

Orientalist Discourse on Partition: An Analysis of Discursive Construction of Jinnah and Gandhi in Stanley Wolpert's "Shameful Flight"

Ms. Ghulam Hafsa

Ph.D. Scholar (Linguistics), Associate Professor, Govt. Associate College for Women, Khushab

Dr. Qurat ul Ain Bashir

Assistant Professor of History & Pakistan Studies, University of Gujrat

Dr. Kanwal Zahra

Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Gujrat

Abstract

The study is exploratory in nature in the interpretivist paradigm. It is based upon Critical Discourse Analysis of Stanley Wolpert's book "Shameful Flight". The study is qualitative with special focus on ideological construction of Gandhi and Jinnah by Wolpert. Six events have been specially focused: introduction, Cripps Mission, Satyagrah Movement, Wavell Plan, Shimla conference and Direct Action by Muslim League. Fairclough's model has been used for discourse analysis of the selected textual items. In these sections of the book contrastive pictures of Gandhi and Jinnah have been given. Main purpose of study has been the explication of Orientalist ideology behind contrastive pictures of both the leaders. Jinnah being the leader of a minority is suppressed, rather ridiculed explicitly; while Gandhi being the nationalist is implicitly defended. The cause behind implicit defense of Gandhi on the one hand is to ridicule Muslims' ideological stance, and on the other hand is to uphold American's own ideological stance on partition. The purpose of the study is to foreground American's implicit ideology about partition of subcontinent and to raise awareness about the discursive injustice to the ideology of Pakistan. The secular aspect of Jinnah's

personality is ideologically highlighted to prove Islamic ideology as hollow and abstract.

Keywords: Partition of India, Orientalists perspective, American Stance, Relative Construction of Reality, Islamic Ideology, Gandhi, Jinnah

Introduction

Partition of India has always remained a hot topic for world historians. This incident has been constructed differently with respect to the varied social and ideological contexts. In this study, a comparative and critical approach has been adopted to the ideological painting of Jinnah and Gandhi by Wolpert in his book "Shameful Flight". The comparative analysis of Jinnah and Gandhi is presented to foreground American ideology about the creation of Pakistan. Wolpert was a professor of history at the University of California and has distinguished authority on the intellectual and political history of modern Pakistan and India. Among the growing literature on partition of Subcontinent, His book "Shameful Flight" is a clinical investigation of success and tragedy of this decisive event. This historical event not only finished British Imperialism, but also triggered the freedom of Asia and Africa. Wolpert, in a dramatic way, constructs the concluding days of British Imperialism. He has painted vivid characters of conspirators of this tragic incident through their secret dialogues and mutual commentaries. He sets the characters to demonstrate themselves through their own words and secret talks of British officials. Wolpert sets the scene of hurried and confused withdrawal of British in the American perspective of 2nd World War. Americans favored a united India because of its economic and geo political importance for West. On account of 2nd World War, British government was economically, administratively and militarily so weak that it couldn't manage the expenses of such a vast territory. Eventually, it was caught up in the web of its own creation and had to rid of itself from its most important colony that had been considered a great Jewel in its crown. The impetuous, unplanned and abrupt withdrawal of "*Mightiest Power*" had been termed as "*Shameful Flight*" by Winston Churchill. According to Wolpert

imperialistic diplomacy created hatred between India and Pakistan that is poisonous for the stability of South Asia.

Significance

Wolpert explicitly emphasizes the political caliber of Jinnah and admits that Muslims could never have succeeded in achieving Pakistan without him; but from the exclusivist perspective the appearance and secular aspect of Jinnah's personality is ideologically over emphasized to stress its incompatibility with the theological inscriptions of Islam. Wolpert is explicitly appreciative of the politically ambitious nature of Jinnah which is discursive technique to exclude religion from the political struggle for Pakistan; and to relegate it to a mere political tactic for the unification a geographically, theologically and politically divided community. The distribution of India is primarily attributed to the diplomacy of British imperialism to negate the political efforts of Jinnah as he had been deceived badly by the twin enemies. In the discursive construction of power struggle, the weak is generally pushed towards wall. Wolpert succeeds in achieving dual objectives: Being critique of British imperialism, his book discursively satisfies the Eastern community; but the ideological objective of "*Shameful Flight*" appears the exclusion of Islamic ideology from the very basis of Pakistan Movement. He ridicules Jinnah and proves him failure whose ambitious nature had been used by the Imperial Raj for their political purpose of dividing the society. Wolpert, on experiential level, commends the political caliber of Jinnah, but gradually the ideological purpose is felt running behind the fascinated description. The purpose of critical approach to Wolpert has been to foreground the western ideology about partition in order to provide awareness about western plans against Islamic ideology even in language domain. Wolpert is being recommended for the Muslim students of history as he is the only one historian who has given comprehensive autobiographical record of Jinnah. The ideological purpose of secular group behind this applause of Wolpert is to inculcate the secular basis of Pakistan into the minds of new generation. A nation that is not clear about its ideological basis can easily be duped and destroyed. It is imperative to be clear about diversified discourses with their

ideological assumptions. This is the only way to save identity and to counter attack secular assumptions on discursive level. Fairclough's model was helpful enough in the explication of injustice being met by the Muslim community in the domain of discourse. There is no denying the fact that Wolpert's discourse is comprehensive enough for the political caliber of Jinnah but religious and spiritual aspect of his personality, that has been the infusing force behind his political struggle, can never be perceived by western historians.

The objective of this research is to explore the discursive techniques used by Stanley Wolpert for the constitution of the identities of Jinnah and Gandhi and to explicate Wolpert's ideology behind the discursive representation of Jinnah and Gandhi.

Literature Review

"Oh East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet".¹ Orientalism refers to the Orient or East in contrast to the Occident or West. This dichotomy expresses that East and West are entirely different rather poles apart. The term Orient is used by researchers, historians and philosopher of all western academic disciplines, for the people of Far, Middle and South East, South East Asia and North Africa. People of all academic disciplines dealing with these areas are called Orientalists, and their efforts in this regard are termed as Orientalism. Orientalism is mostly expresses the authoritative presentation of western colonialism. West has a negative ideological perception of Orient that clearly reflects in western discourse of different disciplines. West has the demoted and degraded conception of eastern civilization and a ridiculous picture of Orient is given by the western writers. West promotes the superiority of its civilization in all the fields of life and being enlightened legitimates its right to control and guide.² Orientalism is the field of great significance for West to work on.³

Diverse angles of partition literature are set as the contextual background for this study. Every historian with his/her respective ideological perception has perceived partition from relative social context. K.K Aziz in his book "Making of Pakistan" uses comparative discursive model for the presentation

Hindu and Islamic nationalism⁴. He defends two nation theory as per the various contours of nationalism and legitimates the demand for Pakistan as the fundamental right of a nation. In the secular environment of 20th century, religion has lost justification as a base for a separate state. Yet Israel and Pakistan has been demanded in the name of religion. In Orientalist discourse Islamic ideology is relegated to mere theology in order to prove that it is incompatible with the modern world dynamics. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan proved a blessing because he defined the foundations of Muslim nationalism. Muslims got self-consciousness and realized the unique nature of their separate entity under his wise and sincere leadership.⁵

Muslim League was formed in 1906 because the establishment of separate organization had become inevitable for political recognition of Muslim community. Aziz defends logically Jinnah's shift from loyalty to disloyalty on the basis successive disappointment from both Hindus and British. Hypocritical role of Gandhi also got exposed, as he preached unity with the threat of noncooperation.⁶

Muslims' demand for partition was reply to Hindus' Unilateralism.⁷ Jinnah was a man of incredible optimism who had gradually developed League's power and prestige. Cripps Mission, Wavell Plan, Shimla Conference, Jinnah Gandhi talks, and Cabinet Mission plan proved blessing as these events showed that Congress was not the only representative party but Muslim League was also important. The selfish and ill intentions of Congress led towards the failure of above mentioned events for political consensus. It also expressed the sharpness and depth of communal differences. The attitude of Congress under the leadership of Gandhi is emphasized as reactionary, undemocratic, hostile, hypocritical, and atrocious. Jinnah was a seasoned politician. His democratic genius organized Muslim League and build up its repute as the sole representative party of Muslims. He also got British government realize that it was equally important with Congress.

In the book "Struggle for Pakistan" Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi⁸ stresses partition as a fateful event that led to the creation of two sovereign states. The reactionary, undemocratic and exploitative behavior of Gandhi was a

political strategy to get concessions from British Government during their critical period war time. According to Jinnah “*Quit India*” movement was tantamount to force demands at the point of bayonet. European and American press also emphatically and sternly denounced 1942 revolt. New York Times wrote that political uprising in India was not a political struggle for freedom as Congress professed but was struggle for what the congress party’s personal definition of freedom. Australia and Turkish newspapers also expressed same views.⁹

Jinnah had been flexible, compromising and ever ready to cooperate but equal behaviors are imperative for honorable settlements. Muslim League policy had been clear and unmistakable because parliamentary system and so called democratic process would nullify Muslims’ rights under Hindu domination; therefore, India must split¹⁰. With the gradual consolidation of League, Jinnah succeeded in persuading the viceroy and British government to accept him as the spokesman of Indian Muslims and the League as the only Muslims’ representative party.¹¹ Jinnah extended a compromising hand for coalition but always received rigid response. The conditions upon which Congress was ready for coalition were totally undemocratic that any party with iota of self-respect couldn’t have accepted.¹² Coupland, Oxford history professor stated that Congress totally lacked the spirit of compromise which was necessary for the success of parliamentary type of government. Qureshi also defends Muslims loyalty towards British Government. Minority generally tends to be less extreme in opposition to the rulers than majority, particularly when majority makes no secret of its future designs to overrule minority.¹³ Jinnah proceeded as a well-schooled politician while Gandhi’s reactionary approach intensified friction. ‘The Times’ also criticized Gandhi’s all-inclusive status for Congress.

Jinnah was fully aware of Islamic identity and culture of Muslims. The final resolution (1940) had also been suggested by Muhammad Iqbal in 1930 from the platform of Muslim League. After the successive events and mounting tension, Jinnah felt that the time had come when the fundamental demand for separate state must be openly expressed.¹⁴

Jinnah replied to Gandhi that abstract philosophies and discussions can never provide a possible practical solution. Mr. Gandhi had been a strong advocate of human rights but practically proved failure because his speeches expressed hatred for Muslims. The Plan of 3rd June was entirely counter to the desires of Muslims. It was imposed upon Jinnah. He had been left with no other option but to accept as viceroy had threatened to entrust the government to the Congress constitutional assembly if Muslim League failed to comply.

Ayesha Jalal¹⁵ is very famous South Asian historian. She has constructed the story of Pakistan with reference to modern challenges in the book "Struggle for Pakistan". She thinks that the cause of present agony of Pakistan is its tragic birth. She acknowledges that Jinnah was a strong anti-colonial and had sincerely led Muslim community to safeguard their rights. But she emphatically asserts that he was the strong advocate of Indian unity and never wished it at the expense of the wider interests of Subcontinent. She highlights the linguistic, geographical, religious, cultural and ethnic diversities of Muslim community in order to negate Islamic ideology of Muslims. She considers it a self-professed nationality. She commends Jinnah's efforts and his political sagacity to square the opposing demands of a minority and majority province for the unification of an entirely diverse community. As a democrat and pragmatic he had been against artificial unity and realized well that federation was the only best workable solution for Indian community. Being centralist he pleaded the case of provinces. Congress secularism and Muslims communalism were reaction to colonialism. Communal demand was political necessity for an ideologically and organizationally divided community.¹⁶

Religion was used for political identity as Islam was the only shared aspect that could hide much internal diversity and could keep them peaceful.

"Faisal Devji" (2013) was an Indian oxford scholar. He has presented an entirely different angle of partition. His book "Muslim Zion" is an open criticism of Pakistan Movement. Devji's discursive angle is completely opposed to the discourse of Aziz who asserts Muslim nationalism. He states that Jinnah's conception of religion was an abstraction as he never defined its

practice for the citizens and his Indian parallelism with China, Russia America was misleading.¹⁷ According to him Muslim leaders in mid-nineties talked accommodation with British Imperialism, and the modernist of Ali Garh even stressed the similarities between Islam and Christianity for educational advantages. He negates Muslim's claim of being nation as per the conventional definition of a nation. He also says that. Muslim community had not been serious about demand for Pakistan before 1930. The use of religion and the change of content from minority to a nation was political necessity. Muslims had been defined politically and religiously as a minority before 1937. After then they were suddenly professed a nation. It was the political requirement to extricate Muslims from democratically untenable position.

Devji commends selfless efforts and democratic movement of Gandhi for the integrity of India. Gandhi and Nehru were nationalists and internationalists. Gandhi opposed the provincial autonomy in the interest of India as he feared that it could lead towards the dismemberment of India. Gandhi knew well that untouchables were not even a minority but Muslims' political manipulation could give them awareness which would initiate the complete disintegration of India. Only the untouchable industrialist extended support to Jinnah for economic interests.¹⁸

According to Cohen (2004) it was the militant, violent and non cooperative behavior of Congress that made British wary. British had realized that Pakistan with westernized leadership and loyal army would be attractive. Indians negate the legitimate demand of Muslims and consider Pakistan an illegitimate product of British diplomacy. He stresses that the concept of Pakistan was based upon the elite Muslims' perception of being distinctive. Until 1920 the elite westernized class of Muslims had been only concerned about their respective economic security. When they felt that numerical strength was necessary for effective political force; they welcomed community for numerical strength. When the British reached India Muslims were not more than 1\10th of the entire population. Almost 100 years after they recognized Muslims as 1\4th of the entire population. Cohen's description

reflects Indian stance that Muslims' political struggle was just a number game for political objectives.

Cohen states that the two prominent Muslim leaders had different conception of nationalism. Iqbal negated territorial nationalism and saw this demand as a vehicle and a step towards a larger Islamic community; while Jinnah envisioned Pakistan as per the European model of nation.¹⁹ He considers it ironical that both the leaders had given little thought to the economic, social and strategic implications of Pakistan. Neither of them realized that Pakistan and India would turn bitter enemies. They had no specific blue print for practical implementation in future and were excessively optimistic about the intrinsic force of Islam. In the very first speech, after creation of Pakistan, Jinnah left his two nation theory and requested all communities to forget about the religious differences. The same Jinnah who had sternly advocated two nation theory in final resolution was ironically stressing the importance of cooperation irrespective of religious differences.²⁰ Here Cohen comes close to secular stance of political utilization of religion. He also stresses Jinnah's political strategic sagacity that he joined secular Congress and rose up to leading position. He was called the ambassador of Hindu Muslim unity. He, in 1930, left politics to practice law in London. Again in 1934 he came back and revitalized League. He headed Muslim struggle and turned the two nation theory into a strong political movement. He properly synthesized together the diversities of Muslims. He was so much dominant in the party that no one could rise up as a second tier leadership. It proved disastrous after his demise.²¹

Crompton(2006), as Devji ideologically highlights Jinnah's traits to exclude Islam from his personality :as his marriage with a Parsee woman, Zoroastrian out of faith, his stubbornness that caused the tragic division, His sensitive rather arrogant nature that couldn't bear criticism etc.²²

"Wolpert" starts "Jinnah of Pakistan"²³ with a proverbial remark to pay tribute to the political genius and legal perception of Jinnah. But a critical angle can foregrounds ideological purpose behind. The book experientially appears to be a tribute to the matchless political sagacity Jinnah but

expressively is the criticism on the Islamic ideology of Pakistan. He commends that Jinnah, with all his personal tragedies and incapacities, remained strong and in the end succeeded in getting Pakistan; but the book ideologically excludes Islam from the very basis of Pakistan and highlights the ambitious nature of Jinnah not Islam as the real infusing force behind cyclonic revolution. His struggle for the unity of Congress and League was also a political strategy to realize his ultimate aim of becoming a sole national leader. He was a mysterious figure just as Gandhi and was much impressed by Dada Bhai, a Hindu nationalist who advocated justice for all communities of India without any religious and racial differences. Gandhi and Jinnah had the same mother tongue. Jinnah as Gandhi was also inspired by the radical views of John Morley who had been elected as bencher in Lincoln Inn, afterwards had served as Lord Morley had remained secretary of the state of India.

Collins & Lapierre also express secular personality of Jinnah. He started his political career by preaching Hindu Muslim unity. Gandhi and he had many similarities, both were British lawyers but unlike Gandhi he returned as English man. His forefathers were converts. God and Quran had no place in his vision of world and after 1937 rejection of coalition government, the apostle of Hindu Muslim unity became the unyielding advocate of Pakistan as he felt rebuked by rejection.²⁴

The contest for separate electorates triggered a new period of his career. As he had climbed very quickly, he was very cautious. His stress on united Punjab and Bengal was unpractical and irrational because other communities of these provinces had also been scared of Muslims. It was the first time that Jinnah changed his westernized dress for eastern sherwani and red fez to portray him a Muslim. Jinnah was a borne Shi-ite Muslim Khoja who had been the disciples of Ismaili Agha Khan. He left forever his wife Emi Bai right after his marriage. His mother and his wife both died in his absence. Wolpert also says that Fatima's defense her brother's chastity was just an embellishment of brother's image by a prudent sister. Jinnah had even Anglicized his name M.A Jinnah instead of cumbersome Muhammad Ali Jinnah.²⁵

Methodology

The study is embedded in the theoretical perspective of constructivism and post structuralism. Constructivists' postulate that the world is independent of human cognition therefore; the knowledge of the world is always constructed. The biological and physical reality is relative as it is socially constructed. Constructivism is entirely opposite to the philosophical stance of positivism and objectivism. Within the parameters of interpretivist paradigm, this study is analytical and critical one for the explication of exclusivist ideology of orientalist discourse. Ontological position is of the construction of reality with in relative context epistemological position is that construction of the reality is subjective and relative. Population of the study is partition literature and by using purposive sampling technique, Wolpert's book "*Shameful Flight*" is selected as the sample of the study. As the book is comprehensive enough so it has been further delimited to some chapters as per the objectives of the study. Only those chapters have been focused that present the contrastive images of Jinnah and Gandhi. Fairclough model of Critical Discourse Analysis being interdisciplinary is a comprehensive model for the exhaustive linguistic analysis and ideological implications. Moreover, it is of great value for emancipatory purpose particularly for the critical analysis of discourses expressing systematic power differences. CDA is a critical approach and reflects the power struggle between unequal groups. In the analyst owns it as a professional duty to thoroughly investigate and foreground linguistically mediated power discriminatory value and the exclusion of the ideological stance of weak.²⁶(Fairclough,1998) ²⁷Jan Blommaert also says that CDA, through critical angle, aspires to the empowerment of weak and results not in an empowered subjects speaking with a more audible voice but in a stentorian analyst's voice (2005:33) Moreover, CDA is not a single approach but a mixture of approaches.²⁸

Analysis

Allied forces desperately desired for federation to maintain the unity as it had economic and strategic importance for west. The president of America, Roosevelt, had been advising Churchill for the peaceful solution of Indian political turmoil. He had been apprehensive about Churchill's war policy

concerning India. Therefore, Wolpert in *“Shameful Flight”* foregrounds the imperialistic attitude of Britain to highlight imperialism as the main cause of Indian disintegration. The emphasis on imperialism as main cause is a discursive technique to exclude Islamic ideology from the very basis of Pakistan and to defame Jinnah’s efforts. As division was thrust upon Jinnah and had Churchill behaved technically and thoughtfully the division could have been averted. In the very start of the book, *“Shameful Flight”* Wolpert states the secret stories about the fall of Singapore in mid-February 1942. Then he constructs a relation between the political advancement in India and the sudden fall of Singapore. The very start of the book doesn’t follow traditional way of chronological order rather it is ideologically set in the context of Singapore event. Muslims’ political Movement is implicitly excluded. In the first 4 chapters, Churchill is mainly focused and Jinnah is mentioned least and that too introduced as a nationalist whose endeavors had been for the unity of India. In the remaining half book Mountbatten and Jinnah are discussed. In the introduction of characters, Churchill’s imperialistic behavior appears to be the main cause of Indian division; Jinnah appears as a nationalist and also as an opportunist who favored British against Congress. While, Gandhi is presented as a nationalist from the beginning till the end of the book. The introductory chapter of the book *“Shameful Flight”* also highlights many similarities between Gandhi, Jinnah and other Indian leaders. According to Gopal Krishna Gokhail, Jinnah was the best ambassador of Muslim Hindu unity. Gandhi and Jinnah both had been inspired by Gokhale and had been the disciples of same national hero. Both of them are introduced as nationalists who desperately endeavored for the freedom of a united India. Gandhi’s violent reaction to the treachery of British Government is ideologically given positive coloring. The violent reaction of Gandhi in Muslim Nationalist’s discourse is portrayed as a political strategy to pressurize British and get desired political decisions. The following terms are used by Gandhi for British laws: *“Cruellest and Meanest Laws”*, *“Black acts”* and *“stannic acts”*. “Even the terms express that Gandhi was right in his reactive policy. Jinnah resigned from viceroy Legislative Council because of

British injustice. It was the betrayal by Raj after 1st World War that united Hindus and Muslims. Lucknow pact (1916) brought them together on one platform and it was the expression of British injustice. Moreover, it also expresses that Hindus and Muslims could have lived together had British not sown the seeds of hatred between them. Both the leaders gradually were divided and in 1944 they seemed controlling over “*distant universes*”. It is ideologically expressed that the distance was not because of injustice by Congress as is portrayed in Muslims’ nationalist’s discourse; but it had been politically created by the British.

Moreover, Wolpert’s discourse expresses that differences between both the Indian leaders were of political nature not religious or ideological and these differences gradually got intensified because of British imperialistic policies. Again Muslims’ claim of two nation theory is excluded and negated. Wolpert ideologically constructs diplomatic and political objectives of Britain government behind Cripps Declaration. In the starting two chapters, technical mistakes and implicit political objectives behind the declaration are described which express that Cripps Mission had not been a sincere political development but a political tactic particularly to deceive the Allied forces and generally to enhance the differences between two communities. These events are used as inter textual context in order to approve Satyagrah movement and to implicitly justify the reactionary policy of Gandhi. Gandhi “*bluntly*” opposed Cripps Declaration and “*very definitely*” said that Congress would never accept the Cripps Mission document as it had been a diplomatic strategy to further divide Indian community. He termed it “*a cut and dried scheme*”. He also said it was “*a blank cheque on crashing bank*.” Gandhi emphasized the importance of amicable solution of communal conflict and guarded the masses that their rift would surely affect their ultimate goal of independence. British government again took a wrong decision of suppressing and arresting his followers. “*Unarmed Indians*” had been fired in Jallianwala Bagh in Punjab Amritsar. At this stage Churchill should have behaved as responsible rulers to control the mounting tension but his imperialistic behavior led him towards severe reaction and he started

the crackdown of Gandhi's followers. They "*ejected Indians from the dwellings*" without providing any compensation that was an "*unnatural domination*" against the wishes of Indians.

Linguistic scheme selected by Wolpert for the construction of professed facts and the framing of events implicitly set the defensive context for Satyagraha Movement to express it as a legitimate reaction of unarmed masses against artificial domination. Wolpert's construction reflects Indian nationalists' stance of Congress as a nationalist party struggling justly for the freedom of India entire India. Devji also thinks that Cripps Declaration was a planned tactic to create rift; therefore, Congress forcefully opposed in favor of national unity. Gradually Wolpert's stance comes close to Indian stance and entirely runs counter to Muslim Nationalists' discourse. Critical analysis draws same pictures of Gandhi and Jinnah in Indian and American discourse. Muslim Nationalists portray Gandhi as an insane, reactionary and diplomat whose main objective had been to relegate Muslims to a perpetual minority.

Pakistani nationalists even defend Jinnah's loyalty to British government and describe the sway of Congress to Japan as a diplomatic technique to exploit the tense situation. Wolpert paints Gandhi as true and sincere nationalist who was always in requesting mood. Although he himself started "*Quit India*" Movement (*Karega ya Marega*), yet he desired to see viceroy. But viceroy, Linlithgow, had no interest in political communication with Gandhi. Gandhi with his working committee had been arrested. Amery and Linlithgow had political apprehensions about Gandhi's untimely arrest. They feared that it would strengthen his position. Gandhi's reactionary behavior is defended because he had lost faith in British because of their imperialistic policies. Jinnah criticized Gandhi's revolutionary decision as "*irresponsibly provocative madness*." He labeled his threat of big move as a political propaganda in order to pressurize British for desired decisions. When Rajagopalachari decided for all parties meeting to discuss the confinement of Gandhi and other Congress leaders, except Jinnah many important leaders participated in the meeting. He avoided it and said that it was "*a personal Hindu mater*". The contrastive pictures of Jinnah and Gandhi express

positive and negative coloring by Wolpert. Gandhi appears to be a stern nationalist whose reaction is being justified while Jinnah appears to be an opportunist. The secret talk between Linlithgow and Eden is also ideologically embedded in this context to authenticate Wolpert's portrayal of Jinnah and Gandhi. Both of them discussed secretly that decline of Congress and untimely death of Sikander Mirza (Punjab Muslim Premier) enhanced luster of Jinnah's leadership and he became confident of this political vacuum of leadership as it was an opportunity to materialize his political aims.²⁹

In the initial chapters Jinnah is described as an opportunist whose loyalty to the British government had been to gain concessions for "*his minority*". The pendulum of his loyalty kept on oscillating between British and Congress. Wolpert's conception of Muslim League comes very close to Devji who also labeled the policy of League as a number game. Experientially Wolpert focuses the imperialistic policy of British government as the cause of their early withdrawal. Even the title of the book exposes follies of imperialism; but on expressive level politically ambitious personality Jinnah of is stressed. The shift in his attitude from an ambassador of unity to the British loyalty and then of unconcern to the imprisonment and the torture of Gandhi and other leaders of Congress expresses his political objectives. As soon as he found the opportunity, suddenly declared his aims and the final decision for practical realization of his plans at any cost. According to Wolpert Mr. Jinnah was an Anglophile shining leader who initially joined Congress. When British diplomacy perceived the increasing fame of Gandhi and Jinnah; they encouraged Muslim feudal princes led by Agha Khan for the formation of a separate Muslim Party. The members of Tory Party: Sir John Simon, Lord Birkenhead, Winston Churchill and the Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin extended support to Muslim League. They thought that princely feudal were best counter to "*half naked Fakir*." Polar opposition of Muslim League to the Congress proved very helpful in 2nd world war. Muslim soldiers had been denied recruitment in British army since 1857 Sepoy Mutiny. They again got access to British army and played an important role in the war. "*Jinnah was wise enough to take full advantage of British favoritism*".³⁰

British Government's support for the formation of Muslim League was a political move to nullify Congress claim of being sole representative party of Indian nation. 1919 to 1939 bloody Hindu Muslim conflicts have been portrayed as a result of British policy. British government gradually intensified the differences between both the communities that it resulted in severe bloody conflicts Churchill could never afford to annoy Sikhs and Muslims during war time. Wolpert expresses that Jinnah and Gandhi both were barristers at London's Inn of Court and were disciples of the same political guru but "*regrettably*" were divided on the freedom of India. It was because of British diplomacy of weakening opposition so that they couldn't get united against the masters. Although Gandhi remained the same throughout the process but Jinnah as an opportunist got tilted to the British and played in the hands of British. Had he not changed the fate of India would have been different. Jinnah's appearance is ideologically highlighted to express religion as least important in his life. His background is also ideologically touched to exclude religion from his life. He belonged to a traditional Muslim family but his modern secular appearance did not match his family traditions. He was brilliant and genius just as Gokhail. He had command on western secular laws and parliamentary rules of governance. He could eloquently plead Indians case before British. On experiential level, Gandhi appears to be blunt, violent and die hard but on relational level is defended as his distrust and agitation represented the reaction by suppressed subjects against imperialism.

Again in Shimla Conference, the contrastive picture of Jinnah and Gandhi are given. Wavell tried his level best to convince Jinnah by referring to the united efforts of Muslims and Hindus in army and coalition for about 7 years in Punjab. He tried to convince Jinnah that the unity of India was very important for the peace of East and the world. Jinnah uncompromising attitude expresses his obstinacy that didn't allow him to perceive the future disastrous effects. He appears to be the main hurdle in the peaceful solution of Indian politics. Wavell tried desperately to convince Jinnah that divided India with serious internal problems would be just a menace to the peace of

the whole world; but Jinnah had been strict about his conviction that Pakistan was “*both necessary and desirable.*” Lord Wavell’s episode of emphasizing seriousness of united India expresses the division of India just a tragic event that threatened the peace and prosperity of entire Asia. So far as Jinnah is concerned, he had neither logical arguments nor alternative programs to justify his decision. It also expresses abstractness of Pakistan idea. The friendly nature of Jinnah is experientially commended; but his conviction about the separate state is expressed as hollow, illogical and emotional dream of an over ambitious politician. “*Crompton*” in his book “*Pakistan*” also highlights the geographical unity of India. He states facts about the nomenclature, geographical location and culture etc. to express the hollowness of demand for Pakistan. He says that the name subcontinent is derived from Indus that is the natural uniting geographical element of this area. Casey (the governor of Bengal) and Wavell had been fearful about the “*dangers of Pakistan*” Casey said that Jinnah and his Muslim followers had least thought about the financial concerns of “*Bifurcated Muslim State*”. Here Nehru’s conception of Jinnah’s “*hallucination*” of prosperity is ideologically justified. Casey said that demand for Pakistan had scarcely advanced beyond the “*political wishful thinking.*” He labeled it as as valuable “*bargaining counter.*” The figurative expression used for s Jinnah as “*riding his own tiger*” exposes his personal political objective of becoming president behind his demand for Pakistan.³¹

Wavell and Amery loved Indian Army and the Punjabi or frontier Muslim soldiers. Both of them agreed in secret conversation that Jinnah was more congenial and familiar “*Englishman*” who was getting old and would never commit himself. He would “*pose*” as an Islamic hero. His manners were very bad and unchangeable as in six hours he did not show flexibility. He had been “*continually entrapping into some concession*”. Wolpert says that Cripps found Jinnah “*a self-styled Indian*” and Azad “*extremely friendly*”. Jinnah strongly opposed Azad and he was infuriated by Azad’s “*shameful elevation*” to the presidency of Congress. Jinnah even did not shake hand with Azad; and criticized him openly as “*showcase Muslim*”. The inter textual context

before Wavell plan is ideologically set. The practical apprehensions about partition discussed by different people express Jinnah as emotional die hard who just cared about his own ambitions and completely ignored the retrospective and perspective aspects of partition. The comparative description of Jinnah and Azad also defame the image of Jinnah and prove Azad right. Jalal, *Devji*, *Cohen* and *Crompton* also consider that religion had been used as a sentimental appeal for the unification of a divided community united. Western and Indian discourses ideologically highlight the secular aspect of Jinnah's personality to exclude religion from the basis of Pakistan. His marriage with Parsee women, westernized education, eating habits and dressing are ideologically emphasized to prove the secular basis of Pakistan idealized by the westernized secular leader. Pakistani Nationalists emphasize religion as the sole inspiration for the creation of Pakistan. Jinnah insisted that he would select all the Muslim members. Wavell resisted that it was "*entirely unacceptable*". He also blamed that Jinnah intentions were "*to wreck the conference*". Wavell requested the provincial governors to suggest some course of action in case Muslim League "*declined to cooperate*". Many of the provincial governors opined that Wavell should form a council excluding Jinnah if he remained "*unreasonable*". According to Glancy Jinnah's desire was "*outrageously unreasonable*." He said that a Bengali Muslim Khawaja Nazimudin had anticipated the failure of conference as Jinnah would never agree. Jinnah even didn't send the list of members. Through Wavell's secret report Jinnah is constructed as all authoritative and die hard whose obstinacy caused the failure of Shimla conference. Congress also considered Jinnah responsible for the failure of conference. Wavell said Jinnah was: "*A very clever advocate from Bombay, a very bad Muslim as far as religion goes on but a man of considerable courage and quite incorruptible*".³²

Wolpert commends the political caliber of Jinnah as a daring and shrewd politician but ideologically excludes Islam from the basis of his demand. Jinnah is expressed as a rigid and arrogant person who even stopped Liaquat Ali Khan from meeting Wavell. Congress was apprehensive about parity

proposal. Wavell said it was the only “*expedient way*” to convince and get him into the government for interim period. Here Wolpert tries to prove that being minority Muslims didn’t deserve parity and it was just an effort to convince Jinnah for interim period. Pethick Lawrence, the Secretary of State for India, ensured Congress that Parity Proposal had been a political necessity only during period of tension. Pakistani Nationalists’ stance of Muslims’ success is nullified as it is expressed just a need based political strategy. Wolpert says that initially Jinnah resisted Cabinet Mission Plan but when he heard about parity proposal he got ready. Patel was also sure that Jinnah would try to break India. According to Wavell Jinnah had been straightforward, resolute, politically sharp and sincere who had the knowledge of British parliamentary system. According to Wolpert He was a commendable politician but his demand was more than he deserved that was disastrous for the unity of India.

Gandhi also feared that Pakistan being based upon abstract idea would get entangled in internal and external threats. Therefore, he had been trying to maintain the geographical integrity of India for its future security. He feared that Muslims’ demand for separate state would set precedent for all other minorities and consequently it would lead towards the complete disintegration of India. British government had been strategically pursuing the policy of dividing Indian community to strengthen its control. Gandhi knew it and stressed the importance of a strong unitary form of government for the freedom and stability of India. On experiential level, Jinnah and Gandhi; both appear to be rigid but on expressive level, Gandhi’s rigidity is justified as true and seasoned nationalists resisting for the security of India. A humanist who had been worried about the impending tragedy of masses and a sincere leader who had been concerned about the future of India. The overall picture of Gandhi expresses him the hero of this tragedy and Jinnah appears to be a British stooge and a villain whose selfish political ambitions caused Indian tragedy. Jinnah’s plan to seek the support of minorities against Congress was a diplomatic move to raise the impression of League as a national party and to create division in Hindu community. Wolpert emphasizes Jinnah’s

mysterious character, his maneuvering for the numerical strength to give check to Congress.

Jinnah's recourse to direct Action is constructed entirely different from Gandhi's Satyagrah movement. Wolpert considers that the tragedy of Muslims was due to "*folly and bad leadership*". Muslims atrocities in Naukhaili incidents are ideologically discussed to highlight their practical incompatibility with their demand. "*Non-Muslims with some justice*" regarded Muslims not less than animals. Immediate fighting was expected in the very first session of League because of their internal differences. Burnings, abductions, raps, and forcible conversion of Hindu women Naukhaili district of East Bengal expose the practical failure of Muslims and the hollowness of Jinnah's Islamic ideology.³³ It seems ironical as all this was being done in the name of religion. It also justifies Hindus' reaction. Gandhi had been forced to leave his ashram and started pilgrimage of peace on foot. Humanism and peace that were to be expressed by a nation who upheld Islamic ideology were being stressed by Gandhi. It is an ironical expression of Islamic ideology and proves religion was just a sentimental appeal to get the support of "*illiterate highly excitable masses*". Gandhi is pictured as "*countering unleashed terror*" with the "*healing power of love*".³⁴ Pethick Lawrence felt for the "*bestiality of attacks on Muslims*" but he also justified it as "*undoubtedly the retaliation of the "wrong direct action policy."*" Wolpert thinks Muslims, as a minority, lacked strengths and prestige and used Islam for numerical strength and prestige of a minority. Islam had been used to "*inflame*" ignorant and emotional followers. Idea of Pakistan had been presented as new "*prophet's paradise*". Wolpert again reflects *Devji* who considered Muslims' movement as a "*number game*" for political strength. The contesting linguistic schemes, top secret talks of officials, declarative sentences etc. are the discursive techniques to carry on ideology implicitly behind the description. Where ever he uses negative linguistic choices for Gandhi, he defends it as hatred of masters against reactionary subjects. On the contrary, the negative linguistic scheme remains the same when he himself describes Jinnah or presents him through the conversations of British officials. Thus the negative picture of

Jinnah is authenticated through the top secret discussions of British officials. The modality level rises when he describes Jinnah's follies. The setting of successive events and the framing adjustments express ideological objective of ridiculing Jinnah as the leader of a minority while defending Gandhi as a nationalist. The defense of Gandhi is also ideological requirement of Wolpert as per Americans ideological similarity with Gandhi.

Conclusion

A comparative approach to the constitution of both the prominent leaders expresses them foil characters throughout the book. Gradually during the interpretive process Gandhi appears as strong national hero who remained from beginning till the end the great well-wisher of Indian community and national unity. Not a single fluctuation or turn is seen in his mood; while Jinnah kept on changing as per his objectives. An ambassador of Muslim Hindu unity and a nationalist is gradually changed into an enemy of Congress. In the concluding chapters he appears to be a politically ambitious person rather obsessed personality. A diehard ready to sacrifice the unity of India for his selfish objectives. Who had been following a plan without any blue print; therefore, he is painted as responsible for the resulting bloody human tragedy. He has been firm in his demand for separate state without any practical substitute. His over ambitious nature has blinded him of the bloody results of his abstract ideology. Since the beginning he has been portrayed as endeavoring for the political career. He had also wished to become the viceroy of India but as he perceived that he his dream could not be materialized, he compromised for the League presidency and started dreaming about the headship of a separate state. When he saw that the time had reached for the practical realization of his dream; he became hard and turned blind to the bloody effects of partition and the integrity of entire South East Asia. In the end everyone is seen busy in convincing him about the disastrous effects of his demand; but he couldn't be staggered from his cherished aim. His selfish refusal is termed as "*immoral*". Wolpert paints Jinnah's character through the conversations of other characters as a discursive technique to assert his stance about Jinnah. Jinnah seems to be a

secular westernized personality with legal knowledge. A clever Politian who knew well how to please his masters. When he had gained enough force, became diehard to snatch a state for his minority. He had been decisive to wrest a state for "*his Muslim League*" irrespective of his physical weakness and impending death. Had he expressed bit flexibility, federation could have been achieved. In his first speech, right after the inception of Pakistan, he says that everyone would enjoy rights in Pakistan without any discrimination of their cultural and religious differences. It exposes the abstractness of Islamic conception and stresses the secular nature of Pakistan.

Gandhi's objective of Indian integrity appears to be "*antitheses*" to Jinnah's objective. Gandhi's all apprehensions about the aftermaths of partition proved right. Gandhi being nationalist had even warned Patel and Nehru against their political aims that could affect Indian safety. Both were old enough, having serious health problems and both were inflexible but one appears to be a determined nationalist desperately struggling for the integrity of India; while the other appears an obstinate person thinking of his selfish political objectives. Amery compares their ages to justify their inflexibility, but implicitly one is defended as a resolute nationalist and the other is criticized as obstinate. Experientially, Gandhi is the most hated Indian leader throughout the book. Churchill despised him intensely for his opposition to his policies Wolpert's implicit ideological stance defends Gandhi as a true nationalist and raises him as the hero of the partition event. Gandhi was very realist who rightly understood British diplomacy at the back of every political development. Jinnah being ambitious didn't see through British plans. Terminology used by British officials enforce Wolpert's personal ideological conception Jinnah, while negative terms used by British officials for Gandhi express British grudge for a nationalist who always reacted to their policies. Jinnah and Gandhi are painted as foil character. As per the Orientalist tradition Jinnah, being the leader of a minority, is ridiculed for his political aims and abstract religious ideology; while Gandhi is defended because of the ideological similarity with Americans. Fairclough model of CDA proved helpful to foreground the orientalist ideology behind "Shameful Flight" In

Pakistan CDA of Orientalist Discourse is direly required to counter attack the discursive assaults on the basic Ideology of Pakistan.

References

- ¹ Rudyard Kipling, *An Old Indian Imperialist* "1865-1936
- ² Said, Edward W, *Orientalism*. (New York: Vintage Books, 1998)
- ³ McLeod, John, *An Introduction to Councelling* (UK: Open University Press, 2003)
- ⁴ Aziz, Kursheed Kamal, *The Making of Pakistan: A Study in Nationalism* (Lahore: Sange-e- Meel Publications,1966).
- ⁵ Aziz, Kursheed Kamal, *The Making of Pakistan: A Study in Nationalism* (Lahore: Sange-e- Meel Publications,1966).
- ⁶ Aziz, Kursheed Kamal, *The Making of Pakistan: A Study in Nationalism* (Lahore: Sange-e- Meel Publications,1966).
- ⁷ Aziz, Kursheed Kamal, *The Making of Pakistan: A Study in Nationalism* (Lahore: Sange-e- Meel Publications,1966).
- ⁸ Qureshi, Ishtiaq Hussain. *The struggle for Pakistan*. Karachi: Karachi University Press.1969
- ⁹ Qureshi, Ishtiaq Hussain. *The struggle for Pakistan*. (Karachi: Karachi University Press.1969), 165.
- ¹⁰ Qureshi, Ishtiaq Hussain. *The struggle for Pakistan*. (Karachi: Karachi University Press.1969), 113.
- ¹¹ Qureshi, Ishtiaq Hussain. *The struggle for Pakistan*. (Karachi: Karachi University Press.1969), 170.
- ¹² Qureshi, Ishtiaq Hussain. *The struggle for Pakistan*. (Karachi: Karachi University Press.1969), 77.
- ¹³ Qureshi, Ishtiaq Hussain. *The struggle for Pakistan*. (Karachi: Karachi University Press.1969), 139.
- ¹⁴ Riaz, Syed Hasan. *Pakistan was Inevitable*. (Karachi: Karachi University Press.1987), 226-247.
- ¹⁵ Jalal, Ayesha. *The Struggle for Pakistan: Muslim homeland and global politics*. London: Howard Press.2014
- ¹⁶ Jalal, Ayesha. *The Struggle for Pakistan: Muslim homeland and global politics*. London: Howard Press.2014
- ¹⁷ Devji, Faisal. *Muslim Zion: Pakistan as a political idea* (Massachusetts: Howard University Press.2013), 31.
- ¹⁸ Devji, Faisal. *Muslim Zion: Pakistan as a political idea* (Massachusetts: Howard University Press.2013), 173.
- ¹⁹ Cohen, Stephen. *The Idea of Pakistan* (Washington D.C: Brooking Institute Press.2004), 29-30.
- ²⁰ Cohen, Stephen. *The idea of Pakistan* (Washington D.C: Brooking Institute Press.2004), 44.
- ²¹ Cohen, Stephen. *The idea of Pakistan* (Washington D.C: Brooking Institute Press.2004), 28.
- ²² Crompton, Samuel Willard, Charles F.Gritzner , *Pakistan* (Charles House Publishers.2006), 28.
- ²³ Wolpert, Stanely. *Jinnah of Pakistan*. New York: Oxford University Press.1984

- ²⁴ Collins, Larry, Dominique Lapierre, *Freedom at Midnight*. US: Simon & Schuster. 1975
- ²⁵ Wolpert, Stanely. *Jinnah of Pakistan*. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1984), 9.
- ²⁶ Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. UK: Longman Group. 1998
- ²⁷ Blommaert, Jan. *Discourse: Key Topics in Sociolinguistic*. Cambridge University Press. 2005
- ²⁸ Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. SAGE Publications, 2001.
- ²⁹ Wolpert, Stanely. *Jinnah of Pakistan* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1984), 57.
- ³⁰ Wolpert, Stanely. *Jinnah of Pakistan* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1984), 8.
- ³¹ Wolpert, Stanely. *Jinnah of Pakistan* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1984), 76.
- ³² Wolpert, Stanely. *Jinnah of Pakistan* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1984), 86.
- ³³ Wolpert, Stanely. *Jinnah of Pakistan* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1984), 123.
- ³⁴ Wolpert, Stanely. *Jinnah of Pakistan* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1984), 124.