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Pakistan is our Israel.

— *Chinese official*¹

Verily the word of God teaches us, and we implicitly believe this … that for a Muslim to kill a Jew, or for him to be killed by a Jew ensures him an immediate entry into Heaven and into the august presence of God Almighty. What more then can a Muslim want in this hard world …

— *Ibn Sa’ud, 1937*²

Two states came into existence in 1947 and 1948: one, Pakistan; two, Israel. The two are threats to each other. Ultimately, only one of them will survive.

— *Lt.-Gen. Hamid Gul, Lahore, April 2008*³

Remember, a captive Jew is worth fifty non-Jewish ones.

— *Lashkar-e Taiba (LeT) handler, Chabad House siege, Bombay, November 2008*⁴
'Pakistan,' so the Israeli sociologist Shalva Weil opines in the opening of a summation, ‘was never traditionally anti-Semitic. In fact it may come as a surprise that Pakistan hosted small, yet thriving, Jewish communities from the 19th century until the end of the 1960s.'\(^5\) Her contention is incorrect on two counts. There was no Pakistan until August 14, 1947 and those Jews domiciled in Karachi, Lahore and elsewhere, during the ‘19th century’ as well as the early twentieth, belonged to British India. It is a truism that in South Asia, as the Far East, the attitudes of local peoples or their rulers (Hindu dynasts, Mughals), towards Jews were neither predicated nor animated by anti-Semitism stemming from either deicide or distrust charges. Weil correctly states elsewhere that, ‘In pre-partition India, the Jews are treated with tolerance and equality.’\(^6\) Credit where credit due, the Raj — not devlet, mamalakat or saltanat thus putting paid any lachrymose nostrums nurtured by part-time islamophiles qua full-time anti-semites (or vice-versa?) of a ‘golden age’ or convivencia.\(^7\) Chesterton once quipped that the golden age only comes to men when they have forgotten gold.

The second objection, understandably overlooked by Weil, to say nothing of historians of South Asia generally, is that the germ of anti-Semitism among Indian Muslims turned Pakistanis overnight is detectable right away in the Jinnah Papers, the official pronouncements and correspondence of its founding father, Mohammed Ali Jinnah (1876-1948). One cannot conjecture why it has escaped the attention of those routinely engaged in a close, critical combing of primary sources for Jinnah or Pakistan Studies.

Therein one discovers, on the eve of the Quaid-e Azam’s (‘Great Leader’) death, a telegram designated ‘TOP SECRET/MOST IMMEDIATE’ wired by its first ambassador to the United States, M. A. Hassan Ispahani, from Washington DC to Karachi, notifying that arrangements were afoot for a certain Dr. McLeod Riggins, ‘very renowned chest and lung
specialist’, to be despatched swiftly to the ailing Jinnah in Balochistan, now the shadow of a ‘terrific dandy’ whose ‘monocle completed the picture of some suntanned eccentric from a Michael Arlen novel’.  

Seventy-two hours prior to his demise — in Karachi where he was flown from Quetta — is a rejoinder appended alongside a reply tersely telegrammed to Ispahani by one F. Amin, Assistant Private Secretary to the Governor-General: ‘Continuation my telegram of September 8. Kindly intimate immediately names of specialists selected by you. Needless to say they should not repeat not be Jews.’ There is, subsequently and ironically, anecdotal evidence for European Jewish physicians recruited by the newly formed Pakistan army.

What can be dispelled is a dying Jinnah having expressed any such preference prior to being treated. As Margaret Bourke-White presciently prophecised, it was left to the messiah’s minions, for ‘now that his new nation had been achieved the bigots were in a position of authority.’ Jinnah, as reminisced by Frank Moraes following his death, ‘more surely understood the Muslim mass mind of India, nor knew better how intuitively to appeal to it, to cajole and rouse it. With Pakistan Mr. Jinnah rang a bell which acted like a tocsin.’ It went down as a tonic with Indian Muslims in 1946 whose ‘[i]ncreased popular support for the Pakistan demand was reflected in the growing number of people who directly participated in League processions and rallies, not all of whom were eligible to vote in the elections themselves. In provinces such as Punjab, there was clear evidence of a newly-emerging popular consciousness linked to greater awareness of the possibility of some kind of separate political future for the subcontinent’s Muslims.’

One swallow does not make a summer. Two do. An ominous forerunner of Pakistani mentality was, publicly and wrathfully, demonstrable in the capital, Karachi, with the burning of its central synagogue, May 15, and assault on the American embassy, May 21,
1948 — the first of many such down the years.\textsuperscript{14} (Pakistan remains the sole country whose populace successfully and thoroughly razed to the ground an American chancery, November 21, 1979.\textsuperscript{15}) What invited the ire of Muslim Pakistanis was the caesarean birth of its surrogate, Israel, on the distant shores of West Asia. A mob of some 3,000 marched to the American chancery in Karachi and, in violation of diplomatic sanctities, perorated whilst perched on its window ledges, against Truman and the Americans. A besieged Ambassador Alling, through an Urdu interpreter, assuaged that he would convey their message.\textsuperscript{16}

In New York, Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, Pakistan’s articulate representative at the newly convened United Nations, was haranguing home just that. Israelis recall him as, ‘undoubtedly one of the ablest and most impressive delegates present from any country.’\textsuperscript{17} Sir Zafrullah’s legal sophistry in those years (1947-54) impressed not a few, especially less lettered Arabs, who could not bless or adulate him enough for his yeoman’s service to Islam and Arabism.\textsuperscript{18}

Khan’s carapace of casuistry could scarcely shield his factitiousness. It ought be borne in on the thoughtful that such treasured blind-spots only impair those whose sights are set on dilating their pre-conceived prejudices. In remonstrating against a guilt-racked Occident, Khan passionately queried how could the U.N. ‘insist upon the breaking up of a homeland or shatter the political, geographical and economic unity of a country without the consent and against the wishes of the majority’ [emphasis mine].\textsuperscript{19} That the Indian empire had been vivisected into two dominions, to the voluble, vehement opposition of its Hindu majority, left him unfazed. Khan, uncharitable and contradictory, next tried to live down the story that the majority had reluctantly agreed to such a division. Partition of the subcontinent, \textit{a posteriori}, was permissible because only where Muslims were preponderant did those territories become the contiguous borders of Pakistan, and because they were
already indigenes, not emigrants, over a historical continuum, unlike what was happening in mandated Palestine. Khan ran true to form, as did other Pakistanis, for ‘partition to Muslims was anathema elsewhere.’

Freudian transference is observable as Khan railed against his birthplace about Kashmir, another iron in his General Assembly fire: ‘[T]he objective of the policy of the Government of India towards Pakistan through all these months has been to punish Muslims for their temerity in demanding the partition of India.’

More Muslims resided without this ‘moth-eaten’ homeland than within. It was those from British India’s Muslim-minority districts, Zionist footmen, who decamped to erect it. Indian Muslims, a congeries of sects and denominations, had no common consciousness, language, dress, diet, observances or outlook to show for themselves, unlike Jews, who constituted a ‘nation’ and ‘spiritual principle’ through the ‘possession in common of a rich legacy of memories [and] the present consent, the desire to live together, the will to continue to validate the heritage that has been jointly received.’

Risible, had the gravity of the matter been lighter, to remind that Jews conquered Palestine ca. 1020 BC and held sway until 587 BC. An interregnum apart, Jewish control resumed in 164 BC and ended in AD 63.

Pre-Islamic Hittites, Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians and Byzantines, to the discomfiture of Muslims, might also be adduced who came and cleared the decks. Naturally the arrival of the next marauders, Islamised Arabs, is laudable, doctrinally and politically. But history, as the Mughal historian Bada’uni recounts, has many by-ways.

Ambassador Alling’s fellow American, Life magazine’s celebrated correspondent Margaret Bourke-White, had grasped the nettle: ‘Jinnah’s most frequently used technique in the struggle for his new nation had been the playing of opponent against opponent. Evidently this technique was now to be extended into foreign policy. Not only the tension between the great powers but the Palestine situation as well held opportunities for profiting from the
disputes of others. Pakistan was occupied with her own grave internal problems, but she still found time to talk fervently, though vaguely, of sending a liberation army to Palestine to help the Arabs free the Holy Land from the Jews.\(^{24}\) Waziri tribesmen from the NWFP were spoiling for a scrap westward ho. A telegram sent by North Waziristan’s honcho, Malik Jahangir Khan, addressed to Jinnah went like this:

‘We the Waziri tribes are very anxiously waiting the end of the Palestine war. Our sympathies are with the Arabs. We the Waziris will never give the Holy Land to the Jews. We appeal to the Muslim world to declare war against the Jews. We are ready to go to Palestine to help our Arab brothers. Kindly arrange for our transport to Palestine, so that we may join the holy war. We congratulate the Arabs on their unity in the war. Please send our message to the Arabs.’\(^{25}\)

Bourke-White was spot on — Pakistan, broke but belligerent, a week following Jinnah’s burial, appealed to the Food and Agricultural Organisation’s International Emergency Food Council for 160,000 tons of grains on September 20, 1948. That very day the Pakistan Central Palestine Aid Commission announced it was disbursing £20,000 to Palestine.\(^{26}\) The leading English broadsheet, \textit{Dawn}, founded by Jinnah, and staffed by articulate, semi-anglicised Muslims, could exhort in one editorial the liberation of Palestine for, ‘That way lies the salvation of Islam.’\(^{27}\) Clearly its op-ed writers had totted up priorities and the settlement of millions of refugees still pouring in from India; a practically bankrupt treasury at home, given New Delhi’s refusal to honour its transfer of assets, with the onset of
the First Indo-Pakistan war in October 1947; and the exodus of Pakistan’s non-Muslims with their acumen, bullion and capital were anything but pressing.

The stridency and bellicosity of despairing Muslims is a given in Islamic history. What with the ‘bankruptcy of ideas’ in a ‘nation drawing its spurious warmth from the embers of an antique religious fanaticism, fanned into a new blaze’, it would instinctively impel them to berate in time-honoured fashion. Six decades on, a foregone conclusion.28

The emergence of Israel in 1948 — or rather, the failure of the Arab armies to prevent it — was a climactic event ... It was bad enough to be dominated by the Franks, but they were after all the invincible masters of the world, ... It was a very different matter, and an intolerable humiliation, to submit to the Greeks or Jews, to local dhimmīs whom the Muslims had long been accustomed to despise as inferiors. The Franks, moreover, would, sooner or later, go back whence they came. But the Greek Great Idea — megalē idea— of a revived Byzantine empire and the Zionist idea of a Jewish state were clearly intended to be permanent. The same sense of outrage coloured the Kemalist reaction against the Greeks, and the Arab reaction against Israel.29

A sharp-eyed BBC reporter, visiting three years later, exclaimed: ‘The attitude of Pakistanis tends to be aggressive and austere because they feel themselves threatened from all sides, and also because they are determined to protect their new freedom and nationhood. ... You find yourself in the middle of a mutual admiration society which you must accept with due solemnity.’30
Solemnity ought not be accorded valuation over sobriety. It certainly gives the rise among Israelis and Pakistanis ‘because of their embattled, now nuclear armed, military rivalries with their neighbours and their own populations, and their entanglement with global rivalries’ when they inspire analogies ‘compelling as it may seem to outsiders’ but not ‘particularly welcome in either country.’\(^{31}\)

Farzana Shaikh’s learned distillations are anything but unwelcome. For ‘both countries shared a vision of themselves as refuge for the persecuted; both attracted the hostility of the religious establishment; both sought to balance the expression of communal interests with demands to justify them on religious grounds; and both held to the vision of impregnable fortresses dedicated to the creation of just and humane societies.’\(^{32}\) Shaikh, knowing her constituents only too well, cuts through the cant and pabulum of those reticent to bring into sharper relief the well-springs of piety propelled by power, divinely bestowed and vouched \textit{in perpetuum}, lest they be castigated for pandering to essentialism and orientalising tendencies. Professionally fatal in academe and commentariat, today.

Shaikh is not one to hitch her wagons with the fatuous and baldly points out that where Pakistan differs from the Israeli case is that Muslims, votaries of an unabashedly triumphalist credo, remain conscious of their \textit{Sitz im Leben} and that ‘an essential part of being Muslim’ was predicated ‘on their pre-eminent claim to power’ which ‘flowed from the experience of Muslim dominance.’\(^{33}\) As past masters of the Old World, from the Pyrenees to Panjab, Muslims have always been self-assured by the Qur’anic injunction (3:110) that they are the best of community raised among mankind expected to establish a social order with implicit legal concepts. Setbacks, past or present, do not vitiate their vivid identities or complaisancies as is amply discernible among Pakistanis — Jews are not the only chosen ones.
Unchosen and unmentioned, however, are Pakistani Jews in a quasi-official booklet, *Minorities in Pakistan*, wherein chapters are dedicated to Hindus, Christians, Parsis and Buddhists cheerfully ensconced in an Islamic idyll. There is a smidgen of truth for Pakistani non-Muslims did not find conditions entirely unendurable. It was more than tolerable and such Pakistanis played their part in national life, a point in fact not unnoticed or unappreciated by some of their then Muslim compatriots. Pakistan and its western neighbour, Pahlavi Iran, for a while, were two heterogeneous societies because inhabiting both, unlike anywhere else in the Muslim oecumene, were adherents of practically all traditional faiths, namely, Zoroastrians, Jews, Bahais, Ahmadis, Christians, Hindus, Jains, Sikhs, Buddhists and Animists. A perilous, penurious remnant remains in both Islamic republics where social apartheid, informally self-imposed and formally enshrined, has come to stay. Honed from formative years, it is integral to the national curriculum as one Pakistan Studies’ textbook clarifies: ‘The Islamic state, of course, discriminates between Muslim citizens and religious minorities and preserves their separate entity. Islam does not conceal the realities in the guise of artificialities or hypocrisy.’

Disgraceful, half a century on, that Jews do not merit mention in two cyclopaedic compilations conceived, prepared and published under the aegis of Oxford University Press, Pakistan. No entries appear in either volume on Pakistani Jewry. After all, in the ensuing years, Pakistani Jews have quietly departed for Israel or the West with each international crisis (1956, 1967, 1973). Pakistan is the only Islamic polity whose Jews deliberately dissimulate and pass off as Parsis or Christians to avoid attention and potential persecution. This is simply unimaginable, not just in the Perso-Turkic but even Arab worlds, right through wars and *intifadas*. It only vindicates how Pakistan has transmogrified into a living nightmare for a community contemptibly, if disputably, numbering 300 souls. Pakistan’s
Election Commission, according to a recent news report, registered, to the contrary, ‘800 Jewish voters’. Even Pakistan’s two million odd Hindus, fifth columnists of its Indian nemesis, precariously exist but have not en masse resorted to identifying as anything else. Pakistani Muslims, rootless and driftless, are driven to anchoring their Islamic moorings in anti-Semitism reminiscent of medieval-minded Europeans baying for Jewish blood.

In his ground-breaking study, Dr. Rusi Jaspal, a British-Panjabi psychologist, demonstrated:

There was a desire not to compel Israel to enter into peace negotiations with the Palestinians but rather to destroy the Jewish state, highlighting the destructive orientation of their anti-Zionist stance. Respondents were unable to accept the notion of a Jewish state, although they did see the logic in state-building along ethnic and religious lines in other contexts. This highlighted double standards and the singling out of the Jewish state [as Zafrullah Khan’s Pakistanis supra]. In his research into antisemitism and anti-Zionism among Muslims in North America, Baum and Nakazawa (2007) found that Pakistani Muslims appeared to score highly on the antisemitism and anti-Zionism scales. The present study suggests that some British Pakistani Muslims may believe there is a historical clash between Islam and Judaism, which is currently reflected in the form of the Israeli-Arab conflict, and that Islam must, and eventually will, defeat Israel, a tangible outcome of Jewish self-efficacy (Jaspal, 2013a). … Given the Islamicisation of anti-Zionism and the social desirability of taking an anti-Israel stance … [it] was cynically perceived as an unifying thread between Pakistani Muslims and Muslims of other ethnic backgrounds.
Written in 1984, during Haq’s heyday, is an *apologia* whose matter-of-fact tone is in consonance with the confident, unquestioned axioms of Muslim thinking and sentiment typically dismissed or ignored by apoplectic, western liberals. (Islamophobia now too can be loaded to the ballast of racialising orientalism.) The author breezily declaims: ‘It is no use to work under the pretence that a non-Muslim can become head of the state or head of government in Pakistan where the bulk of the population consists of Muslims because real power will always remain with Muslims [Farzana Shaikh’s assertion *supra*]. Furthermore, Pakistan is based on the Islamic Ideology and as such the nominal head of the state (the president) and the working head of the state (the prime minister of the country) must be Muslims so that the ideological nature of the state is not compromised in the name of toleration or liberalism [emphasis mine].’

When the shoe, obviously, is on the other foot, Muslims are only too quick to slip into patched soles. Bernard Lewis recalls how Muslims at a gathering in Berlin could belabour, “In a thousand years they [the Germans] were unable to accept 400,000 Jews. What hope is there that they will accept two million Turks?” They sometimes use this line, playing on German feelings of guilt, to advance their own agenda.

That ‘most superb and patriotic liar’, Zia ul-Haq, forthrightly declared: ‘Pakistan is like Israel, an ideological state. Take out the Judaism from Israel and it will fall like a house of cards. Take Islam out of Pakistan and make it a secular state; it would collapse. For the past four years we have been trying to bring Islamic values to the country. Not because Zia ul-Haq wants it. We would not have lasted four months if we were not acting in accordance with the aspirations of the people of Pakistan.’ Immediately following this *praeparatio islamica* is the correspondent’s gem, ‘May be so. But the system Zia has built in these four years provides no channels for gauging popular aspirations for Islam or for
anything else.'\textsuperscript{43} Zia, compared to his democratically inclined detractors, comprehended that ‘an Islamic state is not necessarily a political and social democracy’, even though Muslims ‘are conscious of their responsibilities to a community which is the raw material of nationhood.’\textsuperscript{44}

The raw reality, as that journalist concluded, after announcing the startling presence of 800 Jews remaining in Pakistan, was that, ‘[T]here is no political party that has tried to woo the Jewish voters for the coming elections. Perhaps there will never be. No party has dared challenge the conspiracy theories either…’\textsuperscript{45} Another perceptive Pakistani writes:

‘If we are to trust our political mullahs and some non-mullah politicians, this *Yahood-o-Hunood Ki Laabi* ['Judaeo-Hindu web'] is responsible for everything going wrong in Pakistan. From supplying of dead donkey meat to our fleshpots, attacks on polio vaccinators to the almost daily dose of suicide bombings, the Jews and the Hindus are behind everything. We have to thank our stars that Israel is a long way away with brotherly Muslim countries between them and us that prevent their death-dealing agents from infiltrating our sacred land more frequently or they would have undone our poor country years ago.’\textsuperscript{46}

Scholarship, thankfully, is obliged to challenge ugly, domestic verities. Ayesha Jalal, regrettably, did not during her editorship of *The Oxford Companion to Pakistani History (OCPH)*, 2012.\textsuperscript{47} (I eschew discussing Hafeez Malik’s near-similar scissors-and-paste project lest one dignifies carping mediocrity.) Plainly answerable for such *lacunae* are the successive
project editors at Oxford University Press, Pakistan. During the six years it took this volume to gestate, Nadia Ghani and her team, including earlier project managers, Salma Mahmud and Fahd Raza, were unable to locate any academic anywhere for an entry on Israeli-Pakistani relations or Pakistani Jewry.\(^{48}\) Ghani was not at a loss to submit her entry on ‘Palestine’ (p. 404). Nor did she pause to cogitate how germane would an entry commissioned on ‘Camp David Summit’ (p. 84) be for Pakistan Studies. A Pakistani reviewer did.\(^ {49}\) I might afford some leads here on the limited albeit extant body of literature available on Israel-Pakistan relations over and above those cited *infra* on the history of Pakistani Jews.\(^ {50}\)

Ghani’s piece, rather plaint, on Palestine petulantly ascribes ‘injustices perpetrated against the Palestinians, and the West’s support for Israel, particularly American, is a deeply emotional issue for most Pakistanis and a major cause for their disaffection with Pakistan government’s pro-American foreign policy.\(^ {51}\) Fouad Ajami, recently deceased, summed up Ghani and kindred spirits: ‘If Muslims truly believe that their long winter of decline is the fault of the United States, no campaign of public diplomacy shall deliver them from that incoherence.’\(^ {52}\)

Miss Ghani may be recommended a period of silent reading of Bernard Lewis: ‘In the theater of Middle Eastern politics, the United States is cast in several roles — sometimes as arbiter and enforcer, i.e., as suzerain; more often, and more popularly, as villain and scapegoat — and is variously denounced, sometimes by the same people, for claiming and shirking an imperial mission. The range of American policy options in the region is being reduced to two alternatives, both disagreeable: Get tough or get out.’\(^ {53}\) Or Sir Muhammad Iqbal, her founding father: ‘Cheapened like water is the blood of Muslims/Disquietened are you for your hearts knows not the secret.’\(^ {54}\)
The Ispahanis, Burkis, Amins and their like may rest well knowing their esteemed Quaid rested his case with history, without encountering Jewish physicians, or in his elegant edifice designed by a Jew and Lahorite, Moses Joseph Somake (1875-1947):\textsuperscript{55} Flagstaff House, Karachi, a buff-stone, colonial mansion was designed by the aforementioned architect. Jinnah purchased it from Sir Kavasji Katrak, an old Parsi family, in March 1944.\textsuperscript{56} A local historian, Gul Hasan Kalmatti, lamented that the Jew built Karachi while Muslims build shopping plazas over their razed synagogues. The last one, Magen Shalom, was destroyed on the express orders of General Zia-ul Haq on July 17, 1988.\textsuperscript{57} Zia went to his condign judgement, exactly a month to the day, on the afternoon of August 17, 1988.\textsuperscript{58}

Having departed for the Holy Land, Pakistani Jews, unlike others of the Pakistani diaspora, are ineligible for dual citizenship.\textsuperscript{59} A recent aliyah to Israel was laconically made public by the Jewish Agency in November 2010 following an ‘undercover’, ‘complicated’ and ‘confidential agreement’ between Islamabad and Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{60} Duplicity and cupidity always override piety and sincerity.\textsuperscript{61} It merits no asseveration that money must have changed one too many grabbing Pakistani hands for ‘contacts were more than diplomatic niceties or polite conversations; they often involved a degree of convergence of Israeli and Pakistani interests.’\textsuperscript{62}

Notes:

ignore Sir Muhammad Iqbal, their national poet and spiritual founder’s appeal, ‘Unite Muslims towards overseeing the [Meccan] sanctuary, from the banks of the Nile to the sandy wastes of Kashgar.’ Muhammad Iqbal, Bang-e dara (Lahore, 1930), p. 301. Translation mine.


10. Shahid Javed Burki *apud* Kenneth Robbins, *Western Jews in India: from the Fifteenth century to the Present*, eds. Kenneth X. Robbins and Marvin Tokayer (New Delhi, 2013), p. 15 and n. 2. Burki was a former Pakistani finance minister. Robbins, a South Asian art collector and independent scholar, also happens to be a practicing psychiatrist, and would do well to see through the posturings of Pakistanis, superficially westernised Muslims. One is reminded here of Hassan Ispahani’s 1946 missive to Jinnah that, ‘I have learnt that sweet words and first impressions count a lot with Americans. They are inclined to quickly like or dislike an individual or organization.’ Husain Haqqani, *Magnificent Delusions: Pakistan, the United States, and an epic history of Misunderstanding* (New York, 2013), p. 33. Robbins, however, soundly states (*loc. cit.*) that Pakistani society is one where ‘anti-Semitism is endemic and there is no longer a Jewish community.’ In Robbins and Tokmayer, *op. cit.*, 2013, p. 19, fig. 8, note the misprint in a bi-lingual, commemorative sheet marking the 75th anniversary of *The Jewish Religious Union*, Bombay. The building, in Hindi, is incorrectly spelt as ‘Rofed Shelom’ but correctly in English as ‘Rodef Shalom’. It is, as the post-code reveals, at Byculla in central Bombay, a locality traditionally housing Jews, including a synagogue, as well as Anglo-Indians, Christians, Parsis and Muslims.

11. Margaret Bourke-White, *Halfway to Freedom: a report on the new India in the words and photographs of Margaret Bourke-White* (London, 1949), p. 101. Jinnah’s physician at the time of his death, Lt.-Col. Dr. Ilahi Bakhsh penned a slim memoir, *With the Quaid-i-Azam during his last days*, foreword by Fatima Jinnah (Karachi, 1949). This first hand account is not only commemorative but also controversial for the author’s initial draft was excised to gloss over Jinnah’s acrimonious relationship with his lacklustre deputy, Liaquat Ali Khan. As pointed out in the foreword to the third edition (Karachi, 2011) by his son, M. Nasir Ilahi Bakhsh, who tacitly refers (p. xvii) to Jinnah’s ‘difficult meetings with his close
political allies who he felt were departing from the cardinal concepts of the state of Pakistan [which] emphasized the guiding principles of equality, justice, and fair play for all the citizens of the new State’. But the principal text reprinted here is that lifted from the second edition (1978) published to mark Jinnah’s 1976 birth centennial under the aegis of the Quaid-i-Azam Academy. Its director, Sharif al-Mujahid, a Madras muhajir (‘immigrant’) and, obviously, ardent nationalist, has toiled long and hard towards marshalling primary and secondary sources on Jinnah Studies. Mujahid, unsurprisingly, was not averse to expunging passages to fit Pakistan’s Procrustean palate. Skewering such historical fare has only burnished his credentials in officialdom. Laden with state honours and retired, he remains Distinguished National Professor, Higher Education Commission (HEC), Pakistan. As Akhtar Balouch, ‘The deleted bits from Fatima Jinnah’s “My Brother,”’ Dawn (Dec. 27, 2014), online: http://www.dawn.com/news/1153284/the-deleted-bits-from-fatima-my-brother notes, Mujahid is on record for exclaiming that Fatima Jinnah’s biography of her brother had to be bowdlerised since some of its ‘pages were against the ideology of Pakistan and I had to take care of it.’ The said extracts concern Liaquat Ali Khan’s visit to Jinnah at the hill station resort of Ziarat, Balochistan sometime towards the end of July 1948. At this residency of the Governor-General’s agent, Dr. Bakhsh recalls being closely questioned by Liaquat Ali Khan about Jinnah’s ill health. The former refused to divulge his condition to the latter as a breach of confidentiality. Fatima Jinnah recalls as well how Jinnah, feeble yet alert, told her that a supposedly solicitous Liaquat had arrived only for, ‘He wants to know how serious my sickness is. How long will I last.’ All of the aforementioned has now been reinserted in the posthumous autobiography of Qudratullah Shahab, Shahabnama (Lahore, 1987; repr. 2012), pp. 291-93. Apparently the author sought amends for his censorious zeal since Mujahid declared to Balouch that Shahab, in the first place, had ‘played a pivotal role in getting these pages removed back then.’


15. Haqqani, op. cit., 2013, pp. 11, 242f., overlooks mentioning that the attack, Nov. 21 1979, was also the first day of the new Islamic century, 1400. Its messianic signification was not lost on Juhayman al-Utaybi and his cohort of Saudi, Sunni
fanatics responsible for defiling the Meccan sanctuary. Pakistanis, as Muslims universally, bought into Khomeini’s calumny broadcast that the Americans and their Zionist agents were responsible for the desecration. Plainly ignorant then they were that the Saudis mulled bringing in Pakistani special forces. See John Kifner, ‘Khomeini accuses U.S. and Israel,’ The New York Times (Nov. 22, 1979), p. 1; ‘Pak mob burns US embassy,’ The Times of India (Nov. 22, 1979), p. 1; ‘Embassy burnt: the United States,’ The Times (Nov. 22, 1979), p. 1; ‘US anger after Muslim “outrages” spread,’ The Guardian (Nov. 22, 1979), p. 1; Harold Jackson, ‘Waves of fury in US against the Ayatollah,’ The Guardian (Nov. 22, 1979), p. 8; Martin Woollacott, ‘New politics of the Muslim world,’ The Guardian (Nov. 22, 1979), p. 17; Burzine Waghmar, ‘Complaisant Pakistanis, Condescending Persians: Orientalist observations on Irano-Pakistan relations,’ Studies on Iran: Articles, Reports (New Delhi, 2013), p. 187, nn. 3, 4. Peter Niesewand, ‘Police prevent new Islamabad attack on Americans,’ The Guardian (Nov. 24, 1979), p. 6, recounts the harrowing, pre-dawn evacuation of Americans, including documentless diplomats whose passports were destroyed in the burnt building, and escorted by military personnel, alongside other American expatriates, to fly out in ‘no more than the clothes they stood up in’. A Muslim mob, following prayers and a whipped up sermon in Rawalpindi, wanted to attack them to avenge two fundamentalist students as well as two embassy employees killed, by Pakistani forces, three days earlier. Indian Muslims were no less agitated as 3,000 stoned Calcutta’s American consulate, one of the oldest US missions in the world since 1792. An authoritative account is Yaroslav Trofimov, The Siege of Mecca: the forgotten uprising in Islam’s holiest shrine (New York, 2007; repr. London, 2008). Robert Lacey, The Kingdom: Arabia & the House of Sa’ud (New York: 1981; repr. 1983), pp. 478-91, repays reading as one of the earliest narratives. Utaybi and his lot would assuredly be in the higher echelons of ISIS today. Dennis Kux, Disenchanted Allies: the United States and Pakistan 1947-2000 (Washington DC, 2001) is silent about the 1948 occupation but does discuss the 1979 destruction (pp. 242-45). Kux’s descriptive, diplomatic history, a sound standby, is now complemented by a far more rigorous analysis of the entire question in Howard Schaffer and Teresita Schaffer, How Pakistan negotiates with the United States: riding the rollercoaster, foreword by Stephen Cohen (Washington DC, 2011).


17. P. R. Kumaraswamy, Beyond the veil: Israel-Pakistan relations, Memorandum 55, Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, Tel Aviv University, 2000, pp. 23, 69 and n. 21.

18. M. J. As’ad, ‘Chaudhry Muhammad Zafarullah Khan’s Services to Pakistan and The Muslim World,’ online: https://www.alislam.org/library/zafar2.html


Fernbach (London and New York, 2010), p. 63. Pakistanis must wince as they read these words. It would be cruel to conjure the chasm between the headiness of the late 1940s and the grimness of the present.

23. S. v. ‘Palestine’, Cyril Glasse, The New Encyclopedia of Islam, fourth edn. (London, 2013), p. 414. This is the most balanced, comprehensive, one-volume reference work on Islam in the anglosphere. It is an admirable evidence of industry. Glasse, compared to the superficial drivel of Muslims purportedly producing such compact works, is nothing if not superior. Himself a learned Muslim, he is a promising, honourable exception, given the depressing options available to researchers and students. It is pleasant to note his generosity in placing at my disposal galley proofs of the aforementioned volume.


28. Ibid. C. Christine Fair, Fighting to the end: the Pakistan army’s way of war (New York, 2014) has now skilfully surveyed and confirmed Pakistani intentions since inception.


33. Ibid.

34. Minorities in Pakistan (Karachi, 195[?]). Absent in this work, alongside Jews, are Jains, Sikhs and Animists, the last mentioned then not only in East Pakistan’s Hill Tracts but also as the Kalash of the Trans-Indus basin. The literature remains frequently scant, inaccessible and apologetic. A recent contribution, a full tome on the topic, is Haroon Khalid, A White Trail: Journey into the Heart of Pakistan’s Religious Minorities (New Delhi, 2013). Was no Pakistani publisher willing that it had to come to pass across the 1947 divide? Small wonder the author had to rename interviewees in order not to compromise their security. Or his: Khalid defines an Ahmadi mosque as ‘place of worship’. Quite a few Hindus and Christians have adopted Islamic names so as to deflect suspicion or duress. Reviewed by Kishalay Bhattacharya, ‘Truth about Minorities,’ The Book Review, XXXVIII, 2 [South Asia no. XXIII], (February, 2014), p. 23. Shaikh, op.cit., 2009, pp. 46-80 is a scathing indictment on the ‘mirage of citizenship.’


40. Naumana Amjad and Alex Wood, ‘Identifying and changing the normative beliefs about aggression which lead young Muslim adults to join extremist anti-Semitic groups in Pakistan,’ *Aggressive Behaviour*, 35, 6 (November-December, 2009), pp.


47. *Vide* n. 37.

48. Shalva Weil and Nathan Katz, for example, are two scholars of South Asian Jewry. Not impossible to communicate in this internet age. For it is the internet which must have made it possible for the *OCPH* to invite and include four submissions by Prof. Yohanan Friedmann, Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Caveat lector that the entry on ‘Ahmadis’ (pp. 12-13), authored by Friedmann, has been misattributed to Nadia Ghani. See ‘Yohanan Friedmann: List of Publications,’ (p. 5), online: http://academy.ac.il/data/persons__data/156/list_of_publications_2013.pdf

49. Rightly questioned in a review by Ali Raza, *Dawn Books & Authors* (Apr. 7, 2013), online: http://www.dawn.com/news/800452/review-the-oxford-companion-to-pakistani-history-edited-by-ayesha-jalal. He asks, ‘Precisely how this [2003] summit was relevant to Pakistan — as opposed to other Camp David summits, for example — remains a mystery. It could of course be the case that it was important for Pakistan, but then a case should have been made for it.’

51. S.v. ‘Palestine’ (by Nadia Ghani), Jalal, op. cit., 2012, p. 404. S.v. ‘Minorities’ (by M. R. Kazimi), pp. 339-40, is a conspectus where the only mention anywhere of Jews is cursorily given as: ‘There were also a sizeable number of Marathi-speaking Jews in Pakistan at the time of Partition with their synagogue in Karachi, but with the creation of Israel and Pakistan's refusal of accept it [sic], they felt threatened and almost all of them left.’ Kazimi, a Bombay-born, Karachi-based muhajir, knows full well the score. Compared to the vitriol federally prescribed for the Social Studies' syllabi, his writings are shorn of bigotry. See M. R. Kazimi, Pakistan Studies: for B.A./B.Sc./B.Com./B.Sc. (Home Economics), introd. by Massarrat Abid and foreword by Stanley Wolpert (Karachi, 2007; repr. 2014).


54. Khizr’s response <<Ho gaya manind-e ab arzan musalman ka lahu, mużtarihib hai tu ke tera dil nahi dana-ye ra>> in Muhammad Iqbal, Bang-e dara (Lahore, 1930), p. 300. Translation mine.


58. A point in fact hitherto not highlighted. Zia’s death produced a cottage industry of canards and culprits. Pakistan’s disgruntled Twelver Shia are one of the usual suspects. This might well lead some fetid, febrile, fervent Sunnis to adumbrate a Jewish complot. On historical Sunni polemics against the Shia see Steven Wasserstrom, ‘‘The Ši‘is are the Jews of our Community’’: an Interreligious Comparison within Sunnī Thought,’ Israel Oriental Studies, 14 [Concepts of the Other in Near Eastern Religions], (1994), pp. 297-324.
59. As pointed out by me in Waghmar, *art. cit.*, 2013, n. 23, p. 193f.: ‘Pakistan extends visa-free travel by issuing a Pakistan Origin Card to those individuals who were born and/or resided previously in Pakistan. But former Pakistanis currently holding citizenship or nationality of Israel or India are debarred. Online: http://www.pakmissionuk.gov.pk/nadra/poc_eligibility_details.asp


61. Former Prime Minister Gilani, at the time of writing, has come under scrutiny for salting away a precious necklace, once a wedding gift, belonging to Turkish First Lady, Emine Erdoğan, and donated by her towards Pakistani flood victims in 2010. Gilani claimed that, ‘The necklace belongs to my sister and is with me.’ See Iftikhar Khan, ‘Missing necklace found, but plot thickens,’ *Dawn* (Jun. 13, 2015), pp. 1, 5.


*****