the country a federal constitution is not the scope of the instant study since here we make the point that there were several attempts after independence to suggest that Pakistan had to have a federal constitution?

Conclusion

It has been established by various studies that every province which was to constitute Pakistan in 1947, had attempted to secure an independent and sovereign status before it joined Pakistan or was made to join Pakistan (Khan, et. al, 2013). This argument and the discussion offered in the preceding pages suggest that the provinces which were not willing to join Pakistan in the first place, would only accept a federal form of government which should have allowed them a maximum amount of internal autonomy. This argument is further supported by the evidence of political and constitutional history

of Pakistan. The establishment of the One Unit in West Pakistan in 1955 in an "undemocratic" and forceful manner created unrest and rebels in Balochistan and Sindh. East Pakistan became Bangladesh in 1971 after an army action and bloodshed on a large scale. The province of Balochistan had constantly been facing political turmoil and unrest whereas Sindh had become a land of rebellions and civil war and had faced heavy casualties, deaths and arrests at the hands of the military establishment of Pakistan. All these events suggest that Pakistan is still at its starting point and has to evolve a political system and a form of government which has to be broad-based in its popular support and has to provide for a peaceful co-existence of different "nationalities". The struggles by the people of different provinces in demanding their national rights suggest that Pakistan is a multi-national, multi-linguistic state (Interview of Akbar Bugti and Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo with Fayyaz Ahmad Hussain, Quetta May 1982 and London September 1984 respectively). Some political leaders believe that Pakistan is an aggregation of many nationalities and every nationality should be guaranteed to have its national rights (See statements of Hamida Khuhru, Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo in the Daily Jang (Urdu) London 26 April 1984) and it is generally believed by many political leaders and scholars that Pakistan can be saved from further disintegration only through a federation (There is a large number of statements by the Political Leaders of which the following are a few examples. See M. M. Daultana and Hanif Ramay's statements and Benazir Bhutto's statement in the Daily Jang (Urdu) London dated 23 January 1984 and 9 April 1984 respectively).

From the study of the problems of nation building and national integration in Pakistan, we have concluded that the problem of federalism is very closely associated with the problems of national integration. Our conclusion is that Pakistan has a federal society constituted by different ethnic, cultural and linguistic groups and requires a federal arrangement to promote integration among these different groups. But the absence of the federal principle in the different constitutional arrangement had been responsible for the earlier dismemberment of Pakistan is still a potential danger for further dismemberment. We have argued that had the federal principle been incorporated in the constitution it would have helped develop a common culture and a will to stay together leading to the evolution of a single nationalism. We can cite Jinnah here who realized this fact even before the partition of India and stressed that since India was never a country or a nation but a subcontinent of different nationalities hence herein the cultural, social, political and economic differences were so fundamental that they could not be covered up, concealed or confused but must be acknowledged and handled by all sides as realists. It is interesting to note that what was realized by Jinnah before 1947 was not practiced him afterwards however still it is the need of the hour for the ruling elite in Pakistan to rationally dissect the underlying problems in that regard and adopt a pragmatic approach to resolve them.

References

- Afzal, M. R. (1966). *Speeches and statements of the Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah (1911-34 and 1947-48)*. Lahore: Research Society of Pakistan, University of the Punjab.
- Ahmad, J. (1970). *Historic Documents of the Muslim Freedom Movement*. Lahore: Publishers United.
- Ahmad, M. (1970). *Government and Politics in Pakistan*. Karachi: Space Publishers.
- Ali, C. R. (1978). *Pakistan: The Fatherland of the Pak Nation (Revised Ed.)*. Lahore: Publishers United.
- Ali, T. (1966). *Pakistan: A Political Geography*. London: Oxford University Press
- Amery, L. S. (1942). *India and Freedom*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Aziz, K. K. (1972). *The All India Muslim Conference, 1928-35: A Documentary Record*. Karachi: Guild Publishers House.
- Callard, K., (1969). *Pakistan: A Political Study*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Chaudhri, M.A. (1968). *Government and Politics in Pakistan*. Dacca: Puthighar.
- Chaudhry, G. W. (1967). *Documents and Speeches on the Constitutions of Pakistan*. Dacca: Green Book House.
- Choudhry, G.W. (1969). *Constitutional Development in Pakistan*. London: Longman.
- Choudhry, G.W. (1974). *The Last Days of United Pakistan*. London: C. Hurst & Company.
- Coupland, R. (1944). *The Indian Problem: Report on the Constitutional Problem of India (Three Parts)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gwyer, M. & Appadorai, A. (1957). *Speeches and Documents on the Indian Constitution: 1921-1947 (Two Volumes)*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hicks, U. K. (1978). *Federalism, Failure and Success: A Comparative Study*. London: MacMillan.
- Jalal, A. (1985). *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, The Muslim League And The Demand For Pakistan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khaliquzzaman, C. (1961). *Pathway to Pakistan*. Lahore: Longmans.
- Khan, M. M., Iqbal, R. & Farooq, M. (2013). The Identity Crisis in Muslim State of Pakistan: A Historical Analysis and Future Prospects. In *Pakistan Journal of Islamic Research*. Vol. 11. June 2013. 59-68.
- Mansergh, N. & Moon, P. *Constitutional Relations between Britain and India: The Transfer of Power 1942-47*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Moon, P. (1945). *The Future of India*. London: Pilot Press.

Nehru, J. L. (1948). *The Unity of India: Collected Writings, 1937-40*. New York: The John Day Company.

Pirzada, S. (1966). *Quaid-e-Azam Jinnah's Correspondence (2nd Revised Ed.)*. Karachi: Guild Publishing House.

Sayeed, K. B. (1967). *Political System of Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Smith, V. A. (1958). *The Oxford History of India (3rd Ed.)*. London: Oxford University Press.