



Abid Ullah Jan



Pragmatic Publishing Company
Toronto, Canada

Occupied Pakistan

Table of contents

Introduction

Fifty-five Years Ago

A Simple Question

Reasons for British Leaving India

British Tactics for Consolidating Occupation

- a. Sectarianism
- b. Regional and linguistic Feudal system
- c. British education

Supporting factors: Differences among religious leaders

One Point of View

Second Point of View

Effects of the Difference in Opinion

Our Forefather's Response to British Tactics

Targeting Curriculum of *Maddaris*

Targets Under American Occupation

Target: *Madrasa, Jihad* or Our Identity?

US Forces in Pakistan

Pak Army vs. Pakistan

Consolidating Occupation

Conclusion: A half-dead Nation Fully Occupied

Solution

Occupied Pakistan

"Pakistan is still not free. Previously it was Britain's colony. Now it has become America's colony."

(Sajjad Ali Shah, former Chief Justice of Pakistan, speaking at a seminar on human rights in Karachi)¹

"Pakistanis know that they are bought and paid for, and so the way to assert pride is to spit in the face of those who have owned and used them."

Quoted in Christopher Hitchens, "On the Frontier of Apocalypse," *Vanity Fair*, January 2002, p. 86.

¹ Daily *Nawai Waqt*, August 11, 2002.

Occupied Pakistan

INTRODUCTION

We have yet to understand the limits of our naivety from the joy and festivity of celebrating independence days of Pakistan. Immersed in happiness, rulers in the gay capital exaggerate and regurgitate their successes stories as usual. Some out-of-power political leaders, however, equate such occasions with celebrating slavery under an oppressive government. In reality, starry lights on lifeless buildings smile at the inner darkness of their inhabitants in occupied Pakistan.

No one really knows for how long we would celebrate such independence days without cutting ourselves from the environment of negligence and noisy political fairs for honestly reassessing the state of our independence. Who are we and what is our status? Questions like these have started haunting every Pakistani who believes that we freed ourselves from British rule in 1947, but still wake up to the news such as: "FBI arrested Dr. Amir Aziz in Lahore," "FBI agents and troops are directing Pak-military in conducting operations against Al-Qaeda in tribal areas," "all arrested suspects handed over to US," "US, diplomat, Bruce Nelson, has been constantly witnessing the proceedings of Nawaz Sharif's case," etc. etc.

The present rulers of Pakistan have inherited weak spine to the extent that while previous administrations nervously buckled under pressure, Musharraf's regime appears to relish the job or serving his masters. It does so with a lot of enthusiasm, even with a measure of pride. Previous governments handed over a few individuals demanded by Washington. Musharraf's regime, before and after the sham elections, has no hesitation spreading a dragnet and offering whatsoever falls under it, on a plate to our new colonial masters in Washington. It has restored to high-handed tactics that have no place in the history of independent nations or sovereign states.

We are now back to the dreaded midnight knock. The visits by occupation forces are not secret or stealthy. US agents can descent on their target any time of the day with utter contempt for rights of the citizens, or vague suspicions and allegations based on a role in some imaginary activity or misconstrued interpretation of a professional act. Arrest of Dr. Amir Aziz in Lahore is one example of such incidents. There have been the cases of Dr. Bashir udd Din Mahmood, Dr. Abdul Raoof, and others.

Pakistani government has started acting as arrogant policeman, worse still as proxy policeman serving dubious designs of the US and its Allies. Measures that are palpably illegal and an affront to the self-respect of citizens of Pakistan are no more than a clear surrender of sovereignty.

Beside physical occupation, a full scale cultural domination is already underway as a measure to neutralise our Islamic identity and eliminate any chances of resistance by future generations to the consolidated occupation. This is the kind of imperialism to which our public surrenders as much as the government does. A study titled "Freedom in the World 2001-2002" by the US based Freedom House ranked Pakistan among the 48 countries labelled as "Not Free." Are we "not free" because analysts, such as those sitting on *Washington Times* editorial board, consider "Islamic Fundamentalism" the main hurdle to human freedom?² Or Pakistan is "partly free" and Iran is "totalitarian" because we do not have mayors like Norm Rice of Seattle to march in city's gay-parade

² Editorial, *Washington Times*, December 26, 1994

Occupied Pakistan

and none of the men or women, who expose their private parts during the parade, should be arrested for indecent exposure.

In fact, we are not free because we do not have an independent foreign or internal policy. We are not free because our government cannot make any decision without first obtaining a nod from Washington. But we are considered “not free” because our government does not have the power to allow the basic requirements for facilitating cultural imperialism, such as allowing alternative life styles, like homosexuality and premarital sex.

Under the banner of different wars, our government is doing all the best to hand over its citizens without any legal ground and consolidate physical occupation. But it is labelled “not free” because it could not establish schools to proselytise our children by requiring them to read books that say “religion is social conditioning,” “homosexuality is a matter of ‘preferences’ and ‘sado-masochism’ may be very acceptable for some people.” It has, however, taken a step in this direction by first eliminating *Jihad* related Qur’anic verses from school curriculum and making Islamic studies optional than a compulsory subject.

Would surrendering sovereignty and accepting such standards of life help us win the label of a “free nation”? We must not get deceived with the certificates of “freedom” issued by the fake champions of the mock human rights. Even animals, having no moral values, do not act in such demeaning ways, absolutely against nature, as we are forced to accept under the banner of human rights and freedom at a time when our actual freedoms to govern ourselves and defend our sovereignty and independence are curtailed. This amounts to dictating: “Pakistanis must not govern their lives with an interpretation of religion that is not approved by Washington, just as Islamabad must not govern Pakistan with a national or international policy which is not approved by Washington.”

Under the acceptable-to-Washington free Pakistan, our government would be free to arrange and pay for a 14-year daughter to have an abortion, and conspire to keep it secret from her parents. The parents would not praise their government for this kind of freedom if they are following true interpretation of Islam. By that standard, the cultural domination is incomplete. What the American analysts call “a battle for hearts and minds of masses” is also incomplete. Yet our government is enslaved. We are occupied and our independence curtailed in other ways, which many of us may not even realise.

An axiom says, “when a people believe they are oppressed they are oppressed.” Of course we, whom they call “repressed” and “partly free”, are not free to be animals. We, in fact, are free to be human. But we are not free to act as a free nation. The question is: Are we independent in real sense? Is Pakistan a sovereign state?

As there are growing signs that the United States-led “war on terrorism” is broadening into Pakistan and military operations are being carried out by the US and other coalition forces on Pakistani territory, with or without the consent of the Pakistani authorities, interesting questions are being raised about Pakistan's sovereignty. Earlier, Pakistan's grant of four military bases to the US and the increasing influence of the US over national policy-making in Islamabad had raised growing

Occupied Pakistan

concerns among Pakistanis. These developments have led to a dilemma regarding a clash between Pakistan's national security policies and sovereignty.

This development has a little longer history and is self-generated. Since the end of the Cold War, the Pakistani ruling classes in search of personal survival have been inadvertently undermining the sovereignty of the state itself. The basic principles for which the covert war against Soviet intervention in Afghanistan was fully supported by the Pakistani state have been sacrificed one by one in the name of achieving the objectives of national security.

The US started considering the Cold War structures, both at the ideological and material level, as a threat to its interests as well as to the survival of Pakistan. Even before September 11, many Pakistani analysts expressed concern over these ominous developments. The current ruling regime had also sensed the trajectory of these developments. The military establishment had for some time been divided over turning Pakistan into a secular state, closing religious institutions in the name of curbing sectarian violence and banning various religious parties and groups.

And yet, many analysts were taken by surprise when General Pervez Musharraf abandoned the Taliban as the US put him on notice after the September 11. He had been trying for some time to distance himself from the Taliban and curb the powers of some of the Islamic groups at home. That divorce was not possible without force. His earlier attempts at secularising the state and prolonging his rule were an indication that he needed a pretext. September 11 provided him that pretext, support and legitimacy to carry out with force what his internal reforms were supposed to have done — i.e., to turn Pakistan into a secular state without any external sovereignty at all.

To find out if we are independent in real sense, we need to have a look at the 55 years of our existence and compare the situation our forefathers faced under British occupation with the reality we are facing under American occupation today -- particularly after its consummation since September 11, 2001.

Putting facts in historical perspective may help those who still disagree to consider Pakistan an occupied state. The following discourse would also make clear that establishing military bases in Pakistan and conducting operations without even informing the government are not the only ways to interference in internal affairs, there are many hidden forces and plans at work, which actually consolidate occupation of Pakistan.

FIFTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

Some of us are of the view that Pakistan came into existence on 14th August 1947. This day, others think, a sub-continent was parted in two. Yet others believe it was the last day of 175-year British colonial rule. Apparently all such thinking seems alike, but each of these statements has deep thoughts and mindset behind it. We have to ask those, who lived through that age, to understand what the present generation is ignoring at its peril because the pre-independence situation in sub-continent was exactly what the Muslims are facing these days at local and global level.

The people who went through struggle for independence know that living in East Punjab, East Bengal, Uttar Pradesh (UP), Bihar and Western Punjab was no less than living in hell by any degree. Torture, killings, rape, destruction of Muslim property and uncertainty were norms of the day. According to independent historians, Sikh were also targeted, but Muslim killings were systematically planned and carried out. It is also worth noting that Hindu migration to India was carried out in an orderly manner. They were able to leave safely and take almost all their belongings with them because they were well aware and prepared for the upcoming events.

It is interesting to note that in most cases when the oppressive occupational forces are overthrown, it is the down trodden and oppressed who take their revenge and the oppressors have to face the wrath. To the contrary, the British colonialists were peacefully watching and enjoying Hindus and Muslim busy in cutting each other's throat. No one of us even looked at occupation forces with disdain.

British occupiers rather became more important and honourable. A British, who had never been to Indian sub-continent, was sitting in a Hotel in Lahore, drawing red lines and giving final touches to the future map of the sub-continent. Every line from his pen became a crack in the Muslims unity and added strength to India in the years to come.

On the other hand, last viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, was sitting with top Indian leaders in his Delhi palace. The Indian leadership delivered eloquent speeches in Indian parliament on the blessings of independence and freedom from the British rule on August 5, 1947. However, soon afterwards they visited Lord Mountbatten, and Jawaharlal Lal Nehru offered him to be the Governor General of India. He gladly accepted the offer. Perhaps Indians needed British guardianship and blessings for occupying Kashmir and resolving other such issues.

What kind of independence was this? Who was liberated and from whom? Sons of the soil were dying in hundreds and thousands. Daughters of the soil were being raped. But those who occupied the sub-continent for 175 years were becoming Governor General once more. Definitely this was not an independence earned with struggle. It was something else. Let's see how.

A simple question

It must go without saying that British had to overthrow Muslim rule to occupy the Indian sub-continent. Muslims were the sole rulers for more than a thousand years. The incompetent Muslim rulers threw India into British lap as a result of British-Hindu conspiracy, but Muslims, as a nation,

Occupied Pakistan

never accepted British rule just as the common man in the streets in Pakistan is not satisfied with which the gradual surrender of sovereignty and independence by the government in Islamabad for consolidating remote control colonialism.

From time to time various Jihad movements were launched against British rule. Ulema issued many *Fatwa* against joining British army. Thousands of Muslim died fighting British forces and hundreds of *Ulema* were hanged. Like the present day Muslim struggle against US-Israel global domination, from war with Tipu Sultan to *Fatwa* against Shah Abdulaziz, from 1957 war of independence to the *Reshmi Romal* and *Khilafat* movement and establishment of Darul-uloom Deoband, every minute of Muslim life under British rule is a story of struggle for liberation and independence.

Such movements shook the very foundations of British rule. British faced many losses but with the active cooperation of Hindus, it continued its war against Muslims and Islam. It never called it a war on Islam, nor did many Muslims realise the reality. British never called local Muslim and Hindu leaders to discuss its departure plans and to find out if they want to live together or separate from each other.

A man then appeared on the scene, who threw away his English dress and put on a simple *Dhoti*. He picked up a stick that became a hallmark of his personality. This man used to loathe violence and introduced himself as a. He gathered people against British rule but told them that there should be no violence. Interestingly, British were scared to death with his simple, non-violent calls to leave India.

A few followers of the Messiah of peace burned some policemen alive in two police posts. The disappointed Hindu leader was about to quit his campaign, when the occupiers came to let him know that they were worried of his non-violent movement and that contemplating to leave India for good was on their cards.

Is it a believable story? Only those with no knowledge of British nature may believe in this fairy tale. But others will not. In fact, Ghandi was not a magician, nor was there a magic in his movement, not even the British were so scared of his movement to start quitting India. There were other factors that forced British to end its occupation but after achieving its core objective. Policy makers in London were constantly calling for an end to occupation that would grow more and more financially and politically expensive with each passing day.

British had only two objectives to fulfil: one to hand over rule to its faithful Hindu slaves, and second to make a meaningful strike on its eternal enemies – the Muslims – before leaving India. It had already institutionalised three curses, which had made taking power in India almost impossible for Muslims.

Before discussing these curses in detail, let's have a look at the causes, which forced British to leave India.

Reasons for British departure from India

There were so many local and international problems, which forced British to leave India, but it is evident without any doubt that none of these was related to Gandhi's non-violent movement. It is important to note that the real face of the British rulers, whose much-vaunted claims for human rights and civilisation have no bounds, is more horrible than anyone can imagine. Even the worst kind of animals cannot get involved in the kind of activities which the British undertakes for serving its interests. Opium smuggling to China to undermining a powerful nation is one of such acts. In the subsequent war, China lost Hong Kong to British in 1897.

On the one hand China started strengthening its military position and on the other hand leftist movement in India gained momentum. British could any time become target of the Chinese wrath and the Indian sub-continent could pose a direct threat to US and Europe after falling into the lap of communism. The British thus wanted to hand over power to its faithful to keep this country among the loyal of British and America.

British occupied India for economic exploitation. It had completed its plunder. British was neither a reformer nor was it interested in bringing eternal peace to subcontinent. Without losing a single minute, it plundered its resources to the last drop and any further stay had become absolutely needless. Moreover, British no longer needed man power for its armed forces after the World War-2.

Most importantly, as a basic tactic, British exploits weaknesses of the occupied nations in such a way that they use to run after it even when the occupation has long ended. As a result, the occupiers are emulated as heroes, not oppressors.

In India, British used the same tactic and were successful to a great extent. It had introduced and established an education system, in the presence of which it was no more needed to sit in India to occupy it. It was certain that due to this kind of education, all the British systems would remain in place for an indefinite period and British interests would be served even long after it is gone. British had ensured that remote control colonialism would remain in place.

Lord Macaulay, who developed this educational system, proudly declared that now the Indian youth would just look like Indians because of their facial figures; mentally and socially they would remain British slaves. The same is what we witness today. This education system has transformed physical and territorial occupation into mental and civilisational slavery. Unfortunately, this slavery is accepted as development, open-mindedness and enlightenment. The signs of this slavery appeared well under British occupation.

When the British realised that indoctrinated people under this system have grown up to handle power in India and under their rule British interests would be safe, it decided to say an end to occupation. Local population was expected to forget British atrocities. While living under apparent freedom and independence, they would gradually accept British as their

Occupied Pakistan

educational, cultural and civilisational masters. British handed over power to Oxford-stricken community. Since then, they didn't let the system move an inch from what had been established under the colonial rule. They always looked for direction to London and then Washington.

BRITISH TACTICS FOR CONSOLIDATING OCCUPATION

- a. Sectarianism
- b. Regional and linguistic Feudal system
- c. British education

British did not need to work hard on Hindus for they had put their personal interests above everything else. They cared the least for freedom or slavery as long as their personal interests were served. Moreover, moral bankruptcy of Hindus had gone to the extent that British did not even feel the need to intervene rob them any more. Glamorising sex, reducing the prices of tobacco and liquor and increasing accessibility to all such things covered the little leftover values, which led to moral debauchery. Hindus were, therefore, not considered as a threat – neither for the present nor for the foreseeable future.

On the other hand, just like the present day American government, British had then not forgotten the Crusades and the fall of Roman Empire. For that reason, during the course of its colonial rule, it left no stone unturned to suppress or throw away Muslims with its roots.

Just like the present day crusade against anything related to *Jihad*, British remained weary of the Muslims' passion for *Jihad*. British used to get annoyed at the word *Jihad* and tried to let the Muslims understand that they are not against the Muslims but *Jihad*.

Like the present American and Israeli *Jihad* -phobia and moderato-mania, the British used to tell the Muslims that all of them who renounce *Jihad* would be acceptable Muslims.

British scholars and thinkers were unanimous in their belief that Muslims can never be dominated as long as they have a passion for *Jihad*. To keep them away from *Jihad*, the British came up with a three pronged strategy with a right conviction that as long as these three curses remain imposed on Muslims they would never be able to stand up for *Jihad*, or achieve what they have lost due to incompetence of their forefathers.

a. Sectarianism

To find out vulnerable points for an onslaught or slow poisoning, British researchers studied every aspect of Muslims' life. They found out that Muslims are prone to sectarianism and mischief in the name of religion. Although the germs were in existence before British occupation of India, but colonial rulers systematically nourished them for close to two centuries. These conflicts and disagreements have now become part of our life for ever.

Muslims entered the **sub-continent in 712 from the South and in 1000 A.D under Mehmood Ghaznavi** (even though they started visiting much earlier) from the North. All these Muslims had strong faith and were united. This strength and unity lasted until 18th century. Hindu religious leaders were in waiting for a suitable opportunity to strike. They never came out for an open confrontation with Islam. They always attacked all alien religions in disguise.

Occupied Pakistan

Conversion of more and more Hindus to Islam spread deep anxiety among high caste Hindus. Using different tactics, they put some Muslims to practicing *Shirk*. *Tasawo'af* and *Salook*, earlier used for the propagation of Islam, were exploited for spreading *shirk* and *bid'at*. Some of the Muslims started worshipping graves like Hindus. The Muslims also started using the same attributes for *Aoliya -ullah*, which the Hindus used for their deities. *Malang*, *Faqir*, half-naked *Babas* – clad in yellow (Hindu's sacred religious colour) sheets also appeared among Muslims. It used to be a norm among Hindus but now the Muslims started mixing Islam and Hindu religion together.

British paid special attention to this issue and spent large sums to construct new *Maz'ar* and sponsor fake *Pir*. Most of them were Hindus in the guise of Muslims. They were even provided with estates so that they may effectively distract Muslims from the real teachings of Islam. Thousands of fake *Pir* and *Maz'ars* are still misleading Muslims both in India and Pakistan.

Similarly, Mirza Qadiani was actively promoted. This curse is still haunting the Muslims of the sub-continent. Misconception about *Jihad* has reached far and wide. Sir Syed promoted another sect of the half-Sir and half-Syed people. They started considering themselves enlightened interpreters of Islam. Their slave mentality and inferiority complex still forces them to go against the Qur'an. Their hallmark is to go against every edict of Qur'an, which becomes target of Western criticism. They believe they are defending Islam from being labelled as medieval. In fact, they are striking at the roots of Islam.

At the same time, British promoted people such as Abdullah Chakarralwi, who repudiated all *Hadiths*. In short, during colonial era, sectarianism among Muslims spread like wild fire. Due to the same influence, some Brahman are sitting on the seats of Syed and Shah and *Mashaikh*, and millions of Muslims are paying them taxes for forwarding their mercy petition to Allah and granting them heaven in an easy manner. They have put bangles of cowardice in Muslim hands, which can no longer even imagine of going to war for Allah, because *Jihad* has become a curse and exercise in futility for them.

Everyday new *Maz'ar* projects are launched after having new dreams. The millions in income from these *Maz'ar* go to families of fake *Pir*. As a result, thousands of Muslims fight among themselves on pity issues like *Rafa'yadeen* and *Ameen-bil-jeher*. These local trends are now being promoted on global scale. Different groups are promoted in the name of modernity, moderation and liberalism. "War within Islam" is actively promoted for diluting the real message of Islam in the name of re-interpretation and enlightenment. While the core of Islam is under heavy onslaught by the enemies of Islam, we are needlessly struggling to save our respective branches.

b. Regional and linguistic feudal system

For shattering Muslim unity and keeping them away from *Jihad*, the second tactic was to spread the cancer of regional prejudice and linguistic division. British knew that the teachings of Islam would keep Muslims united like a single body -- above nationality, colour and creed. To weaken this bond of brotherhood, the British introduced feudal system.

Occupied Pakistan

Colonial masters sent kith and kin of their loyal servants to Cambridge and Oxford. They were granted titles, positions and land. The same feudal lords used to suck blood of their respective communities. With full doses of indoctrination vis-à-vis regional, linguistic or religious differences, they keep their communities away from education. They used to present themselves as guardians of the poor and marginalised. The germs of ethnic divide and regionalism existed even before the arrival of British. However, this weakness was exploited to the maximum. Consequently millions of people became virtual slaves of their British sponsored feudal lords.

The vicious cycle continued in the following manner. They kept people working on their land, collected taxes from them, and kept them loyal through systematic indoctrination of fear and hatred of other sects. They kept on presenting proceeds from the poor people tilling the gifted lands to British government. The colonial rulers in turn were satisfied with the fact that under a democratic set up, the same land lords would extract votes from their loyal poor and form a government with an assured loyalty to Britain.

c. Education

Our former colonial masters made full effort to ensure that Muslims do not remain Muslims. Just like the present day campaigns for “moderating” and “modernising” Muslims, the objective was then to keep them at bay from the core values and crux of Islam through making non-Muslim rites and practices attractive. Like the present day conscious efforts to remove Islam from public life, the idea then was also to reduce Islam to practicing a few rituals and rites. The Muslims were expected to make fun of their religion like communists and others. Objective of Christian missionaries (such as Shelter Now International in Afghanistan under the Taliban) changed from converting Muslims to Christianity to keeping them away from Islam.

The envisaged education system did the intended trick. The first lesson and the conclusion of years of schooling was that religion has no role to play in politics. Just as Musharraf declared in his internationally televised speech on January 12, 2002 that religion “has nothing to do with politics.” Many of us gladly accepted the logic that religion is a private affair and material development is the ultimate objective of our existence.

This type of education accelerated Muslims social and moral bankruptcy. They became income generating machines. This type of education deprived Muslims of the spiritual leadership of *Ulema* because hatred for religious scholars of Qur'an and *Hadis* was planted as a hidden part of their curricula.

A movement in the name of modernity and change was launched, which resulted in expensive life style that needed more and more financial resources to sustain. Stuck in the quagmire of worldly affairs, the Muslim mind kept inching away from religion on a steady pace.

Occupied Pakistan

In the later part of this document we will see how occupation forces of the 21st century are busy in influencing and shaping our education policies for eradicating the leftover identity and link to Islam to achieve the same aforementioned objectives in a comprehensive way.

SUPPORTING FACTORS: DIFFERENCES AMONG RELIGIOUS LEADERS

Differences among Muslim religious leadership appeared simply due to Hindus speaking from both sides of their mouth. The major factor that split Muslim opinion vis-à-vis Hindus' future role in a joint set up was the Hindu attitude of sitting and planning extermination of Muslims at night and talking of Hindu-Muslim unity during the day.

Muslim religious leaders took some courageous and far sighted steps to take Muslims away from the brink of disaster. Prominent among religious leaders of that age were Maulana Shah Ashraf Ali Thanvi, Maulana Syed Hussein Ahmad Madani, Maulana Abu Kalam Azad, Abulala Moudodi, etc. They had some differences in their approach to tackling the problem but they were sincere in their cause and their efforts saved the remaining values, norms and identity of the Muslims.

We need to look into the following point of views and compare it with the contemporary issues thrown like bones of contentions among Muslims. These differences are exaggerated and conflict is intentionally flamed in the name of promoting a "war within Islam."

One point of view

Some of the religious leaders were of the view that Muslims and Hindus cannot live together under a democratic system in which Muslims would forever **remain second fiddle** to Hindus. Muslims who were already marginalised in every walk of life would get further marginalised. Being in majority, Hindu culture and civilisation would prevail -- rather imposed -- and Muslims values and culture would vanish in thin air.

According to this school of thought, Muslims did not do all the sacrifices for the last 175 years for the sake of getting out of the British frying pan and ending up in Hindu fire. They were of the opinion that if not the whole, at least part of the sub-continent should be liberated for establishing a pure Islamic state. They tightly held to this opinion, because they had an eye on activities of Hindu organisations which had invented a slogan: Become Hindu if you want to live with Hindus.

Second point of view

Another school of thought among Ulema was of the opinion that sub-continent shall not be divided after departure of British because Muslims would lose unity and strength as a result of their division. Hindus would remain united and Muslims would have to live with a constant threat to their survival.

They were also sceptical for the reason that the British government actually proposed division of sub-continent between Hindus and Muslims. Life of the Muslim leaders who supported this idea was a clear evidence of this fact. Most of these leaders were educated in England and they were immersed in western culture. The same leaders were strong proponents of Hindu-Muslim unity and as living models of secularism they had little relation with Islam.

Occupied Pakistan

Suddenly then they started asking for a separate homeland which left many of the contemporary Muslim leader with deep suspicion. The pro-separate homeland leaders also claimed that even if they succeeded in achieving a separate homeland, they would not press for Islamic system. The party, which demanded separate homeland, was in the hands of feudal lords and well-wishers of the British government.

Most of the Muslim leaders were sceptical because the leaders who were demanding a separate homeland could not apply Islam to their personal life; how could they apply it to a nation in a whole new country. The same English system was expected to prevail in the new country. So, some considered it wise to stay together and try to regain the lost paradise after the departure of colonial forces.

This school of thought also argued that India was divided in many states and sub-states before the arrival of Muslims and it were the Muslims who gave it a unified form. Now if the Muslims go for the option of separate homeland, they would get just a fraction of the total land and Hindus would get a big chunk unified by the Muslim after centuries of hard work.

Effects of the Difference in opinion

No matter how well intentioned a difference of opinion may be, it has its own negative consequences. Remember the level to which mischief-makers took the sincere difference of opinion among the companions of Prophet Mohammed (PBUH). Some analysts also present the difference of Muslim leaders' opinion on the issue of partition like an issue of *kufer* and Islam. Some of us sarcastically blame those who opposed the creation of Pakistan as traitors. But history has proved that their point of view had some blessings in disguise as well.

If there were no Muslim opposition to the partition of sub-continent, India would not have emerged as a secular (despite being a so-called) state. Similarly devoted religious communities in Pakistan can claim that their support has provided Muslim league the necessary legitimacy and credibility among the Muslim masses. It is the fruit of these leaders and their followers that despite a genuine hankering for secularism, Pakistani feudal lords and military dictators couldn't declare Pakistan a secular state. They had to incorporate some Islamic clauses as part of the constitution against their will.

The partition had to occur and it occurred, but Hindus and British could not achieve all that they wanted. For a long time, Pakistan couldn't become a permanent base for the British forces and due to Pakistan's strength India is somewhat reluctant in using full force against the Muslims on its side of the border. Luckily, India declared itself secular. Otherwise it would have been split in many parts by now.

The negative consequence of the difference of opinion was the hatred spread against *Ulema*, which even led to physical attacks on them. They were declared British agents. From the Congress platform, Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi was declared as British slaves. This was the beginning of *Ulema* and *Maoulana* image tarnishing process that we see today in a much organised form. Since public emotions were on its peak, the masses were exploited to use and

Occupied Pakistan

accept filthy language for attacking religious leaders. Even the British could not use such a debased language in 175 years.

Religious leaders, however, remained stuck to their guns until August 14, 1947 approached. Pakistan was declared an independent state and the next day India declared its independence under the leadership of an ex-Viceroy. Many parts of Pakistan were given to India and Pakistan was left permanently unstable with the division of Punjab and Bengal. Those who were dreaming for a strong and stable Pakistan could only watch in disbelief. Those religious leaders who were not in favour of partition called Pakistan a “mosque of Allah” and the leaders who were in favour of Pakistan promised to support the left over Muslims in India in life and death. Time has proved that their struggle and difference of opinion was only for the sack of Islam and Muslims. However, what we have made of the “mosque of Allah” is beyond description.

OUR FOREFATHER'S RESPONSE TO BRITISH TACTICS

In response to the British imposed curses of sectarianism, feudalism and educational systems, Muslim leadership took defensive actions with the objective to keep Muslims aware, on the right track, ready to practically engage in spreading the message of Islam and engage in physical *Jihad* whenever necessary. They took some short and long term measures to keep Muslims from criticising each other for petty things and forming different sects for no basic difference at all. The three long-term defensive measures they took in this regard are given below. The same measures are as valid on national and global scale today as they were 60-80 years ago on local scale.

- a) Establishment of pure religious institutions
- b) Revival of Sufism
- c) Da'wa: invitation to Islam

We will discuss the first point in detail.

Establishment of religious institutions

Just like the present crusade against *Madrassa* in Pakistan, Lord Macaulay was of the opinion that the kind of education that he had introduced would keep Muslim at bay from religion and subsequently *Jihad*. After giving deep thought to every aspect of the challenge, religious leaders of the time decided to establish Deoband *Madrassa*. Initially the movement to establish *Maddaris* seemed extremely vulnerable before the fully supported English education system, but soon the light spread all over the sub-continent.

One of the main objectives of the movement was to provide pure Islamic leadership to Muslims – a leadership that is groomed and trained in an Islamic environment. The aim was to convey the message of Islam and Qur'an in its true sense with out any misinterpretation or dilution so that modern challenges do not force them to reinterpret *deen* for the changing times. Instead, they shall change times according to the *deen-il-llah* (religion of Allah). This was an effective way to end the British promoted difference among Muslims on the basis of tribe, cast, language or region.

Since root cause of sectarianism is ignorance and unawareness from the real message of Islam, *Maddaris* were established to provide Muslims with spiritual education and make them aware of their *deen*. Looking at the success stories of English Education, British were contended with the thought that very soon there would be no “complete Muslims” available in India. But sooner than that many graduates from these *Maddaris*, fully clad in Islamic dress, were giving Azan in every corner of the world. Branches of these *Maddaris* are now spread over the whole world from Afghanistan to the islands in America and Africa.

There were many great *Mujahid* leaders in Afghanistan, but their American, French and Russian degrees showed their effect at last. They slipped at one or another point in life. They couldn't resist their temptation, nor could they combat international pressure the Taliban did. They sacrificed their lives but refused to bow down for the sake of power of foreign exchange reserves.

Occupied Pakistan

A consensus has now once more emerged throughout the European and American capitals that Islam can never be defeated as long as these *Maddaris* are not eradicated altogether. Efforts are underway to tear down the established systems in these *Maddaris*. Whatever was happening in the beginning of 20th century at local level under British colonial rule is happening on global scale under American colonial rule. And interestingly, we are more cooperative under remote control American occupation than the direct British occupation.

It is interesting to note that economic sanctions have become a potent weapon in this age. An in depth view reveals that all the funds are going to schools and colleges established for secular education. In a Muslim country like Pakistan, all jobs go to those who have secular degree either from Pakistan or abroad. Those who can speak English very well occupy all top-level positions. But despite all such sanctions, no one could starve millions of students in *Maddaris*. No one could reduce their number. And no one will ever be able to bulldoze them -- neither with secular curriculum and secular system, nor real bulldozers.

We must remember the former Soviet Union, which erased every mosque, every *Madrassa* and martyred almost every bearded person, but the West still needs leaders like Islam Karimov to close down mosques on worshipers and jail "Islamists." We see people like Sheikh Abdullah Noori signing as future rulers of Tajikistan. Where did they come from?

For consolidating occupation, it has wrongly been propagated that *Maddaris* cause sectarian problem. If we do a little research, we will find that all big statues of sectarianism are the direct products of secular colleges and universities. How many people died due to violence by the linguistic groups, but no one goes for closing down colleges or universities for being incubators of such ideas. Thousands die due to political differences in the same universities, but no one blame universities and the curriculum they teach for it. Crime statistics also shows that majority of the criminals involved in theft, rape, murders, abduction, etc., are educated persons from secular institutions – not religious schools. Some of the university campuses are homes for drug trade and use. No one blames secular education for that. No one suggests any changes in their curriculum.

Feudal lords have killed thousands in the name of honour. They have put hundreds of innocent and helpless people in their private jails. Raping poor women of the area is not a crime in their eyes. Why does no one ask about their Alma metre? Where did they graduate? Why do we not close them or legislate like *Madrassa* for their alleged crimes? Why not check the lists of most wanted in Pakistan and see that few of them have obtained their degrees from *Madrassa* and the rest of them from the regular secular schools and colleges? Why not obtain crime statistics from the police posts and close down all such institutions from where these criminals get educated?

Maddaris are being blamed for fanning sectarianism. We need to keep in mind that *Maddaris* do not teach how to hate and whom to hate. They don't call each other traitors like politicians do. *Maddaris* only teach the basic components of faith, which one must believe, and practice to be a Muslim. A Maulavi neither develops these injunctions of Islam nor is any Mufti authorised to add or subtract anything from the Holy Qur'an. Why do the accusers of *Maddaris*

Occupied Pakistan

not think that these institutions are in existence since centuries but there were no Shia-Sunni clashes or hatred among them? If religious institutions were responsible for sectarianism, it would not have been a latest phenomenon. We would have witnessed all such classes among Muslims and terrorist attacks since centuries.

This shows that there are different motives behind targeting *Maddaris*. It is something that is best understood when looked in the context of occupied Pakistan.

Targeting Curriculum of *Maddaris*

One of the serious threats to *Maddaris* is the multiple focus of different forces to introduce secular subjects. We must remember that none of the religious leaders were against secular subjects nor did they ever refuse to accept their importance. Instead they had achieved excellence in some of these subjects. But they were against introduction of such subjects in religious schools simply for the reason that specialised schools for such subjects far out number *Maddaris* and for various reasons none of these schools focus on religious education. As a result, even highly qualified persons from our universities do not even know the basics of Islam.

There are countless graduates and PhDs who cannot even understand the essence of *Kalima*, let alone recitation of the holy Qur'an with proper pronunciation. Some of these highly educated persons, who know the basics of Islam, know them by virtue of their parents or private guidance from some other family elder.

To some it might sound a valid argument that the West is trying to conquer Mars and we are talking about *Kalima* and *Tajweed*. They forget to realise that as long as human being need water and food for their physical survival, they need *Kalima* and Qur'an for spiritual survival. We must look at what kind of graduates are our secular institutions adding up to the society on annual basis. A majority of them have revolted against religion and some have taken up to challenge Islam on the basis of whatever little knowledge they acquire after skimming a few religious books.

Pakistan is in the hands of such people for the last 55 years. Their materialist thinking makes them believe in well being in this material world alone. Such godless education has given a police to this nation, which robs the people more than any type of robbers can rob. It has given us an army, which didn't let the people rule the country and robbed resources in such an organised manner of black budgeting that no one can even point a finger to that robbery. It has given us a bureaucracy that has pushed the country to the depths of poverty and underdevelopment.

In such a situation, *Maddaris* remained the most harmless institutions in the country. They were initially exploited by the US agencies for developing a bad blood between Iran and Pakistan through inciting violence among Shi'ites and Sunnis. Various killings took place in the mid 1990s when the US focus remained on Pak-Iran relations. Religious institutions were exploited by the US agencies for distribution of *Jihad* related material and later on recruiting the Taliban.

Special textbooks were published in Dari and Pashtu, designed by the Centre for Afghanistan Studies at the University of Nebraska-Omaha under a USAID grant in the early

Occupied Pakistan

1980s. Written by American Afghanistan experts and anti-Soviet Afghan educators, they aimed at promoting “*jihadi*” values and militant training among Afghans.³ USAID paid the University of Nebraska U.S. \$51 million from 1984 to 1994 to develop and design these textbooks, which were mostly printed in Pakistan. Over 13 million were distributed at Afghan refugee camps and Pakistani Madrasa “where students learnt basic math by counting dead Russians and Kalashnikov rifles”.⁴ After the war ended, these textbooks were still used in Afghan schools.

This movement was intended to support the US cause in Afghanistan but later on when it turned on its head, the US took advantage of the situation and left no stone unturned to demonise the Taliban and *Maddaris*.

It is being suggested that beside Arabic, English, and besides *Fiqh*, Chemistry and Physics shall be introduced in *Maddaris*. Here we must go to the objectives of the *Maddaris* movement and see if these can be achieved with such kind of mixed-education. Here we must keep in mind that quality of education in *Maddaris* has already suffered and addition of secular subjects would leave them in the middle of nowhere. There are many other alternatives if the objective of including secular subjects in religious institutions is to reduce gap between the two sectors. For instance, interested graduates of *Maddaris* shall be given opportunity to attend medical, law and other schools after graduation from *Maddaris*. Maulana Mufti Taqi Usmani is a role model for us. Other experiments of including goodness of *Madrasa* in schools, such as Iqra Public Schools, are underway and the results are quite encouraging.

³ Joe Stephens and David B. Ottaway, “The ABC's of Jihad in Afghanistan”, *The Washington Post*, 23 March, 2002. Sec A, p. 1. After 11 September, the United States removed jihadi images and messages and reintroduced these books for Afghan schools that reopened in March 2002.

⁴ Ibid.

TARGETS UNDER AMERICAN OCCUPATION

As recently as July 28, 2002, the US Secretary of State, Colin Powell, specifically highlighted American support for "Pakistan's efforts to reform its education system." Undoubtedly, Americans are very much involved in Pakistan's education policy – and Musharraf government's steps to remove Jihad related Qur'anic verses from school curriculum and making Islamiyat an optional subjects are clear indications of following instructions by the American advisors.

US press has been actively denouncing *Maddaris* in Pakistan. Some think tanks and academic institutions, such as College of Communication at Boston University, have been conducting surveys among teenagers to find out the level of their anti-Americanism. Pakistan's former Education Minister, Zubaida Jalal, has had several meetings with numerous American officials, including the US Secretary of State, Colin Powell, the US National Security Advisor, Condoleezza Rice, and the now Ambassador to Pakistan, Nancy Powell to discuss Pakistan's education policy and related matters. And the Americans have backed their words with a heavy financial commitment to Pakistan's education.

America's US Agency for International Development (USAID) pledged \$100 million to support reforms in Pakistan's education sector over the next five years on August 9, 2002. The Americans have a clear agenda behind their involvement in Pakistan's education. Like reaping the bitter harvest of following British education policies, American interference in our educational system has grave implications for the future of the already enslaved nation. America is concerned about Muslim opposition to American domination. It regards Pakistan's youth as the key to dealing with its opposition.

In the words of American Senator, Edward Kennedy, "Today's high school students are tomorrow's leaders ... We must do all we can to dispel the disturbing trend of anti-American rhetoric and beliefs by engaging Islamic peoples in the realms of values and ideas." This is why the American colonialist institutions have been so concerned about Pakistan's education. The Co-Chair of the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force on Higher Education in Developing Countries, Professor Henry Rovosky, the US Secretary of State, Colin Powell, and the US National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, met Pakistan's Education Minister, Zubaida Jalal On May 8, 2002 to review Pakistan's education reforms. After the meeting, it was revealed that the US was backing education reforms to make Pakistan a moderate state. The State Department Spokesman, Richard Boucher, announced American support for "moving Pakistan toward a more modern and moderate course where education plays a very key role."

The World Bank-UNESCO report "Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise" announced a complete change in the personality of youth in developing countries. The report calls for "a general or liberal education" whose focus is "the whole development of an individual, apart from his occupational training. It includes the civilizing of his life purposes, the refining of his emotional reactions..."

There is no hidden agenda for reforming education system for effective domination. The colonialists openly admit that liberal education is based on Western values and norms – they have nothing to do with Islam, except diluting its influence on our lives. The report states: "this particular

Occupied Pakistan

method of education has Western roots." Furthermore, the colonialists realise that there will be resistance to the colonialist system of education. The report states that liberal education "recalls colonial domination and education" but then dismisses this as "unfortunate."

Musharraf's government is providing every possible support to realise dream of the occupation forces. Together they have ensured that Pakistan implements "liberal education" under the label of "general education." The World Bank financed Pakistan's own Task Force on Higher Education and members of the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force were actively involved in formulating Pakistan's policy on education. That is why Pakistan's Task Force has also called for general (or liberal) education in its March 2001 document, which says "General education was recommended not only for secondary and higher secondary levels but also for Baccalaureate programmes... "

It is interesting to note that the new policy encourages ownership of schools by foreign Churches whilst at the same time it calls for restrictions on foreign funding of *Maddaris*. The Governor of Punjab, Khalid Maqbool, announced that "the Supreme Court had ruled that the nationalized educational institutions should be returned to their original owners" and the "government had already received an application from the Presbyterian Church to return the Government Foreman Christian College and the Kinnaird College."⁵ In Sindh, the government has received applications from Christian missionary institutions for the return of St. Joseph's College for Women and the St. Patrick's College. Again these plans are a direct result of the World Bank's influence over Pakistan's education.⁶

The World Bank calls for tighter control over *Maddaris*, whilst at the same time calling for loosening the grip of the state on other schools: deregulation. The World Bank's Report No. 23916-PAK calls for "mainstreaming *Maddaris*," whereas the World Bank-UNESCO report criticizes state control over other schools and maintains that "De-regulation in many countries is loosening the state's grip on the founding and operation of private institutions."

The education reforms in Pakistan are thus part of the long term attempts at neutralising our Islamic identity and indoctrinating Muslim youth with Western culture and values. The colonialists are using education as a mean to make us accept domination without any resistance. As mentioned earlier, educational indoctrination and cultural domination have always been the central pillars of colonialism and occupation. In 1835 in his minute on education, the British colonialist, Lord Macaulay, wrote that the colonialists wanted an education system, which produced "a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion in morals and in intellect." Pick up any English daily in Pakistan and read views expressed by the educated elites to find out how western they are in taste, in opinion and morals.

Another example is General Musharraf, who has never made any secret of his modernist views. After his coup Islamabad's formidable rumour machine relayed stories about his penchant for whisky and the general himself recounted how he had gambled in casinos. He said that while most people favoured a 'double or quit' strategy in roulette he had found 'treble or quit' to be a better approach. His relatives, too, made little effort to conceal their attitude towards religion. Shortly after the 1998

⁵ Daily *Dawn*, July 25, 2002.

⁶ Daily *Dawn*, July 27, 2002.

Occupied Pakistan

military coup, a BBC interviewer asked the general's father: 'Does your son pray fives times a day?' 'If the father doesn't,' comes the deadpan reply, 'I don't see why the son should'.⁷

Before 11 September Musharraf had expressed his concern about the *Madrassa* and had taken some limited steps to control them. The dictatorship sent a four-page form to all the country's *Maddaris* asking them to give details of their syllabi and sources of their funding. Few bothered to reply. After 11 September Musharraf had greater confidence and he announced sweeping measures to control the *Maddaris*. Clerics running the schools were told they had to turn away foreign students who did not have a letter of approval from their own governments and to start teaching science, English and Pakistan studies alongside religious subjects. Musharraf also ordered the creation of a registration system for all those attending the *Maddaris*. The US provided \$10 million dollars to purchase the necessary computer equipment.⁸

Target: Madrassa, Jihad or our identity?

The years long demonising campaign against the Taliban and the subsequent bloody drama of September 11 has successfully turned the world opinion against *Mullah*, *Talib* and *Madrassa*. Worldwide audience is whole-heartedly accepting whatever is published to further accuse the basic institutions of Islam as schools of terrorism and extremism. International Crisis Group's (ICG) latest report, "Pakistan: *Maddaris*, extremism and the military," is the latest example of such efforts to actually fight against the spirit of Jihad in the name of fighting terrorism.⁹

Interestingly, words such as *Jihad* and *Jihadi* have been used no less than 140 times in just 39 pages of the ICG report (excluding appendix). It shows *Jihad* phobia, which has always been the hallmark of those who think of ways to dominate Muslim societies. It is a grand misconception that eradicating the existing nature of *Madrassa* would eradicate the spirit of *Jihad*. Apart from the fact that *Madrassa* are not military training centres, those who understand the ground reality know that a single sitting before CNN, BBC or an hour of browsing American news media outlets on internet rekindles the spirit of *Jihad* more than staying for years in an isolated *Madrassa*.

Keeping the colonial tradition alive, the report defines *Madrassa* in the very second paragraphs of the report as "Pakistani religious schools that breed extremism of many hues," which "produce indoctrinated clergymen of various Muslim sects." The report goes on to blame military government for "the lack of commitment to reform." It calls the government's crackdown on religious institutions as "cosmetic," lacking "substance, legal muscle or intent to institutionalise long-term change." The strongest of its recommendations is in the form of an appeal to western donors "focus heavily on rebuilding a secular system."

⁷ Jones, Owen Bennett. (2002). Pakistan - eye of the storm, page 18-19, Yale University Publications. 0300097603

⁸ Jones, Owen Bennett. (2002). Pakistan - eye of the storm, page 32-33, Yale University Publications. 0300097603

⁹ "Pakistan: Madrassa, extremism and the military," International Crisis Group (ICG) Report, July 29, 2002.

Occupied Pakistan

The first misconception needed to be clarified is that not all the Afghan Taliban came from “Deobandi seminaries in the Pashtun areas of Pakistan.” Almost 65 per cent of the Taliban officials and workers at lower level had never been to any religious school. Most of the faculty members at Kabul University were graduates from US and other European countries with years of experience abroad. The concept of *Jihad* and a people’s willingness to die for Allah is independent of *Maddaris*. Most people come forward at anyone’s call for *Jihad* when they physically or psychologically suffer consequences of one or another kind of oppression. Madrassa do not play “supporting role” of recruiting grounds for “*Jihadis*,” occupied land of Palestine and Afghanistan, however, certainly do.

To understand if *Maddaris* education and upbringing really “aim to indoctrinate with an intolerance of other religious systems,” or not, one has to go back in history.

Just like Bush, British during their colonial rule over Indian subcontinent had not forgotten the Crusades and the fall of Roman Empire. For that reason, during the course of colonial rule, British left no stone unturned to suppress or throw away Muslims with their roots. Just like the present day American crusade against anything related to *Jihad*, British remained fearful of the Muslims’ passion for *Jihad*. They used to get annoyed at the word *Jihad* and tried to let the Muslims understand that they are not against the Muslims but *Jihad*. Like the present American and Israeli *Jihad*-phobia and moderato-mania, the British used to tell Muslims that all those who renounce *Jihad* are acceptable Muslims.

British scholars and thinkers were unanimous in their belief that Muslims can never be dominated as long as they have a passion for *Jihad*. It was thus necessary to keep them away from *Jihad*. To achieve that objective, British rulers came up with a three-pronged strategy. They promoted sectarianism, imposed a regional and linguistic feudal system and introduced British education. They were right in their conviction that under the influence of these three snakes, Muslims would never be able to stand up for *Jihad*.

The crux of anti-*Madrassa* campaign is the fear of Jihad as the ICG report highlights: “Its rationale of existence remains virtually unchanged and as emotive as ever: to defend the faith of Islam - if need be through jihad.” Actually this is the best form of *Jihad*. Not every war in which Muslims are involved is Jihad, but the one for defending the faith of Islam certainly is.

It is good that reports from organisations such as ICG admit the reality that these *Madrassa* “do not necessarily conduct military training or provide arms to students” and that only “few” who went to fight in Kashmir and Afghanistan “had ever been to a traditional *Madrassa*.” The report also admits: “Traditionally, *jihadi* texts are not a part of the normal curricula of *Madrassa*.” The grievance, however is that they “encourage” them to “espouse jihad.” So, the grievance is against the message of *Jihad* in Islam, not *Madrassa*, which is considered as a means and thus blamed and targeted.

It is worthwhile to mention that more than 90 per cent of the thousands of *Mujahideen* who fought the former Soviet Union in Afghanistan were never to any *Madrassa*. We know

Occupied Pakistan

our own friends or relatives who did not need any *Madrassa* to “indoctrinate” them before taking part in *Jihad*, which is part and parcel of Islam – despite deliberate distortions of the term, most of the Muslims know when it is *Jihad* for Allah and when it is not.

Central Asian, North African and Caucasian Muslim arrived to participate in the Afghan war of liberation with preconceived knowledge of Jihad. None of them came to *Madrassa* to stay and take lessons before going to Jihad. Promotion of Jihad, like other obligations of Islam is not a curse. It should, however, not be misdirected to achieve political ends or worldly interests. If it is rightly targeting an evil, instead of fighting the sources, which promotes *Jihad*, the scaremongers should work to eradicate the evil against which Jihad became necessary.

Most of the Afghans who went back for *Jihad* were victims of Soviet aggression. *Madrassa* did not send them back. Like the Palestinians, they would not have engaged in fighting back if they were not orphaned, if they were not occupied, if they were not repressed. Instead of hating *Jihad*, why not stop supporting the aggressors and needless occupations. The US played a key role in originally targeting the message of *Jihad* against communism. We were told that godless communists are out there to eradicate Islam. Today the same US plays a far worse anti-religion role than former USSR and proposes way and means to promote and support secularism.

According to Joe Stephens and David B. Ottaway (“The ABC's of Jihad in Afghanistan”, *the Washington Post*, March 23, 2002), International patrons supplied arms and religious literature that flooded Pakistani *Madrassa*. Special textbooks were published in Dari and Pashtu, designed by the Centre for Afghanistan Studies at the University of Nebraska-Omaha under a USAID grant in the early 1980s. Written by American Afghanistan experts and anti-Soviet Afghan educators, they aimed at promoting values of *Mujahideen* and military training among Afghans.

The same lessons are equally applicable to the all invaders and occupiers. As mentioned earlier, USAID paid the University of Nebraska U.S. \$51 million from 1984 to 1994 to develop and design these textbooks. What else can the US expect from the kith and kin of the people they trained and “indoctrinated.” Why blame *Madrassa*? Whatever was true yesterday is true today as well. There can be no double standards of application for truth and justice.

Besides speaking volumes of the fear of *Jihad*, a careful reading of anti-*Madrassa* material also reveals the deep-rooted fear of Islam. For instance, towards the end, the ICG report starts attacking any institution associated with Islam in the following words: “A new generation of modern religious schools is already transcending old barriers of class, gender and ethnicity in Pakistan.

Networks of religious education for women and children, far more sophisticated and modern than the old *Madrassa* are competing with private schools and the government sector. Some, such as the al-Huda and Hira schools, indoctrinate young women through preaching and religious mobilisation. Women and children of urbanised, upper middle-class families are, therefore, being indoctrinated with the same zeal that marks the *Madrassa*

Occupied Pakistan

system. The stereotype of the turbaned, provincial Taliban is being re-moulded in a presentable package, as an extremist ideology permeates the upper classes of Pakistani society.”

We would close down all *Madrasa*, but unfortunately they are not the only target. The above passage shows that every kind of religious education has become “indoctrination” and promotion of “extremist ideology” for Muslims. They have to shun religion altogether if they want to be accepted as good Muslims. It proves that *Madrasa* are not the only targets. Eyes are set on every kind of institute that focuses on Islam in its curriculum -- no matter how well it may mix it up with secular education. There is no end to compromise on Islam.

US forces in Pakistan

Every Pakistani feels ashamed of the ways in which we have surrendered our military bases and other vital locations to the American forces. After taking oath in National Assembly, Leader of Jamaat-i-Islami, Qazi Hussain Ahmad, demanded sovereignty of the parliament. The demand to have sovereign institutions in an un-sovereign state is no more than wishful thinking. But Pakistan is a sovereign state, someone may argue. The question is: Can foreign forces be indefinitely imposed on a sovereign state against its will? Of course not, is the right answer. Have, then, we willingly allowed the US troops and agents to station and act as they may wish in Pakistan? We are not a sovereign state if the answer is: “We have allowed them to save Pakistan from the direct American or indirect Indian military attack.”

Pakistan was the strategic cat’s-paw for United States ever since the days of CENTO and SEATO, but it was never occupied. The picture of Pak-US military-to-military relations in 2001-2002 is different and stands out in stark comparison, inviting in depth analysis to look into the ways in which we surrendered our independence and implications of US military presence in Pakistan.

It is important to note that even at the height of Pak-US strategic relationship, we did not give access to US military personnel and the CIA to our military facilities, dumps and bases. The US military presence in Pakistan today is in thousands, located at strategic Pakistani military bases around the country. Most importantly, the American military presence was brought about not by Pakistan Army’s willingness but under dire American coercive pressures and threats.

Both Pakistan Army and public cannot be said to have been unmoved by the impact of US military presence in Pakistan and the circumstances under which it was brought about. This symbol of our armed forced emasculation was definitely not brought about under any military alliance – except an alliance with an Army Chief, who represents nobody.

The reality that cannot be brushed aside is that the US’s policy of intervention in Afghanistan is not viewed with favour in Pakistan. Apart from the results of recent elections, a CNN poll reveals that over 56 per cent of the people are not supportive of Musharraf’s pro-US policies, which have turned Pakistan into an occupied country. In fact, they are more than 56 per cent.

Occupied Pakistan

It is hyperbole to portray Musharraf's decision to allow US bases in Pakistan as a courageous, de Gaulle-like gesture. Instead, Musharraf can be compared to another military dictator, Hungary's Adm. Nikolaus Horthy de Nagybanya, who attempted to defect from his alliance with Adolf Hitler and switch his support to the Allies. Horthy failed in his gamble, whereas Musharraf has been apparently successful (so far). But that success should not diminish the significance of the historical analogy. Horthy and Musharraf were simply switching to the winning side, well aware that the alternative would bring about their own political destruction.¹⁰

There was no conversion of the masses to alien values or forces on native lands in either case. Like most of his predecessors, Musharraf's knew that Islamabad's ties with Washington were dictated by specific political-military interests and lacked any deep ideological roots. When US officials were hailing Pak-US cooperation in providing support to Afghan *Mujahideen*, Pakistani leaders seemed to have no illusions about their relationship with Washington. Unlike Musharraf, they recognized that after a short marriage of convenience, the two governments would eventually have to deal with the reality of their diverging core national interests and values.

During a December 6, 1982 meeting in Washington, General Zia told Secretary of State George Shultz in clear terms that the two countries were a "union of unequal" and "incompatible" in terms of culture, geography, and national power, even though they had strong common interests.¹¹ The cautionary remarks Zia made probably apply more to the current Pak-US relationship, in which Musharraf is the more enthusiastic partner, surrendering everything for prolonging his stay in power.

Of course, a client state can secure support and increase its leverage over the US by accentuating common strategic interests. However, there needs to be a limit to conceding our sovereignty. The erosion of our independence leads to continuing political instability, leading to the weakening of our fragile governing system. Existence of US bases in Pakistan has tarnished Pakistan's image even in Washington and contributed to the volatility of bilateral relationship.

Cold War rhetoric aside, Pakistan and US not only lack common historical and cultural ties, they are not operating on the same strategic wavelength. After September 11, the Bush administration decided, not only to target Pakistan's strategic and ideological ally in Kabul, but also to destroy the entire education system for the fear of *Jihad* against its double standards, injustice and state terrorism.

Musharraf made Pakistan a big loser after September 11 with the misconception that it had no other option but to accept that outcome. From a systemic perspective, September 11

¹⁰ For a historical analysis of Horthy's strategy, see Ian Kershaw, *Hitler (1936–45): Nemesis* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2000), pp. 734–35.

¹¹ Quoted in Kux, p. 268. The quotes are taken from a State Department memorandum and talking points for Secretary Shultz's meeting with Zia that Kux obtained through the Freedom of Information Act.

Occupied Pakistan

helped Washington establish its military presence in Pakistan and also re-establish the “red lines” that had disappeared after the collapse of the Soviet superpower, impelling Washington to restrain its Pakistani client state.

From the American perspective, US military bases in Pakistan are necessary to keep an eye on “fundamentalist forces” taking control of sensitive locations, the ISI and some “cells” in the military that may get out of control and act like “rogue” institutions.¹² Musharraf’s strategy of reaping rewards of his appeasement has miserably failed. From day one, Washington didn’t pay any attention to his calls, such as those for a halt to bombing in Ramadan, or not to let Northern Alliance taking full control in Kabul.

Instead the Bush administration decided to continue pursuing the war during Ramadan and gave a green light to Northern Alliance forces to occupy Kabul. Musharraf again tried to reduce losses by demanding that Kabul be “demilitarized” and the Northern Alliance forces “must not” hold it.¹³ Pakistan couldn’t play a role in formation of a new government in Kabul and today Islamabad is totally sidelined from whatever good or bad is happening in Afghanistan.

Pakistan has become one of the strategic losers in the international system that has evolved since September 11. Yet the US has continued to portray Islamabad as a “friend,” and has provided economic and military assistance on the basis of promises to unconditionally support its “anti-terrorism” campaign. US military bases are the strings attaches to this assistance.

The case of US bases in Saudi Arabia or Kuwait is based on the premise to defend these countries against Iraq. In our case, Afghanistan is fully occupied with a CIA man on throne in Kabul and American forces dug in military bases throughout the country. There is no justification for continued US military presence in Pakistan because unlike pre-Afghanistan-occupation, the Allied forces do not need any additional support from US bases in Pakistan.

Those of us who have turned a blind eye to the presence of US forces on Pakistani soil under different pretext must not ignore the reality that they are here to stay indefinitely. They are here to ensure that unlike the 1980s, Pakistan does not get a blank check from the US to combat terrorism, and spend it on building up forces that may threaten US adventures in the region.¹⁴

The conflicting national interests of Washington and Islamabad have become more obvious during the past year. The US has openly rejected Pakistan’s position vis-à-vis Kashmir. Pakistan’s nuclear programme has become the prime target of the US government. The US establishment-backed analysts have declared Pakistan “the most dangerous place on

¹² See, for example, Douglas Frantz, “The Rogue to Fear Most Is the One Following Orders,” *New York Times*, January 13, 2002, p. WK1

¹³ “Now for an Equally Hard Part,” *The Economist*, November 17, 2001, p. 15

¹⁴ Fear expressed by many, such as Christopher Hitchens, “On the Frontier of Apocalypse,” *Vanity Fair*, January 2002, p. 153

Occupied Pakistan

earth.”¹⁵ Permanent induction of armed forces in Pakistan’s governance mechanism has been fully supported by the US and we have gladly accepted it on “something is better than nothing” bases. Furthermore, the US has a clear interest in establishing strong ties with India.¹⁶ Pakistan, on the other hand, is increasingly considered as a “potential long-term adversary.”¹⁷

At a time when American policy makers are planning for a disengagement from Pakistan, we need not host American bases on Pakistani soil any longer. Even some of the US policymakers reject any idea of continuing American military bases in the existing political environment of Pakistan, which could lead to an escalation of violence and a perfect ruse for a war on Pakistan.¹⁸

We do not need any American forces for taking steps that are in our own interest, such as reforming our political and economic system, arresting actual terrorists, or reducing tensions with India. Rewards for Musharraf’s cooperation is not establishment of military bases in Pakistan but growing diplomatic, economic, and cultural ties without any strings attached for domination. It’s time for Americans and Pakistanis to bring a sense of normalcy and dignity into their relationship by removing both American military and agents from different agencies from Pakistan. That means ending the invisible occupation of Pakistan.

If there is any lesson in the words of Tipu Sultan for us, it is: A few days of living in a sovereign Pakistan is better than a thousand years under invisible occupation embraced only to avoid American or Indian military adventures.

Pak Army vs. Pakistan

Apart from accommodating huge US military presence in Pakistan, our army shoulders a major responsibility for the present and future state of Pakistan for its staying in power, or behind the power, for most of the time since 1947. Before assessing our armed forces role in defending or occupation of Pakistan, we need to keep the following three points with respect to defence parameters in mind.

First, the strength of defence does not in any way connote Pakistan army’s involvement in politics. Whatever may be the reasons of the army’s involvement in politics, it is ethically wrong and leads to disastrous consequences. Pak army should obey the Constitution under which it has taken oath. Those in uniform who negate and disobey should meet due punishment.

¹⁵ Jim Hoagland, Nuclear Enabler, Pakistan today is the most dangerous place on Earth, Washington Post, Thursday, October 24, 2002; Page A35

¹⁶ As analyst Victor M. Gorbarev argued in a recent policy paper, “India could become a strategic counterweight to China and a crucial part of a stable balance of power in both East Asia and South Asia.” Victor M. Gorbarev, “India as a World Power: Changing Washington’s Myopic Policy,” Cato Institute Policy Analysis no. 381, September 11, 2000, p. 2.

¹⁷ Leon T. Hadar, Pakistan: Strategic Ally or Unreliable Client? Policy Analysis, No 436, May 08, 2002.

¹⁸ Kamran Khan and Thomas E. Ricks, “U.S. Military Begins Shift from Bases in Pakistan,” *Washington Post*, January 11, 2002

Occupied Pakistan

Second, the strength of defence doesn't simply lie in the management of certain hardware or temporary events. The perils encountering ideology of the country due to appeasement of one or another kind must be routinely assessed to find out potential threats to national security.

Third, there is no justification in treating defence as holy cow – one above all evils. In light of Muslim history and traditions, defence affairs are also to be confined within limits. Defence affairs must also be processed and sieved, its working should be – with little restraint - talked in parliament and its performance should be checked by some kind of accountability process.

Assessed on such parameters, the army that prides itself on being a unifying power, in reality, has always been not only a force of decay and disintegration but also a facilitator of the ultimate occupation of Pakistan in many ways. Since 1951 Washington has felt that the army was the best guarantor of its interests. Pakistan's first military coup, in October 1958, backed by the US, sought to pre-empt the country's first general election amid fears that political parties hostile to the US security alliance might win a substantial majority in parliament.

The first dictator, General Ayub Khan, was secular in outlook and fond of his drink. Weakening of state institutions began during his rule. He imprisoned and tortured dissidents, destroyed the free press and set precedents for rigged referendums and elections. He started the dirty work of creating a civilian facade for unconstitutional military rule.

Just as General Musharraf is ignoring majority of Pakistanis under the label of “vocal minority,” General Ayub also ignored the needs of the majority in East Pakistan. After a six-month popular uprising, General Yahya replaced him and immediately announced the country's long-postponed general election to take place in January 1970.

The elections took place on schedule. The Bengali province elected the nationalist Awami League to power. The bulk of the army and the 22 families that controlled 80 per cent of the wealth belonged to West Pakistan. General Yahya as their representative refused to accept the Bengali victory and declared war on the majority of Pakistan, which led to the break-up of Pakistan. The Pakistani expeditionary force surrendered without a battle. It was a total humiliation.

In 1977, Bhutto's refusal to cancel the nuclear project led to his overthrow and a US-sponsored public agitations and coup saw another General taking destiny of Pakistan in his hands. Unlike his military predecessor, Zia pledged elections within 90 days. The Pentagon and the Defense Intelligence Agency, eager for a proxy in Afghanistan, spawned General Zia, whose monstrous regime brutalized political institutions for 11 years.

After completing his services to the US, Zia had to be removed through assassination in 1989. Real assassins were never uncovered. However, the American plot, which soon became an open secret, was definitely carried out by the military men because Mrs Zia also confirmed that her husband had been killed "by his own" – the army.

Occupied Pakistan

After ten years of civilian rule, Nawaz Sharif attempt to get rid of General Pervez Musharraf backfired. Nawaz Sharif and his company created an enterprise culture in which everything was for sale, including generals. Rumours abound that to buy time and extract yet more money, Sharif and company provided sacks full of dollars to friendly generals.

For the first time in Pakistan's history, General Musharraf took power in October 1999 against the will of the US. The events of September 11, however, transformed the General from a despicable dictator to a desirable ally. But his job was more difficult than his predecessor's. Musharraf had to unravel the only victory ever won by his army for the US: the Taliban takeover of Kabul. This has created severe tensions inside an army whose discipline has never broken.

Throughout this saga of failure and devoted service to American masters, nowhere we see the in-power armed forces strengthening other state institutions for the benefit of common man. Even the latest attempt by General Musharraf to end the intriguing corruption – that gulps out one-fourth of the national wealth annually – ended in bringing the same corrupt blood to power in return for their promising support to legitimising dictatorship. While embracing corrupt political leaders for its own interest, the military ignored that Rs.400 billion to Rs.500 billion are lost to the country every year because of the same persons once charged by his accountability apparatus.

As one dictator followed another, instead of the pre-independence Pakistan's movement, the army's vision of Pakistan began to define the state. The army has profited materially from its dominant role in politics. Spurred on by the belief that the army is Pakistan's leading institution (an assertion that is true because all other institutions have neither guns nor resources, and are decaying because the army sucks 80% of the vital resources), the generals seek to impose a military structure on the rest of society. That effort includes educational qualifications for officeholders, an attempt to "grow" a new generation of politicians by non-partisan local elections, and a constitutional role for the army in the higher councils of government in the form of a national security council.

The army under General Musharraf has further demonstrated to the US that it is able to demonstrate its brutality for arresting countrymen, invading and demolishing homes like an occupation army and controlling large-scale anti-government demonstrations. Earlier, the army's willingness to turn on its own people had been in doubt. The military is not good enough to defend Pakistan, but the US is now pleased to see it shattering the myth of the power of "the Islamic extremists" to turn out hundreds of thousands of protestors or to disrupt the operation of the state. And that's what the US looked forward to for so many years.

Pakistan is not likely to experience a breakaway ethnic-group situation similar to the East Pakistan movement of 1970. But there is no doubt in its living as a non-existent, weak, failed state, run by a few "liberals" and sell-outs like Hamid Karazai. Similarly, in the presence of this army, an Islamic model for Pakistan can be safely ruled out for the foreseeable future. With the Supreme Court's ruling against the clear injunctions of Qur'an,

Occupied Pakistan

the stigma attached to Islamic education and the government's crackdown on religious institutions, Islamic movements will suffer considerably. Terrorist incidents will likely to continue in Pakistan and religious movements would have to get the blame for all the wrong that happens in the country.

The military's attempts at defeating *raison d'être* of Pakistan would lead to Pakistan's failure, which various objective criteria can measure. The region that belongs to Pakistan would play its vital role in the years to come irrespective of Pakistan's survival as a state. The failure seems to be our destiny, although the downward trend in many indicators of state failure can be temporarily halted. In the long run, however, it is not the lack of economic opportunity, the booming birth rate or the weak educational system that could leave Pakistan vulnerable. It would be, in fact, a generation of "moderate" Pakistanis with few prospects for economic advancement that would see the promise of Pakistan as a cruel joke.

Pakistan is in the ambivalent position of having an army that can neither govern nor allow civilians to rule. Whether the army has the conceptual ability to plan a strategy of incremental change that would fundamentally reform Pakistan's ailing institutions is also questionable. It is not in a position to end the invisible occupation it has brought upon Pakistan due to myopic vision and self-interest of military leadership. All failing states have weak armies; Pakistan's army is strong enough to prevent state failure for some time to come but not courageous enough to stand for the objective of Pakistan or imaginative enough to transform it into a model Islamic state, which are the only pragmatic ways for its sustainability and one of the main parameters for defence.

A truly independent, Islamic Republic of Pakistan is unlikely to emerge until the military and politicians set aside their personal interests and broker some kind of grand accord in the interest of Pakistan. In the invisible conflict of army vs. Pakistan, if Pakistan does not get dissolved, still it will definitely continue as a state that hovers on the edge of true independence and sovereignty for a long time to come. In the final analysis we would come to know that Pakistan was not at war with India or someone else, but its own armed forces. And the forces that we nurtured at the cost of 80 per cent of our limited resources proved to be the facilitators of occupation.

Consolidating Occupation

The way Musharraf is liquidating Pakistan's sovereignty; it is a matter of time that the Pentagon would have full control over Islamabad's nuclear toys.¹⁹

The days of buying a few Pakistani agents for specific assignments have long since passed. It is now time for the powerful to buy us en masse and bring in as many agents from abroad as required to consolidate occupation of Pakistan. Literal meaning of occupation is taking or maintaining possession of a country by military conquest. However, the line between independence and occupation is getting finer with each passing day in the 21st century. The cost of weakness is now an occupation without a military conquest. Pakistan

¹⁹ Musharraf goes nuclear, Editorial, *Frontier*, April 21-27, 2002.

Occupied Pakistan

has, unfortunately, become the first victim of this new kind of occupation -- a model of "failed state" perfectly controlled from outside with curtailed sovereignty and limited freedoms.

Despite our government's wholehearted sacrifice of all principles of justice and norms of independent states, American analysts, such as Leon T. Hadar of Cato Institute, consider Pakistan "with its dictatorship and failed economy" a "reluctant Partner" and a "potential long term adversary."²⁰ Therefore, occupation is a must and here we are: fully occupied. Like any other occupied territory, dictatorship is in full swing in Pakistan. Hundreds of people, pointed out by the intelligence of occupation forces, are rounded up on daily basis to please the aggressors.

Illegal detentions and extraditions are on the rise. More than a dozen non-government organisations with any link to Muslim countries, or Arabic words in its names, have been closed down. Newspapers report that guns and "computers have been recovered" from these organisations, as if computers have suddenly become illegal commodities. Hundreds of additional FBI and CIA agents are on their way to Pakistan to join the thousands of foreign agents who are already spying on occupied people.

Signs of helplessness are all around. The government says, it "can't abolish *Riba*" no matter how un-Islamic it may be. Minister for Religious Affairs says "private *Jihad* not to be allowed," as if the Muslim countries have the will and power to wage public *Jihad*. Remember there has not been any public *Jihad* since 19th century, except when the US declared so against the former Soviet Union in Afghanistan. Kashmiris have been left at the mercy of Indian occupation forces. Pakistan cannot move its own troops without prior permission from Washington. And we have desperate suicide attacks on occupation forces like anywhere in occupied territories.

There are no signs of independence at all. We cannot prepare our budgets without an approval from international lending agencies. We cannot conduct any investigation without assistance of FBI agents. Our agencies cannot operate any longer, except in coordination with FBI. We have to detain every person from the Middle East as a potential terrorist and it's the US agencies to decide their fate. The morbid dread of Al-Qaeda is being used to crackdown on religion and to further reduce our freedoms as citizens of an independent state. There is no open discussion on any aspect of the ever-intensifying occupation.

We are ensuring American "strategic interests" in everything we do, from implementation of American directions on religious institutions to spying on citizens and banning everything that may promote the spiritual message of Islam. The government officials work round the clock to ensure interpretation of Pakistan's occupation as crisis management. It is rather becoming a cause of the future crisis.

For aggressors, such remote control occupation is far better than military conquest, where occupiers may lose their men and resources on daily basis. Besides American lives,

²⁰ *Policy Analysis*, No 436, May 8, 2002.

Occupied Pakistan

maintaining occupation and elevating Karzai to the position of Pervez Musharraf and Hosnie Mubarak is costing US a billion dollars a month. Just like Palestinian authorities in occupied Palestine, US can force our government to routinely violate basic standards of decency in human behaviour as expressed in international human rights law without anyone raising an eyebrow. It can now arrest, indefinitely detain, torture and even kill anyone under the pretext of destroying Al-Qaeda network.

Al-Qaeda's threat has been blown out of proportions to intensify occupation in what a senior British diplomat Robert Cooper calls failed states in the post-modern era. Full text of Cooper's essay appeared in the *Observer* on April 07, 2002. Main characteristics of such occupations described by Cooper are: the breaking down of the distinction between domestic and foreign affairs of the occupied states; "mutual" interference in domestic affairs and "mutual" surveillance (the word "mutual" is used to deceive the weak as Pakistan cannot even imagine interference in domestic affairs of the US, let alone surveillance); and the growing irrelevance of borders when comes to safeguarding interest of the strong.

In 21st century occupations, there are no security threats in the traditional sense; that is to say, the powerful do not consider invading the weak. Going to war is rather a sign of policy failure. Mr. Cooper elaborates:

"The challenge to the post-modern world is to get used to the idea of double standards. Among ourselves, we operate on the basis of laws and open cooperative security. But when dealing with more old-fashioned kinds of states outside the post-modern continent of Europe, we need to revert to the rougher methods of an earlier era - force, pre-emptive attack, deception, whatever is necessary to deal with those who still live in the nineteenth century world of every state for itself. Among ourselves, we keep the law but when we are operating in the jungle, we must also use the laws of the jungle."

So the laws of jungle are being applied in occupied states like Pakistan and Afghanistan. To remove any leftover doubts about Pakistan being a failed state, news reports from *New York Times* and *Washington Post* are pouring in, alleging that Al-Qaeda is regrouping in Pakistan and fighting in Kashmir. As a "pre-modern" state, Pakistan is, thus, considered as weak enough "even to secure its home territory... but it can provide a base for non-state actors who may represent a danger to the post-modern world." An occupation of Pakistan is thus justified and "our" leader calls for more and more US assistance after each desperate attack on its interest.

This new form of occupation is acceptable to a world of human rights and cosmopolitan values. In the western eyes it is an occupation that "aims to bring order and organisation but which rests today on the voluntary principle or people like Musharraf coming forward and offering services. If there were no Musharrafs and Mubaraks, it is not just soldiers that come from the international community; it is police, judges, prison officers, central bankers and others. Kosova is an example where elections are organised and monitored by the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Local police are financed and trained by the UN. As auxiliaries to this effort - in many areas indispensable to it - are over a hundred NGOs.

Occupied Pakistan

We must debate and resist occupation of Pakistan under the pretext of dismantling Al-Qaeda's network. What kind of a clearinghouse Osama has created for terrorist adventures that is so hard to dismantle? It seems Al-Qaeda and Osama have become the one-size-fits-all scapegoat for every action that all the world's aggrieved peoples take against America. And we might be tempted to believe this, if it weren't for the fact that some of America's own citizens, such as Timothy McVeigh and Theodore Kaczynski, have proved that one need not be a Muslim to perform such acts of terror.

Freedom comes with a heavy price tag. Under British occupation, Benjamin Franklin observed in 1755 that those "who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." You don't abandon the rule of law, principles of justice and hard won independence simply because America is angry. Pakistan is strong enough at least to handle its internal affairs within the precious boundaries of the law and the abandoned Constitution. If new rules are needed for dignified interaction with the super-power or detention and extradition of suspects, then by all means establish new rules. But you don't leave your self at the mercy of American will without any policy and principles. Of what use is our assistance in the "war on terrorism" if it puts our very freedoms and independence at stake. Our assistance should not become cooperation for occupation. If we are not defending our freedom and Islamic way of life, then we're just blowing stale smoke rings of hypocrisy when we raise our hand and pledge to defend sovereignty and independence of the "Islamic" Republic of Pakistan.

CONCLUSION: A NATION FULLY OCCUPIED AND HALF DEAD

By now, the US may not have finished Taliban and Al-Qaeda but the Taliban Government has disappeared along with Pakistan's strategic depth. Pakistan's sovereignty has not only been compromised but diminished to a great extent. Now, US forces are stationed at various centres of Pakistan and it seems that it would stay in Pakistan for long. The geo-strategic location of Pakistan may not have served Pakistani citizens so much as it has the Pakistan Army and its elite. It is this location which makes Pakistan prone to military dictatorships. Again, it is this location, which ultimately landed Pakistan as an Anglo-American client State with greatly diminished sovereignty.²¹

A nation dies the day when it starts dying for others against its will. A nation dies when it starts a battle against its *raison d'être*: Eliminate a nation's purpose, and you extinguish its spark of life. The country that acquiesces in evil can hardly hope to enjoy the benefits of goodness. No one draws freedom or life from a land of oppression and death. The half-dead Pakistani nation is silently dragging the cross of Bush Junior's "crusade" to its own Golgotha. On the military front, the nation helplessly watched PTV News that called 10 army men, who died for America in an encounter in tribal areas, as "martyrs." On legal front, the nation didn't say a word in protest as its Supreme Court staged a successful *coup de main* on clear Qur'anic injunctions and claimed its survival in going against Qur'an for its banking system.

Everyone is silently reading reports about their army going on rampage in South Waziristan. The infuriated army commanders herded people out of their houses and blasted their houses by artillery and mortar fires to revenge the killings of their fellows. It seems the story of another West Bank or Gaza strip: another factory of desperate "suicide bombers" in making.²² No one asks, what is this nation fighting for, or what is the meaning of our existence?

In search of Al-Qaeda men "army and law enforcement agencies are capturing every bearded person who has some contact with religious people of mosques' affairs."²³ A tribal elder of Wana, South Waziristan, told *Baluchistan Post* that it seems as if "the Army is not operating in its own country rather it is fighting a war in a hostile country." Just to please Bush and company, we are at war with ourselves on military, intellectual, legal and social fronts. This is what Thomas Friedman of *New York Times* calls a "war within Islam," and this is for what spokesman of the State Department very proudly thanks General Musharraf.

Are we acting like living nations, which act upon the instructed judgement of their conscience? They might be mistaken; but they ought ceaselessly to be aware that the act they oppose is, after all, no more than the opinion of other nations who, like them, are also fallible. The business of a government in living nations is to satisfy the rational desires of citizens or, at least, to make possible

²¹ Dina Nath Mishra, *The Pioneer*, May 22, 2002.

²² *Baluchistan Post*, June 29, 2002.

²³ *The Statesman*, June 30, 2002, front-page story.

Occupied Pakistan

such satisfaction; and nothing is more likely to prevent the fulfilment of its purpose than silent acquiescence in the prohibition of such desires.

Whenever a nation is silent in the face of a refusal to let it follow the true spirit of its religious norms and to hear the burden of its social, moral, legal and political experience, it is always assumed by powerful interests that it is, in fact, silent because it has nothing to say: because it is dead. Our government has made countless compromises since September 11 but we seem to have no words to utter in protest. Initially, many of us justified its surrender for lack of alternatives. Surrendering under pressure has now become a habit. Not only does the habit of acquiescence transform the nation into an inert recipient of orders whom it is difficult to rouse from lethargy; it also persuades a government that it has only to show a bold front to secure acceptance of any command it receives from Washington to impose. Before attitudes such as these, liberty has no chance of survival; for the eternal vigilance, which is its necessary price, is then wanting.

Let it be clear to all that like absolutely absent definition of “terrorism” in the “war on terrorism,” there is no definition of Al-Qaeda membership. Any alien who lived in Afghanistan during the Taliban era is a sure candidate to be considered as a member of “Al-Qaeda network.” Similarly, opposition members - particularly those belonging to Islamic parties - who oppose policies of the US sported regimes, such as Karzai, Mubarak and Musharraf, are now set for being labelled as supporters of “Al-Qaeda network.” Like communist enemies of the Cold War era, “Al-Qaeda network” would never come to an end until Washington clearly declares victory in its 21st century crusade. Until then every bearded person, as the *Statesman* report says, is a potential Al-Qaeda member. Before the US declares a victory, it will have to bury many a half-dead nations, such as Pakistan.

Some might argue that there is terrorism in Pakistan and the government is simply combating it. Incidents like assassination of Interior Minister’s brother, attack on US consulate, etc., are simply part of the reactions that we are witnessing in occupied Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan and elsewhere. For the laws, systems and policies under which we live are someone’s induction. They represent a response to someone-in-Washington’s interpretation of our social, religious and political needs. If what they do contradicts our religion, our experience and our needs, it is simply folly to assume their necessary wisdom and take it for granted that we are wrong. We forget that justifying and imposing the wrong triggers a reaction as well.

Imposed leaders, might save themselves from negative consequences of their acquiescence with installation of \$ 50 million anti-missile system on their planes, or installation of hundreds of surveillance cameras along the roads from their residence to offices, but the nation suffers the reaction of wrong policies and for its lack of collective courage, which is the secret of freedom. The resistance and reaction to wrong somewhere begin in a minority of one; the courage of one man heartens others to make articulate their burden of experience as well. A repression at this stage stimulates the sleeping sense of religious and civic obligation.

It leads to a sense in those who have been content with passivity, that active minded obligation may, even though it involve discomfort, not necessarily be dishonourable. One never knows if the US may start wondering as to who is not Al-Qaeda in the Muslim world. Details of the 10 wanted men in connection of attack on US consulate, published in *Dawn* June 29, reflect that these “Al-

Occupied Pakistan

Qaeda members” are not Arabs indeed. Apart from the fringe violent minority, in the end, “Al-Qaeda” in each occupied country would be majority of the most truly citizens against a few US-sponsored rulers. These members of living nations would insist upon bringing back their rulers to a realisation of the harmful conditions upon which their power is held.

A nation half-dead doesn't mean that it would die. There is an equal opportunity for it to recover and resist. It only needs to understand that it is living in a world in which supporters of secular morality are anxious at all costs to legislate against the religious diversities, particularly Islam, of which they disapprove. Islam and independence of Muslims they view as sin; and they seek to clothe the old Calvinist dictatorship in new terminology in order to enjoy the luxury of suppression. Our salvation is not in dropping our guards and dying for America, but in dispelling myths such as *Madrasa* are the source of terrorism. Instead of a nationwide crack down on religious institutions, we must ask impartial observers to come and verify that not even a single gun exists in these institutions. It was rather the same army that is being used to suppress this nation, which trained Afghan *Mujahideen* as well as *Taliban* at its own training camps.

We must remember that policies built on the US clamant expression of what it desires will never cease to proliferate. And every time it is successful in extracting concessions from us and making us surrender our principles and freedoms, its appetite grows for power. Bush began in a humble way; but he ended by sweeping the world into his vision. His associates now pronounce with confidence their judgment upon every subject from the choice of rulers in the Muslim world to the governmental limits within which the Mosque may live a life of its own. Their impudence is the measure of our futility. Their self-expression is purchased by the suppression of ours. Like many other Muslim nations, we, too, run to meet our chains because the citizen is too afraid to venture out of the little private corner in which he is buried. He does not seem to know that the power to insist upon his freedom lies in his own hands. He is powerless because he is unconscious of his power.

Because we share, that is, in a collective experience, we are not effortlessly assured of individual salvation. We do our duty by examination, not by submission, by zeal for truth, not enthusiasm for uniformity with American standards. Nothing can ever entitle us, as free spiritual beings, to disown our religion, merge our lives into secular utopia, and accept standards which within ourselves, we know to be contradictory to the spiritual message of the religion we profess to follow. For all obedience that has the right to regard itself as ethical is built upon a conscious agreement with the purpose we encounter. Anything else is a betrayal of ourselves; and when we surrender the truth we see, by that betrayal we betray also the future of this nation and Islamic Ummah as a whole.

SOLUTION

The solution is to search for a non-violent form of conflict, separation between genuine points of difference and simplistic and superficial fears and accusations, embarking on a historic dialogue to guarantee a positive interaction that stops the undue intervention in the internal and external affairs of Pakistan out of a fear of confrontation collision between the Muslims and the West.

It is time to call an end to the destructive infringement of Pakistan's sovereignty -- a permanent break from the Western interference that would give us time to regain our energy, concentrate on putting our house in order, and seriously consider ways to build on our strengths. Supporting a dictator only to safeguard pro-US policies, no matter how these may destabilise the country and repress the nation, would have far destructive consequences in the long-term than allowing people to govern themselves with their own representatives, working under their own set of rules and regulations. Should we succeed in achieving such a break from the invisible occupation by the "international community" and exploit it in the manner outlined, then that in itself would be a great achievement for the West in winning our hearts and minds.

How can this break come about? Who will negotiate it, and what will the agenda be? What is the desirable outcome? What we need here is a joint negotiated effort by Islamic scholars, the un-sold leaders and journalists for chalking out a way to assert a common Islamic identity (socio-politically) and the concept of an Islamic entity (institutionally and politically). Such an effort should make the leaders of Muslim countries realise that their survival is not in following external dictates for curtailing our freedoms and uprooting our identity but in serving their own people according to the principles of their faith.

Negotiations may be direct or indirect. In the latter case, the Pakistanis first come up with a balanced common position regarding the issues at hand, and then stick to it. This effort must include groups and individuals from all Muslim countries and the process of occupation is not limited to Pakistan alone. If the people in the West accept our position, the negotiating process would have fulfilled its goals. And would have pressure groups right in the place where policies for our occupation are chalked out.

Should our point of view is rejected; we can then ignore this rejection and act according to what we agree even if this common Muslim position is in contravention of international resolutions. If there can be a European Union and NATO, there can also be an Islamic Union and Islamic Defence Organisation to protect our sovereignty.

PARTNERS

In all cases, however, the Muslims have to keep in mind that efforts are underway to divide Muslim thought. This is called fanning a "war within Islam." We must negotiate with each other in order to arrive at a balanced position on the points of conflict with our own rulers and outside powers that sponsor them. Discussions at the mailing lists would not help much. The appropriate venue for negotiations such as these is the establishment of think tanks in all the Muslims countries and then meetings of their representatives in international meetings and seminars. Once consensus is

Occupied Pakistan

achieved, the Muslims can then deputize the imminent scholars and leaders to negotiate the issues with the “international community” on behalf of the Muslims.

The agenda for the negotiations should be drawn up such that practical results are achieved within a reasonable time frame. For example, the so-called dialogue of civilizations should be excluded and areas or factors that constitute direct interference in the internal and external affairs, or activities that directly undermine our sovereignty should be included.

On the other hand, since the problems between the Muslims and the US are so many, they can be subdivided and dealt with successively, starting with the most pressing issues related to our sovereignty and independence. Needless to say, the first of such issues to be tabled should be the urgent ones of the Muslim states under Western sponsored tyrannical regimes and their impact on overall relations with the West.

The term “international community” refers to the US and its allies. The US, UK and France alone would suffice, the logic being that the Muslims do not have a real quarrel with the other members of the Western community. If the Muslims come to a negotiated arrangement with these parties, then the objective would automatically be achieved, viz. correcting the Western position towards Islam as a whole.

OUTCOME

The desired outcome of this process is breaking the chains of domination and occupation -- the smoothing out of the relations between these presently invisibly occupied Muslim states and the “international community,” and the creation of a new climate of international relations for the Muslim countries and their wretched population.

The Muslims must come up with practical and tangible suggestions regarding the problems they face. Nevertheless, the mere idea of a joint Islamic negotiating position may be enough to influence the others to moderate their stance.

To take a start, we must begin at home. We need to debate the ways in which we are fully albeit indirectly occupied and come up with solutions for course correction in time.

We may never see an end to occupation and global apartheid as long as we do not force our Muslim leaders to stand up against injustice and Western double standards. It is highly unlikely that 52 countries would unanimously say one thing and US would do another. The US would never continue following the course once travelled by Hitler, provided we have the courage to tell the whole truth.