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Frontier Discord between Afghanistan and Pakistan

BY

AHMAD ALI KOHZAD

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF FOREIGN PUBLICATION DIVISION OF THE AFGHANISTAN REVIEW

PRESS DEPARTMENT
Sir George Cunningham, an Englishman, who after the partition of India did not quit his post, but tried rather to continue his country’s age-old policy in India, forming a kind of Anglo-Pakistani Government on Frontier territory, has written an article in furtherance of his opinions. Entitled “Frontier Discord: Pakistan and Afghanistan”, it appeared in the Manchester Guardian of February second last. We will now proceed on comment on this article.

In the first place, I personally am of the opinion that the problem of discord on the frontier between Afghanistan and Pakistan, which Sir George Cunningham has taken for his title, is a problem that British policy has itself created. For if the British in dividing the Indian sub-continent, out of which they have formed countries like Burma, Ceylon, India and Pakistan, had based their partition on solid foundations of truth and equity, the dispute over Kashmir between India and Pakistan, as well as the Frontier between Afghanistan and Pakistan, would never have arisen. It is self-evident that those who divided the Indian sub-continent, had they no interest in some day returning, might have made a division sanctioned both by justice and local conditions. There would have then been no discord,—neither internal nor external. And all the massacres and rancour might have been avoided.
But, unhappily, they had not a single good intention. Their immemorial policy had always been to draw plans in their own proper interest. Thus war was kindled between Kashmir and Pakistan, and two Islamic states were separated, Afghanistan and Pakistan. Three years have now elapsed since the Indian sub-continent was divided, but in spite of that the situation in this part of Asia has remained unaltered. The problem has indeed assumed a form that is complex and insoluble. Nevertheless an English politician, who is cognizant of the true state of affairs, instead of asking from his own countrymen their reason for sowing bitter dissension, takes pen in hand and writes an article.

2. CONGRESS POLICY TOWARDS THE FRONTIER

The topic with which Sir George Cunningham begins his article, as announced in our sub-title, is that of the Congress policy on the Frontier, whose influence, according to the English writer, has perturbed the Government of Afghanistan. This is a subject that concerned the Frontier even before the partition of India, going back to the opening days of the First World War, when the Imperialists adopted their policy of Divide and Rule. By means of this policy they have always divided the peoples of India, so that the spirit of division grows ever deeper, and, until the appropriate time, on one hand the Afghan and Muslim frontier is stirred up on the basis of Islam and nationalism against Afghanistan, and on the other hand, the Muslims of India are excitated from the standpoint of religion against the Muslims of the Frontier.

So the Imperialists who have pushed the Congress Party towards the Frontier, and the Frontier towards the Congress Party. Not only have they shoved Congress from the Ganges basin and the very heart of India towards the Frontier, but they have also
stirred up enmity between Hindu and Muslim, as well as strife between the Muslim League and Congress. Afghanistan, as we will explain below, had no fear at all of Congress policy at the time to which Sir George alludes, but, on the contrary, the imperialistic Britannic state was so afraid that the Frontier and other Muslim regions might join Afghanistan, that they themselves turned the thoughts of Congress towards this region.

That brand of Pan-Islamism which today the Imperialists peddle from Karachi did not exist in former times. That which they now parade under the name of Islam in the neighborhood of Afghanistan, an Islamic country, they formerly worked against, and with the tendencies of Congress policy, set off one against the other.

This policy of the Imperialists had influence even in the Indian Parliament, weighing in balance the Congress Party against the Muslim League. And at the same time they pretended to weaken the Muslim League against the Hindus while really strengthening it.

In my opinion the sole reason why the Frontier chiefs collaborated with the Congress Party was that if one day India were to be divided, in furtherance of British policy, into two parts, Hindu and Musulman, then the Frontier province might assume its own distinct personality in a country at the same time Muslim and Pushtu (Pushtunistan). For even a child knows that the political opinions of the Frontier had no ties at all with the Congress Party. The Pushtu chiefs are devout Muslims, and solely on the ground of politics have they withdrawn from the Muslim League, in order that by so doing they might win the freedom of their country. It is for this love of liberty that they languish now in Pakistan jails. The imperialist policy of Downing Street and the Vice-regal Mansion tried with the infiltration of Congress ideas to separate the
Frontier from Afghanistan. But as the injection of these ideas served only to strengthen the freedom-loving chieftains of the Frontier between the two Muslim states, Afghanistan and Pakistan, the imperialists then attempted to destroy the nascent Frontier state with the weapon of Pan-Islamism.

3. THE CREATION OF PAKISTAN

After these opening statements, on which we have commented, Sir George Cunningham touches upon the question of Pakistan's formation. He says:

"These particular anxieties were removed by the creation of Pakistan. There were other reasons of wider importance for anticipating friendship between the two Moslem states. A chain of Moslem countries from the Hindu Kush to Lahore, from Kashmir to Turkey, would become a solid barrier to the advance of Russian arms and Russian ideas from Central Asia, a barrier not so much of armed force as of the mobilized moral strength of the Islamic religion and Islamic way of life."

This from the mouth of an English diplomat, the Anglo-Pakistani Governor of the Frontier Province, illustrates in a striking manner the real reason for Pakistan's creation and the true intent behind his manifestation of friendship towards Islam: We hope the representatives of the Islamic countries, who, several days ago, met together at the Conference of the Islamic World in Karachi, and also His Excellency, the Grand Mufti of Palestine, one of the truly great personalities of the Muslim world, whose arrival in Kabul has so honored us, will hear of this unequivocal statement. The imperialists would like a vast portion of the Islamic world in the Mid-
dle East, from Kashmir to Turkey, to gird itself for the field of battle,—and this without weapons! I ask why they should want it to fight with nothing more than moral force and religious faith? So that the great nation which Sir George is proud to call himself citizen, may maintain its prestige in the political sphere against its enemies? I pray the rulers at Karachi, Mr. Khaliq Azaman in particular, that for the setting up and strengthening of Sir George's defensive line and barrier, they canvas the whole Muslim world; and I pray him to listen attentively to the orders of the governor of his suzerain state so that he may well and faithfully carry out the orders of his master.

4. "FOR AFGHANS FREE ACCESS TO THE MARKETS OF PAKISTAN AND INDIA AND TO THE INDIAN OCEAN IS OF VITAL IMPORTANCE".

After Pakistan's formation Sir George waxes amiable and places our hand on the ocean. But surely access to, and opportunity within, the markets of neighboring countries, especially as regards transit from one country to another, is a problem of international law, having distinct rules; during peace it continues, and sometimes even war itself fails to paralyse communication, for commerce and trade between two countries is a bilateral exchange from which both benefit.

Here we do not complain of the pressure which the Pakistan Government has brought to bear upon the trade of Afghanistan, but we would like to remind Sir George that in the markets of the British dominion of Pakistan, Afghan merchants encounter grave difficulties.

It is true that "for Afghans free access to the Indian Ocean is of vital importance", as both you and your country have long well known.
But why then at the time when you held the power in your hands, or at the moment when you partitioned India, did you not give effect to this policy, so that Afghanistan and Pakistan today might enjoy the fruits of your wisdom, as well as those countries for whom you dreamed up obstacles to restrain from becoming puissant and strong?

5. ANNEXATION OF THE PUSHTUNS OF THE FRONTIER TO AFGHANISTAN.

Sir George Cunningham asserts:

"The Afghans claim that the Pathan frontier tribes which Pakistan inherited from British rule should be, and desire to be, Afghan subjects. They appeal to history. But history shows that by 1820 the Afghan rulers had lost for good the authority they once held over those parts, to be succeeded first by the Sikhs and then by the British.

We must say at once that Afghanistan has not demanded the incorporation of the Pushtuns into Afghanistan. During the four years that have elapsed since 1947 until today, Afghan representatives abroad, magazines, press, radio and competent authorities alike, have unremittingly clarified this question: But Afghanistan's enemies seeking deviously to deprecate her real purpose, that is the liberation of Pushtunistan, clothed truth in another and sinister form. But let us suppose that, according to the desires of the Frontier Pushtuns, and as Sir George Cunningham avers, Afghanistan contemplates their annexation. One must ask if the ardent desire of a people to fulfil their destiny is a contravention of international law? Has not the UNO itself proposed a plebiscite for the people of Kashmir? And has not Pakistan espoused that proposal? Thus
in spite of the fact that Afghanistan has not demanded the incorporation of the Pushtun Frontier tribes, yet if Sir George, ex-Governor of the Frontier, should still attribute this design to her, would it be a breach of the Law of Nations?

When Sir George asserts that Afghanistan’s hegemony over the Frontier had come to an end by 1820, and that then the Sikhs and subsequently the British seized it, he is quite correct. The ex-Governor of the Frontier has thus by his own words confirmed the fact that Afghan influence up to 1820 was predominant on the Frontier. Is not Sir George—for members of his family are historians and have written books on Afghanistan and India—also aware that Ranjit Singh, Saheb Singh, Ghulab Singh, Mahabat Singh, and their ancestors, until the time of Zaman Shah, were under the vassalage of the Afghan state of the Sadozai? And does he not know that Ranjit Singh was appointed by that Afghan King to the governorship of the Punjab? Is he aware that the Sikhs, with the help and excitation of the British, violated Afghan territory? Does he not know that under a trilateral agreement, Anglo-Sikh-Shuja, the British themselves, with the Sikhs in collaboration, but working for the benefit of the British, by means of political trickery, the object of which was aggression upon the Afghan land, abducted the loyal Government of Amir Dost Muhammad Khan? True, the Sikhs took Peshawar and Dera Ghazi Khan, but it was the British who shoved them forward. This very same policy of fomenting discord and provocation, destruction and occupation, assumes every day a different guise, and even yet has not disappeared in this unhappy portion of the East, where today in the name of Pakistan and under the cloak of Islam it deprives seven million Frontier Pushtuns of their liberty.
6. THE FIRST FORTY YEARS

His Excellency, Sir George Cunningham, states:

"For the first forty years of British rule, the boundary with Afghanistan was not defined, and Afghan control extended into some areas which they subsequently lost.

Does not the phrase "in some areas" contradict what he has said above? Is it not an affirmation that, during the first forty years of British rule in India, the Afghans retained their influence over a part of the frontier? This proves that not solely in the Sikh period, but also when the British ruled in India, Afghan influence was exercised over the frontier. Sir George also states that during the first forty years of British domination over India, the frontier between India and Afghanistan was not clearly demarcated: in other words they have tried for forty years to delimit a frontier.

7. THE DURAND LINE

"But the Durand agreement of 1893 laid down the Indo-Afghan frontier from end to end; it was reaffirmed in 1919 and stood unchallenged until the close of British rule in India.

It is true that this accord, wrung by force from Afghanistan, was signed in 1893 between Sir Mortimer Durand and Amir Abdur Rahman Khan. But Amir Abdur Rahman Khan did not wish to sign such an agreement, and, fortunately, his autobiography is at hand. In the second volume of the English edition of Sultan Muhammad Khan, at pp. 157-8, the Amir declares as follows:

"As to these frontier tribes known by the name of Yaghtistan, if they were included in my dominions I should
be able to make them fight against any enemy of England and myself.... I will gradually make peaceful subjects and good friends of Great Britain. But if you should cut them out of my dominions, they will neither be of any use to you nor to me: you will always be engaged in fighting and troubles with them, and they will always go on plundering. In your cutting away from me these frontier tribes... you will make me weak, and my weakness is injurious to your Government.

During the conversations of the Durand Mission at Kabul both sides argued much. In these discussions the Amir politely implied that Yaghistan was a desolate region with few resources and people; accordingly why did they attach so much importance to it. But Durand at once seized upon this expression, saying: "Your Majesty admits that Yaghistan has few resources and inhabitants; therefore what good is it to you?" Abdur Rahman replied sententiously, "The name!" He meant that his honor, his power, and his country demanded that Yaghistan should not be split asunder from the nation. That single word reveals the feelings and heartfelt desire of the King of Afghanistan during the discussions with Mortimer Durand at Kabul, and we, with all the evidence in mind, call this agreement an agreement obtained by duress.

Sir George Cunningham goes on to state that this agreement "was reaffirmed in 1919" in plain disregard of the fact that in this year all prior Afghan British treaties were abrogated by Mr. Hamilton Grant, appointed by the British Government to negotiate a settlement.

Since in the Treaty of Rawalpindi, whereby peace was negotiated in August, after the War of Independence, between Afghanistan and Great Britain, the word "independence" was intentionally omit-
ted on the part of the British, Amir Amanullah wrote a letter to Mr. Grant, the British plenipotentiary for signing the treaty.

In his letter of reply Grant specifically confirms the independence of Afghanistan and, moreover, at the end, deems all the old treaties abrogated. The relevant parts of his letter read as follows:

"You asked me for some further assurance that the Peace Treaty which the British Government now offer contains nothing that interferes with the complete liberty of Afghanistan either in internal or external matters. My friend, if you read the Treaty carefully, you will see that there is no such interference with the liberty of Afghanistan. You have told me that the Afghan Government are unwilling to renew the arrangement whereby the late Amir agreed to follow unreservedly the advice of the British Government in regard to his external affairs. I have therefore pressed this matter and no mention of it is made in the Treaty. Therefore the said Treaty and this letter leave Afghanistan officially free and independent in its internal and external affairs. Moreover this war has cancelled all previous treaties.

This letter by virtue of which the British officially recognized the independence and freedom of Afghanistan, and considered cancelled all prior Anglo-Afghan treaties, and in particular the Durand Treaty, is it valid or not?

Is it conceivable that one part of the letter be valid and another not?

The Treaty of November twenty-second, 1921, between Afghanistan and Great Britain, at Article 11, has granted Afghanistan a species of right to express herself on the future of the inhabitants of the Frontier. Here follows the text of that article:
“The two High Contracting Parties having mutually satisfied themselves each regarding the goodwill of the other, and especially regarding their benevolent intentions towards the tribes residing close to their respective boundaries, hereby undertake each to inform the other in future of any military operation of major importance, which may appear necessary for the maintenance of order among the frontier tribes residing within their respective spheres, before the commencement of such operations.

Do not the British by virtue of this article recognize regions and spheres of influence for Afghanistan in the Frontier territory in 1921?

With the abolition of all old treaties in 1919, followed by the Treaty of 1921, could it be said that the Frontier zone was part of British India?

And after the disappearance of one of the High Contracting Powers to the Treaty of 1893, can it still be deemed of full force and validity?

All these documents combine to show the Durand Line is not really valid. Those who wish to challenge the Treaty can justifiably present their case to the World Court at the Hague.

8. TRIBES NOMINALLY INDEPENDENT

Sir George Cunningham comments on the “tribes (that is the Pushtu tribes of the Frontier) nominally independent”.

“Nominally independent” is an imperialistic expression employed with regard to peoples and tribes whom one wishes to deprive of their freedom. If that be not the meaning, why then does he,
add these tribes were "all linked with (the British) Government by treaties or unwritten agreements".

First, I do not know to what treaties he refers. Or is it that the import of treaties of friendship is the deprivation of independence of a people or tribe?

Against these unwritten treaties the reader will place a question mark, and will ask what they portend and what is the value of such a treaty? Such treaties, recorded only orally, in the view of Sir George Cunningham touch on several questions. What questions? "Denial of refuge to outlaws, protection of the roads", and so forth, for which the British in recompense paid subsidies to the Chiefs of the Tribes.

Such payments to tribal chiefs show that the inhabitants of Pushtunistan jealously preserved their independence. Did the British Government pay other chiefs in different parts of India? Can one consider a region to be under British domination where the law and the roads were maintained and preserved by means of allowances and gifts?

9. INTERNAL AFFAIRS

Lastly Sir George Cunningham avers:

"Each tribe managed its own internal affairs, punished its own malefactors and ran its own business under the authority of its JIRGA, or council of elders. They were free of law courts, police, taxation, and land revenue.

Thus the region which Sir George calls nominally independent did not pay taxes and was independent of police control. Law courts
there had no authority at all. It was by means of local Jirgas, or assemblies, that the people were punished or rewarded. That is the true form of local government in Pushtunistan, and shows these people in enjoyment of democratic usages that are the ancient tradition of their ancestors, and the PUSHTUN-WALLEI (the Pushtu law or custom), as well as the Islamic regulations which have fortified their flair for self-government. This spirit coupled with complete liberty should flourish to such an extent that one of the peoples instinct with humanity can take its rightful place among the nations.

10. POLITICAL AGENTS AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Sir George Cunningham says:

"Such control as was exerted by Government depended mainly on the personal influence of their political officers,...In some tribal areas officials could move freely and were welcome; from others they were politely but firmly excluded. Here and there a handful of malcontents would look to the smaller Afghan officials across the frontier for encouragement and financial help, but this practice was frowned on by the tribal leaders and was often disowned by the Central Government at Kabul.

These specious explanations by a responsible British Governor reveal the truth in such a crystal-clear fashion that there is no need to comment on it. It is evident that all tribal chiefs were not pleased to have the British intrude upon their own affairs. It goes without saying that the Government of Afghanistan did not deem it proper that the British Government should meddle in Frontier questions."
11. AFTER AUGUST FIFTEENTH, 1947

At this point Sir George Cunningham states:

"Such was the relationship between the tribes and Government which Pakistan inherited from the British on August 15, 1947.... Early in November the Jirgas (some of them two thousand strong) of every big tribe up and down the frontier gave me their solemn assurance, confirmed by written agreements, that they wished to remain part of Pakistan and to continue the same relations they had had with the British. They have not, so far as I am aware, changed their attitude in any way since then.

The word 'inherited' may perhaps have some meaning in the vocabulary of imperialism. Aside from that it has no meaning. Moreover, what oral affirmations and what written treaties have the Frontier regions granted to Pakistan? Only at the formation of Pakistan's creation were we informed of a plebiscite on the Frontier carried out under British military control, where the voters were secretly confronted with the choice of the Holy Koran or the Granth of the Sikhs. Even with all these subterfuges and precautions half the population of the Frontier did not vote.

If these be oral affirmations and written treaties then Sir George is really right.

12. PATHANISTAN OR PUSHTUNISTAN

"But ill-wishers were busy and laboured to revive the cry of 'Pathanistan', which had often been heard in the early months of 1947. That movement had been fostered by Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the old Congress Redshirt Leader, and aimed at creating a Pathan province independent of Pakistan and conceivably
though not necessarily to be linked with India, but certainly not to be an appendage of Kabul. Today that name has been changed to ‘Pukhtunistan’, a Pushtu word coined in the hope of making it more palatable to Pathans; for ‘Pathan’, curiously enough, is not Pushtu but an Indian word.

“The movement, too, has now a different meaning—no less than the absorption in Afghanistan of all Pathan of the North-West Frontier Province, or at least the Pathans of the tribal belt. This is alleged to conform with the wishes of the tribes themselves. But, unless they have completely changed their character, that is the very last thing they would wish.

In this long paragraph the one-time British Governor of the Frontier speaks from the viewpoint of the governor of an imperialist country. He does not like to contemplate a free Pathanistan or Pushtunistan, the ardent hope of Abdul Ghaffar Khan; but, as we have already said vis-a-vis Congress policy, he Sir George confirms the idea of forming a free Pushtun nation on the frontier, to be independent of Pakistan, adding, nevertheless, that Abdul Ghaffar Khan thought of attaching it to India. As I have already explained, the reason for the Frontier Leader’s attachment for Congress was to preserve the identity and freedom of the Pushtuns, to which in the framework of the ancient policy prevailing in India he could give no other form.

He wished through the friendship and aid of Congress to withdraw the Frontier from Pakistan and then to give it full freedom. It is for this reason that they have now put him in prison. Let us suppose, in accordance with the interpretation of Sir George Cunningham, that the word “Pathan” be of Indian origin. But what does it matter? This only proves that Pashdana, that is to say the Pushtuns, has penetrated as a proper name for the designation of its people.
even into the Indian language; but the word Pushtunistan is purely Pushtu, and better employed with regard to the people and nationalities of the Frontier.

13. CONCLUSION.

The end of Sir George's article comprises a number of different subjects such as follows:

"They (the Frontier tribes) were happy with the British connection; they are happy with the Pakistan connection. They have little in common with the Pathans of Afghanistan, and the alleged secession of individual tribes by the Durand line is with one exception a figment. If, in brief, it is true that in the days of British rule the tribes looked to Peshawar and not to Kabul for help and guidance, it is merely natural that they should continue to do so when Peshawar is the seat of a Moslem Government. Still stronger is the argument against the settled districts of the North-West Frontier Province being merged into Afghanistan, though they are also predominantly Pathans. These districts are now one of the most prosperous and progressive parts of Pakistan.

The reply to a part of this has been given above, while the other part does not merit a reply. The British writer has tried hard to hide the truth. In his last phrase the adjective "prosperous", which he attributes to the Frontier, is worthy of attention, because many enemies of Pushtunistan's liberty assert that the Frontier is desperately poor, and from the economic viewpoint cannot stand alone, and for this reason is not worthy of independence. Sir George calls it among the most Prosperous Pakistan's provinces. It is thus self-evident that this most pros-
perous province, upon achieving independence, can, from the economic point of view, stand alone.

14. THE PRESENT DISPUTE.

Sir George Cunningham considers tragic the present dispute between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and he regrets that the flame from that fire is fanned by yet other capitals. When he speaks of a tragedy we sympathize with him, but one should at once ask who created this tragedy, and why his own Government at the time when it reigned and could settle it, prepared the ground for this tragedy. And again why have they not tried to excorcise this tragedy? If, when dividing the Indian sub-continent, they had had sincere intentions, they might have easily constituted India, Pakistan, and Pushtunistan. Thus the difficult question of Kashmir would also have been settled, for a free Pushtunistan would have been found at the side of the two Muslim states, Afghanistan and Pakistan. Among the Islamic countries Pushtunistan would take its rightful place, and instead of the present dissension and discord in this corner of Asia, a durable peace, in accordance with the desires of the United Nations, would have been established.
Regarding the Views of Sir George Cunningham

by

Saidal Yusufzai

In these last few days we have read an article in the weekly Pakistan News by Sir George Cunningham, ex-Governor of the North West Frontier Province, bearing the title "Discord on the Frontier: Pakistan and Afghanistan". This article, first published in the Manchester Guardian for February second, was subsequently borrowed by the Weekly Pakistan News and presented as the opinion of a diplomat, "well-informed", "impartial" and "experienced" on the want of agreement between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Before we proceed to analyse the opinions of Sir George Cunningham, and give the lie to them, we would like briefly to summarize the biography of this diplomat, "well-informed", "impartial" and "experienced"—for the world, Sir George Cunningham is a product of that famous school, (the Indian Civil Servant), the sole academy of learning for the imperialistic period of Great Britain in the Orient. Indeed he graduated from that school. After having held various posts in the Second World War, he was appointed governor of the North-West Frontier Province.

Our readers know well that this post, over and above its intrinsic importance for an English governor, was most vital as regards the affairs and relations of the Free Tribes, and particularly at that time, to the Vice-Roy of India at Delhi and the Minister of Indian Affairs at London. Sir George was among the most zealous partisans of the
Pakistan Constitution and he played a very strong part in the plans for the division of the Indian sub-continent. Accordingly, notwithstanding that his post in 1945 had terminated and he had been recalled as governor, during the partition of the sub-continent, and at the moment of the referendum of 1947, the Vice-Roy of India recalled Sir Olaf Carpe and, for the time being, reappointed Sir George Cunningham. He was sent to the Frontier Province to handle the referendum and, according to his masters' desires placed on one side of the ballot boxes the Koran and on the other side the Granth, in this way obliging the devout pushtuns to vote for Pakistan.

But Sir Cunningham did not content himself with this. After having obliged the people to vote, and having executed a sort of mock referendum in buying and arranging manipulated votes, only fifty per cent of the population had cast their votes, while forty nine and one-half per cent, because of the illegal and prejudicial system, had stayed away. Nevertheless Sir George Cunningham declared the referendum in favor of Pakistan.

Immediately afterwards Sir George proclaimed martial law, as had been done in the imperialistic era, in the name of the Pakistan Government, and, by virtue of martial law, relegated to prison all the Pushtun liberals on the pretext that they had made speeches, published articles, and convoked assemblies. He likewise ordered the massacre of the population of Chahrsada, and liquidated the legal government of Doctor Khan Saheb, appointing instead Abdul Khayyum Kashmiri.

When he had chased the majority of dissidents from the Frontier Province, that is from controlled Pushtunistan, he departed on a tour of Free Pushtunistan, declaring everywhere people hired to hear him, that the Islamic Pakistani Government
was still dominated by Great Britain, and that consequently they would forever retain their titles and allowances. And in return for these vague assurances he demanded pledges of loyalty.

Later, when the Kashmir question arose, it was again His Excellency, Sir George Cunningham, who, in the Pedeaci (Government House) of Peshawar, drew up the plan for the occupation of Srinagar by the valiant men of the Afghan tribes. By means of gold and weapons he recruited not a few simple souls from the tribes and earmarked them for the attack on Kashmir. His plan was as follows: a squad of five thousand men would move secretly along the route between Abbotabad and Baramula in the direction of Srinagar while another small force at Pathankot would cut the line of advance of the Indian soldiers towards Kashmir. However, the meticulous plan of Sir George Cunningham, because of the want of ability and lack of discipline of the Pakistani officers and bureaucrats, was not carried out, and it was the Indian troops who arrived first at Srinagar.

It was Sir George Cunningham who, at the outbreak of war in Kashmir, compelled men from the tribes of Pushtunistan to participate in that war. But in spite of that the representatives of Pakistan at Lake Success announced that tribal participation in the Kashmir war was in violation of their wishes and beyond their control.

Moreover, in addition to all this, at the time when the Pakistan Government was drawing plans for the Mogalghai disaster (the wanton, unprovoked bombing of non-combatants in Afghan territory), it was again Sir George Cunningham who was competent governor of the Frontier. From what has been said, this nefarious design was also, at least in part, a master plan emanating...
ting from the brain of “experienced”. “impartial” Sir George Cunningham. Happily, this plan too, owing to the watchfulness of the Afghan people, came to nought.

After these terse explanations, can we not claim that Sir George is no stranger to us; and that we are well acquainted with his life work, his “experience”, and his “impartiality”? And we know with what purpose, and on what evidence, he has written his article on the topic of Pakistan:

(Persian Diptych)

“The charmer of snakes knows well the serpents, abode;
I recognize the natural fragrance of thy hair,
even though thou drench it in musk.

Now, after these preliminaries, we will proceed to analyse and give the lie to the words of Sir George Cunningham.

He speaks for instance of “the Afghan claim that the Pathan frontier tribes . . . should be, and desire to be, Afghan subjects”.

We fail to understand how Sir George, in the face of our official publications that for the last three years and a half have constantly reaffirmed the contrary, can really believe that Afghanistan wishes to annex the Frontier tribes. To the same effect are the declarations made by us to the Government of Great Britain, to the ex-Governor-General of India, as well as to the present Government of Pakistan at the very time that Sir George was governor of the Frontier Province. How can Sir George, with the repeated declarations of the Afghan Press, mirrored in the press of the world, still regard the claims of Afghanistan to be annexation? For the purpose of confusing and confounding public opinion he repeats the same words employed by Liaquat Ali Khan, Zafarullah Khan, and Abdul Kayyum Khan,
Does not all this clearly demonstrate that he speaks prejudicially?

Again Sir George states that "early in November (1947) the Jirgas (some of them two thousand strong) of every big tribe up and down the frontier gave me their solemn assurance, confirmed by written agreements, that they wished to remain part of Pakistan and to continue the same relations as they had had with the British."

It reply to this statement of Sir George, we wish to say only one thing, and that is assuming he has told the truth, can two thousand or so men, in receipt of subsidies, be taken as truly representative of three or four million people? And can such an assurance by a group of hired men be rightfully deemed a pledge of loyalty from all the Frontier peoples who, for a hundred years, have struggled against your red bayonets, and never have become enslaved? How can one deem such peoples loyal to the Pakistan Government?

Do you, Sir George, remember that at the time of your visit to the Afridi Jirga at Jamrud, at the very moment you spoke about the constitution of the Islamic government of Pakistan, and on the state of religious and worldly well-being, and urged collaboration with this Islamic government, do you recollect Malek Wali Muhammad Khan Kukikhel Afridi, and if so, how would you explain away what he said? If you have forgotten his answer, we will refresh your memory from the dispatch published at that time by the newspaper Anis. The Malek said: "The Khyber belongs to us, it is our Afridi land. We have never sold it to anyone, nor will we ever sell it. We will open it to those whom we want, and close it to those whom we do not. We refuse to recognize Pakistan and the promises we mad with you have disappeared. . . . . ."
After this statement you were compelled to lift the veil of expediency from the face of truth and you confessed that Pakistan was your own dominion, pursuing your policy. We ask you if this be loyalty? We leave it to you to judge.

Sir George implies that before the creation of Pakistan Afghanistan had said nothing about its own desires.

Concerning this we will lead you to dossiers in the Foreign Office at London, where we will invite you to read the unending stream of letters and political discussions of twenty-five years between the two countries, and especially the last declaration made before that of June 3, 1947, after the trip of Sir Stafford Cripps to India, between the Foreign Office and India. We counsel you to read them carefully.

More particularly we draw your attention to the response of your last Ambassador who had assured us that "the British Government would lend a friendly ear to our opinions and, at a propitious moment, study them attentively." But unhappily the diplomats of the Foreign Office did not keep this promise, like so many others, and up to the very day of the partition and independence of India, gave no inkling of that partition...

Sir George Cunningham, apropos of historic developments, writes:

"The tribes, nominally "independent", were all linked with Government by treaties or unwritten agreement; nearly all enjoyed allowances, in return for which they undertook certain obligations—for example, the denial of refuge to outlaws, maintainance of peace, protection of roads... many thousands of their young men enlisted in the Indian Army."
Without wishing to penetrate into the minute details of official and historic documents that confirm the freedom of the tribes, we will state categorically that the signing of such treaties does not denote the domination of a people. The ancient Swiss were valiant fighters who participated in the wars of other peoples, and in the protection of roads and other services demanding bravery, in return for money, but without being dominated by the people who hired them. If this be not so why does Sir George admit that in some tribal areas British "officials were politely but firmly excluded", and that "they (the tribal areas) were free of law courts, police taxation, and land revenue"?

Do not these explanations reveal the absolute freedom of the tribes?

Again Sir George Cunningham asserts that the tribes "were happy with the British connection; they are happy with the Pakistan connection." Will your Excellency permit me to ask you (in the event that the tribes were happy and content under British domination), why then all those bombardments which, according to you, lasted forty years, but which in reality lasted from your coming till your going; and why the economic blockades and crushing fines levied on the inhabitants? And if the tribes are really happy with Pakistan and, as Liaqat Ali Khan asserts, "loyal to Pakistan", what sense do the battles, arrests, bombardments, economic blockades, migrations and national assemblies make?

Does tribal happiness and felicity under British domination mean the misery, ignorance, and exile which during one whole century of your dominion became more and more harsh? If you regard the Mohmand and Afridi wars of 1930-33, and the Waziristan war of 1936-39, signs of tribal contentment with the British Government,
then you have cause to assert that the national movement of the Pushitun people of today, the creation of local councils, and the rising of the people against bombardments and the Pakistani Government, signs of "loyalty" on the part of the Afghans towards Pakistan.

His Excellency the Governor asserts that the wishes of Pushitunistan have their origin elsewhere, but after the explanations given above, it is superfluous to comment upon that. We will say to Sir George that for three years we have listened to this monotonous refrain from the mouths of his pupils, and that if he himself had not started it again, we would still know from what throat the voice issued, and to what music Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan and Zafarullah Khan dance.

Lastly we advise you Sir George Cunningham, to publish your articles anonymously in the future so that your life story and your important services, your prejudices and your animosity towards the Afghans, be not revealed through your name, to wound the hearts of the Afghan people, into whose blood, alas, your hands and those of your collaborators, have dipped.
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