



Sociology & Cultural Research Review (SCRR)
 Available Online: <https://scrrjournal.com>
 Print ISSN: [3007-3103](#) Online ISSN: [3007-3111](#)
 Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)



Religion and State-Building: Similarities between Pakistan and Israel in Post-Colonial Contexts

Dr. Iftikhar Ahmad,

Assistant Professor, department of International Relations, University of Management and Technology Sialkot

Ms. Syeda Umm E Laila

Lecturer, Political Science, Department of Governance, Politics and Public Policy, Abasyn University Peshawar

Dr. Ramzan Shahid

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

The paper discusses the parallels between Pakistan and Israel on their post-colonial state-building experiences, and the key role of religion in the stages of the establishment of the two states. Regardless of the variation in political stability, governance, and socio-economic systems, ideological premises that exist between Pakistan and Israel are founded on religious identity and self-determination. Both states were formed in the situation when the corresponding population was a minority in the bigger regional structures, which required the adoption of the strategies focusing on the establishment of equality and the safeguarding of the religious and national interests. The Pakistan formation was facilitated by the attempt of the All India Muslim league to have its own homeland and Israel was formed due to the efforts of the Zionist movements backed by the international guarantees like the Balfour Declaration. In either scenario religion became the means of cohesion, as political policies and the attitudes in society were molded. The response of the majority people to demands of the minority people was however very different as India was willing to accept partition as the only solution whereas, Arab countries were not willing to allow Israel to set up shop leading to a long conflict. This comparative study contains the insights into how religion, demographic facts, and political bargains influenced the premises.

Keywords: *Pakistan, Israel, state-building, religion, self-determination, post-colonialism and the beginnings of state-building in Pakistan and Israel.*

Introduction

It's even unnoticed that both states have so many things in common that are usually not seen on the official level. But their political designs are different from each other. Pakistan is politically instable but following democracy as system of government on the other hand Israel is up-to-the-minute country. Social and economic differences are very important to note. But apart from these disparities Israel and Pakistan share a common history and struggle for a homeland. Israel and Pakistan faced divisions due to their interior problems. Both states have common bases for establishment of their respected states. Israel and Pakistan are ideological states; religion was the supreme force behind the creation of their homeland. Their issues on bringing their nations on same platform were identical to each other. People who wanted to create Israel and Pakistan used religion as a weapon. But both leaders did not want to create theoretic states. (Akbar, 1996)

Right to choose their own fate

In the wings of 2nd world war, so many new states emerged in the arena of world. These states have different composition of population, some dominated by economic realities and other dominated by religion. Every country has majority of his population that belongs to a specific class and other to a minority, a lesser population as compare to majority. A country can deal its majority and minority differently. Situation of minorities may be different or it varies from country to country or region to region. It depends upon the relationship of majority with minority. Minorities are fewer in number and self determination requires huge numbers so it did not work for minorities. The main issue that played very important role or instrumental between greater part of population and lesser population is religion.

Religion

Pakistan: Religion is quite important in molding the behavior and attitudes of people that follow a common religion. Through the slogan of harmony and brotherhood, follower of every religion wanted a single system; they have divided those selves in believer and non-believer. The focus or emphasize on one religion also create differences among other religions and their followers. Every religion has its own ways to tackle the outsider. Some religious teachings are more moderate and up to date while others are not.

Jews and Muslims followed same policy for the right of self-determination in Arab as well as subcontinent. They were less in numbers but it was expected that decision would be based on adult franchise. But Pakistan foreign minister clearly rejected any similarity between Israel and Pakistan. Muslim inhabitants far more in numbers as compare to Jews, to some extent he was correct.

Apart from Muslim countries, subcontinent was the largest to have Muslims inhabitants. This irregular division of population compelled Muslim League to strive for the equal and shared rights for Muslims of subcontinent. The All-India Muslim League divided the undivided sub-continent in Muslim and Non-Muslim population or merely US vs. Them.

The all-India Muslim League was quite successful in achieving its objective that league was succeeded in realizing the people was subcontinent the importance of separate homeland as well as to British crown that Muslims are not a minority in British India but an equal group to congress. This way it was became possible to avoid the numbers for Muslims in India. (Shaikh, 1986). League clearly rejected the elections of Muslims in non-Muslim areas or other than AIML. Even such things affected the AIML's stance too. (Kumaraswamy P. , 2005)

Israel: A parallel situation occurred in case of Israel. The discussion of a Jewish country just started after the Balfour Declaration that assured the British assistance in the favor of establishment of a Zionists homeland in Palestine. Even it's said that the non-Zionists would be even more secured and safe in Jewish land. Religious right would be equal to Jews. Whilst Arthur James Balfour (1848-1930) gave these guarantees to the Jews in 1917, the Zionists population in Arab land was tiny and non-Zionists composed of 92 per cent of the whole inhabitants. In spite of constant lawful and unlawful migration since the late 19th century, the numerical irregularity against the Jews sustained right until the formation of the Jewish state in 1948. Even the UN separation suggestion foresees a Jewish state with a slight majority. (Sajjad, 2015) It was due to the huge migration from European and Arab continents and the mass departure of Arab immigrant from the area that became the Jewish state, only than Israel was able to lock a Jewish majority. Contradictory elucidation to the side, it actually stands that making of a Zionist state and paved the way for them that they can return to their forerunners soil. They knew the

demographic irregularity, the Jews, like the Muslims of subcontinent, chooses for a national self-determination based not on universal adult franchise but on the principle of equivalence between Zionists and non-Zionists or between arriving Zionists and native Palestinians. In July 1937, summing up the general position of the Jewish nationalists, the Royal Palestine Commission headed by Earl Peel remarked:

The Jews did not wish, they said, to be 'dominated' by the Arabs, neither did they wish to 'dominate them'. They were prepared, therefore, to adhere to the principle of 'parity'. If a Legislative Council were now established, and if the present Jewish minority were given an equal number of seats thereon with the present Arab majority, the Jews would never claim more than that equal number whatever the future ratio between Arab and Jewish population might become (Palestine Royal Commission Report, 1937).

Whilst Jews were asking equivalence with the Arabs, the yeshiva composed of just over 28 per cent of the total population of Palestine. In both cases Israel and Pakistan or Jews and Muslims opted out the same approach. Their reactions were formed by well-built Islamic considerations. Even though Muslims in India were less in numbers but they claimed that they are separate nation on the bases of religion with the Hindus. They had a separate identity and according to that identity wanted to spend their lives. But in case of Palestine, it was not helpful because Muslims were in majority. Consequently, because Islam treats the Jews as sheltered dhimmis (non-Muslim subjects of a Muslim ruler), the minority Jews would have to accept the majority rule and dump their demand for a separate homeland.

In the words of S.M. Burke, "Separation the only means of genuine liberty to the Muslims of subcontinent was abhorrence to Muslims somewhere else."

Zafarullah Khan said that UN cannot deny to the standard that an ethnic or spiritual minority, whether arising from national development or came into being as a result of migration, can insist upon the breaking up of a homeland or smash the political, geographical and economical harmony of a state without the consent and beside the desires of the majority.

While it is likely to be relevant this judgment to the Indian subcontinent, Zafarullah Khan himself developed second thoughts about the partition of Palestine. During his conversations with Arab interlocutors in December shortly after the UN vote in November 1947, but a few months before the formation of Israel, he remarked that division was the only resolution for Palestine and had counselled the Arabs to agree to the existence of a Jewish state.

In equally cases, the reaction of the majority against minority independence was also drastically diverse. Despite of its basic resistance to the two-nation theory, the majority section of the subcontinent inhabitants represented by the Congress Party, had acknowledged the partition as a hurting but unavoidable price for freedom. While one might question the wisdom of Nehru's negotiating position vis-à-vis the League, the partition had mutual consent. As a result, even though Pakistan had legitimate security concerns and fears over India's regional ambitions, no responsible Indian leader sought to undo the partition. Even those segments of Hindu nationalists who visualized the incorporation of Pakistan into a greater India or Akhand Bharat gradually came to terms with the objective reality.

The same cannot be said about the partition of Palestine where the Arab leaders had vehemently opposed the partition plan. The Arab-Israeli problem was not about territorial integrity, border or other political differences. It is largely a far more fundamental conflict over Israel's right to exist. Not only have the Arab leaders refused to accept the partition but for decades the Arab

and Islamic countries in the region and elsewhere treated Israel not as a state but as an alien and even temporary "entity". Even after the on-going peace process between Israel and its Arab neighbors, Israel does not figure in the official maps published by many countries in the region

Homeland for their People

Both nations in a joint land were afraid that what would be their future after British departure and freedom under a majority would be more prison than independence actually. It's quite possible to ask that these were only fears or actually does have any reality.

Pakistan: The AIML was succeeded to make that realize to the people of subcontinent that after British withdrew from the region the 1000 years rulers of India would become their slaves and spend their lives on their mercy. Muslims of India realized that Hindu cannot secure their interests. They had very little interests on the existing setup of India and political accountability. But they preferred religious affiliations.

Zionists: The apprehension of the Jews was slightly diverse. The demand for a Zionists state in the land of Palestine was the end of a variety of social, political, religious and economic hounding that harassed the Jews for two millennia. In contrast to the opinion in developing states, dhimma status granted to the Jews does not foresee parity between Muslims and non-Muslims. (Bajwa, 1996)

The achievement of freedom and establishment of their home land was only available option for safe and secured future. Migration to Palestine was not that they will live their lives under Muslim rule. Only objective was to be their own rulers, they were not seeking for new masters.

The creation of Jews and Muslims highlights the significance of minority separatism; both wanted a home land where they can spend their lives according to their religion, cultural and economic with self-respect and self-esteem. Their distinct status needs a distinct homeland because they were separate nations.

Their ambition for political power and autonomy was an unavoidable result of this procedure when religious separatism steadily assumed a territorial form. In case of Jews and Muslim, the leaders are enough wise to achieve the homeland for their nations. Israel and Pakistan are contemporary states and came into existence as motherlands for Muslims and Zionists. For welfare and betterment of their citizens the creation of their homeland was much necessary.

Israel is homeland for every Zionist living in every corner of the world:

The unconditional support for AIML and Jewish leadership was because of their slogan of a country where the people can spend their rest of life according to their desires and on the basis of religion. There are glaring dissimilarity between both the states, for instance, a law was implemented in 50's that awards nationality to any Zionist living anywhere across the world.

Yet they have faced swear criticism from every corner of the world for the right of nationality to every Zionist living across the world or in other countries. But this idea is widely accepted in Israel. After its creation Israel supported the notion that Israel is the homeland for Jews so Jews from every corner of the world should migrate to Israel or their homeland. (Ali, 1983)

Zionists of Middle East had faced so many secret missions in the era of 50's and 60's, and infect Jews living other countries also fought the war of their survival in their countries. Even when many states announced ban on migration than a strong reaction came from the Jewish lobby.

Vision behind creation of Pakistan:

Vision behind creation of Pakistan is bit different from the idea of Israel. Israel is homeland of every Jew living anywhere but Pakistan was the land of every one living in Pakistan, whether he

is Hindu or Muslim. Hindus would spend their lives according to their religion and customs and Muslim would spend their lives according to their religious beliefs. When Pakistan was coming into being existence it was never thought by the leaders that it would be homeland for Muslims only rather what about those Muslims who left behind in India. Pakistan's sole purpose was to live according to the faith of inhabitants living in the country (Cashman, 1993).

Hindu will come to an end as a Hindu and Muslim as a Muslim. No restrictions are imposed in the citizens of Pakistan. That was the main thought or vision behind the creation of Pakistan.

Difference between both states for the question of Motherland:

The ideology of Pakistan or two nation theory belonged to those regions where Muslims were in majority. Israel award citizenship to every Jews living in the world but in case of Pakistan it was not happened. For Israel motherland was everything but in case of AIML it was just a slogan to drive the population of India to achieve their political ends. Because of their objectives so many problems of nationality and homeland rise in Pakistan (Hasan, 1984).

Security Issues faced by Pakistan and Israel

After came into being existence, both countries fought the war of their existence and acceptance in their regions. It's an important point to note that safety and defense is the first priority of both states. For Israel their security is important for their national harmony while in case of Pakistan its necessary due to power designs of India. India is persistently disturbing the balance of power in the south Asia. Both states facing outer bullying, no doubt about it that both states have threats from their existence that the nations they are separated from. Although Pakistan and India are not indulged in the direct hostile conflict, but Israel and Palestine faced in their regions (Hussain M. , 1994).

Indian authors are writing about Pakistan for more than 6 decades but it did not work for them. Indian attitude was partial toward the distribution of things that belongs to Pakistan after partition. The distance between both the wings of Pakistan proved vital for India and due to Indian support in form of moral and material, Pakistan lost its Eastern part in hands of India. After fall of Dacca in 1971, India was successful in proving that ideology of Pakistan was more a fantasy then reality. Creation of Bangladesh was first step to disturb balance of power in the region (Ziring, 1971).

Similarly, existence of Israel was also unacceptable for its neighbors and they plotted against Israel, they have fought many wars just like India and Pakistan. For countries having common borders with Israel, their first priority was to destroy the Zionists state and again complete authority over the land which is now divided between Israel and Palestine. After so many efforts to destroy Zionist from the map of world, with sad hurts Arab accepted Israel as a painful reality. Pakistan and Israel is standing on the same path because Arabs are more in numbers while India is militarily superior nation and a nuclear power just as Pakistan.

Even though their thinking towards their neighbors may be wrong and one can deny the fact but the threat from Pakistan from India and Israel from their Middle Eastern neighbors are important to note. Even some theorist had opinion that its wrong in a sense that both states wanted to unite their national so they blame their border sharing countries to promoting instability in their countries. Whether it's wrong or right but threats from their enemies and their thoughts toward their enemies were not wrong. Both states choose the similar option for their existence that they established strong links and achieved nuclear power to tackle their foes. The cold war and US's efforts against USSR was in favor of Pakistan as well as Israel. During cold war period, in spite of

USSR both the states choose US as their ally because only this way they can fight to their own national issues and problems.

Dissimilarity between Israel and Pakistan in case of Alliances:

There is huge difference between the position of Pakistan and Israel in cold war period. Pakistan had signed many defense pacts with US. Which are given following:

1. SEATO
2. Baghdad Pact or CENTO
3. RCD (Jillani, 1991)

Israel's situation was bit deferent in this regard because Israel had not signed any defense pact. In fact, due worse criticism from the Middle Eastern countries, Israeli entry was ban in many regional and international organizations. Israel desperately wanted to have military alliance with west but due to Middle East, Israel was failed to sign any pact with US. Because oil rich Arab world had very much for US's interest so US intentionally not went for any pact with Israel. Even when internal instability in Arab world was at its peak, Israel was not allowed to speak so Israel decided to change its side from US to France and signed an agreement with France. After France the US also signed a pact with Israel.

Following where the benefits that Israel got:

1. France helped Israel to obtain nuclear power
2. With the help of US Israel tackle its border sharing neighbors

Signatory of NATO: From the begging both countries have the fear of their strong neighbors so they signed the west originated pact called NATO for help in their security issues. (Spector, 1990)

Nuclear Capability:

It's thought that even before India, Israel and Pakistan obtain the nuclear power and they can achieve the status of nuclear power countries. Israel is technologically more advanced country as compare to Pakistan. Pakistan is technologically is less fortunate like Israel. Even Israel from the beginning is afraid that Pakistan's nuclear capability may become the capability of whole Islamic world and this is the major threat to existence of Zionists. both states achieved nuclear power to maintain balance of power in their regions. Their developers were the same, America and France.

Non-signatory of NPT:

Both states have not signed NPT but their purpose of not signing the agreement is bit different from India. India is seeking to play the role of God father in the region and try to control regional security arrangements but in case of Israel and Pakistan, both states are facing worse security threats in the region. They are not contributor of arms race in the region but their only purpose is to secure their national interests. That's the reason that they sent their correspondents to last two meetings of NPT.

There foreign policy lines not depend on other injections like their neighbors but their supreme objective is security concerns. After their creation, they had formed a policy of good will gesture toward all the nations (Levtzion, 1979).

Pakistan and Israel are unable to form any clear-cut policy, many Zionists are living in Russia and in case of Pakistan, and Pakistan's immediate neighbors are Muslims so they can't adopt a hostile policy toward them. Arrangements in region minimize their choices so both states moved to western alliance.

Both faced Egyptian Animosity

It's even more interesting to note that both were distrust full according to Egyptian President Nasser. Nasser was wanted to unite the Arabs on the basis of Arab nationalism. Israeli intention was different. In spite of Arab nationalism, Pakistan wanted a strong Muslim bloc and, in this struggle, Nasser brought both the countries under same banner. The issue became more serious after Suez incidents in 1956. Israel was already member of western bloc but Pakistan was also included due to its non-recognition to the notion of President Nasser (Wolpert, 1993).

But after some times, their positions were got enhanced, the reasons were several. After collapse of Nasser and coming out of Saudi Arabia as uniting Muslims on a single platform, Pakistan gained its position again. After creation of OIC, Pakistan's position became stronger in the world (Hussain A. , 1966).

Both countries wanted to end Egyptian seclusion from the region and after the recognition of Israel by the Egypt and agreement between Israel and Egypt. Pakistan officially denies the Egyptian move toward Israel or it was against the lines of Islam or against cause of Palestine (Hasan, 1980).

Different ways to recognize Israel Adopted by different Countries

1.2. Pattern of Turkey: Turkey has recognized the Zionists but they never established official relations after recognizing Israel. This sort of decision never affected the identity of Turkey so Pakistan should not afraid from the religious sentiments and so called Molvies.

1.3. Pattern of Iran: This model was described by the Shah of Iran. They have recognized Israel as an independent state but their relations are restricted. Pakistan should wiser because Israel doesn't have feelings of animosity toward Pakistan just have for Iran.

1.4. Pattern of Jordan: Jordan has not formally accepted Israel as an independent country but they maintain very cordial political and armed cooperation with each other. Just as Jordan was once a worse enemy of Israel. Israel is much more superior in military so we need strong allies like Israel.

1.5. Pattern of China: Pakistan can choose Chinese pattern and only military relations with Israel may enough for Pakistan just as china have only military relation with Jewish state.

According to many scholars in near future, the relationship between Pakistan and Israel would be undecided. Both countries have their hidden contacts since past but they are hesitant to set up any sort of relationship with each other, that can bring normality in their discourse with each other. Pakistan and Israel are not directly involved in any sort of hostility. For example, the feelings of animosity Israel has for Iran is not for Pakistan. Our course and text books are filled with the hatred against Israel. Even we are not that much concerned to Kashmir issue that connected with Palestine problem. Pakistan may continue its support to Palestine but here are some suggestions to recognize Israel without affecting the cause of Palestine.

1. For peace and prosperity in the region, inter religion unity and trust is necessary
2. Important location of Pakistan and Israel can harmonize the situations in their countries
3. We are unable to select our boarders but we are free to select our allies.
4. To combat the pressure from India, Pakistan needs strong friends.
5. Pakistan's image would improve as modern state in the world
6. Strong trade relations
7. Imports/exports
8. New and best technology
9. Modern agricultural equipment

10. To settle Palestine and Kashmir issues
11. To overcome Indian influence
12. To purchase Israeli arms and ammunition, Pakistan needs to establish good ties with Israel
13. Recognition of Israel may improve Pak-US ties
14. Educational and social collaborations
15. Visits to holy places without fears
16. Due to similarities in their religions, we can proceed to a better understanding
17. Israel can influence India in solving Kashmir issue
18. Only when Pakistan and Israel would recognize each other, they can solve the long persistent issues in Middle East
19. No joint statement ever come on the Kashmir issue in the meetings of OIC
20. Arabs don't want to displease India on just because Kashmir issue
21. Pakistan is unable to grab attention from Muslim countries, for example, Iran is just looking for any mistake from Pakistan.

Conclusion

Now it's time to study all the related issues and with the help of active media, we may bring change in the mind sets of people. Pakistan cannot do anything with Israel so it's time to accept the truth and move toward the strongest allies. Israel came into existence to stay.

Israel has no wrong aspirations for Pakistan. Pakistan is the only super power that belongs to Muslim Ummah. Israel started to take Pakistan as nuclear power in South Asia and assured that Israel doesn't have any wrong ambitions toward Pakistan. Israel was very much positive that Pakistan would not spread nuclear proliferation in Arab world and bomb of Pakistan is more Chinese bomb than an Islamic bomb. Even without any formal recognition Israeli media argued that Israel will have a permanent representation in Pakistan. Even strong feeling of hatred and worse public opinion toward Israel, Pakistani rulers assumed a positive approach toward Israel. Pakistan and Israel relations are even important in the context of Pakistan and US relations. No doubt about it Pakistan Israel normalization of relations have its own impacts in the relations with west. In addition, the extended Israeli anxiety over its nuclear program is a supplementary reason for Pakistan to reach some wide understanding with the Jewish State, even if full normalization is not imminent (Kumaraswamy P., 2005).

References

- Akbar, M. J. (2003). *The shade of swords: Jihad and the conflict between Islam and Christianity* (1st ed.). London, UK: Routledge. (Original work published 2002)
- Bajwa, H. A. (1996). *The Jews and the Arab world: Historical perspectives*. Lahore, Pakistan: Vanguard Books.
- Cashman, P. (1993). *Pakistan: The emergence of a nation*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Hasan, M. (1980). *Pakistan's foreign policy and the Islamic world*. Islamabad, Pakistan: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.
- Hasan, S. M. (1984). *Pakistan and the Middle East: Historical and political perspectives*. Karachi, Pakistan: Oxford University Press.
- Hussain, A. (1966). *Pakistan in world affairs: 1947–1965*. Lahore, Pakistan: Research Society of Pakistan.
- Hussain, M. (1994). *Pakistan's security challenges*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Institute of Strategic Studies.

- Jillani, Z. A. (1991). *Pakistan's strategic alliances and defense pacts*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Institute of Policy Studies.
- Kumaraswamy, P. R. (2005). *The Israel-Palestine conflict: A political history*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Levtzion, N. (1979). *Muslim missions in West Africa: The impact of Islam on society and culture*. London, UK: Longman.
- Sajjad, S. (2015). *The Jewish question in Palestine: Historical and political perspectives*. Karachi, Pakistan: University of Karachi Press.
- Shaikh, F. A. (1986). *The Muslim League and the creation of Pakistan*. Karachi, Pakistan: Oxford University Press.
- Spector, S. (1990). *Israel's strategic posture and foreign relations*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Tel Aviv University Press.
- Wolpert, S. (1993). *Zionism and Israel: A historical perspective*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ziring, L. (1971). *Pakistan: The political economy of military rule*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.