

**Thoughts  
ON SOME ASPECTS  
OF ISLAM**

*By*  
**Zulfikar Ali Bhutto**

Reproduced by:

**Sani Hussain Panhwar**

Member Sindh Council, PPP

**THOUGHTS**  
**ON SOME ASPECTS OF**  
**ISLAM**

**BY**  
**Zulfikar Ali Bhutto**  
*Former Prime Minister of Pakistan*

*Introduction by:*

**MAULANA KAUSAR NIAZI**

**Reproduced By**  
**Sani Hussain Panhwar**  
**Member Sindh Council, PPP**

## CONTENTS

### INTRODUCTION

By Maulana Kausar Niazi, Minister for Religious Affairs ... .. 1

### 1. THE ISLAMIC HERITAGE:

Address in the University of Southern  
California, Los Angeles, 1 April 1948 ... .. 3

### 2. WORLD MUSLIM UNITY:

Address to the Islamic Summit Held in  
Lahore, 22 February 1974 ... .. 16

### 3. PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY PROPHET:

Address to Inaugurate the International  
Congress on Seerat at Rawalpindi,  
3 March 1976 ... .. 30

### 4. PAKISTAN WILL BE FORTRESS OF ISLAM:

Address at Reception of Delegates to the International  
Congress on Seerat, at Karachi, 13 March 1976 ... .. 35

## INTRODUCTION

This small volume contains four of the addresses delivered by Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto on subjects related with Islam. As Chairman and Founder of the Pakistan People's Party which swept the polls in December 1970 on a programme of economic well-being for the masses, then as President of Pakistan, an office he assumed in December 1971 after the separation of East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) and the fall of the military dictatorship, and later as Prime Minister under the new Constitution promulgated in August 1973, Mr. Bhutto made numerous speeches on various aspects of Islam as it affected life in this country. The people of Pakistan have unbounded love and devotion for their religion, and Mr. Bhutto's opponents tried their utmost to turn the people against him by painting him as anti-religious, or rather un-Islamic, in his political approach, an effort in which they miserably failed. These four speeches amply show what position Mr. Bhutto has given to Islam over the years (from a young student in an American University to the polished leader of today acknowledged and respected the world over) in his personal attitude towards life and how the faith has influenced--and almost permeated -- his opinions on politics, economics, social behavior and international relations.

It would be pertinent to mention here some of the extraordinary and unprecedented services rendered for Islam by Mr. Bhutto ever since he assumed the reins of power. In the new Constitution Islam was declared the State religion of Pakistan. In the first Hajj performed after his Government came into office all restrictions on travel to the Hejaz were removed and about one hundred thousand Pakistanis went on the sacred Pilgrimage. This was much more than doubled the maximum number that had ever performed Hajj in any previous year. The same liberal facilities have been provided during the subsequent years despite severe economic constraints.


It was laid down in the Constitution that teaching of Arabic would be encouraged, Islamiyat would be a compulsory subject for students and that error-free printing of the Holy Qur'an would be ensured. It is gratifying to note that under the able guidance of Mr. Bhutto all these constitutional provisions are being adequately fulfilled.

In implementation of another Constitutional provision, the Council of Islamic Ideology has been commissioned with the task of bringing all existing laws in line with the laws of Islam and of ensuring that in future no law against the spirit of the Holy Qur'an and *Sunnah* is enacted.

In the field of relations with the Islamic world the entire policy has been reoriented. Pakistan now stands on terms with Muslim countries more cordial than ever. The Islamic Summit held in Lahore in February 1974 was a unique gathering in the modern history of Islam. And the International Congress on *Seerat* which travelled to all the important cities of Pakistan in March 1976 was an occasion of which we can justly feel proud: Recently on visits to Pakistan the Imam of Masjid-i-Nabvi and the Imam of Holy Ka'bah led prayers in which the congregations were described as decidedly the biggest ever seen or heard of in the whole history of Islam. The love of the people of Pakistan for Islam can be matched only by the devotion shown to its cause by their leader.

***KAUSAR NIAZI***

Islamabad  
May 1976



**THE ISLAMIC HERITAGE**  
**Address In:**  
**The University of Southern California**  
**Los Angeles 1 April 1948**

## THE ISLAMIC HERITAGE

THE ISLAMIC HERITAGE: How am I to unfold this opulent heritage of ours; where can I begin? Where should I find the common meeting ground, the point of assimilation of our civilization with yours? Some say it lies in the conflict of the Crusades, others say it is to be found in the bloody conquest of Constantinople, yet others hold it to be the Moorish occupation of Spain, and still others maintain that the true blending of the West and the Islamic East came when Sir Thomas Roe set foot on Emperor Jahangir's Hindustan. To lift the curtain from any point would entail the omission of some handsome part of the Islamic civilization. It would mean the omission of the immortal 'Umar, the dauntless Khalid, the wise Akbar, the brave Tariq and a host of other outstanding celebrities, including 'Ali, Abu Bakr and 'Amr. How can I dare to call this talk "The Islamic Heritage" if such names are omitted? How can I have the effrontery to start from as late as the Crusades merely because the Western role in our lives is arbitrarily said to have started from that period? At the same time, it may seem out of place to reveal those aspects of Islamic history with which you do not share a common denominator. Nevertheless, I shall try to integrate all the important events and contributions of Islam in a manner that will interest you.

Throughout this talk, I shall refer to the accomplishments of Islam as my own accomplishments, for I genuinely consider any accomplishment of the Islamic people as a personal feat, just as I consider any failure of the Muslim world as a personal failure. There is something binding about the Muslim world in spite of the fact that it is torn by dissension. This may seem strange to you, but it is true. This unique attachment is partly because of a common religion which, from the outset, emphasised the strong ties of one Muslim to another as an essential part of the religion. This thought is cherished by the common association of the Muslim people in a geographical link that stretches from Europe to about the farthest corner of Asia.

I am not here to preach Islam to you or to threaten you with its dormant powers; I only want to tell you of the Islam that was a burning light of yesterday, the ember that it is today, and the celestial flame of tomorrow, for that is how I envisage the future of Islam. I must also tell you that, religiously speaking, I am not a devout Muslim. I do not say my prayers regularly; I do not keep all the fasts. I have not yet been on a Pilgrimage to Mecca. Therefore, religiously speaking, I am a poor Muslim. However, my interest is soaked in the political,



economic and cultural heritage of Islam. I will not discuss the religious implications of the faith, but its political and cultural developments. Before plunging into this task, I feel it essential to briefly give you a background of the essentials of Islam, the birth of the religion.

Arabia of the sixth century was surrounded by countries that had adorned world civilization. On the one hand was Alexandria in Egypt, Damascus in Syria, Antioch in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, ancient Babylon, Baghdad in Iraq, the pageantry of India, and, still farther East, the splendid civilization of China. On the other side of Arabia was the grandeur of Greece and the splendour of Rome and the majesty of the Byzantine Empire. Arabic was a little known and undisturbed expanse of sand in this array of jewels encircling it; even the reflections of these civilizations gave no light to the barbaric nomads of the desert. Not only was the country barren, but also the minds of its people. They were a people diseased with degrading moral codes. These people buried their daughters alive, considering the birth of one a disgrace; and a man among them could have a woman by merely throwing his cloak over her. Mecca was their centre of worship, with three hundred and fifty idols as their holy shrines.

But soon, these lizard-eating and moribund people of the desert were to be aroused by a vigorous force, a venerable and potent force that was to transform their lives. The founder of this dynamic force, whose religion was to embrace all the three known continents with lightning speed was Muhammad, his religion was Islam, which means submission to God. His fundamental tenets were:

- (a) The indivisibility of God.
- (b) The simplicity of belief.
- (c) The brotherhood of man.

He did not claim supernatural power of relationship with any deity, but said he was a humble messenger of the one and only Creator of the world. He was a rebel and a destroyer of all that was evil and decadent. Muhammad was at times forced to use the sword, not to defend himself, but to protect the infant religion of Islam. If the Arabs of his day had planned only to kill him, he would have given his life without hesitation, but the blood-thirsty, lawless nomads of the desert sought to destroy Islam and not Muhammad. These Arabs were brutal and fierce but it was Muhammad who cultivated these people and stimulated them with moral and intellectual curiosity, refined their laws, prohibited gambling and drinking, gave protection to women, raised them from the lowest human conditions to the most distinguished place in civilization. He inculcated in them a spirit of brotherhood and loyalty, fed them with virtuous ideals, and established for them a meaningful code of existence. Without any nebulous symbolism, without any ostentatious exploitation of altars, Muhammad



enshrined an immortal message in the hearts of not only his Arabs, but of the entire mankind.

“Ye people! hearken to my speech and comprehend the same. Know that every Muslim is the brother of every other Muslim. All of you are of the same equality,” said he to his people again and again until the believing Negro became the equal of the Khalifah of Islam. Europeans, conscious of the racial complexion of civilization, may know that from the first day racial differences were stamped out in Islam. Through a free intermingling of Muslims, the dominance of one particular race over another was abolished. It may be worthwhile to substantiate these remarks by pointing out that when the Aryans invaded India centuries ago, they immediately segregated the people of the country, drawing up the obnoxious caste system, but when the Mughals entered India, they allowed marriages with the Hindus, and associated them in running the State. Freed slaves even became sultans.

Now I shall deal briefly with the rapid spread of Islam. In a hundred and fifty years the march of Islam covered vast areas. On the west, the nineteen years old Tariq shattered the bulwarks of Spain, and, with it, captured the strategic rock which is named after him, Jabal-al-Tariq—the rock of Tariq, or, as we now call it, Gibraltar. In the Eastern Theater, the followers of Muhammad the Prophet reached the banks of the Indus and the Ganges. From the palaces of Vienna and France on the one side to the Great Wall of China; from the steppes of Russia and the fortresses of Venice to the plains of Iran and the jungles of Indonesia and Malaya; from the romantic Danube to the ever-winding Yangtze—vast territories came under the influence and control of a people who were derelict until the Prophet of Islam created in his followers the spirit to spread a doctrine of equality to the world. Many Westerners believe that Islam was a danger to Christianity, but this notion is unfounded. At the peak of Islam’s strength, the Christians were treated kindly everywhere and given full liberty to worship according to their ways. The Prophet had frequently stated that the lives, properties and laws of the Christians and the Jews were under the protection of God, and he said: “If anyone infringes their rights, I myself will be his enemy and, in the presence of God, I will bring a charge against him.”

There have been numerous Muslims who have strayed from the Islamic path, but that has been in spite of the law and not because of it. By token, there have been many Christians who have been most unchristian in their dealings. Christian priests, bishops and popes have repeatedly sworn to exterminate the infidels, and as late as the time of Gladstone, Turkey was in danger of being exterminated solely because she was a Muslim country. Isabella and Ferdinand of Spain did a much better job of wiping out the Muslims of Spain than any “infidel” had done with the Christians in any Muslim empire. Tolerance is not the monopoly of any

one religion. All prophets and reformers have preached the love of humanity, and the followers of all the religions have in some way violated the teaching of their founders.

Most of the literature I have read in this country on Islam has tried to show the intolerance of the Muslim people and the militant character of their religion. There is a reason for this propaganda and it does not lie in a true reading of history. It is based on prejudice arising out of rivalry.

During the Dark Ages, at the time when the kings and popes of Europe were exterminating "unbelievers," the Muslims were harboring non-Muslims in our lands. At the time when bigotry and hate drove out the non-Christians from Europe in the name of heresy and inquisition, the Islamic world opened its gates to them and gave them protection of their religious and social rights.

Pandit Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, says: "The Christianity that was practised there at the time was narrow and intolerant, and the contrast between this and the general toleration of the Muslim Arabs, with their message of human brotherhood, was marked. It was this that brought whole peoples, weary of Christian strife, to their side."

So supreme was the Muslim trust in the West that the popes were occupied in organizing the Christian world to exterminate the infidels in the name of God. Eight Crusades were mustered against Islam: on eight occasions the armies of Europe set out to defeat the Muslims in their own land. The first Crusade, as you know, proved disastrous for the Muslims. The Christian armies, pent up with zeal and determination to crush the infidels, did a savage job of liquidating as many Muslims as came their way. The barbarism of the first crusaders has badly scarred the face of the human race. It may have been a glorious victory of the Christian God, but it was a gruesome act of man against man in the name of God. After the first Crusade, from the Christian point of view, all the other Crusades were failures. When the intrepid Ghazi Salahuddin recaptured Jerusalem, he was magnanimous to the defeated Christians, allowing all of them to leave the Holy City after paying a ransom, and those who could not afford a ransom were permitted to leave through the beggars' gate; while those who wished to stay on were allowed to do so, in spite of the fact that they had formed a dangerous fifth column on previous occasions. During that time, Muslims were not only engaged in repulsing the crusaders, but also the ferocious Mongols who repeatedly attacked Muslims from the East.

About 1228 C.E., Frederick II, grandson of Barbarossa, after being excommunicated by Pope Gregory, went to Palestine to negotiate with the Muslims. He was received honorably and was successful in inducing the Muslim

rulers to restore Jerusalem to him in the name of the Christian nations. This was the most magnanimous gesture ever made, but it did not satisfy the Pope; on the contrary, it made him still more furious because he declared in anger that one should fight the infidel and not befriend him.

By citing these examples, I am not trying to state that only we are capable of tolerance, but that we also have an impressive record of virtue and moral goodness; that we are different from what the West thinks of us in the East. We are not barbarians. Instead, we opened the doors of civilization and culture.

The spread of Islam upset the *status quo* in Europe and Asia to such an extent that in the eighth century Pepin the Short, the son of Charles Martel, obtained the sanction of the Pope to declare himself the ruler of the Frankish nation merely because his father had defeated the Sacracens in the Battle of Tours in 732 C.E. This Muslim defeat in a shingle battle ended the Merovingian Dynasty and established the Carolingian line of kings, a dynasty which has been the pride of the Christian world because it gave birth to Charlemagne.

It would suffice to say, without going into further detail, that before the advent of the Industrial Revolution it was Islam that challenged the combined powers of the West and the East.

Toynbee says: "Centuries before communism was heard of, our ancestors found their bugbear in Islam. As late as the sixteenth century, Islam inspired the same hysteria in the western hearts as communism in the twentieth century. Like communism it wielded a sword of the spirit, against which there was no defence in material armaments."

It is difficult to describe the yearnings of man to build for permanence. To probe into the depths of a civilization is a time-consuming task. To delineate the achievements of art and literature and of science and philosophy, of any people is a strenuous undertaking. How am I to explain the contributions of a Hafiz or an Iqbal in this brief period? Where can I ask you to tarry for a moment and admire the fine works of art? Shall it be Umar's Mosque in Jerusalem or the Badshahi Mosque in Lahore or the Jami Masjid in Delhi or the city of Fatehpur Sikri? The followers of the Prophet have built for permanence wherever they have exerted their influence, at Granada, at Cairo, at Jerusalem, at Baghdad and at Delhi. The splendid Mosque of 'Omar, the gigantic Mosque of Hussain and the tall, dignified Qutb Millar depict in a most striking manner the Muslim talent for creative art.

In the lofty and masculine fort at Delhi, the silver and gold ceilings, die black marble floors, the magnificence of the Peacock Throne and splendour of the

jewelled halls, well befit the Persian inscription written in the rhythmic sweep of the Arabian script, which still survives: "If anywhere on earth there is Paradise, it is here, it is here, it is here." The forts of Agra and Fatehpur Sikri are today in defeated ruins, destroyed not by age but by rapine and plunder. Their debris is a constant reminder of our defeat, a living symbol of our disintegration. The conquerors of India must have been blind in their aesthetic senses, for they uprooted all the delicate beauty of our forts and mosques, our palaces and our monuments. Lord William Bentinck once even thought of selling the Taj Mahal to a Hindu contractor who believed that better use could be made of the material! The living pride of our architecture is the Taj Mahal, which we in our romantic feelings call "Love in Marble". It is the epitome of perfection, the most profound and concise symbol of love, the most lasting appreciation of man's affection, the most serene exhibition of his purity. On its main entrance is a quotation from the Qur'an which invites "the pure in heart" to enter "The Gardens of Paradise". There is nothing foreign about the Taj; it is the product of Muslim thinking and Muslim taste. Will Durant, the American historian, says, it is "completely Mohamedan, even the skilled artisans were, in part, brought in - from Baghdad, Constantinople and other centres of the Muslim faith".

The gardens of Shalimar in Lahore and Nishat in Kashmir, with their beautiful symmetry of the lawns and the cool surroundings chosen with immaculate care, the careful plantations of alluring flowers and the systematic structure of sparkling fountains, are a living wonder of man's efforts to strive for the highest form of beauty. H.G. Wells says: "The artistic and architectural remains of Moguls are still very abundant. When people speak of Indian art without any qualification, it is usually this great period that they have in mind." At this stage, it will be interesting to note that before the Mongols were converted to Islam, they were ruthless and uncivilized, but after the mass voluntary conversion of the descendants of the warlike Chengez Khan, they developed refined and cultivated values.

Now, I would like to mention some of the Muslim contributions in the fields of literature and science, starting with some of the universities of today and going back to the past contributions.

The University of al-Azhar in Cairo has the largest student body in the world, and it is the cultural seat of the Muslim world. Then there is the University of Istanbul, an excellent centre of learning with all the modern facilities for educational research. Another outstanding venue of Islamic learning is the University of Aligarh, the educational capital of the Muslims of the subcontinent. Yet another university of fame is the Osmania University in Hyderabad, Deccan; its fine campus, splendid buildings, and an outstanding faculty have made it a learning headquarter.

The influences of Muslim knowledge have been tremendous. Arabic words such as zero, cipher, traffic, admiral, magazine, alcohol, caravan, cheque, and tariff have become international words. The Moors of Spain have a distinguished history. Their hard work added much to Islam's wealth. Agriculture reached progressive stages under the Moors in Spain. They practised farming in a scientific manner, fertilizers were utilized by them, and they were the first to adapt crops to the quality of the soil. The Moors excelled in horticulture; they produced new varieties of fruits and flowers, and introduced to the West many trees and plants from the East and wrote treatises on farming. Their skilful use of irrigation is still utilized in Spain. They introduced the plantation of sugar, rice and cotton, and also perfumes, syrups, and a variety of wines. The Moors pioneered and perfected the carpet; silk, silver and gold embroidery; and leather manufactures.

SAYS HENRIETTA WAGNER: "We are indebted to the Saracens of Spain for the elements of many of the useful sciences, especially chemistry. They introduced the simple Arabic figures which we use in arithmetic. They taught mathematics, astronomy, philosophy and medicine, and were so superior in knowledge to the Christian nations of Europe that many Christians of all nations went to be educated in the Arabian school of Cordova."

Up to the fifteenth century the earth was considered as the centre of the universe, with the sun moving around it. However, as early as the seventh century, the Qur'an in its 36th *Surah* said: "The sun moves in a fixed place and each star moves in its own heaven. "This explains the movement of the sun around an axis and the movement of the moon, the earth, and other bodies. When the Western scientists read this explanation in the 36th *Surah* of the Qur'an, they ridiculed it. Nine hundred years later the world of science discarded the Ptolemaic conception, and Western astronomy adopted a line parallel with that of the Qur'an.

The zero was unknown until Muhammad Ibn Musa al-Khwarizmi invented it in the ninth century. He was also the first person to utilize the decimal notation and give the digits the value of position. However, many Indians claim that the zero is an Indian invention. Nevertheless, it would be safe to say that algebra particularly is a creation of the Muslims. Al-Khwarizmi, besides writing treatises on arithmetic, made great contributions in algebra, dealing mainly with quadratics. 'Umar Khayyam, who reformed the calendar in 1079 C.E., went even further with his contributions by using cubic equations. Spherical trigonometry is another Muslim achievement inventing sine, tangent and cotangent. In physics, the pendulum is an invention of the Arabs. Al-Hazen (Ibn Haitham) developed optics and challenged the view of Ptolemy and Euclid that the eye

sends out visual rays to its object. The Arabs built several observatories and astronomical instruments which are still used. They calculated the angle of the ecliptic and the precession of the equinoxes. Our universities also concentrated strongly on metaphysics, zoology and medicine.

In chemistry, the Muslims were the first to discover and use nitrate of silver, and nitric and sulphuric acids. Physiology and hygiene were developed by Muslims and the materia medica used by our forefathers was practically the same as today's. Muslim surgeons understood the use of anaesthetics centuries ago and performed some of the most difficult operations known. At the time when in Europe the practice of medicine was forbidden by the Church, the Muslims had a well-advanced science of medicine. Ibn Sina (Avicenna) known as "the Prince of Physicians," taught medicine and philosophy in Ispahan, and from the twelfth to the seventeenth century he was used in Europe as a guide to medicine. Al-Razi (Rhazes), who wrote more than two hundred treatises on medicine, is famous for his theses on the causes, development and remedies of smallpox and measles.

In manufactures the Muslims surpassed the world in beauty of design and accuracy of workmanship. Their contribution to the development of textiles is well known. Muslims made glass and pottery of the finest quality developed all the intricate secrets of dyeing yarns and invented processes of dressing leather. The manufacture of paper, which the Muslims learned from the Chinese by way of Central Asia, was brought to Europe by the Arabs. Before that, Europeans wrote on parchments.

Commerce was greatly developed by Muslim traders. This gave an impetus to worldwide contacts and spread Arabic as a world language.

At the time of Khalifah al-Mansur's rule in the middle of the eighth century, a research and translation bureau of Greek, Syriac, Zend, Latin and Sanskrit was established in Baghdad. Old monasteries in Syria were explored for valuable manuscripts. Greek philosophy mainly that of Plato and Aristotle was brought to the Muslim world by scholars driven out from old Alexandrian schools. Ptolemy and Euclid were studied extensively in universities at Baghdad and Cordova. When the works of Aristotle were banned in European universities, Muslim scholars encouraged their study in these centers of learning. Bertrand Russell says that Aristotle's reputation is mainly due to them; in antiquity he was seldom mentioned, and was not regarded as on the same level as Plato. The philosophical works of Plato, and especially of Aristotle, have had such a great influence on the Muslim mind that ever since the eighth century they have become standard subjects for study in Islamic schools. The materialist school of Greek philosophy led to the rise of rationalism and materialism in the Muslim world: The intellectual clashes of the two schools of thought spread from



Baghdad over all the Muslim countries, and finally reached Spain. In an age of religious fanaticism, the nature of God was discussed most freely in the various schools of Muslim metropolises. Ibn Rushd (Averroes), the illustrious philosopher, discussed with full freedom the nature of God in a spirit of free inquiry. Despite the rigid religious fanaticism of the ruling dynasty his views were heard and tolerated.

Muslim literature has been prolific both in poetry and in prose; 'Umar Khayyam as a poet pales into insignificance when compared with poets of the calibre of Sa'di or Hafiz or Nizami. The dazzling tales of Arabian Nights are only a fraction of our literature. However, our literature is little known to the West perhaps because it is difficult to translate and perhaps because of the traditional difference in the matters of style and subject-matter.

The flowering of Muslim culture has derived its inspiration from many sources; the Arabs have given it sensitivity and simplicity; the Turks, a spirit of vigour; the Indians, a rare subtlety; and the Iranians, the grace and delicacy of their creative talents.

We are living in a world torn by dissension, a world in which international relations are dominated by two factors—collective security and the balance of power, and, according to the influence of our chaotic times, we are forced to align ourselves in blocs. In one breath the leaders of the world preach peace and, in the next, threaten to obliterate civilization with atom bombs. Our position is pathetically unstable. Imperialism has sapped our vitality and drained our blood in every part of the globe. This is the time when the young generation of Muslims, who will be the leaders of a new force, of an order based on justice, wants the end of exploitation. We still retain a host of homogeneous affinities and with the unity of our culture we can unite again politically. In an Islamic confederation lies the future security of the disciples of Muhammad. In order to achieve this goal, we will have to tussle with destiny. To civilization we have given the essence of growth, and in return, we have become a plaything of foreign powers. In Indonesia we are being butchered because we demand freedom from foreign oppression, and we have enemies from Morocco to Java. I do not ask for unity in order to seek revenge, but in order to safeguard those rights which still remain in our possession. In order to be safe and secure, we have to be powerful, and that we can do only through unity. Force, unfortunately, has to be met by force. In our hands lies the future of our people and the responsibility of protecting their liberty. We will give to the world a blueprint of a brotherhood of mankind just as our founder gave the formula of human co-operation to the world more than thirteen hundred years ago.



During the First World War, the Indian Muslims refused to fight against the Muslims of Turkey. When Turkey was attacked in 1911, the Muslims of India felt a spontaneous wave of personal sympathy for them. The Muslim leader, Muhammad Ali and his brother were imprisoned by the British for their pro-Turkish feelings. The Khilafat Movement epitomized the fraternity of a Muslim people for their fellow Islamic nation. Muhammad Iqbal, the poet of Pakistan, has been immortalized for expressing Muslim sentiment on the fate of Turkey. When Kamal Pasha died, a gloom blanketed Muslim India.

I was very young then, but I still remember my servant telling me with tears in his eyes that he would rather have heard of the death of his only son than to be told of the death of Mustafa Kamal. I must point out the deep feeling of brotherhood among the Islamic people for Indonesia and the Arab nations. After World War II, we in our country took a great deal of interest in the crisis of Iran and were jubilant when the tension subsided. When Pakistan came into being we received Muslim delegations from all over the world, and were touched by the affection shown by the Muslims of the world for our new State. Very recently in an article, "Labours of the North-West," in the London Economist, tributes were paid to the sense of Islamic brotherhood developing between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Making a comparison between the British and Pakistan administrations in the tribal areas, the article says: "The Pakistan government has had the advantage of being able to appeal to Islamic sentiments, and it has, consequently, been able to show decisiveness which seemed lacking in the previous administration."

I could go on indefinitely into the evidence of harmony that exists among the Islamic peoples. However, there is no guarantee that this feeling will last for ever; as a matter of fact, there are signs of new tensions. It is my firm belief that these bonds will have to be consciously strengthened before the Muslim nations begin to industrialize on a large scale. With rapid technological advances, and the values going into it, traits of the past might come under new strains. It is incumbent upon us to consolidate our advantageous position at this stage and build a base for a new order bound by ancient ties. Another factor that will promote this unity is the sense of grief and grievance felt by all Islamic nations against the calculated injustice done to them, the common oppression experienced by all of them without exception.

Some people object to an Islamic confederation on the ground that there will not be any economic gains from such an association. The co-operation of nations is an advancement. It has political and economic benefits, but even if the benefits are not colossal, even if certain Muslim countries have to make sacrifices economically for a few years, such a union should take place, for one blood, one culture and one heritage subjected to ruthless exploitation for over a century

demand this association. This is the century in which underdeveloped countries are being developed. Our potential economic resources are abundant, as is amply indicated by the Western interests in our theater of the world.

Unfortunately, because of our feebleness, our economic resources are being most unscrupulously exploited by outsiders. The exploiters are shamefully busy filling the coffers of the money-mad and cut-throat business interests of the West. An Islamic confederation, even at its weakest, will take charge of the wealth of its people and place it in the hands of its own people.

Now I would like to present a skeleton of this plan. According to the law of evolution, this association will develop in stages; first will come a harmonizing of our own people by massive contacts, by a large scale exchange of students, professors, artists, and all other intellectuals who influence the minds of men. Those intellectuals through conventions and conferences will discuss common problems. In due course permanent information and cultural centers and public relations bureaus will be established in our large cities. Our people will be encouraged to travel in our countries on concessional rates. Passport restrictions will be lifted, and communications developed. These efforts will be followed by economic co-operation climaxing in a loose political alliance, from one continent to the other.

If we work conscientiously in this direction, I think that within the space of the next twenty years, this movement will take a definite shape. I must make it clear that it will not be based on a theocratic principle. There are some non-Muslim countries in the Middle East which are today members of Muslim Arab Leagues and which will willingly enter this union because of mutual interests. We will have to look mainly in the direction of Pakistan for this divine inspiration. From Turkey we will have to take the means of attaining methods of modernity without losing the Islamic identity, and from Iran the spirit of accommodation. The Arabs and the Africans, the Indians and the Indonesians will each render a profound contribution. The new concepts will have to be mingled with the spiritual values, the maxims of democracy with those of socialism. We will have to raise from our soil an Atatürk or a Jinnah who will mobilize our people, rekindle our spirits, reconcile our traditions and customs with technological developments and establish an impregnable bulwark.

There are some people who say that Turkey will shy away from such a union. There is no truth in such a belief. Turkey was forced to retreat from the Muslim orbit because the weaknesses of the Muslim nations were heavily sapping her vitality. Thus, because of the derelict position of the Muslim world and the delicate position of Turkey in European affairs, Turkey for her own security had no alternative but to concentrate fully towards the developments in the West.

Because of her unique position and strategic location, Turkey has been forced to sign agreements with countries that have always sought to destroy her. She has been forced to bow her head to a country thousands of miles away from her only because she cannot turn today in another direction. Turkey has no desire to lose her Islamic character, and with the organization of a potent unification of the Muslim world, dictating its own terms, Turkey will align herself with her own people. With her own people awakening, Turkey will one day gladly untie the chains of the West and amalgamate with those who are of her own kind.

Today, I am as hopeful of an Islamic confederation as I was of the creation of Pakistan before the division of India. Pakistan has taken its rightful place in the family of nations; tomorrow a confederation of the Islamic nations will be a reality. Those who mocked the foundation of the largest Muslim nation are now retreating from their previous stands. It is inevitable that the small pebbles that are endeavoring to obstruct the flow of events will be washed aside. We shall toil ceaselessly for the rejuvenation and renaissance of our people.

Toynbee says: "Pan-Islamism is dormant— we have to reckon with the possibility that the sleeper may awake, if ever the cosmopolitan proletariat of a 'westernized' world revolts against western domination and cries out for anti-western leadership. That call might have incalculable psychological effects in evoking the militant spirit of Islam—even if it has slumbered as long as the Seven Sleepers— because it might awaken echoes of a heroic age. On two historic occasions in the past, Islam has been the sign in which an oriental society has risen up victoriously against an occidental intruder. If the present situation of mankind were to precipitate a 'race war', Islam might be moved to play her historic role once again."

Destiny demands an Islamic association, political reality justifies it, posterity awaits, it, and by God we will have it. Courage is in our blood; we are the children of a rich heritage. We shall succeed.



**WORLD MUSLIM UNITY**  
**Address To:**  
**The Islamic Summit**  
**Lahore, 22 February 1974**

## WORLD MUSLIM UNITY

This unique assemblage of Monarchs, Presidents and Prime Ministers has gathered at a moment in world affairs which is as critical as it can be creative. Here is a resplendent array of statesmen and leaders, profound in their insight into the issues that will engage us at this Conference. By asking me to preside at it, you have conferred an honour upon me which in reality is a tribute to Pakistan. I am filled with both humility and pride: the humility is personal and the pride national.

By agreeing to meet here, this assembly has honored also the city of Lahore. This ancient city symbolizes not only Pakistan's national struggle but also its abiding solidarity with the Muslim world. Here in Lahore lived that magnificent herald of Islamic renaissance, Muhammad Iqbal, who fathered the idea of Pakistan, who articulated the Muslim's anguish and his hope and whose voice sounded the clarion call of revolt and resurgence.

Also here in Lahore, thirty-four years ago, was adopted the celebrated resolution that inaugurated the glorious freedom struggle of the Muslims of the South-Asian subcontinent under the leadership of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah. It is a fact of no small significance that the same session of the Muslim League which adopted the Pakistan Resolution also adopted unanimously a resolution on Palestine. The resolution recorded, and I quote, "the considered opinion, in clear and unequivocal language, that no arrangements of a piecemeal character should be made in Palestine which are contrary in spirit and opposed to the pledges given to the Muslim world." The resolution further warned against the danger of using force in the Holy Land "to overawe the Arabs...into submission".

With only the amendments necessary because of the disappearance of British colonialism, the resolution is as pertinent today as it was in 1940. Not the quirks of history but the sublime logic of Providence has decreed that the same warning should again issue from Lahore.

Pakistan's support for the just causes of the Muslim world is organically related to its own national vocation. It has never suffered a severance between its national impulse and the urges of Muslim emancipation. When the partition of Palestine was decided under the British Mandate, a demonstration was held here

in Lahore at which Iqbal was present. On that occasion, he emphasised that the problem of Palestine, and I quote his words, "does not concern Palestine alone, but will have wide repercussions in the entire Islamic world." Later, in October 1947, soon after our emergence, the Quad-i-Azam warned that the partition of Palestine would entail, and I quote his words, "the gravest danger and unprecedented conflict" and that "the entire Muslim world will revolt against such a decision which cannot be supported historically and morally." Soon afterwards, Pakistan said at the United Nations that the Holy Land was being nailed and stretched on the cross. All these words went unheeded, but today, decades later, they are still timely.

Pakistan's involvement with the issue whose scene is the Arab Middle East is accompanied by its deep attachment to its dear neighbor Iran and to Turkey and by friendship and cordiality with other Muslim countries—and if I specially mention Indonesia and Malaysia, I do not underrate our relations with others. Pakistan's cultural history bears a Persian-Turkish stamp. It is an immense source of satisfaction to us that this historical affinity is now reflected in close fraternal relations with both these countries, relations which have proved sustaining in times of stress. With Afghanistan, Pakistan shares a good part of its history, culture and traditions. Pakistan's approach to the problems of the Muslim world its, therefore, informed with a certain range of sympathy and awareness. This, we believe, is in accord with the great ends of Muslim brotherhood.

A few moments ago, in deference to the sentiments of the leaders participating in this Conference and as a result of the mediatory efforts of this Conference my Government has extended formal recognition to Bangladesh. We hope this mutual reconciliation, which is in the spirit of Islamic fraternity, will now bury a past that the peoples of both our countries would prefer to see forgotten.

It is only natural that the leaders of the Muslim world, even when coming to this meeting, should have their minds full of a variety of concerns—some national, others regional, all bearing on Muslim interests. But this Conference cannot address itself except to the specific pin-rose for which it has been convened as a sequel to the war of October 1973. All of us are aware that the previous Summit Conference, which was held in Rabat in 1969, was convened to consider the question of Jerusalem following the outrage committed under Israeli occupation to the Holy-al-Aqsa Mosque. Likewise, this conference has a circumscribed agenda. By adopting the agenda, we do not deny that there are other vital issues which agitate Muslim minds. These are burning issues too. Your host country, for instance, has been a victim of international conspiracies and is concerned with an intense question in which, it believes, its stand is based on nothing but justice and concern for Muslim rights. However, we would be doing a disservice

to the Conference if we sought to exploit this platform to ventilate our national standpoints. If Muslims sustain their unity, if they mutually strengthen themselves, if they place equity above expedience, if they perceive the direction of historic forces, a time will come when such issues can be discussed without apology or awkwardness. At present, this Conference is primarily concerned with the preeminent issues that are inscribed on its agenda and that concern the heartland of Muslim life and culture.

The situation in the Middle East is an outgrowth of the problem of Palestine and the core of the Problem, viewed both historically and concentrically, is al-Quds or Jerusalem. Fifty years ago, there was no Palestine problem; there was only a country named Palestine. Only the right arrogated to itself by Western colonialism enabled one Western nation to promise to a section of another people, namely, the Jews, the country of a third, the Arabs. It needs to be reiterated that it is this fundamental injustice, this uprooting of a people from their homeland and the planting of an alien population on it that evokes the resentment of the entire Muslim world. The malady consists of a cancerous outgrowth of colonialism, the establishment of settler regimes or the imposition of immigrant minority rule. The root cause of the conflict is not an innate animosity between the Muslim and the Jew or even between the Arab and the Jew. As Muslims we entertain no hostility against any human community; when we say this, we do not exclude the Jewish people. To Jews as Jews we bear no malice; to Jews as Zionists, intoxicated with their militarism and reeking with technological arrogance, we refuse to be hospitable. The pogroms inflicted on them during the centuries and the holocaust to which they were subjected under Nazism fill some of the darkest pages of human history. But redemption should have come from the Western world and not have been exacted, as it was, from the Palestinian people.

The tragedy of Palestine has agitated Muslim minds for half a century. The outrage of its partition in 1947 and the graver injury of its occupation by Israel in 1967 have been intolerable because the territory is part of the spiritual centre of the Muslim world. The Palestine question was referred to the world organization at a time when that organization was hardly representative of the international community. The plan which it put forward for the partition of Palestine would not obtain a passing consideration today from the majority of its membership consisting of the Third World nations that are sworn to the principle of the self-determination of peoples. Even at that time, the Muslim nations reminded the Western world of its own long-term interests and of the folly of forcibly driving a wedge into the Middle East. These reminders proved fruitless. These importunities were scorned.

This is the historic dimension of the Middle East problem which cannot be banished from sight even when present realities are to be focused upon. Israel



has gorged and fattened on the West's sympathies, nurtured itself on violence and expanded through aggression. It has brought suffering to the inhabitants of the land which it usurped, sequestered their patrimony and ejected them by the hundreds of thousands. Its neighbouring nations have been robbed of their peace and tranquility. Its apologists have sought to justify its repeated resorts to force on the ground of security. But nothing could be clearer than that belligerency towards its neighbours will only turn Israel into an international ghetto. Force cannot bring it security nor obduracy peace.

After 1967 Israel became more and more arrogant; it derided the censure of its actions by the United Nations. Its advocates became increasingly apathetic to the growing signs of the untenability of the situation arising from the war of 1967. The result was that an iniquitous, indeed an absurd, situation was frozen and the forces of sanity became immobile.

This was the cause of the war of 1973. A recourse to war can never be a happy decision. Which nation would willingly sacrifice the flower of its manhood or wish to forfeit its development and mortgage its progress? But situations arise in which there is no choice but war against the usurper. Such a situation was created for the Arab peoples. Tribute is due to them for meeting it manfully. Let us pay homage to those who laid down their lives in the sands of Sinai and the heights of Golans. These martyrs died in the cause of justice and human dignity.

The war has released currents which could flow towards a just settlement of the Middle East problem. The Arab cause has been actively supported by a vast segment of humanity. The nations of Africa have demonstrated their solidarity with Arabs and placed principle above expediency. Under the pressure of the economic forces, if not through a perception of the rights and wrongs of the situation, the Western powers have awakened to the urgency of a definitive settlement of the Middle East problem. The mediatory processes which have thus been put into motion are not to be disdained.

These are good auguries. But they can vanish if apathy towards the root of the problem, and a satisfaction at partial solutions, begins to sway the policies of those who have supported Israel. On their part, the Arab States have shown that their approach to the problem is not theological, like Israel's, but one which visualizes a series of peaceful adjustments beginning with disengagement.

Disengagement, however, is not peace. It can turn peace into a mirage if it operates as a substitute for a comprehensive settlement. We have a right to expect that the peace which is negotiated in Geneva will deal with all the issues integral to the Middle East conflict. The withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, the restoration of the Holy City to Arab

sovereignty and the restitution of the rights of the Palestinian people are the essential elements of a settlement.

All these elements derive from the rational principles of a just and durable peace. All of them come within the four corners of Resolution 242, if that resolution is rightly interpreted. The exponents of the Israeli view contend that the Security Council resolution envisages the possibility of Israel retaining a part of the occupied Arab territories. This contention is sought to be based on the provision regarding the right of every State in the region “to live in peace within secure and recognised boundaries”. The perversity of such an interpretation is evident from the fact that the resolution as a whole states its objective to be “the fulfillment of Charter principles”. What principle is more basic to the Charter of the United Nations than the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force? Furthermore, no State can arrogate to itself the right to determine its secure borders even if these encroach on the territory of another. No State claims such a right. The security of a State’s frontiers depends on their conformity to international law. A nation’s defence strategy is based on its recognised frontiers and not on its aggressive appetites. Finally, the question arises: Whose security comes first? Certainly, on the record of the aggressions committed during the last twenty-seven years, it is the Arabs who need secure borders against Israel and not Israel against the Arabs.

Among the Arab territories occupied by Israel, al-Quds holds a special place in Muslim hearts. A unique symbol of the confluence of Islam with the sacred traditions of Abraham, Moses and Jesus, all of them Prophets whom Muslims hold in the highest reverence, Jerusalem is inscribed on our souls as the site of, in the words of the Holy Qur’an, “the Farther Mosque the precincts of which Allah has blessed”. Associated as it is with the Ascension of the Last Prophet, it is tied to our inmost spiritual fiber. Except for an interval during the Crusades, it has been a Muslim city – I repeat, a Muslim city – from the year 637 C.E. For more than thirteen hundred years Muslims have held Jerusalem as a trust for all who venerated it. Muslims alone could be its loving and impartial custodians for the simple reason that Muslims alone believe in all the three prophetic traditions rooted in Jerusalem.

We gladly recognize that Jerusalem affects the cherished sensibilities of men and women of three world faiths. But there are two thousand million Muslims and Christians, and fifteen million Jews, in the world. Out of these, less than three million owe their allegiance to Israel. What principle of justice would confer on this minority the right to hold dominion over the Holy City? What except a kind of cynicism can allow the City of Peace to be treated by Israel as the spoils of war? I must make it clear that it is our position on Jerusalem but Israel’s which is contrary to the objective criteria by which the status of territories is determined.

It is Israel which cites the name of a religion and a culture and invokes its memories or emotions in order to lend justification to acts that are wholly illegal. Such attempts can only make a conflict implacable and bring in its train a religious war. Viewed in a non-religious perspective, the question of Jerusalem's status cannot be unrelated to the sovereign rights of the people of Jerusalem itself the majority of whom were Arabs, violently expelled and uprooted from the western part in 1948. Nor can the special attachment of Jewish people to Jerusalem override the principle of the inadmissibility of territorial acquisition by force. The Jewish right to Jerusalem certainly connotes the right of access and worship. We cannot recognize any additional right.

On the basis of all these considerations, the issue of the Holy City of Jerusalem admits of no doubt or division in our ranks. Let me make it clear from this platform that any agreement, any protocol, any understanding which postulates the continuance of Israeli occupation of the Holy City or the transfer of the Holy City to any non-Muslim or non-Arab sovereignty will not be worth the paper it is written on.

This is not a threat. I am saying it in full awareness of the intricacies of the negotiations which may be under way. Not to give this warning would be to encourage an illusion which will be fatal to the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East. In this respect, there is a fire in our hearts which no prevarication, no skilful evasions on the part of others, will ever be able to quench.

The international community, and particularly those States which sponsored the partition of Palestine in 1947, bear a heavy responsibility. They have to redress the injustices perpetrated on the Palestinian people. If it were not also tragic, what could be more bizarre than the phenomenon of a people being dispossessed of its homeland and condemned to live in agony and dispersion, not in imperialism's hoary past but in our day and age? Who cannot understand their anger at seeing immigrants from all over the world invited, nay cajoled, to settle on their own homeland? It is not the eruptions of insensate violence, disowned by their leadership, but the purity of their rights which must influence the world's attitude to their problem.

The States gathered here today are committed by the very fact of their adherence to the Charter of the Islamic Conference to strive for the restitution of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. This is our obligation not only to the people of Palestine, not even merely to the cause of Islamic brotherhood, but also to the larger cause of universal peace. We see glimmers today of a new recognition of the need to resolve the problem of Palestine. This recognition has

been earned by the heroic sons and daughters of Palestine through their suffering, their fortitude and the constancy of their commitment.

We are emerging today out of nearly a half millennium of decline. During this long period, our collective attitude has been one of nostalgia for a vanished glory mixed with incomprehension of the movements of history. There were occasional thrusts of hope and endeavor but, by and large, we have lived, as Iqbal said, "in a prison-house of thoughts and emotions which, during the course of centuries, we have forged around ourselves". "The superb idealism of our faith," in Iqbal's words, was stifled by "the mediaeval fancies of theologians and legists." And intellectual lethargy paralyzed our thought. Empiricism withered among us. Obscurantism took hold. The spirit of inquiry and enterprise was deadened. Form became more important than substance. We broke ourselves into schisms; we became a collection of warring factions. This brought about the inroads, and eventually the invasion, of Western colonialism. From Maghreb to Indonesia, the Muslim peoples came under the domination, in one form or another, of Western Europe. Our cultures were fragmented, our traditions ruptured and our mutual communications disrupted. The imperialist powers belittled our heritage, pillaged our treasures, denuded us of our resources and the flower of our manhood was sacrificed to serve their strategies. Muslim was turned against Muslim, brother against brother. There was a continuity of setbacks, a succession of disasters, which we shared in common with all the oppressed peoples of the world.

Not until the Second World War exhausted the warring States of Europe did the era of colonialism come to an end and the nations of the Third World, including the Muslim countries, achieve independence. But mere political independence brought nothing more than the trappings of sovereignty. Economic life in the developing countries remained tied to the so-called "metropolitan" areas. The Third World remained consigned to the role of supplying raw materials for the industrialized nations. It had no control over the exploitation of its natural resources and no power to determine the prices of the commodities which it produced. Steadily, the value of these commodities fell in relation to the price of industrial goods and services supplied by the affluent nations. This enormous iniquity has been much talked about. The Third World has emphasised, time and again, that poverty and affluence cannot co-exist in the world of today. But, apart from the scant response from the industrialized world, we ourselves have not fully realized the nature and value of economic power nor grasped the urgent need of developing science and technology for our progress, indeed for our very survival. We have not appreciated that it was not a want of spiritual strength in us, compared with other peoples that made humiliation our lot, but the weakness of our economic enterprise and organization. After all, even in the darkest days of colonialism, we did not lack faith but we certainly lacked an

understanding of economic forces and technology and the role played by them in fashioning a people's fate.

The war of last October has, however, precipitated a chain of events and created an environment in which the developing countries can at last hope to secure the establishment of a more equitable economic order. Some far-reaching possibilities have been opened by the demonstrated ability of the oil-producing countries to concert their policies and determine the price of their resources. This may well be a watershed in history. It may well presage the end of a deranged world order.

With the recent dramatic improvement in the terms of trade of the oil-producing countries, which will lead to a rapid increase in their financial resources, an unprecedented shift will occur in the global monetary and financial balance of power. The Third World can now participate in the economic and financial councils of the world on an equal footing with the developed countries and will be able to acquire a due measure of influence and control in international financial and economic institutions. Indeed, for the first time, the Third World is potentially in a position to use its own resources for financing its development through co-operative effort. It can now forge its own financial institutions for bringing about rapid development of the less developed countries.

These are exciting opportunities. They can be grasped or they can be missed. For there are also perils and pitfalls in the present situation. The gravest of these is that of a division between the oil-producing and the non-oil-producing countries of the Third World. The dislocation in the balance of payments position of developing countries which has occurred suddenly can be used to sow discord and cause disarray in the ranks of Asian and African nations with grave damage to the political causes they are espousing today.

This is a danger which must be overcome by positive action. Concrete measures have to be evolved, institutions established and machineries devised, which would channel the resources now commanded by the oil-producers in such a way as to release them from their dependence on countries outside the Third World for their basic needs and services and also strengthen the Third World economically. The concept implicit in this approach is not that of aid as a form of charity from one developing country to another. The concept is that of mutually supportive economic activity in countries of the Third World which would complement their individual resources and give them a collective economic strength.

I said before that, compared to other peoples, it is not spiritual but economic strength that we have lacked so far. There is no power without economic

strength. Unless we reorientate our outlook and try to develop the potential to meet our basic economic and security needs through cooperative endeavor, we will continue to lack the inherent strength, the solidity, which is necessary for achieving our social, cultural and political purposes. The Muslim countries are now so placed as to be able to play a most constructive and rewarding role for co-operation among themselves and with other countries of the Third World. Nor only are they possessed of a common heritage and outlook, but also their economies are such as to enable them to supplement one another's development effort. It is time that we translate the sentiments of Islamic unity into concrete measures of cooperation and mutual benefit. It will bring us strength in spirit and substance. Let not posterity say that we were presented with an historic, possibly unrepeatable, opportunity to release ourselves from the injustices inflicted on us for many centuries and we proved ourselves unequal to it.

The kind of action that we envisage may entail some new departures. But it can be fuelled by certain positive elements. There are distinct signs of a new vision today. Moved by it, and despite the current hardships they face, the non-oil-producing countries like Pakistan are determined not to succumb to any pressures which would disrupt the unity of the Third World. Efforts are being made to achieve viable solutions in the larger context of the problem of commodity prices in relation to the prices of industrial products. The United Nations certainly has to shoulder a responsibility in this field. We have warmly supported the initiative taken by Algeria to have the problem discussed in a global, and not a parochial, perspective. The issues, though seemingly economic, are political in the deepest sense. But given an attitude of mutual understanding and accommodation, the apparently conflicting interests of the various groups of countries can be reconciled. We must all pool our endeavors towards that objective.

As we meet here today, I find it necessary that we should clearly set forth not only our attitudes to the issues of the day but also the bases of Muslim unity. There are certain features of our aim and purpose which are not yet clearly perceived by the rest of the world. These must be stressed if an understanding of the Muslim world is to be promoted in the rest of the human race.

First, we repudiate chauvinism as much as we reject alien dominance. This repudiation arises not only from our recognition of the realities of time and space, but from the very spirit and temper of Islam. As there is an arrogance of power, so also can there be an arrogance of belief. Our religion warns us severely against any conceit which would breed the delusion that we are the chosen people and we enjoy immunity from the operation of the forces that shape the destinies of mankind.



Secondly, our vocation as Muslims is not to harbour hostility against other human communities, East or West, North or South, but to so conduct ourselves that we can help build bridges of communication and sympathy between one set of nations and another. We draw our inspiration from the Holy Quran and I quote:

*“Say: To Allah belong both. East and West: He guideth whom He will to a straight path. Thus We have appointed you a midmost nation that you might be witnesses over the nations and the Apostle a witness over yourselves.”*

In being called the midmost nation or the People of the Middle, we are charged with the mission of mediating conflicts, spurning the doctrines of bigotry and hate, trampling underfoot the myths of racial or cultural superiority and translating into social terms the concepts of mercy and beneficence which constitute the core of our faith.

The concept of the People of the Middle is suggestive also of a new synthesis. Through a conventional opposition, the East has been contemplative and the West, materialistic and pragmatic. Islam rejects such dichotomies. The Muslim accepts worlds, the spiritual and the material. What he tries to do is to find the reserves of spirituality, the respect for human personality and the sense of what is sacred in all cultural traditions, which could serve to fashion a new type of man. His aim is more than the mere mastery of Nature. If he is a true Muslim, he is at once Eastern and Western, materialistic and spiritual, a man of enterprise as well as of grace.

Thirdly, it is inherent in our purpose that we promote, rather than subvert, the solidarity of the Third World. This solidarity is based on human and not on ethnic factors. The distinctions of race are anathema to Islam but a kinship of suffering and struggle appeals to a religion which has always battled against oppression and sought to establish justice. This solidarity reflects the similarity of the historic experiences of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They have suffered the same injustices, borne the same travail and are engaged in the same struggle. Theirs is solidarity of the forces that seek to combat exploitation, end the disparities in mankind’s lot and reclaim the inheritance of its majority.

It may well be that, in the cause of the Third World, and in humanity’s struggle towards a balanced world order, we, the Muslims, are now being called upon to play a central role.

I must, in this context, refer to a certain ambivalence in our Muslim minds about the role of nationalism in Islam and its compatibility with the establishment of an



Islamic community. Let us face it that there has been some uncertainty on this issue. We have several nationalisms among us, Arab and non-Arab, all equally vigorous and vibrant with aspiration. All these nationalisms constitute our responses to the historic situation that we have confronted in our different geographical locations. Nationalism as the motive force of a people's liberation, nationalism as an agent of a people's consolidation, nationalism as a propeller of social and economic progress is a powerful force which we will do nothing to weaken. Furthermore, nationalism is a necessary tributary to the broad stream of human culture. It takes a full understanding of one's own country, of its history and language and traditions to develop an understanding of other countries, of their inner life and of our relations with them. Islam provides both the spirit and the technique of such mutuality. Patriotism and loyalty to Islam can thus be fused into a transcendent harmony. As Muslims, we can rise higher than our nationalism, without damaging or destroying it.

But we have studied the history of Europe and we cannot refuse to profit from its experience. Nationalism as a breeder of discord and as an agent of untrammelled egoism has brought untold sorrow to the Western peoples. It has limited mankind's horizons, constricted its sympathies. It has spawned wars. Its history is soaked in blood. Not we, the Muslims, alone, but all peoples of the Third World must despise that kind of nationalism. Without, therefore, visualizing the establishment of a supranational entity which would stifle the positive aspects of nationalism, our grouping together can have no meaning if it does not help us to avoid the perils to which Europe laid prone for nearly four hundred years. It is inevitable that, in the course of human events, we, as nation-states, will sometimes have differences between ourselves. Nothing would be more chimerical than the notion that such differences can be eliminated overnight. But the important thing is our resolve that we shall not let these differences ever be so magnified as to impel one Muslim nation to go to war with another or interfere in its internal affairs.

In an age when no nation can sustain its insularity, at a time when communications and economic forces are serving to promote larger groupings of nations and countries, we owe no apology for the reassertion of the common affinities amongst the countries of the Muslim world.

I have ventured to set forth some basic view-points of the Islamic Community which, I believe, are beyond controversy among us. As we proceed to our discussions, we have to bear in mind that it would be unrealistic to expect a complete identity of approach and emphasis among thirty-six sovereign States. Each State represented here works under compulsions which cannot be precisely the same as those felt by another. But while we can differ on points of stress and on tactics, I believe we will all hold fast to a unity of purpose and aim. We can

say without exaggeration that our purpose is unsullied by any thoughts of aggrandizement. We can say with confidence that our aim is to promote justice and equilibrium. Our unity is not directed against any creed, religious or secular. It is not nourished by hate or rancour. Its drive and force is a passion for justice.

This Conference must awaken the world's appreciation of the fact that the Arab cause is the cause of all countries, small and large, which oppose aggression and will not suffer the use of force to be rewarded with territorial gains.

This Conference must drive home to the world that the cause of the people of Palestine is the cause of all those who believe in the right of a people to determine its own destiny.

This Conference must indelibly impress, indeed brand, on the consciousness of humanity that we will not permit the spiritual vocation of Jerusalem to be subjected to the fortunes of war.

This Conference must herald the coming of an era of fruitful economic cooperation among the developing countries for their common benefit.

Thus, this Conference will contribute towards a covenant of peace in the tormented lands of the Middle East. It will also, I hope, initiate the processes which will result in strengthening the economic, social and cultural enterprises of the Muslim peoples.

As I survey this splendid gathering, I recall that as a young student twenty-six years ago, I was asked to address the student body of a University, almost wholly non-Muslim, on the Islamic Heritage. After making a youthful attempt at defining it, I spoke of Muslim unity against exploitation and of Muslim revival and sketched a plan for a Muslim commonwealth. I ventured to predict that a movement in this direction would take shape in the next twenty years.

There have been periods in my life when, like all of us, I have been assailed by doubts whether this vision of mine would be fulfilled. Today, despite all difficulties in our path, I bow my head in gratitude to Allah for making me witness to a scene which should dispel those doubts.

I trust that we will not fritter away the historic opportunities now presented to us. For long centuries, we have hoped for a turning point. That turning point has arrived. The break of a new dawn is not now a forlorn hope. Poverty need no longer be our portion. Humiliation need no longer be our heritage. Ignorance need no longer be the emblem of our identity.

I cannot conclude better than with that sublime prayerful message which comes at the end of the longest chapter of the Holy Scripture:

*"Allah tasketh not a soul beyond its scope;*

*"For it, that which it hath earned and against it that which it hath deserved;*


*"Our Lord! condemn us not if we forget or fall into error;*

*"Our Lord! lay not on us such a burden as Thou didst lay upon those before us;*

*"Our Lord! impose not on us a burden greater than we have the strength to bear;*

*"Absolve us and forgive us and have mercy on us:*

*"Thou art our Protector; grant us succour against those who reject Thee.*



**PERSONALITY OF THE  
HOLY PROPHET**

**Address To.**

**The International Congress on Seerat  
Rawalpindi - Pakistan  
3 March 1976**

## PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY PROPHET

Let me, first of all, bid our distinguished guests welcome to Pakistan. I am happy to say that the August purpose for which they are foregathered from all parts of the world adds a measure of sacred sentiment to this welcome.

We have in our midst today not only renowned scholars – a fair number of them imbued with deep admiration for the Prophet of Islam, although professing different faith than ours – but also some of the most eminent personalities of the Muslim world revered and respected equally at home and abroad. No less distinguished are the Ministers of Muslim countries who have travelled long distances to pay their homage to the Holy Prophet. It is, therefore, with no small pride and with great happiness that I greet them in Pakistan. Indeed I bow my head in gratitude to Allah Who has enabled my country to organise this magnificent congregation of friends in the service of Islam.

Two years ago Pakistan was host to the biggest Assembly ever seen of leaders representing Muslim countries. It was a giant step towards the achievement of Muslim unity and solidarity, an ideal long envisioned by Muslim leaders such as Jamaluddin Afghani and Dr. Muhammad Iqbal. While the outcome of that historic conference was most satisfying, I have wished since then to see translated into reality the expression of Islamic spirit which overwhelmed its participants. There could not have been a better way than this most practical step to study, understand and disseminate the teachings of the last Messenger of God. It is my firm belief that the study of the life of the Holy Prophet cannot but reinvigorate our faith in equality, fraternity, social justice and universality of mankind – the principles that constitute the message of Islam and the goal of the Summit. This is my conviction; and I have stressed it on a number of occasions that the future of mankind lies in abiding by these principles.

Discussing the features of the foreign policy of Pakistan, I wrote eleven years ago that “the future of mankind clearly depends upon its ability to develop bonds of fraternity between peoples with different racial and cultural backgrounds in different parts of the world”. To this I added that “such a development has so far come only from Islam”.

It was my faith in these principles, as enunciated by the Holy Prophet himself, that has guided me throughout these years, and it was with this view that my Government decided to transform the Milad-un-Nabi celebrations into an

occasion for scholars to study and discuss his life and teachings. For this purpose a National *Seerat* Committee has been constituted to coordinate the numerous but hitherto unorganized annual *Milad* festivities in the country into meaningful and instructive *Seerat* celebrations. It is a measure of the National *Seerat* Committee's success that it has started its activities by an International *Seerat* Congress.

The purpose of convening this Congress is to promote, through discussion of the life and work of the Prophet, the ideal of Muslim solidarity and greater understanding of his message by Muslims and non-Muslims alike. In fact, this is not our final goal. Our final goal is to bring about unity of mankind. For, as the Qur'an says it explicitly, the Prophet was sent to be the "Mercy" for the entire universe. I am, therefore, particularly happy to see in this Congress scholars representing various nationalities as well as different faiths. Their participation has made this Congress a proper platform and a joint venture to study and discuss *Seerat* on a truly international level.

The *Seerat* of the Holy Prophet has interested me not only because I am a Muslim but also because he is the perfect ideal for the modern man. He emancipated the human mind from the bondage of man-made gods and dogmas. He taught equality of man without discrimination of race, colour or faith. He brought to mankind the message of love, peace and compassion. He stood for the rights of the oppressed. He raised the status of women by giving them the right to property, matrimonial security and equality before law. He stressed upon the rights of slaves and urged for their freedom. He made the welfare of the poor and the incapacitated the responsibility of the community and the State. He condemned all types of tyranny and exploitation of the downtrodden in agricultural, commercial and other relationships in the various modes of production.

The Holy Prophet prescribed rules of war which are valid to the present day. He was also a political genius; and he also urged his followers to inculcate in themselves a spirit of enquiry and tolerance. His personality was such that he was not even once betrayed by his close disciples or his Caliphs as happened with Jesus Christ. Women too showed for him the same of deep loyalty.

The Prophet liberated the human mind from superstition. He brought the light of reason to show the way out from the darkness of ignorance in which mankind had languished for centuries. This light not only filled man with self-confidence but also gave him the urge to explore the universe, to study the laws of Nature and to contemplate on the purpose of this whole phenomenon and man's place and role in it.



These teachings of the Prophet brought mankind to a decisive turning point in its history and set into motion a great revolution in human thought. This is the reason that wherever his message reached it launched a new era of social change and intellectual curiosity. It is not surprising; therefore, that long before the advent of the Industrial Revolution, Islam, as a revolutionary force, had become a threat to the exploiting systems of the medieval ages.

This role of Islam has continued to guide mankind, and particularly Muslims in their struggle against injustice. In recent history it again inspired them to fight against colonialism and imperialism. Elaborating on this point, I wrote in 1965:

*“Islam was born to be a force for the establishment of equality and justice. The opposition to imperialism and colonialism of other forces is at best founded on an apprehension and a doctrinaire conviction but in Islam it is a part of the religion itself. Thus Islam is committed morally and historically to the struggle against domination and exploitation.”*

Thus Islam has been associated in history with the revolt of mankind against tyranny and oppression. While it was a threat to the oppressors, the spirit of Islam inspired the oppressed to stand for their rights.

The principles of equality and social justice in the Prophet’s teachings have always reinforced my faith in the relevance of his message for the modern man. As a student of *Seerat* I have venerated him as a great benefactor of mankind who gave practical expression to concepts like social justice and human unity. My faith in this aspect of *Seerat* has in fact always given me strength to live through crisis. I recall that in December 1971, when my country was in the grip of the worst tragedy in its history, I was not dismayed. I was confident that the principles enunciated by the Holy Prophet will lead me and my country successfully through the crisis. It was this conviction that has led us to a better and a more dignified Pakistan which you see today than the shambles that existed four years ago.

The life and teachings of the Holy Prophet has been the cornerstone of my Government’s foreign policy and our land, labour, law, education and other numerous reforms. It has been the governing principle of the Pakistan People’s Party which I have the honour to lead. Therefore, whatever best there is in us, and whatever good we have achieved so far, we owe to our adherence to the teachings of the Holy Prophet, particularly his concepts of equality and social justice.

The deliberations on these aspects of *Seerat* raise a number of questions in the mind of the modern man. Is it not a fact that we are followers of the Holy

Prophet who taught these noble principles of equality, unity and social justice and whose life was the best example of these principles? Then why is it that we form the majority of the people who are suffering from social injustice, inequality, parochialism, prejudice, hate, exploitation and all such vices? Why is it that most of us are still living under the feudal distinction of tribes and castes? Why is it that our percentage of literacy, per capita income and other such progress indexes are lower than those of most of other nations?

Obviously, something has gone wrong with us, or we have failed to understand the teachings of the Prophet. Indeed, it is a very disturbing situation I am sure that during the next twelve days the participants of this Congress will be analyzing some of these questions.


To my mind the first point that calls for the attention of Muslim scholars is the part of the *Seerat* which has been made mythical and legendary and in which the human character of the Prophet has lost its significance. It is, therefore, the duty of Muslim scholars to bring out from the *Seerat* a clear message to the modern man.

The other point addresses itself to the Western scholars of Islam. The image of the Prophet in the West is covered with the cobwebs of hate, prejudice and ignorance. It is rather embarrassing that, while the modern man in the West is so enlightened about the world and its neighborly planets, medieval biases still linger on in respect of Islam and its founder.

I would, however, say that Muslims should spread the message of the Prophet with full confidence and without caring for the prejudices that exist in some parts of the West. We are on the right and we need not be on the defensive in respect of our faith. As Muslims we do not owe any explanation to non-Muslims on the truth and purity of the message of Islam or the sterling character of the Holy Prophet.

However, the Congress must contribute to a better understanding of the *Seerat* of the Holy Prophet among the people of different faiths, and more so among Muslims themselves. Having done this, I am sure, the Congress will herald an era of meaningful cooperation at the religious level between all nations aspiring for human equality and unity of mankind and the sponsors of the Congress will have rendered in truly memorable service to Islam....

May Allah bless this congregation and its deliberations. It is with great pleasure that I inaugurate the first International Congress on *Seerat*.



**PAKISTAN WILL BE  
FORTRESS OF ISLAM**  
**Address at Reception of Delegates To:  
The International Congress on Seerat  
Karachi - Pakistan  
13 March 1976**

## PAKISTAN WILL BE FORTRESS OF ISLAM

Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in a marathon, wide-ranging speech asserted tonight that he was determined to make Pakistan "a mighty fortress of Islam".

The Prime Minister was speaking at a reception he hosted in honour of the delegates to the International *Seerat* Congress.

He spoke with unique fervor and frankness, analyzing the socio-political conditions of the Islamic world in the backdrop of historical forces and political complexities and received frequent cheers from the audience.

Mr. Bhutto called for the study of Islam in its totality in the historical process. He made a fervent call for the unity of the Arab and Muslim countries.

He served notice that the struggle against Israel which is preparing for a fourth war was not a simple struggle. "Israel," he added, "was a very grave threat."

My Bhutto, in his forward looking address, talked about the emancipation of women as stressed in Islam. He described Islam as a progressive force and declared that it was Islam's knowledge which spread and destroyed the dark ages of Europe and gave enlightenment and technology to Europe.

"Islam is the vehicle of modernism and the vehicle of technology," he said.

Admitting that the enemies of Islam injured the case of Islam, he posed the question: "Does no responsibility fall on our shoulders?" Answering himself, he said that degradation, stagnation and illiteracy replaced enlightenment and tolerance in Muslim society. This happened because religion was exploited and religion was made, for a period of time, the opium of the people.

Mr. Bhutto spoke in clear, ringing tones before the international audience of Muslims delegates drawn from various continents. His speech was simultaneously translated in Arabic.

### *Continuing Efforts*

He told the delegates: "We have had the honour to hold this important *Seerat* Conference in Pakistan. We hope that your stay in Pakistan has been constructive

and that you will be returning to your countries with the feeling that, here in Pakistan, we have made and we will continue to make efforts for the promotion of good work like the work that you have undertaken for this Conference.”

He said he wished to make a few observations on the conditions in the world today.

“In our opinion conditions in the world are both in a state of revolution and in a state of turmoil.”

The Prime Minister said: “A panorama of the whole world will show that forces of dynamism, forces of change and forces of progress are at work. A mighty clash is taking place between the old order and the emerging new order.” He said there were many forces at work today but the principal forces were those of ideology, nationalism and religion.

“Ideologies, nationalism and religion have many common factors and many common denominators. They have many common interests, but they have many divergences also.”

He asked: “Is it our duty to stress on divergences to bring greater disorder or is it in our interests to see how the divergences can be reconciled and to bring order out of the chaos? Both these are open before humanity. Both these forces with the consequent effects are before us. The options have to be exercised soon, otherwise I fear the world will get into greater turmoil.”

These divergences, he added, could be rationally reconciled and *modus vivendi* could be arrived at without compromises or without compromising either ideologies, nationalism or religion.

He stressed he did not plead for the triumph of one over the other or the capitulation of either. “In my humble opinion, if we do not comprehend this phenomenon we will not be able to evaluate the historical process.”

### ***Historical Process***

Mr. Bhutto said it was essential for stability, equilibrium and balance, to understand the historical process and come to a correct conclusion and to have a truly worldwide perspective. This should be done without prejudice, fear and complexes overwhelming our thinking. This process, he said, would “be understood and grasped only by a detached analysis without vested interest and by the application of truth”.

The Prime Minister, giving reasons for holding the *Seerat* Conference in Pakistan, emphasised: “I can tell you straightway without any fear of contradiction that we have not held this Conference to have political gains or political advantages. We have held it simply because it is our duty. Why is it our duty? On this matter in the last ten days or so eminent scholars have been reading papers and deliberating on the necessity and the need for such a Conference.

Mr. Bhutto said: “I will not waste your time by repeating the obvious essentials and the obvious need for a *Seerat* Congress to arrive at scientific and logical conclusions on the thoughts of the Holy Prophet and on the scientific approach in the field of Islam. Before the *Seerat* Conference, we have held Islamic Summit Conference. I again repeat that these conferences and activities have been held in my country because it is our duty.”

He declared: “Islam is our faith, Islam is our religion, Islam is the basis of Pakistan. Our Constitution is Islamic in character, the overwhelming majority of our people is Muslim and, as you have seen, we are deeply attached to Islam.”

He said if, therefore, anyone sought to exploit and make gains out of such activities he was not serving the cause of Islam, nor was he being a true Muslim. Islam should never be exploited for individual gains or for the protection of vested interests or for the old order. That would be a very great disservice to Islam.

### *The Exploiters*

“Unfortunately it has been so used in the past. Unfortunately even in the short history of Pakistan it has been so used for political gains or for individual gains or for the gain of groups or gains of the vested interests. This is not only so in Pakistan, but it is also true in many of the Muslim countries. Islam has been opposed by its adversaries and injured by some of its adherents. It has been our struggle—it has been my struggle in Pakistan—not to exploit the name of Islam and not permit exploitation in the name of Islam.”

In measured unequivocal terms, the Prime Minister declared: “Islam is against exploitation and hypocrisy is the greatest sin in Islam. But some of us have been super hypocrites instead of becoming Super Powers.”

He referred to Lenin’s statement that religion was the opium of the masses. “Our struggle—my struggle—is to demonstrate that religion and at least Islam is not the opium of people, but that it is an eternal force of highest moral values,” the Prime Minister declared.



## *Flexibility*

He asked: "What is our aim? What do we live for? To make progress or to destroy ourselves? Some say that there is no world or no life hereafter. Those who say so believe exclusively in the material life. Some say that life in this world is redundant and that there is only the world hereafter. Islam, the realist and rational religion, believes in both the worlds— the spiritual and the material. In the material world Islam teaches compromise and flexibility within its unalterable principles."

These, he said, were only a few principles. They were not in the form of dogmas.

"I can give you many examples. Our Holy Prophet (may peace be upon him) took a flexible, realistic and compromising attitude towards Judaism and Christianity. This was because he laid the greatest stress on rationality.

"It is this stress on rationality which led to a sense of balance and it is this stress on rationality which made him reject excesses. Islam, being an eternal and final religion, is always revolutionary and always modern. It was said in the course of this Conference that we need the moral man and not the modern man. This, in my opinion, is a contradiction because the moral man can be the modern man. Indeed modern man has to be a moral man."

The Prime Minister spoke at length on the status of women in Islam. He said: "The Holy Prophet emancipated the women and yet we find in some parts of the world of Islam, and you must have seen in some parts of Pakistan, women in *purdah*. In some States *purdah* has been abolished by law. We have no intention to do so in Pakistan. But this does not mean that we are in favour of *purdah*. The poor of this country, those women who work in the fields do not observe *purdah*. It is only those who are in middle classes or richer classes who decide whether" to adopt *purdah* or not. Either all our women—poor rich—should observe *purdah*, or all our women—rich and poor—should have the same rights and the same facilities."

Pakistan, he said, was an extremely poor country, one of the poorest countries of the world.

Giving a graphic description of the situation in the country, the Prime Minister observed: "We have no wealth, no oil resources, we do not have many natural resources. Our population is over seventy million. Our financial resources are very limited. We have got great priorities—priorities of defence, priorities of security, priorities of economic development, priorities of education—and yet we have to provide for separate schools and colleges for girls and boys. I know of

places where we have had to build colleges for only seven to ten girl students. In this illiterate country, where illiteracy has to be destroyed and liquidated, where resources are so limited, we had, out of prejudices, out of false prejudices, to indulge in such kind of wastages. This is only one striking example. I can give many more. When the Holy Prophet said: 'To see knowledge you have to go to China,' did he not stress the greatest value of knowledge? And did he say that only men should seek knowledge in China? And did he first say that we must discover whether knowledge in any such country is in mixed schools and colleges or separate schools and colleges?

“When the Prophet emancipated women he set into motion a force—a progressive force—which had no dimension in space or time. And with the passage of time it was anticipated that women would be given more and more rights. He emancipated them from a slave and feudal society. As society progressed from feudalism and slavery came to an end, the emancipation was to proceed with the times.

“It was this quest for knowledge that made Muslim scholars study Ptolemy, Aristotle and Greek thought. And it was this knowledge of Islam which spread and destroyed the Dark Ages of Europe, and brought enlightenment and technology to Europe. Islam was the vehicle of modernism and the vehicle of technology. But what happened? The irony of history is that disservice done to Islam by some of its adherents did injury to it and the forces which were emancipated by Islam turned their knowledge and turned their technology against Islam and the curse of imperialism spread over the whole world and also the Islamic world.”

He asked: “Is there a single Muslim country which escaped from imperialism?” and said: “Every Muslim country came under the domination of imperialism. The religion was the same. It was still the final religion. It was still the last religion. It was still the same religion with the same principles. The religion which spread to Europe, and spread around the world in the shortest possible time, again came in the shortest possible time under the domination of imperialism and colonialism.

“Of course our enemies are responsible. Of course non-Muslims are responsible. But can we say that exclusively non-Muslims and the enemies of Islam are responsible? Does no responsibility fall on our shoulders? You have only to look into the history of the whole period to know to what extent the responsibility falls on our shoulders for distorting our principles.

“Degradation, stagnation and illiteracy replaced enlightenment and tolerance in the Islamic society. Muslims fought Muslims. Why? Because religion was

exploited and religion was made, for a period of time, the opium of the (people. Vested interest tried to bring Islam to a standstill, and (he Islamic society to a standstill.”

The Prime Minister said feelingly: “Efforts were made to deride technology and industry. Efforts were being made to consider that knowledge was no longer valuable. Resistance was brought about against change and the result was that we fought among ourselves. And we got divided and further divided. It is our duty to study Islam in its totality in the historical process. In all parts of the world, we have to study it rind we have to study the other forces at work. We have to study the forces of democracy, nationalism, socialism and communism.

“If we have confidence in our own faith, and we in Pakistan have confidence in our faith, then we need not fear any other ideology or any form of system of life and government. It is the fear of communism that has brought about great insecurity and is shaking the nations unnecessarily. We in Pakistan do not fear communism. We have faith in our religion and we are determined to show to the world that we can preserve our own order progressively, and no inroads can be made into it, if we do so. Yet we have to draw from the virtues and from the benefits of all other contemporary forces. In this material world, we have to make compromises, without compromising our fundamental principles. It is said that a system of economics, which is against the vested interests, is against Islam. But is capitalism then a part of Islam? But capitalism exists in the world of Islam. We have first to fight the system that exists rather than fight the system that has not yet come into being in our society.”

Explaining further the present-day political issues vis-à-vis Islam, the Prime Minister said: “Parliamentary democracy is not a part of Islam, yet many Muslim countries have adopted parliamentary form of Government. So for them, capitalism and parliamentary democracy are compatible with Islam, but an economic system, whatever you may call it, which abolishes poverty and exploitation, which emancipates women, they regard as being against Islam.

The Arab States are the homeland of Islam. It is from Arabia that Islam came and went to all corners of the world.”

He posed the question: “What is the position in the Arab world today?” and said: “A great intrigue is taking place in Lebanon. Who are the intriguers? Who wants to divide Lebanon? Who are the intriguers who want to provoke Israel to take over South Lebanon?

“Arab States are fighting in the Sahara. There is tension, instability and insecurity in the Persian Gulf. While you fight over the word Persian, God knows what

many more forces might arise there. We have the Indian Ocean. We don't call it the Pakistani Ocean.

"It does not make us stronger or weaker, but must Muslims fight with each other over names also? And this is happening at what time?

"This is happening at a time when Israel has had three wars against the Arabs. In all the three wars Israel has achieved her objective and Israel is preparing for the fourth war.

"Why is Israel preparing for the fourth war? Some of our brothers are rebuilding skyscrapers and preparing for eternal peace.

"In China they are building underground tunnels against atomic warfare.

"This struggle against Israel is not a simple struggle. It is a very grave threat and, while this sword of threat hangs over principally the Arab States, these States are divided among themselves and are not choosing the right priorities. This is partly because you do not know who your enemy is and who your friend is.

"You might tell me that Pakistan has a dispute with Afghanistan. This is not correct. Afghanistan has a dispute with Pakistan. Pakistan has no dispute with Afghanistan and Pakistan will never provoke a war with Afghanistan. We have given the facilities to Afghanistan, which no other coastal State has given to a land-locked country. Intriguers tried to cause differences between us and Bangladesh, but you know today, the people of Bangladesh want complete fraternity and friendship and brotherhood with Pakistan. Life is in God's hands and a Muslim must not fear death.

"I can tell you as Prime Minister of Pakistan and Chairman of Pakistan People's Party that I am determined to make Pakistan into a mighty fortress of Islam. But this can be done only if we do not reject technology, if we do not reject modern virtues and values, if we have complete confidence in our own society, if we don't indulge in hypocrisy, if we know that we have to move forward and onward without compromising our great religion. I have perhaps spoken controversially but in this galaxy of great scholars from Muslim countries, in the company of brothers and sisters, I would not be true to my mission if I did not speak at least some truth.