

Pakistan Movement: The Political Contributions of Muhammad Zafarullah Khan

Tayyaba Qamer (Corresponding Author)

PhD Scholar at the Department of Pakistan Studies, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan

Email: tayyabaqamer39@gmail.com

Dr. Lubna Kanwal

Research Supervisor, Professor at the Department of Pakistan Studies, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan

Publication History:

Received: September 10, 2024

Revised: October 15, 2024

Accepted: October 27, 2024

Published Online: November 01, 2024

Keywords:

Muhammad Zafarullah Khan,
Pakistan,
Political Movement,
British Rule,
Indian Muslims,
Partition,

Research related to Academic Areas:

Pakistan Studies

Acknowledgment:

Author 01 wrote this paper while,
Author 02 supervised her.

Ethical Consideration:

This study has no aim to hurt any ideological or social segment but is purely based on academic purposes.

DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.14064929

Abstract

This study focuses on the political contributions of Muhammad Zafarullah Khan during the Pakistan movement by examining an analytical study of the politics of the British Raj and patronage. This period was ruled under an umbrella of the British Government where the deep strive of the Indian Muslims sought to establish a new nation-state that protected the political interest of the Indian Muslims. In the line of this argument, the vital struggle that he directed during the concluding phase of the partition drama would be explored. In the larger context, it would be discovered to find and critically evaluate the political contributions he played in stimulating the Pakistan Movement. He was a diplomat, politician, and jurist who contributed significantly to the cause of Pakistan's creation through various avenues as he advocated for the rights of Muslims in British India and articulated the demands of the Muslim Community, especially during the Round Table Conferences, presenting their case for a separate homeland as well as presenting the case for Pakistan before the Boundary Commission during the partition of British India in 1947. His legal expertise and eloquence were instrumental in shaping the vision for an independent Muslim state in the idea of Pakistan Resolution 1940, which eventually led to the establishment of Pakistan. As far as the literature on Muhammad Zafarullah Khan is concerned, very little work has been written on his personality as well as on his political role in the cause of Pakistan. This study is based on the analytical version and primary and secondary sources are part of the research. This study will explore how Muhammad Zafarullah Khan continued his political voyage and the storms he faced during this journey. The purpose of writing these memories and facts is to help Pakistanis better understand his unforgettable contributions to the Pakistan Movement. Most history books unfold the emergence of Pakistan with a somewhat blurred image of the political contributions of Muhammad Zafarullah Khan. This study attempts to underline his immense role in the struggle for Pakistan which was ignored in previous studies.

Introduction

Nations and states don't seem on the map of the world by chance but are erected by leaders from a diverse group of people who influence the rise or fall of nations in the global community. Similarly, there have been numerous people throughout the history of the Pakistan Movement who have helped and empowered Indian Muslims in various ways. Among these personalities, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was one of them who made political contributions in firming Indian Muslims and the establishment of Pakistan. He rose through the ranks of the British Empire in the Indian Sub-Continent, serving in numerous positions for Pakistan's cause. Though he faced a lot of hurdles but continued his struggle. He took a realistic approach carefully analyzing the basic realities of that time and proposed the Muslims be loyal to the British authorities as they had no choice but to make a lot of adjustments to the policy of reconciliation. He has helped humanity in numerous ways and has committed to infusing political temper and striving for the improvements of public welfare, liberty, and justice. He was a man with high spirits and moral courage; he continued to do what he believed to be right; to improve the conditions of Indian Muslims. He had a multilayered political contribution in India's independence struggle and strived hard for Pakistan's creation acting as a trustee of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah.

Early Public Career

Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was a Pakistani politician, diplomat, and international jurist, recognized mainly for his representation of the Muslims of the Indian Sub-Continent and Pakistan at the national and international forums. The son of the leading attorney of Sialkot was born in his native city in 1893. He received his early education from the American Mission High School Sialkot studied at Government College in Lahore for graduation and received his LL. B from King's College, London University in 1914. At that time, numerous politicians from the Indian Sub-Continent had begun their political exercises in foreign countries whereas at home Indian National Congress and All India Muslim League were playing a significant role in the legislative problems. As a student, he had continually advocated regarding the basic rights of Muslims in the Indian Sub-Continent and was opposed to Hindu rule over Muslims. He practiced law in Sialkot and Lahore respectively and spent more than 18 years i.e. from 1916-35 as a practicing lawyer at India's Lahore High Court (now Pakistan). In August 1916, he was given a position as an assistant editor at "The Indian Cases", the sole judicial periodical printed in Lahore. An overview of Muhammad Zafarullah Khan's life till this point uncovers the inclination he shared with several others towards favoring the Muslims of the Indian Sub-Continent.

Political Role during the Pakistan Movement

- **Montague Declaration (1917) and his Constitutional Struggle**

After Montague Declaration (which was to give India Dominion status), when Indian Secretary of State Edwin Montague came to Sub-Continent in 1917 to examine highlights of the future constitution of India with the different communities of Sub-Continent (Sharma, 2005, P.5), Muhammad Zafarullah Khan initially taken part within the Indian politics and headed the delegation of the Ahmadi community (Abid, 1997, P.51) and very bluntly conveyed predicaments of Indian people. He accounted following points in front of him:

- 1) English has appeared awful attitude towards their people.
- 2) Europeans have adopted a biased attitude toward their subjects in the realm of public activity such as court trials, train journeys, arms possession, etc.

3) Population expansion has resulted in socio-economic issues.

4) Technical education, like other areas of education, suffers from a shortage of resources. Articulation of these concerns showed he was not only representing the problems of his community but of the entire population like Sir Sayed, he ever talked of collective interest. It was the endeavors of Muhammad Zafarullah Khan by which the Sub-Continent was granted the Status of Dominion in 1919. (Khan, 1994, PP. 194-5)

- **Role in the Khilafat Movement and Self-Preservation**

Following the First World War, in 1919 Muslims of the Sub-Continent initiated the Khilafat movement in the headship of Maulana Shaukat Ali, Maulana Mohammad Ali Johar, and Abul Kalam Azad. This movement continued for the next five years up to 1924. Pivotal point of this movement was to safeguard Ottoman Khilafat and the holy places of Makkah and Medina (Tejani, 2008, P. 145). Muhammad Zafarullah Khan on the first hand favored the point of view that holy places ought to remain within the jurisdiction of Khilafat. But on the second hand, he severely questioned the sagacity of Ulema who issued the fatwa of migration towards poor Afghanistan (Minault, 1982, P. 106). He believed that Muslims should seek their strength for self-preservation in the form of political, social, economic, and cultural development. He considered that self-preservation is the most fundamental right that every human being has.

- **Unionist Party and his Political understanding**

In 1919, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan got the appointment as a lecturer at Lahore Law College with the support of Fazle Husain (Khan, 1983, P. 57). Fazle Husain was a close friend of Zafarullah's father. After leaving Congress in 1920 on the policy of non-cooperation and civil disobedience, Fazle Husain established the Unionist Party in 1924. He founded his party along with other local Punjabi elite leaders on a non-communal basis. Her agenda was the purely economic development of the rural areas of Punjab. On the other hand, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan through this lectureship got massive exposure to the legal circles of Lahore which gave him confidence and deep legal insight into affairs. In 1923 Muhammad Zafarullah Khan fought the election of the Central Legislative Council from the districts of Lahore, Gurdaspur, and Amritsar. Though he lost this election but experience gave him sufficient insight into dealing with ordinary masses and the principles of politics.

In 1926, he joined the Unionist party and became a close trustee of Fazle Husain. As he could understand British politics, therefore, he was elected as a member of the Punjab Legislative Council in 1926 (Khan, 1994, P. 232). As followers of Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan's political philosophy, both Fazle Husain and Muhammad Zafarullah Khan believed in cooperation with the British instead of Confrontation to get maximum benefits for the British Indian Muslims. They considered that Muslims could attain success by the policy of reconciliation with the British rather than adopting a harsh policy.

- **Delhi Proposal and Simon Commission**

In the Indian Act of 1919, it was promised after ten years Royal Commission would be formulated to assess the impact of reforms on Indian society (Morland and Chatar G, 1958, P. 481). Ten years had to be completed in 1929, but in 1927 political circles of the Sub-Continent began to sense the coming of some commission before time ended. For the people of the Sub-Continent, the coming of this commission was very crucial because this arrival could prove a great milestone towards drafting the constitution of India. So, serious efforts began to set in to break the impasse between

Muslims and Congress on the issue of a separate electorate, and on the other hand Unionist party of Punjab was looking to visit London to convey the Muslim point of view before rulers regarding issues of Sub-Continent.

In an attempt to break the deadlock between Hindus and Muslims, a meeting between Muhammad Ali Jinnah and Congress leadership was held in Delhi. During this meeting, Muhammad Ali withdrew his demand for a separate electorate and Congress leadership acceded to the rest of the demands of the League. At the end of this meeting, a proposal came out which was rejected by Muslim leaders such as Sir Muhammad Shafi, Dr. Iqbal, Abdul Qadir, etc. These leaders were not ready to accede to joint electorates. This proposal became famous with the name of the Delhi proposal in history. Muhammad Zafarullah Khan and his party were also staunch supporters of a separate electorate, so they also didn't stand with this proposal. He believed that Separate electorates gave the possibility for forming provincial and central councils that were representatives of Indian Muslims (Abid, 1992, PP.119-20).

When Muhammad Zafarullah Khan visited England after the selection by the Punjab Legislative Council as a representative who had to deliver a Muslim point of view before rulers, he advocated a separate electorate. In his meetups with eminent parliamentarians, he emphasized two points (Bitalvi, 1991, PP.20-21):

- 1) Weightage of provinces in the legislature where Muslims are in the minority.
- 2) Continuation of separate Electorate.

Simon Commission visited India under the headship of Sir John Simon in 1928 but was greeted with full hostility and protest (Agrawal, 2008, PP. 136-8) (Khaliquezaman, 1961, PP. 92-93). No member was chosen from India for this Commission. Later on, govt. tried to placate Indian people by announcing there would be two independent reports of central and provincial committees. In which leaders of India can share their recommendations. But this act of govt. was severely ridiculed and considered only an eyewash (Khan, 1983, P. 60).

On the other hand, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan along with his Unionist party was in favor of cooperation with the Simon Commission (Nur Ahmed, 1985, P. 77-78). Because he considered opposition would only serve the purpose of Hindus (Shahid, 2007, P.5). Muhammad Zafarullah Khan put forth his points that had to be presented before the Commission. Those points were:

- 1) In the future constitution, a Separate electorate should be included as a permanent provision.
- 2) Bengal and Punjab should be represented in a way that ensures they remain Muslim-majority areas.
- 3) The NWFP (Now KPK) should be separated into its province.
- 4) Sindh and Bombay should be split.
- 5) Religious freedom must be protected.
- 6) Language is the most important component which contributes to the development of nations. So, Muslims are allowed to learn the Urdu language.

Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was of the view that Muslims either raise armed revolt or accept the parliamentary Commission. The first thing is not possible so they ought to cooperate with the Commission and have their demands fulfilled (Abid,1992, P.129). At last provincial committee was formed and Muhammad Zafarullah Khan and Sir Sikandar Hayat were chosen as their Muslim delegates. When Simon Commission arrived, both welcomed it. The Punjab provincial committee submitted a report to the Commission in which recommendations were made for the future

constitution. Simon Commission went back in 1929 and published its report. According to Muhammad Zafarullah Khan first volume of the report was a great account of the historical perspective of the Sub-Continent but the second volume is utterly disappointing. Simon Commission's report was completely rejected by all shades of Indian life.

- **Constitutional Efforts in Round Table Conferences**

After the failure of the Simon Commission, the British government decided to hold talks in London to settle the issues in drafting the Indian constitution (Chande, 2003, PP. 43-44). This step of government was warmly welcomed by the All-India Muslim League as well as the Indian National Congress. The Unionist Party of Punjab also hailed this decision. Now the round of selecting the representatives from both communities had to be settled. Mr. Gandhi was selected as the sole representative from the side of Congress. Sir Fazle Husain, Governor General's Executive Council member, had considerable power over the government's decision to nominate Muslim representatives to the London Conference.

The Viceroy delegated authority to Hailey and Fazle Husain to resolve the issue of Muslim participation at the Round Table Conference. They proposed Shafaat Ahmad (Sir Shafi's son-in-law) and Muhammad Zafarullah Khan, as Muslim representatives from Punjab, although Sir Shafi's name was already on the government's list. The selection of 'these two' was stated to be required to fight the views of Jinnah's group at the conference (Abid, 1992, P.141). Just after the Round Table Conference nominees were announced, Punjab Governor Sir Geoffrey de Montmorency offered Muhammad Zafarullah Khan the position of Punjab Government Minister, but he chose to join the Round Table Conference to gather political wisdom and represent the Muslim voice for their legitimate rights in the Indian Sub-Continent (Khan, 1983, P.61). Delegates were invited to London to debate the provisions of the future constitution for India. Muhammad Zafarullah Khan had also arrived to protect the rights of Muslims there.

Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was the only representative except for Sir Aga Khan who attended all three Round Table Conferences. Owing to his junior status, in the first conference, he remained silent most of the time, but in the second and third he gave much input and showed he is also a man of wisdom. He was recommended by Fazle Husain so he followed his point of view in this conference like a Separate electorate to be reserved, clear margins for Punjabi and Bengali Muslims, the parting of Sind from Bombay, Provincial status of the N.W.F.P (now KPK) and occupied autonomy for all the provinces (Jalal, 1985, P.11).

Muhammad Zafarullah Khan met Sir Aga Khan and Mr. Jinnah for the first time at the Round Table Conference. The stature of both personalities left an impressive impression on his mind. Unfortunately, the first Conference ended without yielding significant results, and the Second Conference was held in September 1931. A deadlock was maintained on the inclusion of Mr. Ansari in this meeting. Mr. Gandhi refused to accede to the demand of a separate electorate without consulting Dr. Ansari (Nikhat, 2009, PP. 82-83). He wanted Mr. Ansari to be included in the conference as a Muslim representative but Muslim leaders have some reservations regarding him. They considered his presence as a Muslim representative would compromise certain Muslim interests.

During the meeting, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan interacted with Gandhi and posed some questions related to Dr. Ansari. Separate electorates were something that Muhammad Zafarullah Khan could not compromise. He was of the view that for the political safeguard of the Muslims, a system of a Separate electorate is necessary. The reason behind the demand for a separate

electorate was the political framework on the ground. Punjab's Muslim voters were just 40 percent; however, their populace was more than 50%. If a joint electorate is accepted, Hindus would catch all the seats of the Council. An astute man like Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was well aware of these political dynamics. So, he not only raised a question about Mr. Ansari's inclusion, but he also posed multiple questions to reveal the ill intentions of Mr. Gandhi in the shield of Mr. Ansari (Batalvi, 1991, PP. 33-35). The Second Round Table Conference also ended up failing to break the impasse. But the politics of India has taken a drastic change, especially of the Muslim League. Mr. Jinnah left India in 1932 after being disheartened by the behavior of Muslim leaders. On the other hand, after returning from the second Round Table Conference Mr. Gandhi got busy in party politics and was detained (Anjum, P. 780) (Sankar, 1993, P. 123).

The third Round Table Conference was held in November 1932 (Mahmood, 2002, P. 14). Following the Communal Award, the major priority ahead of the Conference was to resolve the issues at the previous sessions. Other debates have to take place about the procedures of election to the federal chambers, the government's planned financial safeguards, and other relevant topics (Morland and Chatar G, 1958, P. 485). In the absence of leaders like Mr. Jinnah, Sir Shafi, and Dr. Iqbal, the whole responsibility of Muslim exposition came on the shoulders of Sir Aga and Muhammad Zafarullah (Khan, 1983, P. 63).

During the Conference, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan took the initiative to defend and convey the image and demands of Indian Muslims. It was, without question, a critical juncture in the development of India's new constitution. Particular legal spirits, such as Muhammad Zafarullah Khan, were critical at the time in fighting for the rights of Indian Muslims in Round Table Conferences. It was this conference for which the Viceroy gave him the choice of representing the Indian Government before the Capitation Rates Tribunal or the Third Round Table Conference in London. He preferred to attend the Third Round Table Conference but the Commander-in-Chief (C-in-C) of the Armed forces preferred that he represent India at the Capitation Tribunal. The Viceroy was the one who sided with Muhammad Zafarullah Khan against the Commander-in-(C-in-C) Chief's wish at the time, and he insisted that Muhammad Zafarullah Khan be allowed to attend the Third Round Table Conference. Commander-in-Chief (C-in-C) at last acquiesced to the viceroy and Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was permitted to participate in the Round Table Conference.

- **Role as Muslim League's President**

On the return from the second Round Table Conference, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was offered the presidency of the Muslim League which he accepted in 1931. Noting his capabilities, Fazle Husain supported the idea of his presidency. But one thing he miscalculated, was that he belonged to the Ahmadi community. The consequences of this decision soon came in front. When Muhammad Zafarullah Khan tried to preside over the annual session of the Muslim League, a mob came out to stop him from chairing the session. At last, the session was shifted to Nawab Ali's house in Delhi. Though he belonged to the Ahmadi community, History is evident his religious identity was never a threat to Muslim interests. Soon afterward he was appointed as a member of the Executive Council of the Governor-General and he resigned from the presidency of the Muslim League (Batalvi, 1991, P. 38).

As President of the Muslim League, he advocated for Muslim unity, which had been fragmented into many schools of thought. He believed, there was no reason for the groups to function separately because they had the same objectives and desired outcomes.

- **Lahore Resolution 1940 and his Memorandum**

The Lahore Resolution, commonly known as the Pakistan Resolution was reportedly written on March 23rd, 1940 by Muhammad Zafarullah Khan while he was a member of the Executive Council of Viceroy (Jalal, 1995, P.184). Some people believe because he is a Qadiani, he cannot claim authorship (Wali Khan, 1984, P.40). However, Pervez Perwazi believes that as a council member, he cannot claim authorship. He would not have been nominated as the Viceroy's Executive Council member if his religious identification had been a problem (Perwazi, 2011, P. 33).

Regarding his claim of authorship, Khan Wali Khan quoted Lord Linlithgow's letter to the State Secretary. (Wali Khan, 1984, P.40). The passage quoted as:

- *"Upon my guidance, Zafarullah composed a memorandum regarding the matter: Two Dominion States. I have just sent it for your consideration. I have likewise approached him for additional explanation, which, he says, is expected. He is on edge, in any case, that nobody should discover that he has arranged this plan He has, notwithstanding, given me the option to do with it what I like, including sending a duplicate to you. Duplicates have been given to Jinnah, and, I think, to Sir Akbar Hydari. While he, Zafarullah, can't concede its authorship, his document has been set up for reception by the Muslim League with the end goal of giving it the fullest exposure".*

Moreover, points of the memorandum of Muhammad Zafarullah Khan also reinforce the claim of his authorship. The full memorandum can be accessed in Perwazi's book *"Sir Zafrulla's Contribution to the Freedom Movement-1926 to December 25, 1947"* (PP. 34-86) those points are as follows:

- *"Federal scheme as set out in the 1935 Act would have to be radically modified before it can afford even a basis of discussion so far as the Muslims are concerned."*
- *"Federation must be a federation of all the Indian peoples and that the people of India, whether British or State, must find representation in the federation."*

The memorandum says,

- *"We are told that this Constituent Assembly will represent all communities and interests in India, and will give satisfaction to all communities and interests in the country."*
- *"We fear that the problem of framing a constitution for India is not so simple as even some British statesmen appear to imagine...we, on the other hand, are convinced that from the Muslim point of view that the implications of the Viceroy's speech are such that the position could scarcely be worse and it, therefore, behooves the Muslims to take careful stock of the position and to make their attitude clear lest their case should go by default."*

Federation of North-Eastern included the current territories of Bengal and Assam, while the Federation of North-Western comprised the Sind, Punjab, Baluchistan, North-West Frontier

Province (now KPK), and the Frontier tribal areas.... The North-Eastern and North-Western Federations will be directly connected to the Crown, as will the Federation or Federations formed by remaining India. If Burma can be established as a distinct Dominion from India, there should be no inherent difficulties or impossibility in establishing the North-Western and North-Eastern Federations.

“The communal safeguard embodied in the 1935 constitution proved to be a dead letter.”

Language, religion, culture, and all other factors should be protected. By analyzing the points of the memorandum and comparing them to those in the Lahore Resolution, it was obvious that Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was the architect of the Lahore Resolution, although the things he wrote were not novel. The notion seems to have been influenced by Jinnah’s fourteen points (1929) as well as Iqbal’s Allahabad address (1930).

- **His Political Will and Resignation of Khizar Hayat**

After the failure of the Cabinet Mission (1946), the prime minister of England had no alternative but to proclaim the partition of India. When the prime minister of England pronounced the partition plan, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was a judge in India’s Federal Court and had separated himself from Indian political views (Wilcox and Embree, 2003, P.12), partition scheme bothered him considerably. Because in Punjab, Sir Khizar Hayat Khan was becoming a stumbling block for the Muslim League. (Khan, 1994. P.601). Jinnah tried very hard to persuade him to join the Muslim League, but he was indisposed and wanted to keep the Jinnah-Sikandar Pact of October 1937 in place (Batalvi, 1991, PP. 137-8).

Muhammad Zafarullah Khan was a long-time member of the Unionist Party and the Fazle Husain’s trustee; therefore, he knew Khizar Hayat Khan as his friend rather than a Unionist Party member. Muhammad Zafarullah Khan worked hard at the time to urge Khizar Hayat Khan to quit and permit the Muslim League to establish a government in the province of Punjab. On The persuasion of Muhammad Zafarullah Khan, Sir Khizar resigned at last. On this favor, Quaid thanked him very much (Shahid, 2007, P. 425).

- **Radcliffe Award, the Boundary Commission**

After the announcement of the 3 June plan, a Commission was set up under the headship of Sir Cyril Radcliffe to mark the boundary between both countries. Mr. Jinnah requested Muhammad Zafarullah Khan to plead the case of the Muslim League before the Commission (Zuberi,1984, P.45). Muhammad Zafarullah Khan with his full ability presented the case before the commission, but could not manage to win the district of Gurdaspur for Pakistan. On this, some people alleged him for surrendering Kashmir in return for Rabwah (Now Chenab Nagar) on the Pakistani side and called him an agent (Munir, 1981, P. 16). But actually, it was the partiality of Radcliffe which had made this all happen (Sundararajan, 2010, P. 81).

Muhammad Zafarullah Khan had to choose a unit to divide the majority of territories in this case. His choices were a district, Sub-district (*tehsil*), village, or a police station as a unit.

If a district is chosen as a unit, the whole district of Gurdaspur will become a part of Pakistan. If a village was to be regarded as a unit, it would have a zigzag borderline, which would not be preferred because the bulk of the population in the villages ended on one side and began on the other. Muhammad Zafarullah Khan utilized *tehsil* as a unit because the police station was too tiny. Sub-district was designated as a unit because it included the Ferozepur and Zira *tehsils* of Ferozepur; Jullundur and Nakodar *tehsils* of Hoshiarpur; the state of Kapurthala; the whole district

of Amritsar including *Tehsil* Ajnala; Shakargarh; Batala, and Gurdaspur *tehsils* of Gurdaspur district.

Keeping in view all these circumstances, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan opted for *Tehsil* as a unit. But a certain group of people alleged that he had made this decision to bring Ahmadi center Rabwah (Now Chenab Nagar) into Pakistan. He argued the Muslim League's case to the best of his ability, but his efforts were failed by Radcliff's prejudice, which was influenced by Mountbatten's demands.

Conclusion

From the foregoing discussion, we tend to conclude that Muhammad Zafarullah Khan played a very important political role in the struggle for Pakistan Movement. In the analysis, it was simmered out that he was mature enough to make their decisions regarding their political fate independently. He is well acquainted with the essence of the political dynamics working at the Indian Sub-Continent and he responds accordingly. It's additionally been determined that he played a very active role in mobilizing the legitimate rights of Indian Muslims through his constitutional and political struggle in the formative process. It was found that in any constitutional dialogue on communal issues such as the Separate Electorate and the weighting of Muslim representation, he has always stood out in the protection of Muslim rights. His political philosophy showed that he like Sir Syed Ahmed Khan forever talked regarding the collective interest of Muslims within the Indian Sub-Continent. His vision was that Muslims ought to pursue self-preservation via political, social, economic, and cultural growth. His political wisdom was to unite Muslims in the same plate form to achieve the same objectives.

It was pointed out in the analysis that his constitutional and legal battle for Pakistan legitimized his leadership by gaining a seat on the Viceroy's Executive Council due to his charisma. It demonstrates that he was aware of how to find out of any tough situation constitutionally. It also shows that his politics were not confused and he was much more straightforward and forthright in his political ideas. It was found that he encountered many issues that he skilfully resolved in favor of his people and soil, notwithstanding the views of his British colleagues on the Council. He was well-versed in strategizing his political course of action in light of the current events. He preferred collaboration with the British instead of conflict and he advocated the policy of reconciliation rather than adopting a harsh approach. Jinnah recommended that Muhammad Zafarullah Khan serve Pakistan by taking over the Foreign Ministry in the coming years because of his skill and Jinnah's expectations of him. He was a single member of Jinnah's cabinet with formal training in the field of international affairs, and due to his efforts, Pakistan might have been able to pursue the Foreign Policy of Jinnah in its initial years.

References

(1994) *Tahdeese Nemat (Urdu reprint)*. Lahore: Tariq Mahmood Panipati.

(1995) *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia: A Comparative and Historical Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Abid, Dr. S. Qalb-i-Abid, (1997) *Muslim Struggle for Independence from Sir Seed Ahmed Khan to Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah (1857-1947)*. Lahore: Sang-E-Meel Publications.

Abid, S. Qalb-i-Abid, (1992) *Muslim Politics in the Punjab 1921-47*. Lahore: Vanguard.

- Agrawal, (2008) M G. *Freedom Fighters of India*. Delhi: ISHA Books.
- Ahmad, Syed Nur. ed. Baxter, Craig. (1985) *From Martial Law to Martial Law: Politics in the Punjab, 1919-1958*. Lahore: Vanguard Books Pvt.
- Anjum, Zahid Husain. (N.D) *Encyclopedia Quaid-e-Azam*. Lahore: Maqbool Academy.
- Batalvi, (1991) A. H. ed. *The Forgotten Years: Memoirs of Muhammad Zafarullah Khan*. Lahore: Vanguard Books.
- Chande, Prakash. (2003) *India: Past and Present*. New Delhi: A.P.H.
- Ekbal, Nikhat. (2009) *Great Muslims of undivided India*. Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.
- Ghose, Sankar. (1993) *Jawaharlal Nehru: A Biography*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers.
- Jalal, Ayesha. (1985) *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Khaliquzzaman, Chaudhary. (1961) *Pathway to Pakistan*. Lahore: Longman.
- Khan, Muhammad Zafarullah. (1983) *Servant of God: A Personal Narrative*. Surrey: Unwin Brothers Ltd.
- Khan, Wali. (1984) *Facts are Facts: The Untold Story of India's Partition*. Trans. Syeda Saiyidain Hameed. Uttar Pradesh: Vikas Publishing House.
- Mahmood, Safdar. (2002) *Pakistan Political roots & Development 1947-1999*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Minault, Gail. (1982) *The Khilafat Movement: Religious Symbolism and Political Mobilization in India*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Moreland, W.H, and chatter jee, Atul Chandra (1958) *A Short History of India*. 4th edition London: Longman's greens and co.
- Munir Ahmed Munir, (1981) "Pakistan kay Pehly Wazir Kharja Sir Zafrulla Khan say Munir Ahmad Munir ka Interview" Published in *Atish Fishan (Urdu) Lahore*.
- Perwazi, Pervez. ed. (2011) *Sir Zafrulla's Contribution to the Freedom Movement-1926 to December 25, 1947*. Lahore: Nia Zamana Publications.
- Shahid, Dost Mohammad. (2007) *Taareekhe-Ahmadiyya, Vol. IX*. Qadian: Nazarat Nashro Ishaat.
- Sharma, Brij Kishore. (2005) *Introduction to the Constitution of India*. New Delhi: Pentice Hall Ltd.
- Sundararajan, Saroja. (2010) *Kashmir Crisis Unholy Anglo Pak Nexus*. Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.
- Tejani, Shabnum. (2008) *Indian Secularism: A Social and Intellectual History, 1890-1950*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Wilcox and Prof Embree. (2003) *Reminiscences of Sir Zafarullah Khan (Sir Zafarullah Khan Ki Yaddashtain translated into Urdu by Prof. Dr. Pervez Parwazi)*. Canada: Maple Ont.
- Zuberi, Masarrat Husain. (1984) *Voyage Through History, Vol. II*. Karachi: Hamdard Foundation Press.