

The discomfiture of the Pakistan Army and the forced secession of East Pakistan have led us into a maze of distorting mirrors. The concepts that gave rise to the State of Pakistan appear to have failed. The propaganda machine of our detractors is determined to lead us along a corridor of distorted images. Along this corridor are placed carefully hidden trap-doors designed to open one after another taking us to a doom far greater than that we have already suffered.

## WHOSE FAILURE IN PAKISTAN ?

Kalim Siddiqui

In a very real sense the 'destiny' that was reached in 1947 was merely a milestone. The destiny itself was never really discovered or defined though we indulged in a great deal of confused talk about 'Islamic State' and now 'Islamic Socialism'. The challenge that now faces the Muslim intelligentsia everywhere, and particularly in Pakistan, is one of defining a new destiny that will lead to national cohesion and economic and political mobilisation of our energies and resources to a far greater extent than that which was achieved during the Pakistan Movement. For this, the first and foremost precondition is an understanding of the role of Islam.

It is important to realise that Islam is knowledge as well as a theory of knowledge. In its role as knowledge Islam is pure science; in its role as an epistemology Islam encourages the continuous development of the applied sciences in all fields of human endeavour. As a pure science, Islam gives us a body of eternal concepts, but Muslims in each epoch must continuously apply and re-apply these concepts according to the changing needs and demands of time and place.

As scientists, social scientists and technocrats we know that a concept or theory can be applied to produce alternative operational models. All aircraft, for instance, are operational models of the theory of aeronautics. But military aircraft look different from civil aircraft; and within each category bombers look dif-

ferent from fighters, and freighters are different from passenger airliners. While the theory of aeronautics stays the same, the size, shape, range, weight, design, engine, fuel, capability and other features can all change. Once an aircraft, no matter how primitive in technology, has flown, the theory of aeronautics has been proved. No number of subsequent crashes can disprove that theory. When an aircraft crashes, attention is centred on that particular design, technology, engine, fuel, navigation, or on human failure in the air or on the ground, but never on the theory of aeronautics. This is, of course, simple common sense and everyday experience.

Let us now take an example from the social sciences. Human psychology assumes self-preservation though each individual knows he has to die one day, the individual and the social order as a whole does everything possible to postpone that day for each member of the society for as long as possible. Hence the doctors and hospitals and medicines. But a number of individuals also commit suicide. The incidence of suicides does not in any way alter the basic premise of human behavioural psychology, i.e., self-preservation. Suicides, like aircraft crashes, are rightly regarded as resulting from psychological disorders or "technological" failures.

Another example from the social sciences may be taken from the field of economics. When, in the depression of the 1930s, the Western world suffered the capitalist system's greatest setback, their economists blamed it on to 'structural failure'. The concepts of the capitalist system were not challenged, at least not by the capitalist system itself. John Maynard Keynes's famous *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* merely reoperationalised the concepts of the capitalist economy, though he came close to challenging the concept of interest or usury on which the whole system rested. Karl Marx had earlier effectively destroyed the rationale of the capitalist system. But neither Marx nor Keynes succeeded in destroying the capitalist system; in fact both in their own ways helped to make the system stronger. It is significant, however, that both Marx and Keynes were prepared to challenge and re-examine not only the structural defects of the operation model of capitalism, but also its most basic concept—interest.

The capitalist economic concept of interest or usury is, however, itself the operational form of another more fundamental concept of human nature—that man is by nature selfish and private gain or profit is the universal motivation of man. Ultimately this view of human nature emanates from Christendom's doctrine of 'original sin'. As such man is born sinful. In this formulation man is by nature bad and aggressive and human relationships consist of, as Thomas Hobbes puts it in his *Leviathan*, perpetual war of 'every man against every man'. The economic concept

of usury, therefore, is merely an extension of the West's religio-philosophical view of the nature of man.

Marx, far from challenging this concept of the nature of man, merely transferred the concept of on-going conflict from man to a collectivity of men called 'class'. He re-wrote economic history in terms of class conflict and went on to make projections into the future and called it 'scientific socialism'. Marx believed that man is by nature bad, selfish and aggressive but, according to him, man acts in his class interest. Marx, therefore, merely reoperationalised the same concept which had given rise to capitalism and ended up with socialism. He merely transferred the capitalist function from man to State. This is why what we see in Communist countries today is 'State capitalism'—hardly a great or 'scientific' advance on private capitalism. In fact, to borrow a phrase from Lenin, we can say that socialism is the highest stage of capitalism! Marx himself admitted this when he said that an advanced stage of capitalist development is a prerequisite to the creation of class conflict, the emergence of the proletariat whom he called the 'gravediggers' of capitalism.

So in fact we find that even in the social sciences all the failures of their structures and models have failed to persuade the Western thinkers to re-examine their most basic concepts.

By contrast what has the Muslim intelligentsia done? Every time we or our models have failed we have persuaded ourselves to believe that Islam has failed or its concepts have failed! Because we failed to build Pakistan on the concept that gave rise to the State, our detractors have gone into a spell of joy proclaiming from all corners of the world that 'Pakistan was never a nation' and that religious beliefs of a people are an insufficient ground for building a nation—State. Using the same 'scientific' and deductive mind the same people do not go on to advocate the disappearance of either of the Vatican or of the State of Israel! Are they being irrational or illogical? To them success in *conflict* is basic to the validity of any concept. Since some people lost a war so their concepts must be defective; because Israel has won a succession of wars, Zionism must be right.

That is by their logic fair enough. But did Muslims really *apply* their concepts and fail? The answer is—and Muslim history is proof of it—that whenever and wherever we have applied our concepts we have nearly always succeeded. The odd failure was merely the exception that proved the rule—like the odd aircraft that falls to the ground or the individual who commits suicide.

But of course in recent years our rate of failure has reached alarming proportions. Almost every time we fail. The time has come when not the individual model but the basic design and concepts must be closely scrutinised.

Let us look at these. What is the situation? Virtually every part of the Muslim world has recently emerged from between a hundred to two hundred years of Western colonialism. The political control of the colonial powers has been withdrawn. They are supposedly 'free'. But an essential feature of the present situation is that the political structures and economic and educational systems are still the same as bequeathed by the departing colonial powers. In particular, before the Western powers withdrew they took care to destroy the Muslim tradition of scholarship. They created among us a group of people baptised in Western philosophy, literature, history, science, economics, politics and sociology. This Western oriented elite was established in the Muslim countries as a politically and economically powerful wealthy and corrupt middle class.

This elite inherited power from its mentor—the colonial power. Before the colonial powers withdrew they had taken care to integrate the colony's economy with their own highly developed economies in a relationship in which the former could not escape from the appointed place of being latter's poor relations!

The Western powers, through a process of education and political socialisation, also gave the concepts of geographical, linguistic and ethnic nationalism. These were secured in a capitalist system of economic structures based on usury—or the concept of 'every man against every man'. They were thus made 'modern'.

This goes to show that the recent Muslim failures are primarily the failures of Western concepts in these societies. If the post-colonial history has proved anything, it is that Western political concepts and *laissez faire* economics are irrelevant to our needs. To hide this obvious fact, Western propagandists tell that Muslim concepts have failed and that if they want to succeed, they ought to become even more modern, more Western, more nationalistic, and more capitalistic. The only spark of originality most of the Muslim intelligentsia is showing is to advocate our headlong advance towards socialism—the highest stage of capitalism! That immediate action is needed to eliminate the injustices perpetrated by the capitalist system is self-evident. It is also true that social justice and economic amelioration is the most urgent need of the Muslim society. But to seek social justice is not necessarily to be a socialist in the Marxist sense.

The other aspect of socialism that attracts the Muslim intelligentsia is the rapid economic development achieved by Russia and China and an equally spectacular economic advance happens to be their pressing need. What the 'socialists' among Muslims advocate is the adoption of economic policies and models of economic development followed in Russia or China in preference to Western economic policies. To advocate certain

*policies* is far from being a socialist. By confusing *policies* and tools of economic management with socialism they betray an ignorance of socialism. Socialism as practised in Russia and China, in Marxist theory itself, is not socialism at all—it is the stage of 'State capitalism' on the road to Utopian socialism when the State would 'wither away'. What is euphemistically called the dictatorship of the proletariat is in fact the dictatorship of capital controlled by a party and State bureaucracy. No socialist State has yet shown any signs of withering away.

Socialism and capitalism have one thing in common—both insist that the values of the people be forcibly changed. Capitalism and its political concomitant, social democracy, have already achieved this among the Western educated elites and the dominant classes in our society. Because democratic capitalism excludes the great mass of the people from political or economic participation—except as wage labourers, peasants, tenants-at-will and ballot box fodder for competing bourgeois parties—it purports to leave the values of the society relatively 'free'.

In fact, as Marx conclusively showed, bourgeois democracy uses such values to its own ends. Thus, though Marx's comment about religion being the 'opium of the masses' was directed at India of his day, he was in fact drawing on European experience. Marx had never been to the Indian subcontinent, or indeed anywhere outside Europe. In Europe the highly institutionalised, structured and hierarchical Churches in fact played into the hands first of the feudal system, and subsequently the capitalist system. Indeed, the Church was the greatest single feudal institution. The Reformation and the Renaissance were revolts against the Churches' feudal-political authority. Once the rise of the emperors against the Pope had broken the R.C. Church's political authority, there emerged the nation-State and the politically subservient Churches. The Church of England and Protestantism are the prime examples. The reformed Churches then became allies of the capitalist/democratic system.

But, with the arrival of full-employment economies and capitalism's advance to the stage of 'high mass consumption', the opium function of Christianity has been replaced by the movie, television, football, horse and dog racing, dance and bingo halls, betting shops, the 'popular' nude-a-day press, and now the sex shops. Capitalism and democracy have as effectively destroyed the Christian values of the European peoples as socialism is said to insist upon doing as part of the proletarian revolution. And yet one is endlessly told that socialism would destroy Islam while a band of so-called religious leaders are content with accepting the capitalist version of Islam. The fact remains that neither capitalism nor socialism can tolerate a situation where the social order is

based on, and draws its ultimate justification from, a set of values that are most generally held by the people.

In bourgeois politics the values of a people—whether Islamic, Christian, Jewish or any other—are used as the 'opium' of the masses. It is precisely in this role that the rulers of Pakistan have attempted to use Islam since 1947. But the attempt failed in so far as the capitalist system failed to legitimise its power in a 'democratic' political framework and the feudal/capitalist/bureaucratic dominance had to be secured through a succession of dictatorships.

The 'Islamic socialism' approach within a bourgeois political system is an admission of the failure of capitalism to use Islam as the legitimising factor. Maulana Maudoodi and his Jamaat-e-Islami fell in the trap of becoming identified with the *status quo* and paid dearly for it. Maudoodi and the Jamaat also became identified as the upholders of the ritualised Islam with greater emphasis on the salvation of the soul than on the needs of the body and mind in the immediate business of living. In any case, to succeed in the politics of a class ridden society, one has to be a bourgeois—a condition which neither Maudoodi nor his party sufficiently met.

Maudoodi insisted on democracy on the premise that the majority of the people being Muslims and being genuinely desirous of a truly Islamic order, would vote for his party in preference for the bourgeois parties of the Right and Left. Here Maudoodi made the most elementary of mistakes in predicting political behaviour. He assumed that the people's political behaviour would follow their *beliefs*. In fact *beliefs* seldom are a decisive factor in a behavioural equation unless these are mixed with an equally strong *reason*. The Pakistan Movement led by Jinnah succeeded because for a brief period the *beliefs* of the Muslims of the subcontinent were combined in a political programme that also appealed to their *reason*.

But *beliefs* on their own are not a sufficient condition for political behaviour. The belief-based Muslim political culture needed the infusion of a rationally articulated political programme which the Pakistan concept provided in the struggle to secure a homeland. But, unfortunately, the alienation of beliefs from reason re-emerged after 1947.\* The results are all too obvious. In one form or another the Muslims of the subcontinent—in Pakistan, Bangladesh and India—are once again under the hegemonic control of Delhi. It was this Hindu domination that they thought they had escaped with the establishment of Pakistan. The reason for rebuilding Pakistan is back with them. Unless they do that they shall piecemeal, like Bangladesh, disappear into the ever open arms of 'Mother India'.

\* The social, economic and political reasons for this are fully discussed in my book, *Conflict, Crisis and War in Pakistan* (London: Macmillan 1972).

policies of the first and second Nixon administrations. After having been awakened to a new awareness of the past heritage and achievements and their future potentialities, young black Americans are not prepared to take regressive or repressive policies meekly; they prefer to put up a fierce, bitter physical struggle.

Despite America's for-foreign-export propaganda about being the land of freedom democracy and equality, the touchstone has always been her treatment of her African minority, and she has come out always as a dual personality. America in 1973 is no more liberal or ready to accede human rights to black Americans than was the America of 1673, 1773 or 1873. Only the charade of mock democracy has marched on. During the past few years, nearly every programme designed to assist minorities in progress has been curtailed or abolished; the poor and disadvantaged are expected to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, though they do not even have shoes, figuratively speaking. Yet, America finds billions of dollars for programmes designed to kill Vietnamese, for example, or to bring back a few pieces of rock from the moon.

A nation that is willing to spend billions more for death than for life encourages the most mindless anti-social violence among its citizens.

S. S. Mufassir

## Letters

### "Whose Failure in Pakistan?"

Dr. Kaleem Siddiqui's article "Whose Failure in Pakistan?" (*Impact*, 2:15, 22 Dec. 1972-11 Jan. 1973) is thought-provoking in more respects than one. He is correct when he says that the failure of the political leadership of Pakistan cannot be laid at the door of Islam. But his observations about 'Maulana Maudoodi and his Jamaat-e-Islami' betray lack of information or a hasty generalisation, or both. The Jamaat-e-Islami did not become identified with the *status quo*, instead it alone rebelled against the *status quo* and 'paid dearly for it'. On the other hand the parties that represented the *status quo* were 'successful' because they did not attack the traditional seats of power, which the Jamaat had done. Sheikh Mujib's Awami League and Mr. Bhutto's Peoples Party represented directly or indirectly the power-complex of Pakistan politics—bureaucracy, feudal and industrial interests, foreign powers and the traditional ground forces. The Jamaat-e-Islami was too much of a rebel to the system and so committed to change it as to be accepted or even tolerated by the establishment. The slogans of the Awami League or the PPP must not confuse any perceptive political analyst. One must try to peep beneath their very thin veneer.

Any one who has some understanding of the political realities in Pakistan would find it difficult to agree with Dr. Siddiqui's other view that 'Maudoodi and the Jamaat also became identified with ritualised Islam'. Here again he shows ignorance or simplicity. In fact what he terms ritualised Islam was represented by Jamiat ul-Ulema Pakistan and the Jamiat-e-Ulema Islam, and if the 1970 election results were a reliable indicator (which many analysts dispute) of political success, this 'ritualised Islam' fared much better than the anti-*status quo* Islam of the Jamaat-e-Islami (the two Jamiats secured central seats as against 4 by the Jamaat). In at least two provinces of West Pakistan one of them even fared better than the PPP.

Dr. Siddiqui states that Maudoodi committed the most elementary of mistakes in predicting political behaviour on the assumption of peoples' belief. Any one who cares to study the Manifesto of the Jamaat or any other literature would agree that Dr. Siddiqui has perhaps tried to read something in the mind of Maudoodi, which was not there. The entire Movement of the Jamaat was directed towards the problem of rebuilding the broken bridge between belief and behaviour, individual and social. According to Maudoodi's analysis the real problem that besets the Muslims is the disruption of the link between *belief* and action. He does argue that action must follow belief but does not presuppose that this would come about automatically. He did not predict political behaviour on the basis of religious belief, on the other hand his efforts precisely were and are directed towards awakening the consciousness that this should. The Jamaat as a movement is nothing else but an effort to educate create a new social and political commitment to one's belief. The approach covers not merely the 'salvation of the soul' but is also directed equally to transforming this 'immediate business of living'. Maudoodi has tried to integrate 'belief' and 'reason' because one without the other is meaningless. Perhaps Maudoodi's failure lies in not pursuing the path of exploitation of politics, or of slogan-mongering. But he instead aimed at an ideological revolution through political education and rational persuasion. That is why the Jamaat has scored better amongst the educated as against the unknowing classes. Over eighty per cent of the 2 million votes the Jamaat got in 1970 came from the hearts of the cities. In Karachi it got about thirty per cent of the votes cast. In East Pakistan its position was second to that of the Awami League; while the Jamaat received 10% of the total votes cast, 12% were shared between some fourteen parties in the Opposition.

The post-1970 and continued success of the Islami Jamiat-e-Talaba in almost all the colleges and universities of West Pakistan can also be seen as a measure of success of this policy of rational persuasion. The Jamaat has yet to cover a vast ground, but it is not guilty of assuming that political behaviour follows automatically from religious beliefs.

KHURSHID AHMAD

Leicester, England.

### On Bangladesh logic and new French Translations of the Qur'an

In *Impact*, Vol. 2:16, you have published:

(a) an interesting interview of Mr. Zafar Ansari on Bangladesh. I have nothing to say about the answers you received, but I take respectfully a view different from yours expressed in one of the questions. You seem to presume that the East and West Pakistan being geographically separated, the union was unrealistic and unviable. I would submit that this very "weakness" was the greatest force and the best means for survival from a military point of view. Against a neighbour four times more powerful, believing in non-violence when un-armed and in Machiavellism when well-armed and desiring and preparing for expansion, even if the two Pakistans were in one piece, they would still be too weak against this neighbour. Even if all the whole of Pakistan was in piece, I would rather wish it to be in two wings so that India would be obliged always to divide its strength before attacking it. The fable of the two oxen and the lion is well-known, and how they were devoured by the lion when they decided to separate. India knew this better than the Pakistanis.

(b) a note on translations of the Quran. The Czech translator has the name Ivan Hrbk (even if you do not know how to pronounce it, the Czechs know that quite well). Your spelling Henryeck is imaginary. A new French translation and commentary has come out by the pen of Mr. Hamza Boubakeur (corruption of Abu-Bakr). Another *de luxe* French translation (costing about £100!) by Mr. Jean Grosjean. I will be reviewing the three for *Impact Insha Allah*.

A. M. NURUDDIN

Istanbul.

### Pakistan—Maugham Style

I never like to get involved in any of the self-maneuvering controversies, but going through Mr Jilani's "Inquest on Pakistan" (*Impact*, Vol. 2:11) and Mr. Kaukab Siddique's subsequent comments (*Impact*, Vol. 2:1) one gets the feeling that politics draw a great deal from fiction.

The sum of our recent history—in fact recent tragedies—lies in the doings of our politicians and statesmen who have been trying to create something popular and beautiful by mixing religion, aristocracy, sex and suspense, in the style of Somerset Maugham. I am, however, sorry to say that Pakistan can no more afford to bear such disastrous ploys. So, would every one, please, come back to the world of reality, of honesty, and of sincerity. Pakistan was meant to be fashioned in the style of *Khilafat-e-Rashidah* and it is still not too late to come to grips with the real problems.

(Miss) FATIMA NISAR

The University, Nottingham, U.K.

**LAGOS EMPORIUM**  
SPECIALISING IN AFRICAN  
AND INDO-PAK GROCERIES  
Fresh Halal Meat

68-D Blackstock Road, Finsbury Park  
London, N.4 Tel: 01-226 0427

# DAWN TRAVELS

dawn of a new  
travel era  
in comfort and in  
economy

Special fares for USA, Middle East,  
Indo-Pak subcontinent & South East  
Asia

**Dawn Travels Ltd**

3 Panton St., Haymarket, London S.W.1

Phone: 01-930 9971 (Two Lines)

## Letters

### Whose Failure in Pakistan?

Professor Khurshid Ahmad's letter (*Impact*, 2:18, 9-22 Feb. 1973) commenting on my article "Whose Failure in Pakistan?" (*Impact*, 2:15, 22 Dec. 1972-11 Jan. 1973) is welcome. I did not say that the Jamaat-e-Islami stood for the status quo; my point was, and remains, that the Jamaat, in popular mind, became identified with the status quo. It may be that the Jamaat wanted to change the system; but I insist that the Jamaat failed to put over its commitment to change and it also failed to capture the minds of those Professor Khurshid calls the "unknowing classes."

Professor Khurshid also disputes my point that the Jamaat represented "ritualised Islam." This is so manifestly true that I do not feel called upon to defend it.

The next point is rather more fundamental and important. If Maudoodi did not expect that at least a majority of the people—Professor Khurshid's "unknowing classes"—would vote with their beliefs, why did he insist on democracy? If Professor Khurshid is right then Maudoodi could not have assumed that the "unknowing classes" would vote with their reason. If so, then, in a country where the bulk of the population is "unknowing", democracy could not be expected to produce the desired result. Yet Maudoodi insisted upon democracy. Why? Why did Maudoodi not realise the true nature of bourgeois democracy? Why did Maudoodi not denounce the democratic farce enacted first by Ayub and then by Yahya? Why did Maudoodi take part in such a farce? Why did Maudoodi, regarding himself and his party as the standard-bearers of Islam, allow the name of Islam to be slurred in an election which was clearly a bourgeois affair? Why did he not stand aside and warn the Muslim *millat* (let us learn not to use the word "nation") that such democratic processes were a fraud perpetrated by the "power complex of Pakistan politics"? Why did he not present Islam's alternative to bourgeois democracy? Unless perhaps Maudoodi does not know what is Islam's alternative. If he does not, then he ought to say so; if he does then he ought to tell us; but to regard bourgeois democracy, even by implication, as "Islamic" or a process that might somehow lead to an "Islamic State," is, to say the least, an untenable position. My own view, perhaps based on "ignorance" (I await enlightenment), is that Maudoodi did not realise the need to produce an alternative to democracy. Professor Khurshid says that Maudoodi's "failure lies in not pursuing the path of exploitation of politics." I am not sure what exactly that phrase means, but it appears to claim credit for participating in a political game without abiding by the rules of that game. Why enter bourgeois politics if you cannot "exploit" it? If you have principles or scruples, why be a democrat?

Professor Khurshid says that the Jamaat has tried to integrate belief with reason and impart "political education." He then claims: "That is why the Jamaat has scored better against the educated as against the unknowing classes." In support he cites the fact that "over 80 per cent of the two million votes the jamaat got in 1970 came from the hearts of the cities." What he really means is that this is because the "educated" live in the cities and the "unknowing" outside them. The Jamaat had reached the former but not the latter. It follows, therefore, we would need large scale organisation before the Jamaat's Islam can be widely accepted.

Professor Khurshid can also be understood as saying that Islam's political message can only be understood by the "educated". If so, then this is a dangerous doctrine and stands the history of Islam on its head. Islam has always challenged the establishment of the "educated" and led the "unknowing" masses. The Jamaat, or any

other movement in the name of Islam, will never succeed, nor will it deserve to, without first (a) rejecting bourgeois democracy, (b) rejecting capitalism, feudalism and communism as equally and totally alien to Islam, and (c) producing an alternative that can be clearly understood by all as a rational solution to their everyday problems. The Jamaat failed on all these counts.

To introduce a distinction between the "educated" and the "unknowing" to defend the failure of the Jamaat and its leadership is a dangerous exercise in self-deception. The Muslim masses are still as good as 25 years ago or at any other time in history. The failure is entirely that of the leadership, both "secular" and "Islamic" and of the so called intellectuals.

Slough, Bucks, U.K.

KALIM SIDDIQUI

### Pattani Conflict: the other viewpoint

I was astonished by "The Conflict in Pattani" (*Impact* Dec. 22, '72- Jan. 11, '73). Astonished most of all by the pack of lies that appeared in the article.

Thailand is a sovereign Democratic Monarchy and if the 2% of the total population refuse to comply with normal convention or UnThai activities in the Kingdom then I would suggest to them to make themselves scarce or in other words 'get lost'.

Yes, there is a lack of qualified teachers in the South as well as brick schools. Why? Bricks school are bombed and burnt down and teachers are assassinated by the bandits and Communist terrorists. The people are forced to pay protection money or risk being shot at or have one's wife raped and brutally murdered before one's own eyes. A Muslim labourer in a rubber plantation was nailed to a rubber tree because the owner had refused to pay protection money. (I'm willing to name the plantation owner).

Would it be fair then to take the blame of the outlaws and place it on the head of the Buddhist government? After all the bandits and the Communists, acting in the name of liberating the Muslims, themselves are destroying the hope and aspiration of the Muslims, at the same time creating international conflict by claiming that the Thai government had placed Thai spies in Malaysia to spy on Malaysian students and their activities.

Turning the provinces into a Republic would result in its economic collapse because the area lacked capital, enterprise, initiative and honest and rational leadership, and when this happens Chin Peng would be very pleased to take over these provinces. And then what would happen both to the Malaysian states of Kelantan, Perak, Kedah and Perlis and these Southern provinces? Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

KASIM RATANAVONGSE

### Muslim hopes and fears

How often I wish to write and complain that *Impact* makes me so miserable! But what can you do if the so-called Islamic world is so boring, so miserably wretched and disgustingly sad and horribly false? Believe me, if I did not read the 'New Spectrum' in *Impact*, I would have a nervous breakdown. But, wait a minute, do not be impatient with my impressions.

The fact is that for almost nine years I was extremely upset and was gradually losing patience with the politicians and journalists (for that matter television can be included) in this country. I thought and thought that not many people were taking any responsibility and a reasonable stand to explain the Muslim attitude, hopes, desires and fears. . . .

Now I can say with a great sense of relief that *Impact* has taken my worries off my little mind and I can look after my home and children a little bit better.

Liverpool 17

Mrs. W. B. ABBASI

## India House Killings:

### Pakistanis in Britain express disgust

Impact Reporter

Around 400 Pakistanis answered the call of Pakistan Solidarity Front to gather at London's Conway Hall on Saturday, 22 February for a mass meeting. The gathering heard speeches from Pakistani leaders and then marched (accompanied by almost an equal number of police) to the Indian High Commission to protest against the shooting of the two Pakistani youths.

Addressing the participants, Mr. Shafiqul Islam said that the Pakistanis have not been doing justice to their commitment to Pakistan and the results were there to be seen. The only way for the two wings to come together, and in fact the only way for Pakistan to save itself from self destruction, was to fulfil the objects for which it was created. To transform Pakistan into a truly Islamic society.

Maulana Asad-ul-Qadri, reciting his speech in prose and poetry, said that all nations pass the stage which Pakistan was going through. But only those survived which understood the essence of life and the relationship between themselves and their Creator.

Dr. Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi spoke of the gross misrepresentation of the Pakistani case in the British Press. "Today", he said, "it is very difficult to get the truth to the British public". He concluded by pointing out that there was no justice for the weak, disunited, and decadent. Unless the Pakistanis rid themselves of these evils there was no hope.

The meeting passed resolutions condemning the police over-reaction in killing the Pakistani boys, on the shooting down of the Libyan Airliner by the Israeli jets, and the presence of arms inside the Iraqi embassy in Pakistan. The meeting also heard messages of sympathy from the Chinese and the Libyan ambassadors.

Pakistanis in Manchester, Bradford, Birmingham and other places also held meetings and organised marches to register their protest at these avoidable and sad killings, and called for the release of the PoWs held by India. The Bradford procession organised by the local People's Party was led by a child carrying a toy gun and a placard: Who's next for the Bobby's gun? In Birmingham, Mr. Denis Howell, M.P., told the meeting: "We must ask India what possible excuses there can be for the retention of these people in this way". Mrs. Jill Knight, M.P., advised Pakistanis not to use violence because "you will destroy your case for justice utterly if you are unjust yourself".

On 27 Feb. over five thousand Pakistanis coming from various parts of Britain offered funeral prayers in London's Hyde Park.

### BALDNESS!!!

When is it beyond repair?

Can Hair Loss be prevented and lost hair regained?

For free advice send S.A.E. to:

Dr. A. M. Khan,  
70, Ockendon Road,  
London N1 3NW. U.K.